Santa Cruz Lectures on Deixis
1971

Charles J. Fillmore
University of California, Berkeley

CONTENTS

- (114

2

Santa Cruz

Lectures On Deixis 1971

CHARLES J FILLMORE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

- (113

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

These lectures were given at the 1971 summer linguistics program at the Santa Cruz campus of the University of California, while I was a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford. In those days I thought of my deixis lectures as a preview to a book that was in the making. I now realize, unhappily, that since a year at the Center, away from classrooms and committees, did not give me the time and the wisdom to finish it, the book is never going to be written.

Revised versions of two of the lectures -- the first and the fifth -- have already appeared in public. I am unhappy about having the rest appear in their present form, but in any attempt to improve and update this material I would not know where to start, and I would certainly not know where to stop. But I can say of the non-existent enlarged improved integrated updated version of these lectures that (1) they would show more of the influence of David Bennett, Eve Clark, Herbert Clark, Paul Friedrich, Geoffrey Leech, John Lyons, Michael Silverstein, Leonard Talmy, and Paul Teller, and that (2) they would show the benefit of at least one more visit (if I would be welcomed) to the members of the Mexican branch of the Summer Institute of Linguistics who, in December of 1970, submitted patiently to my interviews with them, about "their" languages, when I visited SIL workshops in Mitla and Ixmiquilpan.

<div align="right">
Charles J. Fillmore
Berkeley
November, 1975
</div>

. (115

3

COMING AND GOING

In 1965, in a paper entitled "Entailment rules in a semantic
theory" [The Ohio State University Project on Linguistic Analysis,
Report No. 11], and then in 1966 in an article called "Deictic categories
in the semantics of 'come'" [Foundations of Language, Vol. 2, 219-227],
I presented an analysis of the appropriateness conditions for deictically
anchored English sentences containing the motion verbs "come" and "go".
The main conclusion I arrived at in those papers was that, while the
directional complement of the verb "go" indicates a place where the
speaker (or encoder) is not located at coding time, the destination
associated with expressions containing the verb "come" requires some-
what more complicated understandings. The place to which one speaks
of something or somebody "coming" is understood as a place where
either the speaker or the addressee is located at either the coding
time or the reference time.

In 1969, in a paper entitled "Types of lexical information [Ferenc
Kiefer, ed., Studies in Syntax and Semantics, Reidel, 109-137], I
reviewed these findings and added a remark on the function of the verb
"come" in sentences which are not deictically anchored with respect to
speaker and addressee. In third-person narrative, my point was, the
choice of the verb "come" was determined by whether the narrator
regards the destination of the movement as being the location at re-
ference-time of the central character of the episode to which the
sentence has reference. Then in 1970, in a paper called "Subjects,
speakers and roles" [Synthese, Vol. 21, 251-274], I repeated that claim
and added that I took as syntactic evidence for it, namely, the obser-
vation that -- certain conditions being satisfied -- a single sentence
cannot contain references to separate journeys with differing destina-
tions by using the verb "come" for each journey. My evidence was that
while the first of the following two sentences is acceptable, the
second is not:

> After John came to Bill's house, John and
> Bill together went over to Mary's house.
>
> After John came to Bill's house, John and
> Bill together came over to Mary's house.

Then in 1971 I carried out a particularly significant piece of
research into the meaning of these very interesting verbs. I looked
them up in the dictionary.

'The dictionary' in this case, was the Oxford English Dictionary.
The 'signification' part of the entry for "come" in the O.E.D looks
like this:

. (165

53

> An ele.entary intransitive verb of motion
> expressing movement towards or so as to
> reach the speaker, or the person spoken to,
> or towards a point where the speaker in
> thought or imagination places himself, or
> (when he himself is not in question) towards
> the person who forms the subject of his
> narrative.

Motion toward the speaker or the person spoken to is, of course,
motion toward the encoder's or decoder's location at coding time.
Motion toward a point where the speaker in thought or imagination
places himself can be thought of as motion toward the assumed
location of a participant in the conversation at reference time.
The case where the speaker himself is not in question is the case
of a third-person or non-person-deictically anchored discourse,
and the person who forms the subject of the narrative is the
central character that I had discussed.

In the relevant part of the definition of "go" where "go" is
seen as paired with "come", the O.E.D. has this to say:

> (Where) the prominent notion is that of
> destination or direction ... the verb is
> distinguished from COME by the implication
> that the movement is not towards the speaker,
> or the person whose point of view he for the
> moment assumes.

