

# Dependence of pragmatically implied meaning on aspectual-temporal semantics (based on the English and Russian language material)

Alsu N. Makhmutova – Gulnara F. Lutfullina

DOI: 10.18355/XL.2017.10.01.09

## Abstract

The article is devoted to the notion of an implied temporal meaning, which are pragmatically realized in the Russian language. Russian future perfect and English Future Perfect have aspectual meaning of entirety. That is why these tenses imply a pragmatic interest in the after-action or the potential referential meaning of Tunc precedence. Russian Future Imperfect and English Future Continuous have aspectual meaning of the processiveness, which determines interest to previous situation and pragmatically implied meaning Tunc sequence. However, in the English language due to pragmatic factors of language means economy this sense is not expressed. Future Indefinite does not differentiate these meanings and does not imply any pragmatic meanings.

**Key words:** language, text, speaker, tense, aspect, pragmatic meaning, student

---

## Introduction

"Traditionally ... both aspects (perfect and progressive) are treated as part of the tense system in English, and mention is made of tenses such as the present progressive (e.g. *We are waiting*), the present perfect progressive (e.g. *We have been waiting*), and the past perfect progressive (e.g. *We had been waiting*), with the latter two combining two aspects. There is a distinction to be made, however, between tense and aspect. Tense is concerned with how time is encoded in the grammar of English, and is often based on morphological form (e.g. *write, writes, wrote*); aspect is concerned with the unfolding of a situation, and in English is a matter of syntax, using the verb *be* to form the progressive, and the *verb* have to form the perfect. For this reason combinations like those above are nowadays referred to as constructions (e.g. the progressive construction, the present perfect progressive construction)" (Aarts, Chalker, Weiner, 2014: 97).

Semantically, aspects are different ways of viewing the internal constitution of an actualizing situation. These different ways are expressed by different markers on the verb (i.e. suffixes, auxiliaries or a combination of the two, as in the English progressive form), although not all languages have a marker for every one of the aspectual meanings. In principle, a speaker may use a special verb form to refer to a situation in its entirety (perfective aspect), or he may use forms which represent it as beginning (ingressive or inchoative aspect), or as ongoing (progressive aspect), or as ending (egressive aspect). In English, there are only two aspects that are systematically expressed by special verb markers, namely, progressive and non-progressive aspect (Declerck, 2006:164-169).

According to expression means, Declerck distinguishes three aspects. Grammatical aspect is the grammatical expression of a particular meaning; an aspectual label can be applied both to a particular meaning and to the grammatical form expressing it. Thus, the 'progressive form' expresses 'progressive meaning'. There is also so-called lexical aspect (also called 'Aktionsart'), which is referred to as ontological aspect. The latter category (also called 'Aktionsart') has to do with the way the lexical material in the verb phrase determines one or more inherent characteristics of a kind of situation. A third sort of aspect, to be distinguished from

both grammatical and ontological aspect, is what is called actualization aspect, which has to do with whether the actualization of the situation referred to is represented as 'bounded' (i.e. as reaching an endpoint) or not. Both ontological aspect and actualization aspect are determined by the choice of lexical material (Cappelle, Declerck, 2005: 891-905).

In English, there is perfective aspect when the verb form used reflects the fact that the speaker wants to refer to the actualization of a situation in its entirety, i. e. that he views the situation as if it were a temporally unstructured whole. Imperfective aspect means that the speaker uses a verb form which explicitly refers to part of the internal temporal structure of the situation, i. e. a verb form which does not refer to the complete situation, but only to its beginning, middle or end (Declerck, 1997: 50-58). There is progressive ('durative', 'continuous') aspect when the speaker uses a special verb form, viz. the 'progressive form', to express progressive meaning, i.e. to focus on the middle of the situation or on some (punctual or durative) part of the middle of the situation. What matters is that he presents a view of the situation as if from within the situation, that is, from within the interval during which the whole situation takes place. In other words, progressive aspect requires that the speaker assumes a 'vantage time' from which he views the situation as in progress ('ongoing') (Declerck, Depraetere, 1995: 269-283). There is habitual aspect when the verb takes on a special form (suffix or auxiliary) to describe the situation as characteristic of the referent of the subject NP over a certain period of time. English has a special form to express habituality in the past: the semi-auxiliary used to and the auxiliary would. Will can be used similarly to refer to a present repetitive habit, constituting 'characteristic behaviour' (Declerck, 2010: 274-289).

