

Clitic climbing in Spanish imperatives

Marcel den Dikken (Graduate Center) & Mariví Blasco (Baruch College)
The City University of New York

Abstract

In Spanish, the aspectual verbs ‘come’ and ‘go’ allow an object clitic to climb out of their infinitival complement in finite and infinitival contexts but not in simple imperatives. This paper argues that the ban on clitic climbing in simple imperatives with aspectual ‘come’ and ‘go’ (not noted in the literature before) can be related to the (likewise novel) observation that in Hungarian these aspectual verbs show a similar restriction, which (following Den Dikken 1999) can also be analysed as involving clitic climbing. The Hungarian facts crucially implicate Tense: there is a ban on clitic climbing from the complement of aspectual ‘come’ and ‘go’ in the simple present, not elsewhere. The empirical generalisation covering the data is that in aspectual ‘come/go’ constructions clitic climbing onto ‘come/go’ is possible only if the aspectual verb is marked for Tense. This generalisation directly captures the Hungarian facts, and extends to the Spanish cases on the independently supported hypothesis that Spanish simple imperatives are not marked for Tense (while subjunctives are, which takes care of the fact that these do allow clitic climbing).

Keywords: clitic climbing, tense, aspectual verbs, Hungarian agreement, simple imperatives, infinitival imperatives, subjunctives, restructuring, incorporation vs VP-raising to SpecTP

1 Introduction — The Spanish facts*

In Spanish, the aspectual verbs ‘come’ and ‘go’, when they take an infinitival complement with a clitic, take part in two surface patterns, in finite indicative clauses: the clitic may either encliticise onto the infinitive (as in (1/2a)), or climb up into the matrix clause and procliticise to the finite verb (as in (1/2b)):

- | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|
| (1) | a. | <i>Voy</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>verlo.</i> | |
| | | go-1SG | to | see-CL | |
| | b. | <i>Lo</i> | <i>voy</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>ver.</i> |
| | | CL | go-1SG | to | see |
| | | both: ‘I go to see him/it.’ | | | |
| (2) | a. | <i>Vengo</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>verlo.</i> | |
| | | come-1SG | to | see-CL | |
| | b. | <i>Lo</i> | <i>vengo</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>ver.</i> |
| | | CL | come-1SG | to | see |
| | | both: ‘I come to see him/it.’ | | | |

When the ‘come/go’-construction is embedded under a verb that itself takes an infinitival complement, the same two options present themselves (plus a third one, if the highest verb is itself a clitic climbing verb;¹ we will ignore this third case, since it is of no consequence to our concerns); the only difference between (1)/(2) and (3)/(4) is that, since clitics always encliticise onto infinitives, even the clitic climbing variants in (3/4b) now exhibit encliticisation.

- (3) a. *Puedo ir a verlo.*
 I-can go to see-CL
 b. *Puedo irlo a ver.*
 I-can go-CL to see
 both: ‘I can go to see him/it.’
- (4) a. *Puedo venir a verlo.*
 I-can come to see-CL
 b. *Puedo venirlo a ver.*
 I-can come-CL to see
 both: ‘I can come to see him/it.’

Infinitival constructions are not the only context in Romance in which we find enclisis: positive imperatives also exhibit this. On the basis of the patterns established in (1)–(4), we are now led to expect that in positive imperatives with the aspectual verbs ‘come/go’, two surface word-order patterns should manifest themselves, basically parallel to the ones seen in (3)/(4): the clitic should be able to encliticise either onto the infinitive embedded under ‘come/go’, or onto the imperative verb ‘come/go’ itself. Interestingly, however, this expectation is not borne out:

- (5) a. *Ve a verlo!*
 go to see-CL
 ‘Go to see him/it!’
 b. **Velo a ver!*
 go-CL to see
- (6) a. *Ven a verlo!*
 come to see-CL
 ‘Come to see him/it!’
 b. ^(?)*Venlo a ver!*
 come-CL to see

Of the examples in (5), (5b) is flatly ungrammatical; and in the pair in (6), there likewise is a notable contrast between the example with clitic climbing and the one without, the former being substantially degraded.²

The deviance of (5b) and (6b) — not noted in the literature before, to our knowledge — presents us with an interesting puzzle. The descriptive generalisation is not that clitic climbing is incompatible with enclisis onto the higher verb — after all, (3/4b) are grammatical. Nor can we say that it is a property of imperatives that they block cliticisation — after all, simple imperatives with enclisis are perfectly well-formed. Instead, it seems to be a property specific to *simple imperatives* which makes clitic climbing impossible from the complement of the *aspectual* verbs ‘come’ and ‘go’.

That we really have to make this statement as specific as this (making reference to (i) simple imperatives, (ii) clitic climbing, and (iii) aspectual ‘come/go’) is evident from the fact that with verbs like ‘try’, and even with other aspectualisers such as ‘begin’ and ‘finish’, clitic climbing is not impossible in Spanish imperatives — though (7b) and (8b) are generally deemed somewhat worse than the corresponding non-climbing cases in (7a) and (8a), they are not nearly as bad as the clitic climbing cases in (5/6b).³

- (7) a. {*Intenta/ Aprende a*} *hacerlo!*
 try learn to do-CL
 ‘Try/Learn to do it!’

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| | b. | ^(?) { <i>Inténtalo/</i> | <i>Apréndelo</i> | <i>a</i> } | <i>hacer!</i> | |
| | | try-CL | learn-CL | to | do | |
| (8) | a. | { <i>Empieza</i> | <i>a/</i> | <i>Termina</i> | <i>de</i> } | <i>hacerlo!</i> |
| | | begin | to | finish | of | do-CL |
| | | ‘Start/Finish doing it!’ | | | | |
| | b. | ^(?) { <i>Empiézaló</i> | <i>a/</i> | <i>Terminálo</i> | <i>de</i> } | <i>hacer!</i> |
| | | begin-CL | to | finish-CL | of | do |

So the puzzle is how to account for the specific cocktail of properties that manifests itself in (5) and (6): the fact that clitic *climbing* fails when the matrix verb is an *imperative* form of *aspectual* ‘come/go’.

