

Context Dependence (such as it is)

Kent Bach

All sorts of things are context-dependent in one way or another. What it is appropriate to wear, to give, or to reveal depends on the context. Whether or not it is all right to lie, harm, or even kill depends on the context. If you google the phrase ‘depends on the context’, you’ll get several hundred million results. This chapter aims to narrow that down. In this context the topic is context dependence in language and its use.

It is commonly observed that the same sentence can be used to convey different things in different contexts. That is why people complain when something they say is ‘taken out of context’ and insist that it be ‘put into context’, because ‘context makes it clear’ what they meant. Indeed, it is practically a platitude that what a speaker means in uttering a certain sentence, as well as how her audience understands her, ‘depends on the context’. But just what does that amount to, and to what extent is it true?

Philosophers and linguists often say that certain words (and sentences containing them) are *context sensitive*, that what they express is *context dependent*, as if it is perfectly obvious what context dependence is. It is not. So we will need to ask what context is, what depends on it, and what this dependence involves. Answers to these questions are not straightforward. It turns out that there is more than one kind of context and that different sorts of things depend on each. At least they seem to, for as we will see, much of what passes for context dependence is really something else. Looking at what goes on in specific cases suggests that much of what is done in context is not done by context.

Why should we look into these questions? There are two main theoretical reasons, though we will not dwell on them. First, context sensitivity poses a challenge to the common view that the meaning of a sentence determines its truth-condition. This is the assumption underlying the widespread view that the goal of semantics is to give a systematic theory of the truth-conditions of sentences. However, a truth-conditional semantics has to reckon with the fact that the semantic contents of context-sensitive expressions vary from one context of utterance to another, and that is possible only if the meanings of context-sensitive expressions determine *how* their semantic contents vary

with the context. One complication, as we will see, is that many sentences do not seem to have truth-conditions, even relative to contexts.

The second worry, related to the first, is that context sensitivity might undermine the principle of compositionality. This is the common methodological assumption that the semantic properties of complex expressions are determined by those of their constituent expressions and how these are related syntactically. If this principle did not hold, so it is thought, we could not understand, much less knowingly produce, any of the virtually unlimited number of sentences we have not previously encountered. Here the challenge is to show how the contents of complex expressions are determined by the contents of their possibly context-sensitive constituents. In some cases, the semantics of the complex expression creates problems for compositionality. To see this, just compare the meanings of ‘water lily’ and ‘tiger lily’ or of ‘child abuse’ and ‘drug abuse’.

There are more down-to-earth reasons for investigating context sensitivity. If the words in a language all had unique and determinate meanings (no ambiguity or vagueness) and fixed references (no indexicality), and if using language were simply a matter of putting one’s thoughts into words, understanding an utterance would merely be a matter of deciphering whatever words the speaker uttered. But language and our use of it to communicate are not as straightforward as that. Some expressions, most obviously pronouns, like ‘I’, ‘they’, and ‘this’, and temporal terms like ‘today’ and ‘next week’, do not have fixed references. For example, when I use ‘I’ it refers to me, but when you use it it refers to you. Moreover, we often speak inexplicitly, nonliterally, or indirectly, and in each case what we mean is distinct from what can be predicted from the meanings of the expressions we utter. We can leave something out but still mean it, use a word or phrase figuratively, or mean something in addition to what we say. We even can do all three at once.

Here’s an example. Suppose you have a friend whose neighbor is well known to be an incompetent doctor. Your friend complains about a chronic cough, and you say, ‘You should see someone today, but not that genius next door’. You meant, let’s assume, that your friend should see a doctor that very day for a diagnosis, but not the incompetent neighbor. You probably meant also that he could well have a serious medical condition.

What is the role of context in this case? It does not determine what you meant. Your

communicative intention determines that. What context does do is provide information that your friend could use, presuming you intend him to, to figure out what you meant. In that connection context plays a merely evidential role. However, it seems that context can play a more direct, semantic role, at least in connection with such words as ‘I’ and ‘today’. They are context sensitive, in that their contents, what they contribute to the contents of sentences in which they occur, depend on the context in which they are used.

After discussing how this is so in these paradigm cases, we will look at a wide range of other sorts of expressions that have also been claimed to be context sensitive. To evaluate such claims, which fall under the general rubric of *contextualism*, we will need to ask whether it is the content of the expression itself that varies from one context of utterance to another and, crucially, whether it does so because of features of the context. This question rarely gets asked. Rather, contextualists tend to use phrases like ‘context-dependent’ and ‘context-sensitive’ freely and uncritically, as if it is obvious that what is done in context is done by context and equally obvious how. The primary aim of this chapter is to encourage the reader not to take the ‘obvious’ for granted.

1. Introduction: Two kinds of context, two roles for context

One thing should be understood from the start. To hold that certain terms are context sensitive is not to deny that they have dictionary meanings. The claim is *not* that their *meanings* vary with the context. It is that their (standing) meanings determine their contents as a function of contexts of their use. After all, we wouldn’t look words up in the dictionary if they didn’t have (fairly) stable meanings. To be sure, we recognize that a great many are ambiguous and expect their dictionary entries to give their distinct meanings separately. But ambiguity is not context dependence. Take the ambiguous words ‘press’ and ‘suit’ as they occur in the sentence ‘A tailor pressed a suit in court’. It might seem in a certain context that the speaker is using it to mean that the tailor sued someone, but this does not show that ‘press’ and ‘suit’ are context sensitive. For she could instead, however improbably, have used the sentence to mean that the tailor ironed a suit of clothes in a courtroom (for convenience, I will generally use ‘she’ for the speaker and ‘he’ for the hearer). Context cannot prevent that, although she might not be understood unless she clarified how she was using her words. In some cases, the context

may leave that open, as with this sentence in a letter of recommendation: ‘I enthusiastically recommend this candidate with no qualifications whatsoever’.

This sentence, as it might occur in a letter of recommendation, illustrates a different point:

(1) Mr. Tully is a clear and forceful speaker.

If the letter is for the job of radio announcer, the writer surely means that Mr. Tully has an important qualification for the job. On the other hand, if the letter is for a radiologist job, the writer could well use (1) to imply that Mr. Tully is a poor candidate. In neither case does the context determine what the writer means in uttering (1) – that is a matter of her intention – but it does determine what the reader could reasonably take her to mean.

There are different things a speaker might be doing in uttering this sentence:

(2) The cops will break up the party.

Suppose there’s a boisterous party going on very late at night in an otherwise quiet neighborhood. One can imagine different circumstances in which (2) could be used to, and be taken by the hearer to, make a prediction, issue a threat, make a promise, issue a warning, or give an order. For example, a nearby resident, confident in the impatience of another neighbor and in the responsiveness of the police, might utter (2) to her husband to make a prediction. That impatient neighbor, tired of the noise, might call the police, and the responding officer might use (2) to promise that the police will break up the party. And if the impatient neighbor happens to be the mayor, she might call the police chief and use (2) to give an order.

These last examples fall under the domain of pragmatics (see Chapter 8), and the issues they raise will not be pursued here. However, it is important to point out that the role of context in these cases is different from the role it plays with expressions that are semantically sensitive to context. Indeed, two different kinds of context are involved. *Narrow context* consists of matters of objective fact to which the determination of the semantic contents of certain expressions are sensitive. *Broad context* is the conversational setting, the mutual cognitive context or salient common ground. It includes the current state of the conversation (what has just been said, what has just been referred to, etc.), the physical situation (if the parties are face to face), salient personal knowledge, and relevant broader common knowledge. Playing a pragmatic role in communication (on

whether it could also play a semantic role, see Section 3.1), broad context includes the information that the speaker exploits to make what she means evident to the hearer and, if communication is to succeed, and that the hearer takes into account, on the assumption that he is intended to, to figure out what the speaker means.

This difference is often overlooked. For example, Stalnaker, although he contrasts propositions semantically expressed by (context-sensitive) sentences and pragmatic effects of speakers' utterances, treats semantic and pragmatic context sensitivity on a par:

How should a context be defined? This depends on what elements of the situations in which discourse takes place are relevant to *determining what propositions are expressed by context-dependent sentences and to explaining the effects of various kinds of speech acts*. The most important element of a context, I suggest, is the common knowledge, or presumed common knowledge and common assumptions of the participants in the discourse. A speaker inevitably takes certain information for granted when he speaks as the common ground of the participants in the conversation. It is this information which he can use as a resource for the communication of further information, and against which he will expect his speech acts to be understood. (Stalnaker 1999: 67; my emphasis)

However, being used as a resource for communication is very different from determining what propositions are expressed. The pragmatic role of context is to provide a basis, as intended by the speaker, for the hearer to figure out what the speaker means. A speaker's communicative intention is reasonable to the extent the hearer can be expected to recognize it on the basis of what she says and the fact that she says it in the context.