M. Blokh distinguishes two categories. The aspective meaning of the verb that is different from its temporal meaning, reflects the inherent mode of the realisation of the process irrespective of its timing. The aspective meaning can be in-built in the semantic structure of the verb, forming an invariable, derivative category. In English, the various lexical aspective meanings have been generalised by the verb in its subclass division into limitive and unlimitive sets (Blokh, 1983: 155). The aspective verbal subclasses are grammatically relevant in so far as they are not indifferent to the choice of the aspective grammatical forms of the verb. The continuous verbal forms analysed on the principles of oppositional approach admit of only one interpretation, and that is aspective. The continuous forms are aspective because, reflecting the inherent character of the process performed by the verb, they do not, and cannot, denote the timing of the process. The perfect, as different from the continuous, does reflect a kind of timing, though in a purely relative way. Namely, it co-ordinates two times, locating one of them in retrospect towards the other. M. Blokh believes that the verbal system of English has two temporal categories (plus one "minor" category of futurity option) and two aspective categories (Blokh, 2002: 155).

According to the classification P.V. Durst-Andersen, English refers to languages with a focus on listener (hearer-based languages) and "various mental files". Mental archive includes archives of past and present. "The state is stored in the form of pictures, and activities are stored in the form of a film regardless of the type of mental archives" (Durst-Andersen, 1985: 35). Perfect tense presents the event as "news-flash". In this case, the thief shows a "photo" and sums up the day. Imperfect tense verbalizes event in the mental archive. In this case, the thief verbalizes "file with the movie" and shows the film stored in the memory." The choice of tenses depends on the parameters of relevance / irrelevance of situational information. From a pragmatic point *-ing* form expresses the quality of the picture *He is always smoking*, and Indefinite form expresses the quality of the man *He always smokes* (Durst-Andersen, 1985: 30-42).

In Russian there are different interpretations of the aspect category. It is the main category for the formation of any verbal word. Monocentric aspectual field is formed by this category. G.A. Zolotova proposes to distinguish the aspectual semantics of the verb and its aspectual interpretation. It is recognized the following ingredients of verbal aspect: meaning, function and form. The semantics of the verb is an objective basis of its aspectual meaning. Author's subjective interpretation of the process determines the perfect or imperfect aspect in his interests and suggests the implementation of an aspectual function. A set of derivational means of Tense expression determines a form. According to G.A. Zolotova, aspect is a grammatical category that expresses the way the speaker transmits its perception of predictive indication or generalized knowledge of it (Zolotova, 2002: 7-30).

According to P.V. Durst-Andersen classification, Russian belongs to the languages focused on reality and different "mental models". Users are able to anticipate the events. When someone carries a vase toward the table, we can guess that the vase will soon be on the table. You can identify the process with the objective of the state (Durst-Andersen, 1995). Russian speaker has to make a compulsory choice between perfect aspect that verbalizes mental model of an event and imperfect aspect that verbalizes the mental models of a process.

Russian aspect creates for a listener a copy of a specific part of reality: perfect aspect shows a copy of the event, but imperfect aspect shows a copy of the process. Russian belongs to the type of reality-languages, which reflects the internal and external organization of reality. According to P.V. Durst-Andersen, a process that takes place in real time is related to imperfect aspect, and an event that takes place in future is related to perfect aspect.

The question of the invariant meaning of Russian aspect is debatable. In the works of J.S. Maslov, A.V. Bondarko and others, major opposition between perfect and imperfect aspects is considered "completed process" - "evolving process". M.J. Glovinskaya considers the meaning of "begin to exist" as an invariant meaning of perfect aspect, and the meaning "exist in each of the series of successive moments" as an invariant meaning of imperfective aspect (Glovinskaya, 2001: 123). Some scientists find a more general formulation: perfect aspect indicates the beginning of a new state, and imperfect aspect indicates a continuation of the former state or process. A.A. Zaliznyak and A.D. Shmelev consider imperfect aspect as a marked form indicating the state. Perfect aspect covers all other types of situations (Zaliznyak, Shmelev, 2000: 13).

