

## ON COMING AND GOING IN ENGLISH AND GERMAN

GISA RAUH

*University of Göttingen*

In several of his works C. J. Fillmore has pointed out the deictic nature of the motion verbs *come* and *go* in English (Fillmore 1966, 1970, 1971a, 1971, 1972)<sup>1</sup>. Unlike the motion verbs *run* or *fly*, for example, *come* and *go* carry no information concerning the manner or means of a movement; they simply express motion from one place to another, whereby, however, they may indicate information about the source and the goal of the movement, information which is not derivable from the linguistic context but from the situation in which a sentence is uttered. Such deictic information concerns the identity of the speaker, the coding place and the coding time of a locutionary act and the identity of the addressee, and if the communication takes place via letter or telephone, the decoding time and the decoding place of the locutionary act.<sup>2</sup> Fillmore points out that *come* indicates motion toward the location of the speaker or the addressee at either coding time or reference time (Fillmore 1971a:68) and *go* indicates motion toward a location which is distinct from the speaker's location at coding time (Fillmore 1971a:53). Thus the use of *come* in (1)

(1) He comes to the office tomorrow.

predicts that either the speaker or the addressee are located at the reference place at either coding time or reference time. If this is not the case *go* must appear in this context.

A superficial investigation of German *kommen* and *gehen* seems to lead to similar results as far as the deictic nature of these verbs is concerned. Thorough investigation, however, brings out a difference which is relevant for *kommen* and *gehen* in contexts where change of place implies change of state,

<sup>1</sup> A review of Fillmore's analysis of *come* is presented by G. Cinque (1973).

<sup>2</sup> For more discussion of deixis see C. J. Fillmore (1971, 1971a) and G. Rauh (1978).

and where *kommen* and *gehen* do not behave like *come* and *go*. The generalizations which have to be made for the German verbs in this area differ considerably from those which E. Clark (1974) suggests for the English verbs, which will be discussed later.

This paper presents an investigation and comparison of the use of German *kommen* and *gehen* and English *come* and *go* as motion verbs and as verbs of change of state or change of place in those contexts where both verbs may occur, that is, in sentences which may be considered as minimal pairs. It is not intended to give a full semantic analysis of the verbs in question nor is the concern of this paper to present an explanation for all occurrences of either *kommen* or *gehen* even where they express change of state; and the generalizations achieved hold only for cases in which *kommen* and *gehen* occur in minimal pairs.

If the analysis of *kommen* and *gehen* is first restricted to their use as motion verbs, the motion being performed by a person or thing, *kommen* like English *come*, indicates motion towards speaker's location, addressee's location or speaker and addressee's location if they are located at the same place at either coding or reference time. Thus for an utterance of (2)

- (2) Franz muß gleich kommen.  
Franz will come soon.

the following situations are possible. Speaker and addressee are both located at the coding place at coding time and the speaker announces the expected arrival of a person named *Franz*. If the communication takes place via telephone then the place of *Franz*'s arrival can be either the speaker's or the addressee's location. Without any context information, sentence (2) is three ways ambiguous and may be disambiguated by adding complements which express the deictic goal of the motion performed by *Franz*. Thus, sentences (3), (4) and (5), respectively, describe these possible situations:

- (3) Franz muß gleich zu uns kommen.  
Franz will come to us soon.  
(4) Franz muß gleich zu mir kommen.  
Franz will come to me soon.  
(5) Franz muß gleich zu dir kommen.  
Franz will come to you soon.

The occurrence of the pronouns *uns*, *mir*, *dir* as constituents of the preposition phrases determines the goal of the movement as a deictically specified place. If instead of a deictic preposition phrase a sentence contains a non-deictic expression to indicate the reference place, as in (6)

- (6) Kommt Paul Sonntag auch ins Theater?  
Will Paul come to the theatre on Sunday?

then the occurrence of *kommen* predicts that either speaker or addressee or both will be at the reference place (*Theater*) at reference time (*Sonntag*). Reference place and deictic place as either speaker's or addressee's location at reference time are identical.

