

Contrastive Analysis of the English Future Perfect and Its Croatian Equivalents

Leskovar, Iva

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2020

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **University of Zagreb, University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:131:533767>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright / Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-04-23**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[ODRAZ - open repository of the University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences](#)



University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Department of English
English Language Section
Linguistics
Academic year: 2020/2021

Iva Leskovar

Contrastive Analysis of the English Future Perfect and Its Croatian Equivalents

Master's Thesis

Thesis Advisor:
Prof. Milena Žic Fuchs, PhD

2020

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. PRELIMINARY ASSUMPTIONS AND TERMINOLOGY	1
3. THE FUTURE PERFECT IN CROATIAN FICTION: A CORPUS RESEARCH ...	4
4. THE METHODOLOGY AND THE PARTICIPANTS.....	7
4.1. THE METHODOLOGY	7
4.2. THE PARTICIPANTS.....	8
5. THE RESULTS AND THE INTERPRETATION	9
5.1. SENTENCES 6), 7), 8), AND 10).....	9
5.1.1. <i>PERFEKT</i>	9
5.1.2. <i>FUTUR I</i>	10
5.1.3. Sentences 6) and 8).....	12
5.2. SENTENCES 11) AND 12)	12
5.3. SENTENCES 3) AND 14).....	14
5.3.1. THE COGNITIVE GRAMMAR PERSPECTIVE.....	14
5.3.1.1.....	14
5.3.1.2.....	15
5.3.2. THE CONSTRUCTION GRAMMAR PERSPECTIVE	17
6. CONCLUSION.....	23
ABSTRACT	25
REFERENCES	26
APPENDIX 1.....	27
APPENDIX 2.....	29
APPENDIX 3.....	32

1. INTRODUCTION

The main goal of this master's thesis is to investigate the English future perfect and how Croatian native speakers understand this tense. The Croatian language does not have a specific tense that would provide an exact equivalent to the future perfect, and for this reason it is expected that non-native speakers could have trouble with it. Another fact that might cause confusion in understanding is that the form the future perfect takes actually has two separate and homonymous meanings. The linguistic structure 'will + have + past participle' can have a future perfect meaning or a modal meaning. The main focus of this thesis will be the future perfect one, however, the modal meaning cannot be ignored and any analysis that even attempts to give a full insight into this subject must approach it from as many angles as possible.

The discussion of the future perfect in this thesis will start with some theoretical assumptions about the English tense system and the relationship between tense and time in English. The second part will show how often 'will have V' structure appears in language use and how is it being translated into Croatian. For this purpose a parallel corpus of English and Croatian will be used. The central part of the thesis is a research that was done in the form of a linguistic survey. The following chapters will be dedicated to the methodology and the participants and subsequently the results will be interpreted and discussed. For the survey, the participants (first and fifth year students of English) were asked to translate 16 sentences from English into Croatian; all the sentences along with the answers, grouped according to which Croatian tense was used in translation, can be seen in Appendix 3.

The questions this thesis aims to answer are, how do Croatian speakers understand and consequently translate 'will have V' structure; how do they perceive the future perfect; what causes confusion; and is there a specific use of this tense that would be profiled as prototypical.

2. PRELIMINARY ASSUMPTIONS AND TERMINOLOGY

In English, verbs are used to talk about, and conceive of, various situations. These situations can be events and states. But apart from carrying information about the type of the situation, verbs also carry grammatical information, expressed by

grammatical categories of tense, aspect and modality. These categories “specify notions of time and related concepts that apply to a situation” (Radden and Dirven 2007: 171).

At this point it is important to note that for the purpose of this master’s thesis, which deals with an English tense, time will be viewed as linear and thought of in terms of “space-time analogy: the TIMELINE” (Michaelis 2006: 1). The timeline is a straight line unbounded at both ends, and divided into three parts. In spatial terms, the present moment would be in the middle; the past would be located to the left, and the future to the right. It can be schematically represented as in Comrie (1985: 2):




Figure 1. Representation of time

Comrie (1985: 2-3) intentionally left the ends vague, leaving the boundedness of time open for discussion, though a philosophical one, since linguistically it is irrelevant. He also uses 0 (zero-point) to denote the present moment.

The timeline is used to locate times, but also, according to Michaelis, “times paired with events” (2006: 1). She also goes on to argue that, “While we can describe various relations among points on the timeline, only one type of relation counts as a tense relation: that which includes the time at which the linguistic act is occurring.” (Ibid.) However, not all tenses express the same relations, as Žic Fuchs writes:

“apsolutni sustavi glagolskih vremena organizirani su oko sadašnjeg trenutka kao deiktičkog središta, dok relativni sustavi vremena ne uključuju u svom značenju sadašnji trenutak kao deiktičko središte, već se odnose na vremenski okvir neke druge situacije zadane kontekstom.” (2009: 18)

In this sense, in an absolute tense, for instance the simple past tense, the deictic center is in the present moment or the moment of speaking¹, and the relation between it and the time of the situation is a direct one. On the other hand, in a relative tense, such as

¹ As Comrie notices “human language apparently still operates on the assumption that the temporal deictic center is the same for both speaker and hearer.” (1985: 16) The time of the utterance and the time of the message interpretation can differ, but the English tense system does not show this distinction, rather the deictic center is taken to be the one of the hearer.

the past perfect, the situation expressed by the verb is in fact anterior to another time (may or may not be paired with a situation) in the past. In other words, there are three points on the timeline.

This was observed by Hans Reichenbach, and further developed in his 'generative' theory of tense. Reichenbach (1947) was right in introducing a third point of interest, which he called the *point of reference* (R), and he proposed that tenses are, in fact, a relation between the *point of speech* (S) and the (R). This (R) can coincide with the *point of the event* (E) , resulting in absolute tenses, it can coincide with (S), or it can be a separate point on the timeline. (according to Declerck 1991: 224) Declerck (1991) also lists some objections made towards Reichenbach's system; in his words, "a major weakness of Reichenbach's system [is] that it generates more possibilities than are actually to be found in natural language." (225) So, for instance, the following configurations (dashes here represent an interval of time and commas represent simultaneity): S,R-E; S-R,E; S-R-E are expected to generate three separate tenses, which they do not and all three configurations are expressed using only one future tense. The same is true for the conditional tense and the future perfect. Nevertheless, a valuable point has been made with regard to relative tenses, and that is that they simply cannot be explained as a relation of two points on the timeline. Radden and Dirven in their *Cognitive English Grammar* (2007) also use this terminology. However, their understanding of (S), (E), and (R) is broader than that of Reichenbach. They define the speech time (S) "as the speaker's moment of speaking" (202) for which "the speech participants tacitly agree that this moment represents 'now'." (Ibid.) When they discuss (E) they call it the *event time* instead of *point of the event*, which is more felicitous because "The mental space surrounding a given situation is described as event space. Part of an event space is its time of occurrence, i.e. event time (E)." (Ibid.) The terms *event space* and *event time* allow for the possibility that the situation lasts longer than a moment designated by a *point*. Finally, the English tense system works on the assumption that "the speaker normally occupies a viewpoint in the base space at the present time" (ibid.), but also that this viewpoint can shift to the future or to the past relative to the present time, and then it serves as a reference point. "The time of the shifted viewing is therefore known as reference time (R)." (Radden and Dirven 2007: 203)

When writing about relative tenses, Comrie (1985) uses the same notions, however, his terminology differs slightly. The term *reference time* is the same. For the *speech time* he uses the *present moment*, which is taken to coincide with the actual moment of speaking. And what is referred to by *event time* (E) in *Cognitive English Grammar* Comrie simply calls *situation*.

As previously mentioned, tense is not the only grammatical category that verbs manifest. Aspects, as Comrie puts it, “are different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation” (1976: 3), i.e. they provide information about whether the situation is perceived as completed, repeated, or continuous. And finally, modality, as Radden and Dirven point out, “characterizes a situation as having potential reality.” (2007: 171)

Even though a lot of grammars discuss the future perfect, this discussion is usually brief and on rare occasions it takes more than a couple of chapters. This does come as a surprise, since the little that has been written is usually not homogenous (Declerck 1991). Many authors (Comrie 1985; Declerck 1991; Michaelis 1998; Radden and Dirven 2007) touch upon the future perfect and they bring up some very interesting points, but nonetheless, it would seem that a comprehensive study, answering all the questions, some of which will be opened in this thesis, has not yet been published. Admittedly, the future perfect could be considered a fairly infrequent tense, but it is very far from nonexistent. This will be proven and discussed in chapter 3.