Perfect aspect, according to A.V. Bondarko expresses some basic meanings. Entirety of the process means the absence of temporal structure, the inability to identify a middle phase or the absence of an action evolution in time. Perfect forms cannot combine with phase verbs such as to finish: *zakonchila napisat'* (finished write) is incorrect. Perfect aspect expresses the entirety of the initial phase; the continuation phase is implicit (1). Indication "entirety" implies the situation to be considered "from the outside"(2) (Bondarko, 2002: 367-381). Indication "limited extent" means exhaustion, completion. Two feature limitation and entirety complement each other totality and boundedness (Dahl, 2016).

Perfect aspect is the basic marked means of expressing a new situation emergence, which implies limit effects on statement level (Bondarko, 2002: 367-381). On pragmatic basis perfect aspect is differently interpreted. According to G.M. Zeldovich, the situation has only one time interval. Logic formula means that at a certain time interval there is what is described by the verb (Zeldovich, 2012: 55). It is assumed that the time period is entirely occupied by the situation (Landman, Rothstein, 2010). According to G.M. Zeldovich, every situation is individual: there is only one interval, referred to the situation (Zeldovich, 2012: 55). Singularity is a separable from the lexical meaning of the verb. Semantically unmarked imperfective

aspect appears in expressing: 1) generalized-actual meaning; 2) time neutralization; 3) repeated past actions.

Iterative meaning is considered only as one of particular meanings. Imperfect aspect is characterized by an explicit processiveness. Hallmarks of imperfect aspect are middleness, perception, duration, dynamics (Bondarko, 2002: 367-381). Lexical duration is associated with the processiveness meaning. During the situation the speaker positions himself inside the situation. Explicit limits, according to A.V. Bondarko, are expressed only by perfect aspect; implicit limit may be expressed by imperfective aspect (Bondarko, 2002: 345). A.A. Zaliznyak and A.D. Shmelev note that imperfect aspect is characterized by the following meaning: 1) durative meaning; 2) processiveness meaning; 3) iterative meaning (Zaliznyak, Shmelev, 2000: 15).

An interesting interpretation of imperfect aspect is from the point of view of pragmatics. G.M. Zeldovich says that imperfect aspect expresses a homogeneous part of the situation (Zeldovich, 2010). I.M. Boguslavsky proposes that imperfect aspect indicates the presence of the necessary conditions for the implementation of the action (Boguslavsky, 1996: 45). Incompleteness meaning is optional for Imperfect aspect, result meaning statistically prevails. Imperfect aspect implies that the action can not be complete, and represents a situation partially. We choose imperfect aspect if there is one of the following three reasons: 1) the action has not reached its completion; 2) the speaker is not satisfied with the action confinement to a single time interval; 3) perfect aspect is undesirable due to other circumstances. However, the process homogeneity is also important. It is actual-durative meaning that can eliminate the implied multiplicity meaning of imperfect aspect.

Use of imperfect aspect in duration context requires a simultaneous situation (1). If there is no simultaneity, this phrase is embarrassing (2). Durative imperfect aspect is chosen where the implications of the situation are important.

1. *Kogda ya budu varit' sup, Ivan budet razbivat' vazu* (Zeldovich, 2012: 43).
2. *Ona budet vyhodit' zamuzh, potomu chto tak budet velet' otec* (Zeldovich, 2012: 44).
3. *Kogda Ivan budet obedat', budet chitat' gazet* (Zeldovich, 2012: 44).
4. *Ne znayu, budet prygat' Ivan na kryshu ili net* (Zeldovich, 2012: 44).
5. *When I make soup, Ivan will break the vase.*
6. *She will get married, because that would be to order the father.*
7. *When Ivan will have lunch, will read the paper.*
8. *I do not know Ivan will jump on the roof or not.*

Imperfect aspect considers many situations under a single stereotype. Where the action is clearly unusual, imperfect aspect is strange. Perception factors contribute to realize durative meaning of imperfective aspect (4).

