

that, and to trigger the intuition we did, we didn't need to embed that sentence within the scope of 'said that'. This is analogous to Kripke's response to Dummett's wide-scope account of rigidity. Kripke pointed out that we don't need to embed sentences in modal contexts to trigger intuitions about rigidity. We say the same about content sharing across contexts: We need only think about unembedded sentences and whether or not they say the same. The point we've just made, we take to be important and obviously in need of further elaboration and defense. We will have to leave that for another occasion.

Reply to Francois Recanati

Recanati's *Literal Meaning* (2004) has one central objection to the kind of view we call semantic minimalism (what Stanley, in a recent review of Recanati's book, calls *propositional syncretism*): Recanati argues, along with Carston (2002) and Stanley & King (2005), that the minimal proposition will, in Stanley's terms, be 'an idle wheel in an explanation of linguistic practice'. In Chapter 12, we respond to that challenge (we focus on the original version of the argument, found in early papers by Carston), and end with a reversal of that charge: it is Recanati's view that lacks psychological reality. Chapters 8 and 9 also directly object to the view Recanati advocates. In Chapter 8 we argue his view makes communication impossible and in Chapter 9 we argue it is internally inconsistent. So, there are a number of disagreements between Recanati and us it would be interesting to explore.

These issues are not, however, what Recanati chose to focus on in his reply. His central argument concerns tests we present in Chapter 7. He has, unfortunately, misunderstood their status and nature. He has also misunderstood their role in our overall argument. We're afraid most of our reply will take the form 'This isn't our view, see page....'. Given the substantive disagreements between Recanati and us, and given his interesting arguments for his view, we wish this exchange had been more substantive, but as it is, we're forced to reiterate our position and refer readers to relevant passages.

R#1. 'Cappelen and Lepore's book is addressed to their fellow minimalists'

Recanati correctly outlines our argument to the effect that there is a slippery slope from moderate to radical contextualism (in Chapters 3-5). In response to this argument he

says ‘...the argument has force only for someone who antecedently rejects the contextualist conclusion. Cappelen and Lepore’s book is addressed to their fellow minimalists, ... *C&L merely presuppose that contextualism is wrong.*’ (our emphasis)

Reply: We are befuddled. The middle part of our book is called ‘Part III: Refutation of Radical Contextualism’. It includes three chapters, each of which develops various objections to contextualism. Chapter 9 argues radical contextualism is internally inconsistent (something you should care about even if, or, rather, especially if, you’re a contextualist). Chapter 8 argues contextualism cannot account for communication across contexts (again, a point not only minimalists care about, we hope). Chapter 7 argues there’s a great deal of linguistic data (about disquotational reports, collective reports, reports under ignorance, etc.) that contextualism can’t account for. These are all points that should move anyone, regardless of their theoretical biases. So, in no way do we concede that our book presupposes contextualism is wrong – on the contrary, the central part of *IS* tries to show it is wrong, based on assumptions all participants in this debate can and should accept. If Recanati thinks our argument against radical contextualism is inconclusive, he should tell us why. If he thinks communication across contexts is impossible, he shouldn’t write a reply to us.

R#2: Recanati’s Distinctiveness Suggestion

Since Recanati ignores Part III of our book, he tries to help us ‘by providing an argument against the contextualist conclusion’. As noted above, our view is that the generalization is unacceptable for the reason we give in Chapters 7-9. We do not want or need to fill in any gaps with ‘Distinctiveness’. However, this might be as good a place as any to register comments on the idea that there are many kinds of context sensitive expressions. Some readers, including Recanati, seem to think we deny this. We don’t. All we assume is the following truism: *if an expression e is semantically context sensitive, its semantic value changes from one context of utterance to another.* That’s just what it is to be semantically context sensitive. Within the class of semantically context sensitive expressions, there are many different kinds (as we point out (13)). Some are automatic, some are not. Some appeal to speaker’s intentions, some don’t. Some require demonstrations, others don’t. As far as we can tell, these are all differences with respect to how the semantic value is fixed in a context of utterance. We are completely natural on

these matters (see (147-150)). Nothing we say in *IS* depends on how these issues get settled.

R#3. Recanati's Description of our Tests

Recanati does discuss some of the data from Chapter 7. He says: 'Let us now turn to C&L's new criterion for context-sensitivity.' It is clear Recanati takes 'criterion' to be something both necessary and sufficient for being context sensitive. So, an expression is context sensitive, on Recanati's reading of Chapter 7, just in case it passes each and every test there. This is not our view. As we made clear in General Comment #2 above, we construe these tests as sources of evidence. We would never dream of using any one of these as a 'criterion' for context sensitivity – that would be confused methodology

R#4: Recanati on our so-called 'Master Argument'

Recanati claims that in §VI he has presented our 'Master Argument' for semantic minimalism. He thinks our master argument is that only terms in the Basic Set block homophonic reports across contexts. We wish it were not possible to read *IS* in this way. We don't have a master argument. We don't even use the argument Recanati calls our master argument (because we don't treat the tests as criteria, see point R#3 above).