3. THE FUTURE PERFECT IN CROATIAN FICTION: A CORPUS RESEARCH

Native English speakers use this tense intuitively, much like all other grammatical constructions. However, for non-native speakers, the ones who had not acquired it and had to learn it, for example Croatian speakers, this tense might cause some trouble. This could be especially accentuated by the fact that there is no tense in Croatian that would offer an equivalent to the future perfect. It would, however, be wrong to assume that the Croatian language does not provide a way to express the same time relations; it simply does so by different means. In 1954, Rudolf Filipović wrote a textbook of English grammar for Croatian high school students, and there he claims the following for the future perfect: “This tense does not exist in Croatian and it must be translated very carefully. It is usually translated by *već* and the future.” (99) Ideally, to

confirm this, one would look for the ways this tense has been translated in a parallel corpus of English and Croatian. This would provide an irreplaceable insight into how this form is being translated into Croatian and would be particularly valuable since it would enable a quick search for a certain linguistic structure across multiple registers. However, since such a corpus has not yet been built, for the purpose of this thesis a similar corpus was created. This corpus contains material from a single register – fiction, and that is because academic texts, news, and spoken language is seldom translated into Croatian, and if they are, it is not done systematically².

Appendix 1 contains a list of works selected for this corpus. The corpus material is comprised of six fairly large book series (24 novels) all published in the last 30 years. These works of fiction have been chosen because they provide a significant number of words written in the same style, by the same author, and using contemporary English language. This corpus, containing approximately 4,120,000 words was searched for: affirmative forms ‘will have V’; negative ‘won’t have V’, ‘will never have V’; interrogative ‘will Pers. Pron. have V (will I have V, will you have V, and so on); and negative interrogative ‘won’t Pers. Pron. have V’ (won’t I have V, won’t you have, and so on). The results are following:

FORM	OCCURRENCE
Affirmative	56
Negative	3
Interrogative	Ø
Negative interrogative	Ø

The affirmative form of the ‘will have V’ construction occurs 56 times, the negative only three times, and the interrogative and the negative interrogative do not occur at all.

The translations of these novels show how the Croatian translators interpreted the ‘will have V’ structures in the given context. For the purpose of the following analysis, it is important to keep in mind that the construction in question can actually have two unrelated meanings: the future perfect meaning and the meaning of a modal auxiliary. The example (1) shows that when a sentence is understood as expressing the

² Even if this is being done, and such material does exist, it is was not available to the author of this master's thesis.

future perfect tense, it is translated using the Croatian future tense³ called *futur I*. (1a) is the original English sentence and (1b) is its Croatian equivalent.

- (1) a. Darkness has given me a brief reprieve, but by the time the sun rises, the Careers will have formulated a plan to kill me.
b. Tama će mi pružiti kratak predah, ali do zore će Karijeristi uobličiti plan kako da me ubiju.

Out of 59 sentences, according to the translations, the future perfect has been used in 26 of them, but only two times in combination with *već*. 29 sentences express a past situation and in them the 'will have V' structure carries the meaning of a modal auxiliary. Those sentences have been translated using the Croatian complex past tense *perfekt* 28 times, and once using a simple past tense *orist*. There is no significant informational difference in meaning between *perfekt* and *orist* in contemporary Croatian; *orist* is seen as an archaic tense and in everyday communication the Croatian speakers will chose *perfekt* to talk about past situations. If however *orist* is used, especially in cases like this one, translating fiction, it serves primarily the aesthetic function. Examples (2) and (3) show the modal meaning of the 'will have V' structure. (2) was translated using *perfekt* and (3) using *orist*.

- (2) a. You will have seen the ships out in the bay.
b. Jamačno vidjeste lađe na pučini zalijeva.
- (3) a. "They will have heard the talk," he had replied.
b. "Jamačno su čuli priče", odgovorio joj je.

Finally, four sentences have been translated using *kondicional I*, and all of them were conditional sentences expressing hypothetical situations in English. However, not all English conditional sentences were translated using *kondicional I*.

To summarize, in order to even begin any discussion of the future perfect, one must first consider its relation to the modal auxiliary that shares its form. This linguistic structure (will have V) has in this sense two separate homonymous meanings and

³ Croatian has two separate future tenses - *futur I* (*futur prvi*) and *futur II* (*futur drugi*).

precisely for that reason it would be impossible, or futile to say the least, to look at and study it in isolation from the context.

Upon building a parallel corpus of English and Croatian and searching it for all forms relevant for this thesis, it was established firstly, that the structure dealt with here is a relatively infrequent one, and secondly, that in c. 45% of those occurrences is that structure associated with the meaning of the future perfect. This corpus also shows that the future perfect is translated using *futur I* but not necessarily in combination with *već*. For the translation of the modal auxiliary *perfekt/aorist* were used, and for the translation of some conditional sentences *kondicional I*.

4. THE METHODOLOGY AND THE PARTICIPANTS

4.1. THE METHODOLOGY

As shown in chapter 3, due to its multiple meanings, translating the ‘will have V’ structure into Croatian can be problematic. This is in part because of the fact that the same form can be associated with both the future perfect and the modal expression, and partly because the future perfect does not have an equivalent in Croatian.

Chapter 5 will show how students of English understand this structure and what causes confusion. It will try to see which contexts enable easier understanding, or more specifically, are there any pragmatic and/or syntactic environments that would influence the interpretation of the linguistic structure in question.

To test the understanding of ‘will have V’ structure, a linguistic survey was created. The goal of the survey was to translate a given sentence from English into Croatian. The target sentences were always given in context, except in few cases where that one sentence alone was enough to understand its meaning. The sentences were not made up specifically for this research, but they were copied from J.K. Rowling’s *Harry Potter* books, which means that they represent a way in which a native speaker would use this structure. Appendix 3 contains a complete list of sentences in the same form and the same context that the participants were required to translate. The answers are listed directly below the questions and are sorted according to two criteria: which Croatian tense was used in translation and what year was the student who used it.

4.2. THE PARTICIPANTS

The first group of participants in this survey are the first year students of English language and literature at the University of Zagreb. They have all successfully passed the Croatian State Matura Exam and the department of English entrance exam. They finished high school in Croatia and learned English using various textbooks, some of which are listed in Appendix 2.

With respect to their treatment of the future perfect, these textbooks could be considered quite scarce in a sense that they contain very little information about it; they put accent on the form and usage, and usually do not explain the meaning of this tense. Figures 1-5 in Appendix 2 show excerpts from several textbooks used in Croatian high schools. The future perfect here is explained using one sentence, accompanied by one or two examples, which gives very superficial information and hardly makes anything about this tense easier to understand for students. When talking about the future perfect, textbooks in Figures 1, 2, and 5 talk about actions⁴ that will be completed before a specific time in the future. On the other hand, the textbook in Figures 3-4 gives the following instruction on when to use the future perfect: "We use the future perfect to talk about a completed action in the future." According to this, there is not difference between the future perfect and some simple future tense. This instruction does not involve a reference point distinct from the moment of speaking and located in the future. It does not account for the nuance in the meaning of the future perfect that involves completeness of a situation that will be relevant at some future point.

The second group of participants are the fifth year students of the same university. They have all successfully finished the undergraduate program, and are now at the end of their second and final year of the graduate program. Apart from learning

⁴ The term 'action' is infelicitous in this context because it narrows down the situation types to which the definition applies too much.

Radden and Dirven (2007: 176-196) divide situation types into *bounded and unbounded events*, and *lasting and temporary states*, each of which is then further divided into their respective subtypes. Langacker (2008: 147) divides verbs into *perfectives*, which according to him correspond to Vendler's (1967) verb terms: *achievements*, *accomplishments*, and *activities*; and *imperfectives*, which correspond to *stative* verb terms. 'Actions', as used in these definitions, would then correspond to either a subtype of events, perfectives, accomplishments, achievements, and activities, or to all of them in the broadest sense, however, it is firily safe to assume that this term does not involve states or imperfectives.

Chapter 5.3 of this thesis will show that both events and states (perfective and imperfective verbs) can be used in the future perfect.

and perfecting their grammar skills over the years implicitly, they have also learned specifically about this tense during their undergraduate studies. Not surprisingly, this resulted in generally better and easier understanding of some constructions, especially idiomatic expressions.

Figures 6 and 7 show excerpts from two grammar handbooks that comprise obligatory reading for a first year course that teaches normative grammar of the contemporary English language. Handbook in Figure 6 does not give any more information about the future perfect than textbooks used in high schools. The handbook in Figure 7 gives more examples and notes about this tense. However, Note C says: “The future perfect can express an assumption about the past” and corroborates it with an example “You’ll have met my boss – he was at the meeting you went to.” This note does not apply to the future perfect, and this use is not a recognized use of the future perfect. Rather, ‘will’ here serves as a modal auxiliary for expressing past certainty or assumption. The distinction between the future perfect and the modal auxiliary ‘will’ (+ have + past participle) shall be discussed further on in this thesis.

