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Introduction

6. Verbs for "come" and "go," when used as verbs of motion, are not semantically equivalent across languages. The conditions that require the verb for "come" in one language often require "go" in other languages, and it is not usually clear what the differences are between the uses in any pair of languages. Some research has been done on the appropriateness conditions of the English verbs *come* and *go*. For example, Charles Fillmore, in his *Santa Cruz Lectures on deixis* (1971), offers a quite thorough analysis of these verbs, and Eve Clark's discussion of *come* and *go* in her "Normal States and Evaluative Viewpoints" (1974) contributes to our understanding of the idiomatic uses of these verbs. As for "come" and "go" in other languages, there is Anjani Singh's (1972) report on some uses of these verbs in Hindi. Beyond these, however, as far as I know, not much is available in the literature on analyses of these verbs in other languages, and even less is written on comparisons of the uses of these verbs across languages. In this paper, I would like to offer an initial attempt at cross-linguistic comparison by examining the appropriateness conditions for the verbs for "come" and "go" in Spanish, Japanese, English, and Turkish.
1. In order to compare the four languages in situations that are as constant as possible, a list of sentences and a set of pictures depicting situations in which the sentences are uttered were drawn up (Tables I and II). The sentences, combined with the pictures, were designed to include (a) movement towards and away from the speaker by the addressee and by a third party, (b) movement towards and away from the addressee by the speaker and by a third party, and (c) movement which is neither towards nor away from the location of the speaker or the addressee. Sentences A through J of Table I can be uttered in the situations given in the first three pictures of Table II, and sentences K and L are uttered in the situations depicted in pictures K and L, respectively.

Native speakers of English were asked to insert came or go into the given sentences according to the individual situations. Native speakers of the other three languages were asked to translate each sentence into as close and as natural a sentence as possible in their languages. If speakers judged that both the verbs for "came" and "go" could be used in a given situation, they were asked to indicate what the different choice of verbs would mean to them, if indeed there was a difference.

Using these responses as basic data, supplemented by further responses to questions suggested by these initial sentences, the conditions for the uses of the two verbs were drawn up. For each language, the appropriateness of conditions for the verbs for "came" and "go" can nicely be expressed in terms of a set of intersections of presuppositions
A. Are you to my house now / tonight?
B. May I to your house now / tonight?
C. i. Are you to the movie now / tonight?
ii. Are you to the movie with me now / tonight?
D. i. I'm to the movie now / tonight.
ii. May I to the movie with you now / tonight?
E. Is John to my house now / tonight?
F. Is John to your house now / tonight?
G. Is John to the movie now / tonight?
H. Is John to the movie with me (us) now / tonight?
I. Is John to the movie with you now / tonight?

K. a. (A to C)
   1. Please is.
   2. I'm is.

b. (B to C)
   1. Please is.
   2. (about A) He is is.

c. (B to C about A)
   He is is.

L. 1. (A to C) (C is getting very anxious.)
   Don't worry. The waiter's is.
   2. (A to C)
      The waiter's is to my table. Then he'll is to yours.
   3. (A to a)
      The waiter's is to our table. Then he'll is to that one.

Table 1

Sentences in which "come" or "go" must be inserted.

brought to the discourse and assertions being made.

Spanish

2. Let us first review the appropriate sets of intersections for Spanish. In Spanish, the verbs we are concerned with are venir and ir ("come" and "go," respectively). The first case in which venir is used
Table II

Situations in which sentences of Table I are uttered.
can be defined as having the presupposition that the destination place, or place of reference \( (P_x) \), is identical to the place where the speaker is located at the time of the utterance \( (P_u) \), and the assertion that someone \((y)^2\) moves to the place of reference. We can represent this as in (S1):

(S1)  
\[
\text{verir}  
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Presupposition} & \text{Assertion} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[ P_r = P_u \]

\[ y \text{ moves to } P_r \]

This condition accounts for the exclusive use of verir in sentences like 1 and 2.

