1 Introduction

In NA English the verbs *go* and *come* can be immediately followed by a second verb:

(1) *Go get* construction.†
    a. *Go get* me a coffee!  
    b. *Come visit* again soon!  
    c. Every morning I *go buy* a coffee.  
    d. *Every morning he* *goes buys* a coffee.

**Puzzle:** (1) is morphologically restricted: *go get* is only possibly with a bare verb, or with a form of the verb syncretic (homophonous) to the bare verb. Both verbs are subject to this apparently surface-oriented restriction. (Zwicky, 1969; Shopen, 1971; Carden and Pesetsky, 1977)

**Proposal:** the morphological restriction in (1) results from a syntax that places conflicting feature requirements on the verbs, and places the same feature requirements on both verbs.

These conflicting requirements result in verbs that can only be realized when syncretic to their bare forms.

This ties together three things:

1. A theory of feature dependencies as in Matushansky (2008), in which features are assigned by heads to their complements and those features can spread throughout a complement domain, and can stack distinct features (that are potentially morphologically incompatible) on a single head.

2. Affix Hopping in English (Chomsky, 1957), as a limiting case of head-complement feature assignment.

3. The idea that feature conflicts are syntactically licit but (potentially) morphologically problematic.

†This construction has been called many different things in those papers that have discussed it. To avoid adding another name to the collection, I have adopted the theory-neutral name *go get construction* from Pullum (1990).

2 Morphological details of the *go get* construction

The *go get* construction and its morphological restriction were separately discovered by Zwicky (1969), Shopen (1971) and Carden and Pesetsky (1977). Also discussed in Pullum (1990); Pollock (1994); Jaeggli and Hyams (1993); Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001).

Alongside *go get* in English (2) we find similar constructions in other languages: ²

(2) English
    a. *Go buy* yourself a coffee!  
    b. I told him to *come visit* again soon.

(3) Marsalese (Cardinaletti and Giusti, 2001)
    a. *Vaju a pigghiu u pani.*  
       go-1sg to fetch-1sg the bread  
       “I go and fetch the bread.” ³  
    b. *A petra vene a ruzzulla assutta.*  
       the stone come-3sg to roll-3sg here  
       “The stone comes rolling down here.”

(4) Modern Greek
    a. *ela htipise ti bala.*  
       come-IMP.SG kick-IMP.SG the ball  
       “Come kick the ball.”
    b. *pigene stasu eki grigora.*  
       go-IMP.SG stand-IMP.SG there quickly  
       “Go stand there quickly.”

²Similar quasi-serial constructions with motion verbs also appear to exist in Russian and perhaps in Modern Hebrew, but time prevents discussion of those data.
These constructions share the following syntactic properties . . .

1. Distinct from both coordinated (go and get) and infinitival (go to get) constructions. (see appendix a)
2. Not a complex head: adverbs intervene: e.g. You should go quietly wake him up.
3. Limited to a subset of motion verbs.
   (a) English: only go and come.
   (b) Marsalese: iri 'go', eniri 'come', passari 'come by', and mannari 'send'.
   (c) Greek: pigeno 'go', erchome 'come', trecho 'run', among others.

. . . as well as the following morphological properties (the topic here):

1. Only possible with a restricted set of morphological forms.
   (a) English: the bare verb, or a form homophonous/syncretic to the bare verb.
   (b) Marsalese: a form that takes the 'default' stem.
   (c) Greek (some speakers): the imperative.
2. Both verbs must show the same inflection.

### 2.1 Morphological restriction on the go get construction

#### A. English: The construction is good in all verb forms that systematically take the bare or uninflected form of the verb.

(5) go get is limited to (overtly) uninflected verbs:
   a. Come visit us next week.
   b. I want to go take a nap.
   c. Birds will come play in your bird bath.
   d. Her supervisor demanded that she go buy a replacement.

#### B. Marsalese

- Marsalese: go get construction possible only in environments in which iri takes the 'unmarked' verb stem . . .