To sum up, all the participants in this survey are students of English language and literature at the University of Zagreb. 32 of them are first year students and 28 are finishing their studies, having done a three-year undergraduate program and a two-year graduate program. The preceding chapter gives a brief overview of the materials the students would have used to get acquainted with the future perfect. As shown, none of the materials cover this tense in depth, providing very little information or examples.

5. THE RESULTS AND THE INTERPRETATION

5.1. SENTENCES 6), 7), 8), AND 10)

Translations of sentences 6), 7), 8) and 10) can be analyzed comparatively.

5.1.1. PERFEKT

In all four cases, the majority of participants chose to translate the target sentence using the Croatian past tense *perfekt*. In 6), the translation of the target sentence *Then you will have seen that there have been not so much leaks as floods concerning your adventure in the Hall of Prophecy?* has been largely influenced by the preceding context. The previous sentence uttered by the speaker, *I gather that you have been taking the Daily Prophet over the last two weeks?*, indicates that the activity of

taking (reading) the newspaper had been happening before, and up until, the moment of speaking, and also the use of the time marker *over the last two weeks* places the activity in the past relative to the moment of speaking. Considering this, it is only natural to assume that the speaker, when using the 'will have V' structure in fact refers to the time period he had just specified. Therefore, it is not surprising that 51 out of 60 translations were done using *perfekt*.

In 7) fewer students opted for *perfekt*, but the logic behind it is the same. The preceding sentence describes the memory, which implies that the interlocutors had already seen it before and were discussing it in the target sentence. However, there are no explicit time markers that would place the action in the past, but rather the conversational implicatures⁵ from the context. In fact, in sentences 7) and 10), the things that need to be 'noticed' and 'gathered' have just been discussed, and therefore the addressee will assume that it is exactly those things the speaker is referring to, otherwise he would be flouting the maxim of relation.

It would be wrong, however, to assume that the pastness of these situations is inferred only by the means of implicatures; the form of the verb (modal auxiliary expressing past supposition) also indicates that the situation is located in the past relative to the moment of speaking.

Of all the sentences in 5.1., sentence 8) has the smallest number of *perfekt* answers, but nevertheless, they make the majority. Once again, this answer imposes as the most logical for the reasons that will be explained further on in this chapter. Still, there is a significant difference in the translations of the same structure (*will have seen*) in 6) and 8) and the explanation for that needs to be sought in pragmatics.

5.1.2. FUTUR I

Statistically, one of the two Croatian future tenses, the *futur I*, is the second most frequent option for translating 6), 7), 8), and 10). In sentence 6) the context perhaps the most explicitly places the situation in the past, and so do the categories expressed by the verb. In addition to that, the target sentence is a question, admittedly, often

⁵ When terms: the cooperative principle, the maxims, and the conversational and conventional implicatures are used in this master's thesis, they are used in a sense proposed and discussed in: Grice, Paul H. 1975. "Logic and Conversation". In *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3, *Speech Acts* edited by P. Cole, & J. L. Morgan. 41-58. New York: Academic Press

translated as a statement, but in three out of four cases it was left in an interrogative form and one was incomplete. The example (4b) shows one of those three answers.

- (4) a. Then you will have seen that there have been not so much leaks as floods concerning your adventure in the Hall of Prophecy?
- b. *Onda ćeš vidjeti da nije toliko toga procurilo poput poplava što se tiče tvoje avanture u Hodniku Proročanstva?

This sort of a question cannot be asked about the future, which makes those translations illogical and ungrammatical.

For someone to translate these sentences using *futur I*, they would have to understand and think of this structure as expressing the future perfect. This simply cannot be the case because, firstly, there is no second future situation or a point in time, which would then be posterior to the situation expressed by the future perfect and in relation to which would the future perfect be able to realize its meaning. That is, as a deictic category, the meaning of the future perfect is grounded relative to a specific reference point, which in this case does not exist. Note that the posterior point on a timeline does not have to be stated explicitly, it can also be implicated⁶, but in sentences in question it is not. Secondly, and complementary to the previous argument, the only other situation in which *futur I* would indeed be a legitimate choice, is if the situations in the target sentences of 6), 7), 8), and 10) happened in the future, posterior to the moment of speaking but not anterior to any other future moment, and if, as a result, they had been expressed using any linguistic structure in English normally used to express the absolute future time reference. This, obviously, does not apply here. In other words, if the sentences in question could be interpreted as happening in the future, then the author of the English text herself would have used structures like *as you are about to see*, *as you are going to notice*, *as you will gather*, and so on, instead of *as you will have seen/noticed/gathered*. For example, sentence 7):

“Because, I think, he is ashamed of what he remembers,” said Dumbledore.
“He has tried to rework the memory to show himself in a better light, obliterating those parts which he does not wish me to see. It is, as you will have noticed, very crudely done, and that is all to the good, for it shows that the true memory is still there beneath the alterations.”

⁶ This will be shown and proven in Chapter 5.2.

has been interpreted by 13% of the participants as the situation where the interlocutor has not yet seen the memory and is only about to notice some details about it. If this were indeed the case, the original target sentence would be something in lines of *It is, as you are going to notice, very crudely done (...)*.

5.1.3. Sentences 6) and 8)

Another interesting instance in the analysis of this group of sentences, as mentioned previously in this chapter, is the difference in the interpretation between the sentences 6) and 8). 'Will have seen' was translated using *futur I* four times in sentence 6) and 18 times in 8), and this goes on to prove that the semantic meaning of a construction is a constant, it does not change, and it is the same in both sentences. The semantic meaning of this construction could be something like 'must/be bound to have seen/noticed/understood'. But, a sentence is not simply a combination of a number of discrete semantic meanings, rather the combination of smaller units into larger ones results in the rise of pragmatic meaning that holds the units together. In other words, the same smaller unit or a construction, if combined differently, can be interpreted in different ways or that semantically and syntactically the same construction can have different, however false, interpretations depending on the context in which it appears. Specifically, 'will have seen' is clearly a homonymous construction, which has two possible meanings – the future perfect and the modal auxiliary. Since so far it has been established that the future perfect is intuitively translated using *futur I*, the following claim can be made: because of the context, which less explicitly places the situation in the past in 8) – there are no past time adverbials or clauses, only conversational implicatures, more participants falsely understood this construction as denoting a future situation, i.e. as the future perfect.

5.2. SENTENCES 11) AND 12)

Sentences 11) and 12) present possibly the most complex relations to understand because the 'will have V' structures could be interpreted both as the future perfect and the modal auxiliary.

The modal interpretation of the 'will have V' structure in 11) assumes that the speaker supposes the situation happened before the moment of speaking. Therefore, in order to translate it, one would have to use a Croatian construction expressing a supposition about the past. In the survey this was done in two ways: using the Croatian

past tense (*perfekt*) in the active voice and the Croatian present tense (*prezent*) in the passive voice. In the active past tense constructions, the archway is the agent and it sealed itself; in the passive present tense constructions, the archway is sealed now (in the moment of speaking) which implies that some agent, whether an unknown person or the door itself, sealed it at some point in time anterior to now.

On the other hand, unlike the sentences in 5.1., this sentence can theoretically have a future perfect interpretation. As mentioned so far throughout this thesis, the future perfect is a relative tense that conveys the information about a situation being finished before a specific time in the future. Declerck (1991: 226-227) claims that this situation can either happen before, at, or after the moment of speaking, but certainly before the reference point in the future. In 11) the reference point is implicated rather than stated explicitly: *The archway will have sealed again (before we reach it)*. This yields three possible interpretations of the target sentence. The first interpretation is that the archway had already sealed before the time of the utterance and this was expressed in two ways: firstly, by using *perfekt* in the active voice (*Prolaz se zatvorio / zapečatio / zaključao*), and secondly, by using a *prezent* passive construction (*Prolaz je zapriječen / zapečaćen*). This coincides with the possible modal interpretation discussed in the preceding paragraph. The second interpretation is that the archway will seal in the future, i.e. some time between the moment of speaking and the moment the speaker reaches the archway. This is expressed by *futur I* in the active voice. And finally, some students opted for the passive *futur I* construction: *Prolaz će (opet) biti zapečaćen/zatvoren*. This indicates that the archway will be sealed when the speaker reaches it but it does not specify when (it is not known and/or relevant). This interpretation may be closest to the original even though in English it is clear that the archway itself is the agent, and no external agent or doer of the action can be implied. However, there is no tense in Croatian that would correspond to the future perfect, and for this reason, in this specific context, this passive future construction might be the best way to convey the meaning of the target sentence.

Much like 11), sentence 12) can also have a modal interpretation. This implies the speaker's supposition about Dilys seeing the man being rushed to the hospital prior to the moment of speaking. But 12) could also have a future perfect interpretation with an implicated future reference point, for example, *I take it Dilys will have seen him arrive (before she returns to tell us about it)*. Accordingly, once again, it is uncertain whether

the situation took place before, at, or after the moment of speaking. However, in 12) a Croatian future passive construction does not appear among the answers, because, clearly, the agent in 12) is not only known but also relevant.


