

## A TYPOLOGY OF THE GROUND OF DEICTIC MOTION VERBS AS PATH-CONFLATING VERBS: THE SPEAKER, THE ADDRESSEE, AND BEYOND

TSUNEKO NAKAZAWA  
*University of Tokyo*  
tsuneko@boz.c.u-tokyo.ac.jp

### ABSTRACT

This paper examines typical deictic motion verbs *come* and *go* in different languages, Chinese, English, German, Japanese, Korean, and Shibe, as well as other languages in the literature, using Talmy's framework for analyzing motion verbs. While his framework makes it possible to analyze and compare the lexical semantics of deictic motion verbs viewed as Path-conflating verbs, the actual characterization of the Ground, i.e. the deictic center, is far more complicated than suggested by Talmy: "toward the location of the speaker". The analysis of deictic motion verbs in various languages reveals that there is a cross-classified hierarchy among the elements which constitute the Ground: all languages take the location of the speaker at the utterance time as the deictic center while, in addition, the location of the addressee and/or the reference time locations play the role of the deictic center in some languages. Furthermore, it is shown that the Ground of the deictic motion verbs is relativized in some languages to the referent of a particular sentence element such as the subject of the matrix subject, rather than being anchored to the participants of the speech act, which are usually considered to determine the deictic center.

KEYWORDS: Deictic motion verb; Path-conflating verbs; *come* and *go*; deictic center.

### 1. Introduction

Talmy (1975, 1985, 2000) formalizes a situation containing motion as a Motion event. The basic Motion event is analyzed to consist of an object (the Figure) and its movement through a path (the Path) with respect to another reference object (the Ground). These components can be identified in the following sentence:

- (1)   The bottle   moved   into   the cove.  
      [Figure]    [Motion] [Path]  [Ground]

Some motion verbs, e.g. *enter* and *exit*, express not only the fact of Motion as is the case of *moved* in (1), but also (part of) the Path information such as ‘into/out of an enclosure’. These motion verbs, which include the Path of motion in their lexical meaning, are called Path-conflating motion verbs. According to Talmy, deictic motion verbs are a kind of Path-conflating verbs with a special choice of the Path and the Ground, and “the Deictic component of Path typically has only the two member notions, ‘toward the speaker’ and ‘in a direction other than toward the speaker’” (Talmy 2000: 56). Thus, the lexical meaning of *come* is claimed to be ‘MOVE TOWARD a point which is the location of the speaker’, while the lexical meaning of *go* is ‘MOVE TOWARD a point which is not the location of the speaker’.

Talmy’s analytical framework (Talmy 1975, 1985, 2000) makes it possible to schematize the meanings of deictic motion verbs viewed as path-conflating verbs, and to compare the elements of their meanings across different languages. This paper examines typical deictic motion verbs *come* and *go* in English and their counterparts in Chinese, German, Japanese, Korean, and Shibe, an Altaic language, as well as other languages in the literature, using Talmy’s framework. It is an attempt to determine the cross-linguistic patterns of spatio-temporal semantic properties of those deictic motion verbs. More specifically, this paper takes Talmy’s claim about the Path and Ground in the lexical meanings of *come* as the starting point, and then it will show, beyond typical examples, that his characterization is too simplistic and the location of the speaker does not uniquely characterize the Ground of all *coming* verbs.

It is shown that not only the speaker but also the addressee play a systematic role in the determination of the Ground component of the Path in the semantics of deictic motion verbs in some, though not all, languages. In addition to their locations at the utterance time, their locations at the reference time also constitute the Ground in some languages. Furthermore, some languages allow the relativization of the Ground: i.e. the Ground is anchored to the referent of a particular sentence element, rather than to the participants of the speech act. It is hoped that identifying these possible patterns in the choices in the Ground across different languages will shed some new light toward the universal characterization of the deictic motion verbs.

In the following sections, data from Chinese, English, German, Japanese, Korean, and Shibe are collected and analyzed by the present author. Other examples and analyses borrowed from other sources are indicated by the accompanying references. The term “*coming* verbs” is used as a cover term to refer to the deictic motion verbs (or verb affixes) in various languages which require the Ground of the described motion to be the location of the speaker, as well as other locations that are analyzed to constitute the deictic center. The term does not presuppose the same denotational range as the English verb *come*, nor the uniqueness of such a verb within a language (cf. Wilkins and Hill (1994) and Lucy (1994) for a criticism of such assumptions).

## 2. The addressee as the Ground

The Ground is the reference object with respect to which the Figure moves, and according to Talmy, the Ground of the deictic motion verbs is typically the speaker. The notion of the Ground in the semantics of the *coming* verbs corresponds to the spatial “deictic center” (Fillmore 1975), and it is no doubt that the most basic center of the deixis is where the speaker is located at the time of the speech act. However, it has been long recognized (e.g. Fillmore 1966; Lyons 1977; Levinson 1983) that the location of the addressee can also play the role of the Ground and the motion toward the addressee can be described as *coming* in languages like English. The same phenomenon is reported in other languages such as the *coming* verbs *venir* in Catalan (Coseriu 1990 as cited in Taylor 1999), *icha* in Chagga (Emanatian 1992), *venir* in French (Chevalier 1976 as cited in Fleischman 1982 and in Fraser 1982), *kommen* in German (Gathercole 1978; Rauh 1981; Watanabe 1994), *venire* in Italian (Coseriu 1990 as cited in Taylor 1999), *aunu* in Nepali (Gathercole 1978), *vaa* in Tamil (Annamalai 1975; Gathercole 1978), *la* in Tangut (Kepping 1982), *-yeed-* and *-iid-* in Texmelucan Zapotec (Speck and Pickett 1976), and *gel-* in Turkish (Gathercole 1977, 1978).

In these languages, a child might respond to her calling mother as *Coming!* to describe her own motion toward the mother, i.e. the addressee.<sup>1, 2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In the following examples, the uppercase letters which precede sentences, C, E, G, J, K, and S indicate the examples are in Chinese, English, German, Japanese, Korean, and Shibe, respectively. In the gloss, abbreviations are used as:

1/2/3SG (1st/2nd/3rd person singular)	ERG(ative)	NONPST for non-past
ABS(olutive)	FEM(inine)	PART(icle)
ACC(usative)	FUT(ure)	PAST
ASP(ect)	GEN(itive)	PFT for perfective
CL(assifier)	IMPER(ative)	PROG(ressive)
CMPL for completive	IMPFT for imperfective	Q(uestion)
COMP(lementizer)	MAS(culine)	SFP for sentence final particle
DAT(ive)	NEG(ative)	TOP(ic)
DUR(ative)	NOM(inative)	
DYN(amic indicative)	NONHUM(an)	

<sup>2</sup> In Chinese, half of eight informants accepted *lai* ‘come’ in the following example equivalent to (1) while *qu* ‘go’ was accepted by all informants:

- (i) C: Ai, wo mashang jiu lai/qu.  
           yes I soon soon come/go  
           ‘Yes, I’m coming now.’

As discussed in Section 4, Chinese does not generally allow the use of the *coming* verb to describe the motion toward the addressee and in (i), it is the use of *qu* ‘go’, rather than *lai* ‘come’, that conforms to the pro-

(2a) E: Yes, I'm *coming*/\**going* right away.

(2b) German (Rauh 1981: 55):  
 Ja, ich *komme*/\**gehe* jetzt.  
 yes I come/go now  
 'Yes, I'm coming right away.'

