Much has been said about American English and its relation to British English. However, the comparison between the two varieties of the English language usually concerns the level of pronunciation and lexicon, whereas other areas of possible divergence seem to be neglected. It appears that the use of perfect tenses in the two language varieties has not been compared to a greater extent.

Although neither English nor American linguists ignore the subject, their remarks concerning differences between the use of perfect tenses in British and American English are somewhat loose and casual. They are confined to signalling certain phenomena such as the substitution of the Simple Past for the Present Perfect in American English or the smaller frequency of the Future Perfect in the same language variety. Yet not all the contexts where the Simple Past substitution occurs are indicated, nor is the extent of this substitution shown with regard to its obligatoriness or facultativeness.

It would then be of value to try to establish the precondition for substitution and supply numerical data for both British and American English because the Simple Past substitution occurs in either variety of English. It might also be interesting to find the frequency of the Future Perfect in the two dialects in question. This also requires comparable data which are not available.
A quantitative research devoted to these problems has already been made but it is not generally accessible because the work has not been published. The study in question, *Perfect Tenses in Standard British and American English* by Grażyna Dydel, appears to be a pioneer contribution to the investigation of relations between perfect tenses in British and American English. Grażyna Dydel based her examination on three American and three British novels which appeared between 1946 and 1958. On the strength of her results G. Dydel drew the conclusion that in British English perfect tenses appeared twice as often as in American English. According to G. Dydel this difference signals a different interpretation of perfect tenses in the American language variety: the perfect seems to denote a category which does not indicate temporal relations but "current relevance," i.e. "a significant persistence of results, a continued truth value, a valid present relevance of the effects of earlier events, the continued reliability of conclusions based on earlier behaviour."1

The results obtained by G. Dydel suggest that the difference in the use of perfect tenses between British and American English is very sharp. The present article shows that this difference is less marked and that there is some interpenetration of the tendencies between the two varieties with regard to perfect tenses. This discrepancy may be due to the lapse of time between the years when the novels analyzed by G. Dydel appeared and the years from which comes the material used in this paper, the respective dates being 1946-1958 and 1960-1970 / the main body of material in the latter case coming from 1965-1970/. Moreover, a more diversified corpus for analysis has been decided upon. Novels seem to be formally uni-

form because they belong to one genre. The corpus examined in this paper comprises plays, excerpts from newspapers, and excerpts from magazines. The new material may yield new results with regard to the relative frequencies of perfect tense categories in the two varieties of English. It will be likewise sought to establish to what extent the distinction between the Simple Past on the one hand and the Present Perfect on the other hand is kept in British English and written American English as opposed to spoken American English.2 It seems that for this purpose the plays examined herein may be considered quasi-spoken language to be contrasted with written language such as represented by magazines and newspapers. The two terms are therefore employed in a special sense and will henceforward be used in inverted commas.

II

The analysis of perfect tenses in this paper is based on a three-tense scheme where continuity and non-continuity appear as aspects of each perfect tense.3 Thus the following tenses have been examined:

A. The Present Perfect Tense
B. The Past Perfect Tense
C. The Future Perfect Tense

The Conditional Perfect Tense has not been taken into consideration in view of the fact that its very limited occurrence in the studied material makes it practically useless in a quantitative analysis.

The tenses examined are represented by the following constructions:

A. have + Ved
have + been + Ving
has
B. had + Ved
had + been + Ving
C. shall + have + Ved
shall + have + Ving
will + have + Ving
will + have + been + Ving

Ved = the Past Participle of a verb
Ving = the Present Participle of a verb

The tenses will be examined according to the rules of perfect tense usages distinguished by grammarians on the basis of the presence of certain contexts where perfect tenses occur. A survey of the identified rules has been given below:

1. The Present Perfect

The SINCE rule. This rule covers the occurrences of the Present Perfect with phrases or clauses beginning with since such as since yesterday, since you came here, since his arrival.