Finding out that something has been known, in its basic outlines,
for a very long time, in no way detracts from the inherent interest
that the facts may have, and I think it will be very much worth our
while to look into the semantics of the deictic motion verbs today,
between the first and second of my two lectures on deixis proper. We
will, I think, in fact, come up with a few things that are not
derivable from the O.E.D. account.

I will first of all say something about a number of general
concepts associated with locomotion; I will then characterize the
English deictic motion verbs -- "come", "go", "bring" and "take" --
with a remark or two on their kin in other languages; lastly I will
discuss the transferred uses of "come" in third-person narrative. I
mentioned in my earlier lectures the use of "come" and "go" in
expressions relating to the passing of time. I won't say more about
that today.

First, on motion. We say of something that it has moved, in the
"locomotion" sense of movement that I have in mind, if it is at one
location at one time and at another location at another time. I will
disregard the more or less self-contained instances of motion of the

54

wiggling and rotating sort, and I will also disregard unbounded instances of locomotion of the sort planets enjoy. I will discuss bounded motion, motion that can be characterized as having a starting point and an ending point, an origin and a destination -- what I have been calling Source and Goal. In addition to the terminals, we can also characterize or delimit in some way the intervening states which we might call, after David Bennett, the Path. (Whenever we want our discourse about these matters to sound more obscure, we may substitute for the terms Source, Goal and Path, the terms Ablative, Allative and Itinerative.)

Motion, thus, presupposes an understanding of both time and space. We can characterize the initial state as the doublet P_1T_1, with P and T standing for Place and Time respectively, and we can identify the final state of the motion as the doublet P_nT_n. The set of states P_iT_i (with "i" between 1 and n) identifies the Path.

Recall now that I introduced the notion reference time in an earlier lecture, meaning by that the point or period that is the temporal focus or background for the event or condition being described in the clause. The reference time can be made explicit by means of a time specifier phrase. The reference time for a clause indicating motion can either be a span which covers the whole period T_1 - T_n or it can be identified with either T_1 or T_n. (It's not quite this simple, but what I'm telling you isn't all wrong, either.) Examples of sentences in which the reference time is the time of the whole journey are these:

> She swam from the end of the dock to the shore.
> He travelled from Columbus to Biloxi.

If we were to add time phrases like "this morning" or "last week" we would be locating the whole journey in time.

But now consider the verbs "leave" and "arrive" in expressions in which only the Goal phrase is explicitly present. I would like to say of the sentences

> He left for Chicago around noon.
and He arrived in Chicago around noon.

that the reference time is T_1 for the first sentence and T_n for the second. This may all seem too obvious to deserve mention, but we will find it necessary to distinguish between departure time (T_1) and arrival time (T_n) when we talk about the deictic motion verbs, as I think you will agree if you think about the sentences

> He went home around midnight.
and He came home around midnight.

The time specifier in the first sentence could be understood as indicating the time he left the party, say; the one in the second sentence indicates the time he arrived home.

In the first of those sentences, we feel intuitively that there is in the setting or in the previous discourse a location that is a kind of spatial reference point for the sentence, namely the place where, say, a party was going on. What I'm saying is that for a sentence like "He went home around midnight" there is in the discourse not only a presupposed time period on c which the interpreter can anchor the sentence, but also a presupposed location -- in this case, the place from which the movement began.

Since there are so many parallels between space and time expressions, I may as well tell you about another one that I think I see. Not only can we speak of reference time, we might also find it useful to introduce the notion of reference place, the location or object that is taken as the framework or spatial reference point for what is mentioned in the clause. On the one hand the reference place can be either the location of an event that does not involve locomotion or the location of all of the points in an instance of locomotion, and on the other hand it can be either the place which is identified with the Source of the motion, or the place which is identified with the Goal of the motion. The choice is frequently determined by the semantics of the verb. Certain verbs have reference places identified with P_1, the Source (as, for example, "leave" and "go" in one of its uses), others have reference places identified with P_n, the Goal (as, for example, "arrive" and "come"), and still others have reference places that are not uniquely idenitified with either of these (as, for example, "travel" and "go" in one of its uses). In a sentence like

People kept coming and going all day.

the same reference place is understood as the arrival point or P_n for the "coming" and the departure point or P_1 for the "going".

