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In Present-day English, some motion verbs including come and go can be followed by the bare form of another verb, forming so-called “Double Verb Constructions,” which have some unique properties like the inflectional restriction, the selectional restriction on their subjects, and the single event interpretation. These properties are argued to be closely related to their development from V and V constructions in infinitive and imperative uses through grammaticalization in Middle and Modern English. It is shown that as a result of grammaticalization, the relevant motion verbs have been reanalyzed into light verbs located in v that take an infinitival VP complement.*
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1. Introduction

In Present-day English, there is a class of motion verbs including come and go that can be followed by the bare form of another verb, which in turn expresses the purpose or intention of the motion that they denote, as shown in (1). I will call the relevant class of verbs COME/GO verbs and the configurations as in (1) Double Verb Constructions (henceforth, DVCs).

(1) a. They come talk to me every day.
   b. He will go talk to his advisor today.
   c. I expect him to come talk to you tomorrow.

(Pollock (1994: 303))

As observed by a number of linguists (Shopen (1971), Carden and Pesetsky (1977), Jaeggli and Hyams (1993), and Ishihara and Noguchi (2000) among others), DVCs in Present-day English exhibit some interesting properties that

* I am grateful to Masachiyo Amano, Tomoyuki Tanaka, and all of the members of the Department of English Linguistics, Nagoya University. I also thank two anonymous reviewers for English Linguistics for their valuable comments and suggestions on an earlier version of this article. All remaining errors are my own.
have attracted their attention.

First, as shown in (2), if either the COME/GO verb or the following verb appears in DVCs in inflected forms such as a third person singular present tense form, a past tense form, or a participial form, it leads to ungrammaticality, which is called the inflectional restriction.¹

(2)  a. *John goes talk to his advisor every day.
     b. *Mary comes talk to me whenever she has a problem.

     (Jaeggli and Hyams (1993: 316))

Second, DVCs impose a selectional restriction on their subjects in that they require an agentive subject, as illustrated in (3).

(3)  a. *Pieces of driftwood come wash up on the shore.
     b. *Our sewage might go pollute the town water supply.

     (Shopen (1971: 259))

Third, DVCs have a single event interpretation in which the events denoted by the COME/GO verb and the following verb are simultaneous with each other. Thus, the DVC in (4) means that both the motion and purchase has taken place, and hence yields a contradiction in interpretation.

(4) *They go buy vegetables every day, but there never are any vegetables.

     (ibid.: 257)

This paper has three main goals: to identify the source of DVCs diachronically, to clarify their development in terms of grammaticalization, and to provide explanations for their unique properties mentioned above in such a way as to relate them to the development of DVCs.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 examines the development of DVCs, based on the data from historical corpora, Visser (1969), and *The Oxford English Dictionary* (henceforth, OED), and suggests that DVCs were historically derived from *V and V* constructions (e.g. *They go and visit the dentist every year*), not from *V to V* constructions (e.g. *The children go to visit the dentist every year*), in Middle English. Section 3 analyzes the change of DVCs from *V and V* constructions in terms of grammaticalization, and argues that the COME/GO verb in DVCs, which has both lexical and functional properties, is a light verb in Present-day English that occupies an intermediate position between full verbs and auxiliaries on the verbal cline of grammaticalization proposed by Hopper and

¹ In this paper, I will not address the issue whether uninflected verbs in DVCs have zero morphology or are bare stems, because the analysis of the inflectional restriction to be presented below will remain unchanged under either of the two options.
Based on their historical development, section 4 attempts to account for the three unique properties of DVCs, i.e. the inflectional restriction, the selectional restriction on their subjects, and the single event interpretation. Section 5 is the conclusion of this paper.

2. Diachronic Aspects of DVCs

2.1. COME/GO + Infinitive in Old English

Visser (1969) observes that in Old English, both types of infinitives with and without *to* were used to express the purpose or intention of the motion denoted by COME/GO verbs, as illustrated in (5).