In this paper we set out to find a solution to this puzzle. We go about this job as follows. After rejecting (on the basis of English) a possible approach that would base itself on the premise that — for some reason — restructuring is blocked categorically in imperatives with aspectual ‘come/go’ (section 2), we will present facts from Hungarian clitic climbing with aspectual ‘come/go’ to make the case that clitic climbing with these verbs is dependent on a specification for *Tense* in the matrix clause (section 3). This generalisation will be seen (in section 4) to naturally carry over to the Spanish facts in (5/6b) on the assumption, independently defended for English imperatives in Beukema and Coopmans (1989), that simple imperatives in Spanish lack a specification for Tense — a hypothesis for which independent support will be provided in the text. It also makes sense of the difference between imperatives and subjunctives (polite imperatives) in Spanish, when it comes to clitic climbing. In section 5, we finally proceed to an analysis of the Tense effect, couched in a structural analysis of restructuring in aspectual ‘come/go’ verbs in Spanish (and Hungarian) in terms of VP-movement to SpecTP.

2 No general ban on restructuring — The case of English ‘come/go’

Clitic climbing is often taken to be a hallmark of so-called ‘restructuring’ (or ‘clause union’) effects (cf. Rizzi 1982 and much subsequent work). And since clitic climbing is possible in aspectual ‘come/go’ constructions in Spanish, we can conclude that restructuring is possible in them. This said, one may be tempted to blame the failure of clitic climbing in the examples in (5/6b) on the failure of restructuring.

Notice, however, that clitic climbing *is* possible in the imperatives in (7/8b). So there cannot be a general ban on restructuring in imperatives — it apparently works successfully in imperatives with verbs like ‘try’ and ‘begin/finish’. Perhaps, then, restructuring fails only in imperatives with aspectual ‘come/go’ type verbs? But that cannot be true as a general statement about the UG properties of aspectual verbs either, in the light of the following facts from English, discussed in detail by Jaeggli and Hyams (1993).

In English, the aspectual verbs *come* and *go* are peculiar in that they can ‘shed’ the infinitival marker *to* that occurs in their complement, under certain circumstances. In particular, *come* and *go* can take a *to*-less ‘bare’ infinitival complement if they are themselves uninflected (i.e., show up as the bare stem), and not otherwise. The facts in (9) illustrate this for *go*; parallel facts obtain for *come*.

- | | | |
|-----|----|---|
| (9) | a. | <i>I/you/we/they go (to) fetch a newspaper every morning.</i> |
| | b. | <i>(S)he goes *(to) fetch a newspaper.</i> |
| | c. | <i>I/you/(s)he/we/they went *(to) fetch a newspaper.</i> |
| | d. | <i>I/you/(s)he/we/they have/has gone *(to) fetch a newspaper.</i> |
| | e. | <i>I/you/(s)he/we/they am/are/is going *(to) fetch a newspaper.</i> |
| | f. | <i>I/you/(s)he/we/they want(s) to go (to) fetch a newspaper.</i> |
| | g. | <i>go (to) fetch a newspaper!</i> |

Whenever the form of the aspectual verb is identical with the verb stem (i.e., in the simple present tense except for the third person singular, in infinitives and in imperatives), *to* can remain absent; otherwise it must show up.⁴ One may relate the absence of *to* to the absence of overt inflectional morphology by saying that, when *to* is absent, the lower ‘bare’ infinitive and the aspectual verb undergo restructuring — when *to* is absent, the only way to license the lower infinitive is by incorporating it into the aspectual verb; the link between *to*-drop and lack of inflectional morphology will then follow on the assumption that inflected verbs (in English at least) are not suitable incorporators/restructuring predicates (possibly as a consequence of general restrictions on complex X^0 elements, perhaps of the type laid out in Kayne 1994).

We will not dwell on the details of the restriction on restructuring exhibited by the English *come/go* facts in (9). Instead, we will simply take them to be explained by some morphophonological constraint whose nature need not concern us here. What matters for our purposes is that restructuring apparently succeeds in the imperative in (9g): *Go fetch a newspaper!* is grammatical. What this shows is that even a relativisation of a putative ban on restructuring in imperatives such that it would refer only to aspectual ‘come/go’ verbs would not be accurate cross-linguistically: English would refute it. To make such a claim with specific reference to Spanish would hardly gain us insight into what is really going on in (5)–(6), of course. At minimum, we should try to relate the account of the Spanish facts to peculiarities of ‘come/go’ verbs elsewhere, and we should manage to prevent the analysis of the Spanish facts from inadvertently carrying over to English. In the next section, we will address the former task, turning to the latter towards the end of the paper.

3 A Tense effect — The case of Hungarian clitic climbing with ‘come/go’

The Spanish facts which are at the heart of this paper (cf. (5)–(6)) present us with a *prima facie* surprising ban on clitic climbing out of the complement of a class of verbs which is otherwise very flexible when it comes to clitic climbing: the aspectual verbs ‘come’ and ‘go’. Interestingly, in Hungarian these verbs also treat us to a tricky analytical problem, once again in the domain of clitic climbing. In this section we will lay out the relevant facts (first noted in Den Dikken 1999) and pinpoint the generalisation that covers them, subsequently taking this generalisation as the stepping-stone towards the analysis of the Spanish facts.

Hungarian has two types of agreement: subject agreement (for the person and number of the subject) and object agreement (typically only for the definiteness of the object). Subject and object agreement cannot be segmented; they surface as a portmanteau morpheme. This is illustrated in (10) (for indefinite objects) and (11) (for definite objects).

