

## 「来る」と「行く」の統合理論

### An Integrated Theory of Coming and Going

奥 野 忠 徳\*

Tadanori OKUNO

#### 論 文 要 旨

It has been pointed out that the concept of empathy plays a pivotal role in the semantics of such verbs as kuru (to come) and iku (to go). But few works seem to have been successful in coming up with a system rigid and comprehensive enough to account for it. We propose here three sets of hypotheses to that end: (a) an empathy-related hypothesis about the inherent meanings of kuru and iku, (b) an empathy hierarchy, and (c) a set of auxiliary principles that determine pragmatically which participants in the event the speaker is liable to empathize with. It is shown how these three modules of hypotheses interact in a complex, but interesting way to account for a wide range of data.

#### 1. Introduction

It seems widely accepted that the Japanese verbs iku (to go) and kuru (to come) are best analyzed based on the concept of viewpoint or some such analogue. However, opinions differ as to how to implement the idea in concrete terms. While it seems basically correct to say that, in describing the movement of A to B, we use iku when we are viewing it from A's viewpoint, and kuru when we are viewing it from B's viewpoint, I claim that this simple-minded hypothesis should be revised and that other supplementary principles are needed.

The solution to this problem apparently involves the following:

- (I) the isolation of empathy-related restrictions inherent in iku and kuru,
- (II) the determination of the empathy hierarchy, and
- (III) the discovery of other necessary supplementary principles.

The procedures in (I), (II) and (III) should not, and cannot, be separately executed; they are interrelated in exactly the way in which the determination of a set of phrase structure rules was thought to be closely related to that of a set of transformational rules.

As for the procedure (I), there are a number of conceivable options. Let us take for example the situation in which A moves to B. Some of the intuitively satisfying empathy-related situations for iku would be:

---

\* 弘前大学教育学部 英語・英文学科教室

Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Education, Hirosaki University, Japan

- (1) that we feel empathy with A,
- (2) that we feel no empathy with B,
- (3) that we feel more empathy with A than with B, or
- (4) that we feel no empathy with A or with B.

The same applies to kuru. To each of these possible situations correspond different versions of the empathy hierarchy. In addition, we have all sorts of possible auxiliary principles to choose. This indicates how difficult the problem is to solve.

What properties must a combination of possibilities have to qualify as the best theory? A first requirement is, as is natural, that the combination be able to describe as much relevant data as possible. A second is that it be simpler than any other combination, keeping a set of necessary principles down to a minimum.

## 2. An Analysis

We will begin with the following sentences:

- (1) Kazuo-wa Hanako-no tokoro-e kita.
- (2) Kazuo-wa Hanako-no tokoro-e itta.

While (1) and (2) are both acceptable, they are not interchangeable. On hearing (1), we might infer that the speaker of the sentence lives in the same town as Hanako, to which Kazuo has moved from another town. (2) might lead us to think that the speaker lives in the same town as Kazuo, from which he moved to Hanako, who lives in a different town, or that the speaker has seen Kazuo move to Hanako from a distance (possibly, with a telescope) and is reporting it to the hearer. From this observation, the following hypothesis might be entertained:

[Hypothesis A] : When A moves to B, we use kuru when we feel that we are in the same place as B, and iku, either when we feel that we are in the same place as A, or when we feel that we are not in the place(s) of A or B.<sup>1</sup>

The parenthetical 'we feel' in the hypothesis is necessary because it is often the case that the positions of A, B and the speaker mentioned in the hypothesis cannot be equated with purely objective spatial positions. Take (3) for instance:

- (3) a. Kazuo-wa 5gatsu-ni Tokyo-kara Yamagata-e kita.
- b. Kazuo-wa 5gatsu-ni Tokyo-kara Yamagata-e itta.

The two sentences in (3) could be appropriately uttered in Sendai, which means that purely objective spatial positions are not adequate for the determination of iku versus kuru, though we admit that it affects greatly where the speaker 'feels' he is.

