Investigating interlanguage in present perfect acquisition through translation

Investigando interlíngua na aquisição do presente perfeito através de tradução

José Vicente Santos Mendes 🆔 🔗
vicente.mendes@ufsb.edu.br
Universidade Federal do Sul da Bahia - UFSB

Abstract

The paper uses the blind translation into English of a youth reader originally written in Portuguese by two Brazilian college students with different proficiency levels – one upper-intermediate, who has never lived in an English-speaking country though visits her mother in the US often, and the other one advanced, who lived in the US with his family from the age 4 to the age 14 – to verify if Selinker's (1972; 2013, elsewhere) interlanguage hypothesis holds as far as the use of the present perfect goes. The two outcomes are contrasted with the translation of the reader by a Portuguese/English bilingual native speaker. The methodology for the case-study at hand is a quantitative-qualitative analysis of the data we gathered: Taking into consideration not only the number of tokens each of the three translations includes but also the typological nuances the verb tense encompasses in the three outputs, the investigation yields as a result an inference that can be drawn from our here observed continuum upper-intermediate student > advanced student > bilingual speaker for the use of the present perfect, as far as how the verb tense interacts with Selinker`s interlanguage hypothesis, namely, that subsequent surveys shall yield similar conclusions. After all, the 3 participants involved are correspondingly high-performance informants, which renders the current case study outstandingly representative. We deployed Comrie (1976) and McCawley (1971) as benchmark for the shades of meaning the present perfect in English may convey.

Keywords

Second Language Acquisition. Proficiency. Interlanguage. Present Perfect. Translation.

Resumo

O artigo usa a tradução cega para o inglês de um paradidático para jovens originalmente escrito em português por dois estudantes universitários brasileiros de diferentes níveis de proficiência – uma pós-intermediário, que nunca morou em país falante de inglês, mas visita sua mãe nos Estados Unidos frequentemente, e o outro avançado, que morou nos Estados Unidos com sua família dos 4 aos 14 anos – para verificar se a hipótese da interlíngua de Selinker (1972; 2013, alhures) se prova no que diz respeito ao uso do presente perfeito. Os dois resultados são contrastados com a tradução do paradidático por um falante nativo bilíngue português/inglês. A metodologia para o estudo de caso

em questão é uma análise quantitativa-qualitativa dos dados arrolados: Levando em consideração não só o número de instâncias cada uma das três traduções inclui, mas também a tipologia de nuances que o tempo verbal engloba nas três produções, a investigação gera como resultado uma inferência que pode ser computada a partir do nosso aqui observado continuum estudante pós-intermediário > estudante avança-do > falante bilíngue para o uso do presente perfeito, no que tange a como o tempo verbal interage com a hipótese da interlíngua de Selinker, qual seja, a de que sondagens subsequentes provavelmente gerarão conclusões semelhantes. Afinal, os 3 participantes envolvidos são, correspondentemente, informantes de alto desempenho, o que torna a presente sondagem destacadamente representativa. Utilizamos Comrie (1976) e McCawley (1971) como parâmetro para as acepções de sentido que o presente perfeito em inglês pode transmitir.

Palavras-chave
Aquisição de Segunda Língua. Proficiência. Interlíngua. Presente Perfeito. Tradução.

Introduction

This paper discloses the results of a research initiation project, Mendes (2020), that looked into the most difficult verb tense Brazilian learners have to gra-pple with while learning English: the present perfect. The investigation compa-red the output of 2 students – one at the upper intermediate level of proficiency, the other one at the advanced level of proficiency – in how they blindly translated into English a reader for youth written in Brazilian Portuguese, Rabbani (2018). The students were not told that the focus of the study would be the form-func-tion mappings related to the present perfect tense-aspect when asked to transla-te the book. Then we contrasted their tokens of present perfect usage with those in a translation by a bilingual English/Portuguese native speaker, Rabbani (2019). The aim was to check if an interlanguage *continuum* would be verified after the contrast of the 3 translations: upper-intermediate student > advanced student > bilingual native speaker[1].