- (10) a. *János olvasott-∅* {*∅/valamit/egy könyvet/néhány könyvet/minden könyvet*}.
 János read-PAST-3SG.INDEF *∅/something/a book/some book/every book*
 b. **János olvast-a* {*∅/valamit/egy könyvet/néhány könyvet/minden könyvet*}.
 János read-PAST-3SG.DEF *∅/something/a book/some book/every book*
- (11) a. **János olvasott-∅* {*azt/a könyvet/azt a könyvet/Mari könyvét/Marinak a könyvét*}.
 János read-PAST-3SG.INDEF *that/the book/that the book/Mari book/Mari-DAT the book*
 b. *János olvast-a* {*azt/a könyvet/azt a könyvet/Mari könyvét/Marinak a könyvét*}.
 János read-PAST-3SG.DEF *that/the book/that the book/Mari book/Mari-DAT the book*

Every Hungarian object triggers either definite or indefinite agreement on the finite verb. But there is one special deviation from the pattern. When the direct object is second person (singular or plural) *and* the subject is first person singular, a special agreement form shows up on the verb: the *-lak/lek* suffix, illustrated in (12):

- | | | | | |
|------|----|-------------|-------------------|--|
| (12) | a. | <i>Én</i> | <i>szeret-lek</i> | <i>téged/titekét/benneteket.</i> |
| | | I | love-LAK/LEK | you _{sg} /you _{pl} -ACC/you _{pl} -ACC |
| | b. | * <i>Én</i> | <i>szeret-ek</i> | <i>téged/titekét/benneteket.</i> |
| | | I | love-INDEF | you _{sg} /you _{pl} -ACC/you _{pl} -ACC |
| | c. | * <i>En</i> | <i>szeret-em</i> | <i>téged/titekét/benneteket.</i> |
| | | I | love-DEF | you _{sg} /you _{pl} -ACC/you _{pl} -ACC |

This *-lak/lek* form is arguably a complex entity (cf. also Simonyi 1907:352, Bartos 1997:364, fn. 2) — it consists of the *-k* of first person singular indefinite agreement, a morphosyntactically uninteresting epenthetic vowel, and the *-l* of second person. In effect, then, *-lak/lek* is the only Hungarian inflectional form in which subject and object agreement appear to show up sequentially. Den Dikken (1999) makes a detailed case, however, for the claim that the *-l* of *-lak/lek* is not object agreement inflection but an *object clitic*. He shows that the clitic approach allows us to understand the otherwise elusive fact that there is indefinite agreement (the *-k* of *-lak/lek*) in (12a), and provides independent support for the analysis from the realm of permissive causative constructions.⁵ We will not go over the evidence here but simply adopt the analysis of *-lak/lek* in terms of cliticisation, treating *-l* as an object clitic in examples like (12a).

Interestingly, now, in Hungarian indicative aspectual ‘come/go’ constructions with a first person singular subject and a second person object, the aspectual verb cannot show up with the complex marker *-lak/lek* (the combination of an object clitic and subject inflection) in simple present-tense contexts:⁶

- | | | | | |
|------|----|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| (13) | a. | <i>Mentelek</i> | <i>meglátogatni</i> | <i>(téged).</i> |
| | | go-PAST-LAK/LEK | PV-visit | you |
| | | ‘I went to visit you.’ | | |
| | b. | * <i>Megylek</i> | <i>meglátogatni</i> | <i>(téged).</i> |
| | | go(PRES)-LAK/LEK | PV-visit | you |
| (14) | a. | <i>Jöttelek</i> | <i>meglátogatni</i> | <i>(téged).</i> |
| | | come-PAST-LAK/LEK | PV-visit | you |
| | | ‘I came to visit you.’ | | |
| | b. | * <i>Jölek</i> | <i>meglátogatni</i> | <i>(téged).</i> |
| | | come(PRES)-LAK/LEK | PV-visit | you |

The contrast is robust: while past-tense (13a) and (14a) are perfect, present-tense (13b) and (14b) are completely impossible. In the context of Hungarian *-lak/lek* agreement, this Tense effect manifests itself *only* with the aspectual ‘come/go’ type verbs (cf. note 6). With the *-lak/lek* form analysed in terms of object cliticisation (as in Den Dikken 1999), this suggests that there is something peculiar to these verbs when it comes to clitic climbing.

In particular, the generalisation that suggests itself for the Hungarian facts is the following:

- (15) Clitic climbing onto aspectual ‘come/go’ is possible in Hungarian indicatives only if the aspectual verb is marked for Tense.

The Hungarian present tense is morphologically unmarked, while the past tense forms all feature a *-t* (doubled in certain contexts; cf. *jött* ‘(s)he/it came’, *jöttelek meglátogatni* ‘I came to visit you’). Apparently, the presence of explicit marking for Tense is a precondition on successful clitic climbing onto aspectual ‘come/go’ in indicative clauses (on subjunctives and conditionals, see note 11, below). With this generalisation in hand, let us return to the Spanish facts to see what sense we can make of those now.

4 Back to Spanish — True imperatives vs fake imperatives and the role of Tense

Let us first refresh our memories. In Spanish simple imperatives with ‘come/go’ verbs featuring an embedded infinitive construed with an object clitic, the clitic can occur encliticised onto the infinitive but it cannot encliticise onto the imperative ‘come/go’ verb:

- (5) a. *Ve a verlo!*
 go to see-CL
 ‘Go to see him/it!’
 b. **Velo a ver!*
 go-CL to see
- (6) a. *Ven a verlo!*
 come to see-CL
 ‘Come to see him/it!’
 b. ^(?)*Venlo a ver!*
 come-CL to see

This turns out to be a restriction peculiar to simple imperatives, not to the entire illocutionary class of commands — thus, polite commands and negative imperatives do not exhibit it, as shown in (16)–(17):⁷

- (16) a. *Vaya a verlo!*
 go-SUBJUNC to see-CL
 b. [?]*Váyalo a ver!*
 go-SUBJUNC-CL to see
- (17) a. *No vaya(s) a verlo!*
 not go-SUBJUNC to see-CL
 b. *No lo vaya(s) a ver!*
 not CL go-SUBJUNC to see

Likewise, infinitival imperatives are immune to the ban on clitic climbing (cf. (18)), and so are what Bosque (1980) calls ‘retrospective imperatives’ of the type in (19), featuring the auxiliary *haber* with a past participial complement headed by *ido* ‘gone’.⁸

- (18) a. *Ir a verlo!*
 go-INF to see-CL
 b. *Irlo a ver!*
 go-INF-CL to see
- (19) a. *Haber ido a verlo!*
 have-INF gone to see-CL
 b. *Haberlo ido a ver!*
 have-INF-CL gone to see
 ‘You should have gone to see him/it!’.