The FOR rule. Present Perfect occurrences covered by the rule are those collocated with clauses or phrases that begin with for (since, in, over, the past/tens/years/weeks, hours) or with such phrases as long enough, four years where for is implicit.

The AMT rule/Adverbial Modifier of Time/. The rule includes Present Present Perfect occurrences with adverbs such as already, before, often, yet, so far, up to now, lately, recently, ever and never/meaning at any time up to the present/today, this week, etc.

The JUST rule. Occurrences of the Present Perfect with just / denoting a very recent activity / are signalled by this rule.

The RESULT rule. This rule comprises the occurrences of the Present Perfect with no modifier. The term result has been used because Present Perfect occurrences without any modifier are usually discussed in grammars as denoting an action connected through its results with the present moment / where the result is thought of as including zero results/.

2. The Past Perfect

After necessary adjustments the five rules distinguished above are applicable to this tense and need not be repeated. The tense also occurs in some other contexts to indicate a past action preceding an event already in the past. This occasions more rules.

The WHEN rule. The rule signals the cooccurrence of the Past Perfect with conjunctions such as when, until, used, as soon as, etc.

The AFTER rule. This covers the Past Perfect occurring with the conjunctions after and before. They have been treated separately because the Past Perfect, when collocated with them is replaced by the Simple Past more frequently, possibly because the sequence of events is signalled clearly by the two conjunctions.

The PM rule /Past Time Modifier/. The rule applies to Past Perfect occurrences with such adverbials as a week before, earlier, previously, /x years ago.

3. The Future Perfect

The FOR rule. This rule comprises occurrences of the Future Perfect with phrases for years/days, hours/.

The AF rule /Anterior Future/.Future Perfect occurrences subject to this rule are those cooccurring with phrases or clauses beginning with by, when, as soon as, before and after.

The perfect tenses found in the material have been examined according to these rules. Cases where a given rule has not been expressed by a perfect tense have also been registered. The deviations from the rules are represented by Simple Past substitutions. Conclusive evidence has consequently been
obtained from the proportions between perfect tenses and
Simple Past substitutions in British and American English.

The bulk of the British material is practically equal to
that of the American material /15024 versus 13529 lines of
text respectively/, which was indispensable for the compar-
ability of the figures obtained from the texts.

III
The amounts of Present Perfect occurrences registered
in the corpus are 596 and 463 for British and American Eng-
lish respectively. If their total sum /1059/ is taken to be
100% and the equality of length of the material in either
language variety is borne in mind, the percentages of the oc-
currence of the Present Perfect appear as 56.2 for British
English and 45.8 for American English, the proportion be-
tween the two being 1.21:1. As this figure represents a rela-
tion indicative of the whole material it cannot be treated as
conclusive, though the fact deserves noting. More conclusive
will be proportions and percentages concerning Present Per-
fected occurrences in each kind of British and American
text /i.e. plays, magazines, newspapers/ and with regard to
particular rules of usage. The proportion of Present Perfect
occurrences against Simple Past substitutions in the texts
of either dialect has likewise been taken into consideration,
although this has been limited to plays only as no instances
of Simple Past substitution have been encountered in the mag-
azines or the newspapers under examination.

The rules pertaining to the Present Perfect usage where
"spoken" /i.e. represented by the analysed plays/ British and
American English differ considerably are the RESULT, AMT, and
JUST rules. The number of Present Perfect occurrences in
each rule has proved to be greater for British English/, the
proportions being 1.51:1 /RESULT/, 2.61:1 /AMT/, and 1.51:1
/JUST/. This suggests that "spoken" American English tends
to express the above rules by the Present Perfect less often,
which is indeed attested by the percentage of Simple Past
in substitutions that dialect. The Simple past is used in 30%
of cases to express the RESULT rule in American English, while
with the other two rules there is still a greater tendency
towards the supercession of the Present Perfect: 67.4% of
Simple Past substitutions in the AMT rule and 67.7% in the
JUST rule. In British English the percentage of Simple Past
substitutions is much smaller: from 1.9% in the RESULT rule
and 7% in the AMT rule to 35.3% for the JUST rule. It may
then be said that in "spoken" American English there is a
tendency to substitute the Simple Past for the Present Per-
fected in the RESULT, AMT, and JUST rules, the Simple Past be-
coming dominant in the last two rules, whereas in British
English the Present Perfect is generally preferred, although
with varying frequency as seen in the JUST rule. It may be
added that the proportion of percentages for the JUST rule
in "spoken" British English - the Simple Past : 33.3%, the
Present Perfect: 66.7% - is exactly the reverse of that for
American English - the Simple Past: 66.7%, the Present Perfect:
33.3%. Remarkable as this may be, the above relative data are
based on very small absolute figures and allowances need to
be made for accidental relations.