The structure of the paper will be the following: first I review the concept of interlanguage Larry Selinker put forward more than 40 years ago which proves still worth paying attention to today (Selinker, 1972; 1992; 2013), (Han; Tarone, 2014), (Chen, 2016). Then, I look at the Tense and Aspect verbal categories as features of the expression of temporality in general, and close in on the present perfect form and meaning characteristics therein. Afterwards I analyze the data and propose a

---

1   The gradience in performance the study observes has 2 dimensions: It looks at each student's production in comparison with one another, and at the same time at how each student's output fares when contrasted with the bilingual native-speaker's rendition. Following Hawkins's (1999, p. 210) stance: "Proficiency can be described for an individual either in terms of whether she or he is the same as, worse than or better than comparable peer L2 speakers, or in terms of the degree to which she or he approximates to native-speaker norms." Dubiner (2019) is also worth checking at this point.

discussion of the findings the enterprise unveiled.

1 Interlanguage as a concept

Selinker (1972, p. 213-214) defined this technical term in Applied Linguistics as "the utterances which are produced when the learner attempts to say sentences of a TL (Target Language); (...) a separate linguistic system based on the observable output which results from a learner's attempted production of a TL norm."

In other words, interlanguage amounts to the self-restructuring *interim* systems from L1 to L2, an evolving that is believed to include successive hypotheses formation, abandonment and reformulation (Oliveira, 2015), and that subsumes several cognitive oper-ations, as Richards and Schmidt (2013, p. 293) summarize:

> **Interlanguage** n. the type of language produced by second- and foreign-language learners who are in the process of [acquiring]/learning a language. In language learning/[acquisition], learner language is influenced by several different processes. a. borrowing patterns from the mother tongue (see LANGUAGE TRANSFER), b. extending patterns from the target language, e.g., by analogy (see OVERGENERALIZATION), c. expressing meanings using the words and the grammar which are already known (see COMMUNICATION STRATEGY). Since the language that the learner produces differs from both the mother tongue and the TARGET LANGUAGE (1), it is sometimes called an interlanguage, or is said to result from the learner's interlanguage system or approximative system. See also INTERIM GRAMMAR.

Selinker (2013) underscores that interlanguage amounts to "new forms" which are neither native nor target language and that learners sometimes "get stuck" in this production deviant from the norm. A process that came to be known as fossilization. Besides, the scholar mentions that perhaps at most 5% of learners manage to reach a level of proficiency that is indistinguishable from native speakers' usage of the target language. That is to say, only *very* few learners, if any at all, end up passing the threshold of interlanguage and deploying the target language with a native-like degree of fluency, accuracy, creativity and naturalness.

2 The categories of tense and aspect in the expression of temporality

Natural language temporality transpires in several dimensions mainly pertaining to verbs or revolving around verbs: tense, aspect, mood, modality, and

voice no doubt soon come to mind in this regard. Since the aim of this paper is to deal with the semantic and pragmatic nuances the English Present Perfect encompasses and the difficulties 2 Brazilian learners may show in acquiring them, I will focus only on the tense and aspect verbal dimensions here. For those interested in voice, see, for instance, Hurford (1994, p. 6-8). For mood and modality, I refer the reader to Palmer (1986), as a first beacon.

As for the concept of tense, Matthews (1997, p. 374) gives us a straightforward definition:

> Inflectional category whose basic role is to indicate the time of an event, etc. in relation to the moment of speaking. Divided notionally into **present** (at the moment of speaking), **past** (earlier than the moment of speaking) and **future** (later than the moment of speaking). Thence extended to any forms distinguishing these, whether or not they are inflectional: e.g., English has an inflectional distinction between past (loved) and present (love), but in addition the auxiliary will is often said to mark a future tense (will love).

In contrast, if we follow Trask (1993, p. 21) we learn that aspect is

> a grammatical category which relates to the internal temporal structure of a situation. Aspect is most commonly reflected in the form of the verb, and in many languages, the expression of aspect is intimately bound up with the expression of tense, from which, however, aspect must be distinguished. In English, for example, the forms I did it, I was doing it and I used to do it are all past tense, but they express different aspects. Among the aspectual categories often expressed in languages are **perfective**, **imperfective**, **perfect**, **progressive**, **habitual**, **durative**, **punctual**, and iterative.