Morphologically speaking, the contrast between (5/6b) and (16/17b) involves a difference between imperatives and subjunctives — Spanish uses the subjunctive to make polite and negative commands. This is interesting in the light of the generalisation that came out of the discussion of the Hungarian facts in section 3. So we pick it up from there and build up an analysis of the Spanish facts from that point of view.

In section 3 we noted that Hungarian indicative ‘come/go’ verbs allow clitic climbing onto them only if they are marked for Tense. The distinction between imperatives and subjunctives in Spanish can be looked upon in the same light, on the assumptions in (20) (on (20a) see Beukema and Coopmans 1989).⁹

- (20) a. Spanish simple imperatives are not marked for Tense.
 b. Spanish subjunctives are marked for Tense.

The accuracy of the claims laid down in (20) for Spanish is shown by the impossibility of (21b), and by the grammaticality of the past-tense subjunctive in (22b) alongside the present-tense example in (22a).

- | | | | | | | |
|------|----|------------------|------------|---------------------|----------|---------------|
| (21) | a. | <i>Ve</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>verlo!</i> | | |
| | | go-IMP | to | see-CL | | |
| | b. | * <i>Ve+PAST</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>verlo!</i> | | |
| | | go-IMP-PAST | to | see-CL | | |
| (22) | a. | <i>Quiero</i> | <i>que</i> | <i>vayas</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>verlo.</i> |
| | | I-want | that | go-PRES.SUBJUNC.2SG | to | see-CL |
| | b. | <i>Quise</i> | <i>que</i> | <i>fueras</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>verlo.</i> |
| | | I-wanted | that | go-PAST.SUBJUNC.2SG | to | see-CL |

And we can support the absence of Tense from Spanish simple imperatives further on the basis of the ban on sentential negation in these constructions, illustrated in (23).¹⁰

- | | | | | |
|------|-------------|-----------|----------|---------------|
| (23) | * <i>No</i> | <i>ve</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>verlo!</i> |
| | not | go | to | see-CL |

Given Zanuttini’s (1997) arguments for an inextricable link between negation and Tense, the fact that Spanish simple imperatives cannot be negated is incontrovertible evidence that they lack a projection of Tense.

With the statements in (20) in hand, we may now return to the contrast between (5b) on the one hand, and (16b) and (17b) on the other, and relate it directly to the generalisation in (15) which emerged from our discussion of Hungarian.¹¹

- (24) Clitic climbing onto aspectual ‘come/go’ is possible in Spanish commands only if the aspectual verb is marked for Tense.

And with Tense taking centre-stage in the account of the restrictions on clitic climbing in Spanish as well, we can readily understand why clitic climbing is also successful in the ‘retrospective imperative’ in (19b): with Aspect (‘secondary Tense’) being dependent on a higher Tense, the perfect signals the presence of Tense in the matrix clause, and as a result clitic climbing is unproblematic.¹²

So we may conclude this section on the positive note that, with (24) in place alongside (15), all the clitic climbing restrictions discussed so far (from both Spanish and Hungarian) fall out from a simple statement about the role of Tense-marking.

5 An analysis of the Tense effect — VP-movement to SpecTP

The question still remains, though, why it is that clitic climbing in aspectual ‘come/go’ constructions should be sensitive to the Tense-marking of the aspectual verb. This question is all the more poignant in the light of the fact that no such sensitivity manifests itself with other types of verbs — Spanish (7b) and (8b) are grammatical; similarly, Hungarian auxiliaries like *akar* ‘want’, control verbs like *igyekez* ‘strive’ and the permissive causative verbs *hagy* and *enged* ‘let’ allow clitic climbing regardless of the Tense of the sentence:¹³

- | | | |
|------|----|---|
| (25) | a. | <i>Meg akarlak látogatni (téged).</i> |
| | | PV want-LAK/LEK visit you |
| | b. | <i>Meg akartalak látogatni (téged).</i> |
| | | PV want-PAST-LAK/LEK visit you |
| | | ‘I want(ed) to visit you.’ |
| (26) | a. | <i>Igyekezlek időben felhívni (téged).</i> |
| | | strive-LAK/LEK time-in PV-call you |
| | b. | <i>Igyekeztelek időben felhívni (téged).</i> |
| | | strive-PAST-LAK/LEK time-in PV-call you |
| | | ‘I will try/tried hard to call you on time.’ |
| (27) | a. | <i>Hagylak/engedlek meglátogatni (téged).</i> |
| | | let-LAK/LEK PV-visit you |
| | b. | <i>Hagytalak/engedtelek meglátogatni (téged).</i> |
| | | let-PAST-LAK/LEK PV-visit you |
| | | ‘I let people visit you.’ |

In this section we will address the question of why clitic climbing onto aspectual ‘come/go’ shows a sensitivity to Tense.¹⁴

We will embed our answer to that question in an approach to the syntax of restructuring in aspectual ‘come/go’ constructions in Spanish and Hungarian which makes the following central assumption:

- (28) Restructuring in Spanish/Hungarian aspectual ‘come/go’ constructions involves raising of the infinitival VP into the matrix SpecTP position.

A partial derivation of a Spanish/Hungarian aspectual ‘come/go’ construction with restructuring (or ‘clause union’) will hence read roughly as in (29).¹⁵

- (29) $[_{AgrSP} SU [_{AgrS} [_{TP} [_{VP2} Vinf OB]_i [T [_{VP1} ‘come/go’ [_{CP/IP} (...) t_i]]]]]$

This structure will allow us to manoeuvre the object clitic included in the raised VP into a position in the matrix inflectional domain (thereby delivering the quintessential ‘clause union’ effect) without any particular difficulty, so long as there is no barrier to block movement from out of the VP in SpecTP. We assume that, when T is marked for Tense, TP as well as the VP in its specifier are transparent. When T is *not* marked for Tense, on the other hand, it could simply be absent altogether (as is likely in the case of atemporal simple imperatives; cf. (the text below) example (23), above), or, if it is present, it will fail to serve as an attractor, leaving the infinitival VP *in situ* and making it impossible for the object clitic to raise into the matrix inflectional domain (due to the intervention of at least one barrier: CP/IP).