The replacement of *kommen* by *gehen* in (6) changes the situation in such a way that now neither speaker nor addressee have to be at the reference place at reference time. This, however, does not mean that they must not be there under any circumstances, since a question like (7)

- (7) Geht Paul Sonntag auch ins Theater?  
Will Paul go to the theatre on Sunday?

may lead to further statements such as (8) or (9)

- (8) Dann gehe ich auch.  
Then I'll go, too.  
(9) Dann geh du doch auch.  
Then, why don't you go, too?

which may prepare a final situation where speaker, addressee and a person named Paul meet at the indicated place at reference time. Analogous examples can also be found in English. It may be deduced, therefore, that with *kommen* in this context the goal of the movement has deictic qualities, while with *gehen* no deictic qualities can be distinguished. In sentences (7)–(9) it is not the goal of the movement which is relevant but rather the fact that a movement has been or is going to be performed. If one of the two prominent points of a movement, source and goal, has any relevance at all in the context of *gehen*, then this is the starting point or the source, as the following contrasting examples demonstrate:

- (10) Ich komme jetzt.  
I'm coming.  
(11) Ich gehe jetzt.  
I'm leaving.

Since the goal of *kommen* is either speaker's or addressee's location and since it is not possible for the speaker to move towards his own location (unless his home base is meant), sentence (10) predictably expresses movement towards the addressee's location. A paraphrase for (10) is therefore (12):

- (12) Ich komme jetzt zu dir.  
I'm coming to you now.



In (11), however, the goal of the movement is not predictable, but the source is, that is, the source of the movement expressed in (11) is the speaker's location.

Predictability of the source of the movement in sentences with *gehen* and of the goal in sentences with *kommen* is the reason why both source and goal are specified, and thus identifiable, if sentences with *gehen* contain a complement indicating the goal and sentences with *kommen* contain a complement indicating the source. In (13) and (14)

- (13) Ich komme vom Bahnhof.  
I'm coming from the station.  
(14) Ich gehe zum Bahnhof.  
I'm going to the station.

both source and goal of the movement are specified. Predictability of the deictic source of a movement in the context of *gehen* is, however, not only guaranteed if the person who performs the movement is either the speaker or the addressee as G. Wotjak (1971) in his attempt to present a semantic analysis of *kommen* and *gehen* would like to have us believe. His argument goes as follows: German *gehen* as a verb of motion indicates movement towards a location where neither speaker nor addressee are located; and since speaker and addressee are always simultaneously present at the same place, i.e. the location of the locutionary act, *gehen* always expresses withdrawing oneself ("Sich-Entfernen" (Wotjak 1971:218)). German *kommen*, however, indicates movement towards the place where speaker and/or addressee are located. Thus, so Wotjak's argument goes, *kommen* expresses an approach to the goal of the movement where speaker and/or addressee are felt to be located. But, and this is the main point to be challenged, the direction of the movement indicated by either *kommen* or *gehen* is neutralized if the movement is performed by neither speaker nor addressee but by a third person. Wotjak concludes that in these cases *kommen* and *gehen* can substitute for each other without evident difference in meaning (Wotjak 1971:208f).

First of all, the claim does not hold that speaker and addressee are always simultaneously present at the same place, the location of the locutionary act, since there exist such locutionary acts as telephone calls and letter writing, where speaker and addressee obviously occupy different places. Sentence (15)

- (15) Wann gehst du?  
When are you going?

uttered during a telephone conversation questions the time when the addressee is leaving his location, which is distinct from that of the speaker at coding time. Secondly, it is not true that in such cases where neither speaker nor addressee are involved in performing a movement expressed by either *kommen* or *gehen*,

that is, if a third person is performing the movement, the direction of the movement is no longer predictable and *kommen* and *gehen* may be substituted for one another without any difference in meaning. This false conclusion of Wotjak's is probably due to his wrong assumption concerning the location of speaker and addressee at coding time. Thus sentence (16)

- (16) Peter geht jetzt.  
Peter is leaving now.

expresses indeed that a person named *Peter* is leaving a place where the speaker is located at coding time. However, the indicated source of the movement need not be the immediate, rather restricted space occupied by the speaker but it may just as well be a larger area surrounding him. Thus (16) could very well be uttered in a situation where the speaker observes a person stepping out of the door of a building opposite, and leaving. In this case, the exact starting point as the source of the movement is not predictable, but the overall area is, which is the referent of deictic *here* in what Fillmore calls its "symbolic" use as opposed to its "gestural" use, the latter referring to the immediate space occupied by the speaker (see Fillmore 1971:226f). That the deictic qualities of *kommen* and *gehen* are not neutralized if a third person performs the action, as Wotjak claims, becomes obvious if *gehen* in (16) is replaced by *kommen* as in (17),

- (17) Peter kommt jetzt.  
Peter is coming.

which expresses that a movement towards speaker's location is being performed. Thus, in all examples analyzed so far, independent of the role of the person who performs the movement, in the sentences with *gehen* the source of the movement is in focus, whereas in those with *kommen* it is the goal of the movement. Examples (18) and (19) also provide evidence for this claim and, furthermore, demonstrate that the movement may even be performed by an object, that is, it is not restricted to persons:

- (18) Wann geht der Zug nach Hannover?  
When does the train for Hanover leave?  
(19) Wann kommt der Zug nach Hannover?  
When does the train for Hanover arrive?