In other words, tense, in general terms, is a verbal category chronologically deictic, since it points the situation described by the verb for the anteriority, concomitance or posteriority (past, present or future, respectively) to/with the moment of speaking/writing. Whereas aspect is the verbal category that deals with organizing the temporality inherent to a situation, expressing how the speaker/writer conceives it from within, so to say: as having an end point (telic), as not having an end point (atelic), as having a result (resultative), as having permanence (permansive), as having repetition (iterative), and so on.

As Boogart & Janssen (2007, p. 812) observe:

> Whereas tense locates a situation with respect to the evaluative situation (usually the time of speech), aspect does not serve any such deictic, or

grounding, function. Rather than linking the situation externally to the discourse's ground, aspect concerns the internal temporal structure of situations (Comrie 1976; 1985). More specifically, aspect indicates whether a situation is conceptualized as unbounded (imperfective aspect) as in 'He was reading a book' (imperfective past) or as bounded (perfective aspect) as in 'He read a book' (perfective past) [for the sake of illustration].

For a thorough overview on tense and aspect, see Binnick (2012).

3 The form-function configuration of English Present Perfect tense-aspect

The most classical distinction between tense and aspect, as the previous section points out, is, arguably, stated by Comrie (1976, p. 1-3): "Tense establishes a connection between the time of the situation expressed and that of the utterance proper (...) [whereas] aspect is defined as different ways of viewing the internal constituency of a situation."

As far as the form of the Present Perfect is concerned, it does not pose so much difficulty to foreign learners: The verb 'have' as an auxiliary or helping verb + the past participle of the main verb. Students simply must pay attention to the unique form of irregular verbs past participle, since the regular verbs past participle form is the same as the simple past form: adding -ED to the stem or base form.

It is the meaning or function that relates to the Present Perfect that proves difficult for foreign students to learn or acquire. Comrie (1976, p. 52, p. 56-60) will be our departure point here. The classical reference divides the semantic range of the English Present Perfect in four different meanings:

» Experiential perfect: Bill has been to America.
» Perfect of current result: I've found my glasses (and that is why I can work on this paper).
» Perfect of recent past: I have recently learned that the match is to be postponed.
» Perfect of persistent situation: He has lived in Argentina for 5 years now.

This typology basically coincides with the four usages of the Present Perfect in English that McCawley (1971) *apud* McCawley (1981, p. 81) identifies:

> (a) to indicate that a state of affairs prevailed throughout some interval stretching from the past into the present ('Universal'): I've known Max since 1960.
> (b) to indicate the existence of past events ('Existential'): I have read *Principia Mathematica* five times.

(c) to indicate that the direct effect of a past event still continues ('Stative'):
I can't come to your party tonight – I've caught the flu.
(d) to report hot [breaking] news ('Hot news'): Malcom X has just been as-
sassinated.

It is not hard to see how Comrie's (1976) 'recent past' sense matches Mc-
Cawley's (1971) 'hot news' meaning. Likewise, what Comrie (1976) calls 'experien-
tial', McCawley (1971) calls 'existential'; 'current result' in Comrie's (1976) terminolo-
gy amounts to 'stative' in McCawley's (1971) wording; and the 'persistent situation'
shade of meaning for Comrie (1976) parallels the 'universal' one for McCawley
(1971).

In a nutshell, the categorization both linguists deliver encompasses two
broad perspectives. One is that the present perfect somehow relates an event
or situation at the moment of speech/writing with a previous state of affairs. The
other is that the present perfect indicates that this past situation or event in some
way or another continues to be important at the moment of speech/writing. The-
refore, we can say that the essence of the present perfect usage combines the
sense of 'prior' (Celce-Murcia; Larsen-Freeman, 1999) with the nuance of 'current
relevance' (Langacker, 1991). Such an analysis is corroborated by countless publi-
cations in the literature: Mello; Dutra (2000), Oliveira (2009; 2015), Parrot (2010),
Swan (2005), among others.