However, it does not literally determine, in the sense of fixing, what the speaker means. Rather, it enables the hearer to determine, in the sense of ascertaining, what she means.

This characterization suggests that broad context imposes a rational constraint on the speaker's communicative intention. However, it would be misleading to say that this constraint determines what a speaker should intend, given that she says a certain thing. After all, a speaker can try to communicate anything she pleases. The constraint, rather, is this: *given* what she intends to communicate, she should say something that, even if she is not being fully explicit, makes evident to the hearer what she aims to convey. In order to understand the speaker, the hearer relies on the assumption that she intends him to be able

to figure out what this is, and to do that he must take into account contextual facts that he can reasonably take her as intending him to take into account (see Grice 1989, chs. 2 and 14, and Bach and Harnish 1979, chs. 1 and 5).

In the remainder of this chapter we take up a variety of examples of expressions that have been thought to be context sensitive. Many turn out not to be. In some cases, this is because the source of the contextual variation is not the expression itself but the open range of possible ways in which speakers can use simple sentences containing that expression. In Section 2 we will discuss so-called *indexicals*, some of which, such as ‘I’ and ‘today’, do seem to be context sensitive in a straightforward way, and compare them with demonstratives, whose contextually variable uses seem to depend on the speaker’s intention in using the expression, not on the context in which the expression is used. We will also briefly consider the claim that certain sentences that would otherwise not have truth-conditions contain ‘hidden indexicals’, whose values are somehow provided by context and thereby complete the proposition being expressed. Then, in Section 3, we will discuss various issues about speaker intentions, contexts of utterance, and the relationship between the two. Do intentions really trump contexts, or is intention part of context? Finally, in Section 4, we will take up more examples, mostly involving various kinds of adjectives that have been thought to be context sensitive.

One aim of this chapter is to show that many supposed cases of context sensitivity are really instances of something else, which I call *semantic incompleteness*. That is, many sentences containing such expressions fall short of expressing a proposition and are therefore not capable of being true or false, even relative to a context. The idea of semantic incompleteness is straightforward if you think in terms of structured propositions rather than truth conditions, as built up out of objects, properties, and relations (see Kaplan 1989a). Since these are made up of building blocks assembled in a particular way, it makes sense to suppose that in some cases such an assemblage, put together compositionally from a sentence’s constituents according to its syntactic structure, might fail to comprise a proposition (see Bach 1994b and Soames 2009). That is because, although this comprises the entire semantic content of the sentence, it lacks at least one constituent needed for it to be true or false and to be the content of a thought or a statement. Even so, like a mere phrase (see Stainton 2006), a semantically incomplete

sentence can be used to *assert* a proposition.

2. Indexicals: Automatic, discretionary, and hidden

The common philosophical term for contextually shifty terms is ‘indexical’. The obvious examples of indexicals are pronouns (‘she’, ‘we’, ‘you’, ‘they’, etc.) and demonstratives (‘this’, ‘those’, ‘there’, etc.), but there are also temporal terms, such as ‘now’ and ‘today’, ‘last week’, and ‘three days ago’, as well as discourse indexicals, notably ‘the former’ and ‘the latter’. Pronouns also function as discourse indexicals, when used anaphorically, as linguists say, to refer back to previously mentioned items (for a thorough discussion, see Neale 2006). In fact, anaphoric pronouns illustrate one of our main themes, as with these examples:

- (3) a. A cop arrested a robber. He was wearing a badge.
- b. A cop arrested a robber. He was wearing a mask.

It is natural to suppose that in (3a) ‘he’ refers to the cop and in (3b) to the robber. It is natural all right, but not inevitable. The speaker of (3a) could be using ‘he’ to refer to the robber, and the speaker of (3b) could be using it to refer to the cop. Such speakers would probably not be understood correctly, at least not without enough stage setting to override commonsense knowledge about cops and robbers, but that would be a pragmatic mistake. Nevertheless, the fact that ‘he’ could be so used suggests that it is the speaker’s intention, not the context, which determines that in (3a) it refers to the cop and in (3b) to the robber. The same point applies to these examples with two anaphoric pronouns:

- (4) a. A cop arrested a robber. He took away his gun.
- b. A cop arrested a robber. He used his gun.
- c. A cop arrested a robber. He dropped his gun.
- d. A cop arrested a robber. He took away his gun and escaped.

In (4a), presumably ‘he’ would be used to refer to the cop and ‘his’ to the robber, whereas in (4b) both would be used to refer to the cop, in (4c) both would be used to refer to the robber, and in (4d) ‘he’ would be used to the robber and ‘his’ to the cop. However, given the different uses of the pronouns in what is essentially the same linguistic environment, what explains these differences in reference can only be the

speaker's intention, not the context. It is a different, pragmatic matter how the audience figures out the references, and that depends on the broad, communicative context, which comprises the extralinguistic information to be taken into account. If the speaker does not correctly anticipate the hearer's inference, her references will be misunderstood.

2.1 Automatic indexicals

Matters are different with those indexicals that refer independently of the speaker's intention. Suppose you said (5) to me,

(5) I am relaxed today.

The word 'I', the present tense form of the verb, and the word 'today', as you are using them, refer to you and the time and day when you spoke. Indeed, they seem to do so automatically, not because of your intention. That is why Perry calls them 'automatic' rather than 'discretionary' indexicals. What they refer to depends not on what you intend to refer to but 'on meaning and public contextual facts' (Perry 2001: 58). So, if instead I had uttered (5) and done so on the following day, the references would have been to me and to a different day, and again the references would have been automatic. Also, if I were then to remind you what you said the previous day, I would use different indexicals and utter (6), not (7).

(6) You said you were relaxed yesterday.

(7) You said I am relaxed today.

It is a fact about the standing meaning of 'I' that, as used on a given occasion, it refers to its user and a fact about the meaning of 'today' that, as used on a given occasion, it refers to the day it is used. These facts about their meanings are essentially rules for their use.

The stable meaning of the expression, or what Kaplan (1989a) calls its *character*, determines what contextual parameter fixes its reference, or what Kaplan calls its semantic *content*. This was just illustrated by the difference between 'I' and 'today'. The content (reference) of each varies, as a matter of its respective linguistic meaning, with a certain sort of fact about the context. Moreover, as Kaplan argues, the terms' characters (meanings) do not enter into the semantic contents of sentences in which the terms occur. Rather, their references enter in (Braun (2008) argues similarly regarding demonstrative phrases, like like 'that guy'). So if the day after you uttered (5) I spoke (8) to you,

(8) You were relaxed yesterday.

I would be saying the same thing you said the day before. That is, despite their lexical differences, sentence (5) as uttered by you on one day and sentence (8) as spoken by me to you the next day would have the same semantic contents, in that what it takes for them to be true depends on the same thing, your being relaxed on the day in question. The rules for the use of ‘you’ and ‘yesterday’ are different from those for ‘I’ and ‘today’ but in the situations described their respective contents are the same.

2.2 Discretionary Indexicals

Terms such as ‘now’, ‘then’, ‘here’, ‘we’, ‘you’, ‘she’, and ‘that’ seem to differ in how they work from ‘I’, ‘today’, and ‘last week’. Just compare ‘now’ with ‘today’. Whereas the reference of ‘today’ as used on a given occasion is straightforwardly the day of that use, the reference of ‘now’ is not straightforwardly the time of its use. This is because the extent of that time is not fixed. Is it strictly the moment that ‘now’ is used, or can the time in question be a larger duration that includes that moment? One might insist that it is strictly the moment of use and that any larger duration merely including that moment is not, strictly speaking, the reference of ‘now’.

That might seem plausible until one considers ‘here’. The analogous claim would be that ‘here’ as used on a given occasion refers to the place of that use. But which place is that? What is the spatial analogue of the moment of utterance, even if we exclude regions that extend beyond the speaker’s body? The location of the speaker’s mouth, her complete vocal apparatus, her entire body?

