

1 **Kimian/Davidsonian, Individual/Stage and non-verbal predication: a Romance perspective**

2

3 **Abstract**

4 The distinction between Kimian and Davidsonian States is conceived of as a different paradigm  
5 as compared to the Individual-Level/Stage-Level dichotomy, and under this theory, copular  
6 constructions are considered a uniform class of Kimian predications. These two main  
7 generalizations have widely been taken for granted by K/D theorists, both for English and for  
8 Romance languages. Based on Romance data (namely, Spanish, Portuguese, French and  
9 Italian), this paper provides evidence that, contrary to what has been suggested, copular  
10 constructions do split between the Kimian and Davidsonian classes, and that the  
11 Kimian/Davidsonian account is essentially equivalent to the Individual-Level/Stage-Level  
12 distinction. This contribution has two substantial advantages: first, it shows that the domains of  
13 verbal and non-verbal predication are aspectual-symmetric; second, it provides a unified  
14 understanding of the multiple aspectual notions under scrutiny.

15

16 **Keywords**

17 Kimian/Davidsonian, Individual/Stage-Level, states/events, non-verbal predication, ser/estar

18

19 **1. Introduction: the Kimian/Davidsonian distinction**

20 The notion of “event” has been challenging for scientists, philosophers and linguists over  
21 centuries. What is an event? This basic question, which relates to some of nature’s most  
22 fundamental properties such as time and space, has received a lot of possible answers,  
23 however, it remains essentially mysterious.<sup>1</sup>

24 The study of events becomes even more complex and exciting when it comes to the fields  
25 of neuroscience, philosophy of language and linguistics, where our understanding of “natural”  
26 (or “real”) events meets the domain of the mind, that is, the human inner representation (or  
27 conceptualisation) of events. In the case of linguistics, we are called to respond many  
28 challenging questions: what is an event predicate? Is there a parallelism between real world  
29 events and event predicates? How can we recognize an event predicate (and a non-event  
30 one)? How can we justify and analyse their linguistic behaviour? These are just some of the  
31 questions that have been tackled by linguists over time. In this piece of work, we want to pay  
32 attention to an emerging trend in the study of eventivity, related to the difference between  
33 eventive and non-eventive predicates, with a particular focus on the domain of non-verbal  
34 predication.

35 Following the Davidsonian tradition, in some recent works, Maienborn defines events as  
36 “particular spatiotemporal entities with functionally integrated participants” (Maienborn, 2019,  
37 2011, 2007, 2005a, 2005b, 2005c). Based on this definition, Maienborn assumes a set of  
38 ontological properties of eventivity: as spatiotemporal entities, events can be perceived (1a) and

---

<sup>1</sup> See (Casati and Varzi, 2014, 2008, 1996) and references therein for a comprehensive overview of the notion of “event”.

39 are located in space and time (1b); moreover, given their inherent implication of participants,  
40 events can vary in the way they take place in the world (1c).<sup>2</sup>

41

- 42 (1) Ontological properties of events:  
43 a. Events are perceptible.  
44 b. Events can be located in space and time.  
45 c. Events can vary in the way they are realized.  
46 (Maienborn, 2011: 808)

47

48 In addition, Maienborn connects these ontological features with three very well-known  
49 linguistic properties of eventivity (2), which can serve as syntactic tests to identify event  
50 predicates: events can appear as infinitival complements of a perception verb (2a) and they can  
51 be modified by locatives (2b), comitatives or manner adverbials (2c).<sup>3</sup>

52

- 53 (2) Linguistic diagnostics for events:  
54 a. Event expressions can serve as infinitival complements of perception verbs.  
55 b. Event expressions combine with locative and temporal modifiers.<sup>4</sup>  
56 c. Event expressions combine with manner adverbials, comitatives, etc.  
57 (Maienborn, 2011: 808)

58

59 Examples in (3) illustrate the way the abovementioned tests can help distinguish between  
60 events (e.g. *talk*) and non-eventive predicates (e.g. *know*): only an eventive verb can appear in  
61 the complement position of a perception verb (3a) and allows for event-related modifiers (3b,c).

62

- 63 (3) a. I saw Anna {talk to her boss / \*know Spanish}.  
64 b. Anna {talked to her boss / \*knows Spanish} at the office.  
65 c. Anna rudely {talked to her boss / \*knows Spanish}.

66

67 In addition to the aforementioned syntactic tests, from a semantic point of view, eventivity  
68 has generally been connected to the notion of “action” (Davidson, 1967; Vendler, 1957)<sup>5</sup> and, in  
69 consequence, to the aspectual property of “dynamism” or “processuality”, that is, the property of  
70 being structured in successive phases that follow one another in time (Comrie, 1976; Kenny,  
71 1963; Pustejovsky, 1991; Vendler, 1957; a.o.).<sup>6</sup> On the basis of these properties, event

---

<sup>2</sup> A critical approach to this notion of “event” can be found in Higginbotham (2005), Dölling (2005), and Ramchand (2005).

<sup>3</sup> In her last work, Maienborn (2019) proposes two additional ontological properties of eventivity, namely that events (i) are closed under complementation and (ii) are causally efficacious. We take into account the property of closure in section 2.4, where we observe that it cannot be taken as reliable evidence of eventivity; as for causality, it is excluded from discussion because it refers to nominalizations, which are not taken into account in this paper. For these reasons, closure and causation are not included in the set of ontological properties in (1).

<sup>4</sup> Temporal modification is not a discriminatory proof of eventivity, because temporal modifiers are frame-setters (see Section 2.2). For the same reason, Maienborn mentions this test but then avoids it.

<sup>5</sup> In fact, the predicates we refer to as “events” have also been known as “activities” since Vendler (1957).

<sup>6</sup> The relation between the notion of “action” and “dynamism” is clearly described by Comrie (1976), who claims that dynamic eventualities “require a continual input of energy” (Comrie, 1976: 13). Nevertheless, it is not so clear whether actionality is a primary property of events: many events cannot be qualified as actions, as in the case of some achievements, e.g., *win*, *explode* (see Vendler,

72 predicates have generally been described as expressions denoting dynamic eventualities, as  
73 opposed to the class of stative predicates (or states), which denote non-dynamic, or static,  
74 eventualities.<sup>7</sup> Some prototypical sets of stative and eventive predicates are given in (4).

75

76 (4) States: *know, weigh, own...*

77 Events: *run, talk, eat...*

78

79 The novelty of Maienborn's approach stems from her striking observation that states do not  
80 homogeneously reject the eventive tests in (2), contrary to what is expected by virtue of their  
81 inactive and non-dynamic nature. By applying the eventive tests to stative predicates,  
82 Maienborn finds out that even if, as predicted, many stative predicates do not satisfy any of the  
83 diagnostics (5), some states do meet the criteria for typical Davidsonian eventualities (6): they  
84 can serve as infinitival complements of perception verbs (6a) and they can combine with event-  
85 related locative modifiers (6b), as well as with manner adverbials or comitatives (6c).

86

87 (5) a. \*I saw the tomatoes weigh 1 pound.