We now have an account of the Tense effect. When T is marked for Tense, the infinitival VP in the complement of the aspectual ‘come/go’ verb can be attracted to SpecTP and is then transparent to movement of the object clitic into the matrix inflectional domain (AgrS, in particular). By tying ‘restructuring’ in aspectual ‘come/go’ constructions directly to the matrix T–node, we are awarded an immediate perspective on the sensitivity of object clitic climbing to the Tense properties of the matrix clause in these constructions.

That there should be a privileged link between the matrix T–node of an aspectual ‘come/go’ construction and the infinitival VP can be understood from the point of view of the aspectual contribution made precisely by ‘come/go’. With Tense and Aspect viewed as two sides of the same coin, we can easily envisage a close relationship between the infinitival VP and the matrix Tense, which we suggest embodies both the temporal properties of the matrix clause and the aspectual properties of the whole construction.

With verbs like ‘try’, there is no such privileged relation between the infinitival VP and the matrix Tense node. ‘Restructuring’ in constructions with verbs of this type will not involve VP–raising to SpecTP, therefore. Instead, a more traditional account in terms of ‘reanalysis’ of the matrix and embedded verbs (‘(abstract) incorporation’ *à la* Baker 1988, perhaps elaborated along the lines of Terzi 1996 in terms of T–raising; cf. note 14, above) is more likely to be on the right track for those kinds of ‘restructuring’ verbs. And since there is no VP–raising to SpecTP in such cases, we do not expect there to be any particular dependency of such restructuring on the temporal properties of the matrix verb. Indeed, this is precisely what we find: it does not matter whether the matrix clause is specified for Tense or not, clitic climbing will succeed regardless (cf. Spanish (7/8b) and Hungarian (25)–(27)).

One last note is now due with reference to the difference between Spanish/Hungarian ‘come/go’ verbs and their English counterparts.¹⁶ Recall that, following Jaeggli and Hyams (1993), we analysed the absence of the infinitival marker *to* in the complement of English *come* and *go* in examples such as (9) in terms of ‘restructuring’. But recall also that in English, this ‘restructuring’ effect with aspectual *come/go* is not sensitive to the difference between indicatives and imperatives — *I go fetch a newspaper* and *Go fetch a newspaper!* are both good. With English imperatives unmarked for Tense (cf. Beukema and Coopmans 1989), this leads us to the conclusion that ‘restructuring’ in English *come/go* constructions lacking *to* cannot involve VP–raising to SpecTP — otherwise we would expect it to be blocked in the absence of Tense marking. This is not an embarrassing result; on the contrary. After all, we observed before (following Jaeggli and Hyams) that there are peculiar morphological restrictions on the availability of *to*-drop (hence ‘restructuring’) in English *come/go* constructions — restrictions which are much easier to account for if one assumes that restructuring in these constructions involves incorporation of the infinitival verb into the matrix aspectual verb (so that the two verbs actually become a unit, something which is apparently blocked when the aspectual verb is morphologically complex), rather than raising of the VP to the matrix SpecTP.

6 Conclusion

We conclude, then, that ‘restructuring’ in Spanish and Hungarian aspectual ‘come/go’ constructions involves VP–raising into the matrix SpecTP, and that this is what ultimately explains the sensitivity of this phenomenon to the temporal specification of the matrix aspectual verb, and thereby the *prima facie* baffling restrictions on clitic climbing exhibited by ‘come/go’ constructions in Spanish imperatives and Hungarian simple present contexts. Other ‘restructuring’ constructions (including the English *come/go* construction, with its morphological restrictions peculiar to the matrix verb) do not involve VP–preposing to SpecTP but instead receive a more traditional account in terms of head-to-head movement. As a result, those constructions do not show any sensitivity to the matrix tense.

Thus, we have identified two different ways in which ‘restructuring’ can come about — head-to-head movement and VP-raising. Some of the ‘restructuring’ pie has been reanalysed in terms of XP-movement rather than head movement; but the head movement and XP-movement derivations *both* exist. They are not in free variation, the two being used in complementary contexts. Some constructions which have traditionally been thought to involve head movement turn out to involve XP-movement instead; but it seems that not all restructuring can be reanalysed in terms of XP-movement — at least, not of the type we have proposed here.

With specific reference to the analysis of imperatives, we have found that Beukema and Coopmans’ (1989) conclusion that simple imperatives are not marked for Tense is correct — at least for English and Spanish (though see note 9 for an indication that this is not a universal). We have shown that ‘being unmarked for Tense’ is tantamount, in the context of restructuring in ‘come/go’ constructions, to the absence of ‘clause union’ effects in the domain of clitic climbing — something which we have suggested may ultimately be blamed on the inability on the part of a T-node unmarked for Tense to attract the VP in the complement of aspectual ‘come/go’ up into its specifier position.

It goes without saying that this first stab at the analysis of the Spanish and Hungarian data laid out in this paper raises a host of questions. We express the hope that future research will be able to benefit from the discussion in these pages, and will find interesting answers to the questions raised.

Notes

* We would like to express our gratitude to the native speakers of Peninsular and South-American Spanish who we tested the Spanish examples presented in this paper out on. We also thank Ricardo Otheguy, the audiences at the CUNY Syntax Supper (New York, February 2001), WCCFL XX (University of Southern California, February 2001) and ‘Imperatives and functional projections: A workshop for Frits Beukema’ (Leiden, June 2001), and the editor of this volume for useful comments and discussion. We are immensely indebted to Anikó Lipták and Ildikó Tóth for initially pointing out the Hungarian facts, and for their help with these data. This paper is presented to Frits Beukema, the first author’s first syntax teacher, with many thanks for his teaching, guidance, advice, help, multiple co-authorship and friendship over the more than fifteen years that our paths have run along parallel lines.