5.3. SENTENCES 3) AND 14)

Sentences 3) and 14) are the only target sentences that have been translated completely unanimously. In both, all the participants chose the *futur I*, and this is in compliance with the textbook suggestions mentioned in chapter 4.2. But what is it about these sentences that urges all the participants to understand the ‘will have V’ structure as expressing the future perfect and as a result translate them using *futur I*?

5.3.1. THE COGNITIVE GRAMMAR PERSPECTIVE

5.3.1.1.

Radden and Dirven (2007: 229) claim that “In using the future perfect, the speaker adopts a viewpoint in the deictic future as a reference point (R) and looks back at an anterior situation (E).” which is in accordance with what is being stated in this thesis. They also make a division of situations into events and states but hold that both form the future perfect in a similar way. The example (34b) from *Cognitive English Grammar* (Radden and Dirven 2007:228) shows graphically how the three-part structure of the future perfect can be decomposed into constituents and it describes what their meanings are.



‘Will’ in this structure is a future marker; it locates the (R) in the future. (R) is established as a point form which the situation is observed, and it is posterior to both event (E) and speech (S) time. The (E) point on the timeline is paired with the past participle part of the structure, which represents the situation type. The so called “state verb *have*” (Radden and Dirven 2007: 229) describes the state that stretches from (E) to (R), and its duration is determined by a time marker. As previously mentioned, such

compositional meaning, as represented in (34b), holds for both events and states. That is, states stretch from their beginning in (E) to (R), and with events “the state is inferred or results from the event and reaches from the completed event to reference time.” (Ibid.)

If sentences 3) and 14) are to be approached from this perspective, then the following could be said: in sentence 3) *Before the night is out, Potter will have come to find me* the reference time (R) is easily identifiable as *Before the night is out* or a point in the future relative to which an event is positioned on the timeline (or grounded in time). This event, expressed by *will have come* and happening at the event time (E), is located before (R), or to the left of (R) on the timeline. According to Radden and Dirven (2007) a state is to result from this event, for example *Potter is here*, and this state lasts from (E) to (R). In sentence 14) *By that time, my faithful servant will have rejoined us* –, the reference time is also overtly expressed (*By that time*), but unlike in 3), this time adverbial is not paired with an event or a state, but it is simply a point on the timeline. The relation between (E) and (R) is the same as in 3), and a state inferred from the event *will have rejoined us* that reaches from the time of the completed event up to (R) could be something on the order of *the servant is now with us*.

For the Croatian equivalents of the sentences 3) and 14) can undoubtedly be asserted that the verb takes *futur I* form. That is, all the participants in this survey, both first and fifth year students, chose *futur I* to translate these sentences. *Futur I* is a periphrastic future tense in Croatian, much like the future perfect in English, but unlike the structure of the future perfect, the structure of *futur I* is bipartite. It consists of the short (unstressed), imperfective⁷ form of the auxiliary verb *htjeti* (to want, will) and a content verb (perfective or imperfective) in the infinitival form.


5.3.1.2.

As mentioned before in this thesis, the meaning of the future perfect is seldom discussed in grammars of English, but in *Tense* (1985), Comrie raises the question of the

⁷ Perfective and imperfective aspects in Croatian differ from English. Wayles Browne (1993) says the following for Serbo-Croatian, but the same is true for Croatian:

Aspect affects a lexical item's whole paradigm; a verb is either perfective (napisati/написати 'to write' and all its forms) or imperfective (pisati/писати 'to write' with its forms). However, many verbs are bi-aspectual, including some of the commonest: ići/ићи 'to go', biti/бити 'to be', razum(j)eti/разум(ј)ети 'to understand', kazati/казати 'to say', vid(j)eti/вид(ј)ети 'to see', čuti/чути 'to hear', ručati/ручати 'to have lunch'. (331)

meaning of the future perfect, and proposes the following answer. The future perfect is a relative tense that indicates “a situation prior to a reference point in the future, allowing the situation to be located after the present moment, at the present moment, or before the present moment, as indicated in figures 4-6.” (70)



However, it is clear even from a small sample of sentences, take for instance the ones in Appendix 3, that in some sentences this meaning is profiled, making it impossible to know exactly which of the possible configurations on the timeline would correspond to the situation described. On the other hand, in some sentences this is not the case, and the future perfect in them can only be understood as denoting a situation about to happen between the present moment and the reference point. To account for this difference, Comrie (1985) claims, it is not enough to look for an explanation in semantics of the tense alone, but one must look at pragmatics of specific constructions. In other words, this difference does not stem from different meanings of the tense, but rather “it can all be accounted for in terms of implicatures following from the meaning of the future perfect, the context, and the general conversational maxims of the Gricean kind.” (Comrie, 1985: 71)

If the future perfect is used in a sentence such as *I will have finished my manuscript by tomorrow*⁸, the interlocutor, assuming that the speaker is following the cooperation principle, will understand the implicature that neither the configuration represented by Comrie’s (1985: 70) Figure 5. nor the configuration represented by Figure 6. (ib.) are

⁸ The example taken from Comrie (1985: 73)

actually possible. As the result, this sentence can only be understood as expressing tense relation represented by Figure 4. (Ib.) In Comrie's (1985: 73) words:

since people are normally supposed to be aware of their own actions, the *sentence I will have finished my manuscript by tomorrow* would hardly ever be appropriate in circumstances where I have already completed my manuscript, and one would have to imagine bizarre circumstances to allow cancellation of the implicature – for instance, that the speaker habitually works in a drug-induced stupor, and thus literally may not know whether or not he has completed his manuscript.

The same principle can be applied to the interpretation of sentences 3) and 14) and the tenses used in them. In 3), when the speaker says *Potter will have come to find me*, he uses the future perfect, but what is being implicated is that the action will take place some time between the moment of speaking and (R). The same is true for 14). In saying *My faithful servant will have rejoined us* it is conventionally implicated that the situation is about to happen. This is because the speaker holds that the interlocutor can deduce that the speaker, for the purpose of maintaining the cooperation principle, would not use this tense if the servant has already rejoined him.

Going back to the question from the beginning of this chapter – what about sentences 3) and 14) caused such a homogeneity in answers. That is, in what form and in what context is the future perfect most easily recognized. According to cognitive grammar, it would be fairly safe to conclude that the future perfect is best understood if it is in a sentence where: 1) the verb is in the 'will + have + past participle' form; 2) the reference point (R) or the deictic center is overtly expressed, usually by a time adverbial or clause with *by* or *before*; and 3) the possible future perfect configurations (E-S-R and E,S-R) have been cancelled out by conventional implicatures, as described in Comrie's *Tense* (1985).

5.3.2. THE CONSTRUCTION GRAMMAR PERSPECTIVE

In her book *Aspectual Grammar and Past-Time reference* (1998), Laura Michaelis talks about three perfect types: the present perfect, past perfect and future perfect, and claims that what these perfect types have in common is that "Each perfect type denotes a relationship of temporal anteriority: some event occurred before some time point." (106) In Reichenbachian terms, the event time necessarily precedes the reference time ($E < R$) and the difference lies in the relationship with the speech time. More specifically, in the present perfect the reference and speech time are simultaneous ($R =$

S), in the past perfect the reference time precedes the speech time ($R < S$), and in the future perfect the reference time follows the speech time ($R > S$)⁹. From this follows that the

meanings of the three perfect types are compositionally derived, i.e. the interpretation of a given perfect type is a function of the tense of the auxiliary combined with the anteriority relation denoted by the participle. (Ibid.)

However, the past participle in the perfect constructions is not the same as passive participles found in adjectival modifiers (*a cooled soup*) or adjectival passives (*The soup is cooled*) and the perfect auxiliary *have* is different from *have* in experiencer-subject constructions, such as *I had my wallet stolen* (according to Michaelis 1998: 107). Furthermore, if the meaning of the perfect construction were indeed compositional, no real distinction between the present perfect and the simple past could be made. Laura Michaelis (1998: 108 – 119) proves that this claim is therefore not feasible. For that reason, the meaning of perfect constructions is "not reducible to the interaction of tense and aspect" (ibid., 120), i.e. it is not simply a combination of the *have* constituent (tense) and the *past participle* constituent (aspect). Rather, the "three perfect types represent distinct grammatical constructions" (ibid.), which are mutually connected through their links to the 'general perfect construction'. Žic Fuchs explains this as follows:

... *present perfect* ostvaruje suodnose s prošlim perfektom (*past perfect*) i budućim perfektom (*future perfect*) , a taj se suodnos ostvaruje 'općom perfektnom konstrukcijom' (*general perfect construction*). Točnije, riječ je o apstraktnoj razini koja objedinjuje sve tri konstrukcije perfekta. No, i *present perfect* i *past perfect* i *future perfect* povezani su s 'općom perfektnom konstrukcijom' putem 'jedinstvenih spona' (*instance links*)... (2009: 167)

but the future perfect is also an instance of both the 'general perfect construction' and the 'non-finite perfect'.