88 b. \*The tomatoes weighed 1 pound besides the carrots.

89 c. \*Bardo owned {thriftilly / generously} much money.

90 (Maienborn, 2011: 819)

91

92 (6) a. I saw the child sit on the bench.

93 b. The pearls gleamed in her hair.

94 c. Carol sat {motionless / stiff} at the table.

95 (Maienborn, 2011: 820)

96

97 In short, two groups of predicates are found in the domain of states: one group consists of  
98 those predicates that completely lack eventive properties, while the other consists of those  
99 predicates that, despite being static, show the typical linguistic behaviour of events. Maienborn  
100 labels these two classes as “Kimian” (henceforth K) and “Davidsonian” (D) states respectively.  
101 Contrary to Davidsonian predications, which are eventive in nature, Kimian-States are  
102 conceived of as ontologically poorer entities, which lack an inherent spatial dimension and have  
103 no constitutive participant structure. Therefore, K-States are characterised as properties of a  
104 holder at a time.<sup>8</sup> The resulting taxonomy is depicted in (Table 1).<sup>9</sup>

105

106

---

1957: 25). For a more refined and comprehensive notion of “action” as “animacy”, see Folli and Harley (2008, 2007: 211) and references therein.

<sup>7</sup> We borrow the label *eventuality* from Bach (1986), in order to refer to both states and events.

<sup>8</sup> The “Kimian” label refers to Kim’s (1976, 1969) notion of ‘temporally bound property exemplifications’.

<sup>9</sup> Maienborn’s distinction between two classes of states can be seen as a more refined version of Dowty (1979)’s observation on the non-uniformity of stative predicates. Dowty (1979: 173) observes that not all states behave as such, but some of them are allowed in the progressive: e.g., *The socks are lying under the bed*, *Your glass is sitting near the edge of the table*; *The long box is standing on end* (see also Bennet and Partee, 1978: 72). Curiously enough, this set of predicates coincides with Maienborn’s D-states: *sit, stand, lie*, etc.

Non-dynamic (States)		Dynamic (traditional Events)
Kimian <i>know, weigh, own...</i>	Davidsonian <i>sit, stand, lie, gleam...</i>	<i>run, talk, eat...</i>

Table 1: The taxonomy of predicates under the K/D account

The presence of a Davidsonian (that is, event-like) group of predicates in the domain of static predicates also points out that eventivity and dynamicity are independent properties. More precisely, the existence of eventive static predicates shows that, as far as aspectual primitives are concerned, eventivity precedes dynamicity (see also Author, 2017; Fábregas and Marín, 2017, 2013 on this point). In other words, event predicates are now conceived of as present both in the domain of static predicates (or states) and in the domain of dynamic predicates (traditionally labelled as events). From now on, in this paper we will make reference to eventivity (e.g., *event*, *eventive*) in the sense of Maienborn, therefore including dynamic events (or traditional events) and static events (that is, Davidsonian States). As for Kimian States, they are considered pure statives, by virtue of the fact that they are static (non-dynamic) and they do not show any eventive property.

With regard to copular constructions (henceforth CopPs), Maienborn sustains that they all reject the linguistic tests for events and, therefore, they are Kimian states. She observes that when combined with perceptual reports, the copula cannot appear in the infinitive form (7); and as for event-related modification, no locatives (8), manner or comitatives (9) modifiers are allowed with CopPs.

(7) \*I saw the child be on the bench.  
(Maienborn, 2011: 820)

(8) a. \*The dress was wet on the clothesline.  
b. \*Bardo was hungry in front of the fridge.  
(Maienborn, 2011: 820)

(9) a. \*Bardo was {calmly / with his teddy} tired.  
b. \*Carolyn was {restlessly / patiently} thirsty.  
(Maienborn, 2011: 820)

Moreover, the fact that CopPs are K-states is argued to be an independent phenomenon from the distinction between Individual-Level (IL) and Stage-Level (SL) predication, which is interpreted by Maienborn as a contrast between permanent and transitory qualities: “Copular constructions behave uniformly like stative [Kimian] verbs, regardless of whether the predicate denotes a temporary property (SLP) or a more-or-less permanent property (ILP)” (Maienborn, 2011: 819).

In sum, the picture we are left with by the K/D account can be illustrated as in (Table 2): while VPs are spread over any aspectual class, CopPs are confined to the K-class.

Non-dynamic (States)		Dynamic (traditional Events)
Kimian	Davidsonian	
VPs	VPs	VPs
CopPs	–	–

Table 2: VPs and CopPs over the aspectual classes

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

The K/D account has received a widespread approval in the recent studies on stativity, especially for Romance languages (e.g., Alexiadou, 2011; Dalmi, 2016, 2012; Fábregas and Marín, 2017, 2013, 2012; Jaque, 2014; Moltman, 2019; Rothmayr, 2009). Nevertheless, this approach has two major and immediate shortcomings, which can be clearly observed in (Table 2). First of all, it promotes a suspicious asymmetry between the domains of verbal and non-verbal predication: why should it be the case that languages lack Davidsonian CopPs? Why should CopPs be aspectually poorer than VPs? At first sight, this does not seem a plausible basis.<sup>10</sup> Second, treating CopPs as a homogeneous aspectual class is not consistent with the well-established postulate that CopPs show differences with respect to their inner aspectual content, no matter what labels we use to refer to such distinction (“Individual”/“Stage” or any other). And even if we were to accept that under the K/D account CopPs are all Kimian, then for the sake of coherence we should establish how the IL/SL distinction fits into a global aspectual characterization of predicates without altering the K/D picture, that is to say, define the relationship between the IL/SL and the K/D distinctions.<sup>11</sup>

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

This work aims to give a possible solution to the abovementioned problems of the K/D account. With respect to the first one, it is argued here that the domains of verbal and non-verbal predication are aspectual-symmetric, that is, that the K/D distinction is not exclusive of VPs, but rather it also concerns CopPs. The argumentation is built on empirical evidence from Romance languages, mostly from Spanish, as well as from Portuguese, French and Italian. These languages have been used for three main reasons: first, Spanish and Portuguese overtly mark aspectual differences within CopPs by means of two different copulas (*ser* and *estar*); second, the problems discussed above have not been subject to analysis in the previous literature on the K/D distinction in Romance; and third, the fact that the K/D distinction in non-verbal predication is common to many different languages indicates that we are facing a generalized phenomenon. This last observation is confirmed through the use of mono-copular languages (like French and Italian), which, as English, do not have different copulas to mark aspectual differences within CopPs.

<sup>10</sup> Higginbotham (2005) also casts doubt on Maienborn's thesis about the non-eventive nature of all CopPs. Of course, one could think that these questions are trivial and ask the opposite: why would CopPs not be poorer than VPs? The answer is easy: because CopPs are VPs, the only difference being the base predicate, which is a non-verbal category for CopPs and a lexical verb for VPs. Therefore, it makes sense at least to raise the question on the extent to which CopPs are aspectually similar to VPs.