One way English grammars usually teach the Present Perfect is by under-
lining its opposition to the Simple Past, or the Past Simple, as the British tend to
call it. Murphy (1994, p. 28), for instance, compares 'Tom has lost his key. He can't
get into the house.' with 'Tom lost his key yesterday. He couldn't get into the hou-
se.' And the reference book explains that when the Present Perfect is used, we are
thinking of the present result of the action. Tom does not have his key now. Whe-
reas when the Simple Past is used, we are thinking of the action in the past only.
We do not know from the sentence if Tom has his key now. Therefore, Murphy
(1994, p. 28) concludes: "The present perfect always has a connection with *now*.
The past simple tells us only about the past."

Fonseca (2012, p. 268) also contrasts the present perfect and the simple
past in English, from a point of view of EFL/ESL teaching and learning. Following
Michaelis (1998, p. 232), who observes that "'Harry has been in Bali for 2 days' is
ambiguous with respect to continuative and existential interpretations"[2], Fonse-

---

2   'Unfinished past' and 'indefinite past', respectively, in Soar and Soar's (2018, p. 50-52) American Headway
    3rd edition parlance.

ca (2012) reminds us that such ambiguity had been already called attention to in Dowty (1979, p. 343), where we read: "'John has lived in Boston for 4 years' is first interpreted out of context as implying that he still lives there, but it could also be used to introduce John, a former Boston resident, to someone who wants to know more about the city."

Hence, although sentences in the present perfect with 'for + a period of time' would by default have an up-to-now / continuative or unfinished-past meaning, the speaker may also contextually, semantically-pragmatically want to convey an indefinite-past-time or existential reading, the nuance that a prior situation in an unspecified past bears a current state as a consequence. Therefore, 'Harry has been in Bali for 2 days' may be intended to mean that there was one or more events of Harry being in Bali which lasted for 2 days that occurred at some point(s) in time prior to the utterance of the sentence, which has current relevance. Likewise, 'John has lived in Boston for 4 years' may be meant in the following way: as somebody who used to live in Boston, John feels emotionally linked to the city, he has knowledge about it and therefore could help someone who will move there or visit Boston soon to feel more at ease in that new environment.

To sum up, in spite of the fact that in a context-free situation a certain use of the English present perfect could have 'x' as a preferred interpretation, the situation anchoring the usage may overcome that, and coerce interpretation 'y' to the instance. Pragmatics may override semantics.

4 The data analysis

Here a word on methodology is in order. We all know by now since Radford (2004), to mention a reference in this regard randomly, that any linguistic research enterprise must meet observational, descriptive and explanatory levels of adequacy. We also learn from Severino (2018) and many other theorists that the quantitative-qualitative approach to any scientific incursion in accounting for the complexity of the world is the most reliable one a field work or case study could opt for. This is exactly what the paper at hand sets out to do: to fulfill both these requirements. In this section, we thus look at the instances of the present perfect in the blind translation of Rabbani (2018) into English by 2 Brazilian learners of English – one advanced and another one at the upper-intermediate level of proficiency – and compare them with how a bilingual native speaker of English and Portuguese, Simeon Kohlman, used the present perfect when he rendered the youth reader into English in Rabbani (2019).

Student A lived in the United States from age 4 up to age 14, with his parents. Student B visits the United States often, since her mother lives there, but she herself has never lived in the United States or in any other English-speaking country for that matter. Therefore, if Selinker's interlanguage hypothesis holds, student A's use of the present perfect should be closer to Rabbani (2019) than student B's use of the verb tense in focus.