The choice of *come* in English and *kommen* in German to describe the motion toward the addressee in (2) is not optional in the sense that *go* is unacceptable for the intended meaning. The use of *go* would result in a different meaning that the child intends to make a motion to some place other than where the calling mother is located. The obligatory choice of *come* in English and *kommen* in German is confirmed in a less idiomatic example in (3) which is assumed to be an utterance in a cafeteria.

(3) E: I'll *come*/\**go* to your office at three o'clock.

G: Ich *komme*/\**gehe* zu deinem Büro um drei Uhr.  
 I come/go to your office at three o'clock  
 'I'll come to your office at three o'clock.'

The motion described as *come* and *kommen* in (3) is not toward where the addressee is located when the speaker utters the sentence, i.e. the utterance time, since the addressee is assumed to be in a cafeteria talking with the speaker. Rather, the addressee is expected to be in her office, waiting for the speaker when the speaker arrives. In other words, the motion is directed toward where the addressee will be located when the motion takes place, i.e. the reference time. As Fillmore (1966, 1975) clearly demonstrates, the location of the addressee counts as the Ground of the motion described as *coming* in English whether it is where the addressee is located at the utterance time, or will be or was located at the reference time.<sup>3</sup> Thus, for *come* in English, as well as for the *coming* verbs in German and other languages, Talmy's specification needs be modified to en-

---

ductive pattern of the distribution of the motion verbs in Chinese. Thus, the choice of *lai* should be regarded as an isolated example though it remains unclear whether it is idiomatic or dialectal.

<sup>3</sup> Gathercole (1977, 1978) claims that in English, if a motion toward the location of the addressee at the reference time is described as *coming*, then the Figure of the described motion must be the speaker; the motion is described as *going* otherwise. She goes so far as to claim it is a pervasive phenomenon which is observable not only in English but also about the *coming* verbs in Croatian, German, Indonesian, and Tamil. While I do not have a means to confirm or disconfirm this with regard to the other languages, the claim about English is not borne out. All four informants I consulted accept the use of *come* in the following example, which describes the motion by a non-speaker toward the location of the addressee at the reference time (and half of them accept *go* as well).

(i) E: When the strange man *came*/*went* into the library, you were there waiting for Mr. Smith, weren't you? Also, Fillmore (1966: 220) gives an example which describes a non-speaker's motion and states that "*He will come to the shop tonight* is appropriate when either you or I will be at the shop tonight".

compass the location of the addressee as the Ground, without a further temporal restriction: 'MOVE TOWARD a point which is the location of the speaker or the addressee'.

Given that the notion of Ground is anchored by reference to the addressee as well as to the speaker in some languages like English, it is probably not surprising that in yet other languages, the distinction between the two possible Ground objects, i.e. the speaker and the addressee, is explicitly encoded by different deictic motion verbs. Josephs (1975) reports such a language and describes a three-way distinction of deictic motion verbs in Palauan, an Austronesian language: *me*, *eko*, and *mo*. Their lexical meaning may be schematized as: 'MOVE TOWARD a point which is the location of the speaker' for *me*, 'MOVE TOWARD a point which is the location of the addressee' for *eko*, and 'MOVE TOWARD a point which is not the location of the speaker or the addressee' for *mo*. The motion which would be described as *coming* in English is expressed either by *me* or *eko* in Palauan, depending upon whether it is the location of the speaker or the addressee that plays the role of the Ground, as shown in (4).

Palauan (Josephs 1975: 267; the gloss is provided by the present author, following Josephs (1975, 1977))

- (4a) Ng səbəc̣h-em əl *me* ər a bli-k ər a klukuk?  
it ability-your to come to house-my on tomorrow  
'Can you come to my house tomorrow?'
- (4b) Chochoi. Ng səbəc̣h-ek əl *eko* ər a bli-m ər a klukuk.  
yes it ability-my to come to house-your on tomorrow  
'Yes. I can come to your house tomorrow.'

The choice of *me* in (4a) reflects that the Ground of the motion is the location of the speaker while the Ground is the location of the addressee in (4b) as indicated by the choice of *eko*. Thus, in Palauan, not only can both the speaker and the addressee play the role of the deictic center, but they are also lexically encoded as the Ground of the distinct *coming* verbs.

### 3. The addressee as a conditional Ground

While English and German speakers unanimously describe the motion toward the location of the addressee by *come* and *kommen* 'come' in examples (2) and (3), Japanese and Korean speakers' unanimous choice of deictic motion verb is *iku* 'go' and *kata* 'go' respectively. The following examples give the Japanese and Korean equivalents of (3).

- (5a) J: Sanzi-ni anata-no kenkyusitu-ni \**ki*-/*iki*-masu.  
three o'clock-at you-GEN office-to come-/go-NONPST  
'I'll come to your office at three o'clock.'

- (5b) K: Na-nun seysi-ey tangsin samwusil-ey \*o-/ka-kessupnita.  
 I-TOP three o'clock-at your office-to come-/go-will  
 'I'll come to your office at three o'clock.'

The choice of *iku* 'go' and *kata* 'go' in (5) appears to indicate that the location of the addressee cannot play the role of the Ground of the *coming* verbs in Japanese and Korean. The cross-linguistic patterns of distribution of deictic motion verbs are, however, more complicated than is characterizable by a simple dichotomy between the languages which group the addressee together with the speaker as the Ground of the *coming* verbs, and which do not, as some of the authors seem to suggest (e.g. Fraser 1982 and Hockett 1990). This simplistic view triggered claims that Japanese belongs to the latter class of languages in which "*come* is used for motion towards the speaker (but not towards the addressee)" (Gathercole 1978: 75; also see Fillmore 1975: 68; Fleishman 1982: 329; and Kageyama 2002: 23 for a similar claim about Japanese). Such claims, however, cannot be maintained and the following example demonstrates that a motion toward the addressee is indeed described by the *coming* verb in Japanese, as well as in Korean, in some cases. Example (6) assumes an utterance directed to a friend who is leaving for the library, and each of Japanese and Korean examples contains two occurrences of the deictic motion verbs, which exhibit different acceptability.

- (6a) J: Watasi-wa kyou-wa \*ko-/ika-nai-to omoi-masu-ga,  
 I-TOP today-TOP come-/go-NEG-COMP think-NONPST-but

zyon-wa kuru-/iku-kamosiremasen-yo.  
 John-TOP come-/go-might-SFP

'I don't think I will come today, but John might come.'

- (6b) K: Na-nun onul mos \*ol- kal-keskatciman,  
 I-top today cannot come-/go-looks like

con-un ol-/kal-citomorunta.  
 John-TOP come-/go-might

'I don't think I will come today, but John might come.'

In English, as the translation in (6) indicates, the presence of the addressee at the destination triggers the use of *come* in both occurrences (three out of four English informants accept *go* as well). On the other hand, Japanese and Korean speakers unanimously reject *kuru* 'come' and *ota* 'come' respectively for the first occurrence of the motion verbs, indicating that the location of the addressee as the Ground of the motion does not satisfy the condition for the use of the *coming* verbs. For the second occur-

rence of the motion verbs, however, *kuru* ‘come’ and *ota* ‘come’ are acceptable as well as *iku* ‘go’ and *kata* ‘go’ to describe the motion toward the addressee. For some speakers, *kuru* ‘come’ and *ota* ‘come’ are the only choices. In order to account for the different acceptabilities of the *coming* verbs between the first and the second occurrences of the motion verbs in each language, a new factor must be taken into consideration since the discourse situation is identical for both occurrences. It is natural to assume that the difference lies in the subject of the motion verbs, or equivalently, the Figure of the motion event.