<sup>11</sup> Of course, this is not a problem for Maienborn, for whom the IL/SL distinction is not an aspectual criterion. It is a problem, instead, once we understand that the IL/SL dichotomy is a core property of predicates that has nothing to do with permanence and transience (see Section 3).

175 With regard to the link between the K/D and the IL/SL distinction, the paper shows how  
 176 these different labels refer to one and the same opposition; therefore, the incoherence that  
 177 arises from the traditional IL/SL account of CopPs in combination with the uniform K-analysis  
 178 proposed by the K/D approach is solved.

179 The paper is structured as follows: following this introduction to the problem, section 2  
 180 analyses the K/D nature of CopPs on the basis of the canonical D-tests and additional criteria  
 181 borrowed from the literature on eventivity; after an interim conclusion about the K/D split  
 182 observed among CopPs, section 3 explores the relationship between the K/D and the IL/SL  
 183 paradigms. Conclusions are dedicated to the impact that our main claims regarding the identity  
 184 of K/D and IL/SL classes have within the study of eventualities. This is a descriptive, data-driven  
 185 work, which focuses on conceptual and empirical grounds of the K/D and the IL/SL distinctions.  
 186 The paper does not aim to provide a new formal way to analyse K/D and IL/SL predications:  
 187 formal questions regarding these aspectual classes are left for future research, as a further step  
 188 following the paper's base observations about the identity of the K/D and the IL/SL distinctions  
 189 and their cross-categorial scope.

190

## 191 2. On the K/D split within copular constructions

192 As observed above, the claim that all CopPs are K-states is not convincing because of the  
 193 asymmetry this claim generates with respect to verbal predication and the fact that it contradicts  
 194 the common knowledge that CopPs do not constitute a uniform class, as far as inner aspect is  
 195 concerned.

196 Allowing that the K/D distinction is indeed a relevant split in the class of stative predicates,  
 197 the first step to judge whether CopPs are really K-states is to test them against the eventive  
 198 diagnostics (2). As we will see, despite what had been suggested in the original K/D account,  
 199 CopPs do not behave in a unified way under the eventive tests: only a subpart of them are  
 200 excluded in those contexts, as typical K-states are, while others meet the eventive criteria, thus  
 201 behaving as true D-states.

202

### 203 2.1. Perceptual reports

204 In Romance languages, we can clearly appreciate that some CopPs can perfectly appear  
 205 as complements of perception verbs (10), apart from those CopPs that, as expected within the  
 206 K/D approach, are excluded in the same contexts (11). We can also observe that there is a  
 207 clear parallelism among Spanish, Portuguese, French and Italian: in all these languages the  
 208 same CopPs are allowed (e.g., *to be attentive*, *to be silent*) or excluded (e.g., *to be a student*, *to*  
 209 *be from the Canary Islands*) from perceptual reports.<sup>12</sup>

210

211 (10) a. *Vi a Ana estar { atenta / callada}.* (Spanish)  
 212 see-PST.1SG to Ana be<sub>estar</sub>-INF attentive silent

---

<sup>12</sup> In order to ensure the default reading of the predicates, throughout the paper we use predicates that can hardly be coerced into other interpretations. Some notes on coercion in the domain of non-verbal predication can be found in section 3 and the references therein.

- 213 b. *Vi a Ana a ficar { atenta / calada}. (Portuguese)*  
 214 see-PST.1SG the Ana to stay-INF attentive silent
- 215 c. *J' ai vu Anne être { attentive / silencieuse}. (French)*  
 216 I AUX.1SG see-PTCP Anne be-INF attentive silent
- 217 d. *Ho visto Anna stare { attenta / zitta}. (Italian)*  
 218 AUX.1SG see-PTCP Anna stay-INF attentive silent  
 219 'I saw Anna being {attentive / silent}.'
- 220
- 221 (11) a. *\*Vi a Ana ser { estudiante / de Canarias}. (Spanish)*  
 222 see-PST.1SG to Ana be<sub>ser</sub>-INF student of Canary Islands
- 223 b. *\*Vi a Ana ser { estudante / das Canárias}. (Portuguese)*  
 224 see-PST.1SG to Ana be<sub>ser</sub>-INF student of.the Canary Islands
- 225 c. *\*J' ai vu Anne être { étudiante / des Canaries}. (French)*  
 226 I AUX.1SG see-PTCP Anne be-INF student of.the Canary Islands
- 227 d. *\*Ho visto Anna essere { studentessa / delle Canarie}. (Italian)*  
 228 AUX.1SG see-PTCP Anna be-INF student of.the Canary Islands  
 229 'I saw Anna being {a student / from the Canary Islands}.'

230

231 As pointed out in the set of the linguistic diagnostics for events, one of the conditions to  
 232 ensure the correct application of this test is the appearance of the verb in the infinitive form (2a);  
 233 and this is exactly what happens in the examples in (10).<sup>13</sup> Nevertheless, we can go one step  
 234 further and observe that the presence of the infinitive does not seem to be as relevant as  
 235 suggested. In fact, neither the grammaticality of the examples in (10) nor the ungrammaticality  
 236 of those in (11) depends on the appearance of the copula. Indeed, if we were to get rid of the  
 237 copula in both sets of examples, the judgements would not change: non-verbal predicates in  
 238 (10) would still be allowed, as shown in (12), and the ones in (11) would still be excluded in  
 239 perceptual reports, as shown in (13).

240

- 241 (12) a. *Vi a Ana { atenta / callada}. (Spanish)*  
 242 see-PST.1SG to Ana attentive silent
- 243 b. *Vi a Ana { atenta / calada}. (Portuguese)*  
 244 see-PST.1SG the Ana attentive silent
- 245 c. *J' ai vu Anne { attentive / silencieuse}. (French)*  
 246 I AUX.1SG see-PTCP Anne attentive silent
- 247 d. *Ho visto Anna { attenta / in silenzio}. (Italian)*  
 248 AUX.1SG see-PTCP Anna attentive in silence  
 249 'I saw Anna {attentive / silent}.'

250

- 251 (13) a. *\*Vi a Ana { estudiante / de Canarias}. (Spanish)*  
 252 see-PST.1SG to Ana student of Canary Islands
- 253 b. *\*Vi a Ana { estudante / das Canárias}. (Portuguese)*  
 254 see-PST.1SG the Ana student of.the Canary Islands

<sup>13</sup> The case of Portuguese is a bit more complicated, because the CopP is embedded in an *a*-PP as a complement of the perception verb, and the copula *ficar*, not *estar*, is required. In this case, Brazilian Portuguese would prefer the *ficar*P in gerund: *Vi a Ana ficando atenta* (Bruno Rafael Costa, p.c.). These structures may need a more in-depth study, but this phenomenon does not alter our observation about the eventive nature of the non-verbal predicates under scrutiny (e.g., *atenta*, *calada*).

- 255 c. \**J' ai vu Anne { étudiante / des Canaries}. (French)*  
 256 I AUX.1SG see-PTCP Anne student of.the Canary Islands  
 257 d. \**Ho visto Anna { studentessa / delle Canarie}. (Italian)*  
 258 AUX.1SG see-PTCP Anna student of.the Canary Islands  
 259 'I saw Anna {a student / from the Canary Islands}.'

260

261 This evidence suggests that the presence or the lack of the copula is not the fundamental  
 262 criterion to distinguish between K- and D-expressions. What is ultimately essential is the  
 263 predicate. This is not surprising, because we are testing the aspectual nature of predicates. In  
 264 the case of verbal predication, the infinitive can be indirectly connected to the K/D distinction,  
 265 and then look as main evidence, because the predicate is a verb; in the case of CopPs, the  
 266 predicate is a non-verbal category, and therefore a predicate in the infinitive form is impossible.  
 267 As attested in (12) and (13), the appearance of the copula does not influence the compatibility  
 268 between the main predicate (in this case, the perceptual verb *saw*) and the secondary one (e.g.,  
 269 *attentive, in silence, student, from the Canary Islands*): it is the predicate, and only the  
 270 predicate, which is responsible for the grammaticality of the sentence. In sum, from these  
 271 observations not only do we conclude that some CopPs (e.g., *to be attentive, to be in silence*) fit  
 272 in the D-diagnostic of perceptual reports, but also, importantly, that the K/D distinction is rooted  
 273 in non-verbal predicates, in the same way it is in verbal ones. This is fundamental evidence  
 274 against the asymmetry between the verbal and the non-verbal predication stipulated by the  
 275 original K/D account.

276 That being said, it is convenient to note that the appearance of the copula is not always as  
 277 optional as we saw in (10) and (12): as noted for English by Maienborn (7), in many cases,  
 278 although the predicates are allowed, the copula is not acceptable at all, as shown in (14).

279

- 280 (14) a. *Vi a Ana (\*estar) { cansada / hambrienta}. (Spanish)*  
 281 see-PST.1SG to Ana be<sub>estar</sub>-INF tired hungry  
 282 b. *Vi a Ana (\*ficar/ \*estar) { cansada / faminta}. (Portuguese)*  
 283 see-PST.1SG the Ana stay-INF be<sub>estar</sub>-INF tired hungry  
 284 c. *J'ai vu Anne (\*être) { fatiguée / affamée}. (French)*  
 285 I AUX.1SG see-PTCP Anne be-INF tired hungry  
 286 d. *Ho visto Anna (\*essere) { stanca / affamata}. (Italian)*  
 287 AUX.1SG see-PTCP Anna be-INF tired hungry  
 288 'I saw Anna being {tired / hungry}.'

289

290 In any case, once we understand that the presence of the infinitive is an independent  
 291 phenomenon with respect to the K/D distinction, the data in (7) and (14) cannot be taken as  
 292 valid counterexamples to the D-nature of non-verbal predicates. As we reason above, what  
 293 matters here is that predicates like *tired* or *hungry* are allowed in perceptual reports, thus they  
 294 can be considered D-predicates.

295 As for the possibility of the copula to appear in the infinitive form in perceptual reports, it  
 296 seems that this phenomenon occurs due to another cause, which is not directly relevant for our

297 discussion. Apparently, the presence of the copula with perception verbs is conditioned by the  
 298 aspectual identity between the main verb and the CopP. Perception verbs, such as *saw* or  
 299 *notice*, are activity verbs, and the same aspectuality is required for their CopPs-complements  
 300 with an overt copula: only when the secondary predication is conceived of as an activity, the  
 301 appearance of the copula in the infinitive form is accepted (Author, 2017). In fact, if we take a  
 302 look at the cases in which the copula is allowed in perceptual reports, we observe that those  
 303 CopPs are interpreted as an activity of the subject: they do not simply describe a state of the  
 304 subject, as typical CopPs do, but they indicate that the subject deliberately remains in such a  
 305 state (10) or behaves in a certain way (15).<sup>14</sup>

306

- 307 (15) a. *Ví a Ana ser { amable / maleducada} con los clientes.* (Spanish)  
 308 see-PST.1SG to Ana be<sub>ser</sub>-INF nice impolite with the guests  
 309 b. *Ví a Ana ser { amável / mal-educada} com los clientes.* (Portuguese)  
 310 see-PST.1SG to Ana be<sub>ser</sub>-INF nice impolite with the guests  
 311 c. *J'ai vu Anne être { polie / malpolie} avec les clients.* (French)  
 312 I AUX.1SG see-PTCP Anne be-INF nice impolite with the guests  
 313 d. *Ho visto Anna essere { gentile / maleducata} con i clienti.* (Italian)  
 314 AUX.1SG see-PTCP Anna be-INF nice impolite with the guests  
 315 'I saw Anna being {nice / impolite} with the guests.'

316

317 The fact that these CopPs are different from the “canonical” CopPs is well-known (see  
 318 Partee, 1977 “active *be*”); moreover, in the last years, it has become a central topic in the  
 319 literature on Spanish (Arche, 2011, 2006; Author, 2017; Fábregas and Marín, 2016, 2015;  
 320 Fernández Leborans, 2007; García Fernández and Gómez Vázquez, 2015; Morimoto, 2008;  
 321 a.o.). The agentivity of these CopPs is clearly attested by the fact that these predications can be  
 322 uttered in the imperative (16) and that they can appear in cleft sentences with the agentive *do*  
 323 (17), contrary to non-agentive CopPs (18)-(19).<sup>15</sup>

324

- 325 (16) a. *¡Sé { amable / maleducada}!* (Spanish)  
 326 be<sub>ser</sub>-IMP.2SG nice impolite  
 327 b. *Sê { amável / mal-educada}!* (Portuguese)  
 328 be<sub>ser</sub>-IMP.2SG nice impolite  
 329 'Be {nice / impolite}!'   
 330  
 331 c. *¡Estate { atenta / callada}!* (Spanish)  
 332 be<sub>estar</sub>-IMP.2SG=CL.2SG attentive silent  
 333 d. *Está { atenta / calada}!* (Portuguese)  
 334 be<sub>estar</sub>-IMP.2SG attentive silent  
 335 'Be {attentive / silent}!'   
 336

<sup>14</sup> Maienborn (2005a), following Schmitt (1996), also observes the link between the appearance of the copula and the agentive interpretation, but she still claims that the appearance of the infinitive is relevant for this test.

<sup>15</sup> Moreover, from a cross-linguistic point of view, we can observe that Italian tends to distinguish such CopPs from the canonical ones: although there is no copular alternation in Italian, these are the only cases in which the copula *stare* is maintained (16g).

