

Sequence of Perfect in Appalachian English
 Christina Tortora, CUNY (CSI and The Graduate Center)
 [work with Beatrice Santorini & Greg Johnson]

**The Audio-Aligned and Parsed Corpus of Appalachian English (<http://csivc.csi.cuny.edu/aapcapp/>)
 Tortora, C., B. Santorini, F. Blanchette, & C.E.A Diertani (to appear)**

The AAPCAppE is a publicly available corpus of vernacular speech which is:

- 1,024,043 words / 127,375 sentence tokens
- syntactically annotated according to PPCHE method (and searchable by any standard tree query language e.g., *CorpusSearch*, Randall 2009)
- accompanied by a full set of digitized recordings of the underlying speech signal, in the form of *.wav* files, text-searchable using Praat (Boersma and Weenink 2011)

Underlying speech signal: The AAPCAppE is based on the speech from oral history project recordings housed at various colleges and institutions in the Southern Appalachian region (Eastern KY, Northeastern TN, Western NC, Southwestern VA):

I. Dante Oral History Project (DOHP). Collection of interviews on cassette tape with residents of Dante, VA (recorded 1997-98). Recordings are housed at, and curated by, the Archives of Appalachia at ETSU.

II. Joseph Hall Collection (JHall). Interviews with residents of the Great Smoky Mountains in Tennessee and North Carolina (1939); collector: Joseph Hall.

III. Appalachian Oral History Project (AOHP_I) at Alice Lloyd College, in Pippa Passes, KY. This history project was conducted from 1971-75 and its materials are housed in the library at Alice Lloyd College, Pippa Passes, Kentucky.

IV. Appalachian Oral History Project (AOHP_II) at Appalachian State University, in Boone, NC. This history project was conducted from the 1960s through the 1980s, and its materials are housed in the library at Appalachian State, in Boone, NC.

V. The Appalachian Archive (SKCTC) at Southeast Kentucky Community and Technical College, in Cumberland, KY. This history project was conducted from the 1960s through the 1980s, and its materials are housed in the library at Southeast Kentucky Community and Technical College, in Cumberland, KY.

1. Infinitival perfect in Englishes: infinitival form of the auxiliary verb *have* plus a participle, embedded under either a modal or under infinitival *to*:

UNDER MODAL: She would have said...
 UNDER *TO*: She has to have said...

- In spoken (vernacular) English, infinitival *have* in this context is typically pronounced [əv] or [ə]
- In spoken **Appalachian English**, infinitival *have* in this context is often null

2. The infinitival perfect in the AAPCAppE

2.1 Modals with null *have*

Some examples from the AAPCAppE of the infinitival perfect with null *have* embedded under a modal:

- (1) a. You **could heard** a pin drop.
- b. We **could** all **rode** on the passenger train.
- c. If I hadn't raised stuff and all, I don't guess we **could got** by.
- d. I said, No, you the one **should said** something, cuz I wasn't going to say nothing...

- e. But he **shouldn't** never **told** me like he did.
- f. I **must been** four or five years old.
- g. She **must took** some axle grease, put it in, and made a pretty topping...
- h. I don't know what in the world I **would done** if it wasn't for Ginny.
- i. They **wouldn't knowed** what to done with the underclothes they've got today.
- j. The other boy, of course, **may been** [...his fault].
- k. They **might been** one or two killed over at just below {proper-name}.

Null *have* with modals is not obligatory:

- (2) a. You **could [əv] heard** a pin drop. (uttered directly before (1a))
- b. Said, I **could [əv] paid** you.
- c. People **would [əv] been** afear'd to told it if they didn't know it.
- d. Well now I think through the Depression lots of kids that **would [əv] went** to school had to quit.
- e. I **would [əv] knowed** then, but I don't know now.
- f. He **must [əv] felled** in love with her.
- g. Well hit **must [əv] started** along in forty.
- h. Well they **might [əv] had** some money.
- i. Course that **may [əv] been** a bad thing for these coal companies.
- j. They just **should [əv] paid** him his pension at that time...

Given the variation between (1) and (2): let's posit that the structures in (2) involve hidden infinitival perfects.

2.2 Infinitival *to* with null *have*

The AAPCAppE also exhibits structures with infinitival *to* followed by what appears to be a participial verb form, instead of an infinitival verb (e.g., *to go*), such as *to went*, *to been*, *to had*, *to got*, *to gone*, *to done*, *to slipped off*, *to worked*, *to told*, *to killed*, *to gave*:

- (3) a. And them mules went right on up there, just where they was supposed **to went**.
- a'. cf. *...just where they was supposed to go*.

