

Speech reports: Day 2

Hybrid strategies

Pranav Anand ¹ & Natasha Korotkova ^{2,3}

¹ UC Santa Cruz

²University of Konstanz

³University of Tübingen

ESSLI 31 @ University of Latvia, Riga



Today

- Strategies that simultaneously exhibit properties of direct and indirect discourse
 - Mixed Quotation
 - Free Indirect Discourse

Mixed quotation

The phenomenon

- (1)
 - a. In a 2008 paper, [Warren] acknowledged that single-payer would be a preferable system but claimed it was “politically unacceptable.” *Jacobin*
 - b. [Trump] demanded that the Obama administration “stop the EBOLA patients from entering the U.S.” and declared that people who fight deadly diseases overseas “must suffer the consequences!” *Mother Jones*
- Some readings: Davidson (1979); Cappelen and Lepore (1997, 2003); Recanati (2001, 2008); Shan (2011); Maier (2014)

Defining characteristics I

- (Mostly) faithful and opaque
- Always integrated syntactically
- Simultaneously mentioned and used

	PURE QUOTATION	MIXED QUOTATION
INPUT	any string	well-formed expressions
OUTPUT	DP	category of the input

Faithfulness I

- Substitution

- (2)
- a. John said that he wants to “purchase all of it”.
 - b. #John said that he wants to “buy all of it”.
 - c. ✓John said that he wants to buy all of it. (Maier 2014:6)

- *De re* blocking

- (3)
- a. ✓Hank said that “Heisenberg is a drug manufacturer”.
 - b. # Hank said that “Walter White is a drug manufacturer”.

Faithfulness II

- Indexical shift

- (4) a. POSSIBLE
Bill Waterson said that reality “continues to ruin my life”.
(Maier 2014:6)
- b. NOT OBLIGATORY
Bob Dylan said that he continues his music career because
“he made a vow years ago, he sold his soul”.
(Maier 2014:13)

- Language shift

- (5)
 - a. Palin tweeted that “peaceful Muslims” should “refudiate” the mosque being built at Ground Zero. (Maier 2014:8)
 - b. Nicola said that Alice is a “philtosopher.” (Cappelen and Lepore 1997:11)

Faithfulness III

- Tense

- (6) He said that his “delivery ✓**would** / ??**will** be late” but I think he just wasn’t prepared for the meeting.
- (7) ✓In his letter, Napoleon wrote that his “first division is a bunch of cowards” and that the Germans “will make mincemeat of them”.
- (8) ??Napoleon screamed to his generals that that his “first division is a bunch of cowards” and that the Germans “will make mincemeat of them”.

Any syntactic role

(9) DP:

According to Trump, he had begun to address a group of “orderly and civil Nazis” at a downtown arena. (*The New Yorker*)

(10) NP:

He meant not Donald Trump but Joseph Mifsud, whom he identified as a “mysterious professor who works in Rome and London”. (*The New Yorker*)

(11) VP:

The study of quotation “sheds new light on what it means to refer to and manipulate representations”, writes Potts. (Saka 2013)

(12) MODIFIER:

U.S. Citizen held by CBP: ‘Inhumane’ conditions made me want to self-deport. (*The Daily Beast*)

Non-constituents

- (13) CBP [...] said it can take “more time to verify” an individual’s citizenship in certain situations.

\Rightarrow [more time [to verify [an individual’s citizenship]]]

\nRightarrow [more time [to verify]]

(*The Daily Beast*)

- (14) She allowed as how her dogs ate “strange things, when left to its own devices”.

\Rightarrow [ate [strange things] [when left to its own devices]]]

\nRightarrow [[strange things [when left to its own devices]]]

(Maier 2014 citing Abbott 2005)

- (15) The dean asked that a student “accompany every professor”.

$\Rightarrow \forall > \exists$

$\nRightarrow \exists > \forall$

(Maier 2014 citing Cumming 2005)

Syntactic integration I

- The sentence has to be well-formed as though the syntax doesn't see quotation marks
- Case in point: gender in Italian

(16) a. *Ken says:*

Gli uomini italiani mi sembrano molto
DEF.M.PL men Italian.M.PL to.me look very

carini
cute.m.pl


'Italian men look very cute'.