337	e.	<i>Sois</i>	{	<i>polie</i>	/	<i>malpolie</i>	/	<i>attentive</i>	/	<i>silencieuse</i> !}	(French)		
338		be-IMP.2SG		nice		impolite		attentive		silent			
339		'Be {nice / impolite / attentive / silent}!'											
340													
341	f.	<i>Sii</i>	{	<i>gentile</i>	/	<i>maleducata</i> !}					(Italian)		
342		be-IMP.2SG		nice		impolite							
343		'Be {nice / impolite}!'											
344	g.	<i>Stai</i>	{	<i>attenta</i>	/	<i>ziitta</i> !}					(Italian)		
345		stay-IMP.2SG		attentive		silent							
346		'Be {attentive / silent}!'											
347													
348	(17)	a.	<i>Lo</i>	<i>que</i>	<i>hizo</i>	<i>Ana</i>	<i>fue</i>	{	<i>ser</i>	<i>amable</i>	/	(Spanish)	
349			ART.N	that	do-PST.3SG	Ana	be-PST.3SG	be <sub>ser</sub> -INF	nice				
350													
351													
352													
353		b.	<i>O</i>	<i>que</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>Ana</i>	<i>fez</i>	<i>foi</i>	{	<i>ser</i>	<i>amável</i>	/	(Portuguese)
354			ART.N	that	the	Ana	do-PST.3SG	be-PST.3SG	be <sub>ser</sub> -INF	nice			
355													
356													
357		c.	<i>Ce</i>	<i>qu'</i>	<i>Anne</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>fait,</i>	<i>c'</i>	<i>est</i>	<i>d'</i>	<i>être</i>	(French)	
358			That	that	Anne	AUX.3SG	do-PTCP	that	be-PRS.3SG	of	be-INF		
359													
360													
361													
362													
363													
364													
365													
366	(18)	a.	* <i>¡Sé</i>	{	<i>estudiante</i>	/	<i>de</i>	<i>Canarias</i> !}				(Spanish)	
367			be <sub>ser</sub> -IMP.2SG		student		of	Canary Islands					
368													
369		b.	* <i>¡Sê</i>	{	<i>estudante</i>	/	<i>das</i>	<i>Canárias</i> !}				(Portuguese)	
370			be <sub>ser</sub> -IMP.2SG		student		of.the	Canary Islands					
371													
372													
373													
374													
375													
376													
377													
378													
379													
380													
381													
382													
383													
384	(19)	a.	# <i>Lo</i>	<i>que</i>	<i>hizo</i>	<i>Ana</i>	<i>fue</i>	{	<i>ser</i>	<i>estudiante</i>	/	(Spanish)	
385			ART.N	that	do-PST.3SG	Ana	be-PST.3SG	be <sub>ser</sub> -INF	student				
386													

- 387            be<sub>estar</sub>-INF    tired  
388    b. #*O que a Ana fez foi { ser estudante / (Portuguese)*  
389        ART.N    that the Ana    do-PST.3SG    be-PST.3SG    be<sub>ser</sub>-INF    student  
390        *estar cansada*}.  
391        be<sub>estar</sub>-INF    tired  
392    c. #*Ce qu' Anne a fait, c' est d' être (French)*  
393        That that Anne    AUX.3SG    do-PTCP    that be-PRS.3SG    of be-INF  
394        { *étudiante / fatiguée*}.  
395        student    tired  
396    d. #*Quello che ha fatto Anna è { essere studentessa / (Italian)*  
397        DEM    that    AUX.3SG    do-PTCP    Anna    be-PRS.3SG    be-INF    student  
398        *stanca*}.  
399        tired  
400        'What Anna did was being {a student / tired}.'

401

402            In sum, the appearance of an overt copula in the complement position of perception verbs  
403 is subject to the condition that the CopP refers to an action. This certainly deserves more  
404 attention,<sup>16</sup> however, as we saw in (10)-(14), this fact is not connected to the possibility of a  
405 non-verbal predicate to appear as a complement of a perception verb, which is what matters in  
406 testing the D-nature of any predicate. Therefore, regardless of the presence of the copula, we  
407 can clearly distinguish between two groups of predicates: the ones that are not allowed in  
408 perceptual reports (e.g., *student, from the Canary Islands*) as typical K-predicates, and the ones  
409 that are accepted as perceptual reports (e.g., *attentive, in silence, tired, hungry*) and, as such,  
410 are to be considered D-predicates.

411            Now, if we turn to the examples used by Maienborn to illustrate the non-existence of D-  
412 CopPs ([7], repeated here as [20]), we will appreciate that the ungrammaticality of (20) is not  
413 due to the fact that the predicate (*on the bench*) is not a D-predication; it is however conditioned  
414 by the fact that the copula is not allowed to appear there because *to be on the bench* cannot  
415 receive an agentive interpretation in English, as shown in (21). Nevertheless, *on the bench* can  
416 appear in perceptual reports (22), thus it is a D-predicate, contrary to typical K-predicates, which  
417 are excluded in the same contexts (23) (see also Ramchand, 2005: 365-366). This also shows  
418 that the K/D distinction in the non-verbal domain is not only characteristic of Romance  
419 languages, as it might have seemed at first.<sup>17</sup>

420

- 421 (20)    \*I saw the child be on the bench.  
422  
423 (21)    a. \*Be on the bench!  
424        b. \*What the child did was being on the bench.  
425  
426 (22)    I saw the child on the bench.  
427  
428 (23)    \*I saw the child {a student / from the Canary Islands}.

<sup>16</sup> See Author (2017: 515-525) for a formal analysis of this phenomenon.

<sup>17</sup> The same observation is made by Higginbotham (2005: 350-351) for *I saw Carol tired*.

429

430 **2.2. Event-related modification: locatives, comitatives and manner modifiers**

431 When it comes to event-related modification, either with locatives, comitatives or manner  
432 adverbials (2b, c), we observe that, contrary to what is defended by the K/D approach, there are  
433 substantial differences among CopPs. On the one side, we find CopPs that, as expected,  
434 cannot be modified by locatives (24), comitatives (25) or manner adverbials (26). On the other  
435 side, we find CopPs that, contrary to the expectations, do allow event-related modifiers, as  
436 shown in examples from (27) to (29).

437

- 438 (24) a. \**Ana es { estudiante / de Canarias} en la biblioteca.* (Spanish)  
 439 Ana be<sub>ser</sub>-PRS.3SG student of Canary Islands in the library  
 440 b. \**A Ana é { estudante / das Canárias}* (Portuguese)  
 441 The Ana be<sub>ser</sub>-PRS.3SG student of.the Canary Islands  
 442 *na biblioteca.*  
 443 in.the library  
 444 c. \**Anne est { étudiante / des Canaries} à la bibliothèque.* (French)  
 445 Anne be-PRS.3SG student of.the Canary Islands at the library  
 446 d. \**Anna è { studentessa / delle Canarie} in biblioteca.* (Italian)  
 447 Anna be-PRS.3SG student of.the Canary Islands in library  
 448 'Anna is {a student / from the Canary Islands} in the library.'

449

- 450 (25) a. \**Ana es { estudiante / de Canarias} con sus libros.* (Spanish)  
 451 Ana be<sub>ser</sub>-PRS.3SG student of Canary Islands with her books  
 452 b. \**A Ana é { estudante / das Canárias} com os* (Portuguese)  
 453 The Ana be<sub>ser</sub>-PRS.3SG student of.the Canary Islands with the  
 454 *seus livros.*  
 455 her books  
 456 c. \**Anne est { étudiante / des Canaries} avec ses livres.* (French)  
 457 Anne be-PRS.3SG student of.the Canary Islands with her books  
 458 d. \**Anna è { studentessa / delle Canarie} con i suoi libri.* (Italian)  
 459 Anna be-PRS.3SG student of.the Canary Islands with the her books  
 460 'Anna is {a student / from the Canary Islands} with her books.'