The object which performs the movement is the train for Hanover. (18) questions about the departure and (19) about the arrival of the train. Both sentences may be uttered at the station, source and goal of the movement in this case being more or less the immediate space occupied by the speaker, but they also may be uttered in the town or city which includes both the station and the speaker's location. The deictically specified location is thus the



whole city. If the station as the source or the goal of the movement is in a town or city which is not at the same time the location of the speaker, then (18) and (19) cannot be used, but in a sentence with *gehen* the source of the movement must be mentioned and in a sentence with *kommen* the goal, as in (20) and (21) respectively:

(20) Wann geht der Zug nach Hannover von Hamburg?

When does the train for Hanover leave Hamburg?

(21) Wann kommt der Zug nach Hannover nach Hamburg?

When does the train for Hanover arrive in Hamburg?

So far, everything which has been said about *kommen* and *gehen* also holds for *come* and *go*.<sup>3</sup> This means that Fillmore's hypotheses about *come* and *go* (see p. 55) also characterize *kommen* and *gehen*. The examples presented so far describe situations where a person or thing performs a movement and where either the source or the goal of the movement are specified. If there is no reference place mentioned in a sentence then the identification takes place via deictic information. In the case of goal-oriented *kommen* the goal of the movement is identified, in the case of source-oriented *gehen* the source of the movement is identified. Both source and goal are identified if the sentences contain the necessary complements as in (13) and (14). If a sentence with *kommen* contains an adverbial to indicate the goal of the movement, it was said that, as with English *come*, reference place and deictic goal are identical. However, in German there are significant exceptions to the rule. In (22)

(22) Bill comes from London to New York.

the reference place New York is also, due to *come*, the location of either the speaker or the addressee. The German equivalent

(23) Bill kommt von London nach New York.

may but need not provide information about the location of speaker or addressee. If source and goal of a movement are specified by adverbials, then the deictic information of *kommen* concerning the goal may be neutralized. What remains, though, is goal-orientation, that is, the goal of the movement expressed by an adverbial is in focus. Thus a sentence like (24)

(24) Der Händler kommt jeden Samstag von Hamburg nach Göttingen.

Every Saturday the salesman goes from Hamburg to Göttingen.

may be uttered in Hamburg, in Göttingen or anywhere else. Substituting *gehen* for *kommen* in an otherwise identical context

<sup>3</sup> Similar observations have also been made for the equivalents in Italian (Cinque 1971) and Hindi (Sinha 1972).

(25) Der Händler geht jeden Samstag von Hamburg nach Göttingen.  
Every Saturday the salesman goes from Hamburg to Göttingen.

demonstrates that now goal-orientation is no longer present. Source and goal have the same importance; *gehen* in this context only indicates the movement.<sup>4</sup>

Neutralization of the deictic feature of *kommen* seems to be possible whenever an adverbial complement identifies the goal of the movement. Even in sentence (6),

(6) Kommt Paul Sonntag auch ins Theater?

Will Paul come to the theatre on Sunday?

which was correctly analyzed as carrying the information that either speaker or addressee will be at the reference place at reference time, it is not quite clear, whether this information is due to *kommen* or rather to the particle *auch*. Other examples with *kommen*, in which no disturbing particle occurs, make no prediction about the location of speaker and addressee. The question

(26) Kommst du heute in die Stadt?

Are you going to town today?

in contrast to

(27) Gehst du heute in die Stadt?

Are you going to town today?

simply expresses that the goal of the movement is in focus. The same holds true for the following sentence:

<sup>4</sup> Contrary to the characterization of *gehen* presented here, G. Wotjak supposed that *gehen* is goal-oriented (Wotjak 1971:209f). Wotjak develops his arguments comparing (1) and (2)

(1) Er geht nach Leipzig.

He is going to Leipzig.

(2)\* Er geht aus Leipzig.

