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2. ‘Rational ways of speaking’
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3.2. QUOTATIONS AS SELECTIVE DEPICTIONS. The heart of our proposal is that quotations, like demonstrations, depict rather than describe. As demonstrations, they should follow these versions of the decoupling, partiality, and selectivity principles:

DECOUPLING PRINCIPLE: Speakers intend their addressees to recognize different aspects of their quotations as depictive, supportive, and notative.

PARTIALITY PRINCIPLE: Speakers intend their addressees to take the depictive aspects to be the quotation proper, the point of their quotation.

SELECTIVITY PRINCIPLE: Speakers intend their quotations to depict only selective aspects of the referents under a broad description.

Suppose Alice, in reporting what George said, chooses to depict only the question he asked and the timidity with which he asked it. If she speaks in English (instead of George’s French) and in her own pitch (instead of a male pitch), these would be supportive aspects. And if she titters and smirks during her quotation, these would be annotative aspects. The remaining aspects would be incidental. By the first principle, Alice intends Ben to see this division. By the second, she intends him to take only the question and timidity to be depictive, the quotation proper, as the point of her quotation. And by the third principle, she intends to depict only two aspects of what George said—his question and his timidity.

The practical problem is for speakers and addressees to coordinate on which aspects of a quotation are which. One method they have can be expressed this way:

MARKEDNESS PRINCIPLE: Whenever speakers mark an aspect of a quotation, they intend their addressees to identify that aspect as nonincidental—that is, as depictive, supportive, or annotative.

Suppose Alice is speaking with Ben in English. If she quotes George in French, she MARKS the language used as a nonincidental aspect. Depending on the circumstances, she may intend it to be depictive (George spoke in French), supportive (she doesn’t want overhearers to know what George said), or annotative (she is commenting on George’s urbanity). The markedness principle is simply Grice’s 1975 maxims of quantity and manner applied to demonstrations. To mark an aspect is to imply that it has a recognizable purpose and, therefore, isn’t incidental.

What can people quote? Demonstrators can demonstrate anything they can.
Filler-as-word hypothesis. Uh and um are interjections whose basic meanings are these:
(a) Uh: “Used to announce the initiation, at t(‘uh’), of what is expected to be a minor delay in speaking.”
(b) Um: “Used to announce the initiation, at t(‘um’), of what is expected to be a major delay in speaking.”
This talk:
analyze collateral signals in terms of mixed (hybrid) quotation as if non-meta discourse is wholly quoted
Layering in discourse: iconic, dynamic

Beth: Let’s play gold rush.
Alan: Okay, Beth, I'll be Wild Bill.
Beth: And I'll be Calamity Jane.

Although Alan and Beth do things to establish domain 2, their actions are in domain 1. Next consider this series of events:

Alan puts dirt on the old plate and swishes it around, revealing a small pebble.
He picks it out.
Alan: Look, Calamity Jane, I've found a gold nugget.
Beth: We're rich.
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Beth: Let's play gold rush.
Alan: Okay, Beth, I'll be Wild Bill.
Beth: And I'll be Calamity Jane.

Although Alan and Beth do things to establish domain 2, their actions are in domain 1. Next consider this series of events:

Alan puts dirt on the old plate and swishes it around, revealing a small pebble. He picks it out.
Alan: Look, Calamity Jane, I've found a gold nugget.
Beth: We're rich.

Layering is essential to the use and interpretation of utterances. Let us consider two utterances by Alan:

1. Alan: Beth, your dad is here now, so I guess you have to go.
2. Alan: Look here, Calamity Jane, now you and I both have nuggets.

Although Alan uses the deictic terms “I,” “you,” “here,” and “now” in both utterances, in 1 he is referring to Alan, Beth, San Francisco, and 1952, and in 2, he is referring to Wild Bill, Calamity Jane, Deadwood, and 1876.
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Quotation has a certain anomalous feature (Quine 1940)
Quine says quotation ‘has a certain anomalous feature’
(Davidson 1979)
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Mixed (hybrid) quotation

Quotation has a certain anomalous feature  (Quine 1940)
Quine says quotation ‘has a certain anomalous feature’
   (Davidson 1979)

\begin{align*}
\text{Quine 1940} \\
\text{has a certain anomalous feature} \\
\lambda x. \begin{array}{c}
e_1 \\
hacaf(e_1, x)
\end{array}
\end{align*}

