

# Disagreement in Context

Erik Hoversten

University of Wyoming, Department of Philosophy

May 2008

Semantic relativism is the thesis that propositions possess a truth value only relative to some non-standard parameter of evaluation such as times, standards, or judges. In this essay, I examine the evidence for judge-relativism provided by discourses involving disagreement over matters of taste. Intuitively, these discourses involve faultless disagreement despite having a point of genuine conflict between them, both parties involved make correct assertions. An analysis of the semantic significance of these discourses reveals a number of criteria that an adequate proposal for the semantics of predicates of personal taste must meet. While relativism offers one adequate proposal, I argue that the semantic contextualist can also adequately account for the intuitions elicited by these discourses. According to the contextualist, the disputants semantically express true propositions that do not conflict. Their disagreement, however, stems from conflicting commitments that arise from certain pragmatic effects of their utterances in the conversation.