\* He is going from Leipzig.

The difference between the two characterizations of *gehen* is obviously one of the definition of the term 'goal-orientation'. Goal-orientation in (1) is indicated by the adverbial *nach Leipzig*, not by the verb *gehen* itself. Sentence (3) provides evidence,

(3) Er geht aus Leipzig fort.

He is leaving Leipzig.

where the addition of the particle *fort* changes (2) to a grammatical sentence. Thus according to Wotjak's definition *gehen* in (3) would have to be called source-oriented due to the change of the preposition phrase. But this, of course, cannot be what Wotjak would like to say and, therefore, *gehen* inherently is rather source- than goal-oriented and takes a complement indicating the goal of the movement to express both prominent points, source and goal, of a movement.



- (28) Ich bin noch nie nach Japan gekommen.  
I have never got to Japan.

In such contexts as (26) and (28) in English it is not possible for *come* to occur. In English the deictic feature of *come* is resistant whereas with German *kommen* this feature can be neutralized if a sentence contains an adverbial which specifies the goal of the movement. Thus with *kommen* the goal of the movement must always be specified, which obviously is the reason why *kommen* has been called "goal-oriented". It is deictically specified as speaker's and/or addressee's location at either coding time or reference time in those cases where a sentence does not contain any adverbial complements indicating the goal of the movement. But it may also be specified by an adverbial referring to the non-deictic goal of the movement. In the latter case the deictic feature of *kommen* can be neutralized.

As E. Clark (1974) has pointed out, the deictic feature of *come* is not only resistant in contexts which express physical movement, but also in figurative uses in the sense of 'change of state'. A normal state is predictable just as deictic information about the location of speaker and addressee in a speech act situation is. The change from a normal state to a state deviating from the norm is indicated by *go* while movement towards the normal state is indicated by *come*:

- (29) Jane's temperature went up today.  
(30) Jane's temperature came down today.

The indicated deviation from the norm here is 'high temperature'. If it is 'low temperature' the following pair of sentences is appropriate:

- (31) Jane's temperature went down today.  
(32) Jane's temperature came up today.

Such regularity, which E. Clark states for recurrent normal states as in (29)–(32), as well as for non-recurrent normal states, where *come* is used for entrance boundary states, e.g. 'legal adulthood' in (33)

- (33) Martin came of age in 1975.

and *go* for exit boundary states, as e.g. 'Freshness' or 'edibility' in (34) and (35) respectively,

- (34) The bread went stale.  
(35) The fruit has gone bad.

cannot be observed in German. Both entering and leaving a recurrent normal state may be indicated by *kommen*. The direction of the movement or change is expressed by the accompanying preposition and not by substituting *gehen* for *kommen* as the following phrases demonstrate:

- (36) von Kräften kommen — lose one's strength  
zu Kräften kommen — gain one's strength  
von Sinnen kommen — lose one's senses  
zur Besinnung kommen — come to one's senses  
außer Atem kommen — start panting  
zu Atem kommen — catch one's breath again  
aus der Fassung kommen — lose self-control  
zur Fassung kommen — gain self-control

Unlike English *come* German *kommen* may express change from exit boundary states as in the rather archaic expression *in Verfall kommen* used in (37):

- (37) Das Haus ist in Verfall gekommen.  
The house decayed.

Another regularity which E. Clark observed in the use of *come* and *go* is related to evaluative viewpoints. Thus an expression containing *come* carries with it a positive connotation while the choice of *go* in the same context carries a neutral or negative connotation:

- (38) Look at all he came through!  
(39) Look at all he went through!  
(40) The show came off last night.  
(41) The show went off last night.

Here again no corresponding observations can be made for German *kommen* and *gehen*. *Kommen* as well as *gehen* may be used in expressions which carry with them negative connotation:

- (42) auf den Hund kommen — go to the dogs  
an den Bettelstab kommen — be reduced to poverty  
jemandem auf den Leim gehen — fall into a p.'s trap  
jemandem ins Garn gehen — fall into a p.'s trap

Both *kommen* and *gehen* may also be used in expressions which carry with them positive connotation:

- (43) Peters Traum ist in Erfüllung gegangen.  
Peter's dream came true.  
(44) Franz ist zu Reichtum gekommen.  
Franz became rich.