(7) Go get is possible with the unmarked verb stem
   a. In the present, for some person/number combinations:
      (i) Vaju a pigghi u pani.
      go-1sg to fetch-1sg the bread
      “I go and fetch the bread.”
      (ii) Vai a pigghi u pani.
      go-2sg to fetch-2sg the bread
      “You (sg) go and fetch the bread.”
      (iii) Va a pigghi u pani.
      go-3sg to fetch-3sg the bread
      “She/he goes and fetches the bread.”
      (iv) Vannu a pigghianu u pani.
      go-3pl to fetch-3pl the bread
      “They go and fetch the bread.”

---

4 Shopen (1971) reports that have, run, stay, etc. and try are also grammatical in the go get construction, but I have not replicated those judgements with any English speakers.

5 At least two previous analyses of the morphological restriction have hinged on the bareness of these environments (Jaeggli and Hyams, 1993; Pollock, 1994). Such approaches will not allow unification of the English data with the morphological restrictions seen in other languages.

6 The contrast between (5e) and (6a) is really morphological, not a semantic restriction against third-singular subjects.

7 Veniri shows a stem alternation in the same person/number/tense environments. Passari doesn’t show stem alternations, but shares the distributional restriction.
b. In the canonical (singular) imperative:

\[
\text{Va pigghia u pani} \\
go-IMP-2SG buy-IMP-2SG the bread
\]

“Go fetch bread!”

…rather than the marked/irregular stem \(i-/e-\):

(8) \( Go \) \( get \) is impossible with the ‘marked’ stem

a. In the present, for 1st- and 2nd-person plurals:

(i) \( *\text{Emu a pigghiānu u pani} \)

\( \text{go-1PL to fetch-1PL the bread} \)

“We go and fetch the bread.”

(ii) \( *\text{Iti a pigghiā} u pani \)

\( \text{go-2PL to fetch-2PL the bread} \)

“You (pl) go and fetch the bread.”

b. In the plural imperative:

\( *\text{Iti go pigghiāti u pani} \)

\( \text{buy-imp-2PL the bread} \)

“Go (pl) fetch bread!”

c. In other verb forms that take the ‘marked’ stem:

(i) \( *\text{Ii go pigghiāi u pani} \)

\( \text{fetch pst-1SG the bread} \)

(ii) \( *\text{Ia go pigghiava u pani} \)

\( \text{fetch impf-1SG the bread} \)

(iii) \( *\text{Si timi issi a accattassiu pani ne sta butia} \)

\( \text{buy-subj in this shop, spend-subj less} \)

C. Modern Greek

- For at least some speakers, the \( go \) \( get \) construction is limited to the morphological imperative in Greek.
- For all speakers, it is banned from all particle-verb constructions (such as the future):

\( \text{Go get is limited to the imperative for some speakers:} \)

a. \( ela klotsise ti bala \)

\( \text{come-IMP-SG kick-IMP-SG the ball} \)

“Come kick the ball!”

b. \( %\text{Kathe kirjia, i Maria erhi} \text{te majirevi ja tin jaja} \)

\( \text{every Sunday the Maria come-IMPF cook-IMPF for the grandmother} \)

\( \text{her-GEN} \)

“Every Sunday, Maria comes cooks for her grand mother.”

c. \( *\text{Avrio, i Maria tha erthi majirepsi ja tin jaja} \)

\( \text{Maria} \)

\( \text{thi fut} \)

\( \text{come majirepsi} \)

\( \text{cook for tin the jaja grandmother her-GEN.} \)

“Tomorrow, Maria will come cook for her grandmother.

For the purposes of this talk, I will be concerned with those speakers for whom the construction is limited to the imperative.

2.2 Source and basis of the morphological restriction

- The focus of this talk is not what allows there to be two verbs in a single clause.
- There is nonetheless a correlation between the availability of the construction and the morphological restrictions described above. We can adopt a placeholder for this syntactic correlation: \( Go \) \( get \) licenser = \( gg \)

Whatever licenses the construction is also reasonably the source of the featural restriction on the verbs.

What is the featural basis of the morphological restriction? A feature that describes the \( \text{bareness} \) restriction in English, the \( \text{default stem} \) restriction in Marsalese, and the \( \text{imperative} \) restriction in Greek is \( \text{[imperative]} \).