This place/time parallelism exists on the deictic level as well, and the whole thing becomes fairly easy to conceptualize if we can think of a communication act as metaphorically an instance of motion -- the travelling of a message from one person to another. Whenever the time period or time span determining the center of the tense system is simply taken to be the time during which the communication act as a whole takes place, we may simply speak of coding time. (This, of course, is the typical situation for speech, since spoken messages are usually received at the same time they are sent.) If the center for the tense system is the time the message is being encoded, we speak of encoding time, as exemplified in a written message like

I'm writing this letter on the balcony of my hotel in Debrecen.

. (168

56

Where the tense center is taken to be the time the message is being interpreted, we can speak of _decoding time_, as exemplified in

You have just read my last letter to you.

Viewing communication as analogous with motion, we can see that the encoding time is T_1, the decoding time is T_n, and the coding time in general is $T_1 - T_n$. Similarly, when sender and receiver are both "in the same place", we can speak of the _coding place_, as in

It sure is nice here now, isn't it?

Where the encoder's and decoder's locations are distinct, we can speak of the _encoding place_, the encoder's location, and the _decoding place_, the decoder's location. Both are indicated in the sentence

It's nice over here, what's it like over there?

The encoding place is analogous to the P_1, the decoding place is analogous to the P_n, of the motion, and the coding place in general is simply the place which includes $P_1 - P_n$.

Now to the deictic motion verbs. What is there to say about the verbs "come" and "go" in English, and about the verbs "bring" and "take"? Description of these verbs will mention something about the location of the conversation participants, and what we need to do now is to make sure we can be clear about the details. My method will be that of proposing, disconfirming, and revising hypotheses. I will begin by considering only uses of the verbs in person-deictically anchored discourse, that is, in discourse in which speaker and addressee are "in question".

Sometimes we find, in descriptions of exotic languages, grammatical categories associated with, say, directional affixes of some sort, that are named "Toward Speaker" and "Away from Speaker". Let's take it as our first hypothesis that "come" and "bring" have to do with motion toward the speaker, "go" and "take" with motion away from the speaker.

Hypothesis I: (a) "come" and "bring" indicate motion toward
                    the location of the speaker at coding time;
                (b) "go" and "take" indicate motion toward a
                    location which is distinct from the speaker's
                    location at coding time.

Fancy Version of Hypothesis I:
                (a) for the movements indicated with "come"
                    and "bring", the encoder is at P_n and T_n;
                (b) for the movements indicated with "go" and
                    "take", the encoder is at P_1 and T_1.

57

Nondisconfirming observations are easy to find, as, for example, sentences like

      Please come in.
and   Please go away.

Disconfirming sentences are also easy to find, unfortunately for Hypothesis I, as, for example, the sentences

      He came here two hours before I arrived.
and   I saw him go over there to way over there.

The first of these refers to motion toward a place where the speaker is at coding time, and "there" is, at the very least, a place where the speaker is not at the coding time. A hypothesis compatible with all of the above examples is that the verbs have to do with "motion toward here" as opposed to "motion toward there", the two deictic adverbs understood as having their symbolic and not their gestural (or anaphoric) senses.

Hypothesis II: (a) "come" and "bring" indicate motion toward the location of the speaker at coding time;
             (b) "go" and "take" indicate motion toward a location which is distinct from the speaker's location at coding time.

Fancy Version of Hypothesis II:
             (a) for the movements indicated with "come" and "bring", the encoder is at P_n at coding time;
             (b) for the movements indicated with "go" and "take", the encoder is not at P_n at coding time.

Ungrammatical sentences whose nongrammaticality is accounted for by Hypothesis II include such as

      Please go here.
      They went here.
      Take them here.

(I restricted the way we were to understand the adverb "here" as symbolic rather than gestural. In the gestural use, as in pointing to locations on a map, these sentences are perfectly acceptable.)

But now let's consider some more sentences. The first two do not disconfirm the hypothesis:

      I'll take it there right away.
      I'll go there right away.

170

But the next two that I'll give you raise some questions about the (a)
part of the hypothesis, the part relating to "come" and "bring":

    I'll bring it there right away.
    I'll come there right away.

The destination of the movements in these cases is neither the encoder's
location at arrival time, nor his location at coding time. It's not the
first. because, since I chose first-person subject examples. it is the
encoder whose movements are in question; it's not the second, because
of the way we understand the adverb "there" symbolically.