The situation is similar with ‘we’, but also interestingly different. For not only can the extent of the reference be larger or smaller, it can be disparate. ‘We’ can be used on a given occasion to refer to a plurality (or group) that includes the speaker, but which plurality is that? It could include the intended audience, but it might not, as when one person speaks on behalf of a group of people not present.

What determines the reference? A first thought is that the context does, but does it? On second thought, it seems that the speaker’s referential intention does the trick. What context does is to impose rational constraints on that intention and on the hearer’s inference as to what that intention is. This contrasts with what determines the references of ‘I’, ‘today’, and ‘last week’, as used on a given occasion. A specific, objective fact

about the context (the identity of the speaker in the case of ‘I’ and the time of the utterance with ‘today’ and ‘last week’) determines the reference. In Section 3 we look more deeply into intentions and contexts in connection with uses of demonstratives like ‘this’ and ‘that’.

2.3 Hidden indexicals

Several types of sentences raise an interesting issue. As used in a given context, they seem intuitively capable of being true or false – they seem to express definite propositions – and yet they seem to be missing something necessary for that. To account for this it has been suggested that they contain a ‘hidden indexical’. This phrase was introduced by Schiffer (1977: 31-36) to address the longstanding philosophical puzzle about belief reports. We will take up some less puzzling cases.

Weather and other environmental reports

So-called weather reports have attracted considerable attention ever since they were first discussed by Perry (1986) in connection with his notion of ‘unarticulated constituent’, his phrase for an element in the proposition expressed by the speaker that does not correspond to any expression in the uttered sentence. The debate has focused on ‘It is raining’, but there are similar sentences, some of which pertain to aspects of the environment other than the weather:

- (9) It is raining.
- (10) It is windy.
- (11) It is noisy.
- (12) It is eerie.

These sentences do not specify a location where it is said to be raining or whatever. Moreover, they do not seem to say merely that it is raining (windy, etc.) somewhere or other, although this is a matter of some debate (see Recanati 2002, Stanley 2002, and Taylor 2001), at least in the case of (9). This line seems far less plausible with the other sentences, especially (12). It seems that these sentences, as they stand, do not fully express propositions (are not true or false), even given the time of utterance. That is, it seems that a location where it is being said to be windy, noisy, or eerie needs to be understood. This is not a general requirement, as Taylor points out with examples like

‘John is dancing’. That sentence expresses a proposition even though dancing must take place at a location. However, something is missing in what sentences (10) – (12) express, with the semantically empty ‘it’ as subject. Compare them with ‘Chicago is windy’, ‘Midtown Manhattan is noisy’, and ‘Carlsbad Caverns is eerie’. Speakers uttering sentences like (9) - (12) must intend some location as part of what they mean. It is as if they uttered a richer sentence, one that included a locative phrase, as here:

- (9+) It is raining in St. Andrews.
- (10+) It is windy in Chicago.
- (11+) It is noisy in midtown Manhattan.
- (12+) It is eerie in Carlsbad Caverns.

These sentences do express propositions, and speakers could use (9) - (12) to convey these propositions, but only in the right contexts, where they can reasonably expect to be taken to be talking about the location in question.

Do (9) - (12) contain a hidden indexical, something like ‘(in) x’, for the unspecified location that a speaker must mean? That is an interesting linguistic question. Recanati (2004) and Stanley (2005a) have continued their debate about whether contextualism, to be defensible, must take the form of *indexicalism* (this is Recanati’s term for the view that Stanley defends). However, neither addresses the underlying question of how context does what each assumes it does, whether it is to provide values for hidden indexicals or merely to supply unarticulated constituents.

Regarding this interesting linguistic question, the main reason for positing a hidden indexical is to account for the meaning of sentences like (13a), as represented in (13b):

- (13) a. Wherever John is on his vacation, it rains.
- b. Wherever(x) John is on his vacation, it rains in x.

That is, we seem to need the variable to account for the variation in the place, indicated by ‘wherever’, where it is said to be raining. Moreover, so the so-called *binding argument* goes, if the variable is present because of a quantifier needing a variable to bind, as in (13), the variable is present, functioning as an indexical, in the absence of a quantifier, as in (9). However, this argument does not seem to work for (14) and (15):

- (14) Whenever John is on his vacation, it rains.
- (15) Whenever John doesn’t have his umbrella, it rains.

In these cases the variation in location is understood, but there is nothing in the sentence ('whenever' has replaced 'wherever') to require that location be marked syntactically.

Terms with missing complements

A similar situation arises with certain expressions that can be used without what linguists call *complements*, as in these sentences:

(16) Ronnie is ready.

(17) Lynn is late.

Because one can't be just plain ready or just plain late (being ready and being late are relations, not properties) and these sentences do not indicate what Ronnie and Lynn are being said to be ready or late for, these sentences seem not to express propositions and not capable of being true or false. Yet these sentences are perfectly usable. How can that be?

Borg (2004) and Cappelen and Lepore (2005) maintain that these sentences do express propositions but not the ones they are used to assert. For example, Borg thinks that (16) expresses the proposition that Ronnie is ready for something or other, even though it cannot be used to assert that proposition. Cappelen and Lepore think that it expresses the 'minimal' proposition that Ronnie is ready, full stop. Their critics (in Preyer and Peter, eds., 2005) doubt that there is such a proposition (one can't be just plain ready), and some suggest that (16) must be context sensitive, perhaps with a hidden variable whose value is what Ronnie is being said to be ready for. Even if there is such a variable, rather than merely an unarticulated constituent, for reasons we have seen the context does not provide that value.

The most economical approach denies that (16) and (17) express propositions, whereas the following augmented versions of these sentences, with the extra material in italics, do express propositions (given a time of utterance):

(16+) Ronnie is ready *to go to school*.

(17+) Lynn is late *for work*.

A speaker can reasonably use (16) or (17) to assert the propositions expressed by (16+) and (17+) even without specifying what she means Ronnie is ready to do or what Lynn is

late for, provided she does so in a context in which the hearer can figure what she is trying to convey. Context does not determine what completes the proposition, but enables the hearer to figure out how the speaker intends it to be completed (see Bach 1994b).

Relational Terms

Relational terms, like ‘neighbor’, ‘fan’, ‘enemy’, ‘local’, and ‘foreign’, are so-called, unsurprisingly, because they seem to involve a relation to something. You can’t just be a neighbor, full stop, but only a neighbor of others. You can’t just be a fan; you have to be a fan of something, such as a team or a performer. You can’t be an enemy, full stop, but only an enemy of a person or a group. That is why sentences like the following seem semantically incomplete and have been thought to contain hidden indexicals:

(18) Oliver is a neighbor.

(19) Oscar is a fan.

(20) Osama was an enemy.

They seem to be missing something present in these augmented versions:

(18+) Oliver is a neighbor *of the Joneses*.

(19+) Oscar is a fan *of FC Barcelona*.

(20+) Osama was an enemy *of Obama*.

Does this show that who the person is being said to be a neighbor, fan, or enemy of is determined *by* the context? No, it shows only that this is determined *in* the context. When someone utters a sentence like one of these, what she means must include such relational information. Whether or not sentences (18) - (20) contain hidden variables, context does not determine what fills the gap.

Perspectival Terms

A similar point applies to perspectival terms, like ‘left’, ‘distant’, ‘horizon’, ‘faint’, and ‘occluded’. Sentences like the following seem to be semantically incomplete for essentially the same reason as the previous three, and have also been thought to contain hidden indexicals:

(21) The post office is on the left.

(22) One can see a ship on the horizon.

(23) The old firehouse is occluded by an apartment building.

In these cases there is no explicit indication of a perspective and, since something can't just be on the left, full stop, be on the horizon, full stop, etc., the explicitly expressed semantic contents of these sentences seem to be sub-propositional. In contrast, the semantic contents of their explicitly completed counterparts are fully propositional:

(21+) The post office is on the left *after you cross the intersection of 1st and Main*.

(22+ *From the top of the hill* one can see an island on the horizon.

(23+) *From the post office* the old firehouse is occluded by an apartment building.

Once again context does not determine what fills the gap. Rather, it provides information to help the hearer to figure out how the speaker intends the gap to be filled.

We have certainly not settled the questions of whether sentences like (9) – (23), the ones considered in this section, contain hidden indexicals or are merely used to convey propositions with unarticulated constituents, but either way they are semantically incomplete. That does not mean that they are context sensitive. Unfortunately, the tests that Cappelen and Lepore (2005: ch. 7) and Cappelen and Hawthorne (2009: ch. 2) have proposed for context sensitivity fail to discriminate between that and semantic incompleteness.