- b. But the men should [əv] refused **to went** in. [i.e., into the mines]
- b'. cf. *The men should [əv] refused to go in*.

- c. Course, if it'd [əv] lasted much longer, he would [əv] had **to went**. [i.e., off to war]
- c'. cf. *If it'd [əv] lasted much longer, he would [əv] had to go off to war*.

- d. That was supposed **to been** a rare seed.
- d'. cf. *That was supposed to be a rare seed*

- e. She continued to work as long as she was able to work, which she had **to been** up in her sixties...
- e'. cf. *...she had to be up in her sixties (..when she quit working)*

- f. I'd [əv] loved **to had** them back. [i.e., her grown children]
- f'. cf. *I'd [əv] loved to have them back*

- g. I' [əz] supposed **to got** one. [i.e., an award]
- g'. cf. *I was supposed to get an award*.

- h. I would [əv] really loved **to got** that baseball. [regarding a foul ball in the stands at a game]
- h'. cf. *I would [əv] really loved to get that baseball*.

- i. They wouldn't knowed what **to done** with the underclothes they've got today.
 i'. cf. *They wouldn't have known what **to do** with the underclothes they've got today.*
- j. Wouldn't you like **to worked** in the mines today?
 j'. Wouldn't you like **to work** in the mines today?

Null *have* with infinitival *to* is not obligatory:

- (4) a. And then a time or two, I was supposed **to [əv] done** something, and I didn't speak up for myself.
 b. For him at one time **to [əv] been** a governor of a state, ...
 c. ...and **to [əv] fought** against uh people that had lost their lives, I mean, uh just because our husbands were killed wasn't no sign that we didn't die too.
 d. He accomplished a whole lot **to [əv] had** a-- not much to start with, you know, no opportunity to go to school, that kind of thing.
 e. Yes, yes, if-- if we had candles, we had **to [əv] made** them.

What is the nature of this null element?

- a. **is there no such morpheme in the underlying representation at all? (radically missing), or**
 b. is it the silent version of the morpheme *have*? (i.e., silent *have*), or
 c. is there a morpheme *have* in the underlying representation but it's just deleted via a phonological reduction rule? and
 d. should we be thinking of this morpheme not as a form of the auxiliary *have*, but rather, as the "complementizer" *of*, a la Kayne 1997?

3. The AAPCAppe: the behavior of null *have* with modals versus *to*

- The data in (1)/(2) and (3)/(4) at first glance give the impression that null *have* is a uniform phenomenon with infinitival *to* and modals.
- Previous literature, Montgomery & Hall (2004): "[a]uxiliary *have* and *had* are sometimes elided in Smokies speech, especially between a modal verb and a past participle...; [this phenomenon is] more favored under a modal verb."
- **Our study reveals the opposite.**

It is true that infinitival perfects with modals are overall more frequent than infinitival perfects with *to*:

- (5) a. modals + infinitival perfect: 795 tokens
 b. *to* + infinitival perfect: 83 tokens

However, despite their differences in absolute frequency, null *have* is relatively less frequent with modals, and relatively more frequent with infinitival *to*:

- (6) **TABLE 1:** Frequency of [modal + infinitival perfect] versus [*to* + infinitival perfect]

	overt <i>have</i> [hæv] or [əv] or [ə] or [v]	null <i>have</i>	total
modals + infinitival perfect	714 (90%)	81 (10%)	795
<i>to</i> + infinitival perfect	25 (30%)	58 (70%)	83

- there is a total of 795 infinitival perfects with modals
- there is a total of 83 infinitival perfects with *to*
- only 10% of the infinitival perfects with modals occur with null *have*
- in contrast, a full 70% of the infinitival perfects with *to* occur with null *have*

3.1 Relative rarity of *to*-perfects in English overall. Important to note that this rarity in the AAPCAppE has nothing to do with the fact that this is vernacular speech. An examination of the frequency of *to*-perfects in the *Penn Parsed Corpora of Historical English* (PPCHE; Kroch et al. 2004; 2010) reveals that the rarity of the *to*-perfect is a general property of English (written or spoken, historic or contemporary).