The shift of the Ground of the *coming* verbs from the location of the speaker to the addressee, or more generally, the shift of the deictic center, has been discussed in the literature under various terms: e.g. point of view (Fillmore 1975), view-of-extended-self (Morita 1977), deictic projection (Lyons 1977), empathy (Kuno and Kaburaki 1977; Kuno 1978; Kuno 1987), and pivot (Sells 1987). According to Kuno and Kaburaki (1977: 628), “empathy is the speaker’s identification, with varying degrees, with a person who participates in the event that he describes in a sentence”. When the speaker identifies herself to a certain degree with the addressee or participants of the described event, she may shift the deictic center from herself to that person, and describe the event from that person’s “camera angle” rather than her own, or by “standing in [the person’s] shoes” (Sells 1987). The shift of the deictic center, however, is not totally linguistically unconstrained, and it is not the case that the speaker is free to identify with anybody’s camera angle at will, as the constraint is captured in (7).

(7) Speech Act Empathy Hierarchy (Kuno 1987: 212)

The speaker cannot empathize with someone else more than with himself.  
empathy with the speaker > empathy with others

The Empathy Hierarchy (7) states that the degree of identification, or empathy, is inherently the highest with the speaker herself, and to a lesser degree with the addressee or other participants. Consequently, when the speaker is a participant of the described event, she is anchored to her own camera angle which commands the highest degree of empathy. Only when she is not involved in the event which she is describing does the speaker have the freedom to empathize with the addressee or other participants. Note that (7) is a linguistic constraint in that the deictic expressions are lexically specified to make reference to the speaker as the deictic center, regardless of the social situation behind the described event.

In describing a motion event, the Ground of the *coming* verbs is the focus of empathy: i.e. the speaker, or someone the speaker empathizes with most. If the speaker is the Figure of the motion directed toward the addressee, as is the case of the first motion in (6), Speech Act Empathy Hierarchy predicts that the motion may not be described as *coming* since it would require the addressee to be the empathy focus, rather than the speaker herself. On the other hand, if the speaker is not part of the described motion, as is the case of the second motion in (6), then the speaker may empathize with one of the

participants of the motion event, depending on extra-linguistic factors such as physical or psychological proximity: that is, the Speech Act Empathy Hierarchy, as a linguistic constraint, does not uniformly predetermine the relative degrees of empathy with people other than the speaker herself. If the speaker empathizes more with the addressee at the destination, it gives rise to the choice of *kuru* ‘come’ and *ota* ‘come’. If the speaker does not empathize with the addressee, e.g. if she empathizes more with the Figure, John, or does not emphasize with anybody but herself, then the addressee at the destination cannot play the role of the Ground of the *coming* verbs, and the motion is described as *iku* ‘go’ and *kata* ‘go’.

The relative nature of degree of empathy is demonstrated in examples such as (8), where the addressee is the only possible participant of the described event on whom the speaker can place the empathy. (8) assumes a telephone conversation with a distant friend.

(8a) J: Taihu-wa anata-no mati-ni *ki-/iki-masita-ka?*  
 typhoon-TOP your-GEN town-to come-/go-PAST-Q  
 ‘Has the typhoon come to your town?’

(8b) K: Tayphwung-i nenuy tongnay-ey *o-/ka-ass-e?*  
 typhoon-NOM your town-to come-/go-PAST-Q  
 ‘Has the typhoon come to your town?’

Since there is normally no reason to empathize with the typhoon rather than the addressee, the addressee is the natural focus of empathy. As a result, the motion directed toward the addressee is exclusively described by the *coming* verbs both by Japanese and Korean speakers.

Note that while the Ground of the *coming* verbs in (8) is the location of the addressee at the utterance time, the addressee is located at the destination only at the reference time in (6). As the acceptability of the *coming* verbs in describing the second motion in (6) indicates, Japanese and Korean allow the location of the addressee to play the role of the Ground of the *coming* verbs regardless of whether it is her location at the utterance time or the reference time. Unlike English and German, however, Japanese and Korean minimally require that the speaker is not the Figure of the described motion. The lexical meaning of *kuru* ‘come’ and *ota* ‘come’ is schematized as: ‘MOVE TOWARD a point which is the location of the speaker, or if the Figure is not the speaker, the location of the addressee’.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Lee (1977) claims that the location of the addressee can play the role of the Ground of the motion described by *ota* ‘come’ in Korean only in interrogative sentences. It is not surprising if the deictic center shifts to the addressee more readily in interrogative sentences than in declarative sentences since interrogative sentences by definition inquire about the addressee’s perspective. However, the acceptability of *ota* ‘come’ in the declarative sentence in (5), as well as of the Korean example in (i), converted from an example in Lee



Among various literature on deictic motion verbs, Allen (1956) reports that the deixis in Abaza, a Northwest Caucasian language, exhibits a similar condition for the location of the addressee to serve as the Ground of motion described as *coming* (see also Anderson and Keenan 1985: 277). Verbs in Abaza can productively take deictic prefixes, called Directives: *ʃa* ‘here’ indicates that the motion expressed by the verb is directed toward the deictic center in contrast to *na* ‘there’ or no prefix. Examples (9) illustrate the difference between these Directives prefixed to the motion verb *yra*.

Abaza (Allen 1956:165)

(9a) *ʃayra*  
‘come here’

(9b) *nayra*  
‘come there’

The Directive *ʃa* usually indicates the direction toward the speaker, but when the speaker is not involved in the described event, it marks the direction of the addressee as in (10a) and (10b) respectively.

Abaza (Allen 1956: 166–167; the gloss is provided by the present author, following O’Herin 2001)

(10a) *y-ʃa-sə-y-t-d.*  
3SG.NONHUM.ABS-here-1SG.DAT-3SG.MAS.ERG-give-DYN  
‘He gave it to me.’

(10b) *y-ʃa-wə-l-t-b.*  
3SG.NONHUM.ABS-here-2SG.MAS.DAT-3SG.FEM.ERG-give-FUT  
‘She will give it to you.’

It is not clear, however, whether the lack of the speaker’s involvement in the described event always shifts the deictic center to the addressee, or if the relative degree of psychological proximity toward the addressee and other participants plays a role in determining

---

(1977), demonstrates that the occurrence in an interrogative sentence is not a necessary condition for the addressee to play the role of Ground of the *coming* verb, as pointed out by Nakazawa (1990). Example (i) assumes a situation where the addressee plans to attend the meeting while speaker does not.

(i) K: Chelswu-to    neny    moim-ey    o-/ka-lkepnita.  
Chelswu-also    your    meeting-to    come/go-will  
‘Chelswu is also coming to your meeting.’

the deictic center, as is the case in Japanese and Korean. Also, O'Herin (2001: 481) characterizes *ʃa*, which he calls a directional prefix, in the following way: "The basic meaning of this highly productive prefix is direction towards the speaker. In some contexts, it may indicate the direction towards the subject", which would place these morphemes in the class of relativized motion deixis discussed in Section 5, rather than the same class as Japanese and Korean, where the relative degree of empathy placed on the participants is relevant to the determination of the Ground as discussed in this section. It is clear, however, that Abaza exhibits the directional prefixes whose meaning can be schematized as 'TOWARD a point which is the location of the speaker, or under certain conditions, the location of the addressee',<sup>5</sup> though the conditions are yet to be determined.