Thus assume that \( gg \) assigns an \( \text{[imperative]} \) feature to the two verbs.
- This is a \text{morphological [imperative] feature} – it does not imply that a clause with \( go \) \( get \) is syntactically or semantically imperative.

\[ \text{[imperative]} \]

\[ \text{[imperative]} \]

\[ \text{[imperative]} \]

\[ \text{[imperative]} \]

\[ \text{[imperative]} \]

\[ \text{[imperative]} \]

\[ \text{[imperative]} \]
2.3 Inflectional identity between the two verbs

This section shows that both the wider syntactic environment and GG impose their restrictions on both verbs in the go get construction.

- Marsalese and Modern Greek: trivial – both verbs are overtly inflected.
- English: more subtle to show this, as the construction is restricted to uninflected forms.

Nonetheless, two environments show the inflectional identity between the verbs clearly for English:

1. Complements of perfect have
2. Be as V₂ in go get

2.3.1 The go get construction under perfect have:

Go is restricted from occurring in the go get construction under have, because its perfect participle is gone:

(10) have gone ungrammatical in go get construction

a. *He has gone bought the newspaper already.
b. *Georgia wished she had gone visited Paris when she got the chance.

Unlike go, come has a perfect participle homophonous to its bare form. Despite this, it cannot occur in the go get construction when it is followed by a regular (non-bare) perfect participle:

(11) have come + regular perfect participle: still ungrammatical

a. *Alex has come knocked on my door three times. (*come knock)
b. *Jacob has come bought a paper every day this week. (*come buy)
c. *Helen has come visited her grandmother only twice. (*come visit)

- Carden and Pesetsky (1977) observed, however, that when second verb is also one of the handful of verbs whose perfect participle is exceptionally homophonous to its bare form, the perfect examples improve for many (though not all) speakers:

\[ \text{I have come hit the ball.} \]  

(GG licenser)

\[ \text{Both verbs are doubly restricted:} \]

- This shows that both the wider syntactic environment and the construction itself impose their peculiar morphological requirements on both verbs:

\[ \text{The complete list of verbs with exceptional bare/perfect-particle homophony, as reported by Pullum (1990), is: bet, bid, burst, cast, come, cost, cut, fill, hit, hurt, let, pay, quit, run, set, shed, shut, spit, split, spread, thrust, wed, wet.} \]
Expressed in terms of features on the two verbs:

\[
\text{environment } F \quad \begin{array}{ll}
V_1 & \text{[imperative]} \\
V_2 & \text{[imperative]}
\end{array} \quad \text{←− determined by } GG \text{ licenser}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
F & \text{←− determined by environment } F
\end{array}
\]

3 A Theory of Syntactic Feature Conflicts

What we need to describe the *go get* construction:

1. A way to impose identical featural requirements on two separate verbs.
2. A way to impose conflicting inflectional requirements on the verbs.

A syntactic theory with exactly these properties has been proposed within a novel approach to predicative Case. Matushansky (2008) proposes that the features that result in morphological case are assigned via local head-complement relationship, in which a head can assign features to its sister, features that are then inherited by all the daughters of that sister.

(15) Feature Dependencies in Matushansky (2008):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{XP} \\
\text{X}^0 \quad \text{YP } [F] \\
\text{Y}^0 [F] \quad \text{ZP } [F] \\
\text{Z}^0 [F] \quad \text{...}
\end{array}
\]

- Feature percolation can be blocked: Matushansky (2008) proposes that phase-boundaries are blockers; in principle, there may be other blockers.

Extended to verbal inflection, this has the properties required for *go get*:

A. Spreading of features onto more than one head.

(16) Other evidence for spreading: inflection in Serial Verb Constructions

a. Konça (Steever, 1988, 71–73)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
v\ddot{a}n-a \\
\text{come-NONPAST-1PL.exc}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
s\ddot{u}n-ap \\
\text{see-NONPAST-1PL.exc}
\end{array}
\]

‘We will come and see’

b. Lango (Noonan, 1992, 211–12)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\dddot{a}cw\ddot{e} \quad \dddot{a}l\ddot{i}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{1sg-fat-HAB} \\
\text{1sg-exceed-HAB king}
\end{array}
\]

‘I am fatter than the king’ (lit. I-fat I-exceed king)

c. Saramaccan (Byrne, 1990, 152)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
a \quad \text{bi} \\
\text{he TENSE paint the house TENSE finish}
\end{array}
\]

‘He had painted the house already.’