(5) a. nelle ge wenen þæt ic come towerpan þa læge
not think that I come_1sg.Past destroy−Inf the law
‘do not think that I came to destroy the law’

(O.E.Gosp., Mt. 5, 17)

b. ne com ic righteous to gecigeanne
not come_1sg.Past I righteous to call−Inf
‘I didn’t come to call righteous people’

(O.E.Gosp., Mt.9, 13)

c. Nu ge moton gangan… Hroðgar geseon
Now ye may go−Inf… Hrothgar greet−Inf
‘Now you may go to greet Hrothgar’ (Beowulf 395)

d. ic and þæt cild gaþ us to gebiddenne
I and that child go−3pl.Pres us to stay−Inf
‘I and that child go to stay for us two’ (Ælfric, Gen, 22, 4)

(Visser (1969: 1391–1399))

In view of the similarity in form and meaning, it might be assumed that DVCs were historically derived from the configuration of COME/GO verbs followed by a plain infinitive in Old English. However, this assumption seems to be problematic because both a COME/GO verb and the following plain infinitive appeared with inflectional affixes in Old English, in violation of the inflectional restriction. Furthermore, as Los (2005) argues, plain infinitives with the meaning of purpose or intention went out of use after motion verbs by late Old English, which caused the development of *to*-infinitives with this function. Instead, plain infinitives acquired an imperfect or progressive meaning, and they were later replaced by present participles, as observed by Visser (1969).

(6) a. Mi leof kumeð… leapinde oðe hulles
My dear comes… leaping over hills
‘My dear comes leaping over hills’

\[(c1225 \text{ Ancr. R. (EETS 1952) 173,3})\]

b. huy him eoden alle þretning.
they him go−3pl.Past all threaten−PresPart
‘they all went threatening him’

\[(c1300 \text{ Childhood Christ (Alteng. Legenden) 408})\]

\[(ibid.: 1392–1396)\]

2.2. \textit{V and V} Constructions in Early English

Another candidate for the historical source of DVCs is \textit{V and V} constructions where the verb following \textit{and} expresses the purpose or intention of the motion denoted by the COME/GO verb. Visser (1969) observes that \textit{V and V} constructions began to be attested in late Old English, as shown in (7) with both verbs inflected.\(^2\)

(7) a. he ærest mid his geferum to ðære seonoðstowe
he first with his comrade to that meeting place
cume & gesitte
\[\text{come−3sg.Pres} \text{ and sit−3sg.Pres}\]
‘he first comes and sits with his comrade to that meeting place’

\[(cobede,Bede_2:2.100.31.951)\]

b. ac he swiðe goað & geomrað hine
also he soon go−3sg.Pres and mourn−3sg.Pres him
‘also he soon goes and mourns him’

\[(cobede,Bede_1:16.88.14.806)\]

It might be suggested that the historical source of DVCs is not \textit{V and V} constructions, because both verbs could involve inflectional markings in the latter. In order to check the validity of this suggestion, I have examined instances of \textit{V and V} constructions in early English from historical corpora, Visser (1969), and OED.

Table 1 shows the numbers of tokens and forms of \textit{V and V} constructions in YCOE.

\(^2\) The examples in (7) are cited from \textit{The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose} (henceforth, YCOE).
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COME and V</th>
<th>GO and V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambiguous, imperative/subjunctive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present tense, unambiguously indicative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present tense, unambiguously subjunctive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present tense, ambiguous form</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past tense, unambiguously indicative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past tense, unambiguously subjunctive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past tense, ambiguous form</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present participle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past participle (verbal or adjectival)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that in Old English, there are very few tokens of V and V constructions; moreover, no instances are found of V and V constructions in infinitive forms.

In Middle English, as the inflectional system of verbs became weaker, V and V constructions came to be more frequently used in less marked forms, such as infinitive and imperative forms. The relevant examples are given in (8), and the results of the survey based on *The Second Edition of the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English* (henceforth, PPCME2) are shown in Table 2 below.