First, let us take a look at how Student B handled the task of translating Rabbani (2018) into English without knowing we were searching for the instances of the present perfect the rendition would amount to:

> (i) At that very moment, Mrs. Alice came flying as a hawk… With a very ugly face, she looked with eyes to give fear. Only those who **have seen** an angry bird know how it is.
> (ii) – Spider… Around here again?! **Have you not given up** being a plant yet? **Have you not eaten** a fly since yesterday? (2 tokens in a row)
> (iii) Meris arrived. That plump little thing upset Vivian. The caterpillar, as always, **has arrived** talking: – This tree is more agitated every day. Why do you not go get a life? You are here again making noise…
> (iv) **Have I ever told** you about my cousin-sister Atta?
> (v) – Sage? **I have never heard** of such a thing.
> (vi) Because you are poisonous and carnivorous, you help to reduce insects and other bugs in this place, helping to balance the forest. **Have you ever thought** if you did not eat the Syrs out there?
> (vii) – My dear spider, I **have lived** a long time in this tree, and believe me, although it is very quiet here, from time to time it has a quick word with me…

Now let us turn to Student A's instances of present perfect in his blind translation of Rabbani (2018) into English:

> (a) In this exact moment, Dona Alice showed up flying as fast as a hawk… and with a very mean face she looked with fearful eyes. Only who **has ever seen** an angry bird knows how it is.
> (b) – Spider… you here again?! **Haven't you already given up** being a plant? **Haven't you eaten** any little flies since yesterday? Hum? (2 tokens in sequence)
> (c) – Oh my, nobody in this forest seems to have right reasoning. I **have already said** no. We are looking for Hina, the ant, repeated Meris.

(d)   – Wise one? **I have never heard** of such a thing.
(e)   Vivian insisted to tell her story: – I **have crossed** the forest searching for this wise one, in search of his answers.
(f)   – This journey **must have taught** you something, right? (modalized) I believe **you have received** much more answers than you needed, **have you not**? (3 tokens in a row, taking the tag question into account too)
(g)   – My dear spider, I **have lived** for so long in this tree, and believe me, even though she is very silent, sometimes she gives a word…

Below we list the instances of present perfect Simeon Kohlman used in his translation of Rabbani (2018) into English, that came out as Rabbani (2019). Since he is a bilingual English and Portuguese native speaker, we will deploy his rendition as a yardstick to suggest whether Selinker's (1972 and elsewhere) interlanguage hypothesis holds or not, as a gold standard student A's and student B's output will be contrasted with.

A. She always wondered if her spots might **have come** from her father. (modalized)
B. At first, she thought it must **have been** her lucky day and that a huge juicy snack had fallen into her web. (modalized)
C. At that very moment, Mrs. Alice appeared, flying as fast as a hawk, her fearsome eyes framed by her angry face (only those who **have ever seen** an enraged bird know what *that* is like).
D. **"I've already told** you that your lineage goes back to the Uirapurus, the great flying birds, and that you will not be the shame of the family! We must keep training!"
E. Vivian looked on sadly, thinking about how fragile the little bird was and how much that ugly tumble must **have hurt**. (modalized)
F. **"I've never met** my mother. As long as I can remember, my name **has been** Vivian and **I've been** alone in this world." (3 instances in a row)
G. That was enough of an invitation for Meris to turn it all into a major event. She began telling everything she had heard, **having spied** on the conversation between Vivian and the bird. (gerundive)
H. "Spider… you're here again?! You **haven't given up** on being a plant yet? You really **haven't eaten** any flies since yesterday?! Hmm?!" (2 tokens in sequence)
I. "I'm not a wasp. I'm a fly and my name is Syr. I live on the other side of the forest, and I must have gotten lost admiring and feeding from the flowers and fruits from this side of the woods." (modalized)
J. "Stop making up stories! **Has** a 'spider' **turned into** a 'plant' now? Spider, everyone knows that in this life, we are all born with our own function. Some are vegetables, and some are animals."

K. "Oh silly… I won't devour you now because **I've already eaten**. I just dined[3]

---

3   Following American English standard usage, simple past instead of present perfect for recent past action. 'I just dined'. Not 'I've just dined', as British English would have preferred.

on a dove who wasn't paying attention. I'll devour you later."

L. "**Have I told** you about my cousin Atta, how strong and powerful she is?"

M. The cicada made a face as if she had no idea what they were talking about and answered, "Wise insect? **I've never heard** of such a thing."

N. Vivian insisted on telling her story. **"I've traveled** across the entire forest in search of this wise insect, in pursuit of his answers."