As for the remaining two rules, it has been found that
both British and American English express the FOR rule by the
Present Perfect in 10%, while with regard to the SINCE rule
no conclusion can be arrived at because the amount of data
obtained is negligible.

So far as "written" English is concerned, the investigation has shown that British and American English use the Present Perfect to express the five rules that have been distinguished above almost to the same extent. No Simple Past substitutions have been found and in no rule have the proportions between Present Perfect occurrences in the two dialects attained values 1:2:1 in the case of the "written" form of English. The existent difference concerns the actual amount of Present Perfect occurrences in either language variety; the number of these in British English being greater (466:146), i.e. 1:3:1 in the magazines and 145:127, i.e. 1:1:1 in the newspapers.

IV

The Past Perfect Tense appeared in the corpus much less frequently. The number of Past Perfect occurrences is 159, of this 78 occurrences have been found in the British material and 81 in the American material. The proportion is thus practically 1:1. This fact deserves noting, even though the diversity of the material makes it necessary to present the results in reference to different kinds of text and to the rules distinguished before. However, the distribution of occurrences throughout the rules opens room for chance relation because in most cases the relative figures are based on very small absolute data. Moreover, Simple Past substitutions for the Past Perfect appear only in the case of the WHEN and AFTEN rules. Again, with the WHEN rule the absolute figures are too small to permit reliable conclusions. As for the AFTEN rule, the respective overall percentages for British and American English are the following: 31.8% of Past Perfect occurrences versus 62.6% of Simple Past substitutions and 16.2% of Past Perfect occurrences against 8.6% of Simple Past substitutions. This shows that the Simple Past is preferred to the Past Perfect in either dialect in the AFTEN rule. American English employing the Simple Past more often.

The high percentages of Simple Past substitutions in the AFTEN rule in the two varieties of English and the lack of substitution in all other rules suggest that there is little difference between British and American English, both "spoken" and "written", so far as the Past Perfect is concerned.

V

The Future Perfect Tense has not appeared but in one case in the whole corpus. This is not surprising in view of the fact that the use of the Future Perfect, or any Future tense for that matter, is already limited by the requirements of grammar in the case of temporal and conditional clauses where the Present tenses appear in subordinate clauses instead of the Future tenses. Secondly, the use of modifiers BY or BEFORE signals the sequence of events sufficiently for the Future Perfect to be redundant.

VI

What has been discussed above shows that the difference in the use of perfect tenses in British and American English, although existent varies in its extent from tense to tense. In so far as the Present Perfect is concerned, it may be seen that in "spoken" English some degree of difference between the British and the American variety is a fact. Of the total of 249 occurrences of the Present Perfect and Simple Past substitutions in the American material, Simple Past substitutions form 38% of occurrences (107), while in
the British material 18 occurrences constitute only 5.6% of the total /368/. Thus, in its "spoken" form American English tends to substitute the Simple Past for the Present Perfect in about 40% of cases. As for "written" English, the two varieties do not appear to use the Simple Past for the Present Perfect; no instance of Simple Past substitution has been found.

In the case of the Past Perfect it is evident that there is little difference; as has already been said, with regard to this tense between British and American English, the two make great use of the Simple Past instead of the Past Perfect to express the AFTER rule. In other rules the Past Perfect seems to be preferred.