(7) **TABLE 2:** Frequency of *to*-perfects across corpora

		# <i>to</i> -perfect tokens	# sentence tokens	percentage
written corpora	PPCHE: Early Modern English (years 1500-1710)	58	105,614	.054%
	PPCHE: Modern British English (years 1700-1899)	129	178,160	.072%
spoken corpus	AAPCAppE (1930s –1990s)	83	127,375	.065%

4. What's different about *to*-perfects?

4.1 The “pleonastic” Sequence-of-Tense (SoT) infinitival perfect vs. true anterior tense

Previously unnoted semantic difference between **null *have* vs. overt *have* with *to*-perfects** indicating that the “null *have* construction” is a marker of a particular tense interpretation (or lack thereof!)

4.1.1 The “Sequence of Tense” (SoT) phenomenon

Zagona (2014):

- (8) Terry believed that Sue was pregnant.
- The time of Sue's pregnancy precedes the time of Terry's belief (precedence)
 - The time of Sue's pregnancy overlaps with the time of Terry's believe (simultaneity)
- The **simultaneity** interpretation is the **pleonastic / SoT** interpretation (= not a true anterior)
 - Zagona (2014): this is a case of **formal agreement** in tense features

4.1.2 Perfect SoT in written English

English has also historically exhibited a pleonastic (SoT) tense interpretation with the infinitival perfect.

PPCHE

- (9) a. He had intended to have gone to London with Mr. Oates. (= *He had intended to go to London*)
 b. If the prisoner had chosen to have staid in France... (= *If X had chosen to stay in France...*)

Molencki (2003): pleonastic perfect has essentially been rigorously proscribed out of the language, though one can still find the following variant in *would have loved to...* type contexts:

(10) I would have liked **to have settled** down sooner.

However, in writing, editors (e.g. of newspapers) routinely correct forms like that in (10) before going to press, to one of two possible variant forms:

- (11) a. I would have liked **to settle** down sooner.
 b. I would like **to have settled** down sooner.

4.1.3 Perfect SoT in vernacular speech (the AAPCAppE)

Recall (3): the majority of our *to*-perfect examples with null *have* correlate with a SoT interpretation:

- (3) a. And them mules went right on up there, just where they was supposed **to went**.
 a'. cf. ...*just where they was supposed to go*.
 b. But the men should've refused **to went** in.
 b'. cf. *The men should* [əv] *refused to go* in.
 c. Course, if it'd've lasted much longer, he would've had **to went**.
 c'. cf. *If it'd* [əv] *lasted much longer, he would* [əv] *had to go off to war*.
 j. Wouldn't you like **to worked** in the mines today?
 j'. Wouldn't you like **to work** in the mines today?

4.1.4 Null *have* in *to*-perfects is a marker of SoT in AppE

Hypothesis: null *have* in *to*-perfects is on its way to being a marker of pleonastic tense (SoT).

Prediction: null *have* should be more frequent with an SoT interpretation, and less frequent with an anterior interpretation; overt *have* should be more frequent with an anterior interpretation and less frequent with an SoT interpretation

(12) **TABLE 3** Frequency of *to*-perfects with **SoT** (= pleonastic) versus **anterior** interpretation:

		# overt <i>have</i>	# null <i>have</i>	total #
[A]	anterior interpretation	9 (75%)	3 (25%)	12 (14%)
[B]	SoT interpretation	13 (21%)	49 (79%)	62 (75%)
[C]	unclear	3	6	9 (11%)
[D]	total	25 (30%)	58 (70%)	83 (100%)

- line B: out of the total number of tokens of ***to*-perfects** that can be identified as encoding **SoT**, **79% exhibit null *have***, while only 21% exhibit overt *have*
- line A: out of the total number of tokens of ***to*-perfects** that can be identified as encoding **true anterior** tense, **75% exhibit overt *have***, while only 25% exhibit null *have*

Predictions are borne out.