B. Stacking of multiple features of one type onto a single head.

- A head can easily receive sets of incompatible features on this model.
  (Unlike in an Agree model, this does not require merging a head with illicit combinations of features)
- In general this stacking of incompatible features is what creates feature conflicts.
- Such feature conflicts are syntactically licit, but may be uninterpretable in the morphology - if incompatible features remain on a single head to the point of Vocabulary Insertion, they will only be interpretable if they happen to be syncretic.

3.1 Feature Spreading and Affix Hopping

The one-to-one dependencies of Affix Hopping can be seen as a limiting case of this kind of feature movement - instead of affixes literally moving down the tree, the features that determine the spell-out of those affixes are assigned downward by each inflectional head.

Each inflectional head also acts as a blocker to feature spreading from the head above it. Thus each head uniquely assigns morphological features to the VP and \( V^0 \) that is in its complement.

\[\text{Examples drawn from Aikhenvald and Dixon (2007).}\]
For illustration, consider the following example:

(17) The students will have been reading the book.

When progressive \textit{be} is merged above \textit{read}, it assigns a feature requiring progressive participle morphology to its complement (I adopt the simplification of assuming this is a single feature):

(18)

![Diagram](image)

When the perfect auxiliary \textit{have} is merged, it assigns a feature requiring a perfect participle to its complement: this feature does not percolate past the next auxiliary down (\textit{be}) into the boxed portion of the tree.

(19)

![Diagram](image)

It is necessary that the VPs headed by auxiliaries be blockers to feature percolation; otherwise incompatible features \textit{[prog]} and \textit{[perfect]} would end up on the head \textit{read}.

- Final spell out:
  a. \textit{read}[prog] $\rightarrow$ \textit{reading}
  b. \textit{be}[perfect] $\rightarrow$ \textit{been}

### 3.2 Applying this syntax to the \textit{go get} construction

Assume that the feature required by the \textit{go get} construction originates from whatever element licenses the construction.

That is, the syntactic placeholder \textit{GG}

- \textit{GG} assigns a feature \textit{[imperative]} to its complement. This feature spreads across two lexical verbs.
- \textit{GG} is not a blocker to further percolation.

Thus, in a sentence like (20) . . .

(20) Alex will have \textit{come} hit the piñata.

. . . we get a subtree like the following (including the stand-in projection \textit{GG}):

![Diagram](image)
... then when HAVE merges, we get the following:

Any features later assigned to HAVE will be blocked, however, from percolating further down.

- Both COME and HIT end this derivation with multiple features. Due to coincidental properties of their paradigms, they can nonetheless spell out these multiple features with single vocabulary items, so we want something like the following to occur at the point of morphological realization:

(21) Desired result at spell-out: resolution via syncretism

a. COME \[imperative\] \[perfect\] \[imperative\] \[perfect\] \[imperative\] \[perfect\]

b. HIT \[imperative\] \[perfect\] \[imperative\] \[perfect\]

By contrast, if we replace the verb HIT with a verb like EAT, we get the same derivation, but at the point of lexical insertion we get a crash.

(22) *Alex will have come eaten the cake.

The desired effect is for the derivation to crash at lexical insertion because there is no element in the paradigm of EAT that can spell out all the features it has been assigned:

(23) Desired result at spell-out: crash

a. COME \[imperative\] \[perfect\] \[imperative\] \[perfect\]

b. EAT \[imperative\] \[perfect\] \[imperative\] \[perfect\]

Uninterpretability at the morphological interface does not come for free with a theory such as DM, however. Section 4 discusses this point.

4 Morphological Resolution of Feature Conflicts

For the purposes of this discussion, I adopt the post-syntactic model of Distributed Morphology (DM) (Halle and Marantz, 1993, 1994; Harley and Noyer, 1999).

How do we expect (incompatible) Feature Stacking to be interpreted by the morphology?