1 For the sake of completeness, let us illustrate this in (i):

(i)	<i>Lo</i>	<i>puedo</i>	<i>ir/venir</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>ver.</i>
	CL	I-can	go/come	to	see

2 This is true both for speakers of Peninsular Spanish and for speakers of Latin-American Spanish, though the strength of the contrast in (6) varies somewhat from speaker to speaker (in ways that do not, in any obvious way, lend themselves to generalisations along geographical lines). A couple of hunches are worth discarding in this context. Johan Rooryck (p.c.) has suggested that (6b) does not meet with universal rejection because constructions with *venir* are ambiguous between a construal of *venir* as a real directional verb (literally ‘to come’) and one in which it is an aspectual auxiliary; however, we do not see how this would differentiate between (5b) and (6b). Also, one might suspect a link between the ban on clitic climbing and the fact that, while the Spanish singular imperative normally corresponds to the third singular present-tense indicative form, the forms of ‘come’ (*Viene* vs *Ven!*) and ‘go’ (*Va* vs *Ve!*) do not; this suspicion is discredited, however, by the fact that *haz* (the imperative of *hacer* ‘do, make’), which likewise is special in not corresponding to the third singular present-tense indicative (*hace*), does not bar cliticisation: alongside non-climbing cases like *Haz leerlo en público!* ‘make read-CL in public’, clitic-climbing examples like *Hazlo*

leer en público! are fine (thanks to Johan Rooryck for suggesting that we check this). Finally, one might think that the strong deviance of (5b) is a special quirk of the form *ve*, caused by its ‘unbearable lightness’ — and one might want to seek support for this in the fact that the homophonous singular imperative form of *ver* ‘see’ also bars cliticisation (cf. **Velo bailar!* ‘see-CL dance’); however, the deviance of this last example does not tell us anything about cliticisation restrictions since non-cliticised **Ve a Juan bailar!* ‘see (to) Juan dance’ is likewise unacceptable (though slightly less bad; curiously, both examples become acceptable in the plural imperative with *ved*), and moreover, the singular imperative form *da* of the verb *dar* ‘give’ is just as light as *ve* yet is perfectly happy to host clitics (cf. *Dale a entender que lo quieres!* ‘give-CL to understand that CL love-2SG’). The long and the short of it is that, although *ve* is even more restricted than *ven* (and this may ultimately have its roots in non-syntactic factors like lightness), the two imperatives both behave in a special way when it comes to clitic climbing — and it is this special behaviour that this paper will provide a syntactic account for, built on the role of Tense in clitic climbing.

3 Moreover, Kayne (1992) has argued with reference to Italian infinitival imperatives with procliticisation (cf. (ib), alternating with the uneventful encliticisation case in (ia)) that these involve a structure featuring a null modal matrix verb taking the projection of the infinitival verb as its complement, with climbing of the clitic onto the null modal (cf. (ib’)). If Kayne’s (1992) analysis of (ib) is on the right track, this is another case of perfectly unobstructed clitic climbing in a Romance imperative.

- (i) a. *Non farlo!*
not do-CL
‘Don’t do it!’
b. *Non lo fare!*
not CL do
b’. [MOD₀+CL₁ (...) [_{VP}fare ec_i]]

4 The fact that the generalisation in question must be stated in terms of *physical* inflectional morphology, rather than in terms of the possession of abstract morphosyntactic features, suggests that we are dealing with a PF-restriction here.

5 The key fact here is that the *-lak/lek* form is blocked in Hungarian permissive causative constructions with a dative-marked causee; cf. (i) (where ‘PV’ stands for ‘preverb’, aspectual particles like *meg*).

- (i) *Hagylak (*Jánosnak) meglátogatni (téged)*
let-LAK/LEK János-DAT PV-visit you
‘I let {*John/(unspecified)} visit you.’

The example in (i) is good when *Jánosnak* is left out (something which is hard to render directly in English, since English does not normally allow the causee of a *let*-causative to be dropped, an exception being *live and let live*), but it is ungrammatical with the dative-marked causee present. This will follow as a Relativised Minimality effect (Rizzi 1990, Chomsky 1993) if (i) the *-lak/lek* form involves overt-syntactic movement of the lower object into the matrix clause, à la clitic climbing, (ii) the clitic (*-l*; or its *pro* associate — Sportiche 1996) raises via a two-step movement process (A-movement followed by head-movement), and (iii) the dative-marked causee occupies an A-position c-commanding the extraction site of the object clitic, blocking the first step of the clitic climbing process (cf. (ii); for detailed discussion, see Den Dikken 1999).

- (ii) **[_{VP} embedded object_i ... [_{XP} Jánosnak ... [_{VP} V t_i]]]*
A-spec A-spec

6 We illustrate the pattern here with the aid of just *megy* ‘go’ and *jön* ‘come’; but *elmegy* ‘away-go’, *jár* ‘go’ and *van* ‘be’ behave essentially the same way (cf. e.g. *Voltalak meglátogatni (téged)* ‘be-PAST-LAK/LEK PV-visit (you)’, which once again has no present-tense counterpart; as É. Kiss 1987:227 points out, non-aspectual *kész van* ‘be ready’ blocks the *-lak/lek* form). These are further specimens of the class of aspectual verbs. Like in Hungarian, Dutch *zijn* ‘be’ belongs to the same class of aspectual verbs as *gaan* ‘go’ and *komen* ‘come’; all three take the same type of complement (a bare infinitive in both languages; cf. Dutch *Ik ga/kom/ben lunchen* ‘I go/come/am lunch-INF’). We will continue to refer to this class of aspectual verbs as ‘come/go’ verbs, where it should be understood that this class has ‘be’ as a member in Hungarian (and Dutch), though not in Spanish (and English).