The hypothesis A is supported by the following sentences:

- (4) a. \* Watashi-wa kinou Kazuo-no tokoro-e kita (noda).<sup>2</sup>
- b. \* Kazuo-wa kinou watashi-no tokoro-e itta (noda).

Assuming that the speaker is not where Kazuo is, the hypothesis A predicts correctly that the sentences in (4) are out.

Whereas the basic tenet expressed in the hypothesis A is correct, there are examples

which run afoul of it. Consider (5) :

(5) Kazuo-ga Hanako-no tokoro-e kita-rashii.

The hypothesis A can accommodate the fact that (5) is acceptable if the speaker is at Hanako's place at the time of utterance or at the event time. But (5) can also be appropriately uttered even if that condition is not met. For example, consider the situation in which the speaker, who has been told by Hanako over the phone that Kazuo moved to her place, in turn wants to inform the addressee of the fact. In this context, (5) can be properly uttered even if the speaker is not at Hanako's place at the time of utterance or at the time of the event of Kazuo's moving.

Consider next the sentence in (6) :

(6) Kazu-wa kinou kimi-no tokoro-e kimashita ka?

The sentence in (6) can also be appropriately uttered even if the speaker is not at your place at the time of utterance or of the event. Note also that such sentences as (7) are also acceptable:

(7) Watashi-wa kinou kimi-no tokoro-ni kimashita ka?

The sentence (7) is somewhat out of the ordinary in that the speaker is asking someone else for the information about his own action, but it makes perfect sense in a context of a loss of memory on the part of the speaker.

Let us turn to (8) :

(8) Kazuo-wa kinou kimi-no tokoro-e kimashita yo.

The sentence (8) is fully acceptable when the speaker is at your place at the time of utterance or at the event time. It is also not fully bad when the speaker saw the event from a distance or heard about it from someone else. The same is true of (9) :

(9) Kinou Kazuo-ga boku-no ani-no tokoro-ni kimashita.

The examples in (5)–(9) clearly show that the hypothesis A is not fully satisfactory in its present formulation.

### 3. A Revised Hypothesis

We consider in this section how to set about explaining such examples as in (5)–(9) on the basis of what merits the hypothesis A has, plus other necessary auxiliary principles. The most promising approach seems to me to be one based on Kuno's empathy. (About this concept, the reader is advised to consult Kuno (1975), Kuno (1976) and Kuno and Kaburaki (1977), among others.)

Provided with the concept of empathy, the hypothesis A could be recast in the form of the following hypothesis:

[The hypothesis B] : In describing A's movement to B, kuru is used when the speaker is empathizing with B, and iku when he is either empathizing with A or empathizing with neither.

One important fact about this hypothesis is that it is unable to make acceptability judgments by itself; it only shows what inherent restrictions kuru and iku have and we are left

with no substantial theory unless it is specified what entities we are liable to put empathy on in reality. Another important thing to remember is that the hypothesis B is nothing other than a hypothesis. As remarked in section 1, the two Japanese verbs in question are susceptible to a number of possible analyses, and the hypothesis B is only one of them. The best hypothesis should be such that if it is chosen, the empathy hierarchy needed will be the simplest and the necessary auxiliary principles will be the most natural and the smallest in number.

I would like to make the following claim in this paper:

[The hypothesis C] : In describing A's movement to B, the speaker uses *kuru* when he is empathizing with B. He uses *iku*, either when he is empathizing more with A than with B, or when he is empathizing with neither.