The almost total lack of the Future Perfect in the whole corpus may mean that both British and American English use this tense less frequently.

What has been said so far implies that there is no sharp difference in the use of the perfect tenses between British and American English, although the Simple Past is used instead of the Present Perfect and the Past Perfect more frequently in American English. This is reflected in the interpretation of perfect tenses by American grammarians.

While in British English the perfect category is interpreted in terms of periods of time, in American English the perfect is considered in terms of "current relevance"/defined earlier/. This concept, for the first time used by Vendler, is accepted by M. Joos as the meaning of the perfect. Moreover, for Joos the English perfect is not a tense but the category of aspect of the three tenses: Present, Past and Future. In American English then, a speaker uses the perfect only when he wants to stress the "current relevance" of an event. In other cases the use of the perfect will be redundant because the connection with some point of time, signalled by the perfect itself in British English, is indicated either by other linguistic factors, such as time modifiers, or by extralinguistic factors existing in a given situation.

However, only in "spoken" English in the case of the Present Perfect do the two varieties of English adhere to the two interpretations /but not even in all rules/. In "written" English the Present Perfect in either dialect complies with the British interpretation of the perfect. This interpretation is adhered to by the two dialects in most rules for the Past Perfect, the American approach being applicable to the AFTER rule. All this indicates mutual penetration of the tendencies concerning perfect tenses in British and American English.

NOTES

3. e.g. J. W. Ward, The Use of Tenses in English, London 1966, p.53 and Appendix II.
4. The absolute figures for the rules in question are the following: 2091/1401 /BEP/; 50179 /AMT/; 644 /JES/ for British and American English respectively.
5. The proportions in each rule are as follows: a) magazines
   - 1.01:1 /JUST/., 1.38:1 /AMER./, 1.39:1 /ENG./, 1.40:1 /ENG./, 1.41:1 /ENG./, 1.42:1 /ENG./. The JUST rule had to be omitted on the
   grounds that no instances of the Present Perfect with just
   appeared in the British newspapers or in the American maga-
   zines.

   W. B. Trubetzkoy, The Przeciwie and the Perfect Ðene in Present-

7. cf. M. Joffe, Review of "The Tense and Aspect of Present-day
   American English" by Akira Ota, in Language, vol. 40 1960,
   No3-4, p. 495.
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Wojciech Pankowski

FILM WIĘK, JEGO PRODUKCJA I WYKORZYSTANIE

W PRACY NAUKOWEJ JĘZYKÓW OBcych

Sposób wielu pomocy audjozwalnych dużą rolę w nauczaniu
języków obcych może z powodzeniem odegrać film wiesz, odpowiednio
opracowany metodycznie. Wobec braku tego rodzaju filmów w oprze-
du należy do zasady naukę języków obcych do

podejmować prób ich realizacji. Stale postępujący proces unowocze-
śniania metod nauczania i wiesz otrzymywać stworza w tym zakresie
pewne możliwości twórcze.

W Studium Praktycznej Nauki Języków Obcych Wyższej Szkoły
Bolniczej w Lublinie powstał projekt realizowania filmu niemego
na taśmie 8 mm i czasu trwania projekcji do 15 minut. Pierwsza
próba uderza się. Dlatego też ośmiomni się zasądzić lektorów i
naukowców do podejmowania samodzielnych inicjatyw w tworzeniu
filmów niemnych stosunkowo tanich i jasnych pomocnych w nauczaniu
języków obcych. W niniejszym artykule przedkładam opis:

1/ produkcję filmu

2/ i jego wykorzystanie w lekcjach.

Produkcję filmu niemego powinno być podporządkowane okre-
ślonym celom dydaktycznym. Zamierzone cel osiągnięty przez dobrze
przerobione i opracowane scenariusze tematycznych, uwzględniający za-
równo sytuację/nięjącego akcji, jak również problemy językowe.

Zrealizowany przez nas film pt. "Hotel" składa się z 9 nas-
stępujących scen tematycznych: 1/ Na ulicy. 2/ W recepcji. 3/ Przy