- b. Ken ha detto che le persone italiane "mi
ken has said COMP DEF.F.PL person Italian.F.PL to.me
sembrano molto ✓**carine** / #**carine**"
look very **cute.f.pl** / **cute.m.pl**
'Ken said that Italian people "look very cute to me".'

(Shan 2011)

Syntactic integration II

- In constraint talk: syntactic integration >> faithfulness

		INTEGRITY	IDENT
a.	careni	*!	
b.	 carene		*

Syntactic integration III

- Similar effects: word order in Dutch (Maier 2014)
 - obligatory V2 in root declaratives
 - obligatory verb-final in embedded clauses
 - obligatory verb-final in mixed quotes

(17) Dutch

- a. Ik **zal** die idioot een koekje van eigen deeg
I **will** that idiot INDEF cookie of own dough
geven.
give.INF
'I will give that idiot the taste of his own medicine.'
- b. #John zegt hij "**zal** die idioot ...**geven**"
John say.3SG.PRES he **will** that idiot ...**give.INF**
- c. John zegt hij "die idioot ...**zal geven**" **give.INF**
john say.3SG.PRES he that idiot INDEF ...**will**
'John said that he "will give that idiot a taste of his own
medicine".'
(Maier 2014:11-12)

Maier's (2014) analysis I

Proposal

A grammar that handles mixed quotation building on the unquotational analysis of pure quotes

- Mixed quotes are free relatives

(18) Perry said that climate change is a “contrived phony mess”.

(19) \llbracket “contrived phony mess” \rrbracket = what x referred to with his utterance of the phrase ‘contrived phony mess’

Maier's (2014) analysis II

- Pure quotes are referring expressions
- Quoting preserves syntactic categories

- (20)
- a. Input: α
 - b. Output: $\langle ' \alpha ' ; C ; \ulcorner \alpha \urcorner \rangle$
 - c. If α is an arbitrary expression, then $' \alpha '$ is a referring expression, and $\llbracket \ulcorner \alpha \urcorner \rrbracket = \alpha$

- This is the system from (Potts 2007)

Maier's (2014) analysis III

- Free relatives are definite descriptions

(21) $\iota X[E(x, \ulcorner \alpha \urcorner, X)]$
 \approx the X that the source x expressed using the phonological string α

(22) $\iota X[E(x, \ulcorner \text{contrived phony mess} \urcorner, X)]$
 \approx climate change has the property that the source x expressed with 'contrived phony mess'

- Previous discourse: presupposition (cf. Fabricius-Hansen and Sæbø 2004 on the German reportative subjunctive)

(23) Climate change is "contrived phony mess"

- a. PRESUPPOSITION: there is an X such that x uttered the words 'contrived phony mess' to refer to X
- b. ASSERTION: climate change is X

Previous discourse presupposition I

- Not cancellable

(24) Quine said that “quotation has a certain anomalous feature”.
But he never used those words. (Maier 2014:3)

- Informativity: new information
- Challengeability

(25) a. We should just carry on “irregardless”.
b. Hey wait a minute! Who here ever said *irregardless*?
(Maier 2014:38)

Previous discourse presupposition II

- Projection

- (26) I do not “misunderestimate” my opponents.
⇒ Somebody said “misunderestimate”.

- Local accommodation

- (27) a. Why are all the grammar nerds on the forum angry at her?
b. I don't know, maybe she said “could care less” about proper usage? (Maier 2014:39)

Handling non-faithfulness I

Basic idea

Non-identical fragments are not quoted

- (28) a. Bill Waterson said that reality “continues to ruin my life”.
 b. Bill Waterson said that reality “continues to ruin [his] life”.

- non-faithful pieces are not in the scope of the quote

- (29) ...that reality [his] “continues to ruin ...life”

- Quotation has corresponding holes

- (30) λx . continues to ruin x 's life

Handling non-faithfulness II

- Non-constituent mixed quotes: larger discourse is quoted

(31) CBP [...] said it can take “more time to verify [an individual’s citizenship] ” in certain situations.