When we are empathizing with neither A nor B, we are describing the event from a purely objective point of view; it is a neutral, objective description. While it is not immediately clear that there exists a purely objective description of a coming-going action at all, there is some evidence to show that it does exist. Consider (10) :

(10) *Mishiranu hito-ga Kazuo-no tokoro-e itta (rashii) yo.*

Suppose that Kazuo and the stranger live in the same town and that the speaker lives in another town. Suppose further that the speaker has heard from someone that the stranger moved to Kazuo's place and he wants to report the event to you. In this context, he is able to utter (10) without impunity. Suppose next that the speaker has viewed the stranger's movement to Kazuo through a telescope. (We assume here that the distance between where the speaker is and where the stranger was before moving is not shorter than that between the speaker and Kazuo.) Then, the speaker can utter (10) in this context as well. I find it all but impossible to claim that the speaker is empathizing with the stranger in these circumstances. If someone should still insist that the speaker is empathizing with the stranger here, he would be hard put to explain why the sentence (11) is unacceptable:

(11) \* *Kazuo-ga mishiranu hito-no tokoro-e kita (rashii) yo.*

The fact that this sentence is unacceptable seems to show that the verb *iku* can have a neutral way of viewing things.

Note that the hypothesis C allows for another reading of *iku*, namely, that the speaker is empathizing more with A than with B. This formulation of the relevant reading is different from the formulation 'The speaker is empathizing with A.' We will see evidence that the former formulation is more adequate than the latter.

The hierarchy of empathy could be set up as follows:

[The empathy hierarchy]

speaker > hearer > someone close to speaker > others

It is the easiest for the speaker to empathize with himself. This is understandable because empathy is the degree to which the speaker identifies himself with a participant in the event. The next easiest for the speaker to identify himself with is the hearer. 'Someone close to the speaker' comprises such people as are thought to be pragmatically closely

related to the speaker, including his brothers and sisters, his friends and relatives, and what not. Note that closeness is not necessarily a spatial concept here.

We also need a set of auxiliary principles. As has already become clear, since kuru and iku are verbs of motion, it makes a great difference where the speaker and the hearer are located. So we need the following principle:

[The auxiliary principle A] : If the speaker feels that a participant depicted in the empathy hierarchy is located at some place P at the time of utterance or at the event time, the speaker puts empathy on P according to the hierarchy.

Some such principle as this is needed by any theory about iku and kuru, so it is by no means a concomitant of our analysis.

[The auxiliary principle B] : In questions, the speaker (or the interrogator, to be more precise) can optionally put as much empathy on the hearer as on himself.

This kind of empathetic ‘upgrading’ of the hearer seems to be needed in any theory. It is easy to see why such upgrading comes about: questions are used by the speaker (interrogator) to ask the hearer for information about the portion of the interrogative sentence that he (the speaker) has not definite ideas about. In that case, the speaker is naturally expected to put himself into the hearer’s shoes.<sup>4</sup>

[The auxiliary principle C] : The speaker has the option to put no empathy at all on the participants in the empathy hierarchy except the highest ranked one.

The principle C allows for a completely objective description of an event except when the speaker himself is involved in it.

[The auxiliary principle D] : Empathy can be placed on an informant. In that case, the hierarchy is: speaker > informant > hearer

What this shows is that the speaker can report an event that he has heard about from an informant as if he had obtained the information first-hand.

[The auxiliary principle E] : If a participant X is higher than a participant Y in the empathy hierarchy, it is the more difficult to empathize with Y to the exclusion of X, as X and Y are more distant from each other in the hierarchy.

This principle also seems natural. It amounts to saying that when there are two participants X,Y and one is easier to empathize with than the other, the speaker tends to empathize with the one easier to empathize with, a natural tendency.

#### 4. Discussion

In this section, we will see in detail how the empathy hierarchy, the hypothesis C, and the auxiliary principles as defined in section 3 interact in a complex way to explain a wide range of data. Consider (1) and (2) again, repeated below:

(1) Kazuo-wa Hanako-no tokoro-e kita.

(2) Kazuo-wa Hanako-no tokoro-e itta.

Since kuru is used in (1), the speaker’s empathy must be with Hanako. One way that it can be done is by the auxiliary principle A: the speaker and Hanako are at the same place.