4.2 Why null *have* with *to*-perfects is more frequent overall than null *have* with modals (Table 1)

We may also have an account for the quantitative difference between infinitival perfects embedded under modals versus infinitival perfects embedded under *to* which we saw in Table 1, namely that null *have* is more frequent with *to*-perfects and less frequent with infinitival perfects embedded under modals:

- SoT interpretation is far more frequent than the anterior interpretation overall (regardless of overt versus null *have*), for whatever reason: out of 83 *to*-perfects gleaned from the corpus, 62 are SoT perfects, while only 12 are “true anteriors”

- under the hypothesis that null *have* is a marker of SoT, we predict null *have* to be more frequent than overt *have* with *to*-perfects, precisely because SoT interpretations are more frequent than “true anterior” interpretations overall
- This is a consideration which will not come into play with modals, because the SoT vs. “true anterior” ambiguity is not present in infinitival perfects embedded under modals
- Thus, null *have* with modals is a true syntactic variant of overt *have* with modals
- In contrast, the variation between null *have* < > overt *have* in *to*-perfects is not true syntactic variation; the difference represents a real semantic distinction

4.3 SoT null *have* versus SoT overt *have*

4.3.1 EMBEDDING CONTEXTS FOR THE PLEONASTIC *TO*-PERFECT WITH NULL *HAVE*:

[A] MODAL(∂v) + infinitival perfect (24 tokens total)

(13) ex: The men **should** [∂v] **refused** to went in.

[B] “supposta class” (23 tokens total)

(14) a. *supposed to* (17 tokens)

ex: That was **supposed to** been a rare seed.

c. *had to* (3 tokens)

ex: She **had to** been up in her sixties.

d. *ought to* (2 tokens)

ex: And I thought, what an awful hot job. Man said, we’re gonna know what hell is like; he **ought to** knowed it by looking into those furnaces.

e. *happened to* (1 token)

ex: I just **happened to** been lucky.

[C] Unclassified

(15) a. ex1: Wouldn’t you like **to worked** in the mines today? (= (21); see also footnote 10)

b. ex2: I was witched to death myself, there was a witch lived right down there in this bottom, right down there in the house that's way down there, and I lived where Jean lives, my daughter there. She about **to killed** me.

Thus, all 49 tokens of the pleonastic *to*-perfect with null *have* culled from the AAPCAppE are embedded under one of two kinds of matrix structures, namely (i) MODAL(∂v) + infinitival perfect, or (ii) a form from the “supposta class” (*pace* the unclassified category [C]).

4.3.2 In contrast: our 13 tokens of the pleonastic *to*-perfect with overt *have* — limited in number as they may be — exhibit a surprising number of embedding contexts not at all found with the 49 tokens of the pleonastic *to*-perfect with null *have*. We illustrate all five of these examples in (16) (which is 38% of the tokens); the embedding context is underlined:

5 tokens of SoT to-perfect with overt have; contexts not found with the SoT to-perfect with null have:

(16) a. ...and I said No. I said, I’m-- I’m not going to go. I didn’t have a date, I didn't-- wasn't planning to [∂v] **seen you**.

b. But uh, uh, for a long time, maybe two or three years, I just uh-- About any time of the day I wanted to [∂v] **worked** (for as) long as I wanted to, they said just come out when you want to and leave when you want to.

- c. (We certainly do appreciate you letting us interview you.) Well I'əz glad to [əv], if I ain't made no mistakes.
- d. And Clarence just got up there and said Judge, he said, your Honor, he said, I never killed that man. Said, You didn't? No, said, I didn't. Said Who-- who killed him then? Said Boone Potter killed him. Said Why didn't you tell it? Says, I'əz afraid to [əv].
- e. (Well, did any of your children have to leave home or anything during that time, to get a job?) No no, they wasn't big enough to [əv], during the Depression.

5. Outstanding counting issues

5.1 VP Ellipsis

Note that in three out of our thirteen examples with overt *have* with an SoT interpretation, the pleonastic *to*-perfect contains an overt *have* which precedes an elided VP, captured in ~~[[struck through double square brackets]]~~ in (19):

- (19) c. Well I'əz glad to [əv] ~~[[interviewed with you]]~~
 d. I'əz afraid to [əv] ~~[[told it]]~~
 e. They wasn't big enough to [əv] ~~[[gotten a job]]~~

But if we're counting such cases of SoT overt *have*, then our numbers in Table 3 may be **underestimating** (by we don't know yet how much) **the cases of SoT null *have***, given that we didn't count examples such as the following, which we have not counted:

Do these count as null *have*?

- (20) a. About any time of the day I wanted to [əv] worked (**for as**) **long as I wanted to [...]**, they said just come out when you want to and leave when you want to.
 b. And uh, I w- **I'd [əv] liked to [...]**, but I never did get the opportunity to race on that red clay.
 c. And uh, I didn't get much of a education, not as much as **I would [əv] liked to [...]**.