### **Additional conclusion**

Thus, English language has different types of aspectual categories and different aspectual categories. It is recognized the obvious fact that Russian imperfect aspect correlates with continuous aspect and category of the Continuous forms, as well as Russian perfect aspect correlates with general aspect and Indefinite forms and with retrospective coordination category and Perfect forms. In Russian, according to the traditional view, Perfect aspect expresses the emergence of a new situation, entirety, whereas imperfect aspect is characterized by explicit processiveness. According to pragmatics, the perfect aspect expresses singularity, "chain of actions", and perfect meaning, quasi-perfect meaning. Imperfect aspect carries an idea of the real multiplicity of situations and is characterized by the processiveness meaning.

According to our point of view, the verb implies the original lexical aspectual semantics limitless or unlimitless. As table № 1 and table № 2 show in both languages the verb undergoes a grammatical transformation of aspectual nature acquiring new aspectual value due to its temporal form.

**Table № 1. Transformation of verb meanings in Russian**

1 level Lexical aspectuality	2 level Aspectual conversion	3 level Temporal transformation Future tense
<b>limited verb</b> <i>kupit' / to buy</i>	<b>perfect aspect</b> <i>kupit'</i> <b>imperfect aspect</b> <i>pokupat' (prefix)</i>	<b>perfect aspect</b> <i>kuplyu</i> <b>imperfect aspect</b> <i>budu pokupat'</i>
<b>unlimited verb</b> <i>varit' / to cook</i>	<b>perfect aspect</b> <i>svarit' (prefix)</i> <b>imperfect aspect</b> <i>varit'</i>	<b>perfect aspect</b> <i>svaryu</i> <b>imperfect aspect</b> <i>budu varit'</i>

**Table № 2. Transformation of verb meanings in English**

1 level Lexical aspectuality	2 level Aspectual conversion	3 level Temporal transformation Future tense
<b>limited verb</b> <i>to buy</i>	<b>development category</b> <i>to be buying</i> <b>retrospective coordination category</b> <i>to have bought</i>	<b>Future Indefinite – entirety</b> <i>will buy</i> <b>Future Continuous – processiveness</b> <i>will be buying</i> <b>Future Perfect – entirety + precedence</b> <i>will have bought</i>

<b>unlimited verb</b> <i>to write</i>	<b>development category</b> <i>to be writing</i> <b>retrospective coordination category</b> <i>to have bought</i>	<b>Future Indefinite – entirety</b> <i>will write</i> <b>Future Continuous – processiveness</b> <i>will be writing</i> <b>Future Perfect – entirety + precedence</b> <i>will have written</i>
--	--	--

In English the lexical aspectual meaning experiences double aspectual-temporal transformation. Also in the English language there are the development meaning of Continuous forms and the retrospective coordination meaning of Perfect forms while in the Russian language there are two categories - perfect and imperfect aspects. Pragmatically the implied values, as we can be show further, depend on the aspectual semantics.

Referential values of sequence, precedence and simultaneity of predicates are defined relative to Tunc reference point (THAN moment in the past or future) or Nunc reference point (speech moment / NOW ).

## Main text

### Future perfect tense in the Russian language

#### *Tunc precedence as an implied pragmatic meaning of future perfect tense in Russian (quasi-perfect meaning in the terminology of G. M. Zeldovich)*

- (1) *YA svaryu sup. Kupi, pozhalujsta, pertsu* (Zeldovich, 2012: 53);
- (2) *Ivana uvolyat. Nado emu pomoch'* (Zeldovich, 2012: 53);
- (3) *(– Na budushchij den' rozhdeniya ya podaryu tebe tsvety.) – I chto ona tebe skazhet?* (Zeldovich, 2012: 57);
- (4) *– Ladno, – hripit Abnoshkin, – skhozhu korovnik posmotryu* (Okudzhava, 2014: 339);
- (5) *– Podgotov'te lejtenanta k operatsii, – skazal hirurg, – a ya posmotryu tut slozhnyj sluchaj – tyazhyoloe cherepnoe ranenie* (Grossman, 1990: 71);
- (6) *Po doroge iz Moskvy v Monreal' ya zaedu v TSyurih* (Prostyakova, 2002: 6).