3. Context and intention

Some philosophers see no important difference between contents that are 'determined by the speaker's intentions and those that are determined solely by the non-intentional features of the context of utterance (such as the speaker, time, and place). ... [Yet] no substantive or even remotely interesting issue depends upon this distinction' (Cappelen 2007: 8). However, the examples considered so far suggest that the role of the speaker's intention is to determine what the speaker means, not the contents of expressions the speaker uses. And where expression content is determined, as in the case of automatic indexicals, it is determined by (narrow) context, without the help of the speaker's intention. Even so, some have argued that certain aspects of what of we have been treating as broad context, such as relevance and salience, are capable of playing a role in determining the contents of certain expressions. And others have argued that the speaker's intention can itself play such a role and should be construed as an aspect of narrow

context, hence that the role of context of the semantically relevant sort is not limited to automatic indexicals. In this section we will take up several of these arguments and look at the role of intention in the use of demonstratives, the paradigm of discretionary indexicals.

3.1 Context vs. intention

Gauker (2007; 2010) has argued that what is contextually salient or relevant, along with several other ‘accessibility’ factors, can and do help determine semantic content. This is in the spirit of Lewis’s (1979; 1980) liberal conception of the semantic role of context, on which even contextually apt standards of precision can play such a role. Gauker in effect treats salience and relevance as elements of narrow context, not (merely) factors for hearers to take into account to figure out what the speaker means. But how can these factors bear on *semantic* content unless the meanings of the expressions in question somehow require them to play such a role? Gauker’s proposal must in effect treat meaning as character in Kaplan’s sense, but not limited to matters of objective fact, such as the speaker and time of utterance.

This sort of proposal invites the following objection, stated originally by Bach (1994a: 176-9) and forcefully put by Schiffer:

Meaning-as-character may initially seem plausible when the focus is on a word such as ‘I’, but it loses plausibility when the focus is on other pronouns and demonstratives. What “contextual factors” determine the referent of the pronoun ‘she’ in a context of utterance? ... Evidently, the meaning of ‘she’ (very roughly speaking) merely constrains the speaker to refer to a female. We do not even have to say that it constrains the speaker to refer to a contextually salient female, since the speaker cannot intend to refer to a particular female unless he expects the hearer to recognize to which female he is referring, and the expectation of such recognition itself entails that the speaker takes the referent to have an appropriate salience. What fixes the referent of a token of ‘she’ are the speaker’s referential intentions in producing that token, and therefore in order for Kaplan to accommodate ‘she’, he would have to say that a speaker’s referential intentions constitute one more component of those n-tuples that he construes as ‘contexts’. The trouble with this is that there is no work for Kaplanian contexts to do once one recognizes speakers’ referential intentions.

The referent of a pronoun or demonstrative is always determined by the speaker's referential intention. (Schiffer 2005: 1141)

Schiffer's argument applies not only to personal pronouns like 'she' (and obviously to demonstratives) but also to expressions of any other sort for which salience or relevance is thought to play a content-determining role (in the sense of fixing content, not merely ascertaining it). The only exception is automatic indexicals.

It is important to appreciate that Schiffer's argument does not bear on the pragmatic, that is epistemic and normative, role of context, construed broadly to include salience, relevance, and so on. For these factors do constrain what a speaker can reasonably intend. However, that role should not be confused with the semantic role of actually determining content. As Fodor and Lepore explain, 'Since the speaker's access to the interpretation of his utterance is epistemically privileged, nothing about the background of an utterance is metaphysically constitutive of its interpretation. The function of background knowledge in interpretation is (only) to provide premises for the hearer's inferences about the speaker's intentions' (2005: 10).

Instead of appealing to salience and relevance, which are properties that rational speaker intentions exploit but which cannot plausibly be regarded as actually fixing semantic content, one might argue that the speaker's intention fills the semantic gap. Stokke (2010) defends 'intention-based semantics', according to which the speaker's intention is itself an element of narrow context, hence capable of determining semantic content. Focusing specifically on demonstrative reference, he argues that the speaker's intention in using a demonstrative determines its reference.

However, there is a problem with this proposal. Perhaps unaware of the ambiguity of the phrase 'demonstrative reference', which can mean either reference by a demonstrative or reference by a speaker in using a demonstrative, Stokke evidently conflates the two. At best, his proposal renders reference by the demonstrative itself as derivative, with no theoretical importance of its own. As Neale puts the point, in the spirit of Strawson (1950), 'referring is an intentional act, something *speakers* do, [and] talk of an *expression* itself referring, and even talk of an expression referring relative to an utterance, a speech act, a 'context', or a 'tokening', is, at best, derivative' (2007: 254). That is, we can always *stipulate* that to say that when the speaker's intention determines what the speaker

is referring to, the expression thereby refers to it. But what's the point of such a stipulation? It just trivializes intention-based semantics for demonstratives.

There is a deeper problem, pertaining to the speaker's intention. If the speaker's intends to use a demonstrative to refer to a certain object, she does so with the audience in mind. She uses 'that' to enable her audience to focus on the intended object, and does so with the intention that he take that to be the object she is talking about. But this is part of her overall communicative intention in uttering the sentence in which 'that' occurs. As such, it is essentially an audience-directed, hence pragmatic intention. The speaker does not have a separate semantic intention that the word 'that' itself refer to the object she is using it to refer to. As far as reference to that object is concerned, there is just her one pragmatic intention. And recognizing that intention is all the hearer has to do for the reference to be conveyed. It is not the word 'that' but the speaker's *use* of it that manifests her referential intention and triggers the hearer's inference to what she intends to refer to.

3.2 Intentions or demonstrations?

But is it really the speaker's intention that determines demonstrative reference? Kaplan (1989a) initially thought it was the speaker's demonstration (at least an implicit one, when there is no gesture but a particular object is uniquely salient), but later (Kaplan 1989b) he decided that it was the speaker's 'directing intention', so-called because it guides the act of demonstration (if there is one) of a certain object. The demonstration, Kaplan now thought, plays merely the pragmatic role of facilitating communication by making clear to the hearer what the speaker intends to be referring to (Braun 1996 modified Kaplan's account of the character of demonstratives that finessed the difference between intentions and demonstrations). Reimer (1991) subsequently argued that Kaplan shouldn't have changed his mind. Her argument relies mainly on cases where the intention and the demonstration diverge. In one example the speaker uses 'that dog' with the intention of referring to Fido but, as Fido is frolicking around with other dogs, she inadvertently points to Spot. It seems that she is thus referring to Spot, contrary to her intention. This is clear from the fact that she would be speaking falsely if she said, 'That dog is Fido'. The explanation for this, according to Reimer, is that what is controlling is

not the intention but the act of demonstration.

We can agree with Reimer that what the speaker says in this example is false and that this is because the reference is indeed to Spot. However, as Bach (1992) argued, that is because the relevant intention on the part of the speaker is to refer to the dog she is pointing at. She believes that the dog she is pointing at is Fido – that’s why she says ‘That dog is Fido’ – and to that extent intends to refer to Fido. However, the intention that the hearer is to recognize, the one whose recognition is essential to the success of the speaker’s act of communication, is the intention to refer to the dog she is pointing at. And *this* intention *is* decisive in determining the reference. That is because when demonstrating something, the speaker intends the hearer to think of a certain item *as* the one she is pointing at and thereby intending to be talking about. If she intended the hearer to think of the dog as Fido, she could not have thought she was providing him with new information. She would have been telling him that this dog, Fido, was Fido. So, although she failed to refer to the dog she intended to refer to, insofar as she intended to refer to Fido, she succeeded in referring to the dog she intended to demonstrate and did demonstrate, the one she was pointing it. The former intention can be trumped by the demonstrative gesture, but the latter cannot be.

3.3 Context of *utterance*?

At the beginning we assumed that some indexicals, such as ‘I’ and ‘today’, are automatic (rather than discretionary) and that the context of utterance determines their references. However, there are exceptional cases, such as the standard answering machine message ‘I am not here now’ and the similar office door message ‘I will not be in my office today’. These examples raise an obvious problem: the intended time associated with ‘now’, ‘today’, or the present tense is not the time of speaking or writing. Not only that, the speaker (or writer) need not be the right person (the recorded message might have come with the telephone, and a colleague might have posted the note). Similar situations arise with advertisements, signs, wills, fictional and historical narratives, stenographers, and translators.