O. "The journey must **have taught** you something." (modalized)

P. "Vivian, **I've already told** you that everyone is born with certain abilities and virtues, otherwise we'd all be the same."7

Q. Because you are venomous and carnivorous, you help to reduce the number of insects here, keeping the forest in balance. **Have you thought** how it would be if you didn't eat the Syrs out there?

R. Bicolor reminded Vivian, **"I've already told** you, silly spider, we're all born to die one day... and I fight in order to live."

S. "My dear spider, **I've lived** in this tree for a long time, and believe me, though she's very quiet, every now and then she talks a little."

In order to analyze the data, we will follow a two-step procedure. First, we count how many tokens of the present perfect each informant came up with. Student B's rendition amounts to 8 instances. Student A's translation has 10 instances of the present perfect. And our gold standard, Rabbani (2019), uses the present perfect 22 times. So, although student A used the present perfect a bit more than student B, the difference between their tasks was not so significant as to strongly suggest Selinker's interlanguage hypothesis. Nevertheless, a weak suggestion that the hypothesis holds could be gained therefrom, since 10 instances is slightly, but still higher a number than 8 instances.

The second criterion is the diversity of shades of meaning deployed in each translation. We deepen the contrast by examining the typology of meanings the present perfect encompasses in each rendition of the youth reader at hand into English. That is to say, taking into account Comrie (1976) and McCawley (1971) *apud* McCawley (1981) taxonomies, did the students fare better at translating a specific shade of meaning of the present perfect into English than the other nuances the verb tense can express? How similar to Rabbani (2019) was each student's output in the blind task of translating Rabbani (2018) into English, as far as the overall taxonomy of shades of meaning involved goes?

Student B's outcome encompasses 4 experiential/existential usages, (i), (iv), (v) and (vi); 3 persistent situation/universal usages, the 2 tokens in (ii) and instance (vii); and just 1 recent past/hot news usage: (iii).

On the other hand, student A's outcome subsumes 3 experiential/existential usages, (a), (c), and (d); 3 persistent situation/universal usages, the 2 tokens in

(b) and the instance (g); 3 current result/stative usages, (e) [that is why I am here in front of you now] and the 2 last tokens in (f) [that is why you can come to your own conclusions now]; as well as 1 modalized usage: the first instance in (f).

Therefore, if, on the one hand, student B has not produced any current result/stative usage of the present perfect, on the other hand, student A has not produced one of the subtypes either, notably recent past/hot news. However, student A's outcome is somewhat closer to our yardstick insofar as including at least one modalized use of the verb tense in focus. After all, Rabbani (2019) includes 5 modalized usages of present perfect, (A), (B), (E), (I) and (O), as well as a gerundive one: (G). It also includes 9 experiential/existential usages, (C), (D), the first token in (F), (J), (L), (M), (P), (Q), and (R); 5 persistent situation/universal usages, the 2 last instances in (F), the 2 tokens in (H) and token (S); and 2 current result/stative usages: (K) [so I am full at the moment], and (N) [so I am able to ask for your help right now].

Moreover, student A's output coincides with Rabbani (2019) as far as not including the recent past/hot news subtype of present perfect usage[4]. Hence, from the variety of shades of meaning the present perfect encompasses point of view, the data also provides some more robust support for Selinker's interlanguage hypothesis.

Concluding remarks

This paper began by highlighting Selinker's interlanguage hypothesis and by showing how it remains pertinent concerning several issues in applied linguistics even so many years after it was proposed (Selinker, 1972; 1992; 2013), Han; Tarone (2014), Chen (2016) among others.

Next, we briefly went through the expression of temporality in natural language, and focused on the categories of Tense and Aspect therein, according to several publications in the literature. Then, we honed in the present perfect in English, while deploying Comrie (1976) and McCawley (1971), *apud* McCawley (1981) as our theoretical basis to explain the different nuances this verb tense can convey. The paper identified a correspondence among the subtypes in both ta-

---

4   As Swan (2005, p. 287) mentions: When just means 'a moment ago', past and present perfect tenses are both possible in British English. A present perfect is preferred when we are giving news. Compare. Where's Eric? ~ He's just gone out. In American English a past tense is normal. Where's Eric? ~ He just went out.

xonomies.