(8) a. Gaes and fottes me in hij Mine aun armur
    Go\_{\text{Imp}} and fetch\_{\text{Imp}} me in haste my own weapon
    ‘Go and fetch me in haste my own weapon’
    (c1300 Cur. M. 7519)

b. He schal come, and lese these tilieres
    He shall come\_{\text{Inf}} and lose\_{\text{Inf}} these tillers
    ‘He shall come and destroy these tillers’
    (c1380 Wyclif, Luke 20, 16)

c. Every manne was suffred to come and speke
    Every man was suffered to come\_{\text{Inf}} and speak\_{\text{Inf}}
    with hym
    ‘Every man was suffered to come and speak with him’
As shown in Table 2, more tokens of V and V constructions are attested in Middle English than in Old English, mainly because of their appearance in the infinitive form. According to Visser (1969) and OED, it is also in Middle English that DVCs began to appear. What is important here is that the appearance of DVCs roughly coincides with that of the use of V and V constructions in less marked forms, and all the instances of DVCs in Middle English from PPCME2, OED, and Visser (1969) are used in imperative sentences, after modal auxiliaries, or after the infinitival marker to, as shown in (9) from OED. Therefore, these facts point to the close connection between the two constructions, suggesting that DVCs were historically derived from V and V constructions in less marked forms.

(9) a. Ga purches land quhar euir he may
    Go−Imp purchase−Imp land where ever he may
    ‘Go purchase land where ever he may’
    (1375 Barbour Bruce 1, 433)

b. He must come flatter.
   He must come−Inf flatter−Inf
   ‘He must come flatter’
   (c1430 Lydg. Bochas IV. ix. (1554) 107b)

c. I be-seche yow… thys daye to com dyne
   I beseech you… this day to come−Inf dine−Inf
   at my hows
   at my house
   ‘I beseech you… this day to come dine at my house’
   (c1485 Digby Myst. (1882) III. 618)

In Modern English, when the inflectional system of verbs became further
weakened, present tense verbs, except those with third person singular subjects, came to have no overt inflectional markings and became phonologically identical with their infinitive and imperative forms. This would have made it possible for DVCs to appear not only in infinitive and imperative forms but also in finite clauses, in accordance with the inflectional restriction, as illustrated in (10) from *The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts*.

b. “Massa Tommy, you come help me to milk the goats,” said Juno. (1841 Captain Marryat, Masterman Ready)

On the basis of the diachronic consideration of DVCs and *V and V* constructions so far, it seems plausible to assume that DVCs were derived from *V and V* constructions by the deletion of *and* in Middle English: *V and V* constructions, which first appeared in late Old English, came to be frequently used in imperatives, after modal auxiliaries, and after the infinitival marker *to*, undergoing the phonological attrition of *and* in Middle English. Furthermore, with the further weakening of the inflectional system of verbs in Modern English, the use of DVCs in their finite forms became possible when both verbs are not overtly inflected, namely when they are in the same form as imperative and infinitive ones. Therefore, it follows that the inflectional restriction on DVCs is traced back to the fact that *V and V* constructions, the historical source of DVCs, were frequently attested in less marked forms in Middle English.

However, it might be objected that this scenario is problematic because there are examples of *V and V* constructions in Present-Day English where both verbs are inflected, as shown in (11).

(11) She comes and sees him every day. (Jaeggli and Hyams (1993: 321))

Given that like DVCs, *V and V* constructions in less marked forms spread to finite clauses, the inflectional restriction should be imposed on the latter constructions as well. In order to solve this problem, I follow Carden and Pesetsky (1977) in assuming that *V and V* constructions are divided into two subcategories. One is the real- *and* construction, in which *and* is a coordinate conjunction and similarly inflected verbs are coordinated. The other is the fake- *and* construction, in which *and* is a subordinate conjunction and both verbs must be in their bare forms in accord with the inflectional restriction.