This means that the meaning of the future perfect is in fact influenced by the 'general perfect construction', or simply the perfect construction, in a sense proposed by Langacker:

⁹ As pointed out by Michaelis (1998: 270), and also in accordance with what was discussed in chapter 5.2. of this master's thesis, and in accordance with Comrie (1985: 70) and Declerck (1991: 226), the Reichenbachian system leaves open the concrete position of (E) in the future perfect with respect to (S), as long as they both precede (R).

The perfect construction provides a periphrastic means of indicating past time (with respect to RP) with the added nuance that the completed event continues to be relevant. (1991: 224)


If applied to the future perfect, this would indicate that some event happened before the reference point, which is in the future relative to (S), and that the results of this event are still relevant in (R). However, since the position of (E) relative to (S) can be left unspecified (v. chapter 5.3.1.2.) in the future perfect, applying constraints for the ‘general perfect construction’ is more problematic than in the cases of the present perfect and the past perfect. For instance, a constraint on the ‘general perfect construction’, introduced in Michaelis (1998), says: “neither the PrP nor the PaP accepts deictic past-time adverbial expressions like *yesterday* and *three months ago*.” (135) This constraint affects a perfect construction only in those situations where $(E < S)$, and because the relationship between (E) and (S) in the future perfect can be vague and indefinite, it cannot be absolutely asserted that it would affect the future perfect, however it is possible. Comrie (1985) proved this by providing an example of the future perfect combined with a deictic past-time adverbial. He says that “although the context is necessarily quite complex, as it has to be reasonable to talk about a past situation in reference to a future deictic centre” (Comrie 1985: 73), sentences such as *if it rains tomorrow, we’ll have worked in vain yesterday* (ibid.) are unquestionably possible. All this points to the conclusion that all three perfect types “inherit their semantics from ‘general perfect construction’” (Michaelis 1998: 137), however they subject to some constraints differently.

Aside from the ‘general perfect construction’, the meaning of the future perfect is connected to the ‘non-finite perfect’. The ‘non-finite perfect’ “allows deictic punctual past-time adverbials (e.g. last semester)” (Michaelis 1998: 207), and therefore it cannot be considered an instance of ‘general perfect construction’. There are two types of the non-finite perfect complex: participles and infinitives. Infinitives can serve as “the main verbs of accusative-infinitive clauses” (ibid., 206) or as “a bare stem infinitive required by a modal verb” (ibid.), i.e. the perfect infinitive is a complement to a modal head verb. However, their relationship is not strictly compositional. For example, while a sentence like *By the time anybody reported Lady Lucan missing, she would have been buried at*

*sea*¹⁰, can be shifted from the past-time narrative into a present-time narrative; into: *By the time anybody reports Lady Lucan missing, she will have been buried at sea*, the underlying semantics of modals like “*should*, *would*, and *might* have subjunctive readings, rather than the future-in-past readings.” (Ibid., 208) In other words, a modal verb like *might* can have more to its meaning than simply past + *may*. Also, in a modal + perfect-complement construction, the perfect-complement does not necessarily denote anteriority with respect to the reference point indicated by the modal head. Michaelis (1998: 208) corroborates this by saying that a sentence like *Harry must have been sleeping in the bed* can have more than one interpretation. In the first one, *At that time it was necessary to conclude that Harry was sleeping in the bed*, the event time indicated by the perfect form and the reference time indicated by the modal are simultaneous. The second interpretation, *At that time it was necessary to conclude that Harry had been sleeping in the bed for some period*, allows the event time to precede the reference time. This considered, it would appear that the future perfect sentences allow the ‘non-finite’ interpretation insofar as they are a combination of the modal verb ‘will’ and a perfect complement since they can be back-shifted into future-in-past would constructions. Also, they allow the deictic past-time adverbials. On the other hand, some ‘non-finite perfect’ constructions with a modal head verb may be represented with such a configuration of points on the timeline where (E) does not necessarily precede (R), and this does not hold for the future perfect.

In conclusion, the future perfect has a complex meaning. It is an instance (in the Goldbergian sense) of the ‘general perfect construction’ and the ‘non-finite perfect’. The Figure 4.4, proposed by Laura Michaelis (1998: 210) shows the entire ‘Perfect system’ and the types of relations between various perfect types.

¹⁰ All examples in this paragraph are taken from Michaelis (1998)



“Instance links are indicated by the abbreviation *i* next to the link in question.”(Ibid.) This means that the same type of instance link connects all three perfect types, the past perfect, the present perfect, and the future perfect, to the ‘general perfect construction’. And while the past perfect and the present perfect inherit their meaning from it, the “Two dashed lines are used to indicate that the FuP is an instance of both general perfect construction and the non-finite perfect (i.e. modal past)” (ibid.)

The following paragraph will attempt to interpret sentences containing the future perfect from the current survey while approaching the interpretation from the construction grammar perspective. More specifically, it will see what sentences 3) and 14), and sentences 11) and 12) respectively, have in common with the ‘general perfect construction’ and the ‘non-finite perfect’. Firstly, the ‘general perfect construction’ provides a periphrastic means of indicating that the event time precedes the reference time, but the event, or rather the results of the event or some aspects of it, continue to be relevant in (R). In sentences 3) and 14), time adverbials *before this night is out* and *by that time* indicate future (relative to (S)) reference points, and the consequences of the events indicated by *will have come* and *will have rejoined (us)* will be relevant precisely

at the time (R). The same is true for sentences 11) and 12), even though the reference times in those sentences are implicated, rather than stated explicitly. Next, a constraint on the 'general perfect construction' that says, that situations where (E) precedes (S) do not allow any deictic past-time adverbials naturally, cannot be applied to sentences 3) and 14) because in them (E) is limited to a position posterior to (S) by conventional implicatures (v. chapter 5.3.) As discussed in chapter 5.2, sentences 11) and 12) can have a (E-S-R) configuration for the reason that in them the position of (E) had not been explicitly grounded. Therefore, 11) and 12) could in theory be combined with a deictic past-time adverbial, such as *two hours ago* or *moments ago* and still keep its future reference point. For instance, *The archway will have sealed two hours ago* or *I take it Dilys will have seen him arrive moments ago*. The event times are now clearly located in the past relative to the present moment, but the result of these events will be relevant in a future reference point. i.e. the time the speaker and the interlocutor reach the archway, and when Dilys comes back and retells what she saw. Secondly, the future perfect is an instance of the 'non-finite perfect' construction, which means that the two constructions are connected by instance links. A type of a 'non-finite perfect' construction is "a bare stem infinitive required by a modal" (Michaelis 1998: 206), which is also a more generalized construction. The future perfect would then be a more specified construction. In other words, this kind of a 'non-finite perfect' construction has the structure of the perfect infinitive (complement) which is being added to the modal verb (head), and the future perfect structure is: will (modal head) + the perfect infinitive. This confirms that the two constructions are connected by the instance links in a sense proposed by Adele Goldberg:

Instance links are posited when a particular construction is a *special case* of another construction; that is, an instance link exists between constructions iff one construction is a more fully specified version of the other. (1995: 79)

The future perfect in all of the target sentences (3), 14), 11), and 12)) is an instance of the 'non-finite perfect' construction combined with a modal head verb – *will*. Moreover, a combination of a 'non-finite perfect' construction with a modal verb does not necessarily produce one unambiguous interpretation, where (E) precedes (R). However, this holds for neither 3) and 14) nor 11) and 12).