We stress that aspectualisers like ‘begin’ and ‘finish’ do *not* belong to this class: in all four languages referred to in the preceding sentence, the pattern of complementation and syntactic behaviour is quite different for these verbs as compared to ‘come/go’. Recall the clear contrast in Spanish between (5/6b) and (8b); similarly, in English, ‘to-drop’ as in (9) is possible with *come* and *go* but not with *begin* or *start*; in Hungarian, ‘come/go’ but not ‘begin/finish’ (or other verbs) exhibit the sensitivity to Tense seen in (13/14).

7 Illustration, here and elsewhere in this section, will be confined to *ir* ‘go’, for reasons of space. It appears that the difference between simple imperatives and polite commands (i.e., subjunctives) does not assert itself very clearly (if at all) in the domain of *venir* ‘come’, which may be due to the surface similarity between the true imperative (*ven*) and the form used in polite commands (subjunctive *venga*). On the other hand, the difference between singular imperative *ven* and plural imperative *venid* is apparently robust enough to allow clitic climbing with the latter: *Venidlo a ver!* ‘come-2PL.IMP-CL to see’ is grammatical (and similarly, *Idlo a ver!* ‘go-2PL.IMP-CL to see’). What exactly is going on here is not very clear to us; since the distribution of the second person plural imperative in *-d* is restricted (it is found only in Peninsular Spanish, the Spanish Academy preferring it to the infinitival imperative; but even in Spain, while the two forms co-exist, the *-d* form is generally confined to more formal registers) we have chosen, in this paper, to confine the discussion of the simple imperative to the second person *singular* imperative.

8 We thank Wim van der Wurff for drawing our attention to Bosque’s (1980) squib (which does not, however, consider the clitic facts central to this paper). As Bosque notes, the auxiliary of the perfect in ‘retrospective imperatives’ cannot take the form of a simple, second person singular imperative (**Hate levantado antes!* ‘have-2SG.IMP-CL got up earlier’ contrasts sharply with *Haberte levantado antes!* ‘have-INF-CL got up earlier’). Bosque reports that the second person plural imperative (as in *Habed venido!*) is well-formed in this context; but most of the speakers (of Peninsular Spanish, the only variant of Spanish that has plural imperatives in *-d* at all) that we asked found constructions like these quite infelicitous — as a matter of fact, even those (few) speakers who would usually prefer the plural imperative in *-d* to the infinitival imperative (*Venid!* versus *Venir!*) tell us that *Habed venido!* is much less natural than *Haber venido!* We take it, then, that in ‘retrospective imperatives’ the auxiliary must show up in the infinitival form. We will return to this issue in note 12, below, where the ban on ‘retrospective simple imperatives’ is accounted for in the context of the generalisation in (20a) in the main text.

9 Beukema and Coopmans (1989:fn. 5) note that the absence of Tense from imperatives is not a pragmatic fact: languages differ on this point, Dutch having imperatives which feature morphologically past-tense verb forms, as in (i)–(ii) (see also Wolf 2001, and Barbiers, this vol.). For Spanish, however, (20a) holds — the examples in (19) (Bosque’s ‘retrospective imperatives’) do not contradict it since they do not involve simple imperatives; see note 8, above.

- (i) *Had het maar gezegd!*
had it but said
'If only you had said it!'
- (ii) *Soms was hij kwaad. Hield dan maar beter je mond!*
sometimes was he angry held then but better your mouth
'Sometimes he was angry. Then, it was best to keep your mouth shut.'

10 We thank Arhonto Terzi for pointing this out to us. We add that the ban on negation carries over to plural imperatives in *-d*. Negative commands are made with the aid of subjunctives in Spanish; cf. (17).

11 Hungarian makes no formal distinction between imperatives and subjunctives: the morphology for both is the same, and clitic climbing is possible in them (cf. *Ideje, hogy elmenjélek meglátogatni* 'it's time that I went to visit you'). Clitic climbing is also possible in conditionals (cf. *Szívesen elmennélek meglátogatni* 'I would gladly go visit you'). (Thanks to Anna Szabolcsi for pointing out these two examples to us.) This is why the scope of (15) was confined to indicatives. On the assumption that subjunctives and conditionals are always Tense-marked in Hungarian, these cases fit under the umbrella of the main-text discussion. Alternatively, the Mood/Modality head can attract VP to its specifier in Hungarian (though not in Spanish) in the same way that a Tense-marked T can — see section 5; the latter hypothesis seems more readily compatible with the fact that Hungarian subjunctives do not show morphological tense distinctions, but it raises the obvious question of why Hungarian and Spanish differ in the inventory of VP-attracting heads in restructuring constructions.

A separate but related question is why Spanish and Hungarian differ in the domain of clitic climbing in simple present-tense 'come/go' contexts: good in Spanish (cf. (1/2b)) but bad in Hungarian (cf. (13/14b)). We can make the desired distinction by assuming that in the Spanish simple present (unlike in its Hungarian counterpart), the verb is in fact marked for Tense. That the Hungarian simple present is totally unmarked for Tense makes sense in the light of the fact that simple present-tense forms involve the verb stem plus agreement morphology, if any; in the third person singular indefinite, there is no agreement inflection whatsoever, and the bare stem surfaces — it is this form which serves as the dictionary entry for the verb. (Zanutini's 1997 generalisation about the link between sentential negation and Tense then raises a problem for Hungarian, however: negation is grammatical in the simple present.) The morphology of the Spanish simple present, on the other hand, is more complex: the stem and the agreement marker are separated by a thematic vowel; this may give us the legitimation to take the Spanish simple present (and the infinitive as well; cf. (3/4b)) to be marked for Tense.

12 We can in fact go further than this: if indeed Aspect is dependent on Tense, and if simple imperatives in Spanish are Tense-less (20a), we predict that 'retrospective imperatives' are impossible as simple imperatives. As we already pointed out in note 8, this prediction is certainly correct for the *singular* simple imperative. For most speakers we consulted, it is basically accurate for the plural imperative in *-d* as well, but Bosque (1980) himself reports that *Habed venido!* is grammatical; at this time, we do not quite know what to make of the behaviour of the plural imperative in *-d* in Spanish. We leave this for further research.