Fake- *and* constructions are different from real- *and* constructions in semantic, phonological and syntactic properties. Semantically, as Quirk et al. (1985) and Suzuki (1987) observe, the COME/GO verb in real- *and* construc-
tions bears more lexical properties, and the following verb does not necessarily mean the purpose or intention of the motion denoted by the COME/GO verb. Phonologically, the fake-and is pronounced as [n], while a pause is normally put before the real-and, which has the full pronunciation. This phonological difference serves to distinguish the two kinds of and in speech:

(12) a. John will try [n] catch Harry. (fake-and)  
b. John will try, and catch Harry. (real-and)  
(Carden and Pesetsky (1977: 85))

Syntactically, the fake-and construction is not subject to the Coordinate Structure Constraint (CSC) in (13) proposed by Ross (1967). Consider the examples in (14).

(13) The Coordinate Structure Constraint
In a coordinate structure, no conjunct may be moved, nor may any element contained in a conjunct be moved out of that conjunct. (Ross (1967: 161))

(14) a. *Bill is the man that John tried, and caught in the last 200m.  
b. Bill is the man that John will try and catch. (fake-and)  
(Carden and Pesetsky (1977: 86))

In the real-and structure (14a), the extraction of the object of the second conjunct is not allowed, while it does not lead to a violation of the CSC in the fake-and structure (14b). Moreover, parentheticals may appear in the middle of the real-and structure, while it is impossible in the fake-and structure, as illustrated in (15).

(15) a. John will, unfortunately, try and catch me.  
b. John will try, unfortunately, and catch me.  
c. John will try and, unfortunately, catch me. (ibid.)

Thus, there is good reason to distinguish two types of V and V constructions, namely real-and and fake-and structures, only the latter of which obeys the inflectional restriction and hence is regarded as the historical source of DVCs.

3. The Grammaticalization of the COME/GO Verb in DVCs

In the previous section, I argued that DVCs were historically derived from V and V constructions via the deletion of the fake-and. In this section, I discuss what motivated this change and what effects it had on the status of the COME/GO verb in DVCs, building the discussion on the notion of grammaticalization in the sense of Hopper and Traugott (2003). Grammati-
calization generally refers to a process of change from open lexical categories to closed functional categories. If the COME/GO verb in DVCs has undergone grammaticalization in the history of English, it should have more functional properties than that in two related constructions, namely V to V and V and V constructions, in Present-day English.

3.1. Functional Properties

3.1.1. Closed Classes

Belonging to closed classes like determiners, complementizers, and auxiliaries is one of the most typical properties of functional categories. As shown in (16), only three verbs can appear in DVCs, and the number is the least of the three constructions under consideration. This implies that the COME/GO verb in DVCs belongs to the most closed class, so that it is the most functional.

(16) a. DVCs: come, go, run
   b. V and V: come, go, run, try, be sure, hurry up
   c. V to V: come, go, run, try, be sure, hurry up, walk, fly, rush, etc. (Carden and Pesetsky (1977: 82))

3.1.2. Impossibility of Argument Insertion and Modification

DVCs are also different from V to V and V and V constructions with respect to the possibility of argument insertion and modification. As shown in (17) and (18), only the COME/GO verb in DVCs lacks both lexical properties of taking an argument and being modified by an adjunct. On the other hand, the COME/GO verb in V to V constructions can take an argument as well as an adjunct, while that in V and V constructions can take an adjunct, but not an argument.

(17) a. I go all the way there to eat.
   b. #I go all the way there and eat.³
   c. *I go and eat all the way there.
   d. *I go all the way there eat.
   e. *I go eat all the way there.

   (Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001: 378–379))

(18) a. They go to eat by car.
   b. They go and eat by car.

³ The # diacritic is used here to show that the sentence is grammatical under the irrelevant interpretation as a coordination.
3.2. Lexical Properties

3.2.1. Semantic Content

The COME/GO verb in the three constructions under consideration behaves like a lexical verb in that it preserves its semantic content of deictic motion.\(^4\) The completely functional use of _go_ in (19), which constitutes a future auxiliary, lacks its semantic content of motion to a goal.

(19) He is going to leave.

According to Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001), in order to express a designated aspect, _going_ in examples like (19) lacks all the semantic content of deixis, while the COME/GO verb in the three constructions does not display this property. It retains its motion meaning and does not necessarily contribute aspectual information to the sentence.