6. CONCLUSION

This master's thesis attempted to show how difficult a relative and complex tense can be to understand and especially translate into a language that does not have a direct equivalent. In chapter 3 a research of a parallel corpus is presented and discussed. This corpus was specially constructed for the purpose of this thesis and it showed that the future perfect is a relatively infrequent tense in English and that it is translated into Croatian using *futur I*. *Futur I* is a Croatian future tense that can be used to express various tense relations with future time reference, not just the future perfect. However, this research provides only a partial insight into how confusing this tense may be for non-native speakers since it only gives one translator's opinion. For this reason, a linguistic survey was conducted to see which uses of the future perfect are easier and which are more difficult to understand. Chapter 4 gives a brief overview of the groups of participants in this survey and the literature they used to learn about this tense. Not surprisingly, the information about the future perfect in these textbooks was very scarce. Chapter 5 deals with the analysis of the answers collected in this survey and it is divided into 3 subsections, each dealing with a certain group of sentences. The sentences were divided according to the meaning 'will have V' structure carries. The first group of sentences (subsection 5.1., sentences 6), 7), 8), and 10)) includes those instances of the 'will have V' structure where it carries the modal meaning. Here the potential reasons for misunderstanding are discussed. In subsection 5.2., two sentences are analyzed where 'will have V' structure can carry the modal meaning, but also they demonstrate a non-prototypical use of the future perfect, the one with an implicated reference time. The last section (5.3.) deals with two sentences that were translated in the same way by all participants. These sentences were firstly approached from the perspective of cognitive grammar and they represent possibly the most prototypical use of the future perfect. The focus of the chapter 5.3.1.1. is the semantics of the future perfect. Radden and Dirven (2007) offer a compositional perspective, where all three parts of this periphrastic tense are assigned their meanings and their combination results in a new structure with a meaning influenced by all three parts. Chapter 5.3.1.2. accounts for the difference between the second (sentences 3) and 14)), and the third (11) and 12)) group of sentences, and why sentences 3) and 14) can only be understood as expressing the (S-E-R) configuration on the timeline, while sentences 11) and 12) are ambiguous in this respect. Chapter 5.3.2. attempts to explain the unanimity in answers

from a construction grammar perspective. Here it is claimed that the meaning of the future perfect (as a construction) is actually influenced by two more general constructions, more specifically, it is an instance of the 'general perfect construction' and the 'non-finite perfect' construction. Also, the differences between the second and third group of sentences were explained within the construction grammar framework.

ABSTRACT

This master's thesis focuses on the English tense system, specifically, the perfect tenses, and it does so by looking at it from the viewpoint of the future perfect. It starts by providing a theoretical framework that serves to prove how complex the question of the tense in fact is and how difficult can the grounding of a perfect tense be, especially for non-native speakers. From the data from a parallel corpus of English and Croatian, that was built for the purpose of this thesis, it is visible that the future perfect is not only an infrequent tense, but also that there is no single tense in Croatian that would provide a direct equivalent to it. Additionally, it was noted that the linguistic structure 'will + have + past participle' in fact has two discrete meanings. The one of the modal auxiliary 'will' combined with the perfect infinitive, expressing past supposition, and the other carrying the future perfect meaning. If the meaning of the structure is that of the past modal, it is translated using the Croatian *perfekt* or *aorist*. If the verb structure expresses the future perfect, it is translated using *futur I*. This fact might cause confusion in the understanding of this tense, since the *futur I* is not only used to translate the future perfect, but also to translate many other future tense relations, as will be proven later, in the main part of this thesis. The main part attempts to explain the meaning of the future perfect by explaining its understanding by the Croatian students of the English language. The understanding was tested by asking the students to translate some sentences containing the 'will have V' structure from English into Croatian, and the answers were analyzed according to which Croatian tense was used in the translation. The explanation of the results was attempted from the cognitive grammar and construction grammar perspective.

KEY WORDS: *future perfect, tense, meaning, translation, cognitive grammar*

REFERENCES

- Browne, Wayles. 1993. "Serbo-Croat". In *The Slavonic Languages* edited by B. Comrie & G. G. Corbett. 306 – 388. London and New York: Routledge
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Comrie, Bernard. 1985. *Tense*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Declerck, Renaat. 1991. *Tense in English: Its Structure and Use in Discourse*. London and New York: Routledge
- Filipović, Rudolf. 1954. *An Outline of English Grammar*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga
- Goldberg, Adele. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: Chicago University Press
- Grice, Paul H. 1975. "Logic and Conversation". In *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3, *Speech Acts* edited by P. Cole, & J. L. Morgan. 41-58. New York: Academic Press
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1991. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Descriptive Applications, Vol. II*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press
- Langacker, Ronald W. 2008. *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Michaelis, Laura. 1998. *Aspectual Grammar and Past-Time Reference*, London: Routledge
- Michaelis, Laura. 2006. "Time and Tense". In *The Handbook of English Linguistics* edited by B. Arts & A. McMahon, 1 - 23. Oxford: Blackwell
- Radden, Gunter and Rene Dirven. 2007. *Cognitive English Grammar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Vendler, Zeno. 1967. *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Ithaca and London. Cornell University Press
- Žic Fuchs, Milena. 2009. *Kognitivna lingvistika i jezične structure: engleski present perfect*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus

APPENDIX 1

- Collins, Suzanne. 2009. *The Hunger Games*. New York: Scholastic Inc.
- Collins, Suzanne. 2013. *Catching Fire*. New York: Scholastic Inc
- Collins, Suzanne. 2011. *Mockingjay*. London: Scholastic Children's Books
- Collins, Suzanne. 2014. *Igre gladi*. Translated by Mladen Kopjar. Zagreb: Algoritam
- Collins, Suzanne. 2014. *Plamen*. Translated by Mladen Kopjar. Zagreb: Algoritam
- Collins, Suzanne. 2014. *Šojka rugalica*. Translated by Mladen Kopjar. Zagreb: Algoritam
- Dashner, James. 2013. *The Maze Runner*. Frome: The Chicken House
- Dashner, James. 2010. *The Scorch Trials*. New York: Delacorte Press
- Dashner, James. 2011. *The Death Cure*. New York: Delacorte Press
- Dashner, James. 2014. *Labirint: nemogući bijeg*. Translated by Andrea Bagović. Zagreb: Profil knjiga
- Dashner, James. 2015. *Kroz spaljenu zemlju*. Translated by Andrea Bagović. Zagreb: Profil knjiga
- Dashner, James. 2016. *Lijek smrti*. Translated by Andrea Bagović. Zagreb: Profil knjiga
- Meyer, Stephanie. 2008. *Twilight*. London: Atom
- Meyer, Stephanie. 2007. *New Moon*. London: Atom
- Meyer, Stephanie. 2007. *Eclipse*. London: Atom
- Meyer, Stephanie. 2008. *Breaking Dawn*. London: Atom
- Meyer, Stephanie. 2009. *Sumrak*. Translated by Vladimir Cvetković Sever. Zagreb: Algoritam
- Meyer, Stephanie. 2009. *Mladi mjesec*. Translated by Vladimir Cvetković Sever. Zagreb: Algoritam
- Meyer, Stephanie. 2009. *Pomrčina*. Translated by Vladimir Cvetković Sever. Zagreb: Algoritam
- Meyer, Stephanie. 2009. *Praskozorje*. Translated by Vladimir Cvetković Sever. Zagreb: Algoritam
- Martin, George R. R., 2011. *A Game of Thrones*. New York: Bantam Books
- Martin, George R. R., 2011. *A Clash of Kings*. New York: Bantam Books
- Martin, George R. R., 2011. *A Storm of Swords*. New York: Bantam Books
- Martin, George R. R., 2011. *A Feast for Crows*. New York: Bantam Books
- Martin, George R. R., 2011. *A Dance with Dragons*. New York: Bantam Books
- Martin, George R. R. 2003. *Igra prijestolja*. Translated by Tajana Pavičević. Zagreb: Algoritam
- Martin, George R. R. 2003. *Sraz kraljeva*. Translated by Tajana Pavičević. Zagreb: Algoritam
- Martin, George R. R. 2003. *Oluja mačeva*. Translated by Tajana Pavičević. Zagreb: Algoritam
- Martin, George R. R. 2006. *Gozba vrana*. Translated by Tajana Pavičević. Zagreb: Algoritam
- Martin, George R. R. 2011. *Ples zmajeva*. Translated by Vladimir Cvetković Sever and Tajana Pavičević. Zagreb: Algoritam
- Riordan, Rick. 2008. *Percy Jackson and the Lightning Thief*. London: Puffin Books
- Riordan, Rick. 2008. *Percy Jackson and the Titan's Curse*. London: Puffin Books
- Riordan, Rick. 2009. *Kradljivac gromova*. Translated by Andrea Marić. Zagreb: Algoritam
- Riordan, Rick. 2013. *Titanova kletva*. Translated by Ivan Zorić. Zagreb: Algoritam
- Rowling, Joanne K. 2000. *Harry Potter and the Philosophers's Stone*. London: Bloomsbury
- Rowling, Joanne K. 1999. *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*. New York: Scholastic Inc.