That is, should the ellipsis should be interpreted as in (21a) or (21b), or as in (21c) for that matter?

- (21) a. ...(for as) long as I wanted to ~~[[əv worked]]~~
 b. ...(for as) long as I wanted to ~~[[worked]]~~
 c. ...(for as) long as I wanted to ~~[[work]]~~

5.2 Ambiguous infinitives

The possibility in (21c) raises another issue regarding infinitives. Consider the following examples:

- (22) a. Why I think one time he'əz supposed to **give** John Bud a third.
 b. You'əz supposed to **put** down what you drew.
 c. So they didn't pay me for it; supposed to **give** me fifty cents a yard.
 d. and when he got a job on the railroad, he'əz supposed to **move** out of that house...
 e. And we'əz supposed to **put** eighty cars in a lead track over there at Elkhorn.
 f. And, um, they must [əv] had- they've had to **take** them something.
- (23) a. All these counties wouldn't had to **ask** nobody for a dime for to put water back.
 b. If they would [əv] had enough foresight years ago to **let** a company pay d-- like a sales tax or a county tax or uh like a penny on a ton, ... (cf. (47b))

In all of the cases in (22) and (23), we have the following three conditions:

- (i) two of the most frequent embedding contexts for null *have* in *to*-perfects, namely the “supposta” context in (22) and the [modal + infinitival perfect] context in (23);
- (ii) a set of verb forms which could either be parsed as bare infinitives or as past participles (*give, put, move, take, ask, and let*); and
- (iii) a pleonastic tense interpretation of *to + V*, which is entirely consistent either with an infinitive (*to give*) or with a pleonastic *to*-perfect with null *have* (*to HAVE_{null} give*).

Thus, from the perspective of the researcher, it becomes difficult to know whether examples such as those in (22) and (23) should be analyzed as infinitives, or as *to*-perfects with null *have*, as in (22') and (23'):

- (22') a. Why I think one time he'əz supposed **to HAVE_{null} give_{past-part}** John Bud a third.
 b. You'əz supposed **to HAVE_{null} put_{past-part}** down what you drewd.
 c. So they didn't pay me for it; supposed **to HAVE_{null} give_{past-part}** me fifty cents a yard.
 d. and when he got a job on the railroad, he'əz supposed **to HAVE_{null} move_{past-part}** out of that house...
 e. And we'əz supposed **to HAVE_{null} put_{past-part}** eighty cars in a lead track over there at Elkhorn.
 f. And, um, they must [əv] had- they've had **to HAVE_{null} take_{past-part}** them something.
- (23') a. All these counties wouldn't had **to HAVE_{null} ask_{past-part}** nobody for a dime for to put water back.
 b. If they would [əv] had enough foresight years ago **to HAVE_{null} let_{past-part}** a company pay d-- like a sales tax or a county tax or uh like a penny on a ton, ...
- If we analyze these examples (and the many others from the corpus not reported here) as *to*-perfects with null *have*, then our numbers in Table 3 change; in this case, again the number of SoT perfects with null *have* will be much greater

6. What about phonology?

Does the phonological context of a preceding [tu] or [tə] make it difficult for transcribers to hear a following [əv] / [ə] (= *have*) ?

Preliminary measurements indicate that transcribers were not failing to perceive something in the speech signal.

Emily Adams (SKCTC)

(24) *They wouldn't knowd what **to done** with the underclothes they've got.*

vowel between [t] and [d] = 0.04 seconds

(25) *When he got this cooked just right -- (which he =ud had enough L-- “Life Everlasting” in that **to =uv [tə ə] made** forty gallons, but he just had about a quart of it) -- he got him a teacup and dipped down in that, and he drunk that, and all at oncet he had a pain in his stomach.*

vowel(s) [ə ə] between [t] and [m] = 0.24 seconds

(26) *She was too old **to be** put in the orphanage.*

vowel between [t] and [b] = 0.11 seconds

(27) *Mamie Whitaker and Eli Whitaker had decided they wanted **to keep** all four of us.*

vowel between [t] and [k] = 0.079 seconds

Trained transcribers not failing to hear ‘have’ in the speech signal.

Of course, even if all the measurements show no evidence of two segments in a context like *to done* e.g. in (7) — one for the [ə] of [tə], and one for the [ə] of *have* [ə]...