1. \textit{Ven acá.}  
"Come here."

2. \textit{Juan viene aquí a las ocho.}  
"Juan’s coming here at 8:00."

The second use of verir is as in (S2):

(S2)  
\[
\text{verir}  
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Presupposition} & \text{Assertion} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[ P_r \neq P_u \]

\[ x \text{ moves to } P_r \]

and

\[ \text{speaker will be at } P_r \text{ at time of reference } (T_r) \]

and

\[ \text{speaker is involved with } P_r \text{ or action to take place there.} \]
The involvement of the speaker with \( P \) may range from his owning that place to his sponsoring something like a party to be given there. This condition can be found in sentences like 3, uttered in a situation, for example, in which the addressee is going to have a party tonight and the speaker will be going and will be helping in the preparations for the party.

3. \( \text{Viste Juan a tu casa esta noche?} \)
   "Is Juan coming to your house tonight?"

It is probable that both the second and third presuppositions are needed for condition (32) to hold. If only the second holds, the choice of \( \text{venir} \) in sentence 3 is not very strong, and \( \text{ir} \) would probably be used instead. If the third only holds, then sentences like 4 and 5 are judged ungrammatical.

4. \( \text{No estaré yo, pero vengo a la casa esta noche a limpiarla.} \)
   "I won't be home, but I am coming to clean the house tonight."
   (said to maid)

5. \( \text{Siento que no estuviera madr anoche cuando viniste a mi casa.} \)
   "I'm sorry nobody was home last night when you came to my house."

The third condition for \( \text{venir} \) involves the accompaniment of the speaker with the person asserted to be moving (the "mover"). It can be stated as in (33):
(63) **venir**

Presupposition \( P_r \neq P_u \)

Movement \( x \) moves to \( P_r \)

and

mover will be accompanied by speaker

This is the normal understanding of sentences like 6 and 7,

6. **Vienes al cine?**  
   "Are you coming to the cinema?"

7. **Quieres venir a una fiesta?**  
   "Do you want to come to a party?"

where the addressee is involved in the movement with the speaker, and (63) can also apply to the movement of a third party with the speaker, without the addressee, as in 8.

8. **Pregúntale a Juan si viene venir a la fiesta.**  
   "Ask Juan if he can come to the party."

There seems to be a strong inclination, however, to understand sentences involving an assertion about a third party as if both the speaker and the addressee will be accompanying him. My feeling is that this is the case probably because the speaker would be likely to ask Juan himself if the second person was not going along.

It is of note that when the expression **conmigo** ("with me") is overt in the sentence, as in 9 and 10, the difference between **venir** and **ir**
3. Quieres venir / ir a una fiesta conmigo?
"Do you want to come / go to a party with me?"

10. Pregúntale a Juan si puede venir / ir a la fiesta conmigo.
"Ask Juan if he can come / go to the party with me."

In these sentences, what is covertly understood as the presupposition carried by venir without conmigo is made explicit, causing venir conmigo to have essentially the same implications as ir conmigo. Some speakers feel that there is a slight distinction in intimacy between the two, with the sentences with venir conmigo showing a greater degree of intimacy.

If some of the above presuppositions is involved, the speaker must use ir when choosing between the two verbs. This is stated in diagram (24):

(24) ir

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presupposition</th>
<th>Assertion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P_r ≠ P_a</td>
<td>y moves to P_r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(unmarked</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>speaker not involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in any of above ways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This case accounts for ir in most sentences — e.g., 11 and 12.
11. ¿Va Juan a tu casa esta noche?
   "Is Juan going to your house tonight?"

12. Vas al cine?
   "Are you going to the cinema?"

And, finally, the fifth condition involves the movement of anyone away from the location of the speaker:

(35) ir
Presupposition       Assertion
Pr = source          y moves away from source

Case (35) holds in sentences like 13 and 14, where ir only can be used.

13. Puedo ir ya?
   "Can I go now?"

   "Go away from here!"

Japanese

3. Let us now turn to Japanese. In the Japanese uses of kuru
   ("come"), the speaker appears to be the principal center of motion.
   The first appropriateness condition for Japanese is identical to that
   of Spanish.

(31) kuru
Presupposition      Assertion
Pr = Pr             y moves to Pr
This condition accounts for the exclusive use of *kuru* in sentences 15 and 16, when uttered at the place of destination.

15. Watashi no uchi ni kimaru ka?
   "Are you (he, etc.) coming to my house?"

16. Haitte *kite* kodasai.
   "Please come in."

In most cases involving movement that is not towards the place of utterance, the use of *iku* ("go") is preferred. However, if the speaker somehow identifies with the destination place, the verb *kuru* is used instead.

(J2) *kuru*

Presupposition                               Assertion
\[ P_r \neq P_u \]
\[ x \text{ moves to } P_r \]

and

speaker identifies with \( P_r \)

For example, even if the speaker will not be home tonight, he will use *kuru* in sentences 17 and 18 because he identifies with his home.

17. John wa kissai watashi no uchi ni kimaru ka?
   "Is John coming to my house tonight?"

18. Kissai (anata wa) watashi no uchi ni kimaru ka?
   "Are you coming to my house tonight?"

Similarly, if the speaker is the owner of a theater, or the sponsor of
a movie to be shown at a theater, he will use **kuru** in 19 and 20.

19. KoNan eiga ni kimasu ka?
    "Are you coming to the movie tonight?"

20. John wa eiga ni kita ka de sou ka?
    "Would John like to come to the movie?"

The third condition is closely related to the second, and might be considered as included in it. Just as the speaker might identify with a particular place of destination, he can also identify with the addressee, who is located at the place of destination:

\[ \text{(J3) } \text{**kuru**} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presupposition</th>
<th>Assertion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( P_r \neq P_a )</td>
<td>( w ) moves to ( P_r )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P_r ) = location of ( r ) addressee ( (p_a) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaker identifies with addressee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under this condition, sentence 21 is acceptable, for example, in a case where you and I are teachers, and John is a student.

21. John wa ima anata no uchi ni kimasu ka?
    "Is John coming to your house now?"

The final appropriateness condition for the use of **kuru** appears
To be much more prominent than the preceding three, at least for some speakers. It involves the accompaniment of the speaker with the mover:

(34) kuru

Presupposition
Pr ≠ Pu

Assertion
x moves to Pr

and

mover will be accompanied by speaker

Under this condition, sentences 22 and 23 can be uttered.

22. John wa ima (watashi to) eiga ni kimasu ka?
"Is John coming to the movie (with me) now?"

23. Watashi wa kore kara ikimasu; umeta no kitai ni desu ka?
"I'm going right now; is you want to come also?"

Some speakers seem to feel that the use of kuru under this condition also implies that the speaker's actions are primary, and those of the second or third party are secondary. For instance, the speaker may have to take care of the other and be responsible for his actions. If the two parties are on an equal level, then the choice of iku is preferred by these speakers.

Any movement that is not marked for any of the above presuppositions is encoded with iku, as in (35):
(35) **Iku**

Presupposition  \[ P_r \neq P_u \]

Assertion  \[ \text{y moves to } P_r \]

For example, sentence 24.

24. ima eiga ni ikimaus ka?
"Are you (he, etc.) going to the movie now?"

Finally, movement away from where the speaker is located at the time of utterance, as in 25 and 26,

25. Itte mo ii desu ka?
"Is it alright (for me, him, etc.) to go?"

26. Vecta wa watashi-tachi no tteburu ni kimae, sore kara uno

hito no tteburu ni ikimasu.
"The waiter’s coming to our table, then he’s going to that man’s table."

is always expressed with **Iku**:

(36) **Iku**

Presupposition  \[ P_u = \text{source} \]

Assertion  \[ \text{y moves away from source} \]
English

4. In English, the role of the addressee as a center of motion is more prominent than in either Spanish or Japanese. For this reason, the necessary presupposition and assertion conditions can best be expressed in sets of two.

In the first set, we find the first condition identical to that of the first Spanish and Japanese presupposition—assertion pairs.

(R1) (A) come

Presupposition          Assertion
$P_r = P_u$          $y$ moves to $P_r$

This condition accounts for the exclusive use of *come* in sentences such as 27 to 29.

27. *Come* here.
28. I'm *coming* back in 5 minutes.
29. John is *coming* here at 10:00 tonight.

The second member of the set is similar to the first, except that the place of reference is the location of the addressee at the time of utterance:

(R1) (B) come

Presupposition          Assertion
$P_r = P_a$          $y$ moves to $P_r$
For example, if the addressee is at home, and the speaker calls him by phone, he would use *come* to the exclusion of *go* in sentences like 30 through 32.

30. Can I *come* over now?
31. Is John *coming* to your house tonight?
32. If you're going out right now, could you please call me when you *come* back home?

Note that the movement of the speaker towards the addressee is not excluded here, as it automatically is for Japanese condition (J3), where motion towards the addressee can be encoded with *kuru* only if the speaker considers the addressee an extension of himself.

The second set of conditions involves the presupposed presence of the speaker or addressee at the destination at the time of reference (T_r).

---

(ES) (A) some

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presupposition</th>
<th>Assertion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( x \neq P_a ) or ( P_a )</td>
<td>( x ) moves to ( P_r )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and

speaker will be at \( P_r \) at \( T_r \)

Condition (ES A) is the primary reading of sentences 33 through 36, uttered in a context where neither the speaker nor the addressee is located at the destination place at the time of utterance.
33. Are you coming to the movie tonight?
34. Is John coming to the movie tonight?
35. When you come to the dance, Mary will see you.
36. When John comes to the pool, I'll call you.

Condition (EP B),

(Ep) (b) come

Presupposition Assertion
\[ P_r \neq P_a \text{ or } P_s \]
and
addresser will be
at \( P_r \) at \( T_r \).

is the primary reading of sentences 37 and 38, uttered in a context where neither the speaker nor the addressee is located at the destination point at the time of utterance.

37. I've decided to come to the movie tonight.
38. John and I are coming to the dance.

Note that the assertion for (Ep B) involves the movement of the speaker only, not of anyone else. Most speakers find sentences 39 and 40.

39. *Is John coming to the movie tonight?
40. *Do you know if John is coming to the luncheon?
unacceptable under the conditions just stated — i.e., where the speaker will not be present at the destination, but the addressee will. Hence, the presuppositions of (E3 B) are not sufficient to choose come in sentences in which the movement is asserted to be that of a third party.

Set (E3) involves accompaniment by the speaker (E3 A) or by the hearer (E3 B). Under the conditions of (E3 A),

(E3) A come

Preposition Assertion
\[ \neg \left( \neg P_u \text{ or } \neg P_a \right) \quad \text{x moves to } P_r \]

and

never will be accompanied by speaker

in a context in which the speaker is preparing to leave for a party, he may ask his roommate sentence 41, or about a third roommate sentence 42 or 43.

41. Are you coming to the party?
42. Is John coming to the party?
43. Do you know if John's coming to the party?

When with me is overt in the sentence, as in 44 through 46,

44. Are you coming / going to the party with me?
45. Is John coming / going to the party with me?
46. Do you know if John's coming / going to the party with me?
the difference between come and go is, again, more or less neutralized, because what was presupposed in 4.1 through 4.3 -- namely, the accompaniment of the speaker -- is asserted, leading to the leveling of come and go.

It is of interest that the satisfaction of this condition does not necessarily imply the satisfaction of condition (E2 A) above. For example, in a situation where John needs a ride home and the speaker will pass Joan's house on the way to his own home, the speaker can say 4.7, even though their final destinations are not identical.