- Rowling, Joanne K. 1999. *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*. New York: Scholastic Inc.
- Rowling, Joanne K. 2000. *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire*. New York: Scholastic Inc.
- Rowling, Joanne K. 2003. *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*. New York: Scholastic Inc.
- Rowling, Joanne K. 2005. *Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince*. London: Bloomsbury
- Rowling, Joanne K. 2007. *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*. London: Bloomsbury
- Rowling, Joanne K. 2000. *Harry Potter i kamen mudraca*. Translated by Zlatko Crnković. Zagreb: Algoritam
- Rowling, Joanne K. 2000. *Harry Potter i odaja tajni*. Translated by Zlatko Crnković. Zagreb: Algoritam
- Rowling, Joanne K. 2000. *Harry Potter i zatočenik Azkabana*. Translated by Zlatko Crnković. Zagreb: Algoritam
- Rowling, Joanne K. 2002. *Harry Potter i plameni pehar*. Translated by Dubravka Petrović. Zagreb: Algoritam
- Rowling, Joanne K. 2003. *Harry Potter i Red feniksa*. Translated by Dubravka Petrović. Zagreb: Algoritam
- Rowling, Joanne K. 2007. *Harry Potter I Princ miješane krvi*. Translated by Dubravka Petrović. Zagreb: Algoritam
- Rowling, Joanne K. 2007. *Harry Potter i Darovi Smrti*. Translated by Dubravka Petrović. Zagreb: Algoritam

APPENDIX 2




Figure 1 New Headway (Soars, Liz and John Soars. 2008. *New Headway: Advanced Student's Book*. Oxford University Press, Algoritam)

Future Perfect	I / You / He / She / It / We / They will have done all the work by Monday.	I / You / He / She / It / We / They will not (won't) have done all the work by Monday.
Will I / you / he / she / it / we / they have done all the work by Monday?	» actions that will be completed by a particular time in the future	

Figure 2. Tune up! 4 (Charry Roje, Rebecca, Pavlović Irena and Ivana Špiranec. 2014. *Tune Up! 4 udžbenik engleskoga jezika sa zvučnim CD-om za 4. razred gimnazije / prvi strani jezik*. Profil.)




Figure 3. Solutions (Falla, Tim and Paul A. Davies. 2012. *Solutions: Upper-Intermediate Student's Book*, *Udžbenik engleskog jezika B2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press)




Figure 4. Solutions (Falla, Tim and Paul A. Davies. 2012. *Solutions: Upper-Intermediate Student's Book, Udžbenik engleskog jezika B2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press)




Figure 5. New Success (Fricker, Rod. 2012. *New Success: Upper Intermediate Workbook*. Harlow: Pearson Education)

139 future perfect

shall/will have + past participle

We use the future perfect to say that something will have been completed by a certain time in the future.

*I'll **have been here** for seven years next Friday.*

*The painters say **they'll have finished** the downstairs rooms by Tuesday.*

A progressive form is possible.

*I'll **have been teaching** for twenty years this summer.*

Figure 6. Basic English Usage (Swan, Michael. 1986. *Basic English Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press)

A The future perfect

The future perfect is *will have + past participle*.

*When we get to York, we'll **have done** half the journey.*

*Seven is too early. I **won't have got** home from work by then.*

*How long **will the spaceship have been** in orbit?*

We can use the future perfect to talk about something being over at a time in the future.

*I'll **have finished** this book soon. I'm nearly at the end.*

*We don't need all day for the museum. I expect we'll **have seen** enough by lunch time.*

*Sarah **won't have completed** her studies until she's twenty-five.*

NOTE

- a In the first person we can also use *shall*.

*When we get to York, we **will/shall have done** half the journey.*

- b We can sometimes use *be going to* as well as *will*.

*They **aren't going to have finished** the repairs until next week.*

- c The future perfect can express an assumption about the past. > 76C

*You'll **have met** my boss – he was at the meeting you went to.*

Figure 7. Oxford Learner's Grammar: Grammar Finder (Eastwood, John. 2011. *Oxford learner's Grammar: Grammar Finder*. Oxford: Oxford University Press)

APPENDIX 3

1)

“And as there are around twenty of us, that greatly dilutes the power of the *Fidelius* Charm. Twenty times as many opportunities for the Death Eaters to get the secret out of somebody. We can’t expect it to hold much longer.”

“But surely Snape will have told the Death Eaters the address by now?” asked Harry.

	1 st YEAR	5 th YEAR	TOTAL
PERFEKT S. je (za)sigurno (već) (dosad) dao/otkrio/rekao adresu.	28	25	53
MORA DA JE S. mora da je već rekao/dao adresu.	2	1	3
KONDITIONAL I. S. bi (za)sigurno do sada rekao.	2	1	3
FUTUR I. Sigurno će reći adresu do sada.	X	1	1

2)

It seems that Kendra thought the move to Godric’s Hollow was the perfect opportunity to hide Ariana once and for all, something she had probably been planning for years. The timing was significant. Ariana was barely seven years old when she vanished from sight, and seven is the age by which most experts agree that magic will have revealed itself, if present. Nobody now alive remembers Ariana ever demonstrating even the slightest sign of magical ability.

	1 st YEAR	5 th YEAR	TOTAL
PREZENT To su godine kada se magija otkriva/otkrije Pojavi/pokaže Počinje manifestirati/otkrivati	19	13	32
FUTUR I. Magija će se pokazati/otkriti/pojaviti/manifestirati	5	8	13
KONDITIONAL I. Ako je magija prisutna ona bi se pokazala/pojavila/otkrila	7	4	14
Trebala manifestirati/otkriti	1	2	
PERFEKT Magija se već trebala pojaviti	X	1	1

3)

“Aren’t—aren’t you afraid, my Lord that Potter might die at another hand but yours?” asked Malfoy, his voice shaking. “Wouldn’t it be. . . forgive me. . . more prudent to call off this battle, enter the castle, and seek him y-yourself?”

“Do not pretend Lucius. You wish the battle to cease so that you can discover what has happened to your son. And I do not need to seek Potter. Before the night is out, Potter will have come to find me.”

	1 st YEAR	5 th YEAR	TOTAL
FUTUR I. P. će doći (pro)naći mene Potražiti/tražiti mene	15	9	56
Če (sam) doći (k) meni	4	5	
Če me/mene (pro)naći/potražiti	10	13	
FUTUR I. + GL.PRILOG SADAŠNJI P. će doći tražeći mene	1	1	2
FUTUR I. + PRILOŽNA OZNAKA P. će doći u potrazi za mnom P. će doći u potragu za mnom	2	X	2

4)

“So the boy. . . the boy must die?” asked Snape quite calmly.

“And Voldemort himself must do it, Severus. That is essential.”

Another long silence. Then Snape said, “I thought. . . all those years. . . that we were protecting him for her. For Lily.”

“We have protected him because it has been essential to teach him, to raise him, to let him try his strength,” said Dumbledore, his eyes still tight shut.

“Meanwhile, the connection between them grows ever stronger, a parasitic growth. Sometimes I have thought he suspects it himself. If I know him, he will have arranged matters so that when he does set out to meet his death, it will truly mean the end of Voldemort.”

	1 st YEAR	5 th YEAR	TOTAL
FUTUR I. On će srediti/urediti stvari Pobrinut će se da Organizirat će stvari tako	18	21	40
H. će kada će ići ususret svojoj smrti biti siguran da je to V-ov kraj.	X	1	
PERFEKT On je već tako posložio/uredio/sredio/organizirao stvari Pobrinuo se da	12	5	17
Ø	2	X	2
Ako ga poznajem, on je već ima plan	X	1	1

5)

“What if I’m in Slytherin?”

The whisper was for his father alone, and Harry knew that only the moment of departure could have forced Albus to reveal how great and sincere that fear was.

“But just say—”

“—then Slytherin House will have gained an excellent student, won’t it?”

	1 st YEAR	5 th YEAR	TOTAL
FUTUR I. Onda će S. dobiti Će imati (2) Će biti sretni što te imaju (1)	26	24	50
PREZENT (with future time reference) Onda S. dobiva	X	1	1
KONDITIONAL I. Onda bi S. dobio Bi imala (1)	4	3	7
PERFEKT* To će značiti da je S. dobio	2	X	2

6)

“And now, Harry, on a closely related subject . . . I gather that you have been taking the Daily Prophet over the last two weeks?”

“Yes,” said Harry, and his heart beat a little faster.

“Then you will have seen that there have been not so much leaks as floods concerning your adventure in the Hall of Prophecy?”

	1 st YEAR	5 th YEAR	TOTAL
PERFEKT Onda si (za)sigurno vidio/primijetio	27	24	51
FUTUR I. Onda ćeš vidjeti/zamijetiti	2	2	4
Ø	1	1	2
Onda mora da si vidio	2	X	2
PREZENT U tom slučaju znaš	X	1	1

7)

“Because, I think, he is ashamed of what he remembers,” said Dumbledore. “He has tried to rework the memory to show himself in a better light, obliterating those parts which he does not wish me to see. It is, as you will have noticed, very crudely done, and that is all to the good, for it shows that the true memory is still there beneath the alterations.”

	1 st YEAR	5 th YEAR	TOTAL
PERFEKT Kao što si primijetio/vidio Mogao vidjeti	22	21	43
PREZENT Kao što vidiš Možeš vidjeti/primijetiti	6	2	8
FUTUR I. Kao što ćete primijetiti	3	5	8
Ø	1	X	1

8)

“Now,” said Dumbledore, “if you don’t mind, Harry, I want to pause once more to draw your attention to certain points of our story. Voldemort had committed another murder; whether it was his first since he killed the Riddles, I do not know, but I think it was. This time, as you will have seen, he killed not for revenge, but for gain. He wanted the two fabulous trophies that poor, besotted, old woman showed him. Just as he had once robbed the other children at his orphanage, just as he had stolen his Uncle Morfin’s ring, so he ran off now with Hepzibah’s cup and locket.”

