Introduction

Filippo Domaneschi, Carlo Penco, Massimiliano Vignolo

The debate on context dependence of expressions has many roots: the logic-philosophical tradition, starting with Gottlob Frege and his context principle, has developed– with David Kaplan – a paradigm of formal semantics of context-dependent expressions like indexicals and demonstratives. The debate on commonsense reasoning – starting with John McCarthy – has produced a great amount of works on contextual reasoning and on the relations among contexts. Debates in pragmatics, starting with the seminal work of Paul Grice, have posed relevant worries on the traditional paradigm and challenged the boundaries between pragmatics and semantics.

This discussion is characterized by a range of different proposals about the contextual dependence of 'what is said' by an utterance. On the one hand, according to the traditional semantics framework, *Minimalism* says that 'what is said' by an utterance is fully determined by syntax and semantics, to the effect that sentences *per se* have invariant truth conditions. In this view, context contributes to the semantic interpretation of only a *Basic Set* of expressions including pure indexicals ('I', 'here', 'now'), demonstratives ('this', 'that') and some contextual expressions like genitive constructions. On the other hand, *Weak* and *Radical Contextualism* claim that the semantic values of many other linguistics expressions depends on the context. Hence the same sentence might have different contents in different contexts. The linguistic meaning of a sentence underdetermines the semantic interpretation, therefore 'what is said' by an utterance, corresponds to truth conditions that are the result of a contextual modulation. Recently, a number of proposals drawing on relativizing truth in semantics, have opened new theoretical perspectives. According to *Relativism*, the content of a sentence remains constant through different contexts of use. However, the proposition

varies in truth-values with extra parameters, i.e. epistemic, moral or taste standards, which are added to the possible world in the circumstances of evaluation. Some part of the problem is therefore linked to different conceptions of what is said, and among the many attempt to clarify these difference, John Perry developed the idea of multi-propositionalism, that is the idea that truth conditional content may depend on different levels of what is said.

The third[1] Genoa-Workshop on Context addresses this debate. Its first aim is to challenge the main current perspectives on context dependence. The main issue might be divided into three broad questions.

Where to posit contextual dependence? In the context of utterance or in the context of evaluation? In hidden indexes in the syntax or in the structure of the lexicon? *How* what is said is context dependent? Is context dependence a bottom up process of a top down process? *What* is considered context dependent? Shall we consider only the basic set of indexicals and demonstratives or shall we enlarge this set and to which extent?

The following abstracts introduce to reader to some of these topics.

---

[1]   The first workshop in 2000 was an attempt to help philosophers and computer scientists to interact on the topic con context, with the participation of most of the papers have been collected in a volume edited by Carlo Penco, *La svolta contestuale* (*The linguistic turn*), Mc Graw Hill, Milano, 2002. The speakers were: Eva Picardi (Bologna), Carlo Penco (Genova), Marcello Frixione (Salerno), Massimiliano Vignolo (Vercelli), Alessandro Zucchi (Salerno), Marina Sbisa' (Trieste), Nicla Vassallo (Genova), Margherita Benzi (Genova), Fausto Giunchiglia (Trento), Chiara Ghidini (Manchester), Paolo Bouquet (Trento), Massimo Benerecetti (Napoli), Luisa Montecucco(Genova), Roberta Ferrario (Trento), Luciano Serafini (Trento), Claudia Bianchi (Paris), Stefano Predelli (Oslo).
    The second workshop in 2002 have been devoted to the boundaries between semantics and pragmatics, and some of the papers have been collected in a volume edited by Claudia Bianchi, *The semantics-pragmatics distinction*, CSLI, Stanford, 2004. It has been the largest workshop, with the participation of many speakers with different orientations: Kent Bach (San Francisco State University), Anne Bezuidenhout   (University of South Carolina),   Manuel Garcia Carpintero (Universitat de Barcelona), Robyn Carston (University College, London), Stephen Neale (Rutgers University), Stefano Predelli (Universitetet i Oslo), François Récanati (Institut Jean Nicod, Paris), Kenneth Taylor (Stanford University), Jonathan Berg (University of Haifa), Emma Borg (University of Reading), Paolo Bouquet (University of Trento),   Gennaro Chierchia (University of Milano), Eros Corazza   (University of Nottingham), Carlo Penco (University of Genoa), Sandro Zucchi (University of Salerno),   Diego Marconi (University of Oriental Piedmont).