snippets

Issue 37 - December 2019 Special issue in honor of Uli Sauerland

Contents

1.	Andreea C. Nicolae, Patrick D. Elliott, and Yasutada Sudo Introduction
2.	Dorothy Ahn ASL IX to locus as a modifier
3.	Artemis Alexiadou Decomposing scalar approximatives in Greek
4.	Anna Alsop, Lucas Champollion, and Ioana Grosu A problem for Fox's (2007) account of free choice disjunction
5.	Anton Benz and Nicole Gotzner Quantifier irgendein and local implicature
6.	Jonathan David Bobaljik and Susi Wurmbrand Fake indexicals, binding, and the PCC
7.	Brian Buccola and Emmanuel Chemla Alternatives of disjunctions: when a disjunct contains the antecedent of a pronoun 16
8.	Luka Crnič and Brian Buccola Scoping NPIs out of DPs
9.	Chris Cummins Some contexts requiring precise number meanings
10.	Patrick D. Elliott and Paul Marty Exactly one theory of multiplicity inferences

11.	Anamaria Fălăuş and Andreea C. Nicolae Two coordinating particles are better than one: free choice items in Romanian27
12.	Danny Fox
	Individual concepts and narrow scope illusions
13.14.	Danny Fox
	Degree concepts and narrow scope illusions
	Nicole Gotzner Disjunction, conjunction, and exhaustivity
15.	Martin Hackl
	On Haddock's puzzle and the role of presupposition in reference resolution
16.	Andreas Haida
	Symmetry, density, and formal alternatives
17.	Nina Haslinger and Viola Schmitt
10	Strengthened disjunction or non-classical conjunction?
18.	Fabian Heck and Anke Himmelreich Two observations about reconstruction
19.	Aron Hirsch
	Modal adverbs and constraints on type-flexibility
20.	Natalia Ivlieva and Alexander Podobryaev
	On variable agreement and scope reconstruction in Russian
21.	Hadil Karawani
	The past is rewritten
22.	Manfred Krifka and Fereshteh Modarresi Persian ezafe and proportional quantifiers
23.	Paul Marty
23.	Maximize Presupposition! and presupposition satisfaction
24.	Lisa Matthewson, Sihwei Chen, Marianne Huijsmans,
	Marcin Morzycki, Daniel Reisinger, and Hotze Rullmann
	Restricting the English past tense61
25.	Clemens Mayr On a seemingly nonexistent cumulative reading
26.	Marie-Christine Meyer
20.	Scalar Implicatures in complex contexts67
27.	Moreno Mitrović
	Null disjunction in disguise
28.	Andreea C. Nicolae and Yasutada Sudo
20	The exhaustive relevance of complex conjunctions72
29.	Rick Nouwen Scalar vagueness regulation and locative reference
	Scalar vagueness regulation and tocalive reference

30.	Robert Pasternak Unifying partitive and adjective-modifying percent
31.	Hazel Pearson and Frank Sode
	'Not in my wildest dreams': a part time minimizer?
32.	Orin Percus
	Uli and our generation: some reminiscences82
33.	Jacopo Romoli
	<i>Why</i> them?84
34.	Fabienne Salfner
	The rise and fall of non-conservatives87
35.	Petra B. Schumacher
	Vagueness and context-sensitivity of absolute gradable adjectives90
36.	Stephanie Solt
	More or less an approximator
37.	Giorgos Spathas
	Plural anaphoric reference and non-conservativity
38.	Benjamin Spector An argument for the trivalent approach to presupposition projection
39.	Bob van Tiel
	'The case against fuzzy logic revisited' revisited
40.	Lyn Tieu
	A developmental asymmetry between the singular and plural
41.	Tue Trinh
т1.	A tense question 106
42.	Hubert Truckenbrodt
	On remind-me presuppositions and embedded question acts
43.	Michael Wagner
	Disjuncts must be mutually excludable
44.	E. Cameron Wilson
	Constraints on non-conservative readings in English
45.	Susi Wurmbrand
	Indexical shift meets ECM

Scalar vagueness regulation and locative reference

Rick Nouwen · Utrecht University

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.7358/snip-2019-037-nouw

Scalar vagueness (Sauerland and Stateva, 2011, S&S) is a type of vagueness that concerns expressions that refer to points on a scale. S&S make the following observations: (i) scalar vagueness gives rise to granularity effects; (ii) vagueness regulators are shifters to finer (e.g. exactly) or coarser (e.g. approximately) levels of granularity.