(This, incidentally, is the observation made at the beginning of section 2.) Another way it is achieved is by the auxiliary principle D, in which case the speaker has heard from Hanako (informant) that Kazuo moved to her place.<sup>5</sup>

The sentence (1) could also be appropriately uttered in another context where Hanako is one of the speaker's relatives.

In contrast, the sentence (2) contains iku. The hypothesis C dictates that (a) Kazuo > Hanako or (b) Kazuo = Hanako = 0. Compatible with the condition (a) would be when the speaker feels himself located at the same place as Kazuo (according to the auxiliary principle A). Still another would be when the informant is Kazuo himself, according to the principle D. Compatible with the condition (b) is when the speaker is viewing the event from an objective distance.

Let us consider (4) :

- (4) a. \* Watashi-wa kinou Kazuo-no tokoro-e kita (noda).  
b. \* Kazuo-wa kinou watashi-no tokoro-e itta (noda).

The sentence (4.a) sounds unacceptable in a context where Kazuo is a third party, since it is difficult to empathize with him. Even where Kazuo is the speaker's relative, it is still difficult to empathize with him, in accord with the auxiliary principle E. (4.b) is ruled out because it is hard to imagine Kazuo being higher than the speaker on the empathy hierarchy and it is impossible to view the event objectively, according to the principle C.

Consider (5) :

- (5) Kazuo-ga Hanako-no tokoro-e kita-rashii.

The fact that (5) is possible in a context where the speaker has obtained the information from Hanako falls under the auxiliary principle D. Let us take a look at (7) now:

- (7) Watashi-wa kinou kimi-no tokoro-e kimashita ka?

Since (7) is a question, the auxiliary principle B leads us to expect as much empathy placed on the hearer as on the speaker himself. Therefore, the auxiliary principle E does not apply here, and kuru is appropriate and natural. Note that the sentence (12) is also appropriate in the same context as (7) :

- (12) Watashi-wa kinou kimi-no tokoro-e ikimashita ka?

This is so because the upgrading of the hearer allowed by the principle B is optional. Under the interpretation in which the upgrading is not opted for, the speaker's empathy remains more on himself than on the hearer.

We have found that the empathy hierarchy, the hypothesis C and the auxiliary principles interact to explain a variety of data concerning coming and going. We can explain much more on this basis. Consider (13) :

- (13) a. Watashi-wa kinou-no 5ji-ni watashi-no ani-no tokoro-e kimashita.  
b. Watashi-wa kinou-no 5ji-ni kimi-no tokoro-e kimashita.

The sentences in (13) are both acceptable if the speaker is at his brother's place or the hearer's at the time of utterance, as predicted by the principle A. Otherwise, they are somewhat worse, as predicted by the principle E. The fact that (13.b) fares better than (13.a)

supports, together with the principle E, the empathy hierarchy in which the hearer > the speaker's relative.

Let us turn to (14) and (15) :

(14) Watashi-no ani-wa 5ji-ni kimi-no tokoro-ni kimashita (yo).

(15) Watashi-no ani-wa 5ji-ni kimi-no tokoro-ni ikimashita (yo).

If the speaker is located at the hearer's place ((14)), or at his brother's place ((15)), they are fine in accord with the principle A. If not, (e.g., in a neutral situation where the speaker has gotten the information from a third party and the speaker and the hearer are talking on the phone), (14) is somewhat bad, while (15) remains fine. The explanation of this could be sought along the following lines. Kuru is used when the goal participant is empathized with. The empathy hierarchy allows the hearer to have some empathy but surely not the amount of empathy that the speaker has,<sup>6</sup> hence the degradation of (14). In contrast, (15) is still usable in the context specified above; iku allows for a neutral description. This can be confirmed by the sentence (16), which is also a neutral description:

(16) Kimi-wa 5ji-ni watashi-no ani-no tokoro-ni ikimashita (yo).