47. John can come (with me) in my car.

The second member of set (E3) is as follows:

(E3) (H) come

Presupposition

Assertion

\[ P_f \neq P_b \text{ or } P_a \]

speaker moves to \( P_f \)

and

addresser will accompany never

This condition is found in sentences like 4.8 and 4.9, in which a child might be speaking to his mother who is preparing to go out.

48. Can I come?

49. I'm coming to the park.

As might be predicted, the explicit presence of with you leads to
neutralization of the differences between \textit{come} and \textit{go} in meaning, as \textit{with} \textit{me} does in (R3 A). We see this in 50 and 51.

50. Can I \textit{come} / \textit{go} \textit{with} \textit{you}?

51. I'm \textit{coming} / \textit{going} to the park \textit{with} \textit{you}.

Note again that the assertion in (R3 B) only concerns the motion of the speaker. A sentence like 52, in which the movement is asserted to be that of a third party, can not be uttered under the conditions of (R3 B).

52. * Is Johnny \textit{coming} to the movie \textit{(with you)}?

This leads us to the question of sentences like 53.

53. Can Johnny \textit{come} \textit{(with you)}?

My formulation of (R3 B) appears not to allow such utterances as this in situations where the speaker himself will not be going to the place in question. Fillmore (1971) points out that such a sentence is acceptable, while 54 is unacceptable.

54. * Can I \textit{come} \textit{(with Fred)}?

His hypothesis is that the companion does not need to be a conversation participant, but the principal actor does. Thus . . . it's okay for me to ask if Johnny can \textit{join} \textit{you} on a trip by asking "Can Johnny \textit{come} \textit{(with you)}?" but it's not okay to ask if I can \textit{join} Fred on his trip by asking "Can I \textit{come} \textit{(with Fred)}?" (p. 66)
However, Fillmore's analysis cannot explain the unacceptability of 52 in a case where the speaker himself is not going. The formulation in (E3 a) and (E3 b) can explain these problems. Sentence 54 is disallowed because the accompanist is neither the speaker, as in (E3 a), nor the addressee, as in (E3 b); hence, it does not meet the conditions for either of them.

The acceptability of 53 and unacceptability of 52 require a more thorough explanation. Let us compare sentences 52 and 53, along with 55 and 56, all said under the presuppositions of (E3 b).

55. Johnny will come (with you).
56. * Is Johnny capable of coming (with you)?

Sentences 53 and 55 are acceptable, but 52 and 56 are not. The reason is, I believe, because in 53 and 55 the speaker is speaking on behalf of Johnny. In 53 he is asking permission on the part of Johnny, and in 55 he is making the decision for Johnny. In 52 and 56, however, the speaker is detached from Johnny's going; he is merely asking for the facts of the matter. For this reason, sentences 53 and 55 are seen as special cases of (E3 b) above, in that Johnny is an extension of the speaker.

The fourth set, largely drawn from the insights offered by Fillmore (1971) in his discussion of the "home base," and closely related to the Japanese speaker identification with the place or person of the destination, is as in (E4):
(E4) (A) **come**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presupposition</th>
<th>Assertion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( P_r \neq P_u ) or ( P_a )</td>
<td>( x ) moves to ( P_r )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P_r ) = speaker's home base at ( T_r )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) **come**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presupposition</th>
<th>Assertion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( P_r \neq P_u ) or ( P_a )</td>
<td>( z ) moves to ( P_r )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P_r ) = addressee's home base at ( T_r )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This set accounts for the acceptability of **come** in sentences like 57 and 58, 59 and 60, in particular when uttered when the speaker or addressee is not at home at the time of utterance.

57. - 59. I’m sorry I wasn’t home when you / John came to my house last week.

59. - 60. There wasn’t anybody home when I / John came to your house last week.