(Kamp 1981, van der Sandt 1992)
Mixed (hybrid) quotation

Quotation has a certain anomalous feature (Quine 1940)
Quine says quotation ‘has a certain anomalous feature’
(Davidson 1979)

\[
E \left( \lambda x. \frac{e_1}{\text{hacaf}(e_1, x)} \right)
\]

(Quine 1940, \(\text{hacaf}(e_1, x)\), Geurts and Maier 2003, Potts 2007, Shan 2010)
Mixed (hybrid) quotation

Quotation has a certain anomalous feature \hspace{1cm} (Quine 1940)
Quine says quotation ‘has a certain anomalous feature’ \hspace{1cm} (Davidson 1979)

\[
E \left( \lambda x. \begin{array} \vrule \hline e_1 & \text{Quine 1940,} \\
\hline \text{has a certain anomalous feature}, \hspace{1cm} & \hspace{1cm} \text{Quine 1940,} \\
\text{say}(e_2, \text{quine}, Q_3(\text{quotation})) \hspace{1cm} & \hspace{1cm} \text{say}(e_2, \text{quine}, Q_3(\text{quotation})) \\
\text{e}_2 & \text{e}_2 \\
\hline \end{array} \right) \\
\]
Mixed (hybrid) quotation

Quotation has a certain anomalous feature \(\quad\) (Quine 1940)
Quine says quotation ‘has a certain anomalous feature’ \(\quad\) (Davidson 1979)

\[
E\left( \lambda x. \begin{array}{c}
\text{Quine 1940,} \\
\text{‘has a certain anomalous feature’}, \\
\hline
\text{hacaf}(e_1, x)
\end{array} \right)
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
e_2 \\
\text{say} \left( e_2, \text{quine,} \begin{array}{c}
e_1 \\
\text{hacaf}(e_1, \text{quotation})
\end{array} \right)
\end{array}
\]
Unquotation

Quine says quotation ‘has a certain anomalous feature’.
Quine says quotation ‘has [expletive]’.
Quine says quotation ‘has [opacity]’.

*syntactic unquotation*
*semantic unquotation*
Quine says quotation ‘has a certain anomalous feature’.
Quine says quotation ‘has [expletive]’.  
Quine says quotation ‘has [opacity]’.  

\[ e_2 \]
\[ \text{say}(e_2, \text{quine}, Q_3(Q_4, Q_5)(\text{quotation})) \]

\[ e_3 \]
\[ Q_3 \]
\[ E(e_3, \text{comb}, Q_3) \]

\[ e_4 Q_4 \]
\[ E(e_4, \lceil \text{has} \rceil, Q_4) \]

\[ e_5 Q_5 \]
\[ E(e_5, \lceil \text{a certain anomalous feature} \rceil, Q_5) \]
Unquotation

Quine says quotation ‘has a certain anomalous feature’.

Quine says quotation ‘has [expletive]’. syntactic unquotation

Quine says quotation ‘has [opacity]’. semantic unquotation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$e_2$</th>
<th>say($e_2$, quine, $Q_3(Q_4, Q_5)(quotation)$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$e_3$</td>
<td>$Q_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E(e_3, \text{comb}, Q_3)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$e_4$</td>
<td>$Q_4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E(e_4, \lnot\text{has} \neg, Q_4)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$e_5$</td>
<td>$P_5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E(e_5, P_5, Q_5)$</td>
<td>expletive($P_5$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quine says quotation ‘has a certain anomalous feature’.
Quine says quotation ‘has [expletive]’.  
Syntactic unquotation
Quine says quotation ‘has [opacity]’.  
Semantic unquotation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$e_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>say($e_2$, quine, $Q_3(Q_4, Q_5)(quotational)$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$e_3$ $Q_3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$E(e_3, \text{comb}, Q_3)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$e_4$ $Q_4$</th>
<th>$e_5$ $P_5$ $Q_5$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$E(e_4, \text{[has]}, Q_4)$</td>
<td>$E(e_5, P_5, Q_5)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$Q_5 = \text{opacity}$
Quine says quotation ‘has a certain anomalous feature’
Quine says quotation has a certain anomalous feature
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‘ ‘Quine says quotation has a certain anomalous feature’’
Multistage semantics

Quine says quotation ‘has a certain anomalous feature’
Quine says quotation has a certain anomalous feature
‘Quine says quotation has a certain anomalous feature’
‘‘Quine says quotation has a certain anomalous feature’’

Quine 1940 is not what’s quoted.
Mixed quotation licenses unquotation.
Generalize to the worst case.
Describe an utterance then evaluate it.
Each stage introduces its own discourse referents and conditions.