...this does not entail that there is no phonological rule of deletion, for example as follows:

- (28) a. [ə] ‘have’ --> ∅ / [tə] ___ or
 b. [tə] --> [t] / ___ [ə] ‘have’

Acknowledgments [please see AAPCAppE website for a complete list, for the AAPCAppE in general]:

We would like to thank Cristina Schmitt for inspiring discussion about the data in this paper. For the building of the AAPCAppE, the people we wish to thank are quite numerous; we list some folks here, but fuller acknowledgment is given on the AAPCAppE website: Alexia Ault, Greta Browning, Kathleen Currie Hall, Marcel den Dikken, Aaron Ecay, Robert Gipe, Fred Hay, Anton Karl Ingason, Tyler Kendall, Larry Lafollette, Michael Montgomery, Paul Reed, John Shean, Edward Snajdr, Laura Smith, Doug Whalen, Tiffany Williams, Walt Wolfram, Jiahong Yuan, Raffaella Zanuttini. Research has been supported by NSF Grants #BCS-0617197 (Tortora) and #BCS-0616573 (Den Dikken); by an NSF REG Award made to Blanchette on NSF Grant #BCS-0963950 (Snajdr); by a RISLUS Fellowship (Blanchette); by a Graduate Center Fellowship (Blanchette); by the College of Staten Island’s *Provost Research Scholarship* (2010-11); by an NEH 2011-12 Fellowship (Tortora); and by an NEH Digital Humanities Start-Up Grant (2012-14) #HD-51543-12 (Tortora); and by NSF BCS Awards #BCS-1152148 (PI: Tortora) & #BCS-1151630 (PI: Santorini).

Selected Bibliography:

- Bowie, Jill & Bas Aarts. 2011. “Change in the English Infinitival Perfect Construction.”
 Eide, K. 2016. “Finiteness, inflection, and the syntax your morphology can afford.”
 Eide, K. XXXX. “Have-less perfects” in Norwegian: an Old Norse heritage.
 Kayne, R. 1997. “The English Complementizer of,” *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 1: 43-54.
 also in Kayne 2002, *Parameters & Universals*, OUP.
 Kroch, A. & Ann Taylor. 2000. *The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English* (PPCME2). Department of Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania. CD-ROM, 2nd edition, (<http://www.ling.upenn.edu/hist-corpora/>).
 Kroch, A., Beatrice Santorini, and Lauren Delfs. 2004. *The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English* (PPCEME). Department of Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania. CD-ROM, first edition, (<http://www.ling.upenn.edu/hist-corpora/>).
 Kroch, A., Beatrice Santorini, and Ariel Diertani. 2010. *The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Modern British English* (PPCMBE). Department of Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania. CD-ROM, first edition, (<http://www.ling.upenn.edu/hist-corpora/>).
 Molencki, Rafal. 2003. “Proscriptive Prescriptivists: On the Loss of the ‘Pleonastic’ Perfect Infinitive in Counterfactual Constructions in Late Modern English,” *Linguistic Insights: Studies in Language and Communication* 7: 175-196.
 Montgomery, M. & J.S. Hall. 2004. *A Dictionary of Smoky Mountain English*. Knoxville: UT Press.
 Randall, Beth. 2009. *CorpusSearch 2: A tool for linguistic research*. Includes CorpusDraw, a graphical interface for displaying and correcting parsed corpora. <http://corpussearch.sourceforge.net/>
 Stowell, Tim. 2007. “Sequence of Perfect,” in Louis de Saussure, Jacques Moeschler and Genoveva Puskas (eds.) *Recent advances in the syntax and semantics of tense, mood and aspect* (Trends in Linguistics Vol. 185) Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, pp. 123-146.
 Tortora, C. 2014. “Evidence for the non-finiteness of English ‘present’ and ‘past’ verb forms,” talk given at the NYU Syntax Brown Bag series, February 28, 2014.
 Tortora, C., F. Blanchette, T. O’Neill, & S. Arriaga. 2015. “Variation in Appalachian non-present forms,” talk given at the FWAV2 Workshop, May 2015, Reykjavik, Iceland.
 Tortora, C., B. Santorini, F. Blanchette, & C.E.A. Diertani. 2017. *The Audio-Aligned and Parsed Corpus of Appalachian English* (AAPCAppE). <http://csivc.csi.cuny.edu/aapcappel/>
 Zagona, K. 2014. “Sequence-of-tense and the Features of Finite Tenses,” *Nordlyd* 41.2: 261-272.