\Rightarrow [more time [to verify [an individual’s citizenship]]]

\nRightarrow [more time [to verify]]

- Syntactic integration: two strings count as identical if they can be derived from the same syntactic structure
 - gender features
 - word order

Remarks I

- Maier: mixed quotes are about referring
- Our take: mixed quotes share more properties with direct discourse
 - some slack in verbatimness
 - only linguistic expressions
 - presence of an agent and their commitment

Remarks II

- Pragmatics of mixed quotes: distancing

- (32)
- a. Adrian: Where is Natasha?
 - b. Pranav: She is teaching at a summer school.
 - c. Adrian: Pranav says that Natasha is at “a summer school.”
 - c'. Adrian: Pranav says that Natasha is at “a summer school” but it’s only an excuse to go to Riga.

- Commitment

- (33) “Extinct” pygmy elephants have been found living on Borneo.
(Maier 2014:29)

Recanati on quotation

Indexicality I

(34) THE ANSWERING MACHINE:
I am not here now.

Indexicality II



THE FIRST AND LAST TIME DAVID KAPLAN WENT TO YOGA

© Tanya Kostochka 2016

Quotation as context shifting I

- Recanati (2001): not two but three roles for context in determining meaning:
 - content: providing contextual values for determining truth
 - character: specifying the relevant contextual parameters
 - linguistic meaning: determining the language spoken
- Cases of language shift in quotation are the result of the third role – we are crossing a language divide

Quotation as context shifting II

- Proposal: Quotation signals the presence of a *deferential operator* D

(35) $D_e(\alpha)$ used in context c

- a. presupposes a use of α by $\text{AUTHOR}(e)$ in some communicative context c'
 - b. returns what α “would mean in c' ”
i.e., a character X such that $X(c) = \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket_{c'}^{c'}$
- Notation: $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket_{c'}$: the character that α denotes in the language of c'

Quotation as context shifting III

- Indexicals: there isn't a change across language, but context of speech

(36) You said that they “snuck up on me.”

(37) $D(\text{me}) = \llbracket \text{you} \rrbracket_c$, since $\llbracket \text{you} \rrbracket_c^c = \llbracket \text{me} \rrbracket_c^{c'}$

- Lexical meaning shift: there is a shift

(38) Ash said that someone stole “my badometer.”

(39) a. $D(\text{my}) = \llbracket \text{Ash} \rrbracket_c$

b. $D(\text{badometer}) = \llbracket \text{pedometer} \rrbracket_c$

Quotation as context shifting IV

- But what about this?

(40) Bill said he was in the next 'paper' session. (Recanati 2001)

- What is the character X such that $X(c) = \llbracket \text{paper} \rrbracket_c^{c'}$?
 - Recanati: $\llbracket \text{poster} \rrbracket_c$
 - But does this require Bill to misunderstand the meaning of *paper*?
- Another option: not align the scope of D so tightly with the quotes
- Recanati himself argues that quotations are pragmatic indicators of deferential interpretation
- Perhaps:

(41) Bill said he was in the next 'paper session.' (Recanati 2001)

Free Indirect Discourse

The phenomenon II

- Two voices: narrator and protagonist

(43) a. English: personal and temporal indexical

John looked at **my**_{NARRATOR} picture. Yes, he
thought_{NARRATOR}, he **wanted**_{NARRATOR} to marry
me_{NARRATOR} **today**_{JOHN}. (Sharvit 2008:354)

b. German: tense and temporal indexical

Tom **lächelte**_{NARRATOR}. **Morgen**_{Tom} **war**_{NARRATOR}
Tom.NOM smile.PST tomorrow be.PST
der grosse Tag.
DEF.M.NOM.SG big day.NOM
'Tom **smiled**_{NARRATOR}. **Tomorrow**_{TOM} **was**_{NARRATOR} the
grand day.' (Eckardt 2014:75)

The phenomenon III

- A simple recipe
 - start with an attitude report
 - flip temporal/locative indexicals

- (44)
- a. He would be **here**_{SHE} **today**_{SHE}, **she** thought. She needed to get ready.
 - b. ≠ **She** thought he would be **here**_{NARRATOR} **today**_{NARRATOR}.
 - c. She thought he would be **there**_{SHE} **that day**_{SHE}.