S&S follow Krifka (2007) to account for granularity in numeral quantification, the standard example of scalar vagueness. Their view is compatible, however, with Hobbs's (1990) conception of granularity as model simplification. One implementation of this is that, given some domain, a granularity maps that domain to one of its subsets. For instance, a multiples-of-5 granularity for numerals will map 40 to 40, 41 to 40, and 43 to 45.

This perspective is helpful when considering non-numerical cases of scalar vagueness. The meaning of *here*, as in (1), depends on the granularity with which we establish the location of events.

(1) Pope Adrian VI was born here.

At first sight, this example seems to stretch the notion of *scale* somewhat. Standardly, we think of scales as partially ordered sets. With locations, which I take to be continuous sets of coordinates, the only ordering that makes sense is one of containment: L < K whenever the coordinates that make up L are all in K (but not vice versa). This way, we get scales like *my office* < Utrecht < the *Netherlands* < the *Milky Way.* Location-granularity could now be seen as a mapping from a set of locations to a subset. For instance, at town-level granularity, my Utrecht-based office is not in the domain, but mapped by the granularity function to Utrecht. Hence, an utterance of (1) in my office is false on a finer granularity, but true on a coarser one, since Adrian VI was born in Utrecht, though not in my office.

Now let's look at vagueness regulation. The combination *exactly here* is quite odd, but the precisifier *right* operates exactly as one would expect from S&S: it shifts to a finer granularity. An utterances of (2) in my office seems only true if the contextual granularity was originally (much) coarser than town-level.

(2) Pope Adrian VI was born right here.

While *approximately here* is odd, there are other approximators that do modify *here*. However, none of these appear to coarsen the granularity. An utterance of (3) in my office, which is located quite far from Adrian's birthplace, is intuitively false. Expressions like *roughly here* simply cannot provide a shift from room-level to town-level locations. The sentence in (3) means that Adrian was born *close to* the location of the speaker, rather than that he was born *at* that location taken from the perspective of a coarser granularity. As such, the modifiers in (3) appear to tap into a different notion of precision than *approximately* does in the numeral domain. Their meaning appears to be linked more directly to the coordinate system; it involves *distance*.

snippets 37 · 12/2019 75

(3) Pope Adrian VI was born roughly / around / about here.

This poses a dilemma. On the one hand, locations could be taken to be scalar since that would allow us to have a general theory of granularity-dependence for scalar terms. On the other hand, while the precisifier *right* seems to work in a way similar to precisification of numerals, expressions that reduce precision for locative reference function differently. This may suggest that vagueness regulation is a much more heterogeneous phenomenon.

References

Hobbs, Jerry. 1990. Granularity. In *Readings in Qualitative Reasoning about Physical Systems*, ed. Daniel S. Weld and Johan de Kleer, 542–545. Morgan Kaufmann.

Krifka, Manfred. 2007. Approximate interpretation of number words: A case for strategic communication. In *Cognitive Foundations of Interpretation*, ed. Joost Zwarts, Gerlof Bouma, and Irene Kraemer, 111–126. Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sauerland, Uli, and Penka Stateva. 2011. Two types of vagueness. In *Vagueness and Language Use*, ed. Paul Égré and Nathan Klinedinst, 121–145. London: MacMillan.

Rick Nouwen
r.w.f.nouwen@uu.nl
Trans 10
NL-3524JK Utrecht
The Netherlands

76 snippets 37 · 12/2019