

### GO and COME revisited: What serves as a reference point?

This paper develops an analysis of GO/COME (English *go/come* and their counterparts in other languages), which improves on the widely accepted analyses by Fillmore and Talmy:

**Fillmore** (1975/1997): English *go* indicates motion toward a location distinct from the speaker's location at the utterance time; *come* describes motion towards {the location at the utterance time, the location at the event time, or the "home base"} of {the speaker or the addressee}.

**Talmy** (1975, 2000): GO describes motion *from* the speaker or his proxy (the individual to whom the "deictic center" is shifted); COME describes motion *to(ward)* the speaker or his proxy.

There are several kinds of data that these analyses cannot properly deal with: e.g. (i) **asymmetry between *go* and *come***: According to Fillmore's generalizations, (1a,b)/(2a,b) must be all equally acceptable; this prediction is not borne out. Also, if the "center" can be shifted to the addressee (in English), why is shifting preferred in (1), but prohibited in (2)?

(1) Can I {a. ??go/b. come} visit you? (2) Will you {a. \*go/b. come} visit me?

(ii) **a non-SAP reference point**: Fillmore remarks that *come* also indicates motion toward the location of the "central character" in discourse in which neither the speaker nor addressee figures as a character (e.g. *A cat came to Bill/\*I came to John*). Reference to a SAP (speech act participant), however, does not always block a non-SAP entity from serving as a reference point (e.g. *It seems that John came to my sister's place yesterday*). Also, it is not clear what should be considered the "central character" or "the speaker's proxy" in a sentence like (3):

(3) At least two students came to talk to three professors.

I propose that GO/COME refer to a contextually provided *set* of individuals, which I call *RP* (reference point(s)), rather than to a specific entity, and that GO requires that *no* member of RP be at the goal point while COME requires that *some* member thereof be at the goal point. The selection of members of RP is subject to person-based constraints; in English, roughly, (i) the speaker is always a member, (ii) it is preferred (and almost obligatory under certain conditions; Oe 1975) for the addressee to be a member as well, and (iii) a non-SAP entity can be additionally included only if the theme (moving entity) is not a SAP. In (1)/(2), it is preferred for RP to include the addressee (i.e. RP = {spk, addr}) and thus *come* is the preferred choice. In (3), RP includes (all) professors ({spk, addr, prof<sub>1</sub>, prof<sub>2</sub>, ...}) to the effect that *come* is licensed.

The proposed analysis allows us to explain the differences among deictic verbs in a wide variety of languages, including Japanese, Chinese, Sibe, and Palauan (Josephs 1975; Gathercole 1977; Nakazawa 1990, 2005; Kubo 1997), based on two implicational hierarchies. First, a given deictic verb refers to some lower portion of the following hierarchy: **an RP member's location at the utterance time < an RP member's location at the event time < an RP member's "home base"**. Second, languages differ with respect to what is required, preferred, or allowed to be included in RP. Generally, the inclusion of *X* (i) presupposes the inclusion of *Y*, and (ii) sometimes further requires that *Y* be not the theme (moving entity), where *X* outranks *Y* in the hierarchy of person: **1st < 2nd < non-SAP**.

Finally, I discuss the "deictic perspective shift" phenomenon in attitude reports, where the choice between GO/COME is made from the secondary agent's perspective, rather than the external speaker's (e.g., *John believes that I will come visit him*; Kuno 1988). I argue that deictic verbs are indexicals in the Kaplanian sense (e.g., *I, here*), which refer to (a component of) the context of utterance, and further that they can be interpreted either with respect to the external context of utterance or a secondary context associated with an attitude predicate (on a par with logophoric pronouns, etc.; Schlenker 2003).

## References

- Fillmore, Charles. 1975/1997. *Lectures on Deixis*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Gathercole, Ginny. 1977. A study of the comings and goings on the speakers of four languages: Spanish, Japanese, English, and Turkish. *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics* 2.
- Josephs, Lewis S. 1975. *Palauan Reference Grammar*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Kubo, Tomoyuki. 1997. 'Come' and 'Go' in Shive Manchu. *Saksaha: A Review of Manchu Studies* 2.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1988. Blended quasi-direct discourse in Japanese. In W. J. Poser (ed.), *Papers from the Second International Workshop on Japanese Syntax*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Nakazawa Tsuneko. 1990. Pragmatic account of the distribution of *come* and *go* in English, Japanese and Korean. In H. Hoji (ed.) *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* Vol. 1. CSLI: Stanford.
- Nakazawa Tsuneko. 2005. On *come* and *go* in English, Japanese, and Chinese: Why do they come while others go? *Language, Information, Text* Vol. 12. Tokyo: University of Tokyo.
- Oe, Saburo. 1975. *Nichieigo no hikakukenyuu: syukansei o megutte* [A comparative study of Japanese and English: On subjectivity]. Tokyo: Nanundo.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2003. A plea for monsters. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26.
- Talmy, Leonard. 1975. Semantics and syntax of motion. In A. M. Zwicky and J. Kimball (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics* Vol. 4. New York: Academic Press
- Talmy, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics* Vol. 2: *Typology and Process in Concept Structuring*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Kaplan, David. 1977/1989. Demonstratives. In J. Almog, J. Perry, and H. Wettstein (eds.) *Themes from Kaplan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.