- Things are more complicated

- DPs cannot be *de re* (Doron 1991)

(45) *Context: Figaro sees Countess Almaviva, who is wearing his wife's clothes, approaching Count Almaviva in the dark.*

Figaro froze in place. He couldn't believe his eyes.

a. DE DICTO:

His wife_{FIGARO} had swooned into the Count's arms and was now kissing him passionately. (Doron 1991:54)

b. DE RE:

#**Countess Almaviva**_{NARRATOR} had swooned into the Count's arms and was now kissing him passionately.

Pronouns in FID I

- 3-person can be *de dicto*

(46) In the drug-induced haze **Tom** became convinced a large snake was winding up his leg. How big **it_{TOM}** was! **It_{TOM}** would bite and kill him today.

Pronouns in FID II

- 3-person cannot be *de re*: gender mismatch (Schlenker 2004; Sharvit 2008)

(47) **The lady** looked at my baby daughter, dressed in her brother's old clothes and rolling in the dirt.

a. DE DICTO

He_{LADY} would need a bath today, she said.

b. DE RE

#She_{NARRATOR} would need a bath today, she said.

Pronouns in FID III

- Quick note on *de se*: conscious awareness on part of the antecedent (more on Day 3)

(48) a. DE SE

Context: Looking in the mirror, talking about herself:

Natasha thinks that she [I] has a nice haircut.

b. DE RE

Context: Looking in the mirror, not recognizing herself:

Natasha thinks that she [that woman] has a nice haircut.

Pronouns in FID IV

- 3-person pronouns co-referent with the protagonist:
obligatory *de se* (Banfield 1982)

(49) *Context: **John** is going through an old album and comes to a picture of himself as an infant. He doesn't recognize himself in the frilly skirt.*

- a. DE SE
How innocent-looking **he** was! he thought.
- b. NON DE SE
??How innocent-looking **she** was! he thought.

Pronominal Indexicals in FID

- 1-person and 2-person are allowed,
- obligatory *de re* interpretation (Schlenker 2004; Sharvit 2008; counter to Banfield 1982)

(50) **Jim** was looking at **my**_{NARRATOR} baby pictures. What a cute baby **I**_{NARRATOR} was! **he**_{JIM} surely thought.

Root clause phenomena in FID I

- Root clause types

- (51) John sees Mary and thinks: “How widely she is smiling at me!”
- a. DD
John thought: “How widely she is smiling at me!”
 - b. SID
(i) #John thought that how widely she was smiling at him.
(ii) John thought that she was smiling at him very widely.
 - c. FID
How widely she was smiling at him(, thought John).
- (Sharvit 2008:368)

- Discourse particles and speaker oriented-adverbials

- (52) He sighed. Honestly, the work was stressing him out, he thought.

Root clause phenomena in FID II

- No language shift

(53) a. Standard German

Peter sass neben Heidi. Er war nervös.
Peter sit.PST near Heidi. he be.PST nervous
'Peter was sitting near Heidi. He was nervous.'

b. Standard German

Was wollte sie von ihm?
what want.PST she from he.DAT
'What did she want from him?'

b'. Bavarian

Was hot di von eahm wolln?

(Eckardt 2014)

Summing up: a chimera

	SID	DD
3rd pro gender		✓
DP de re		✓
1st/2nd de re	✓	
temporal indexicals unshifted		✓
tenses	✓	
main clause syntax		✓
language-switch	✓	

Mixed quotation?

- A natural idea: FID is a case of mixed quotation (Maier 2015); see also (Recanati 2000; Schlenker 2004)

(54) He was sick “today”, he thought.