Such examples suggest that the context of utterance (the agent and the time of the utterance) does not always determine the reference or else that the notion of utterance

context must be construed more abstractly. Either way, the question arises of how the relevant notion of context ties in with the meanings of words like ‘I’, ‘now’ and ‘today’. That is, what could it be about the meaning of ‘I’ that makes it refer to the person being called or the occupant of the relevant office? And what could it be about the meanings of ‘now’ and ‘today’ that could make them refer to the time of the call or the day of the visit to the office. In defense of the standard appeal to context of utterance, one might point to the distinction between the semantic content of the sentences in which they were originally uttered and the contents they are to be taken to have when heard by a caller or read by a visitor. To defend such a view, one would have to argue that these are not literal uses of the sentences in question or at least that they are to be treated as if they were being uttered at the time they are encountered. However, such moves would require invoking intentions and thereby viewing these indexicals as less automatic and more discretionary than standardly supposed.

To address this problem, or at least the part involving ‘I’, Dodd and Sweeney (2010) refine the notion of agent of the context. They consider different versions of the answering machine and Post-it Note examples and argue that in some cases the agent of the context can be someone other than the person who actually produced the token of ‘I’. In these as in standard cases, ‘I’ automatically refers to the agent of the context. In other cases ‘I’ doesn’t refer at all. For example, if I take an ‘I will be back soon’ note left from yesterday on my neighbor’s door and put it on my door, I am the agent of the context. But if my neighbor, knowing that I am away but will return soon, puts her note on my door, I am not the agent of the context. In this case, ‘I’ does not refer to me, although it is naturally taken as if it does.

4. Adjectives and other additional examples

So far we have attended mainly to the prime candidates for context sensitivity, indexicals and demonstratives, and to several specific sorts of sentences thought to contain hidden indexicals. Now we will take up several kinds of adjectives that have been claimed to be context sensitive. After that we will mention a few other candidates.

4.1 Gradable adjectives

There are thousands of gradable adjectives, and they fall into two broad categories. *Relative* adjectives, exemplified by ‘tall’, ‘old’, ‘fast’, and ‘smart’, are the more abundant by far. Less common but still plentiful are *absolute* adjectives, such as ‘flat’, ‘empty’, ‘pure’, and ‘dry’. Relative adjectives apply in degrees but, unlike absolute adjectives, not to any maximal degree. There are no ultimate degrees of tallness, oldness, etc. Even fastness, though presumably limited in fact by the speed of light, is not limited by the semantics of ‘fast’. Nothing can be completely or perfectly tall, old, fast, or smart. In contrast, absolute adjectives, as their name would suggest, apply to maximal degrees. Even if, as a matter of physical fact, a surface cannot be perfectly flat and a container cannot be completely empty, these phrases, ‘perfectly flat’ and ‘completely empty’, make perfectly good semantic sense.

Relative adjectives

Let us begin with relative adjectives, as they occur in sentences like these:

(24) No jockey is tall.

(25) Richard Hughes is tall.

(26) Fido is old.

(27) Michael Phelps is fast.

All of these sentences may seem true. In particular, (24) seems true. Yet Irish jockey Richard Hughes is 5’10”, and that makes him tall for a jockey. Does that make (25) true and (24) false? Not if ‘tall’ is construed as a context-sensitive term. But is that the right way to look at it? The key thing to notice is that tallness is not a property. One cannot be just plain tall. Richard Hughes is tall for a jockey but not tall for an adult Caucasian man – being tall for a jockey is a property he has, and being tall for an adult Caucasian man is a property he lacks. So it would seem that both (24) and (25), as well as (26) and (27), are semantically incomplete, are not capable of being true or false.

Could (24) and (25) still be true or false, albeit only relative to comparison classes (jockeys, adult men, etc.)? Kennedy (2007) points out that, strictly speaking, the relativization of a gradable adjective is to a standard, not necessarily to a comparison class (even with a specified comparison class, as in ‘tall for a jockey’, a standard is still

needed). Even so, when we relativize explicitly, usually it is to comparison classes rather than to standards, as in these augmented versions of (24)- (27):

(24+) No jockey is tall for an adult human.

(25+) a. Richard Hughes is tall for a jockey.

b. Richard Hughes is tall for an adult Caucasian man.

(26+) Fido is old for a dog.

(27+) Michael Phelps is fast for a swimmer.

(25+a) and (25+b) are relativized to different comparison classes, and express different propositions, one true and one false (notice that what makes the difference is the additional phrase, not the word ‘tall’, whose role is the same in both). Speakers can use (25) to convey one of those (or similar) propositions. Which one she succeeds in conveying depends on the context, in the broad sense in which the proposition she can reasonably expect to be taken to convey and the hearer can reasonably take her to convey depends on what information is mutually available. In some cases it will be necessary to explicitly mention the intended comparison class. (It should be noted that relative adjectives are generally vague, and vagueness might seem to involve a different sort of apparent context dependence. How that is treated depends on one’s theory of vagueness, far too big a topic to take up in this chapter.)

Absolute adjectives

Absolute adjectives, unlike relative ones, apply to maximal degrees. There is a maximal degree to which, for example, a surface can be flat, a container can be empty, a sample of gold can be pure, or a cloth can be dry. So it might seem that sentences like the following determinately express propositions and are perfectly capable of being true or false.

(28) Pool tables are flat.

(29) Some freight cars are empty.

(30) The gold in Fort Knox is pure.

(31) My raincoat is dry.

However, it is debatable whether such predicates have to apply to the maximal degree for sentences like these to be true (never mind whether they can apply maximally in the real world). For example, even though pool tables are not perfectly flat, it seems that (28) is

true. It may seem that such sentences can be true if the relevant predicate applies closely enough, but Unger (1975) argued that something can be flat (empty, pure, dry) only if nothing can be flatter (emptier, purer, drier) than it. However, he later conjectured that these two contrasting views, which he dubbed *contextualism* and *invariantism*, are equally tenable (Unger 1984). Only on a contextualist view are sentences like (28) – (31) semantically context-sensitive; on an invariantist view they are not. If invariantism is correct, such sentences are categorically true only if their predicates apply completely or perfectly, and categorically false otherwise. This means that uses of them are pragmatically context-sensitive. Lasersohn (1999) describes their uses as blessed with ‘pragmatic halos’, which may be larger or smaller depending how tolerant or exacting their use. Utterances of them can be treated as true if they are close enough to applying maximally (as if they included an implicit ‘approximately’, ‘for all practical purposes’, or the like), but what counts as close enough varies. A pool table can be flat for all practical purposes if it is level enough and smooth enough for playing an unimpeded game of pool, assuming that’s the relevant purpose, but an airport runway can be less flat and still count as flat for its purpose.

Why did Unger (1984) suggest that there is no objective basis for deciding between the two views on terms like ‘flat’ and ‘empty’? He pointed out that appealing to intuitions is inconclusive because they point in both directions. For example, it is intuitively plausible that something can be flat only if nothing can be flatter than it, and that phrases like ‘nearly flat’ and even ‘almost perfectly flat’ imply not flat. On the other hand, it seems that phrases like ‘perfectly flat’ and ‘completely flat’ are not redundant, hence that they are stronger than unmodified ‘flat’. So Unger doubted that the conflict between contextualism and invariantism about absolute adjectives could be resolved. However, we should remember that ‘contextualism’ is not really the right term for the first view, since it does not really claim that context determines the standard for applying the term.

4.2 Terms for response-dependent properties

A special case of gradable adjectives are those, such as ‘edible’, ‘scary’, and ‘comfortable’, used to ascribe *response-dependent* properties. These properties are so-called because they apply to things or substances because of the effects that these things

or substances have on other things (so they are better described as relations than as properties). The terms that express them are generally relative adjectives, but some, like 'lethal', are absolute. They are worth singling out here because they might seem to be context-dependent quite apart from being standard-relative (and vague). Consider sentences like these:

- (32) Some roots are edible.
- (33) Horror movies are scary.
- (34) Wassily chairs are comfortable.

These sentences are used to indicate a certain responsiveness (sensitivity or sensibility), either biological or psychological. With edibility obviously this responsiveness is biological, but typically when a speaker makes a statement using a sentence like (32) it reflects the responsiveness of her biological type, that is, *Homo sapiens*. With scariness and comfortableness, although biologically based, it is primarily psychological, a matter of how things of the relevant sorts, horror movies or Wassily chairs in the above examples, are experienced. Things are not edible, scary, or comfortable, full stop, but only relative to animals or people. This suggests that sentences like (32) – (34) are not context-sensitive but, rather, semantically incomplete. That does not mean, of course, that they cannot be used to convey propositions.