- (1) *I'll make some soup. Buy, please pepper;*
- (2) *Ivan fired. We must help him;*
- (3) *(- For the next birthday I'll give you flowers.) - And what did she say?;*
- (4) *- All right, - wheezing Abnoshkin - I'll go see the cowshed;*
- (5) *- Prepare a lieutenant for the operation - told the surgeon - and I'll see here a complex case - heavy cranial injury;*
- (6) *On the way from Moscow to Montreal, I'll come to Zurich.*

G.M. Zeldovich believes that perfect aspect pragmatically focuses on the results. He argues that quasi-perfect interpretation should be systematically chosen in interpreting future perfect tense (Zeldovich, 2012: 53). In the phrases (1), (2) it is natural to understand that everything happens after: *after the dismissal, after the soup being made*. According to G.M. Zeldovich, when quasi-perfect meaning is realized by perfect aspect, there is always a correlated situation or a "resulting situation". Perfect

aspect specifies taxis relations (Zeldovich, 2012: 53). Example (3) demonstrates that anybody currently knows nothing about future situations and cannot know. Predicates *skhozhu* (4), *posmotryu* (5), *zaedu* (6) express quasi-perfect meaning or *Tunc* precedence meaning in relation to the following future situations *skhozhu – uvizhu* (4), *posmotryu – uvizhu* (5), *zaedu – pobudu tam* (6). Correlative situations may be mentally reconstructed as possible. If situation timing is absent in the context, *Tunc* precedence meaning may be pragmatically implied.

## Future imperfect tense in Russian

### *Tunc* sequence as an implied pragmatic meaning

Effect of direct beginning of the action is typical for prospective imperfective tense, since, according to E.V. Paducheva, there always exist some conditions of any situation (Paducheva, 2015:12). If the speaker draws attention to the available conditions for action, this means that the action takes place or is expected soon (Paducheva, 1996: 68).

- (1) – *O, ya budu igrat' bionicheskogo cheloveka* (Dzhim Kehri – iznutri i snaruzhi, «EHkran i scena» 2004.05.06) (NKRYA);
- (2) *Poskol'ku testovyj na 4-chasah ne sil'no peregruzhen otkrytymi pozicijami, to ya budu otkryvat' pozicii na kazhdom iz ehtih urovnej* (Forex, 2004) (NKRYA);
- (3) *Kak tol'ko ya nachala zanimat'sya Lermontovym, Nadya stala boyat'sya, chto ya budu pisat' memuary o Mandel'shtamah* (EH. Gershtejn. Lishnyaya lyubov') (NKRYA);
- (4) *No rasskaz o ego dal'nejshej zhizni – ehto novaya kniga, pisat' kotoruyu budet kto-to drugoj* (L. Solov'ev) (NKRYA).

- (1) - *Oh, I'm going to play the bionic man;*
- (2) *Since 4 hours test is full by open positions, then I'll open positions at each of these levels;*
- (3) *As soon as I started Lermontov, Nadia was afraid that I would be writing a memoir about Mandelstam;*
- (4) *But the story of his later life - it's a new book, which will be written by someone else.*

G.M. Zeldovich considers the following factors as favorable for the realization of the prospectiveness meaning. If the future situation is presented by an agentive verb, it is assumed that Speaker has already his intention at speech moment and it is implied that there are prerequisites for the appropriate action (1). There may be direct references to future situation in the text. In the examples (2) - (4) there are explicit prerequisites for action: a little overload test (2), the beginning of classes by Lermontov (3), the life story (4).

- (5) *S vashego pozvoleniya, ya budu vam zvonit'* (Zeldovich, 2012: 138);
- (6) *Mozhet byt', ya teper' budu uhodit'* (Zeldovich, 2012: 138);
- (7) *Ego budut uvol'nyat' – hotya poka takogo namereniya u nachal'nika net* (Zeldovich, 2012: 139);
- (8) *YA budu razbivat' ehtu chashku* (Zeldovich, 2012: 139);
- (9) *YA budu sdavat' ehzameny* (Zeldovich, 2012: 139);
- (10) *YA budu uezzhat' na neobitaemyj ostrov* (Zeldovich, 2012: 139).
- (11) *With your permission, I'll call you;*
- (12) *Maybe now I'll go;*
- (13) *He will be dismissed - although the chief has no intention;*

- (14) *I'm going to break this cup;*  
 (15) *I'm going to take exams;*  
 (16) *I'm going to go to a desert island.*

According to G.M. Zeldovich, imperfect aspect is impossible, if communication conditions are threatened, for example, by impossibility. In the example (5) one call is expected and not a lot of calls, so the phrase is incorrect. In the example (6) uncertainty is expressed about a possible link between conditions and intentions. Context may exclude prerequisites. Situations can be difficult to imagine due to lack of stereotypical script or natural, easy implied conditions (Zeldovich, 2012: 45). Example (7) sounds awkward, as there is no intention. It is hard to imagine the background in (8), as indicated action is presented as purposeful. In the example (9) there is a prerequisite due to the well-known stereotype. In the example (10) it is impossible to find a situation which may cause a trip to a desert island.

Future tense and modal forms have prospective meaning, but never past tenses. The reason is that if we are talking about a future event, anticipated situation is localized in present time or in immediate future time.

Previous situation can be localized in time which may be activated in the text and pragmatically well available. The phrase *YA budu varit' sup. Kupi, pozhalujsta, pertsa / I'll make soup. Buy, please pepper* clearly involves the interpretation that the pepper will need to prepare the soup. Thus, Russian imperfect future tense pragmatically implies the Tunc sequence after some mentally suggested situation.

#### ***Absence of pragmatically implied temporal values in English future tenses***

Quasi-perfect meaning is realized when there is no reference to situation localization (in the terminology of G. M. Zeldovich). At the same time there are no correlative situation and some reference time point. Pragmatically, a good candidate for correlative situation is the speech moment, which may be considered as a background to the future situation. On the other hand, a good candidate for correlative situation may be the mental model of following situation. According to G.M. Zeldovich, pragmatically more accessible and interesting for the speaker is quasi-perfect interpretation when the situation is correlated not with the speech moment but with another future situation (Zeldovich, 2010: 23).

In the future, the result may be short and rarely is confined to any specific reference point. Quasi-perfect interpretation is the least marked and expected. It is less informative, because it is not bound to a particular time point expressed grammatically. According to G.M. Zeldovich, quasi-perfect meaning corresponds to our typical cognitive model. Pragmatic rule is implemented: if we are interested in the event, its implications should be of interest too. The perfect meaning is realized with respect to speech moment, the quasi-perfect meaning is realized with respect to relatively conceivable future situation. Quasi-perfect meaning suggests pragmatically implied referential meaning of tunc precedence relative to the mentally reconstructed the subsequent situation.

In Russian Perfect aspect defines a singularity of action and imperfect aspect defines their multiplicity. In English Future Indefinite is multifunctional tense which parity expresses both values. That is why it is impossible to recognize that Future Indefinite has strict meaning of entirety. The ability to express a singular action confirms the presence of relative meaning of entirety. Future Indefinite may express "chain of actions", which is implied by tense semantics and is clearly distinguished in past time I read. I drew. However, in future this meaning is neutralized. Depending on the aspectual verbal semantics of limitless diachronic and synchronous interpretations may be chosen: I will read. I will draw. According our

point of view, aspectual meaning of entirety implies quasi-perfect meaning of perfective verbs:

*YA svaryu sup. Kupi perets.  
I will make some soup. Buy pepper (to add after cooking).*

In English this value is not implicit:

*I will make soup. Buy some pepper.*

Future Indefinite may express multiple actions that proves the presence of processiveness meaning. According to our point of view, in Russian processiveness meaning of imperfect implies the interest to previous situation in Russian:

*YA budu varit' sup. Kupi perets.  
I will make soup. Buy pepper (to put in the soup).*

In English, the phrase can be understood in two ways:

*I will make soup. Buy some pepper (pepper needed for cooking or to add after cooking).*

When Future Indefinite tense is used entirety / processiveness meaning depends only on the aspectual verbal semantics of limitlessness. Meaning of unlimited verb to make prevails, so the phrase can be interpreted as to buy pepper for cooking. Pragmatically implied interest to previous situation involves potential referential meaning Tunc sequence relative to mentally reconstructed previous situation. Future Indefinite does not express potential referential meaning Tunc sequence.