#### 4. No addressee as the Ground

In English and German, it is a productive pattern for the *coming* verbs to take the location of the addressee as the Ground of motion. The *coming* verbs in Japanese and Korean also allow the addressee to play the role of the Ground though it is limited to the cases where the speaker is not the Figure of the described motion and where the speaker's empathy lies with the addressee rather than the Figure of the motion. On the other hand, in Chinese and Shibe, the *coming* verbs do not allow the shift of the deictic center to the addressee under any conditions. The *coming* verbs in other languages for which the addressee cannot constitute the Ground include: *-s-* in Botin, a language in Papua New Guinea (Pryor and Farr 1989), *tita* in Jacalteco, a Mayan language (Craig 1979), *venir* in Spanish (Chevalier 1976 as cited in Fraser 1982; Coseriu 1990 as cited in Taylor 1999; Gathercole 1977), and *maa* in Thai (Bilmes 1955; Gandour 1978; cf. Gathercole 1978 for a different claim).

The examples in (11) show that the addressee does not play the role of the Ground of the *coming* verbs in Chinese and Shibe. The examples are assumed to be telephone

<sup>5</sup> In Abaza, the Ground of the directional prefix *ʃa* 'here' makes reference to the speaker's location, or the addressee's location, only at the utterance time. Allen (1956) gives a striking example to demonstrate that the location of the speaker at the utterance time, but not at the reference time, plays the role of the Ground of *ʃa*. The use of *ʃa* in (i) indicates that the speaker expects *wə* 'you', the recipient of the *giving* (*back*) motion, to be where the speaker is located at the utterance time.

(i) Abaza (Allen 1956: 167; the gloss is provided by the present author, following O'Herin 2001)

y-ʃa-wə-s-t-x-b.

3SG.NONHUM.ABS-here-2SG.MAS.DAT-1SG.ERG-give-ASP.again-DYN

'I will give it back to you.'

Thus, the lexical meaning of *ʃa* is more accurately schematized as: 'TOWARD a point which is the location of the speaker at the utterance time, or under certain conditions, the location of the addressee at the utterance time'. The lack of admissibility of the speaker's location at the reference time places Abaza in the same category as Shibe in Section 4, where only the utterance time locations are relevant to the determination of the Ground, though only the location of the speaker (at the utterance time) is relevant in Shibe.

conversations, and both occurrences of the motion verbs in each language describe motion toward the location of the addressee, but by different Figures.

- (11a) C: Ni nabianr re ma? Wo guo \*lai/qu shi liangkuai le jiu hao le.  
 your there hot Q I over come/go time cool PFT then good SFP

Dui le, Beihaidao de Tianzhong mingtian \*lai/qu ni nar ma?  
 by the way Hokkaido GEN Tanaka tomorrow come/go your there Q

‘Is it hot there? I hope it will be cooler by the time I come. By the way, will Mr. Tanaka from Hokkaido come tomorrow?’

- (11b) S: siN teba-de halhuN na?  
 your there-DAT hot Q

miN \*ji-/gene-me siteN sereheN o-ci ta siaN bi-hei.  
 my come-/go-IMPFT by the time cool be-if then good be-PFT

hokkaido-de bi-he tanaka cimare \*ji-/gene-me?  
 Hokkaido-DAT be-PART Tanaka tomorrow come-/go-IMPFT

‘Is it hot there? I hope it will be cooler by the time I come. By the way, will Mr. Tanaka from Hokkaido come tomorrow?’

In the first occurrence of the motion verbs, the motion toward the location of the addressee is described by the *going* verbs, *qu* in Chinese and *gene* in Shibe, as is the case in Japanese and Korean in (6). Unlike Japanese and Korean, however, the second motion toward the location of the addressee is also described as *going* in Chinese and Shibe. The difference in the Figure of the described motion does not alter the choice of the motion verbs, and the location of the addressee does not license the use of *lai* ‘come’ and *ji* ‘come’ regardless of the Figure.

In Chinese and Shibe, the use of the *coming* verbs is limited to describing the motion toward the location of the speaker. Furthermore, the use of the *coming* verb in Shibe is even more restricted than Chinese in that the speaker must be located there at the utterance time, as the unacceptability of the *coming* verb in Shibe in (12) shows. Example (12) describes motions toward where the speaker is located at the reference time, but not at the utterance time.

- (12a) C: Wo zai chezhan deng zhe, san dian ni lai/qu.  
 I at station wait DUR three o’clock you come/go

Tianzhong ye hui lai/qu de.  
 Tanaka also will come/go SFP

‘I’ll be waiting at the station. Please come at three o’clock. Mr. Tanaka will come, too.’

- (12b) S: aki-de        ali-me        ila-me        ilaN    eriN-de  
station-DAT   wait-IMPFT   be-IMPFT   three   o’clock-DAT

\*ju/gene.                      tanaka    gele    \*ji-/gene-me  
come.IMPER/go.IMPER   Tanaka    also    come/go-IMPFT

‘I’ll be waiting at the station. Please come at three o’clock. Mr. Tanaka will come, too.’

In (12), the speaker is at the Ground, i.e. the station, when the motions take place, but not when the sentences are uttered. The choice of *lai* ‘come,’ as well as *qu* ‘go,’ in Chinese shows that the presence of the speaker, even if it is limited to the time of reference, is sufficient to license the use of the *coming* verb in Chinese (see Nakazawa 2005 for more data). On the other hand, as pointed out by Kubo (1997) and Hayata (2002), it is not sufficient for the use of the *coming* verb in Shibe, as the unacceptability of *ji* ‘come’ in (12b) indicates: the use of *ji* in Shibe requires the speaker to be located at the Ground of the motion when the sentence is uttered. The following example (13), assumed to be uttered somewhere other than the speaker’s house, is even more striking. The choice of *gene* ‘go’ in Shibe shows that even places such as the speaker’s house, which are strongly associated with the speaker, do not play the role of the Ground of the *coming* verb unless the speaker is actually located there at the utterance time.

- (13a) C: Ni    mingtian    hui    lai/\*qu    wo    jia    ma?  
you tomorrow will come/go my house Q  
‘Will you come to my house tomorrow?’

- (13b) S: cimare    miN    bo-de        \*ju/gene                      na?  
tomorrow my house-DAT come.IMPER/ go.IMPER Q  
‘Will you come to my house tomorrow?’

In (13), while the speaker is likely to be waiting for the Figure at her house when the Figure’s motion takes place, i.e. tomorrow, the speaker is not at her house when uttering the sentence. As the acceptability of *lai* ‘come’ in Chinese in (13a) indicates, the speaker’s presence at the Ground at the utterance time is not strictly required for the use of the *coming* verb in Chinese due to the “home base” effect (Fillmore 1975: 60): the “home base” is the location that the participants of a described event are associated with, or their normative location, and the home base may play the same role as an actual location in the anchoring of deictic expressions. Thus, it is commonly observed in many languages that the motion toward the speaker’s home is described as *coming* regardless of whether or not the speaker is actually located there. Example (13b) is strik-

ing in that it shows that Shibe does not even show the “home base” effect and the motion toward the speaker’s house is described as *going*, reflecting the fact that the speaker is not there when uttering the sentence. Thus, the Ground of the *coming* verb in Shibe is the deictic center in the most restrictive sense, i.e. only the speaker’s location at the utterance time, and the Ground cannot be extended to the location of the addressee, the location of the speaker at the reference time, or the speaker’s “home base”.