Let us turn next to cases in which the auxiliary principle D plays an important role. They are ones embedded in expressions of hearsay like sooda and rashii:

(17) a. Watashi-wa {inaka-no ani-no/Tokyo-no Kazuo-no} tokoro-ni kinou {kita-rashii/kita-sooda}.

b. Watashi-wa {inaka-no ani-no/Tokyo-no Kazuo-no} tokoro-ni kinou {itta-rashii/itta-sooda}.

In a context where the speaker is located with his brother in the countryside or at Kazuo's place in Tokyo, (17.a) is acceptable. Otherwise, it is somewhat unacceptable: if his brother or Kazuo is the informant, the principle D predicts that they could be empathized with, but even in such cases, it is hard to put empathy on them, since the subject is the speaker himself. This is so because the speaker is higher than the informant on the empathy hierarchy. Consider (18) and (19) next:

(18) a. Watashi-no ani-wa senjitsu watashi-no tokoro-e kita {rashii/sooda}.

b. Watashi-no ani-wa senjitsu Kazuo-no tokoro-e kita {rashii/sooda}.

(19) Watashi-no ani-wa senjitsu kimi-no tokoro-e kita {rashii/sooda} (yo).

The sentence (18.a) is acceptable if the speaker did not know that his brother came to his place the other day: he may have been out of the house or even out of consciousness. Since this is so, the speaker cannot be the source of the information. But even in such a case, the speaker is the highest on the empathy hierarchy.<sup>7</sup> Kuru, therefore, poses no problem here. What about (18b)? We expect Kazuo to receive almost no empathy because my brother > Kazuo on the hierarchy and because Kazuo is a third party. In order for (18.b) to become acceptable, then, it must be that the speaker is with Kazuo (from the principle A), or that the speaker has heard about the event from him (from the principle D). Consider (19) next. Although the hearer is higher than the speaker's brother on the empathy hierarchy, we do not put so much empathy on the hearer in the case of motion verbs, as mentioned in note

6. It seems difficult to find any context in which (19) could be appropriately uttered. Firstly, it is hard to imagine the hearer himself being the source of the information, since, if he were, there would be no point in the speaker's informing the hearer of the event, about which the speaker knows that the hearer already knows. Secondly, let us consider the following scenario. When the speaker's brother moved to the hearer's place, the hearer did not know about the event for some reason or other. However, a man who happened to be near the hearer noticed the event. The man later informed the speaker of the event. The speaker in turn told the hearer about it by using (19). In this context, (19) sounds more natural, and this is precisely what is predicted by our analysis in the following way. The man who informed the speaker of his brother's moving to the hearer gets a handsome amount of empathy, in accord with the principle D. (Let us call the man Mr.X.) Since the speaker believes that Mr. X is at the same place as the hearer, the principle A leads us to expect the hearer to have the same amount of empathy, hence the use of kuru in (19) in accord with the hypothesis C. Note, however, that if the speaker is at the same place as his brother, the use of kuru in (19) is very unnatural, which is also predicted by our analysis: since the speaker and his brother are at the same place, his brother has the highest level of empathy in accord with the principle A. It follows then that the hearer doesn't have much chance of receiving empathy, according to the principle E. Let us consider cases in which the principle B plays a pivotal role. This principle allows the speaker to empathize with the hearer, so that our analysis predicts that whenever the hearer is located at the goal of the moving action, kuru can be appropriately uttered. This is borne out by examples like the one in (20) :

(20) {Watashi/watashi-no ani/Kazuo} -wa kinou kimi-no tokoro-e kimashita ka?

Since the upgrading of the hearer is optional, iku is also appropriate:

(21) {Watashi/watashi-no ani/Kazuo} -wa kinou kimi-no tokoro-e ikimashita ka?

(21) is possible when the speaker is at the starting point of the movement, since the starting point > the goal point in that case. The sentence is also possible when the speaker is not at the starting or goal point, since it can be given a neutral interpretation in accord with the principle C. The following sentences are of course acceptable when the hearer is located at the goal:

(22) {Watashi/watashi-no ani/Taro} -wa kinou {Kazuo/kimi-no niisan} -no tokoro-e kimashitaka?