We managed to find a number of examples that can be pragmatically interpreted as an interest to potentially possible subsequent or previous action.

(1) *All the Alconburys' friends will spend the entire time asking me if I've got a boyfriend yet* (HFB: 102).

(2) *It will be good for me to get away instead of obsessing and waiting for Good Afternoon!* (HFB: 102).

(3) *It will be a lovely surprise for them both ...* (Heald, 1990: 140).

(1) *All Friends Alconbury torment me with questions about whether I have a friend* (HFD: 130).

(2) *I'll feel better if I leave, than to sit here and wait for the good news* (HFD: 128).

(3) *For both it will be a surprise.*

In the examples (1) - (3) there are non-verbal indicators of time localization. As it can be seen from the examples, they are located in the immediate time of speech, so that we can consider as representation of 'pure' future. Unlimited verbs will spend (1), will be good (2), will be (3) in Future Indefinite pragmatically implies "interest" to previous situation: something happened - (now) they tortured me (1), something happened - (now) I feel better (2), something happens - it will be a surprise (3).

### ***Pragmatically implied meaning of Tunc sequence***

Aspectual meaning of processiveness implies a pragmatic interest to previous situation when we use Future Continuous. The phrase *I will be making soup. Buy some pepper / I will cook soup. Buy Pepper* suggests that pepper is needed for cooking soup. However, due to pragmatic factors of language means economy in English this meaning is not expressed.

### **Conclusion**

#### ***Implied pragmatic of Tunc sequence***

Aspectual meaning of entirety implies a pragmatic interest to following situation. Future perfect implies time exhaustion. For example, the phrase with Future perfect *I will have made soup. Buy pepper / I will make some soup. Buy Pepper* suggests that peppers will add to the soup while eating. However, due to the pragmatic factors of economy of language means in English this meaning is not expressed.

Russian future perfect and English Future Perfect have aspectual meaning of entirety. That is why these tenses imply a pragmatic interest in the after-action or the potential referential meaning of *Tunc precedence*. Russian Future Imperfect and English Future Continuous have aspectual meaning of the processiveness, which determines interest to previous situation and pragmatically implied meaning *Tunc sequence*. However, in English due to pragmatic factors of language means economy this sense is not expressed. Future Indefinite does not differentiate these meanings and does not imply any pragmatic meanings.

### **Bibliographic references**

- AARTS, B. – CHALKER, S. – WEINER, E. 2014. The Oxford dictionary of English grammar. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN 0199658234
- BLOKH, M. 2002. Teoreticheskie osnovy grammatiki. – Moskva: Vysshaya shkola. ISBN 5-06-004215-4
- BOGUSLAVSKII, I.M. 1996. Sfera dejstviya leksicheskikh edinit. Moskva: Yazyki russkoy kultury. ISBN 5-88766-030-9
- BONDARKO, A.V. 2002. Teoriya znacheniya v sisteme funktsionalnoy grammatiki: na materiale russkogo yazyka. Moskva: Yazyiki slavyanskoy kultury. ISBN: 5-94457-021-0
- CAPPELLE, B. – DECLERCK, R. 2005. Spatial and temporal boundedness in English motion events. In: Journal of Pragmatics, vol. 37, n. 6, pp. 889-917. ISSN: 03782166
- DAHL, O. 2016. Thoughts on language-specific and crosslinguistic entities. In: Linguistic Typology, vol. 20, n. 2, pp. 427-437. ISSN: 14300532
- DECLERCK, R. 1997. The past perfect with future time reference. English Language and Linguistics vol. 1, n. 1, pp. 49-61, ISSN: 13606743
- DECLERCK, R. 2010. Future time reference expressed by be to in present-day English. In: English language and linguistics vol. 14, n. 2, pp. 271-291. ISSN: 13606743
- DECLERCK, R. – DEPRAETERE, I. 1995. The double system of tense forms referring to future time in English. In: Journal of Semantics, vol. 12, n. 3, pp. 269-310. ISSN: 01675133
- DECLERCK, R. – REED, S. 2006. Tense and time in counterfactual conditionals. In: Belgian Journal of Linguistics, vol. 20, n. 1, pp. 169-192. ISSN: 07745141
- DURST-ANDERSEN, P.V. 1995. Mentalnaya grammatika i lingvisticheskie supertipy. In: Voprosy Jazykoznanija, n 6, pp. 30-42. ISSN 0373-658X