In the case of these last sentences, the destination is under-
stood as the place where the decoder is at coding time. If I say that
I'll come there right away, what I have to be talking about is the
place where you are now. In these sentences, the encoder was the mover,
but even if we had taken a third-person subject, as in

    He'll come there right away.,

we would still have the same understanding about the decoder's being
"there" at coding time.

So this leads us to reformulate the hypothesis, for the part re-
lating to "come" to identify the destination as a place where either the
encoder or the decoder is at coding time.

> Hypothesis III: "come" and "bring" indicate motion toward
>   the location of either the speaker or the
>   addressee at coding time.
>
> Fancy Version of Hypothesis III: for the movements indicated
>   with "come" or "bring", P_n is the location at
>   coding time of either the encoder or the
>   decoder.

Thus we see that the criteria by which a location can be the destination
for "come" or "bring" as opposed to "go" or "take", are different from
those for selecting the place-indicator "here" as opposed to "there".
In the other case about either the encoding place or the decoding place.

The pronoun "we" can be understood inclusively or exclusively, as
we saw earlier. In a sentence like

    Can we go over there?

the pronoun is ambiguous between these two readings; but in a sentence
like

    Can we come over there?

· (171

275

59

the pronoun can be understood exclusively only. The destination for "come" has to include either the speaker or the addressee, but since the pronoun "we" has to include the speaker, we must conclude that the destination for that sentence is the place where the addressee is at coding time. The ambiguity of the first sentence, the unambiguous character of the second sentence, are accounted for by Hypothesis III.

In certain constructions, we know that the first-person-plural pronoun is only understood inclusively, as, for example, in the so-called first-person-plural imperative construction with "let's". In a sentence like

> Let's go over there.

all is well, since you and I can both go to a place where I am not now; but a sentence like

> Let's come over there.

is bad, because you and I cannot both go to a place where one of us already is. Again, Hypothesis III provides the principles by which these facts on ambiguity and grammaticality can be explained.

But Hypothesis III can't stand after all. There are situations in which we can talk about somebody betaking himself to a place where neither speaker nor addressee is at coding time, and yet where the verb "come" is quite appropriate. Consider the case where you and I are together in the same room and I say to you,

> I'll come there at dawn.

In this sentence, "there" is neither the encoding place nor the decoding place. It's not the encoding place by definition, and it's not the decoding place by hypothesis, since I asked you to imagine that you and I were together. I think it's clear that what I would have to mean by "there" in that sentence is a place where you will be at the reference time (which, with this verb, is the arrival time). On the other hand, in a sentence like

> Please come there at dawn.

when said under the same conditions, "there" cannot refer to the decoder's location at arrival time, since it is the decoder whose motion is in question. For this last sentence, "there" is understood as the encoder's location at reference time.

We are ready for another formulation of our account of "come" and "bring".

- (**172**

60

Hypothesis IV: "come" and "bring" indicate motion toward
the location of either the speaker or the
addressee at either coding time or reference
time.

Fancy Version of Hypothesis IV: for the movements indicated
with "come" or "bring" P_n is the location
at T_n or at coding time of either the encoder
or the decoder.

In the examples which led up to this formulation, the mover was one
of the conversation participants, the destination was the location at
the time of reference of the other participant. I'm going to where you
will be, or you're going to be where I will be. If the subject of the
verb is somebody other than either of the conversation partners, as in

He'll come there at dawn.

the sentence is ambiguous, permitting either the understanding that you
will be there when he arrives, or that I will be. In a sentence like

We'll come there at dawn.

as compared with

We'll go there at dawn.

the pronoun is unambiguously exclusive of addressee, since the sentence
has to be understood as motion toward the addressee's location. Again,
while a sentence like

Let's go there at dawn.

is all right, we will find it unacceptable to say

Let's come there at dawn.

I've been using the word "there" in most of these examples merely
to limit ourselves to the situation in which the destination is a place
where the encoder cannot be at coding time; and by placing both partici-
pants in the same location, I was able to remove temporarily from
consideration the possibility that the destination was the place where
the decoder was at coding time. Now if we take a sentence which has no
other place-deictic or person-deictic elements apart from the verb "come"
and ask ourselves under what conditions it could appropriately be used,
we will come up with the conclusions that I presented in my first
lecture. Thus, the conditions under which I can say to you,

Johnny came to the office yesterday morning.

include the cases where I am at the office when I say it. you are at
the office when I say it, I was in the office yesterday morning when
Johnny came, or you were there then.