If none of the presuppositions of sets (E1) through (E4) is present, or if it is known that the conditions are not met, then the verb **go** is used. Hence, diagram (E5):
Condition (E5) accounts for the use of *go* in sentences like 61 and 62.

61. You're *going* to a movie tonight.
62. John's *going* to Kansas City tomorrow.

Lastly, condition (E6),

(E6)  
Presupposition  Assertion
\[ P_r \neq P_u \text{ or } P_a \]  \[ y \text{ moves away from source} \]

yields *go* when the motion is away from the speaker or addressee as in

63 and 64.

63. *Go* away.
64. Is John *going* so soon?

**Turkish**

5. Finally, in Turkish, the use of *gel-* ("come") and *git-* ("go")
are in most respects similar to those of English *come* and *go*. Turkish, like English, recognizes the addressee as a possible center of motion, but does so to an even greater extent than English. The first set of presupposition - assertion pairs is identical to that of English.

\[(T1) (A) \text{ gel-} \]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{Presupposition} & \quad \text{Assertion} \\
\Pr = \Pr & \quad y \text{ moves to } \Pr
\end{align*}\]

\[(T1) (B) \text{ gel-} \]
\[\begin{align*}
\Pr = \Pr & \quad y \text{ moves to } \Pr
\end{align*}\]

Like English *come*, *gel-* is used under these conditions to the exclusion of *giz-*. We find condition \((T1 \, A)\) in sentences like 65 and 66, uttered when the speaker is at home.

65. Sana *geliyor musun?*  
"Are you coming to me (to my house)?"  

66. John simul bana *geliyor mu?*  
"Is John coming to me (to my house) now?"

\[(T1 \, B)\] is the same as \((T1 \, A)\), except that the addressee is located at the place of destination at the time of the utterance. Sentences 67 and 68 satisfy this condition.

67. Sıddi sana *geliyebilir miyim?*  
"Can I come to you (to your house) now?"
68. John bu əkəsən uixe əpəiyor mu?
   "Is John coming to you (to your house) tonight?"

These two conditions might be combined as in (TI'):

(TI') əpə-
Presupposition        Assertion
P_r = P_y or P_a         y moves to P_r

The second set for Turkish places the emphasis on the mutual participation of the persons involved in the action to take place at P_r.

(T2) (A) əpə-
Presupposition        Assertion
P_r ≠ P_y or P_a         x moves to P_r
and
speaker will be participating with other at P_r

(T2 A) gives əpə- in sentences like 69 and 70.

69. Bu əkəsən sinema da əpəjərməsun?
   "Are you coming to the movie this evening?"

70. John sinema da əpəiyor mu?
   "Is John coming to the movie?"

Note that under this condition the presence of the speaker at the place in question is necessarily implied, but his presence is not sufficient for the choice of əpə- in 69 and 70. That is, if I am going to the movie but will not be joining with you or John at the movie, I would use
**giti** instead of **geli** in such sentences. Note also that under this condition, it is not necessary that the persons involved accompany each other to the destination; they need only participate together once they are there.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition (T2 B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>geli</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presupposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_r \neq F_u$ or $F_u$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z$ moves to $F_r$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addressee will be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participating with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other at $F_r$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

is identical to (T2 A), except that the addressee is presupposed to participate with the other party involved. Note that this condition, unlike the corresponding English condition, (E2 B), does not exclude assertions about someone other than the speaker. Thus, under this condition, not only can one say sentences like 71, but also those like 72.

71. *Sima cinemaya geliyorum.*
    "I'm coming to the movie now."

72. *John cinemaya geliyor m?
    "Is John coming to the movie?"

It is interesting to note that the choice of *giti* in the latter case is not so strong as in the former, for *giti* is also acceptable in 72, whereas *geli* is not acceptable in 71.
Again, we might want to collapse both parts of set (T2) as in (T2'):

\[(T2')\]

**pre**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presupposition</th>
<th>Assertion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(P_x \neq P_y ) or (P_a)</td>
<td>someone other than the presupposed participant moves to (P_y)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and

a speech participant (speaker or addressee) will be participating with mover at \(P_y\).