461

- 462 (26) a. \**Ana es { estudiante / de Canarias} tranquilamente.* (Spanish)  
 463 Ana be<sub>ser</sub>-PRS.3SG student of Canary Islands peacefully  
 464 b. \**A Ana é { estudante / das Canárias} tranquilamente.* (Portuguese)  
 465 The Ana be<sub>ser</sub>-PRS.3SG student of.the Canary Islands peacefully  
 466 c. \**Anne est { étudiante / des Canaries} tranquillement.* (French)  
 467 Anne be-PRS.3SG student of.the Canary Islands peacefully  
 468 d. \**Anna è { studentessa / delle Canarie} tranquillamente.* (Italian)  
 469 Anna be-PRS.3SG student of.the Canary Islands peacefully  
 470 'Anna is {a student / from the Canary Islands} peacefully.'

471

- 472 (27) a. *Ana está { sola / tumbada} en su habitación.* (Spanish)  
 473 Ana be<sub>estar</sub>-PRS.3SG alone lying.down in her room  
 474 b. *A Ana está { sozinha / deitada} no seu quarto.* (Portuguese)  
 475 The Ana be<sub>estar</sub>-PRS.3SG alone lying.down in.the her room

- 476 c. *Anne est { seule / allongée} dans sa chambre.* (French)  
 477 Anne be-PRS.3SG alone lying.down in her room
- 478 d. *Anna è { sola / stesa} in camera sua.* (Italian)  
 479 Anna be-PRS.3SG alone lying.down in room her  
 480 'Anna is {alone / lying down} in her room.'
- 481
- 482 (28) a. *Ana está { tumbada / en casa} con su perrito.* (Spanish)  
 483 Ana be<sub>estar</sub>-PRS.3SG lying.down in home with her dog
- 484 b. *A Ana está { deitada / em casa} com o seu cãozinho.* (Portuguese)  
 485 The Ana be<sub>estar</sub>-PRS.3SG lying.down in home with the her dog
- 486 c. *Anne est { allongée / à la maison} avec son chien.* (French)  
 487 Anne be-PRS.3SG lying .down at the home with her dog
- 488 d. *Anna è { stesa / in casa} con il suo cagnolino.* (Italian)  
 489 Anna be-PRS.3SG lying.down in home with the her dog  
 490 'Anna is {lying down / at home} with her dog.'
- 491
- 492 (29) a. *Ana está { tumbada / en casa} tranquilamente.* (Spanish)  
 493 Ana be<sub>estar</sub>-PRS.3SG lying.down in home peacefully
- 494 b. *A Ana está { deitada / em casa} tranquilamente.* (Portuguese)  
 495 The Ana be<sub>estar</sub>-PRS.3SG lying.down in home peacefully
- 496 c. *Anne est { allongée / à la maison} tranquillement.* (French)  
 497 Anne be-PRS.3SG lying .down at the home peacefully
- 498 d. *Anna è { stesa / in casa} tranquillamente.* (Italian)  
 499 Anna be-PRS.3SG lying.down in home peacefully  
 500 'Anna is {lying down / at home} peacefully.'

501

502 Even if the data presented here are only a little sample, the observed split among CopPs is  
 503 a generalized phenomenon, which is not limited to certain predicates. If we look at Spanish, we  
 504 can observe that beside those CopPs that exclude event-related modifiers, a large amount of  
 505 CopPs allows them. Some examples with locatives (30), comitatives (31) and manner  
 506 adverbials (32) are given below.

507

- 508 (30) Spanish
- 509 a. *Ana está de vacaciones en Francia.*  
 510 Ana be<sub>estar</sub>-PRS.3SG of vacation in France  
 511 'Anna is on vacation in France.'
- 512
- 513 b. *Los fieles están de rodillas en el suelo.*  
 514 The faithfuls be<sub>estar</sub>-PRS.3PL of knees in the floor  
 515 'The faithfuls are kneeling on the floor.'
- 516
- 517 c. *Pedro está desnudo en la terraza.*  
 518 Pedro be<sub>estar</sub>-PRS.3SG naked in the balcony  
 519 'Pedro is naked on the balcony.'

520

- 521 (31) Spanish
- 522 a. *Ana está { de compras / de fiesta / de viaje} con su mejor amiga.*  
 523 Ana be<sub>estar</sub>-PRS.3SG of purchase of party of travel with her best friend

- 524 'Ana is {shopping / partying / travelling} with her best friend.'
- 525
- 526 b. *Pedro está                    asomado    a   la   ventana   con   su   gatito.*
- 527 Pedro be<sub>estar</sub>-PRS.3SG leaned.out at the window with his cat
- 528 'Pedro is leaning out of the window with his cat.'
- 529
- 530 c. *Ana está                    sola    con   su   primo.*
- 531 Ana be<sub>estar</sub>-PRS.3SG alone with her cousin
- 532 'Ana is alone with her cousin.'

533

534 (32) Spanish

- 535 a. *Toda la documentación ha estado disponible públicamente*
- 536 All the documents AUX.3SG be<sub>estar</sub>-PTCP available publicly
- 537 *durante muchos días.*
- 538 for many days
- 539 'All the documents have been available publicly for many days.'
- 540
- 541 b. *El chico estuvo a la espera educadamente.*
- 542 The boy be<sub>estar</sub>-PST.3SG to the wait politely
- 543 'The boy waited politely.'
- 544
- 545 c. *No ves mal, la imagen está al revés adrede.*
- 546 Not see-PRS.2SG bad the picture be<sub>estar</sub>-PRS.3SG of.the contrary intentionally
- 547 'It's not that you don't see it properly, the picture is upside down intentionally.'
- 548

549 While using modifiers as event diagnostics, we have to make sure to use true event-related

550 modifiers, and not the frame-setting ones. Frame-setting modifiers are sentential modifiers that

551 provide a domain to which the whole proposition is restricted (indeed, a "frame"). They are

552 merged VP-externally, in a topic position, hence they are not sensitive to the (non-)eventive

553 nature of the base predication.<sup>18</sup> For this reason, they can also appear with stative (i.e., non-

554 eventive) predicates (33) and therefore they are not a useful test of eventivity. This kind of

555 modifiers can receive a temporal, conditional or even an epistemic interpretation (34), which

556 helps to distinguish them from true event-related modifiers when they appear postverbally, as in

557 (33b) (for more details, see Maienborn, 2019, 2001; Maienborn and Schäfer, 2011).

558

- 559 (33) a. In Italy, Maradona was married.
- 560 b. Maradona was married in Italy.
- 561
- 562 (34) a. Temporal / conditional: 'When he was in Italy, Maradona was married.'
- 563 b. Epistemic: 'According to the belief of the people in Italy, Maradona was married.'
- 564 (Maienborn, 2011: 820)
- 565

---

<sup>18</sup> Under a Davidsonian analysis, the evidence that frame-setting modifiers are unresponsive to the eventive nature of the VP has been related to the fact that, as sentential modifiers, they do not add an additional predicate to the VP's event argument (cf. Maienborn, 2019).