3.2.2. Availability of _Do_-support

As pointed out by many linguists, the COME/GO verb in DVCs cannot undergo Subject-Verb Inversion unlike auxiliaries. Instead, like ordinary lexical verbs, _do_-support applies to DVCs in questions and negative sentences, as shown in (20).

(20) a. He does not go swim every Sunday.
    b. Does he go swim every Sunday?

(Ishihara and Noguchi (2000: 133))

Needless to say, the same is true of _V to V_ and _V and V_ constructions.

3.2.3. A Secondary Theta-role

As discussed in section 1, the COME/GO verb in DVCs requires an agentive subject, which leads Jaeggli and Hyams (1993) to assume that it assigns a secondary (agentive) theta-role to its subject.

(21) a. Big boulders (*come) roll down this hill every time there is an earthquake.
    b. Big boulders come down this hill every time there is an earthquake.  

(Jaeggli and Hyams (1993: 321))

(22) a. The smoke fumes (*go) inebriate the people upstairs.

\(^4\) The COME/GO verb in the three constructions does not necessarily retain the same full semantics as its lexical counterpart, because it lacks the ability to appear with a goal argument. For more details, see Suzuki (1987).
b. The smoke fumes go upstairs and disturb the neighbors.

(Shopen (1971: 259))

(21a) and (22a) are ungrammatical, because the agentive theta-role assigned by the COME/GO verb is incompatible with the non-agentive subject. In (21b) and (22b), on the other hand, since come/go is used as a lexical verb, the non-agentive subject is allowed. Assuming that the possibility of assigning a theta-role is a prerogative of lexical verbs, the fact that the COME/GO verb in DVCs assigns a different theta-role from its lexical counterpart shows that it has not lost all the lexical properties.

3.3. The Status of the COME/GO Verb in DVCs

From the observations above, it can be concluded that the COME/GO verb in DVCs has acquired functional properties by Present-day English, while it still retains some lexical properties. Then, what status do such elements have that have both functional and lexical properties? Although the verbal cline proposed by Hopper and Traugott (2003) as a path of grammaticalization shows the change from a full verb to an auxiliary, it does not postulate an intermediate category which behaves neither as a full verb nor as an auxiliary:

\[(23) \text{full verb} \rightarrow \text{auxiliary} \rightarrow \text{verbal clitic} \rightarrow \text{verbal affix} \]

(Hopper and Traugott (2003: 111))

However, Hook (1991) suggests that there is an additional position intermediate between a full verb and an auxiliary. Compound verbs in Hindi and other Indo-Aryan languages consist of a main or primary verb with the main verbal meaning and a vector or light verb with the makers of tense, aspect, and mood, which is homophonous with basic lexical verbs, such as GO, GIVE, TAKE, THROW, LET GO, GET UP, COME, STRIKE, SIT, FALL, and so on. In such compound verbs, the main verb is non-finite, while the vector is finite. The order of the two verbs is main-vector because Indo-Aryan languages are head-final. The examples of compound verbs in Hindi-Urdu are given in (24), where ERG and CTF stand for ergative case and counterfactual mood, respectively.

\[(24) \begin{align*}
\text{a. agar mAI ne darvazaa band kar diyaa ho-taa...} \\
& \text{if I ERG door shut make GAVE be-CTF} \\
& \text{‘if I had closed the door...’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[(24) \begin{align*}
\text{b. baat vahII xatam ho jaa-tii} \\
& \text{thing there over become GO-CTF} \\
& \text{‘the matter would have ended right there’} \quad (\text{Hook (1991: 60)})
\end{align*}
\]

In (24), diyaa hotaa and jaatii are the finite forms of the vectors de ‘give’
and *jaa* ‘go,’ respectively, whereas *kar* and *ho* are the non-finite forms of main verbs. Note also that *ne darvazaa* and *vahII xatam* are an argument and adjunct associated with the main verb, not the vector, respectively.