Whereas in English the goal or result of a movement is predictable in a sentence containing *come*, that is, predictable as the normal state or an ameliorative evaluation, this is not the case with German *kommen*. However, as in the case of *kommen* as a motion verb, the observation can be made that in the context of *kommen* as a verb of change of state the goal or result of the change is



specified. The use of *kommen* indicates that a new state has been or is about to be achieved. The new state is also specified in those expressions of (36) which indicate deviation from the normal state, since normal state and non-normal state are understood as complementary. *Außer Atem kommen* identifies a state where a person does not breathe normally and *von Sinnen kommen* identifies a non-normal psychic state. Specification of a goal or result and achievement of a new identified or identifiable state is, then, a regular difference between *kommen* and *gehen* in those contexts which allow a choice between the two. The choice of *gehen* here indicates that the goal or result is still unspecified or, at least, has not been reached yet. To say

- (45) Ich bin der Sache auf den Grund gekommen.  
I have got to the bottom of the matter.

means that one has got to the bottom of a matter. The investigation is completed. The concentration on the goal or result, however, is not simply a result of the present perfect tense used in (45), as one might suspect. If the reference time is the future, as in (46) and (47),

- (46) Ich komme der Sache auf den Grund.  
I'll get to the bottom of the matter.  
(47) Ich werde der Sache auf den Grund kommen.  
I'll get to the bottom of the matter.

these sentences may be used as a threat meaning "I'll find out" or, in other words, with the implication that the investigation will be successful. However, in (48)

- (48) Ich werde der Sache auf den Grund gehen.  
I'll investigate the matter.

nothing is said about the final results. It expresses only that the speaker is ready to devote his time to the investigation. The same is true for sentences (49) and (50)

- (49) Ich komme ihm auf die Spur.  
I am on his track.  
(50) Ich gehe ihm auf die Spur.  
I shall look for his track.

Sentence (49) is result-oriented, meaning that the speaker is or at least believes he is close to the result he is after, while sentence (50) is either source-oriented, meaning that the speaker sets out to achieve the indicated result or he is already involved in the investigation without knowing how far he still has to go.

There is another regularity concerning *kommen* and *gehen* in contexts where they contrast. One aspect of this has been observed by W. Schmidt (1967:39f). Where *kommen* and *gehen* express change of place in the sense of transfer from one place which includes the place of employment to another which includes the new place of employment *gehen* carries with it the connotation that the change is due to the performer's own decision whereas *kommen* implies that some other person has made the decision and the performer is the patient rather than the instigator. Thus (51)

- (51) Ich gehe nach Berlin.  
I go to Berlin.

indicates that the change of place is a result of the speaker's decision. If, however, a person has applied for a job in different places and has received a positive answer only from Berlin, then sentence (52) appropriately describes the circumstances:

- (52) Ich komme nach Berlin.

In this case the decision was made without the speaker's having any influence on it.

To find themselves in such a situation is very typical for young men who get drafted into the army. Their first experience with this institution is that decisions are made for them. Unless they have connections with influential persons, they have no part in deciding whether to join the army, navy or air force, nor can they choose the military base to which they are sent. Thus commonly heard expressions are:

- (53) Ich komme zur Marine.  
I'll join the navy.  
(54) Ich komme zu den Fliegern.  
I'll join the air force.  
(55) Er kommt zu den Panzern.  
He'll join the tank corps.  
(56) Er kommt nach Kiel.  
He'll be stationed in Kiel.

Replacement of *kommen* by *gehen* in (53)–(56) would imply that the recruit was given a choice and has made his own decision. The fact that in these contexts *gehen* indicates decision on the performer's part, predicts that in these sentences names for non-animate objects must not occur in subject position. If change of place is expressed for e.g. an institution, only *kommen* is appropriate:

- (57) Das neue Institut  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} *geht \\ kommt \end{array} \right\}$  nach Berlin.



A more general approach than that suggested by Schmidt may be found by examining the following examples. Except for (57), the previous examples describe situations in which a person is the patient of a change, a change of place, status or situation. If the change is caused by the involved person himself, this is indicated by *gehen*; if this is not the case, *kommen* characterizes the situation appropriately. If a person is involved as the patient of a change and he himself is not the cause of the change, then other causes can be thought of than only a deliberate decision on the part of another person. A change may be caused by natural law, legal regulation, specified or unspecified circumstances. In such cases where decision on the patient's part may contrast with changes decided on outside the area of his influence, this distinction in German is indicated by *gehen* and *kommen*, respectively.