- Mixed quotation is unconstrained
- An analysis along those lines would require a number of ad-hoc assumptions (see discussion in Sharvit 2008)

Basic solution: bicontextualism I

- Banfield (1982): two contexts
 - the speech context, u
 - the reported thought context, r
- An idea embraced in various ways by Doron (1991); Schlenker (2004); Sharvit (2008); Eckardt (2014)
 - personal indexicals sensitive to speech context
 - pronominal gender features sensitive to reported context
 - adverbial indexicals sensitive to reported context

Basic solution: bicontextualism II

- Bicontextual variance

- (55)
- a. $\llbracket x_i^{1st} \rrbracket^{u,r,g}$ defined only if $g(i) = \text{SPEAKER}(u)$
 - b. $\llbracket x_i^{masc} \rrbracket^{u,r,g}$ defined only if $g(i)$ is male in $\text{WORLD}(r)$
 - c. $\llbracket \text{today}_i \rrbracket^{u,r,g}$ defined only if $g(i)$ is the day surrounding $\text{TIME}(r)$
 - d. $\llbracket t_i^{past} \rrbracket^{u,r,g}$ defined only if $g(i) < \text{TIME}(r)$

- Locus of variation: semantics of pronominal elements
- Parallel from a different domain: contexts of assessment for predicates of personal taste and epistemic modals (MacFarlane 2014)

Tense in FID I

- Tense itself does not shift
- Cross-linguistic variation: SOT vs. non-SOT contrast preserved in FID (Sharvit 2008; Eckardt 2014)
 - English: SOT language, present-under-past does not have a simultaneous reading

- (56) a. #Two years ago, John found out that Mary is pregnant.
b. ✓Two years ago, John found out that Mary was pregnant.

- FID in English: no simultaneous reading

- (57) Original thought: “Yes, I am definitely pregnant.”
- a. #Yes, she is definitely pregnant(, thought Mary).
b. Yes, she was definitely pregnant(, thought Mary).
(Sharvit 2008:357)

Tense in FID II

- Hebrew: non-SOT language, present-under-past can have a simultaneous reading

(58) Hebrew

Yosef gila Se Miriam hara
Yosef find.out.PST COMP Miriam pregnant
'Yosef found out that Miriam was pregnant (at the time of
utterance).'

- FID in Hebrew: simultaneous reading

(59) Hebrew

Ken, hi le-lo safek hara (, xaSva Meri).
 Yes she definitely pregnant think.PST Meri
 ‘Yes, she was definitely pregnant(, thought Mary).’
 (Sharvit 2008:357)

- FID: an attitude environment
- FID operator: a covert doxastic

- (60) a. $\llbracket \text{think} \rrbracket^{u,r,g}(w)(p)(t)(x) = 1$ iff $\forall \langle w', t', x' \rangle$ compatible with what x believes in w at t : $p(w')(t')(x') = 1$
- b. $\llbracket \text{FID} \rrbracket^{u,r,g}(w)(t)(x)(f) = 1$ iff $\forall \langle r', g' \rangle$ compatible with what x believes in w at t :
 $f(r')(g')(world(r'))(time(r'))(author(r'))$

Sharvit (2008) II

- The SOT facts and *de se* pronoun handled by same mechanism: feature deletion under binding (see Eckardt 2014 for disagreement)
- When a tense (or pronoun) is bound by one of the abstractors, the associate presupposition is deleted (leaving just the bound variable)

(61) a. She was pregnant, thought Mary.

b. FID-Mary- t_1^{past} - w_2 $\lambda w_3 \lambda t_4 \lambda x_5$ she₆ t_4^{past} was pregnant

- This is why SOT and *de se* pronominals have matrix world features: morphology that is not interpreted

FID as a speech report I

- FID can be used to report overt speech

(62) He was arriving today, she told him.

- Universal assumption: FID reports thought

(63) He was arriving today, she thought.

- Not all doxastics license FID

(64) He was arriving today, she {??believed, ??was certain}.

(65) What would he say to her? she {??was curious}.

FID as a speech report II

- Non-obvious communicative verbs
 - Most doxastic predicates are not communicative

- (66)
- a. #“He is running late,” she believed/was certain.
 - b. #“He is running late,” she discovered/figured out/knew.
 - c. #“What are we doing?” she was curious (about).

- Some doxastic predicates license direct discourse and quotative inversion

- (67)
- a. “He is running late,” she thought (aloud/to herself).
 - b. “He is running late,” she realized.
 - c. “What are we doing?” she wondered (aloud/to herself).