- GLOVINSKAYA, M. 2001. Mnogoznachnost i sinonimiya v vido-vremennoy sisteme russkogo glagola. Moskva: Azbukovnik. ISBN 5-93786-020-9
- GROSSMAN, V. 1990. ZHizn' i sud'ba. Moskva: Izvestiya. ISBN 5-206-00148-1
- HEALD, T. 1990. A classic English crime. London: Pavilion Books. ISBN 13: 9781851455492
- HFB – FIELDING, H. 2014. Bridget Jones's Diary. London: Pan Macmillan Publishers. ISBN 13: 9780330332774
- LANDMAN, F. – ROTHSTEIN S. 2010. Incremental homogeneity in the semantics of aspectual for-phrases. In: Lexical Semantics, Syntax and Event structure. Oxford: Oxford University Press. P.229– 251. ISBN: 9780199544325
- MASLOV, YU. S. 2004. Izbrannyye trudy: Aspektologiya. Obshchee yazykoznanie. Moskva: Yazyki slavyanskoy kultury. ISBN 5-94457-187-X
- NKRYA - Natsional'nyj korpus russkogo yazyka. 2003–2016. URL: <http://www.ruscorpora.ru>.
- OKUDZHAVA, B. 2014. Noven'kij kak s igolochki. In: Devyat' grammov v serdtse: roman, povesti, rasskazy. Moskva: KoLibri: Azbuka-Attikus. Pp. 316-394. ISBN 978-5-389-07644-0
- PADUCHEVA, E. V. 2015. Ontological classification of verbs and the semantics of Russian conjunction poka 'while'. In: Voprosy Jazykoznanija, vol. 2015, n. 5, pp. 7-25. ISSN: 0373658X
- PADUCHEVA, E.V. 1996. Semanticheskie issledovaniya. Semantika vremeni i vida v russkom yazyke. Semantika narrativa. Moskva: Prosveshchenie. ISBN: 5-88766-046-5.
- PROSTYAKOVA, A. – MIT'KOV A. – PAUND R. 2002. V upotreblenii dopinga my podozrevaem vsekh In: Izvestiya. n12, pp. 6-7
- ZALIZNYAK, A. A. – SHMELEV, A.D. 2000. Vvedenie v russkuyu aspektologiyu. Moskva: Yazyki russkoy kultury. ISBN 5785901706
- ZELDOVICH, G. M. 2010. Russian synthetic perfective passive in sja: Why is it (almost) absent? In: Voprosy Jazykoznanija, vol. 2010, n. 2, pp. 3-36. ISSN: 0373658X
- ZELDOVICH, G.M. 2012. Pragmatika grammatiki. Moskva: Yazyki slavyanskikh kultur. ISBN 978-5-9551-0589-5
- ZOLOTOVA, G.A. 2002. Kategorii vremeni i vida s tochki zreniya teksta. In: Voprosy Jazykoznanija, n 3, pp. 7-30. ISSN 0373-658X

*Words: 5 078*

*Characters: 28 8230 (23, 57 standard pages)*

Assoc. prof. Alsu N. Makhmutova, PhD (Philology)  
 Department of Foreign Languages for Physics, Mathematics and Information Technologies  
 Institute of International Relations, History and Oriental Studies  
 Kazan Federal University,  
 18, Kremlevskaya Str., 420008 Kazan, Russia  
 Alsu.Makhmutova@kpfu.ru

Assoc. prof. Gulnara F. Lutfullina, Doctor of Philology  
 Department of Foreign Languages  
 Kazan State Power Engineering University  
 51, Krasnoselskaya Str., 420066 Kazan  
 Russia  
 gflutfullina@mail.ru