13 Thanks to Anna Szabolcsi for pointing out (26a) to us.

14 Terzi (1996) argues on the basis of tense matching effects in examples of clitic climbing from finite complement clauses in Salentino and Serbo-Croatian for an analysis of clitic climbing involving T-raising as one of its crucial ingredients. Her proposal bears an overall resemblance to the account of clitic climbing in aspectual 'come/go' constructions outlined here in giving pride of place to Tense; since Terzi's article focuses on subject control complements (and their finite counterparts in Salentino and Serbo-Croatian),

however, her proposal addresses the complement set of the cases under investigation in this paper. We will briefly turn to clitic climbing out of control complements to ‘try’ type verbs later in this section. Terzi’s (1996) analysis may well be adopted as is for ‘try’ type constructions; the combination of her analysis of clitic climbing with ‘try’ and the present approach to clitic climbing in aspectual ‘come/go’ constructions then emphasises the key role played by Tense throughout the realm of clitic climbing.

15 In (29), we abstract away from the question — irrelevant for our concerns here — of what the categorial status of the complement of aspectual ‘come/go’ is: either CP or IP will do (but arguably not bare VP). We also abstract away from the question of what and where *a* (in the Spanish examples) is. Note that, with *a* located in the matrix T-head, the derivation in (29) comes to mimic Kayne’s (1999) analysis of constructions featuring infinitival complementisers: the infinitival marker of the complement clause is introduced outside the matrix VP and attracts the infinitival VP up to its specifier.

We assume that ‘come/go’ will raise, in the course of the overt-syntactic derivation, to the Agr position above the landing-site of the moved VP. This will ensure the desired surface word order. An alternative is conceivable which would not involve raising of the infinitival VP and ‘come/go’ to such high positions in the tree: VP could raise to the specifier position of an AspP lower in the structure, with Asp anaphorically linked to T. The Tense effect would still be guaranteed by this approach, thanks to the anaphoric link between Asp and T. A problem for this approach is the fact the Hungarian aspectual preverb *el* ‘off, away’ does not block the clause union effect (i.e., clitic climbing in *-lak/lek*) — (*El*)*mentelek meglátogatni* ‘I went (off) to visit you’ is grammatical regardless of the presence or absence of *el*; if *el* raises to SpecAspP in the course of the derivation (cf. Den Dikken 1999), the grammaticality of this example with *el* present is unexpected if SpecAspP is to be the landing-site of the VP-raising operation that procures the clause union effect. (In point of fact, the presence or absence of *el* is *entirely* immaterial: it does not obstruct clitic climbing (as just shown), and it does not enhance it either — that is, the mere addition of *el* does not eliminate the Tense effect; **Elmegylek meglátogatni* ‘I go off to visit you’ is just as bad as its counterpart without *el*, given in (13b).)

16 We still need to conduct a systematic comparative investigation into the restrictions on clitic climbing in ‘come/go’ imperatives in other Romance languages. Initial checks with a few Italian speakers suggest that clitic climbing (as in (ib)) is entirely natural to most speakers, though some find it awkward in (id); all speakers seem to agree, though, that clitic climbing is dispreferred in the context of ‘come/go’ imperatives. More careful checking of the Italian facts (and those of other Romance languages) is called for. But what we can say off the cuff is that if, in some Romance languages, clitic climbing in ‘come/go’ imperatives is perfectly grammatical, this presumably shows that ‘restructuring’ in aspectual ‘come/go’ constructions in the relevant languages proceeds via head-movement/incorporation rather than via VP-raising to SpecTP. Finding independent morphosyntactic support for head movement *vs* VP-raising (for instance, but not necessarily, of the type discussed for English *vs* Spanish in the main text) will then be the major challenge.

- | | | | | |
|------|----|----------------|----------|-----------------|
| (i) | a. | <i>Va</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>vederlo!</i> |
| | | go | to | see-CL |
| | b. | <i>Vallo</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>vedere!</i> |
| | | go-CL | to | see |
| (ii) | a. | <i>Vieni</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>vederlo!</i> |
| | | come | to | see-CL |
| | b. | <i>Vienilo</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>vedere!</i> |
| | | come-CL | to | see |

References

- Baker, M. 1988. *Incorporation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Barbiers, S. this vol. "Topicalization in imperative clauses".
- Bartos, H. 1997. "On 'subjective' and 'objective' agreement in Hungarian". *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 44: 363–384.
- Beukema, F. and P. Coopmans. 1989. "A Government–Binding perspective on the imperative in English". *Journal of Linguistics* 25: 417–436.
- Bosque, I. 1980. "Retrospective imperatives". *Linguistic Inquiry* 11: 415–419.
- Chomsky, N. 1993. "A minimalist program for linguistic theory". In *The View from Building 20*, S.J. Keyser and K. Hale (eds), 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Dikken, M. den. 1999. "Agreement and 'clause union'". Ms., CUNY Graduate Center.
- Jaeggli, O. and N. Hyams. 1993. "On the independence and interdependence of syntactic and morphological properties: English aspectual *come* and *go*". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11: 313–346.
- Kayne, R. 1992. "Italian negative infinitival imperatives and clitic climbing". In *Hommages à Nicolas Ruwet*, L. Tasmowsky and A. Zribi-Hertz (eds), 300–312. Ghent: Communication and Cognition.
- Kayne, R. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kayne, R. 1998. "Overt vs. covert movement". *Syntax* 1. 128–91.
- Kiss, K.É. 1987. *Configurationality in Hungarian*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Rizzi, L. 1982. *Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Rizzi, L. 1990. *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Simonyi, Zs. 1907. *Die ungarische Sprache: Geschichte und Charakteristik*. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.
- Sportiche, D. 1996. "Clitic constructions". In *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, J. Rooryck & L. Zaring (eds), 213–277. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Terzi, A. 1996. "Clitic climbing from finite clauses and tense raising". *Probus* 8: 273–295.
- Wolf, H. 2001. "Imperatieven in de verleden tijd". Ms., Fryske Akademy, Ljouwert.
- Zanuttini, R. 1997. *Negation and Clausal Structure: A Comparative Study of Romance Languages*. New York: Oxford University Press.