As we saw in section 3.1, the COME/GO verb in DVCs has functional properties in that it belongs to a closed class and does not allow argument insertion and modification. These properties are shared with the vector or light verb in Hindi-Urdu compound verbs, since it also consists of a small number of basic lexical verbs and cannot take an argument or adjunct independently of the main verb. Therefore, I assume that the COME/GO verb in DVCs is equivalent to the vector or light verb in Hindi-Urdu compound verbs, and that it is located in a position intermediate between a full verb and an auxiliary, which is schematically shown on the verbal cline as revised in (25).

(25) full verb > light verb > auxiliary > verbal clitic > verbal affix

3.4. The Development of DVCs

Based on the discussion so far in section 3, together with the conclusion in section 2 that the historical source of DVCs is *V and V* constructions, I argue that *V and V* constructions have changed into DVCs through the deletion of the fake-*and* under promoting factors of grammaticalization like pragmatic inference, reanalysis, and analogy (or rule generalization).

First, let us assume that the pragmatic inference of motion to achieve a purpose or intention was promoted, when *V and V* constructions, which appeared in late Old English, came to be frequently used in less marked forms, such as infinitive and imperative forms in Middle English. In this stage, the real-*and* coordinating two verbs changed into the fake-*and*, which serves as a subordinate conjunction with the meaning of purpose or intention. This change of the real-*and* into the fake-*and* involved the reanalysis in (26), where Co and Sub stand for the categories of coordinate and subordinate conjunctions, respectively.

---

5 Hopper and Traugott (2003) argue that one of the most important factors for grammaticalization is pragmatic inference. In order for inference to play a significant role in grammaticalization, it must frequently occur. If inference frequently occurs in a context, it comes to be conventionalized or semanticized.
Second, the fake-and pronounced as [n] was phonologically attrited altogether, giving rise to DVCs in Middle English:

\[ \text{(27) Stage II VP } \rightarrow \text{ Stage III VP} \]

\[ \text{V SubP V SubP} \]

\[ \text{COME/GO Sub VP COME/GO Sub VP} \]

\[ \text{fake-and } \quad \emptyset \]

When the fake-and was phonologically deleted, the COME/GO verb became contiguous with V, which in turn made it possible for the former to take an infinitival VP complement, as shown in (28).

\[ \text{(28) Stage III VP } \rightarrow \text{ Stage IV VP} \]

\[ \text{V VP V VP} \]

\[ \text{COME/GO Sub VP COME/GO Sub} \]

\[ \emptyset \]

Moreover, the above discussion of the COME/GO verb as a light verb with functional properties in Present-day English would lead us to assume that it was further grammaticalized into a light verb merged in v, as illustrated in (29).

\[ \text{(29) Stage IV VP } \rightarrow \text{ Stage V vP} \]

\[ \text{V VP v VP} \]

\[ \text{COME/GO COME/GO} \]

The contiguity of the two verbs seems to have played a significant role in
the grammaticalization of COME/GO verbs from Stage III to Stage V (see Hopper and Traugott (2003: 87) for the role of contiguity in grammaticalization).

It should also be noted that analogy, which is another factor for grammaticalization, would be related to the spread of DVCs to finite clauses. Namely, with the reduction of verbal morphology in Modern English, the condition on the form of DVCs was revised from (30) to (31) via analogy, so that DVCs came to appear in finite clauses.\(^6\)

\[(30) \text{ DVCs are allowed if they appear in an imperative or infinitive form.} \]

\[(31) \text{ DVCs are allowed if they appear in an imperative, infinitive, or non-third person singular present tense form.} \]

4. Consequences

This section shows that the unique properties of DVCs in Present-day English observed in section 1, i.e. the inflectional restriction, the selectional restriction on their subjects, and the single event interpretation, can be accounted for as consequences of the grammaticalization of DVCs proposed in the previous section.