The lexical meaning of *lai* ‘come’ in Chinese is schematized as: ‘MOVE TOWARD a point which is the location of the speaker’, which does not distinguish the location of the utterance time and the reference time. The lexical meaning of *ji* ‘come’ in Shibe is more restrictive: ‘MOVE TOWARD a point which is the location of the speaker at the utterance time’. Hayata (2002) demonstrates that in a seventeenth century literary text in Manchu, believed to be the direct predecessor of Shibe by many (e.g. Gorelova 2002), *ji-* ‘come’ had the same Ground specification as *ji* ‘come’ in modern Shibe, and allowed no shift of the deictic center from the speaker’s location at the utterance time to the reference time location.

## 5. The relativized Ground

The shared characteristic of the Ground of the deictic motion verbs discussed throughout the previous sections is that their semantic value makes reference to the elements of the speech act, i.e. the speaker and/or the addressee. In some languages, the Ground can also be “relativized” (Anderson and Keenan 1985) to the referents of particular sentence elements when the deictic motion verbs are embedded in more complex syntactic structures. In Japanese, as shown in Section 3, the Ground of the *coming* verb is the location of the speaker, or the addressee if the Figure is not the speaker, when it appears in a simple sentence. When embedded in the complement of another verb, however, the Ground is the location of the referent of the matrix subject as shown in (14). Example (14) is an utterance asking the addressee why the addressee had to call the speaker from the station late on the previous night. The deictic motion verb is embedded under the control predicate *hosii* ‘want,’ which takes *anata* ‘you’ as the matrix subject.

- (14) J: Yuube mayonaka-ni eki-kara uti-ni denwa-si-ta-toki  
last night midnight-at station-from house-to telephone-do-PAST-when

anata-wa watasi-ni eki-made kite-/itte-hosi-kattandesu-ka?  
you-TOP I-DAT station-to come/go-want-PAST-Q

‘When you called me from the station at midnight yesterday, did you want me to come to the station?’

The motion verb in (14) describes the motion of the speaker, directed toward the station where the addressee was located at the reference time, i.e. last night. In English, the Ground of *come* is the location of either the speaker or the addressee as shown in Section 2, and the translation in (14) shows that the motion toward the addressee is described as *coming* as predicted (three out of the four English informants accept *go* as well). In Japanese, however, the choice of *kuru* ‘come’ in (14) cannot be correctly predicted by the schematization of the lexical meaning of the *coming* verb discussed in Section 3. Since the schematized lexical meaning states that the *coming* verb in Japanese can describe the motion toward the addressee only if the speaker is not the Figure, it predicts that *kuru* would not be acceptable in (14), which describes the speaker’s motion toward the addressee. Note that the prediction is borne out if the embedded sentence in (14) is uttered in isolation as in (15), in which the motion cannot be described as *coming*. Example (15) assumes the situation where the addressee will be waiting at the station when the speaker performs the motion.

- (15) J: Watasi-ga eki-ni \*ki-/iki-masu.  
 I-NOM station-to come-/go-NONPST  
 ‘I will come to the station.’

The unanimous choice of *iku* ‘go’ in (15) indicates that a different factor is at work in (14) to reverse the choice of the motion verb from (15). In Japanese, the motion directed toward the referent of the matrix subject, as in (14), is described as *coming*. That is, in Japanese, the Ground of *kuru* ‘come,’ which is anchored to the speech act participants, i.e. the speaker and the addressee, in simple sentences, is relativized to the participant of the described event expressed by the matrix subject when embedded under the control predicates of various semantic types such as *morau* ‘(causative) have,’ *saseru* ‘(causative) make,’ *hosii* ‘want,’ *tanomu* ‘request,’ and *iu* ‘tell.’ Thus, in (14), English speakers use *come* because the described motion is directed toward the addressee, while Japanese speakers use *kuru* ‘come’ because the described motion is directed toward the referent of the matrix subject, which happens to be the addressee.

The choice of the deictic motion verbs in Japanese parts from that in English when the matrix subject refers neither to the speaker nor to the addressee, as in (16), where the motion verb is embedded under another control predicate *saseru* ‘(causative) make.’ The described motion is directed toward the referent of the matrix subject, i.e. the professor, and the unanimous choice of the motion verb is *kuru* ‘come’ in Japanese, but not *come* in English.

- (16) J: Konomae sensei-ga anata-wo jibun-no kenkyuusitu-ni  
 last time teacher-NOM you-ACC self-GEN office-to  
  
*kos-/ik-aseto-toki-wa nanika yoi sirase-ga at-tandesu-ka?*  
 come-/go-caused-when-TOP something good news-NOM exist-PAST-Q

‘When the professor made you go to his office last time, did he have good news?’

In English, the location of non-participants of the speech act, i.e. the professor in this case, cannot play the role of the Ground of the *coming* verbs, and hence the motion is described as *going* in the translation in (16). In Japanese, however, the motion toward the referent of the matrix subject is obligatorily described as *coming*: the choice of *iku* ‘go’ in (16) would imply that the speaker knows that the professor was not in her office when the addressee carried out the motion toward her office. Thus in Japanese, the lexical meaning of *kuru* ‘come’ is amended with an additional clause: ‘MOVE TOWARD a point which is the location of the referent of the matrix subject when embedded under control predicates.’

The extent to which the Ground of the deictic motion verbs is relativized to a participant of the described event in complex constructions varies according to particular predicates, individual speakers, and languages. English and Korean, but not Chinese and Shibe, allow limited degrees of relativization, though not as pervasively as Japanese, when embedded under predicates which induce a logophoric context: typically the verbs of communication and mental experiences (e.g. Sells 1987). For example, when the deictic motion verbs are embedded in the complement of *tell*, a typical verb of communication, the deictic center of the motion verbs tends to shift from the speaker of the entire utterance to the reporter of the motion, i.e. the referent of the subject of *tell* in English as well as in Japanese (but not in Chinese) as shown in (17).

- (17a) C: Zuotian Lingmu jiao wo \**lai/qu* ta de difang wo mei qu.  
yesterday Suzuki ask me come/ go he GEN place I not go  
‘Mr. Suzuki asked me to come to his place yesterday, but I didn’t go.’

- (17b) E: Mr. Suzuki told me to *come/go* to his office yesterday, but I didn’t.

- (17c) J: Kinou suzuki-sennsei-wa watasi-ni kenkyusitu-ni *kuru-/iku*-youni  
yesterday Suzuki-teacher-TOP I-DAT office-to come-/go-COMP

ii-masita-ga watasi-wa iki-masen-desita.  
say-PAST-but I-TOP go-NEG-PAST

‘Mr. Suzuki told me to come to his office yesterday, but I didn’t go.’

The examples in (17) describe the speaker’s motion toward the location of the referent of the matrix subject *Mr. Suzuki* in English and Japanese. Among the four English speakers consulted, one finds only *come* acceptable in (17b), two both *come* and *go*, and one only *go*. As discussed in Section 2, the Ground of *come* in English is either the location of the speaker or the addressee, and consequently, it is predicted that the motion

cannot be described as *coming*. Most English speakers, however, find the choice of *come* relatively acceptable when it is embedded in the complement of *tell* as in (17b) as compared with the use of *come* in the complement of predicates which do not induce a logophoric context, such as *persuade* in (18).