The third case involves the accompaniment of the speaker or addressee with another.

\[(T3) (a)\]

**pre**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presupposition</th>
<th>Assertion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(P_x \neq P_y ) or (P_a)</td>
<td>x moves to (P_y)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and

mover will be accompanied by speaker.

\[(T3) (b)\]

**pre**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presupposition</th>
<th>Assertion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(P_x \neq P_y ) or (P_a)</td>
<td>z moves to (P_y)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and

mover will be accompanied by addressee.

Under (T3 A), for example, if the speaker is going to the store, he might say to his roommate sentence 73.
73. Benimle gel.
"Come with me."

Or if someone is looking for a ride home, the speaker might offer him a ride with sentence 74.

74. Bizim arabayla gel.
"Come with (in) our car."

Similarly, if, for example, both John and you need rides home, and Mary and I have cars, Mary and I may decide that John lives closer to me and you live closer to Mary. As a result, I may say to you sentence 75.

75. Sen Mary'in arabayla gidiyorsun, John da benim arabanla gidiyorum.
"You're going in Mary's car, John's coming in my car."

Under condition (73 b), I might say 76 when I am looking for a ride.

76. Senin arabanın gelebilir misin? 
"Can I come in your car?"

Or if Mary and John have asked for rides home, and I and you have agreed to take John and Mary home, respectively, I may say to you, to remind you, 77.

77. Mary senin arabanın gidiyor.
"Mary's coming in your car."

The effect that the presence of benimle ("with me") or seninle
("with you") and no one speaker's judgments is interesting. In sentences involving the movement and accompaniment of the speech participants, as in 78 and 79, gel- is judged more acceptable than git-, which "sounds rather awkward."

78. Seniyele sindi sinemaya geliyor musun?
"Are you coming to the movie with me now?"

79. Sindi seniyele sinemaya gelebilir misiniz?
"Can I come to the movie with you now?"

In sentences like 80,

80. John seniyele geliyor mu?
"Is John coming with me?"

where the speaker is presupposed to accompany the hearer, and the assertion concerns a third party, the use of gel- with beniyele is preferred, yet git- appears more natural than in the sentences involving both the speaker and the addressee. Lastly, in sentences where the presupposition involves the accompaniment by the addressee, and the assertion concerns a third party, the difference between a sentence with gel- and the corresponding sentence with git- is almost non-existent. This is true, for example, for 81 and 82.

81. John seniyele sinemaya geliyor mu?
"Is John coming to the movie with you?"

82. John seniyele sinemaya gidiyor mu?
"Is John going to the movie with you?"

As before, we might want to combine the two parts of (T1) as in (T1'):
The fourth set for Turkish involves the “home base” phenomenon. Condition (T4 A),

(74) (a) gei-

Presupposition                        Assertion
F_r ≠ F_u or F_a                      \text{someone other than the presupposed participant moves to } F_r
and
F_r \text{ = speaker's } \text{"home base" at } F_r

is operative in a sentence like §3.

§3. Gecey hafıza bize getirildi, evde olsadıga çok Samim. 
"I was very sorry that I wasn't at home when you came last week."

Condition (T4 B),

(74) (b) gei-

Presupposition                        Assertion
F_r ≠ F_u or F_a                      \text{z moves to } F_r
and
F_r \text{ = addressee's } \text{"home base"}
yields gel- in a sentence like 84.

84. DÜS nesam John peldiginde neden evde degildin?  
"Why weren't you at home when John came last night?"

In sentences which are not expressed in the past, there is dis-
agreement among speakers on whether the speaker or addresses would have
to be home to use gel- in sentences like 85 and 86.

85. ? John bu nesam bana geliyor mu?  
"Is John coming to me (to my house) tonight?"

86. ? John bu nesam size geliyor mu?  
"Is John coming to you (to your house) tonight?"