To repeat myself, the destination for "come", unless certain
cases are ruled out by the presence of other deictic information, is
either the encoder's or the decoder's location at either coding time
or reference time. The destination for "go", on the other hand, is
quite simply a place which is distinct from the encoder's location at
coding time. It follows from this difference that there are many
situations where either "go" or "come" would be appropriate. It's
okay to say either

         He'll go to the office tomorrow to pick me up.
    or   He'll come to the office tomorrow to pick me up.

even when the encoder is not in the office at coding time; and, with
similar conditions, these two sentences are also equally okay:

         She'll go there to meet you.
         She'll come there to meet you.

For these last examples I've concentrated on "come" and "go" and
ignored "bring" and "take". In general, "bring" and "take" have the
same possibilities as "come" and "go", with respect to their desti-
nations, but "bring", at least in many dialects, is subject to fewer
conditions than "come". I suspect that in some dialects "bring" has
no deictic components at all, but is merely a destination-oriented
verb having much the same syntactic nature as "deliver". Everybody
agrees that

         Let's come there.

is bad, but many people allow themselves to say things like

         Let's bring it there.

I'm guessing now when I say that: in some dialects, the appropriateness
conditions for "bring" are essentially the same as those for "come";
in some the word is like "deliver"; and in the majority dialect there
is a requirement that the destination be a place where a person having
some importance in the discourse is located. My evidence for this
claim is that many people who would allow themselves to say "Let's
bring it there" when talking about delivering a box of candy to a
friend in a hospital, would not say it when talking about transporting
a flag, say, to the top of a hill on an uninhabited island.

The verbs "bring" and "take", by the way, have different senses
that are relevant to our discussion, and we will shortly discover a
need to keep them apart. A sentence of the form "A brings B to C" is
paraphrasable as either "A enables B to come to C" or "A comes to C

                               ʻ   174

                                                          62

with B accompanying him", or "A comes to C conveying B". We may call these the enabling, the conducting, and the conveying senses of "bring", and we will notice that "take" has likewise three such senses, constructed out of the paraphrases I suggested for "bring" by substituting "go" for "come".

The enabling sense shows up in sentences like:

> A grant from the Ford Foundation brought me to California.
> Fifty bucks will take me to Fresno.

The conducting sense is found in sentences like:

> She brought me to this party.
> Please take me away.

The conveying sense is seen in sentences like:

> I brought it in my pocket.
> I took it to the laundry.

In some languages we find the conducting and conveying meanings separately lexicalized, but not lexicalized with the deictic motion verbs. I have in mind expressions like Japanese "turete kuru/iku" ("come/go accompanying") and "motte kuru/iku" ("come/go carrying").

Even apart from special problems connected with "bring", Hypothesis IV turns out to be unsatisfactory. Consider now sentences like these:

> He came over to my place last night,
>   but I wasn't home.
> I came over to your place last night,
>   but you weren't home.

as opposed to one like:

> I came over to Fred's place last night,
>   but he wasn't home.

which is unacceptable.

In the acceptable cases, the destination of "come" is not a place where either participant is at coding time or was at reference time, but is understood as the home base of one of them. The home base need not be the home base at coding time, because we find acceptable sentences like this one:

> When you lived on Sixth Street, I came over several
>   times to visit you, but nobody was ever home.

. (175

John Lawler pointed out to me that the home base must be the person's home base at reference time, since it is not acceptable, in the home base interpretation, to say

> I came over to that house about a week before you
> bought it.

Here is the latest version of our hypothesis for "come" and "bring", modified to include the home base notion.

> Hypothesis V: "come" and "bring" indicate motion
> toward the location of either the speaker
> or the addressee at either coding time or
> reference time, or toward the location of
> the home base of either the speaker or the
> hearer at reference time.
>
> Fancy Version of Hypothesis V: for the movements in-
> dicated with "come" or "bring", P_n is
> the location at T_n of: the encoder, the
> the encoder's home, the decoder or the
> decoder's home or it is the location of
> either the encoder or the decoder at
> coding time.

But now let's look at some problems connected with sentences which make explicit reference to somebody's home -- sentences containing the adverb "home". The word can be used to indicate Location, Source, Path and Goal, as in the sentences:

> Is Johnny home?
> Fred left home this morning.
> Sheila left for home an hour ago.
> George arrived home after midnight.