566 By contrast, true event-related modifiers are VP-adjuncts, and are licensed only if the verb  
 567 denotes an event.<sup>19</sup> As VP-adjuncts, they specify where, how, with whom, etc. the event  
 568 described by the VP takes place. If we observe the examples from (27) to (32), we will have no  
 569 doubts that we are facing true event-related modifiers. The modifiers in these examples receive  
 570 proper event-related interpretation: ‘there is a state of the subject, and this state holds in a  
 571 place, in a specific company or manner’: the different interpretations for examples from (27) to  
 572 (29) are given below.

573

574 (35) Spanish  
 575 *Ana está {sola / tumbada} en su habitación.*  
 576 ‘Ana is {alone / lying down} in her room.’  
 577 Frame-setting: #‘Whenever Ana is in her room, she is {alone / lying down}.’  
 578 Event-related: ‘Ana is {alone / lying down}, and where she is {alone / lying down} is in her room.’

579

580 (36) Spanish  
 581 *Ana está {tumbada / en casa} con su perrito.*  
 582 ‘Ana is {lying down / at home} with her dog.’  
 583 Frame-setting: #‘Whenever Ana is with her dog, she is {lying down / at home}.’  
 584 Event-related: ‘Ana is {lying down / at home}, and this happens to be in the company of her dog.’

585

586 (37) Spanish  
 587 *Ana está {tumbada / en casa} tranquilamente.*  
 588 ‘Ana is {lying down / at home} peacefully.’  
 589 Frame-setting: #‘Whenever it happens peacefully, Ana is {lying down / at home}.’  
 590 Event-related: ‘Ana is {lying down / at home}, and it happens in a peaceful way.’

591

592 In the case of locatives, their possibility to appear with CopPs was previously observed by  
 593 Maienborn (2011, 2005a, 2005b, 2005c, 2004), who denies that in this case locatives are event-  
 594 related modifiers. More specifically, in her first studies (Maienborn, 2005a, 2005c, 2004) she  
 595 argues that when locatives appear with CopPs they are frame-setting modifiers with a temporal  
 596 reading.<sup>20</sup> However, this does not seem to be the case. In the first place, because as we saw in  
 597 (35), the temporal frame reading of the locative is out. The same happens in the additional  
 598 examples we gave in (30), as shown in (38):

599

600 (38) Spanish  
 601 a. *Ana está de vacaciones en Francia.*  
 602 ‘Anna is on vacation in France.’  
 603 Frame-setting: #‘Whenever Ana is in France, she is on vacation.’  
 604 Event-related: ‘Ana is on vacation, and where she is on vacation is in France.’

605

---

<sup>19</sup> In a Davidsonian framework, event-related modifiers are studied as elements that are licensed via the VP’s e-position. This is also Maienborn’s explanation, whose validity would be weakened under a neo-Davidsonian approach, where all predicates, including statives, have a hidden event argument. An alternative non-Davidsonian agreement-driven formal approach to event modification can be found in Author (2017: 458-481).

<sup>20</sup> Higginbotham (2005: 353) also supports this view.

- 606 b. *Los fieles están de rodillas en el suelo.*  
 607 'The faithfuls are kneeling on the floor.'  
 608 Frame-setting: #'Whenever the faithfuls are on the floor, they are kneeling.'  
 609 Event-related: 'The faithfuls are kneeling, and where they are kneeling is on the floor.'  
 610  
 611 c. *Pedro está desnudo en la terraza.*  
 612 'Pedro is naked on the balcony.'  
 613 Frame-setting: #'Whenever Pedro is on the balcony, he is naked.'  
 614 Event-related: 'Pedro is naked, and where he is naked is on the balcony.'

615  
 616 Second, taking into consideration that the appearance of a temporal adverbial in a  
 617 sentence prevents locatives from being interpreted as temporal frame-setters (Maienborn, 2011,  
 618 2005c), if Maienborn's hypothesis on the frame-setting nature of the locative were correct, we  
 619 would expect that temporal adverbials and locatives could not co-occur in these cases.  
 620 Nevertheless, as we can observe in (39), temporal setters can be added to the previous  
 621 sentences freely, without altering the base predication, and thus suggesting that locatives are  
 622 real event-related modifiers in these cases.

- 623  
 624 (39) Spanish  
 625 a. *Aquel verano, Ana estuvo de vacaciones en Francia.*  
 626 That summer Ana be<sub>estar</sub>-PST.3SG of vacation in France  
 627 'That summer Ana was on vacation in France.'  
 628  
 629 b. *Durante toda la celebración, los fieles estuvieron de rodillas en el suelo.*  
 630 During all the celebration the faithfuls be<sub>estar</sub>-PST.3PL of knees on the floor  
 631 'During the whole celebration, the faithfuls were kneeling on the floor.'  
 632  
 633 c. *Anoche, Pedro estuvo desnudo en la terraza.*  
 634 Last.night Pedro be<sub>estar</sub>-PST.3SG naked in the balcony  
 635 'Last night, Pedro was naked on the terrace.'

636  
 637 Another option given by Maienborn in order to explain the unexpected admission of  
 638 locatives with some CopPs is to analyse these structures as cases in which the locative is the  
 639 attribute and the adjective is a secondary non-selected predicate (i.e., a depictive) (Maienborn,  
 640 2019, 2011, 2005b). For the data in (8) (repeated here as [40]), Maienborn suggests that the  
 641 sentences are well formed only under the alternative syntactic analysis in (41).<sup>21</sup> Under this  
 642 analysis, the sentence in (40a) would express that there was a state of the dress being on the  
 643 clothesline, and this state is included in an accompanying state of the dress being wet  
 644 (Maienborn, 2019).

645

---

<sup>21</sup> On the contrary, the VP-modifier analysis for the locative would be as in (i).

(i) a. [IP The dress was<sub>i</sub> [VP [VP t<sub>i</sub> [AP wet]] [PP on the clothesline]]]  
 b. [IP Bardo was<sub>i</sub> [VP [VP t<sub>i</sub> [AP hungry]] [PP in front of the fridge]]]  
 (Maienborn, 2019: 43)

- 646 (40) a. \*The dress was wet on the clothesline.  
 647 b. \*Bardo was hungry in front of the fridge.  
 648  
 649 (41) a. [<sub>IP</sub> The dress<sub>i</sub> was<sub>i</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>AP</sub> wet<sub>i</sub>] [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> [<sub>PP</sub> on the clothesline]]]].  
 650 b. [<sub>IP</sub> Bardo<sub>i</sub> was<sub>i</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>AP</sub> hungry<sub>i</sub>] [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> [<sub>PP</sub> in front of the fridge]]]].  
 651 (Maienborn, 2019: 43)  
 652