We find then that the hearer is high-ranking on the empathy hierarchy in questions. A corollary of this is that people closely related to the hearer receive a high-level of empathy in questions. Consider (23) :

(23) {Watashi-no ani/Kazuo} -wa kinou kimi-no niisan-no tokoro-e kimashita ka?

The sentences in (23) are naturally acceptable on the reading where the speaker and/or the hearer are at the hearer's brother, but, more importantly, they sound pretty good even if the condition is not met.



## 5. Conclusion

To conclude, I hope to have shown in this paper that the hypothesis C, the empathy hierarchy, and the auxiliary principles A-E interact in an interesting way to account for a wide range of complex interpretations that sentences containing kuru and iku can possibly have. The data discussed in this paper has only covered simplex sentences, but further investigation has convinced me that the theory carries over in its present form directly to more complex data, including those which involve verbs of thinking and believing, though space limitations prevent any further discussion of these sentences in this article.

## Notes

1. When we say that the speaker is at the same place as A or B, we must specify further when he is there; that is, we must specify whether he is there at the time of utterance or/and at the time of the event of A's moving. To simplify matters, I will be assuming here that the speaker is there at both times.
2. The sentence (4.a) is fully acceptable if the speaker is at Kazuo's place at the time of utterance. This can be accommodated on the basis of the considerations in note 1. The sentence (4.b) is also fine if 'watashi-no tokoro' (my place) means some such place as my house or my room and the speaker is/was not there either at the time of utterance or at the time of the event. These results fall out from the hypothesis A. They are therefore not counterexamples to the hypothesis, but rather supporting evidence for it.
3. The hypothesis can be described schematically as:
  - (a)  $kuru: B \neq 0$
  - (b)  $iku: A > B \text{ or } A = B = 0$
4. More generally, we could say that the hearer can be upgraded on the empathy hierarchy when the speaker makes a request of him. In the case of questions, the speaker requests the hearer to give him certain information. There are other forms of request, suggested by the following example, quoted from Ohe(1975; 87)
  - (a) Ashita Yamadasan-ga kitara sono hon-o watashite-kudasai.
5. If we are to be more precise about the matter, we would be obliged to say that we are making use here not just of the auxiliary principle A, but also of the empathy hierarchy and the hypothesis C. But, since that is self-evident, I have omitted reference to the latter. In what follows as well, I will keep to this simplifying practice so long as it is self-evident that explanations are based on interactions among the hierarchy, the hypothesis and the principles.
6. In addition, it seems that the hearer or the speaker's relative does not have as much empathy

in the case of verbs of motion as in the case of verbs of giving and receiving.

7. I will not delve any further into such readings as one in which 'watashi-no tokoro' refers to some such place as my house or my room, where the speaker does not necessarily find himself. Cf. note 2. It seems that such places rank high on the empathy hierarchy due to the fact that they are somehow inherently, not accidentally, related to the speaker.

### References

- Kuno, S. (1975) "Three Perspectives in the Functional Approach to Syntax," *Papers from the Parasession of Functionalism*, Eleventh Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, 276- 336.
- Kuno, S. (1976) "Subject, Theme, and the Speaker's Empathy: A Re-examination of Relativization Phenomena," in C.Li, ed., *Subject and Topic*, Academic Press, New York, 417- 444.
- Kuno, S. and E. Kaburaki (1977) "Empathy and Syntax," *Linguistic Inquiry* 8, 627- 672.
- Murazumi, Y. (1981) "Empathy and Deixis---With Special Reference to 'Come' and 'Go,'" *JACET Bulletin* 12, 47- 62.
- Ohe, S. (1975) *Nichi-Eigo no Hikaku Kenkyu* (A Comparative Study of Japanese and English) Nan' un Do, Tokyo.

(1993.6.1受理)