- Suggestion:
 - Such cases report internal speech

FID as a speech report III

- What FID reports: a speech act, not its entailments

- (68)
- a. Pranav: “Riga is hot today.”
 - b. Pranav said that one Latvian city was hot that day.
 - c. One Latvian city was hot today, Pranav said.

FID as a speech report IV

- Commitments rather than words

- (69) a. • When he wanted to illustrate his theory of descriptions, Russell said: “The King of France is bald.”
b. #When Russell wanted to illustrate his theory of descriptions, he said that The King of France was bald.
c. #The King of France was bald(, said Russell when he wanted to illustrate his theory of descriptions).
(Sharvit 2008:392)
- (70) a. To illustrate inversion in English Zeljko said: “ Is John still here?”
b. # Was John still here, asked Zeljko to illustrate inversion in English.
(Sharvit 2008:392)

Future work

- Psycholinguistic profile (some research: Harris and Potts 2009; Harris 2012; Kaiser 2015)
- Cross-linguistic variation

Tomorrow

- Communicative verbs
 - Complements: indexical shift
 - Subjects: differences between doxastics and communicative predicates

References I

- Abbott, B. (2005). Some notes on quotation. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 17.
- Banfield, A. (1973). Narrative style and the grammar of direct and indirect speech. *Foundations of Language* 10(1), 1–39.
- Banfield, A. (1982). *Unspeakable Sentences: Narration and Representation in the Language of Fiction*. Routledge.
- Cappelen, H. and E. Lepore (1997). Varieties of quotation. *Mind* 106, 429–450.
- Cappelen, H. and E. Lepore (2003). Varieties of quotation revisited. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 17, 51–75. Special issue *Hybrid Quotations* (ed. by P. de Brabanter).
- Cumming, S. (2005). Two accounts of indexicals in mixed quotation. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 17.
- Davidson, D. (1979). Quotation. *Theory and decision* 11(1), 27–40.
- Doron, E. (1991). Point of view as a factor of content. In S. Moore and A. Wyner (Eds.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 1, pp. 51–64. Cornell University.
- Eckardt, R. (2014). *The Semantics of Free Indirect Discourse: How Texts Allow Us to Mind-read and Eavesdrop*. Leiden: Brill.

References II

- Fabricius-Hansen, C. and K. J. Sæbø (2004). In a mediative mood: The semantics of the German reportive subjunctive. *Natural Language Semantics* 12(3), 213–257.
- Harris, J. A. (2012). *Processing perspectives*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Harris, J. A. and C. Potts (2009). Perspective-shifting with appositives and expressives. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 32(6), 523–552.
- Kaiser, E. (2015). Perspective-shifting and free indirect discourse: Experimental investigations. In *Proceedings of SALT 25*, pp. 346–372.
- MacFarlane, J. (2014). *Assessment Sensitivity: Relative Truth and Its Applications*. Oxford University Press.
- Maier, E. (2014). Mixed quotation: The grammar of apparently transparent opacity. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 7, 1–67.
- Maier, E. (2015). Quotation and unquotation in free indirect discourse. *Mind and language* 30(3), 345–373.
- Potts, C. (2007). The dimensions of quotation. In C. Barker and P. Jacobson (Eds.), *Direct Compositionality*, pp. 405–431. Oxford University Press.
- Recanati, F. (2000). *Oratio Obliqua, Oratio Recta*. MIT Press.

References III

- Recanati, F. (2001). Open quotation. *Mind* 110(439), 637–687.
- Recanati, F. (2008). Open quotation revisited. *Philosophical perspectives* 22(1), 443–471.
- Saka, P. (2013). Quotation. *Philosophy Compass* 8(10), 935–949.
- Schlenker, P. (1999). *Propositional attitudes and indexicality: a cross-categorical approach*. Ph. D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Schlenker, P. (2004). Context of thought and context of utterance (a note on free indirect discourse and the historical present). *Mind and language* 19(3), 279–304.
- Shan, C.-c. (2011). The character of quotation. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 33(5), 417–433.
- Sharvit, Y. (2008). The puzzle of free indirect discourse. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31(3), 353–395.