(Smith 1982)
Disfluencies

Quotation has a certain anomalous feature
‘[‘Quotation’] has [‘a certain anomalous feature’]’

\[
\begin{align*}
Q_1(Q_2, Q_3(Q_4, Q_5)) \\
E(e_1, \text{comb}, Q_1) \\
e_2 Q_2 \\
E(e_2, [\text{quotation}], Q_2) \\
e_3 Q_3 \\
E(e_3, \text{comb}, Q_3) \\
e_4 Q_4 \\
E(e_4, [\text{has}], Q_4) \\
e_5 Q_5 \\
E(e_5, [\text{a certain anomalous feature}], Q_5)
\end{align*}
\]
### Disfluencies

Quotation has *uh* a certain anomalous feature

‘[“Quotation’] has [after minor delay ‘a certain anomalous feature’]’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e₁ Q₁</th>
<th>e₂ Q₂</th>
<th>e₃ Q₃</th>
<th>e₄ Q₄</th>
<th>e₅ Q₅</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E(e₁, comb, Q₁)</td>
<td>E(e₂, [“quotation”, Q₂])</td>
<td>E(e₃, comb, Q₃)</td>
<td>E(e₄, [“has”, Q₄])</td>
<td>E(e₅, [“a certain anomalous feature”, Q₅])</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*e₅ < 20120929T131726+02 + 0.46 units*
Disfluencies

Flotation, I mean, quotation has a certain anomalous feature

‘[‘Flotation’ not but ‘quotation’] has [‘a certain anomalous feature’]’

\[
Q_1(Q_2, Q_3(Q_4, Q_5))
\]

\[E(e_1, \text{comb}, Q_1)\]

\[e_1 Q_1\]

\[
e_2' Q_2'
\]

\[
E(e_2', \lnot \text{flotation}, Q_2')
\]

\[e_2 Q_2\]

\[
e_3 Q_3
\]

\[E(e_3, \text{comb}, Q_3)\]

\[
e_4 Q_4
\]

\[E(e_4, \lnot \text{has}, Q_4)\]

\[
e_5 Q_5
\]

\[E(e_5, \lnot \text{a certain anomalous feature}, Q_5)\]
Former, latter

If a beggar meets a bishop, the latter blesses the former.

(Geurts and Maier 2011)
If a beggar meets a bishop, the latter blesses the former.

(Geurts and Maier 2011)

Resolution identifies $5 = f = f'$ and $10 = l = l'$

Actually uh/um is more meta than former/latter
Indexing or echoing an utterance event

Quine says quotation is weird but that's not how he put it

Bo?

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{e } P \ Q \\
E(e, P, Q)
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{e } Q \\
E(e, \lceil \text{Bo} \rceil, Q)
\end{array}
\]
Indexing or echoing an utterance event

Quine says quotation is weird but that’s not how he put it

\[
\begin{array}{c}
e \, P \, Q \\
E(e, P, Q)
\end{array}
\]

Bo?

\[
\begin{array}{c}
e \, Q \\
E(e, \lceil Bo \rceil, Q)
\end{array}
\]
Indexing or echoing an utterance event

Quine says quotation is weird but that’s not how he put it

$$\begin{array}{c}
\underbrace{e \ P \ Q} \\
\underbrace{E(e, P, Q)}
\end{array}$$

Bo?

$$\begin{array}{c}
\underbrace{e \ Q} \\
\underbrace{E(e, \text{Bo}, Q)}
\end{array}$$

collaborative reference, arbitrarily many distinct levels
demonstratives in general, meta-characters
Nothing like the detail required to formulate 3-LISP can be conveyed in a simple diagram, of course, but one facet of 3-LISP is indicated here that is crucial to understand. Each processor runs always: there is not a single locus of agency that moves around between levels (even though this is how the implementation works, as we will see in section 5.c). Thus it is reasonable to ask at what level a given procedure is run, but it is not reasonable to ask at what level the 3-LISP processor is running.
WHAT IF I HAD SOME ICE CREAM? WOULDN'T THAT BE AWESOME?

NO, STOP!

GREAT, YOU'VE TRAPPED US IN A HYPOTHETICAL SITUATION!

MMM, ICE CREAM.

MAYBE IF I HAD A KNIFE I COULD CUT OUR WAY FREE...

MMM, ICE CREAM!

HERE, TAKE THIS ONE.