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1. Transparency

*Modal transparency:*

For all $x$, if $x$ is $N$, then possibly $\ldots x \ldots$ iff possibly $\ldots N \ldots$.

*Attitude transparency:*

For all $x$, if $x$ is $N$, then for all $y$, $y$ $\phi$s that $\ldots x \ldots$ iff $y$ $\phi$s that $\ldots N \ldots$.

2. A *reductio* of the claim that attitude transparency is valid?

(1a) For all $x$, if $x = \text{Superman}$, then for all $y$, $y$ believes that $x$ flies iff $y$ believes that Superman flies.

(1b) For all $x$, if $x = \text{Clark Kent}$, then for all $y$, $y$ believes that $x$ flies iff $y$ believes that Clark Kent flies.

(1c) ? So if there is any $x$ such that $x = \text{Superman}$ and $x = \text{Clark Kent}$, then for all $y$, $y$ believes that Superman flies iff $y$ believes that Clark Kent flies.

3. The context-sensitivity of *de re* attitude reports:

(2a) No-one suspects that I set the fire.

(2b) There is someone whom the detective suspects set the fire.

(2c) ?? There is someone, distinct from me, whom the detective suspects set the fire.

(3a) My favourite philosopher was believed to be an atheist by many of his early readers.

(3b) My favourite philosopher was so successful in preserving his anonymity that only a few of his intimate friends had any idea that he had written any books.

(3c) ?? My favourite philosopher was believed to be an atheist by many of his early readers, while only a few of his intimate friends had any idea that he had written any books.

4. Two conceptions of context-sensitivity

5. What is it for an argument involving context-sensitive sentences to be valid?

(4a) The Eiffel Tower is tall.

(4b) So everyone who sees the Eiffel Tower sees something tall.

(5a) Mary is ready, and everyone who is ready can come on the trip, but Mary can’t come on the trip.

(5b) Everyone outclassed everyone.

(6a) The Eiffel Tower is both tall and short.

(6b) I saw every van Gogh last time I was in the museum, and some weren’t there.

(7a) All of the children were ready, but not all of them were ready, and to go on the trip you had to be ready.

(7b) All of the children were ready, but not all of them were prepared, and to go on the trip you had to be prepared.

(8a) Batman is strong but Batman is not strong.

(8b) Bruce Wayne is strong but Batman is not strong.
6. How this affects attitude reports
(9a) The police believe that I set the fires, but they don’t believe that I set the fires.
(9b) The police believe that he set those fires, but [although he is me] they don’t believe that I set those fires.
(10a) Lois believes that Superman flies but doesn’t believe that Clark Kent flies.
(10b) Superman is believed by Lois to fly, but Clark Kent isn’t believed by Lois to fly.
(10c) Superman is someone Lois believes to fly, but Clark Kent isn’t someone Lois believes to fly.

7. The source of context-sensitivity: options
Compositionality: Every admissible interpretation of a sentence is determined by an assignment of a syntactic structure to the sentence, together with an assignment of admissible semantic values to its syntactic constituents, according to invariant rules.
Options:
(i) The relevant context-sensitivity is in the attitude verbs.
(ii) The relevant context-sensitivity is in the complement clauses.
(iii) Posit some unpronounced syntactic constituent as the locus of context-sensitivity.
(iv) Reject compositionality.

8. The source of context-sensitivity: arguments
8.1. Theoretical economy
8.2. The ellipsis principle
Non-uniform interpretations are available only when the relevant constituents are actually repeated rather than being elided.
(11a) My house is bigger than this but isn’t bigger than this.
(11b) ? My house is bigger than this but isn’t.
(12a) The police believe that I set the fires but don’t believe that I set the fires.
(12b) The police believe that I set the fires but not that I set the fires.
(12c) ? The police believe that I set the fires but they don’t believe it.

Trouble for the ellipsis principle:
(13a) This car is mine, and it isn’t [mine].
(13b) Bruce Wayne is very strong, but Batman isn’t [very strong].
(13c) Giorgone was so-called because of his size, but Bellini wasn’t [so-called because of his size].
(13d) He is believed to have set the fires, but I am not [believed to have set the fires].

8.3. Attitude reports with multiple referring terms
(14) Lois doesn’t know that Clark Kent is at least as strong as Superman.

8.4. Embedded attitude reports
(15) Lois doesn’t know that everyone knows that I am the strongest superhero.

8.5. Semantics for simple sentences
(16) ? Although ‘Superman flies’ semantically expresses the proposition that I fly, almost no one is in a position to use it to assert that I fly.