The result we want: multiple features of the same type impose their morphological restrictions *simultaneously*: the result of morphological interpretation is grammatical only if both features would have the same morphological realization.

(24) Impossible in standard implementations of DM: For any head with a particular set of features, a set of ordered Vocabulary Insertion (VI) rules will always produce exactly one output. 11

a. Hypothetical set of ordered VI rules:

i. $F \rightarrow a$

ii. $G \rightarrow b$

iii. elsewhere $\rightarrow c$

b. Disjunctively ordered VI rules will always produce an output.

A head $X^0$ with features $[F]$ and $[G]$ will always spell out as $a$, if the rule with $[F]$ in its environment is ordered first.

- What is needed is a way to force the set of VI rules to apply more than once, in those cases where ‘incompatible’ features have been assigned to a head.

---

11I am grateful to Alya Asarina for pointing this out to me. This argument is developed in greater detail in Asarina (in preparation).
Assume features are organized into bundles or geometries, as proposed by Harley and Ritter (2002) among many others, and proposed specifically for verbal inflection in Cowper (2003, 2005).

**Proposal:** Assignment (or co-existence) of incompatible features requires the creation of a second bundle, and VI rules apply in sequence once per bundle. All applications of VI rules per head must produce the same output, or the result is ungrammatical.

**A Mechanism for Creating Multiple Bundles:** when features are assigned to a head they check to see if they can form a consistent ‘bundle’ with the features that head already has.

In a normal case:
1. Subject = person and number features, e.g. [1.sg]
2. These are assigned to, or Agree with, T0, which is itself specified for inflectional features: e.g. [pres]
3. All features are compatible, so they form a single bundle [1.sg,pres]

Then in the go get construction:
1. Both the motion verb and the second verb bear [imperative] in go get configurations.
2. A higher head (e.g. T0 [1.sg,pres]) assigns more features downwards
3. Upon assignment, the syntax checks to see whether these features can coexist in a single feature geometry with the features already present on the head.
4. No, so head ends up with two feature bundles: [imperative] and [1.sg,pres]
5. At morphological spell-out, all feature bundles must be realized via a vocabulary insertion rule.

(25) *She comes visits* her grandfather every week.

(26) **Multiple feature bundle spell-out for come (greatly simplified)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COME</th>
<th>COME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[3.sg, pres]</td>
<td>[imp]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.sg → -s</td>
<td>comes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elsewhere →</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comes ≠ come</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...non-identity of outputs results in uninterruptability (crash)

**4.1 Returning to Marsalese and Greek**

The logic is the same, but the available resolutions are different.

**Marsalese:** in Marsalese imperative ‘morphology’ consists of the default stem with no inflection (as in many other languages). Unlike in English, it is indifferent to the presence of agreement suffixes. Thus, features that result in the spell-out of suffixes are acceptable as long as they do not place conflicting requirements on the stem.

**Greek:** in Greek, there is a dedicated inflected morphological imperative. The [imperative] feature is incompatible with all other possible verbal features; all would require different morphological interpretation.

For those speakers of Greek who lack the morphological restriction to the imperative, presumably the construction licenser gg does not assign any morphological features. The same thing can be said for the analogue of the go get construction in Russian, not discussed here, which does not appear to be morphologically restricted at all.

**5 Extension to other facts**

The theory developed here can be applied to more famous cases of morphological resolution of syntactic feature conflict.

Groos and van Riemsdijk (1981) observe that free relatives in German require the gap and the free relative itself to be in positions calling for the same Case, except when the relative pronoun is syncretic for the multiple Case values.

(27) **German Free Relatives (Groos and van Riemsdijk, 1981)**

   1 take who ACC you recommend.
   “I take whoever you recommend to me.” (ACC assigned in matrix and within RC)

b. *Ich nehme, *wer/wen einem guten Eindruck macht.*
   1 take who NOM/ACC a good impression makes.
   “I take whoever makes a good impression.” (NOM and ACC not syncretic for wer)

c. Ich habe gegessen was noch übrig war.
   1 have eaten what NOM/ACC still left was
   “I ate what was left.” (NOM and ACC syncretic for neuter was)
Directly adopting Matushansky (2008)’s assumptions about the composition of Case features: nominative Case results from a single feature \([\text{nominative}]\) while accusative Case results from two features \([\text{nominative, accusative}]\)