Then, following Mendes (2020), the paper delved into the difficulty the English present perfect represents for Brazilian learners (Fonseca, 2005; 2012; Dubiner, 2019) inter alia. It tried to contribute to this field of inquiry by contrasting how an upper intermediate Brazilian college student of English (student B) and an advanced Brazilian college student of English (student A) fared in blindly translating into English a youth reader that came out in Portuguese: Rabbani (2018). By comparing student A's and student B's outcome in the task with Rabbani (2019), a translation into English of the original by a bilingual English and Portuguese native speaker, the paper set out to see if Selinker's interlanguage hypothesis would hold or not.

Since both the sheer amount criterion of tokens of present perfect included in Student A's and in Student B's translations as well as the variety of possible shades of meaning conveyed by the target structure criterion were analyzed, in contrast with their counterparts in Rabbani (2019), the study yielded the following result: a continuum student B > student A > bilingual native speaker could be verified. Thus, the investigation provides at least weak evidence for Selinker's interlanguage hypothesis as far as the use of the present perfect in English was concerned in the translation task at hand. Not only was the number of instances of present perfect in Student A's outcome closer to Simeon Kohlman's rendition than Student B's output, but also insofar as the taxonomy of nuances the present perfect encompasses goes, such proximity to the yardstick holds. Both the advanced student and the bilingual native speaker produced modalized instances of the present perfect, which was not the case for the upper intermediate student. Neither student A nor Rabbani (2019) includes the recent past / hot news shade of meaning in their production. Student B, on the other hand, does include this particular subtype in her production, which does not subsume, by its turn, the current result / stative subtype.

Although the inquiry is based only on 2 informants, whose productions in the blind translation of Rabbani (2018) into English were contrasted with the rendition of the booklet in English by a bilingual English/Portuguese native speaker, Simeon Kolhman, that came out as Rabbani (2019), the analysis of the data provides some evidence for the interlanguage hypothesis: Student B's translation used fewer tokens of present perfect than Student A's translation. And Student A's used fewer instances than Simeon Kohlmann's. Moreover, the taxonomy of usages in Student B's rendition was farther from the bilingual native speaker's

than Student A's translation of the verb tense under scrutiny. Since the 3 participants in the survey are, correspondingly, all "high-performance" informants within their categories, the case study proves quite representative, which lets us expect, in similar further enquiries, *mutatis mutandis*, similar results in this very same direction.

References

BINNICK, R. I. (ed.) **The handbook of tense and aspect**. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

BOOGART, R.; JANSSEN, T. Tense and aspect. In: GEERAERTS, D.; CUYCKENS, H. (eds.) **The Oxford handbook of cognitive linguistics**. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2007. p. 803-828.

CELCE-MURCIA, M.; LARSEN-FREEMAN, D. **The grammar book**: an esl/efl teacher's course. 2nd edition. Newbury: Heinle & Heinle, 1999.

CHEN, J. J. The development of an interlanguage. **Tesol Journal**, v. 3, n. 1, p. 48, 2016.

COMRIE, B. **Aspect**. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

COMRIE, B. **Tense**. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

DOWTY, D. **Word meaning and Montague grammar**. Dordrecht: Reidel, 1979.

DUBINER, D. Second language learning and teaching. From theory to a practical checklist. **Tesol Journal**, v. 10, n. 2, p. e00398, Wiley Online Library, 2019. Available in: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/tesj.398?msockid=3b7669d74d9468b609ce7da94c806934. Access on: 04 Dec. 2024.

FONSECA, M. C. M. Por que é tão difícil ensinar o Present Perfect na escola. In: BRUNO, F. (org.) **Ensino-aprendizagem de línguas estrangeiras**: reflexão e prática. São Carlos: Claraluz, 2005. p. 103-114.

FONSECA, M. C. M. Descrição da oposição Present Perfect vs Simple Past. **Cadernos do IL**, Porto Alegre, n. 44, p. 259-278, 2012.

HAN, Z.; TARONE, E. (eds.) **Interlanguage forty years later**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2014.

