

Motion Deixis, Indexicality, and Presupposition

David Y. Oshima
Stanford University

1. Introduction

This paper argues that deictic verbs GO and COME (English *go* and *come* and their counterparts in other languages) are kinds of indexicals in the Kaplanian sense. In Sections 2-3, building on Oshima (2006a), I defend the view that the acceptability of deictic verbs is determined with respect to a contextually provided *set* of individuals (rather than with respect to a specific individual that serves as the “deictic center”), and demonstrate that the pragmatic meanings associated with deictic verbs are both *presuppositional* and *indexical*.

In Sections 4-6, I address the “deictic perspective shift” phenomenon in attitude reports, and argue that GO/COME can be used either as primary indexicals (which refer to the external context of utterance) or as secondary indexicals (which refer to a secondary context associated with an attitude predicate). Also, I demonstrate that the choice of the deictic perspective has interesting correlations with projection patterns of presuppositions associated with deictic verbs.

In Sections 7-9, I develop an analysis of attitude reports where a presupposition may be filtered by an attitude predicate (in accordance with Heim 1992 and Karttunen 1974), or may be inherited through it. The proposed analysis provides a solution to the more general (and long-standing) problem for the theory of presupposition projection, which has been known as “*de re* presuppositions”.

2. The Set-based Analysis of GO and COME

As the background theory of motion deixis, I adopt the “set-based” analysis proposed by Oshima (2006a). Its essential idea is that deictic verbs make reference to a set of individuals called *RP* (which stands for “Reference Point”) and their meanings involve an existential statement or the negation of an existential statement; i.e.:

- (1) a. GO requires that *no* member of the RP be located at the goal of the described motion.
- b. COME requires that *some* member of the RP be located at the goal of the described motion.

Cross-linguistic differences among motion deictic systems can be sorted out into two dimensions. First, different languages are subject to different sets of

Thanks to Christopher Tancredi, David Beaver, Stanley Peters, Ivan Sag, Tsuneko Nakazawa, and the audience of SALT XVI for valuable comments and help. Any remaining errors are my own.