Again, we might reformulate these conditions as in (Tv'):

(Tv')    gel-
Presupposition  Assertion
P_r ≠ P_u or P_a  someone other than person
and  presuppositionally involved
P_r  moves to P_r
P_r  a speech
participant's
home base

The last two sets yield gel- in Turkish. Condition (Tv)

(Tv)    gel-
Presupposition  Assertion
P_r ≠ P_u or P_a  y moves to P_r
and  (unmarked
or
marked absence of any of above conditions)
can be found, for example, in 87, said in a context where nothing is presupposed about the speaker or addressee.

87. John sinemaya *git*por mat
   "Is John going to the movie?"

Condition (76),

(76) *git-

Presupposition              Assertion
F_y or F_n = source         y moves away from source

accounts for the exclusive use of *git-* in sentences like the second clause of sentence 88.

88. Carson Some bizim masaya gitezek sonra Susirune giditek.
   "The waiter will come to our table first, then he'll go to that one."

Conclusion

6. Looking at all four languages together, it is clear that no two languages presented here have exactly the same appropriateness conditions for their verbs for "come" and "go." Several observations on their likenesses and differences can be made, however.

One thing that they all agree on is that movement towards the speaker's location at the time of utterance is always encoded with "come," and movement away from where the speaker is located at the time of utterance is encoded with "go."
Secondly, it is apparent that for all four languages, in those situations in which either "come" or "go" can be used, it is always the verb for "go" that is unmarked presuppositionally. That is, in these contexts, "come" always carries some presuppositions, while "go" can carry the negation of those presuppositions, or none at all.

Thirdly, it also appears that these languages agree that accompaniment by the speaker with the mover is also encoded with "come," though perhaps with some restriction in Japanese.

And, fourthly, though this was only mentioned above with respect to Spanish, it seems true that in most cases where the presuppositional component is asserted -- e.g., in the sentences with with me -- "come" lends some degree of intimacy or closeness, whether in time, or distance, or emotion. This is perhaps the case also in sentences judged to be marginal.

One of the primary differences we can see in these four languages has to do with which members of the conversation can act as centers of motion for "come." We find this ranges from the exclusive use of the speaker as center in Spanish to an almost equal use of the speaker and the addressee as center in Turkish.

A second important difference lies in the presuppositions carried by "come," when the M is distinct from the location of the center of motion at the time of utterance. If the analysis here for each language is basically correct, no two languages examined have exactly the same presuppositions with "come" in these contexts. However, divergent as
these languages are in this respect, they still demonstrate some sharing
of many of the same presuppositional components, but with different
weight given to the individual components in each language. For example,
the identity of the speaker with P, a major factor in the choice of
kuru in Japanese, appears as a minor factor in the "home base" phenomenon
in English and Turkish. Or, the presupposed presence of the speaker at
P at the time of reference, a major factor in English, appears as a
very minor factor in Spanish. This suggests that once data from many
other languages are examined and compared with what is found here, and
the analysis of the data here has been refined so that any details that
may have been overlooked are included, we will be able to set up a
finite, universal, and possibly quite small, set of presuppositions used
for verbs of "coming."

Footnotes

1 Throughout this paper, "come" and "go" will refer to the verbs
in any language which are roughly translatable into English as come and
go. Actual lexical items of particular languages will always be under-
lined.

2 I would like to thank the following informants for their time
and patience: Karen Booker and Geoff Gathercole (English), Yoshiko Kage
and Kinuko Yamamoto (Japanese), Bertha Rodriguez and Santiago Revin
(Spanish), and Feray and Mehmet Yamas (Turkish).

3 The following variables will be used throughout this paper:
X is a variable which can be replaced by anyone, excluding the speaker
and the addressee
X is a variable which can be replaced by anyone, excluding the speaker
Y is a variable which can be replaced by anyone
Z is a variable which can be replaced by anyone, excluding the addressee.
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