Typically, but not necessarily, statements made in using sentences like (32) - (34) are from the speaker's perspective, perhaps generalized to include a group of which the speaker takes herself to be typical. If advised that most men are not scared by horror movies, a female speaker might retreat and claim that horror movies are scary to most women. Perhaps more realistically, the intended group comprises people like the speaker or perhaps people with sensibilities like the speaker's.

These observations suggest that sentences like the above, if they are to express propositions, need to be augmented in ways like these:

- (32+) a. Some roots are edible *for humans*.
- b. Some roots are edible *for goats*.
- (33+) a. Horror movies are scary *to people like me*.
- b. Horror movies are scary *to small children*.
- (34+) a. Wassily chairs are comfortable, *at least to people of my size and shape*.

b. Wassily chairs are comfortable *to people with strong backs*.

These sentences express propositions that speakers of the semantically incomplete sentences (32) –(34) might mean. Typically, but not necessarily, statements made in using (32) –(34) are from the speaker’s perspective, perhaps generalized to include a group of which the speaker takes herself to be typical as to response. The augmented (a) sentences express such propositions. However, as the (b) sentences illustrate, the intended group need not include the speaker. It is not difficult to imagine contexts, say in response to a question about whether little Billy should watch Halloween 5, in which a rational speaker uttering (33) is likely to mean, and a rational listener is likely to take the speaker to mean, that horror movies are scary to small children. However, this does not show that the context determines that this is what is meant. Note, finally, that the speaker may not have a precise communicative intention when uttering a sentence like (32) - (34), in which case there is no proposition that the speaker determinately means (see Buchanan 2010).

4.3 Predicates of personal taste

The above problems are exacerbated for *predicates of personal taste*, a special case of adjectives for response-dependent properties. They include such adjectives as ‘fun’, ‘tasty’, ‘thrilling’, and ‘funny’. They do not express absolute properties but, so it is sometimes thought, properties that are relative to a judge or to an assessor (see Lasersohn 2005 and MacFarlane 2005). However, arguably they are experiencer-relative, since whether or not something is, say, fun or tasty, depends on how it affects the person, on what sort of experience it causes, not on the judgment or assessment that the person makes on the basis of that experience (see Glanzberg 2007). Statements made using simple, unrelativized versions of sentences containing predicates of personal taste are typically made from the speaker’s perspective:

(35) Pineapples are tasty.

(36) Rafting through the Grand Canyon is thrilling.

(37) Jon Stewart is funny.

However, a speaker can also adopt the perspective of someone else or some group, as perhaps in uttering these sentences with the same predicates:

- (38) Alpo is tasty.
- (39) Skydiving is thrilling.
- (40) Three Stooges movies are funny.

Someone uttering (38) is likely to mean that Alpo is tasty to dogs, or perhaps to her own dog, not to herself. Someone uttering (39), say if she were explaining why some people engage in skydiving, could well mean that skydiving is thrilling to people not afraid to do it, and someone might utter (40) with the perspective of French people in mind, say if she were explaining why *Les Trois Imbeciles* are still popular in France. It is always possible, and to ensure successful communication often necessary, to make the relevant perspective explicit, by uttering a sentence relativized to that perspective, as with these more elaborate versions of (38) – (40):

- (38+) Alpo is tasty to dogs.
- (39+) Skydiving is thrilling to people not afraid to do it.
- (40+) The Three Stooges are funny to French people.

In some cases it is unnecessary to specify the experiencers from whose perspective being tasty, thrilling, or funny is being considered. For example, if you are asking someone whether something is tasty, thrilling, or funny, or you are reporting that someone finds something tasty, thrilling, or funny, normally you are asking for or reporting how it is from their perspective.

Lasersohn (2005) and Stephenson (2007) have proposed relativist accounts of sentences like (35) - (40), according to which such sentences express propositions that are not true or false absolutely but only relative to judges or assessors. Leaving aside general challenges to the idea of relative truth (see Glanzberg (2009) and Soames (2011), and several contributions to García-Carpintero and Kölbel (2008)), Boghossian (2006) and Wright (2008) have raised doubts that truth relativism in a given area, such as where predicates of personal taste are involved, can amount to anything more than property relativism in that area. Their basic idea is that certain ostensibly monadic properties, as expressed by one-place predicates, are actually relational. This is supported by our observation that when the relatum is actually specified, as in the sentences in (38+) – (40+), there is no question of relative truth. Once we take those sentences into account, we can see, by subtraction as it were, that (38) – (40) are semantically incomplete.

Instead of supposing that they express propositions whose truth is judge- or experiencer-relative, we can reject the presupposition that they express propositions at all. This leaves open, of course, what speakers do when they use such sentences. They may or may not have a particular perspective in mind, and they may or may not be understood as asserting something that involves a particular perspective, but these are separate questions, questions about using unrelativized sentences containing predicates of personal taste. As sentences, (35) – (40) are no different from the ones containing terms for response-dependent properties or, for that matter, other relative adjectives.

4.4. Odds and ends

We have discussed a variety of types of expressions thought to be context sensitive. The following list includes them and a few more, which, due to space limitations, cannot be taken up here:

- automatic indexicals: *I, today, next week, last year*, [tense]
- discretionary indexicals and demonstratives: *we, she, they, you, now, here, then, there, that, those*
- weather & other environmental reports: *(It is) raining, hot, humid, windy, noisy, eerie, crowded*
- expressions that can be used without complements: *ready, late, finish, strong enough, legal, eligible, incompetent, experienced, applicable, relevant, difficult*
- relational terms: *neighbor, fan, enemy, local, foreign, employee, mentor*
- perspectival terms: *left, distant, up, behind, foreground, horizon, faint, occluded*
- gradable adjectives, both relative and absolute: *tall, old, fast, smart; flat, empty, pure, dry*
- terms for response-dependent properties: *edible, poisonous, scary, nauseating, comfortable*
- predicates of personal taste: *fun, funny, thrilling, boring, tasty, delicious, tasteful, cute, sexy, cool*
- possessive phrases, adjectival phrases, noun-noun compounds: *John's car, John's hometown, John's boss, John's company; fast car, fast driver, fast tires, fast time;*

water lily, tiger lily; child abuse, drug abuse; vitamin pill, diet pill, sleeping pill, pain pill

- subsentential utterances: ‘A shark!’, ‘In the cupboard’, ‘Scalpel!’, ‘Water!’, ‘Coffee or tea?’
- prepositions: *in, on, to, at, for, with*
- light verbs: *do, have, put, get, go, make, take, give*
- implicit temporal, spatial, and quantifier domain restriction
- certain philosophically interesting terms: *know, might, probable, necessary, explain, and, or, if, obligatory permissible, ought, free, responsible*

Finally, some philosophers and linguists have suggested that all, or at least a vast preponderance, of sentences are context-sensitive, irrespective of which particular words they contain (Searle 1978, Sperber and Wilson 1986, Travis 2000, Carston 2002, Recanati 2004). *Radical contextualism* is based on intuitions about the truth-values of utterances of a given sentence in various contexts. By describing various contexts in which the same sentence can be used to mean different things, as evidenced by intuitions that in some contexts an utterance of the sentence is true and in others false, these writers conclude that the meaning of the sentence, even if it contains no obviously indexical expressions, is context-sensitive.

There are three problems with this line of reasoning (for more detailed discussion see Bach 2005: 29-34). First of all, the most that it shows is that a great many sentences are semantically incomplete. It does not show that they are context-sensitive. Secondly, the sentences usually considered are not random sentences but, rather, sentences of the typically short sort that people use in everyday speech. Even if those sentences are semantically incomplete and even if that showed that they are context-sensitive, it does not follow that there aren't other, more elaborate sentences, one for each context, whose utterance would have made what the speaker meant fully explicit. And there are a lot more of those longer, more elaborate sentences than there are of the short sentences that motivate the line of reasoning in the first place. Thirdly, this line of argument has a rather drastic implication. If it worked not only for the short sentences under consideration but also for the more elaborate ones, we would have to conclude that thoughts are essentially ineffable. That is because the argument would show that no amount of elaboration, of

spelling out the thought the speaker is trying to express, could ever make that thought fully explicit. Perhaps some would welcome this consequence, but it seems to be an unfortunate consequence of the radical contextualist position.

