



only refer to someone skillful as a lawyer (Cinque, 2010). This almost parallel behavior provides a novel argument for the analogy between ‘skillful’ and ‘red’. As argued by Cinque, the behavior of ‘bravo’ is best explained by assuming that the implicit argument providing the activity targeted by the adjective can in general take its value from the context, but is forced to take its value from the noun in pre-nominal modification (see Cinque, 2014, p. 25; cf. also Martin, 2022; Guerrini, to appear). Extending this analysis to color adjectives, we predict that in ‘rossa penna’ (‘red pen’, pre-nominal), ‘rossa’ can take the value of its input property only from the NP it composes with – thus something like  $\lambda x.pen(x)$ . We therefore get a reading where the whole pen is perceived as red, via its visible surface. In post-nominal position, instead,  $P$  can be provided by any contextually salient property, and can therefore be something like  $\lambda x.ink(x)$ . We therefore attribute to the sum of all subparts of the pen that have the property of being ink a degree of perceptual redness higher than  $s$ .

- (4)  $\llbracket\text{rossa penna}\rrbracket = \llbracket\text{pos}\rrbracket(\llbracket\text{rossa}\rrbracket(C)) \cap \llbracket\text{penna}\rrbracket$  pre-nominal, so necessarily  $C = \lambda x.pen(x)$   
 $= \lambda x.\mu_{\text{red}}(\bigoplus\{y : y \leq x \wedge pen(y)\}) \geq s \wedge pen(x)$
- (5)  $\llbracket\text{penna rossa}\rrbracket = \llbracket\text{penna}\rrbracket \cap \llbracket\text{pos}\rrbracket(\llbracket\text{rossa}\rrbracket(C))$  post-nominal, so  $C$  can be e.g.  $\lambda x.ink(x)$   
 $= \lambda x.pen(x) \wedge \mu_{\text{red}}(\bigoplus\{y : y \leq x \wedge ink(y)\}) \geq s$

The same analysis can be straightforwardly applied to the watermelon case. Moreover, notice ‘red’ is sensitive to ‘with respect to’ phrases, just like ‘skillful’: just like we can describe someone as ‘skillful in every respect’ (cf. Sassoon, 2013), we can describe a pen that has red ink, red surface, and so on as ‘red in every respect’, a novel observation that constitutes a further argument for the analogy.

**Quantity and quality of color.** Kennedy & McNally (2010) propose that color adjectives are systematically ambiguous between a scalar meaning bearing on color quality and one bearing on color quantity. On their view, because of their different features, these two meanings are compatible with different scalar modifiers: hence for instance ‘the table is half red’ can only mean half of the table is red, while ‘the table is somewhat red’ means the table is covered in a qualitatively faint red (cf. K&McN, 2010, p. 92) – while ‘very red table’ is compatible both with a table that has much of its surface covered in red and with a table of a very intense red. Our analysis can be seen as a sophistication of K&McN’s ‘quality’ entry, and the points made above hold regardless of one’s stance on the ‘quantity’ reading. However, there are reasons to think that the core meaning of color terms is qualitative, and that the quantitative reading pertains to a more general phenomenon. The main argument against the ambiguity view is that the two readings can co-occur in sentences such as ‘the wall is half{very/slightly} red’ (we checked these judgments with 5 native speakers of English who are not linguists and not aware of our account). ‘Very’ and ‘slightly’ here clearly bear on color quality, and at the same time ‘half’ clearly bears on how much of the wall is covered in intense/light red – but if there were two meanings we would expect only one of them to occur here. ‘Quantity’ seems to be a more general phenomenon not specific to color adjectives, linked to predicate homogeneity (cf. Löbner, 2000). It indeed arises with pure intersective adjectives like ‘Asian’ too, in sentences such as ‘Istanbul is half Asian and half European’. And indeed ‘Asian’ and ‘red’ both behave homogeneously with respect to sub-parts (cf. Löbner, 2000; Paillé, 2021, a.o.), i.e. they apply to all sub-parts in positive sentences, and to no sub-part in negative sentences: ‘this town is European’ implies all of it is, ‘this town isn’t European’ implies none of it is; and similarly for ‘this wall is red/not red’.

**References.** Cinque, G. (2010). The syntax of adjectives: A comparative study (Vol. 57). MIT press. • Cinque, G. (2014). The semantic classification of adjectives. *Stud. in Chinese Ling.* • von Stechow, K. & Heim, I. (1999). *More on lousy teachers and beautiful dancers*. Lecture notes, MIT • Kennedy, C., & McNally, L. (2010). Color, context, and compositionality. *Synthese*. • Križ, M. (2015). Aspects of homogeneity in the semantics of natural language. (Doctoral dissertation). • Križ, M., & Spector, B. (2021). Interpreting plural predication: Homogeneity and non-maximality. *L. & P.* • Guerrini, J. (to appear). Keeping *fake* simple. To app., *JoS*. • Löbner, Sebastian. (2000). Polarity in natural language: predication, quantification and negation in particular and characterizing sentences. *L. & P.* • Martin, J. (2022). Compositional routes to (non) intersectivity (Doctoral dissertation). • Paillé, M. (2022). Strengthening Predicates. (Doctoral dissertation). • Partee, B.H. (2010) Privative adjectives: subjective plus coercion. *Essays offered to Hans Kamp*. • Rothschild, D., & Segal, G. (2009). Indexical predicates. *Mind & language*. • Sassoon, G. W. (2013). A typology of multidimensional adjectives. *JoS*. • Szabó, Z. G. (2001). Adjectives in context. *Pragmatics and Beyond New Series*. • Travis, C. (1985). On what is strictly speaking true. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*. • Travis, C. (1994). On constraints of generality. *P. of the Aristotelian Society*.