4.1. The Inflectional Restriction on DVCs

As we saw above, DVCs obey the inflectional restriction in that both the COME/GO verb and the following verb cannot appear in inflected forms. First, let us consider why the COME/GO verb cannot be inflected. Recall that DVCs were historically derived from the imperative and infinitive uses of V and V constructions, in which the fake-and deletion made the COME/GO verb contiguous with the following verb, thereby leading to its grammaticalization into a light verb. Even after DVCs came to be used in finite clauses by analogy, the COME/GO verb cannot be inflected due to the influence of their source constructions in uninflected forms. Therefore, it seems plausible to assume that the COME/GO verb in DVCs does not have a slot for inflectional features such as number, gender, person, and tense, since it still retains as a grammaticalized light verb the property of

\^{6} Pullum (1990) and Ishihara and Noguchi (2000) observe that in Present-day English some speakers obey the revised condition, while others do not. It would be the case that the former are liberal speakers, whereas the latter are conservative speakers.
its ancestor without inflections. Namely, this is taken to be a case of retention in the sense of Brinton and Stein (1995), where grammaticalized items retain properties of their ancestors after grammaticalization.

Next, the fact that the verb following the COME/GO verb cannot be inflected in DVCs follows immediately from their proposed structure, namely Stage V in (29), where the COME/GO verb takes an infinitival VP complement.7

4.2. The Selectional Restriction on the Subject of DVCs

Recall that the subject of DVCs must be agentive, as shown in (3), which are repeated here as (32).

(32) a. *Pieces of driftwood come wash up on the shore.
   b. *Our sewage might go pollute the town water supply.

The data from PPCME2 show that among 38 examples of V and V constructions (see Table 2), 33 examples occur in contexts in which an agentive subject is required, e.g. in imperatives and after modal auxiliaries such as shulen and willen. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that the selectional restriction on the subject of DVCs is attributed to their source constructions, namely V and V constructions.

This is also closely related to the status of the COME/GO verb in DVCs as a light verb merged in v. Given that v participates in the determination of the external theta-role of subjects in the v-VP configuration (Chomsky (1995)), it would be possible to assume that the COME/GO verb in DVCs assigns a secondary agentive theta-role to its subject in Spec vP, along the lines of Jaeggli and Hyams (1993). Given this assumption, the ungrammaticality of (32) follows immediately because inanimate subjects are incompatible with the secondary agentive theta-role assigned by the COME/GO verb.

4.3. The Single Event Interpretation in DVCs

As discussed in section 1, DVCs have the single event interpretation, in

7 Ishihara and Noguchi (2000) argue that the COME/GO verb in DVCs, which is a prefix as well as a light verb, attracts the following verb to form a complex verb. However, as discussed in section 3.4, the COME/GO verb in DVCs has not yet been grammaticalized into a prefix that is part of a complex verb. This is supported by the following examples from The Collins Wordbanks Online, where the adverb appears between the COME/GO verb and the following verb, contrary to the prediction of Ishihara and Noguchi.

(i) a. … they go actually get sent to district manager …
   b. … you come just throw a blanket over it …
that the events denoted by the COME/GO verb and the following verb are interpreted as being simultaneous with each other, as shown in (4), which is repeated here as (33) for the sake of convenience.

(33) *They go buy vegetables every day, but there never are any vegetables.

Assuming with Higginbotham (1985) that verbs bear an event argument that has to be bound by T, this fact is accounted for in the following way. In (33), the two event arguments of the COME/GO verb and the following verb are both bound by the matrix T, yielding the single event, simultaneous interpretation. This is attributed to the structure of DVCs in Present-day English, namely Stage V in (29), where both verbs share the same T for their event interpretations.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I have discussed the three unique properties of DVCs in Present-day English, i.e. the inflectional restriction, the selectional restriction on their subjects, and the single event interpretation, as well as the development of DVCs in the history of English. It was argued that the historical source of DVCs is the infinitive and imperative uses of V and V constructions in Middle English. The proposed path of grammaticalization of DVCs is that the structure of the COME/GO verb coordinated with another verb was reanalyzed into the structure involving a subordinate clause with the fake-and, and the subsequent deletion of the fake-and eventually resulted in the grammaticalization of the COME/GO verb into a light verb. As a result, the COME/GO verb in DVCs is located in v and takes an infinitival VP complement in Present-day English. Finally, it was claimed that the three unique properties of DVCs mentioned above are explained in such a way as to relate them to the historical development of DVCs.
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