(I assume that in the "leave for home" case, although the word "home" identifies the Goal, the phrase "for home" seems rather to indicate the Path.) The word "home" is to be understood as meaning "X's home", and the question I'd like us to consider now is that of identifying "X".

In the locative expressions, "home" designates the home of the person about whose location something is being said. In the motion sentences, it would appear that the home is the home of the person indicated by the subject of the motion verb. Let's represent this as Hypothesis A.

> Hypothesis A: the construction Motion-Verb + "home"
> indicates motion toward the home of the
> person designated by the subject-phrase
> of the Motion-Verb.

There are many sentences which support this hypothesis. In

. (176

64

Johnny went home.

we understand it that where Johnny went was his own home. In

Johnny came home.

we have that understanding again, but this time with the additional
understandings predictable from Hypothesis V. In

I'm going to go home now.

we understand, from the use of "go", that the speaker is not at home at
the time he says it; and in

I'm going to come home now.

we understand that the addressee is taken to be in the speaker's home at
the time the sentence is said, or that the place is also the addressee's
home. Similarly, I can say to you

When are you going to go home?

only if I am not now in your home; and if I say

When are you going to come home?

it is understood either that I am in your house when I say it, or that
it is my house too. All of these things are explainable from Hypothesis
A and Hypothesis V.

But what about "bring" and "take"? In

I brought a lot of work home tonight, Hon.

"home" is the home of the subject of the verb, and similarly with

He took the documents home.

Hypothesis A seems to work, in other words, for "bring" and "take",
too. Or does it? Look at these sentences:

John took the documents home.
John took Sheila home.

The second sentence permits the interpretation that John took Sheila to
her home. To many speakers, this last sentence could also mean that
John took Sheila to his home, but to every speaker, that is the meaning
that would come out if we were to say:

John took Sheila home with him.

Analogously,

> I brought her home.

could mean that I conducted her to her home; but the sentence

> I brought her home with me.

has to mean that she ended up at my place, as the sentence

> I brought the documents home.

says that the documents ended up at my place.

It looks as if Hypothesis A won't do, unless the verbs "bring" and "take" are given different grammatical analyses corresponding to their different uses, and unless the relations referred to in the hypothesis are definable from the semantic representations rather than from the surface structure.

Suppose, for example, that we relate sentences like

> I brought the documents home.
> I took the documents home.

with their paraphrases:

> I came home conveying the documents.
> I went home conveying the documents.

The subject of the motion verb is the owner of the home. The same relationship is also maintained if we relate the two sentences

> I brought Sheila home with me.
> I took Sheila home with me.

with their paraphrases:

> I came home with Sheila accompanying me.
> I went home with Sheila accompanying me.

In these cases the subject of the motion-verb is the same as the subject of the original sentence. In the third use of these verbs, however, they must be analyzed as causatives. The semantic representation of the two sentences

> I brought Sheila home.
> I took Sheila home.

will have to be something like

. (178

    I enabled Sheila to come home.
    I enabled Sheila to go home.

It is Sheila's home, and it is "Sheila" that is the subject of the motion
verb in the paraphrase.

    In short, Hypothesis A can be allowed to stand, but only with the
backing of a grammatical theory which allows the coreference information
needed for interpreting "home" to be determined from a semantic
representation of the sentence.

    But, alas, matters aren't quite that simple. It is easy to see
"bring" and "take" as lexically complex, but there appears to be a
similar problem with the simple motion verbs themselves. Whose homes
are being talked about in these two sentences?

        Can I come home?
        Can I come home with you?

For the first question, the home is my home, as would be predicted from
Hypothesis A; and it's a question I would ask under the condition that
you are at his home when I ask it, or that it's also your home, as would
be predicted from Hypothesis V. But the question "Can I come home with
you?" is a puzzler. The question can be appropriately asked when both
speaker and addressee are away from the destination referred to in the
sentence, and the "home" in question is the addressee's, not the
speaker's. This means that Hypothesis A cannot stand, unless there is
some paraphrase of "Can I come home with you?" that has "you" as the
subject of the motion verb, and unless there is also some reason to
believe that that paraphrase is close to the underlying structure of
the sentence. A candidate for the paraphrase we are after is

        Can I accompany you when you go home?

But the surface sentence had the word "come", and "come" would be in-
appropriate in the paraphrase. The conditions on "come" do not allow
us to say things like

        Are you going to come home?

when the home is the addressee's alone, and the speaker is not at the
addressee's home at coding time or reference time. Exactly parallel
observations could be made for sentences like these but with the parti-
cipants reversed, as with

        Can you come home?
        Can you come home with me?