+==+==+==+

It takes a lot to show that expressions of a given type are context sensitive. It is not enough to point out that what a speaker means when using the expression can be different in different contexts. It has to be the content of the expression itself that varies, and it has to be the context, in a way determined by the meaning of the expression, that makes the difference. The fact that a sentence does not express a proposition independently of the context does not show that it is context sensitive and that which proposition it expresses depends on the context. For it might not express a proposition at all. What passes for a sentence's 'intuitive' content is often the proposition a speaker uses it to convey.

Appendix: Guide to Further Reading

To look more deeply into the topics touched on in this chapter and into some relevant ones omitted for reasons of space, the reader should consult the references listed below.

Adjectives and context sensitivity: Unger (1984), Lahav (1989), Ludlow (1989), Heal (1997), Kennedy (2007), Glanzberg (2007), Reimer (2002), Rothschild and Segal (2009)

Binding argument: Partee (1989), Stanley and Szabó (2000), Bach (2000), Cappelen and Lepore (2005: ch. 6), Stanley (2005b), Cappelen and Hawthorne (2007), Cohen and Rickless (2007), Neale (2007: 354-8), Elbourne (2008), Sennet (2008)

Context and compositionality: King and Stanley (2005), Fodor and Lepore (2005), Pagin (2005)

Contexts and intentions (and demonstrations): Lewis (1979; 1980), Kaplan (1989a; 1989b), Reimer (1992), Bach (1992), Braun (1996), García-Carpintero (1998), Stalnaker (1999), King (2001), Fodor and Lepore (2005), Bach (2005; 2006a), Gauker (2007), Åkerman (2010), Gauker (2010), Montminy (2010), Mount (2010), Stokke (2010)

Contextualism (semantic): Strawson (1950), Searle (1978; 1980), Lewis (1979), Sperber and Wilson (1986), Travis (2000), Bezuidenhout (2002), Carston (2002), Recanati (2004; 2010)

Contextualism (epistemic): Preyer and Peter, eds. (2005, Part I)

Hidden indexicals (variables, arguments) and unarticulated constituents: Perry (1986), Stanley (2000), Taylor (2001), Recanati (2002), Stanley (2002), Martí (2006), Neale (2007), Hall (2008), Recanati (2010, ch. 4), Landau (2010)

Hidden indexicals and belief reports: Schiffer (1977: 31-36; 1992), Richard (1990), Crimmins (1992), Bach (1997)

Indexicals and their diverse uses: Smith (1989), Sidelle (1991), Predelli (1998), Corazza et al. (2002), Romdenh-Romluc (2002), Weatherson (2002), Predelli (2002), Corazza (2006), Mount (2008), Åkerman (2009), Egan (2009), Stevens (2009), Dodd and Sweeney (2010), Recanati (2010: ch. 6)

Pragmatic intrusion: Levinson (2000), Recanati (2004), King and Stanley (2005), Korta and Perry (2008)

Relative truth: Kölbel (2002), Lasersohn (2005), MacFarlane (2005), Stephenson (2007), Wright (2007), García-Carpintero and Kölbel, eds. (2008), Cappelen and Hawthorne (2009), Glanzberg (2009), Soames (2011), Egan and Weatherson, eds. (2011: Intro. and chs. 4-8)

Semantic incompleteness/underspecification: Atlas (1989: Ch. 2), Bach (1994b), Recanati (2004), Atlas (2005), Soames (2009), and works listed under ‘Contextualism (semantic)’ above

Semantic minimalism vs. contextualism: Unger (1984), Borg (2004), Cappelen and Lepore (2005), Bach (2005; 2006b), Montminy (2006), Preyer and Peter, eds. (2007)

Vagueness and context sensitivity: Raffman (1996), Lasersohn (1999), Fara (2000), Stanley (2003), Shapiro (2006), Kennedy (2007)

References

- Åkerman, Jonas (2009), 'A plea for pragmatics', *Synthese* 170: 155-167.
- _____ (2010), 'Communication and indexical reference', *Philosophical Studies* 149: 355-366.
- Atlas, Jay David (1989), *Philosophy Without Ambiguity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____ (2005), 'Semantical underdeterminacy', in *Logic, Meaning, and Conversation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 3-44.
- Bach, Kent (1992), 'Intentions and demonstrations', *Analysis* 52: 140-146.
- _____ (1994a), *Thought and Reference*, pbk. ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____ (1994b), 'Conversational implicature', *Mind and Language* 9:124-162.
- _____ (1997), 'Do belief reports report beliefs?' *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 78: 215–241.
- _____ (2000), 'Quantification, qualification, and context: A reply to Stanley and Szabo', *Mind and Language* 15: 262-283.
- _____ (2005), 'Context ex machina', in Z. Szabó (ed.), *Semantics vs. Pragmatics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 15-44.
- _____ (2006a), 'What does it take to refer?' in E. Lepore & B. Smith (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Language*, Oxford: Oxford University Press: pp. 516-554.
- _____ (2006b), 'The excluded middle: Semantic minimalism without minimal propositions', *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 73: 435-442.
- Bach, Kent, and Robert Harnish (1979), *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bezuidenhout, Anne (2002), 'Truth-conditional pragmatics', *Philosophical Perspectives* 16: 105-134.
- Boghossian, Paul (2006), 'What is relativism?' in P. Greenough and M. Lynch (eds.), *Truth and Realism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 13–37.
- Borg, Emma (2004), *Minimal Semantics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____ (2007), 'Minimalism versus contextualism in semantics', in Preyer and Peter (eds), pp. 546-571.
- Braun, David (1996), 'Demonstratives and their linguistic meanings', *Noûs* 30: 145-73.
- _____ (2008), 'Complex demonstratives and their singular contents', *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31: 57-99.

- Buchanan, Ray (2010), 'A puzzle about meaning and communication', *Noûs* 44: 340-371.
- Cappelen, Herman, and John Hawthorne (2007), 'Locations and binding', *Analysis* 67: 95-105.
- _____ (2009), *Relativism and Monadic Truth*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cappelen, Herman, and Ernie Lepore (2005), *Insensitive Semantics: A Defense of Semantic Minimalism and Speech Act Pluralism*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- _____ (2007), 'The myth of unarticulated constituents', in M. O'Rourke and C. Washington (eds.), *Situating Semantics: Essays In Honor of John Perry*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 199-214.
- Carston, Robyn (2002), *Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cohen, Jonathan and Samuel Rickless (2007), 'Binding arguments and hidden variables', *Analysis* 67: 65–71.
- Cohen, L. J. (1971), 'Some remarks on Grice's views about the logical particles of natural language', Y. Bar-Hillel (ed.), *Pragmatics of Natural Language*, Dordrecht: Reidel, pp. 50-68.
- Corazza, Eros (2006), 'On the alleged ambiguity of "now" and "here"', *Synthese* 138: 289–313.
- Corazza, Eros, William Fish, and Jonathan Gorvett, J. (2002), 'Who is I?' *Philosophical Studies* 107: 1–21.
- Crimmins, Mark (1992), *Talk about Beliefs*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Dodd, Dylan and Paula Sweeney (2010), 'Indexicals and utterance production', *Philosophical Studies* 150: 331-348.
- Egan, Andy (2009), 'Billboards, bombs, and shotgun weddings', *Synthese* 251-279.
- Egan, Andy, and Brian Weatherson, eds. (2011), *Epistemic Modality*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Elbourne, Paul (2008), 'The argument from binding', *Philosophical Perspectives* 22: 89-110.
- Fara, Delia Graff (2000), 'Shifting sands: An interest-relative theory of vagueness', *Philosophical Topics* 20: 45-81 (originally published under the name 'Delia Graff').
- Fodor, Jerry and Ernie Lepore (2005), 'Out of context', *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 78: 3-20.
- García-Carpintero, Manuel (1998), 'Indexicals as token-reflexives', *Mind* 107: 529-564.
- García-Carpintero, Manuel, and Max Kölbel, eds. (2008), *Relative Truth*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gauker, Christopher (2007), 'No tolerance for pragmatics', *Synthese* 175: 359-371.
- _____ (2010). 'Contexts in formal semantics', *Philosophy Compass* 5: 568-578.