Entry into human existence is a natural event independent of the decision of the person who undergoes it. Thus *kommen* is the appropriate word to indicate this change of state:

(58) auf die Welt kommen — be born

Although humans have no choice at all in their achieving human status, some events in cultural history present an exception. For instance, (659)

(59) Er ist in die Welt gegangen.  
He went into the world.

is inappropriate in the context of birth except when the reference is to the self-incarnation of a deity, as in the persons of Jesus Christ or Zeus, for example.

Legal regulations determine the time when a child has to enter school. If a question is designed to find out, when a child has reached the legal age for entering school, (60) is appropriate,

(60) Wann kommt er zur Schule?  
When will he enter school?

if the question is (61)

(61) Wann geht er zur Schule?  
When does he go to school?

the questioner will be asking "when is he leaving today" or "... usually". The leaving time, then, is not exactly pre-determined but may be set by the child, since he knows the length of the way and the time it will take him to arrive at school on time.

Specified circumstances may be mentioned as the cause of a motion or change of state. A mother may promise her children a desired place or threaten

them with their finally ending up at an undesirable place, so as to cause them to behave well, by uttering (62) and (63) respectively:

- (62) Kinder, die artig sind, kommen in den Himmel.  
Children who behave well go to heaven.  
(63) Kinder, die unartig sind, kommen in die Hölle.  
Children who don't behave well go to hell.

The predicted movement escapes the direct influence of those who are said to perform it. They are the patients rather than the instigators. However, their previous behaviour provides the circumstances which are said to cause the change of place. Since heaven and hell are not places where humans can normally go on their own decision, the gap for *gehen* in this context is not accidental but predictable.

The circumstances which lead to a change of state may be unspecified. When referring to a person's accidental death, (64) is an appropriate statement:

(64) Er ist ums Leben gekommen.  
He has died.

If a person, however, caused his own death, that is, he committed suicide, the change of state is expressed by *gehen* as in (65):

(65) Er ist aus dem Leben gegangen.  
He committed suicide.

Likewise unspecified are the circumstances which have caused the state which a speaker describes in uttering (66):

(66) Er ist mir aus den Augen gekommen.  
I have lost sight of him.

The speaker expresses the fact that he has lost sight of a person. If the person involved, however, deliberately avoids the speaker, then (67)

(67) Er ist mir aus den Augen gegangen.  
He keeps avoiding me.

appropriately describes the situation. A syntactic consequence of the fact that, of the previous sentences, only those with *gehen* carry the connotation that the person involved in a change of place or state caused the change himself or has some influence on it, is that only these sentences can have a corresponding imperative form. Whereas (68) and (69) are grammatical

- (68) Geh zur Schule!  
Go to school!  
(69) Geh mir aus den Augen!  
Get away from me!



(70) and (71)

(70) \*Komm zur Schule!  
Enter school!(71) \*Komm mir aus den Augen!  
Keep avoiding me!

are not in this context. They are grammatical, of course, if *kommen* is used as a verb of motion.

At this point, it seems, a generalization can be made concerning the use of *kommen* and *gehen* as verbs which express change of place or change of state. In contrasting contexts, the use of *gehen* predicts that a person is involved in the change and, furthermore, that he is the cause of the change. With *kommen* no predictions about the cause can be made. As has been demonstrated, the cause may be another person, natural laws, legal regulations, specified or unspecified circumstances. However, with the use of *kommen*, unlike *gehen*, the result of the change or the goal of the movement is in focus, rather than its cause or its source. Syntactic evidence for this claim may be seen in the fact that the sentences in question do not have corresponding imperatives. As G. Lakoff (1966, 1970) pointed out, this is a characteristic of stative verbs. In those sentences which express a change of state and which contain *kommen* the focus is neither on the cause nor on the change but on the resulting state. Thus, it may be suggested that these sentences should not be analyzed as having a verb of motion *kommen* and an adverbial indicating the goal of the movement but *kommen* together with the adverbial constitutes a unit with stative characteristics.<sup>5</sup> This seems to be the basis for many idiomatic terms in German all designed according to the same pattern, where *kommen* and the accompanying adverbial form a semantic unit which cannot be analyzed into the meanings of its parts, as for example

(72) auf den Hund kommen — go to the dogs  
ans Licht kommen — be found out  
auf seine Kosten kommen — reimburse o.s.  
zu Schaden kommen — be ruined  
auf den Gedanken kommen — have the idea  
ins Gerede kommen — be talked of  
in die falsche Kehle kommen — go down the wrong way

<sup>5</sup> Another characterization of stative verbs is that in English they do not occur in the continuous form (see G. Lakoff 1966, 1970). Since the expressions in question here also cannot occur in equivalent German constructions, this again confirms their stative nature. In

(1) Er kommt gerade nach Berlin.