	1 st YEAR	5 th YEAR	TOTAL
PERFEKT Kao što si vidio/primijetio Mogao vidjeti/primijetiti	20	12	32
FUTUR I. Kao što ćeš vidjeti/primijetiti	7	11	18
PREZENT Kao što vidiš	4	4	8
Ø	1	1	2

9)

“We’ve been down to see him by night before,” said Harry.

“Yes, but for something like this?” said Hermione. “We’ve risked a lot to help Hagrid out, but after all — Aragog’s dead. If it were a question of saving him —”

“— I’d want to go even less,” said Ron firmly. “You didn’t meet him, Hermione. Believe me, being dead will have improved him a lot.”

	5 th YEAR
PERFEKT Smrt ga je poboljšala/poppravila itd. To što je mrtav, moglo ga je samo popraviti itd.	12
KONDICIONAL I. Smrt bi ga poboljšala/poppravila	5
FUTUR I. Umiranje/smrt će ga popraviti/učiniti puno boljim	4
PREZENT	7

PREZENT

Being dead will have improved him a lot.

- 1) To što je mrtav ga čini puno boljim.
- 2) To što je mrtav ide mu u korist.
- 3) Sad kad je mrtav, puno je simpatičniji.
- 4) To što je mrtav, napredak je za njegov karakter,
- 5) Vjeruj mi, bolji je mrtav.
- 6) Vjeruj mi, bolje mu je da je mrtav.
- 7) Vjeruj mi, mnogo bolje izgleda mrtav.

	1 st YEAR
PERFEKT Smrt/To što je mrtav ga je unaprijedilo/poboljšalo/poppravilo	9
Bivanje mrtvim ga je zasigurno mnogo poboljšalo	1
* Biti mrtav ga je veoma popravilo	1
* To što je bio mrtav, pomoglo mu je.	1
FUTUR I. To što je mrtav/ Smrt, znatno će ga poboljšati	2
* Umiranje će ga poboljšati.	1
KONDICIONAL I. Smrt bi ga poboljšala/poppravila Mrtav bi ljepše izgledao	4
* Biti mrtav bi mu išlo na ruke.	1
* u smrti bi bio bolji	1
* Bio bi uvelike poboljšan da je mrtav	1
* Bilo bi mu puno bolje da je mrtav	1
PREZENT (Puno) je bolji mrtav (nego živ) To što je mrtav sigurno je bolje ----- To što je mrtav može ga samo uljepšati	6
MORA DA To što je bio mrtav, mora da ga je poboljšalo	1
Dobro će mu doći da bude mrtav	1
* Bivajući mrtvim bi ga još više poboljšalo	1

10)

“Payment?” said Harry. “You’ve got to give the door something?”

“Yes,” said Dumbledore. “Blood, if I am not much mistaken.”

“Blood?”

“I said it was crude,” said Dumbledore, who sounded disdainful, even disappointed, as though Voldemort had fallen short of the standards Dumbledore expected. “The idea, as I am sure you will have gathered, is that your enemy must weaken him- or herself to enter. Once again, Lord Voldemort fails to grasp that there are much more terrible things than physical injury.”

	1 st YEAR	5 th YEAR	TOTAL
PERFEKT Kao što si vjerojatno već Shvatio/primijetio/zaključio Čuo	28	23	51
FUTUR I. Kao što ćeš i sam shvatiti/primijetiti *Ideja je, u što sam siguran da ćete već dokučiti Ideja je, za koju sam siguran da će te je shvatiti	2	2	4
PREZENT Ideja je, pretpostavljam da znaš Shvaćаш Da Vam je to i samima jasno	1	3	4
Ø	1	X	1

11)

“Don’t talk now,” said Harry, fearing how slurred Dumbledore’s voice had become, how much his feet dragged. “Save your energy, sir. . . . We’ll soon be out of here. . . .”

“The archway will have sealed again. . . . My knife . . .”

“There’s no need, I got cut on the rock,” said Harry firmly. “Just tell me where. . . .”

	1 st YEAR	5 th YEAR	TOTAL
PAST TIME Perfekt + Active voice Prolaz se (sigurno/vjerojatno) (već) (opet) zatvorio/zapečatio/zaključao	15	11	26
Prezent + Passive voice Prolaz je (opet) zapriječen/zapečaćen	1	4	5
FUTURE TIME (event) Futur I. + Active voice Prolaz će se (opet/ponovo) zapečatiti/zatvoriti	7	8	15
FUTURE TIME (state)	3	5	8

- (exact time unknown / irrelevant) Futur I. + Passive voice Prolaz će (opet) biti zapečaćen/zatvoren			
Ø	5	X	5
Prolaz mora da se ponovo zatvorio	1	X	1

12)

“He doesn’t look good, he’s covered in blood, I ran along to Elfrida Cragg’s portrait to get a good view as they left —” said Everard.

“Good,” said Dumbledore as Ron made a convulsive movement, “I take it Dilys will have seen him arrive, then —”

And moments later, the silver-ringletted witch had reappeared in her picture too; she sank, coughing, into her armchair and said, “Yes, they’ve taken him to St. Mungo’s, Dumbledore. . . . They carried him past under my portrait. . . . He looks bad. . . .”

	1 st YEAR	5 th YEAR	TOTAL
PERFEKT D. ga je vidjela kad je stigao/kako dolazi...	26	20	46
FUTUR I. D. će vidjeti kako stiže / kad stigne...	3	7	10
KONDICIONAL I. Dilji bi ga trebali vidjeti kako dolazi	1	X	1
D. mora da ga je vidjela	X	1	1
Ø	2	X	2

13)

Nick turned away from the window and looked mournfully at Harry. “He won’t come back.”

“Who?”

“Sirius Black,” said Nick.

“But you did!” said Harry angrily. “You came back — you’re dead and you didn’t disappear —”

“He will not come back,” repeated Nick quietly. “He will have . . . gone on.”

	1 st YEAR	5 th YEAR	TOTAL
PERFEKT On je nastavio/otišao dalje Preminuo/umro...	23	14	37
FUTUR I. On će nastaviti/otići (dalje, u drugi svijet, na drugu stranu)	8	12	20
PREZENT On ... više nije s nama Više ga ... nema	X	2	2
Ø	1	X	1

14)

“You will do it quietly and without fuss; I only wish that I could do it myself, but in my present condition . . . Come, Wormtail, one more death and our path to Harry Potter is clear. I am not asking you to do it alone. By that time, my faithful servant will have rejoined us —”

	1 st YEAR	5 th YEAR	TOTAL
FUTUR I. Do tad će nam se (opet, ponovo) vratiti/pridružiti moj vjerni sluga	32	28	60

15)

“I’m not sure this is going to work, you know,” said Hermione warningly “I’m sure Dumbledore will have thought of this.”

	1 st YEAR	5 th YEAR	TOTAL
PERFEKT Sigurna sam da se D. (do)sjetio toga Da je mislio/razmišljao o ovome Da je ovo uzeo u obzir Da je ovo računao s ovim Da mu je ovo već palo na pamet Da je razmislio o ovome	24	17	41
FUTUR I. Da će se (do)sjetiti ovoga Da će misliti o ovome Da će imati mišljenje o ovome	4	6	10
KONDITIONAL I. Sigurna sam da bi se D. sjetio ovog	2	5	7
PLUSKVAMPERFEKT Sigurna sam da se D. bio sjetio ovoga	2	X	2

16)

“Macnair, if Buckbeak has indeed been stolen, do you really think the thief will have led him away on foot?” said Dumbledore, still sounding amused.

	1 st YEAR	5 th YEAR	TOTAL
PERFEKT (prezent+perfekt) Ako je ukraden, misliš li da ga je lopov odveo pješice?	15	8	23
(perfekt+perfekt) Ako je bio ukraden, misliš li da ga je lopov odveo pješice?	4	1	5
FUTUR I. (prezent+futur I.) Ako je ukraden, misliš li da će ga odvesti?	2	2	4
(perfekt+futur I.) Ako je bio ukraden, misliš li da će ga odvesti?	1	X	1
KONDITIONAL I. (prezent + kondicional I.) Ako je ukraden, misliš li da bi ga odveo?	9	14	23
(perfekt, active + kondicional I.) Ako je bio ukraden, misliš li da bi ga odveo?	1	X	1
(perfekt, passive + kondicional I.) Ako je netko zaista ukrao K., misliš li da bi ga odveo?	X	3	3