    There are two problems for these sentences, one having to do with
interpretations of comitative "with"-phrases in general, the other having
to do with the function of "come" in comitative-phrase sentences.

                                    179

It is frequently the case that the entity named by the head noun of a comitative "with"-phrase is the <u>principal actor</u> in the event described by the sentence, and not the <u>companion.</u> Thus, if there is a host/guest relationship between the Browns and the Smiths in a situation described by the sentence

The Browns had dinner with the Smiths yesterday.

the hosts are the Smiths, the guests are the Browns. In third-person motion-verb sentences like

Sheila went home yesterday.
Sheila went home with Schwartz yesterday.

it is understood that Sheila is the principal actor in the first case, the companion in the second case. I have no idea why this is so, but I know at least that it is not a phenomenon that is unique to deictic sentences. Somehow we will want to relate the sentence about Sheila's going home with Schwartz to a representation suggested by

Schwartz went home with Sheila accompanying him.

in order for the principle of Hypothesis A to make it possible to get the identity of the home-owner right.

The puzzle about the appropriateness of the verb "come" in these sentences is another matter. Notice that although the two sentences

Can you come home?
Can you go home?

have very different appropriateness conditions, the two sentences

Can you come home with me?
Can you go home with me?

have essentially the same function if they are uttered away from the speaker's home. Similar observations hold for sentences with the participants reversed. Compare the two sentences

Can I come home?
Can I go home?

with

Can I come home with you?
Can I go home with you?

An understanding of the function of "come" in these sentences will require a revision of Hypothesis V. It has to do with the use of the verb in sentences in which what is relevant is not anything about the

- (180

68

destination of the movement, but the fact that the principal actor is one of the conversation participants, and the sentence is about something or somebody accompanying him.

Suppose that I am planning to spend a year wandering around, far from home, with no particular destination in mind, and I want to invite you to accompany me. I can say,

Would you like to go (along)?

but I could just as well say

Would you like to come (along)?

The same options are available if you are the traveller and I am asking to be invited along. I can ask either of these two questions:

Can I come (along)?
Can I go (along)?

The revised hypothesis must take into account this new condition. I should mention, incidentally, that the companion does not need to be a conversation participant, but the principal actor does. Thus, in the sense I have in mind, it's okay for me to ask if Johnny can join you on a trip by asking

Can Johnny come (with you)?

but it's not okay to ask if I can join Fred on his trip by asking

Can I come (with Fred)?

unless some of the other appropriateness conditions for "come" are satisfied.

> Hypothesis VI [Hypothesis V plus First Addendum]:
> "come" and "bring" also indicate
> motion at reference time which is
> in the company of either the speaker
> or the addressee.

I think that our account of the appropriateness conditions for "come" and "bring" is complete in respect to the occurrence of these verbs in simple sentences concerning which the identity and the location of the conversation participants are relevant. There is also a use of these verbs in third-person narrative, as I have already mentioned, in which the destination appropriate for "come" is a place that is somehow associated with the central character of the narrative at that point -- either his location at reference time or his home base. This doesn't capture it completely, however, because it's also possible to choose a reference place -- a place with which the narrator somehow

associates himself and his reader in imagination -- which has no particular association with a central character. Thus, if I'm talking about an uninhabited island in a little-known lake in Minnesota, I can talk about a loon "coming" there at night and about the waves "bringing" things to its shores. But I can only let this place continue to be the <u>deictic center</u> for motion verbs if I do not bring the speaker or addressee into the same discourse. After describing this island in the way I suggested, I cannot then add

> I would like to come there some day.

One of the observations that I made about the deictic center in third-person discourse is that you can only have one at a time. I pointed out that it's funny to say

> After John came to Fred's house, John and Fred
> together came over to Bill's house.

I suggested once that the recognition of the central character of an episode as reflected in the choice of "come" in English must have some functional similarity to the distinction maintained in the Algonkian languages and a few others between the "proximative" and "obviative" third person pronouns. Only one person (or other animate being) at a time can be referred to with the proximative pronoun, everybody else getting the obviative one.

Anyway, the final version of our account of the deictic motion verbs will be something like this:

Hypothesis VII [Hypothesis VI plus Second Addendum]: "come" and "bring" also indicate, in discourse in which neither speaker nor addressee figures as a character, motion toward a place taken as the subject of the narrative, toward the location of the central character at reference time, or toward the place which is the central character's home base at reference time.