HAWKINS, R. Measurements of second language proficiency. In: JOHNSON, K.; JOHNSON, H. (eds.) **Encyclopedic dictionary of applied linguistics**. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1999, p. 209-211.

HURFORD, J. R. **Grammar: a student's guide**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

LANGACKER, R. **Foundations of cognitive grammar**: descriptive application. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.

MATTHEWS, P. H. **Oxford concise dictionary of linguistics**. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1997.

MCCAWLEY, J. D. Tense and time reference in English. In: FILLMORE, C. J.; LANGENDOEN, T. (eds.) **Studies in linguistic semantics**. Irvington, 1971. p. 96 -113.

MCCAWLEY, J. D. Notes on the English present perfect. **Australian Journal of Linguistics** v. 1, n. 1, p. 81-90, 1981.

MELLO, H.; DUTRA, D. The teaching of aspectual categories to Brazilian Portuguese speakers. **Series B**: applied and interdisciplinary papers. Essen: LAUD, Paper n. 300, p. 1-8, separate offprint, 2000.

MENDES, V. S. **Mapeamento forma-função do tempo-aspecto referente ao Present Perfect em obra infanto-juvenil traduzida para o inglês a partir do original em português**. Projeto de pesquisa apresentado em resposta ao edital Pibic PROPPG UFSB. Porto Seguro, unpublished manuscript, 2020.

MICHAELIS, L. A. **Aspectual grammar and past-time reference**. London/New York, Routledge, 1998.

MURPHY, R. **English grammar in use**. A self-study reference and practice book for intermediate students. Second edition. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

OLIVEIRA, A. A. O estudo da interlíngua por meio de abordagens combinadas baseadas no uso. In: ZYNGIER, S.; VIANA, V.; JANDRE, J. (eds.) **Linguagem, criatividade e ensino**: abordagens empíricas e interdisciplinares. Rio de Janeiro: Publit, 2009. p. 79-108.

OLIVEIRA, A. A. Gramáticas distintas e seu papel no desenvolvimento da interlíngua. **Gláuks** v. 15, n. 1, p. 101-120, 2015. Available in: https://www.academia.edu/31453847/Distinct_Grammars_and_their_Role_in_Interlanguage_Development_Gram%C3%A1ticas_Distintas_e_seu_Papel_no_Desenvolvimento_da_Interl%C3%ADngua. Access on: 04 Dec. 2024.

PALMER, F. **Mood and modality**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

PARROT, M. **Grammar for English language teachers**. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

RABBANI, A. R. C. **Vivian A Aranta**. Porto Seguro: ARCR, 2018.

RABBANI, A. R. C. **Vivian The Splant**. Translated by Simeon Kohlman. Porto Seguro: ARCR, 2019.

RADFORD, A. **English syntax**: an introduction. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

RICHARDS, J. C.; SCHMIDT, R. **Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics**. 4th ed. Harlow: Longman, 2013.

SELINKER, L. Interlanguage. **International Review of Applied Linguistics**, v.10, n.3, p. 209-231, 1972.

SELINKER, L. **Rediscovering interlanguage**. London/New York: Routledge, 1992.

SELINKER, L. Interlanguage. In: ROBINSON, P. J. (ed.) **The Routledge encyclopedia of second language acquisition**. London/New York: Routledge, 2013. p. 338-342.

SEVERINO, A. J. **Metodologia do trabalho científico**. 24ª edição revista e atualizada. São Paulo: Cortez, 2018.

SOAR, J.; SOAR, L. **American headway**, 3rd ed. Level 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

SWAN, M. **Practical English usage**. 3rd new fully revised edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

TRASK, R. L. **A dictionary of grammatical terms in linguistics**. London / New York: Routledge, 1993.

Sobre o autor

José Vicente Santos Mendes - Doutor em Linguística. Professor do Instituto de Humanidades, Artes e Ciências da Universidade Federal do Sul da Bahia. Campus Sosígenes Costa. Porto Seguro, BA. E-mail: vicente.mendes@ufsb.edu.br. Lattes: http://lattes.cnpq.br/5042460635103414. Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6629-0421.