- (18a) C: Lingmu jingran shuofu le wo, rang wo \*lai/qu canjia ta  
 Suzuki undesirably persuade PFT I cause I come/go attend he  
 zhuchi de wuliao de huiyi.  
 chair GEN boring GEN meeting

‘Mr. Suzuki persuaded me to go to the boring meeting which he chairs.’

- (18b) E: Mr. Suzuki persuaded me to \*come/go to the boring meeting which he chairs.

- (18c) J: Suzuki-san-wa zibun-ga sikai-wo su-ru tsumaranai kaigi-ni  
 Suzuki-Mr.-TOP self-NOM chair-ACC do-NONPST boring meeting-to  
 kuru-/\*iku-youni watasi-wo settoku-si-masita.  
 come/go-COMP I-ACC persuade-do-PAST

‘Mr. Suzuki persuaded me to go to the boring meeting which he chairs.’

Similarly to (17), the described motion is directed toward the non-participants of the speech act, i.e. Mr. Suzuki, and in English, the motion can be described only as *going* in example (18b). The comparison between (17) and (18) clearly indicates that the relativization of the Ground in English is only at work in (17) with a verb of communication *tell*: in (17), the Ground is relativized to the referent of the matrix subject *Mr. Suzuki*, as if the motion were described in a direct quote from the perspective of the referent of the matrix subject, a phenomenon Kuno (1988) calls “quasi-direct discourse”.

Unlike in English, the choice of embedding predicates have little effect on the choice of the deictic motion verbs in Japanese and Chinese, as shown in a comparison of (17) and (18). In Japanese, relativization of the Ground to the referent of the matrix subject is obligatory and the motion toward the subject is equally described as *coming* whether the motion verbs are embedded under *iu* ‘tell’ as in (17c) or *settokusuru* ‘persuade’ as in (18c). In both cases, the use of *iku* ‘go’ would necessarily imply that the speaker believes that Mr. Suzuki is not in the office in (17c) or in the meeting in (18c) when the motion is expected to be carried out. In Chinese, on the other hand, the Ground of *lai* ‘come’ must be the location of the speaker as discussed in Section 4, and no relativization of the Ground takes effect as shown in the unanimous choice of *qu* ‘go’ both in (17a) and (18a).



Although it is difficult to define the exact extent to which each language allows the relativization of the Ground of the deictic motion verbs to the referent of the matrix subject,<sup>6</sup> if it does at all, it is apparent that the semantic property of embedding predicates plays a crucial role: the Ground is relativized more readily when the motion verbs are embedded under predicates which induce a logophoric context, that is, the predicates which express as the complement the content communicated or experienced by the referent of the matrix subject, rather than by the speaker. Furthermore, in Japanese, the Ground is relativized to the referent of the matrix subject not only in the logophoric context but also when the motion verbs are embedded in the complement of any control predicates.

Speck and Pickett (1976) report a similar kind of relativization of the Ground of the deictic motion verbs, which indicates that the phenomenon is by no means limited to English, Japanese, and Korean. In Texmelucan Zapotec, an Otomanguean language, when the deictic motion verbs are embedded under the “verbs of sight” (Speck and Pickett 1976: 60), the location of the referent of the matrix subject, i.e. the location of the “observer,” plays the role of the Ground of the *coming* verbs. Thus, the motion toward the person who sees it is described as *coming*, as if the content of the seeing experience were reported from the perspective of the person who sees it, as in (19).

Texmelucan Zapotec (Speck and Pickett 1976: 60; the gloss is provided by the present author following Speck and Pickett 1976)

- (19) Karp        bzak    yu    yap        na.  
 Policarpo   saw   he   coming   us  
 ‘Policarpo saw us coming.’

In (19), the *coming* verb *yap* describes the motion directed toward the observer, i.e. Policarpo, rather than the speech act participants. This too, is characterizable by the general notion of a logophoric context induced by the verbs of sight, in which motion events are described. Thus, the analysis of Speck and Pickett (1976) states that in Texmelucan Zapotec, the *coming* verb is used when the described motion is directed toward the speaker, the addressee, or the observer.

Speck and Pickett (1976) and Pickett (1976) describe yet another kind of relativization phenomena of the deictic center. In Texmelucan Zapotec (as well as Diuxi Mixtec, also an Otomanguean language (Kuiper and Merrifield 1975)), the Ground of deictic motion verbs is relativized to the home of the referent of the sentence subject, i.e. the

<sup>6</sup> The *PSiCL* reviewer, presumably a native speaker of English, claims that the use of *come* in the English example and translation in (16) and (18) is acceptable as well as those in (14) and (17), which displays a rather Japanese-speaker-like intuition. Although an analysis of intra-language variations is worth pursuing, it would require further research beyond the scope of this paper.

Figure of the motion. In Texmelucan Zapotec, the Ground of the *coming* verbs is the location of the speaker or the addressee either at the utterance time or at the reference time, as is the case in English. In addition, the notion of home, called “Base”, of the Figure serves as a separate dimension in the determination of the Ground of the *coming* verbs. Base is defined to be “the place where the person [the Figure] in motion normally or expectedly returns” (Speck and Pickett 1976:61). Four deictic motion verbs, a pair of *coming* verbs *-yeed* and *-iid* and, a pair of *going* verbs *-ya* and *-a*, are cross-classified according to whether or not the described motion is directed toward a Base of the Figure. In (20), *b-iid* is the second (i.e. toward-a-non-Base) *coming* verb and *ya-y* is the first (i.e. toward-a-Base) *going* verb, and the example indicates that Oaxaca is not Policarpo’s home.

Texmelucan Zapotec (Speck and Pickett 1976: 61)

- (20) Karp        *b-iid*        yu lola.        sa        *ya-y*.  
 Policarpo   CMPL-come<sub>2</sub>   he   Oaxaca   recently   PROG.go<sub>1</sub>-he  
 ‘Policarpo came to Oaxaca. He just left (for home).’

The use of *-iid* ‘come toward a non-Base’ indicates that Policarpo came to Oaxaca, which is (or was) the location of the speaker (or the addressee), but not Policarpo’s home, and the use of *-y* ‘go toward a Base’ indicates that he went home, which is not toward the location of the speaker or the addressee. Thus, the lexical meaning of the *coming* verb *-iid* may be schematized as ‘MOVE TOWARD a point which is the location of the speaker or the addressee AND which is not a Base of the Figure’, while the *going* verb *-y* as ‘MOVE TOWARD a point which is not the location of the speaker or the addressee AND which is a Base of the Figure’. Texmelucan Zapotec not only relativizes the Ground of the deictic motion verbs to the notion of the Figure’s Base, but also incorporates the notion into the system of deictic motion verbs as distinct lexical items. Note that this is a distinct phenomenon from the “home base” effect (Fillmore 1975) in which the home of the speech act participants play the role of the Ground of the *coming* verbs as if it were the actual location of the speaker or the addressee: in Texmelucan Zapotec, the choice of the motion verbs is determined according to whether or not the Ground is the Base of the Figure, i.e. the referent of the sentence subject rather than the speech act participants, and thus is characterizable in terms of the relativized Ground.