Sometimes it is said of English that the use of "come" for motion toward the addressee should be described as an instance of the speaker's taking the addressee's point of view. If assigning a deictic center can be equated with taking a point of view -- as is suggested by the use in third-person discourse -- then it may be that even in deictically anchored sentences, there can only be one deictic center for these verbs, within a single portion of the discourse.

The claim seems not to be true, but raising the question brings into light a number of interesting new issues. Suppose we are talking about somebody who lives half-way between our houses, and we are thinking about journeys that he might make from his house to your

. (182

house and from his house to my house. (I set the situation up this way merely to rule out ouestions about our being close neighbors and whether his moving toward where you are is simultaneously moving toward where I am.) If both speaker and addressee can be deictic centers for "come" in the same sentence, then the addressee's-point-of-view theory about "coming to see you" won't stand. It happens to be acceptable to most speakers of English to say, in the situation I have in mind, a sentence like

> Either he'll come to your house to watch television
>   tonight, or he'll come to my house to play ping-pong.

and it also seems to be okay to say

> He'll come to your house to watch television, and then
>   after the news he'll come to my house to play ping-pong.

But now I have to ask you what you think of these two sentences.

> He'll come to your house before he comes to my house.
> He'll come to my house after he comes to your house.

Some speakers accept both of these sentences, but a large number uniformly reject the one with "after". The hypothesis that there might be only one deictic center in conversational discourse got disconfirmed by a look at a few examples like these, but in the process I was led to this other horror. I have no idea on earth what to say about it.

It needs to be remembered that the account we ended up with is an account of the semantics of the verb "come" and "bring" in English (and, especially for "bring", not all dialects of English at that), and that words which are like these verbs in other languages might have somewhat different appropriateness conditions prescribed for them.

In many languages, for example, the "come" and "bring" verbs are appropriate for motion toward places associated with the speaker only. In these languages, when Mother calls Junior to the dinner table, Junior says "I'm going", not "I'm coming". "Coming" is motion toward me, not motion toward you. Standard Japanese is like this, but, as I've learned from Haruo Aoki, in a great many dialects -- e.g., Nagasaki -- the pattern is more like what we have in English.

It also happens that the conditions for using "come" and "go" in the accompaniment sense isn't equally free in all languages. In Albanian, I've been told, one says

> Can I go (*come) with you?
> Can you come (*go) with me?

My Chinese informant tells me that, in both Cantonese and Mandarin, both ootions are available if the addressee is the companion and the speaker

- (183

is the traveller, but if it's the other way around, the only option is

Can I go with you?

I don't know how general restrictions of this sort are, across languages, and it's difficult to find out how it works in different languages by reading their grammars. It's something I would like to be able to look into some day.

The words "come" and "go" will come up again in my discussion of social deixis, particularly in connection with what I'll be calling "taking the other fellow's point of view". By the way of preview, I point out that in some languages in which the deictic motion verbs refer basically only to the speaker, it happens that in polite or deferential language, the deictic center can be assigned to the addressee. In Mazahua, according to Don Stuart, this applies not only to the motion verbs, but also to the place-deictic words. A polite letter written in Mazahua will say something like "I wish I could come here to visit you, but I can't get away; can you go there to visit me?", where the meaning is "I wish I could go there, and I'm asking you to come here." (I've invented the example, but I believe it's not misleading.)

With my next lecture I'll return to general questions of deixis.

Postscript I: The "tag along" sense of come, provided for in the Hypothesis VI version, mentions the speaker and addressee, but in this case, the relevant conversation participants are not necessarily the speaker and addressee at the performative level. This is indicated by the unacceptability of the second clause in a sentence like: "Fred asked Mary to come with him to Tahiti, so she came with him."

Postscript II: David Peizer has pointed out to me some of the syntactic consequences of associating the reference place for "go" with the Source, for "come" with the Goal; I believe that Jeff Gruber has made similar observations somewhere. They have to do with the fact that, if the reference place is something which is established in the discourse, sentences in which the speaker implies ignorance of the reference place are bad. The principle predicts, therefore, that sentences like "Where did he go?" are all right, but "Where did he come?" are bad (in the motion-verb sense of "come"), and, similarly, that "He went to somewhere " and "He came from somewhere" are acceptable, while "He went from somewhere" and "He came to somewhere" are not.

· (184