*kommen* necessarily is a motion verb. (1) does not carry the connotation change of "state".

zu Vermögen kommen — come into money  
zu Ohren kommen — be told  
zur Sprache kommen — be discussed

and many others.

The final conclusion is that for *kommen* and *gehen* as motion verbs, deictic information in expressions containing *kommen* is only predictable if the expression does not contain an adverbial indicating the goal of a movement and deictic information in expressions containing *gehen* is only predictable if the expression does not contain an adverbial indicating the source of a movement. If such adverbials do occur, however, then in German, unlike in English, the deictic feature can be neutralized, but, German resembles English in that *kommen* still remains goal-oriented while *gehen* is either source-oriented or motion-oriented.

If *kommen* and *gehen* are used to express change of state in any of the senses discussed, then *kommen* is result-oriented and *gehen* cause- or change-oriented. Thus, on a very high level of abstraction, that is, considering change of state as a movement from one state to another, one may establish a basis of comparison for the contrastive function of *kommen* and *gehen* in these two areas of their use. That this generalization about German *kommen* and *gehen* does not correspond to the generalization about English *come* and *go* can be explained by the fact that even in figurative contexts the deictic feature of the English verbs is resistant while it is neutralized in German. Thus in English information about normal states and evaluative viewpoints is predictable due to the choice of either *come* or *go* in figurative contexts, just as deictic information about speaker's and addressee's location is predictable due to the occurrence of *come* or *go* in non-figurative contexts. In German *kommen* and *gehen* carry no information about normal states or evaluative viewpoints; either *kommen* or *gehen* may be used to indicate change towards or away from normal states and towards pejoratively or amelioratively evaluated states. Where *kommen* and *gehen* both may occur in an otherwise identical figurative context, that is, in minimal pairs of sentences, they carry information about the cause of a change. If *gehen* occurs, the prediction is that the person involved in the change is also the cause or instigator of the change. If *kommen* occurs, no predictions can be made concerning the cause, except that the person involved has no influence on it, but the concentration is on the resulting state.

## REFERENCES

- Cinque, G. 1972. "Analisi componenziale del lessico: Prospettive per una applicazione contrastiva". In Lepschy, G. C., Ruwet, N., et al. (eds). 1972. 93—107.  
Cinque, G. 1973. "Fillmore's semantics of *come* revisited". *Lingua e Stile* 7. 575—599.  
Clark, E. 1974. "Normal states and evaluative viewpoints". *Language* 50. 316—323.



- Fillmore, C. 1966. "Deictic categories in the semantics of *come*". *Word* 19. 208—231.
- Fillmore, C. 1969. "Types of lexical information". In Kiefer, F. (ed.). 1969. 109—137.
- Fillmore, C. 1970. "Subjects, speakers and roles". *Synthese* 21. 251—274.
- Fillmore, C. 1971. "Toward a theory of deixis". *The PCCLLU Papers* 3/4. 218—242.
- Fillmore, C. 1971a. "Lectures on deixis". *University of California Summer Program in Linguistics, Santa Cruz*. Unpublished.
- Fillmore, C. 1972. "How to know whether you are coming or going". *Studies in descriptive and applied linguistics* 5. Tokyo: International Christian University. 3—17.
- Kiefer, F. (ed.). 1969. *Studies in syntax and semantics*. Dordrecht-Holland; D. Reidel.
- Lakoff, G. 1966. "Stative verbs and adjectives". In *Mathematical linguistics and automatic translation, Report NSF—17*. Cambridge, Mass. 1—16.
- Lakoff, G. 1970. *Irregularity in syntax*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Lepschy, G. C., Ruwet, N. et al. (eds). 1972. *Scritti e ricerche di grammatica italiana*. Trieste: Editioni Lint.
- Schmidt, W. 1967. *Lexikalische und aktuelle Bedeutung*. Berlin: Akademie.
- Sinha, A. K. 1972. "On the deictic use of *coming* and *going* in Hindi". *CLS* 8. 351—358.
- Wojtak, G. 1971. *Untersuchungen zur Struktur der Bedeutung*. Berlin: Akademie.