Another example of a relativized Ground is given by Craig (1979). In Jacalteco, a Mayan language, the verb suffixes *tij* ‘toward’ and *toj* ‘away,’ which are reduced from the deictic motion verbs *tita* ‘come’ and *toyi* ‘go’ and called directional particles, indicate the direction toward and away from the location of the speaker respectively. As the basic use of the directional particles, “intransitive verbs of motion are generally composed of two directionals” (Craig 1979: 35), and the first directional indicates a direc-

Jacaltepec (Craig 1979: 36; the gloss is amended by the present author, following Craig 1977 and Day 1973)

- Jacalteco (Craig 1979: 38; the gloss is amended by the present author, following Craig 1977 and Day 1973)

- In the transitive construction in (22), while the verb stem *ten* ‘move’ is not a deictic expression, the deictic suffixes, *tij* ‘toward’ in (22a) and *toj* ‘away’ in (22b), indicate the directions of the motion with respect to the location of the referent of the subject. The suffixes *tij* and *toj* make reference to the location of the person expressed by *ha* ‘you’ and express the motions ‘toward you’ and ‘away from you’ respectively. Thus, the Ground of *tij* ‘toward’ is the location of the speaker when it appears in the intransitive construction as in (21), while in the transitive construction, it is relativized to the location of the referent of the subject as in (22a).

This paper has examined the deictic motion verbs in different languages, Chinese, English, German, Japanese, Korean, and Shibe, as well as other languages in the literature, using Talmy's framework as an attempt to determine the cross-linguistic patterns of spatio-temporal semantic properties of those deictic motion verbs.

The actual characterization of the elements constituting the Ground of the *coming* verbs is far more complicated than Talmy predicts. The data clearly shows that the primary deictic center, i.e. the Ground of the *coming* verbs, is the location of the speaker at the utterance time, but some languages allow in addition the location of the addressee and/or the reference time location to play the role of the Ground of the *coming* verbs. There is a hierarchy as to which of these elements of the speech act actually constitutes the Ground of the *coming* verbs, as analyzed in Sections 2–4 and summarized in Table 1. Among them, English allows the location of the addressee to play the role of the deictic center (as well as Catalan, Chagga, French, German, Italian, Nepali, Palauan, Tamil, Tangut, Texmelucan Zapotec, and Turkish), as discussed in Section 2 and indicated by the right hand side column in Table 1, while it plays the role of the deictic center only conditionally in Japanese and Korean (as well as Abaza), as discussed in Section 3 and indicated by the parentheses in Table 1. Chinese and Shibe do not allow the location of the addressee to play the role of the deictic center at all (as well as Botin, Jacaltec, Spanish, and Thai), as discussed in Section 4 and indicated by the left hand side column in Table 1.

Table 1. The Ground of *coming* verbs

	Speaker location	Speaker & addressee location
Utterance time location	Shibe	(Abaza)
Utterance time location	Botin	Catalan
(relevance of reference time location is unknown)	Jacaltec	Chagga
	Spanish	French
	Thai	German
		Italian
		Nepali
		Palauan
		Tamil
		Tangut
		Turkish
Utterance and reference time location	Chinese	English
		Texmelucan Zapotec
		(Japanese)
		(Korean)

The utterance time location of some speech act participants plays a role in the determination of the Ground of the *coming* verbs in all languages. The reference time location, however, is relevant only in English, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean (as well as Texme-

lucan Zapotec) while it does not play any role in Shibe (as well as Abaza). The relevance of the reference time location in other languages is unknown, as indicated by the center row of Table 1, since the reference time location is not separately treated as an independent factor in the cited works.

If the hierarchy is cross-classified according to the relevance of the location of the addressee and of the reference time location, English is positioned at one end of the scale (i.e. the lower right corner of Table 1): it allows both locations of the speaker and the addressee both at the utterance time and the reference time to act as the deictic center. At the other end of the scale (i.e. the upper left corner of Table 1) is Shibe: neither the location of the addressee nor the reference time location is relevant, and consequently, only the location of the speaker at the utterance time is considered as the deictic center.

Furthermore, the Ground of the deictic motion verbs is shown to be relativized to the referent of a particular sentence element, rather than the participants of the speech act. Japanese exhibits an extensive relativization of the Ground of the *coming* verb to the referent of the matrix subject when embedded in the complement clause of the control predicates. Although not as extensive, English and Korean (as well as Diuxi Mixtec, Jacaltec, and Texmelucan Zapotec) also allow the deictic center to be relativized to the referent of the matrix subject when the deictic motion verbs are embedded in the logophoric context induced by the verbs of communication and mental experiences. In Chinese and Shibe, even the verbs of communication do not induce the relativization, indicating that the relativization of the Ground, though observable in many languages, is not a universal phenomenon.

As the final note, it needs to be pointed out that Talmy's schematization of the deictic Motion event assumes that the Ground of the *coming* verbs is complementary to the Ground of the *going* verbs: "the Deictic component of Path [of the deictic motion verbs] typically has only the two member notions 'toward the speaker' and 'in a direction other than toward the speaker'". If the Grounds of the *coming* and *going* verbs are truly complementary to each other, however, then there should not exist any examples where both the *coming* and *going* verbs are acceptable such as the Japanese and Korean examples in (6). Rather than following the assumption of the complementary distribution of the *coming* and *going* verbs, Sections 2–4 represent an attempt to encompass the maximum range of the admissibility of the *coming* verbs in terms of the location of the speaker and the addressee at the utterance time and the reference time. The implicit assumption is that the use of the *coming* verbs is conditioned by elements of the speech act while the use of the *going* verbs fills the distributional gap left by the *coming* verbs. That is, a certain situation of the speech act allows, or requires, the use of *coming* verbs, and only as its consequence, the use of *going* verbs is simultaneously allowed, or prohibited. The consequence of the assumption is the prediction that the distribution of the deictic motion verbs is more naturally characterizable as the admissibility conditions of the *coming* verbs, rather than that of the *going* verbs.

Numerous authors follow this assumption of *coming* verbs as the marked member of the deictic motion verbs, if only implicitly (e.g. Allen 1956; Fillmore 1966; Fleischman 1982; Hoopert and Warkentin 1977; Watanabe 1986). Fillmore (1975), for example, describes the use of *go* as possible in every situation except for the case where the speaker is located at the destination of the motion at the utterance time, i.e. where the use of *come* is absolutely required, rather than only permitted. Wilkins and Hill (1995) and Goddard (1997) go so far as to claim that only the *coming* verbs are lexically deictic while the *going* verbs are not. That is, the lexical semantics of the *coming* verbs, but not the *going* verbs, is specified deictically, i.e. making reference to elements of the speech act, while the use of the *going* verbs is only pragmatically suppressed to give way to the *coming* verbs when the lexical specification of the *coming* verbs is met by the speech act situation. This paper shares an intuition with all these authors in noting that the deictic use of the *coming* verbs is the driving factor behind the distribution of the deictic motion verbs, but leaves it open as to how exactly it can be characterized in Talmy's framework, or in any theoretical framework for the interface between semantics and pragmatics.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, W.S. 1956. "Structure and system in the Abaza verbal complex". *Transactions of the Philosophical Society* 1956. 127–176.
- Anderson, S.R. and E.L. Keenan. 1985. "Deixis". In Shopen, T. (ed.). 259–309.
- Annamalai, E. 1975. "The semantics of the verbs *vaa* and *poo* in Tamil". *Indian Linguistics* 36. 212–216.
- Bilmes, L. 1995. "The grammaticalization of Thai 'come' and 'go'". In Bilmes, L., A. Liang, and W. Ostapirat (eds.), *Proceedings of the Twenty-first Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society. 33–46.
- Chevalier, J.C. 1976. "Sur l'idée d'*aller* et de *venir* et sa traduction linguistique en espagnol et en français". *Bulletin Hispanique* 78(3–4). 254–312.
- Coseriu, E. 1990. "Semántica estructural y semántica 'cognitiva'". In Alvar, M. et al. (eds.), *Col·lecció homenatges 4: Profesor Francisco Marsá: Jornadas de filologia*. Barcelona: Publicacions Universitat de Barcelona. 239–282.
- Craig, C.G. 1977. *The structure of Jacaltepec*. Austin–London: University of Texas Press.
- Craig, C.G. 1979. "Jacaltepec: Field work in Guatemala". In Shopen, T. (ed.), *Languages and their Speakers*. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Publishers. 3–57.
- Day, C. 1973. *The Jacaltepec language*. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Emanatian, M. 1992. "Chagga 'come' and 'go': Metaphor and the development of tense-aspect". *Studies in Language* 16(1). 1–33.
- Fillmore, C.J. 1966. "Deictic categories in the semantics of *come*". *Foundations of Language* 2. 219–227.
- Fillmore, C.J. 1975. "Coming and going". *Santa Cruz Lectures on Deixis, 1971*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics. 50–69. [Reprinted as Fillmore 1997.]
- Fillmore, C.J. 1997. "Coming and going". *Lectures on Deixis*. Stanford: CSLI. 77–102.