- Glanzberg, Michael (2007), 'Context, content, and relativism', *Philosophical Studies* 136: 1-29.
- _____ (2009), 'Semantics and truth relative to a world', *Synthese* 166: 281-307.
- Grice, Paul (1989), *Studies in the Way of Words*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hall, Alison (2008), 'Free enrichment or hidden indexicals?' *Mind & Language* 23: 426-456.
- Heal, Jane (1997), 'Indexical predicates and their uses', *Mind* 106: 619-640.
- Kaplan, D. (1989a), 'Demonstratives', in J. Almog, J. Perry, and H. Wettstein (eds.), *Themes from Kaplan*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 481-563.
- _____ (1989b), 'Afterthoughts', in J. Almog, J. Perry, and H. Wettstein (eds.), *Themes from Kaplan*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 565-614.
- Kennedy, Christopher (2007), 'Vagueness and grammar: The semantics of relative and absolute gradable adjectives', *Linguistics and Philosophy* 30: 1-45.
- King, Jeffrey (2001), *Complex Demonstratives: A Quantificational Account*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- King, Jeffrey, and Jason Stanley (2005), in Z. Szabó (ed.), 'Semantics, pragmatics, and the role of semantic content', *Semantics vs. Pragmatics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 111-164.
- Kölbel, Max (2002), *Truth Without Objectivity*, London: Routledge.
- Korta, Kepa, and John Perry (2008), 'The pragmatic circle', *Synthese* 165: 347-357.
- Lahav, Ran (1989), 'Against compositionality: the case of adjectives', *Philosophical Studies*, 55: 111-129.
- Landau, Idan (2010), 'The explicit syntax of implicit arguments', *Linguistic Inquiry* 41: 357-388.
- Laserson, Peter (1999), 'Pragmatic halos' *Language* 75: 522-551.
- _____ (2005), 'Context dependence, disagreement, and predicates of personal taste', *Linguistics and Philosophy* 28: 643-686.
- Levinson, Stephen (2000), *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lewis, David (1979), 'Scorekeeping in a language game', *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 8: 339-359.
- _____ (1980), 'Index, context, and content', in S. Kanger and S. Ohman (eds.), *Philosophy and Grammar*, Dordrecht: Reidel, pp. 79-100
- Ludlow, Peter (1989), 'Implicit comparison classes', *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12: 519-533.
- MacFarlane, John (2005), 'Making sense of relative truth', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 105: 321-339.
- Martí, Luisa (2006), 'Unarticulated constituents revisited', *Linguistics and Philosophy* 29: 135-166.

- Montminy, Martin (2006), 'Semantic content, truth-conditions and context', *Linguistics and Philosophy* 29: 1-26.
- _____ (2010), 'Context and communication: A defense of intentionalism', *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 2910-2918.
- Mount, Allyson (2008a), 'The impurity of "pure" indexicals', *Philosophical Studies* 138: 193-209.
- _____ (2008b), 'Intentions, gestures, and salience in ordinary and deferred demonstrative reference', *Mind and Language* 23: 145-64.
- Neale, Stephen (2006), 'Pronouns and anaphora', in M. Devitt and R. Hanley (eds.), *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Language*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 335-373.
- _____ (2007), 'On location', in M. O'Rourke and C. Washington (eds.), *Situating Semantics: Essays in Honor of John Perry*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 251-395.
- Pagin, Peter (2005), 'Compositionality and context', in Preyer and Peter (eds.), pp. 303-348.
- Partee, Barbara (1989), 'Binding implicit variables in quantified contexts', in C. Wiltshire, B. Music, and R. Graczyk, (eds.), *CLS 25: Papers from the Twenty Fifth Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 342-365.
- Perry, John (1986), 'Thought without representation', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* Supp. Vol. 60: 263-28.
- Perry, John (2001), *Reference and Reflexivity*, Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Predelli, Stefano (1998), 'I am not here now', *Analysis* 58: 107-115.
- _____ (2002), 'Intentions, indexicals, and communication', *Analysis* 62: 310-316.
- Preyer, Gerhard, and Georg Peter, eds. (2005), *Contextualism in Philosophy: Knowledge, Meaning, and Truth*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____ (2007), *Context Sensitivity and Semantic Minimalism: New Essays on Semantics and Pragmatics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Raffman, Diana (1996), 'Vagueness and context-sensitivity', *Philosophical Studies* 81: 175-192.
- Ravin, Yael, and Claudia Leacock, eds. (2000), *Polysemy: Theoretical and Computational Approaches*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Recanati, François (2002), 'Unarticulated constituents', *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25: 299-345.
- _____ (2004), *Literal Meaning*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____ (2010), *Truth-conditional Pragmatics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reimer, Marga (1992), 'Do demonstrations have semantic significance?' *Analysis* 51: 177-183.
- _____ (2002). 'Do adjectives conform to compositionality?' *Philosophical Perspectives* 16: 183-198.

- Richard, Mark (1990), *Propositional Attitudes: An Essay on Thoughts and How We Ascribe Them*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Romdenh-Romluc, Komarine (2002), 'Now the French are invading England!' *Analysis* 62: 34–41.
- Rothschild, Daniel, and Gabriel Segal (2009), 'Indexical predicates', *Mind & Language* 24: 467–493.
- Schiffer, Stephen (1977), 'Naming and knowing', *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 2: 28–41.
- ____ (1992), 'Belief ascription', *Journal of Philosophy* 89: 499–521.
- ____ (2005), 'Russell's theory of descriptions', *Mind* 114: 1135–1183.
- Searle, John (1978), 'Literal meaning', *Erkenntnis* 13: 207–224.
- ____ (1980), 'The background of meaning', in J.R. Searle, F. Kiefer, and M. Bierwisch (eds.), *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics*, Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company, pp. 221–232.
- Sennet, Adam (2008), 'The binding argument and pragmatic enrichment, or, why philosophers care even more than weathermen about "raining"', *Philosophy Compass* 3: 135–157.
- Shapiro, Stewart (2006), *Vagueness in Context*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sidelle, Alan (1991), 'The answering machine paradox', *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 21: 525–539.
- Smith, Quentin (1989), 'The multiple use of indexicals', *Synthese* 78: 167–191.
- Soames, Scott (2009), 'The gap between meaning and assertion', in *Philosophical Essays, Volume 1, Natural Language: What It Means and How We Use It*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 278–297.
- ____ (2011), 'True at', *Analysis* 71: 124–133.
- Sperber, Dan, and Deirdre Wilson (1986), *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stainton, Robert (2006), *Words and Thoughts: Subsentences, Ellipsis, and the Philosophy of Language*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stalnaker, Robert (1999), *Context and Content: Essays on Intentionality in Speech and Thought*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stanley, Jason (2000), 'Context and logical form', *Linguistics and Philosophy* 23: 391–434.
- ____ (2002), 'Making it articulated', *Mind and Language* 17: 149–168.
- ____ (2003), 'Context, interest-relativity, and the sorites', *Analysis* 63: 269–280.
- ____ (2005a), 'Review: François Recanati, *Literal Meaning*', *Notre Dame Philosophy Reviews*: <http://ndpr.nd.edu/review.cfm?id=3841>.
- ____ (2005b), 'Semantics in context', in Preyer and Peter (eds.), pp. 221–253.

- Stanley, Jason, and Zoltán Gendler Szabó (2000), 'On quantifier domain restriction', *Mind and Language* 15: 219-261.
- Stephenson, Tamina (2007), 'Judge dependence, epistemic modals, and predicates of personal taste', *Linguistics and Philosophy* 30: 427-525.
- Stevens, Graham (2009), 'Utterance at a distance', *Philosophical Studies* 143: 213–221.
- Stokke, Andreas (2010), 'Intention-sensitive semantics', *Synthese* 175: 383-404.
- Strawson, P. F. (1950), 'On referring', *Mind* 59: 320-344.
- Szabó, Zoltán Gendler (2001), 'Adjectives in context', in I. Kenesei and R.M. Harnish (eds.), *Perspectives on Semantics, Pragmatics, and Discourse*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 119-146.
- Taylor, Kenneth (2001), 'Sex, breakfast and descriptus interruptus', *Synthese* 128: 45-61.
- Travis, Charles (2000), *Unshadowed Thought*, Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press.
- Unger, Peter (1975), *Ignorance: A Case for Scepticism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____ (1984), *Philosophical Relativity*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Weatherson, Brian (2002), 'Misleading indexicals', *Analysis* 62: 308–310.
- Wright, Crispin (2008), 'Relativism about truth itself: Haphazard thoughts about the very idea', in García-Carpintero and Kölbel (eds.), pp. 157-185.