There is a section in the book called 'Semantic Minimalism: Arguments' (150-57) where we summarize all our arguments for semantic minimalism. We divide the arguments into two categories: 'Argument by Elimination' and 'Argument from Explanatory Force'. The latter has seven sub-categories. The first of these seven has five sub-categories. What Recanati calls our 'Master Argument' is a version of one of these five sub-categories. So, it should be clear from that section that we do not treat the appeal to homophonic reports as a 'Master Argument'.

R#5: Recanati's 'Counter-Example'

We claim that there are cases where we can give a disquotational indirect report of an utterance of a sentence with a term like 'ready'. We claim that this provides evidence for the view that the term is semantically context insensitive. Again, in so doing we're not alone: that assumption underlines many of the arguments in Hawthorne (2003), Richard (2004), MacFarlane (2005), Egan, Hawthorne and Weatherson (2005).

Recanati, in response, constructs a context in which such a report seems unacceptable, he says:

Whether or not a homophonic report is possible depends upon a number of factors, and, in particular, it depends upon the storytelling context (the context in which the report is made). ... The trivial observation that the possibility or impossibility of homophonic reports depends upon the context in which the report is made is sufficient to dispose of Cappelen and Lepore's theory.

Reply: The objection fails for two reasons, both of which should be obvious by now:

1. Recanati presents us with an instance of what we in General Comments #4 (see above) called a *BP-Example*. We refer the reader to that section and the discussion of these examples on (99) of *IS*. As we argue there, BP-examples are *beside the point*. Recanati might have an objection to our reply, but since he doesn't present one, we don't know how to advance the debate.
2. Even if Recanati has a knock-down objection to our use of the Inter-Contextual Disquotational Report Test, that would not be 'sufficient to dispose of C&L's theory'. As we noted in R#3 above, we don't treat this test as 'a criterion'. It is but one version of one argument out of five arguments that constitute one half of our arguments for semantic minimalism (again, see (150-157)). (That said, we think it is a very strong argument, and we are in no way prepared to give it up. We also think further development and understanding of it and related tests is one of the central challenges in semantics and pragmatics.)
3. Finally: Recanati is seeking a single objection, a silver bullet, that will 'dispose of semantic minimalism. We're quite sure that's not how this debate will play out, and we think it is unproductive to look for arguments that aspire to 'dispose of' one of the positions in logical space (and semantic minimalism is at least that). The issues raised are exceedingly complex – questions about the set of intuitions we should invoke, the interpretations of those intuitions, the best way of describing them, and the best theoretical framework for them. Simple knock down arguments will be hard to come by in this terrain. We're more likely to gradually refine the sense of what counts as evidence, how to access that evidence, and the competing theoretical framework for explaining those intuitions.

R#6: Recanati on Contextual Salience Absorption

In connection with our discussion of contextual salience absorption Recanati says:
...the contextualist can have her cake and eat it: she can invoke Contextual Salience Absorption to account for the homophonic cases, and she can simultaneously invoke the other cases (the Leslie cases) to argue against the literalist schema.

Since we are not denying that there could be cases where the disquotational reports seem unnatural (see General Comment #4) we have no principled objection to this more limited appeal to contextual salience absorption (it is, of course, not an objection to the argument we run in the book, since we were arguing against someone who denied that there could be *any* reports of the problematic kind). What remains to be explained, for the contextualist, is *what* the shared content is in the cases where these reports are possible. Finally, what we call *collective reports* and *reports under ignorance* are unexplained by this strategy.

Reply to Ann Bezuidenhout

B#1 Theoretical Use of 'red'

IS argues that moderate contextualism collapses into radical contextualism and that radical contextualism is self-defeating. The latter part of the argument is presented in Chapters 7-9, and the last of these chapters argues that the way radical contextualists present their views is inconsistent with radical contextualism. In so doing we use examples from a paper by Bezuidenhout – not because we think her paper is particularly guilty of the point we're trying to make, but because it exemplifies a general feature of the contextualist literature. Our argument goes as follows: the way Bezuidenhout uses the expression 'red' when she talks about the kinds of examples that are meant to establish that 'red' is context sensitive is incompatible with the claim that 'red' is context sensitive. She is using 'red' in a context insensitive way to establish that 'red' is context sensitive. We claim that this is general problem – not specific to Bezuidenhout's particular formulation of radical contextualism.

In response to this line of criticism, Bezuidenhout says: