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Plan:
• Tutorial on Shan’s work
• Key emphasis: unquotation
  – A subportion of a quoted constituent can be evaluated wrt to the matrix context
  – Ann wants “to stop Bill from spreading more [malicious] lies”.
• Layered/partial evaluation
• Concrete, explicit implementation
  – monads (Shan, Pryor)

(1) a. ‘The’ is a determiner. PURE QUOTATION
b. Quine says quotation ‘has a certain anomalous feature’. MIXED QUOTATION mentions and uses quoted words

(2) p. 422: a natural language with mixed quotation is like a multilevel programming language

Unquotation in R5RS Scheme (a dialect of LISP):

(3) Quote (technically, quasi-quote):
a. 1 ⇒ 1
b. ‘1 ⇒ 1
c. (+ 1 2) ⇒ 3
d. ‘(+ 1 2) ⇒ (+ 1 2)
e. (eval ‘(+ 1 2)) ⇒ 3

(4) Unquote:
a. ‘(+ 1 2 (+ 3 4) (+ 5 6)) ⇒ (+ 1 2 (+ 3 4) (+ 5 6))
b. (list ‘+ ’1 ’2 ’(+ 3 4) ’(+ 5 6)) ⇒ (+ 1 2 (+ 3 4) (+ 5 6))
c. ‘(+ 1 2 ,(+ 3 4) (+ 5 6)) ⇒ (+ 1 2 7 (+ 5 6))
d. (list ‘+ ’1 ’2 (eval ’(+ 3 4)) ’(+ 5 6)) ⇒ (+ 1 2 7 (+ 5 6))
e. (eval ‘(+ 1 2 ,(+ 3 4) (+ 5 6)) ⇒ 21)
Shan mixed-quoting Bush:

(5) Bush says that he is proud of his 'eckulectic' reading list.

Basic (i.e., atomic) types:

- \( e \): individuals
- \( t \): truth values
- \( s \): worlds
- \( u \): contexts of utterance

Shan English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression Category</th>
<th>Character-type</th>
<th>Character-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>( u \to s \to e ) ( \lambda \text{cw.} \text{bush} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>left</td>
<td>DP ( s )</td>
<td>( u \to s \to (s \to e) \to t ) ( \lambda \text{cwx.}(xw = \text{abe}) \vee (xw = \text{bush}) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6) Composition (merge): \( \overline{A} = B + B \backslash A = \lambda \text{cw.}B \overline{A}(c)(w)(\overline{B}c) \)

\( S = \overline{\text{Bush + left}} \)

\[ = \lambda \text{cw.} \overline{\text{left}}(c)(w)(\overline{\text{Bush}}(c)) \]

\[ = \lambda \text{cw.} (\lambda \text{cw}x. (xw = \text{abe}) \vee (xw = \text{bush})) (c)(w)((\lambda \text{cw.} \text{bush})(c)) \]

\[ = \lambda \text{cw.} (\lambda x. (xw = \text{abe}) \vee (xw = \text{bush}))(\lambda w. \text{bush}) \]

\[ = \lambda \text{cw.} (\text{bush} = \text{abe}) \vee (\text{bush} = \text{bush}) \]

Standard Kaplan:

- \( \text{Bush left} \), the character of \( \text{Bush left} \), is
- a fn from a context of utterance \( c \) to a content, which is
- a function from a circumstance of evaluation \( w \) to the proposition that Bush is Abe or Bush is Bush.

(This is a language in which \( \text{left} \) appears to mean roughly \textit{is identical to Abe or Bush}.)

[picture of Kaplanian dogma]
Comments on Chung-Chieh Shan’s ‘The Character of Quotation’

Embedding Bush’s English inside of Shan’s English:

p. 425: The main idea is for our syntactic categories to embed those of the quoted languages and for our semantic values to include the characters of the quoted languages.

\[
\text{character-type}(\text{DP} \backslash \text{S}) = u \rightarrow s \rightarrow (s \rightarrow e) \rightarrow t
\]

\[
\text{content-type}(\text{DP} \backslash \text{S}) = s \rightarrow (s \rightarrow e) \rightarrow t
\]

In general,

\[
\text{character-type}(A') = u \rightarrow s \rightarrow u \rightarrow \text{content-type}(A)
\]

So

\[
\text{character-type}((\text{DP} \backslash \text{S})') = u \rightarrow s \rightarrow u \rightarrow s \rightarrow (s \rightarrow e) \rightarrow t
\]

Mixed quotation: \( \overline{A} = 'A' = \lambda c w. \overline{A}(c)(w) \). Bush uses ‘is eckulectic’ in \( c \)(w)

- The content of a primed category is (the intension of) its character in Bush’s mouth.
- Quoting Bush’s language requires diagonalization à la Stalnaker: the content of a quoted primed category in a world \( w \) is the content it would have for Bush in world \( w \).
- The context of utterance to which the quoted content is applied \((\varepsilon c...)\) p. 427 ‘stands for some utterance context, perhaps a generic one, in which Bush uses the quoted expression.’
- Moltmann tutorial: assimilate the use practices of others

Advantages:

- Compositional
- Respects syntax of the quoted expression:
  *Bush said his reading list ‘eckulectic’.*
- p. 423: The syntactic category of a mixed quote must match...that of the quoted expression.
Unquotation: p. 432: ‘including non-quoted material inside a quote...’

(7) Syntactic unquotation:
   b. Every boy liked ‘the gift [his uncle’s name] gave me’.
   c. The politician admitted that she ‘lied my way into [redacted]’.

(8) Semantic unquotation:
   b. Every boy liked ‘the gift [his uncle] gave me’.
   c. The politician admitted that she ‘lied my way into [her job]’.

(9) Abbott 2003: apparent quotation of non-constituents:
   a. David said that he had donated ‘largish sums to several benign institutions’.
   b. Mary allowed as how her dog ate ‘odd things when left to his own devices’.

(10) Analyzed using unquotation:
   a. David said that he had ‘[donated] largish sums to several benign institutions’.
   b. Mary allowed as how her dog ‘[ate] odd things when left to his own devices’.

(11) Maier’s 2008 proposal: “breaking” quotations:
   a. David said that he had donated ‘largish sums’ ‘to several benign institutions’.
   b. David: “I donated largish sums to the KKK, and wrote angry letters to several benign institutions”.

(12) Shan’s rule for semantic unquotation: \( \overline{A'} = \lambda cwc' w'. \overline{A} wc \)
   - An alternative: simply allow nested quotation.
   - Especially when resolving the innermost quoted language as the outermost matrix language.
   - p. 435: “the rule in [(12)] lets the unquoted content ... be evaluated not at the world \( w \) where the unquote is evaluated, but at the world where the containing quote is eventually evaluated. In other words, this semantic rule gives rise to de-dicto readings.”
   - Ralph wants to shoot someone who is a spy in each of his belief worlds:

(13) Ralph ‘wanted to find [the spy] and shoot him myself’.
• Monads (Shan 2001):
  – Intensionality: Reader monad
  – Adding quantification: applying the reader monad transformer to the continuation monad (Barker and Shan 2014).
  – Inverse scope as unquotation (Shan 2007):
    ‘Somebody saw [everyone]’
    Deeper is later.
• How crazy things can get (Armstrong 2013):
  Alice saw Bob.
  ‘[“Alice”] saw [“Bob”].’
  ‘[“[“Alice”]”] saw [“[“Bob”]”].’
  ... all the way back to the beginning of the causal chain
• ‘Cicero’ is ‘Tully’.

Main conclusion: unquotation is pervasive.
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