- Fleischman, S. 1982. "The past and the future: are they *coming* or *going*?" In Macaulay, M. et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society. 322–334.
- Fraser, T.K.H. 1982. "The system of verbs involving a speaker-hearer relationship: *come/go, bring/take* in Old and Middle English". In Ahlqvist, A. (ed.), *Papers from the 5th International Conference on Historical Linguistics (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Series IV, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 21)*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 54–61.
- Gandour, J. 1978. "On the deictic use of verbs of motion *come* and *go* in Thai". *Anthropological Linguistics* 20(9). 381–394.
- Gathercole, G. 1977. "A study of the comings and goings of the speakers of four languages: Spanish, Japanese, English, and Turkish". *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics* 2. 61–94.
- Gathercole, V.C. 1978. "Towards a universal for deictic verbs of motion". *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics* 3. 72–88.
- Goddard, C. 1997. "The semantics of coming and going". *Pragmatics: Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association* 7(2). 147–162.
- Gorelova, L.M. 2002. *Manchu grammar (Handbook of oriental studies, Section Eight, Central Asia 7)*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hayata, T. 2002. "Siten ido-no nai 'iku' to 'kuru'" ['Come' and 'go' without view-point shift]. *UP 11* 361. 29–33.
- Hockett, C.F. 1990. "*Bring, take, come* and *go*". *Journal of English Linguistics* 23(1–2). 239–244.
- Hoopert, D.A. and V. Warkentin. 1977. "Tila Chol 'come', and 'go', and 'arrive'". *Notes on Linguistics* 4. 11–16.
- Josephs, L.S. 1975. *Palauan reference grammar*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Josephs, L.S. 1977. *New Palauan-English dictionary*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Kageyama, T. 2002. *Kezime-no nai Nihongo* [Japanese without distinction]. Tokyo: Iwanami Syoten.
- Kepping, K.B. 1982. "Deicic motion verbs in Tangut". *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 6(2). 77–82.
- Kubo, T. 1997. "'Come' and 'go' in Shive Manchu". *Saksaha: A Review of Manchu Studies* 2. 19–24.
- Kuiper, A. and W.R. Merrifield. 1975. "Diuxi Mixtec verbs of motion and arrival". *International Journal of American Linguistics* 41(1). 32–45.
- Kuno, S. 1978. *Danwa-no Bunpo* [Grammar of discourse]. Tokyo: Taisyukan.
- Kuno, S. 1987. *Functional syntax: Anaphora, discourse and empathy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kuno, S. 1988. "Blended quasi-direct discourse in Japanese". In Poser, W.J. (ed.), *Papers from the Second International Workshop on Japanese Syntax*. Stanford: CSLI. 75–102.
- Kuno, S. and E. Kaburaki. 1977. "Empathy and syntax". *Linguistic Inquiry* 8(4). 627–672.
- Lee, K. 1977. "The deictic motion verbs *kata* and *ota* in Korean". In Kim, C.W. (ed.), *Papers in Korean Linguistics: Proceedings of the Symposium on Korean Linguistics*. Columbia, SC: Hornbeam Press. 167–176.
- Levinson, S.C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lucy, J. A. 1994. "The role of semantic value in lexical comparison: motion and position roots in Yucatec Maya". *Linguistics* 32. 623–656.
- Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics* 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morita, Y. 1977. *Kiso Nihongo* [Basic Japanese]. Tokyo: Kadokawa.

- Nakazawa, T. 1990. "A pragmatic account of the distribution of *come* and *go* in English, Japanese, and Korean". In Hoji, H. (ed.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics* 1. Stanford: CSLI. 97–110.
- Nakazawa, T. 2005. "On *come* and *go* in English, Japanese, and Chinese: Why do they come while others go?" *Language, Information, Text* 12. 43–62.
- O'Herin, B. 2001. "Abaza applicatives". *Language* 77(3). 477–493.
- Pickett, V.B. 1976. "Further comments on Zapotec motion verbs". *International Journal of American Linguistics* 42(2). 162–164.
- Pryor, B. and C. Farr. 1989. "Botin deictics: go and come". *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia: Journal of the Linguistic Society of Papua New Guinea* 20(1–2). 115–145.
- Rauh, G. 1981. "On coming and going in English and German". *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics* 13. 53–68.
- Sells, P. 1987. "Aspects of logophoricity". *Linguistic Inquiry* 18(3). 445–479.
- Shopen, T. (ed.). 1985. *Grammatical categories and the lexicon (Language typology and syntactic description III)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Speck, C.H. and V.B. Pickett. 1976. "Some properties of the Texmelucan Zapotec verbs *go*, *come* and *arrive*". *International Journal of American Linguistics* 42(1). 58–64.
- Talmy, L. 1975. "Semantics and syntax of motion". In Kimball, J.P. (ed.), *Syntax and semantics* 4. New York: Academic Press. 181–238.
- Talmy, L. 1985. "Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical forms". In Shopen, T. (ed.). 57–149.
- Talmy, L. 2000. *Typology and process in concept structuring (Toward a cognitive semantics, vol. 2)*. Cambridge–London: The MIT Press.
- Taylor, J. R. 1999. "Cognitive semantics and structural semantics". In Blank, A. and P. Koch (eds.), *Historical semantics and cognition*. Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 17–48.
- Watanabe, S. 1986. "Doitugo idou dousi 'kommen'-ni-okeru daikuisu tokusei chuuritukanituite" [On neutralization of the deictic property of German motion verb *kommen*]. *Si, Gengo* [Poem and Language] 29. 1–11.
- Watanabe, S. 1994. "'Kommen'-no daikuisu-to imi" [Deicis and semantics of *kommen*]. *Doitu Bungaku* [German Literature] 93. Nihon Dokubun Gakkai [Japanese Society of German Literature]. 125–133.
- Wilkins, D. P. and D. Hill. 1995. "When 'go' means 'come': Questioning the basicness of basic motion verbs". *Cognitive Linguistics* 6(2–3). 209–259.