1. In its base position in the free relative, the relative pronoun is assigned \([\text{nominative}]\)
2. In the matrix clause, it is assigned \([\text{nominative, accusative}]\) – the second \([\text{nominative}]\) feature is incompatible with a geometry already containing the first \([\text{nominative}]\), resulting in a second feature bundle on the relative pronoun.
3. We now get two bundles of features, which have to be spelled out at the same time.
4. Spelling out \([\text{nominative}]\) and \([\text{nominative, accusative}]\) will produce the same result, so the Case conflict is resolvable.

6 Conclusion

The empirical focus of this talk was the go get construction, an odd little serializing construction which occurs with morphological restrictions in a number of languages.

In analyzing the morphological restriction, three strands of thought were drawn together:

1. The idea that the morphological restriction is the result of conflicting feature requirements, resolvable only when the conflicting features are syncretic.
2. The idea that features can be assigned in a head-complement relationship, and can spread throughout a domain so long as they are not blocked from doing so.
3. The idea that classical Affix Hopping (hence, English inflection) might be basically correct, but involve downward movement of features rather than of affixes.

Topics of current and future research:

More careful look at the geometry underlying feature incompatibility, particularly in extending this to other cases of syncretism.

Broader cross-linguistic pattern of the go get construction, particularly in languages lacking the morphological restriction.

Precise conditions of syntactic licensing, and possible connection to the features involved in the morphological restriction. Pursuing the imperative connection; this requires a syntax for imperatives.

Investigation of why apparently serial constructions involving motion verbs are frequently possible in non-serializing languages.
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A  Go get is not coordination or non-finite complementation

A common initial assumption is that the go get construction in (28a) is related to either the purpose-infinitive construction in (28b) or the asymmetric VP-coordination construction in (28c):

(28) a. I go buy a coffee every morning.
b. I go to buy a coffee every morning.
c. I go and buy a coffee every morning.

A.1 go get is not go to get

(29) A motion verb followed by a purpose infinitives is not morphologically restricted:
a. I went to buy a coffee.
b. She comes to visit her grandmother often.

(30) Go get and go to get have different truth conditions (from Shopen, 1971):
a. Every Saturday I go to buy vegetables, but there are never any vegetables.
b. #Every Saturday I go buy vegetables, but there are never any vegetables.

(a) is potentially true; I can go somewhere with the intention of buying vegetables even if I never actually succeed in doing so. (b), by contrast, expresses a contradiction; to say that I go buy vegetables appears to entail that I do actually buy vegetables.

A.2 go get is not go and get

The differences here are more subtle: indeed, many authors have failed to distinguish the constructions Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001); De Vos (2004); Wiklund (2005), or have analyzed go get as the coordination go and get plus conjunction reduction (Zwicky, 1969; Carden and Pesetsky, 1977).

(31) No morphological restriction on go and get. 12
a. What have you gone and done this time?
b. He/she goes and gets the paper every morning.
c. The delivery person came and left the package on the porch.
d. He has gone and bought the newspaper already.
e. Susan is coming and having lunch with us.

(32) Go get construction requires an agentive subject. (Shopen, 1971)\(^{13}\)
   a. Will the army come destroy the city?
   b. \#Will the bomb come destroy the city?
   ... while go and get coordination lacks this agentivity requirement.
   c. Will the bomb come and destroy the city?

(33) Go and get allows a verb particle or a locative PP to follow the motion verb. go get doesn’t. (Pullum, 1990)
   a. (i) Every morning you go (out) fetch the mail?
      (ii) Every morning you go (out) and fetch the mail?
   b. (i) I asked the courier to come (*to the office) pick up the package.
      (ii) I asked the courier to come (to the office) and pick up the package.

\(^{13}\)Carden and Pesetsky (1977) correctly observe that try and V and be sure and V constructions are impossible with overt inflection, and they claim that the Inflection condition does apply to coordinated VPs with go or come in the first conjunct. See Pullum (1990) for arguments specifically addressing their examples.

\(^{13}\)Thanks to Patrick Gross for suggesting these examples.