653 Although this alternative analysis is, in fact, a possible option, it does not seem to be  
 654 necessarily the case every time a locative appears modifying a CopP. First of all, even if most of  
 655 these sentences can receive the alternative reading, as if the locative was the attribute and the  
 656 AP was a depictive (as shown in [42] for [35]), this is only an “alternative”, not the only option:  
 657 as we observed above, these sentences can also receive the typical reading of event-related  
 658 modification, suggesting that in these cases there are two competing structures.  
 659

- 660 (42) Spanish  
 661 *Ana está en su habitación {sola / tumbada}.*  
 662 ‘Ana is in her room {alone / lying down}.’  
 663 Reading: ‘Ana is in her room, and there she is {alone / lying down}’.  
 664

665 Second, we can find many cases in which the alleged alternative analysis is not available,  
 666 suggesting that the underlying structure has necessarily the AP as an attribute and the PP as a  
 667 modifier. For example, from a sentence like (43a), it is not possible to interpret (43b), and, in  
 668 fact, the corresponding sentence would not be acceptable. While uttering (43a), by no means  
 669 can we interpret that there is a state of the information being on the internet and this state is  
 670 included in a state of the information being available, that is to say, that ‘the information is  
 671 located on the internet, and in such a location it is available’. On the contrary, we are saying that  
 672 there is a state of the information being available, and this state holds in a place, which is the  
 673 internet (‘the information is available, and the place in which it is available is on the internet’).  
 674 This is the typical reading of event-related modification.  
 675

- 676 (43) Spanish  
 677 a. *La información está disponible en internet.*  
 678 The information <sub>b<sub>e</sub>estar-PRS.3SG</sub> available in internet  
 679 ‘The information is available on the internet.’  
 680  
 681 b. *?La información está en internet disponible.*  
 682 The information <sub>b<sub>e</sub>estar-PRS.3SG</sub> in internet available  
 683 ‘The information is on the internet available.’  
 684

685 Third, CopPs allow multiple modification, as it happens with eventive VPs (44):<sup>22</sup> for  
686 example, the same CopP can be modified at the same time by a locative PP and a comitative  
687 PP.

688

689 (44) Spanish

690 a. *Piensa que estamos solos en un desierto con nuestra víctima.*  
691 Imagine-IMP.2SG that be<sub>estar</sub>-PRS.1PL alone in a desert with our victim  
692 'Imagine that we are alone in a desert with our victim.'

693

694 b. *El año pasado estuvimos de vacaciones en Francia con Pedro.*  
695 The year past be<sub>estar</sub>-PST.1PL of vacation in France with Pedro  
696 'Last year we were on vacation in France with Pedro.'

697

698 c. *Juan está de paseo en el centro con sus amigos.*  
699 Juan be<sub>estar</sub>-PRS.3SG of walk in the center with his friends  
700 'Juan is walking in the city center with his friends.'

701

702 In these cases, it is undeniable that CopPs do allow event-related modification: even if the  
703 locative or the comitative PP was the attribute, the other one would still be a modifier.

704 From these observations, we can conclude that event-related modification is possible with  
705 CopPs. The fact that most of the sentences in which a PP modifies a CopP can receive an  
706 alternative reading *à la* Maienborn is not a counterargument to that and does not prove that the  
707 underlying structure necessarily has the PP as the attribute. Conversely, the possibility of  
708 having different readings, and hence different structures, in those cases in which more than one  
709 non-verbal predicate (AP or PP) appears in a copular construction is absolutely natural in the  
710 domain of non-verbal predication, because it is a direct consequence of the fact that both PPs  
711 and APs can function as attributes.

712 Obviously, modification is subject to some restrictions. Apart from the well-grounded fact  
713 that only eventive predicates allow event-related modifiers, a pragmatic compatibility between  
714 the base predicate and the modifier is also needed: it guarantees a plausible interpretation of  
715 the whole predication (see also Rothstein, 2005 on this point). It is for this reason that being an  
716 event is not a sufficient condition to ensure modification and that, sometimes, the  
717 abovementioned "alternative" readings arise. For example, this is the case of Maienborn's data  
718 in (40) as well as in (9), repeated here as (45). The alleged ungrammaticality of these examples  
719 is not due to the fact that these CopPs cannot be modified, but to the fact that the predicate and  
720 the modifier are not pragmatically compatible: one cannot be tired in a calm way, nor thirsty with  
721 or without patience; likewise, there is no logical connection, a priori, between the fact of being  
722 tired and being in the company of your teddy.

723

724 (45) a. \*Bardo was {calmly / with his teddy} tired.

---

<sup>22</sup> The fact that events can be modified by multiple adjuncts was first noted by Kenny (1963) and it is known as the property of "variable poliadicity" (see also Casati and Varzi, 1996; Davidson, 1967).

725 b. \*Carolin was {restlessly / patiently} thirsty.

726

727 But if we look for a more plausible connection between the predicate and the modifier, we  
728 will find that event-related modifiers are allowed with the abovementioned CopPs, as shown in  
729 (46).<sup>23</sup>

730

731 (46) a. The towel is wet on the floor.  
732 (Google search, 21/11/2019)

733

734 b. And if you go to school and you are hungry in the stomach...  
735 (Corpus of Contemporary American English, 21/11/2019)

736

737 c. I was wondering what you mummies do when baby is hungry in the car...  
738 (Google search, 21/11/2019)

739

740 d. She was unconsciously tired.  
741 (Google search, 21/11/2019)

742

743 The necessity of such pragmatic compatibility between the main predicate and the modifier  
744 is not surprising, after all: the same happens with eventive verbal predicates (47), and no one  
745 would cast doubt on the fact they allow modification.

746

747 (47) a. I usually cook {in the kitchen / #in the nail}.

748 b. I {attentively / #terribly} read the book.

749

750 In sum, as far as event-related modification is concerned, we can conclude that many  
751 CopPs (e.g., *to be {alone / at home / sick / on vacation / satisfied}*) allow event-related  
752 modifiers, and therefore, in the spirit of the K/D account, should be considered D-states. In this  
753 respect, they are clearly distinct from those CopPs that, as predicted for all CopPs in the K/D  
754 account, reject event-related modifiers (e.g., *to be a student* or *to be from the Canary Islands*),  
755 as typical K-states do.

756

### 757 2.3. Additional evidence

758 Once we have concluded that, contrary to what is argued in the canonical K/D account,  
759 some non-verbal predicates and their respective CopPs fulfil the D-criteria, we can look into  
760 some additional tests that serve to distinguish between states and events, even if they are not  
761 part of Maienborn's approach. In particular, it is a well-known fact that state and event

---

<sup>23</sup> Rothstein (2005) also observes that event-related modification is allowed with CopPs and that it can be blocked for pragmatic reasons derived from the stative (non-dynamic) nature of these predicates. Nevertheless, unlike our proposal, Rothstein (2005) does not maintain the distinction between states and events; therefore, although her study coincides with ours in recognizing typical eventive properties in the domain of non-verbal predication, her proposal turns out to be too much radical, because it does not allow for an accurate distinction between those predicates that, while being stative, do have eventive properties (i.e., D-states) and those that are absolutely non-eventive (K-states).

762 predicates differ, at least, with respect to secondary predication, quantification and, obviously,  
 763 their interpretation together with their discourse effect.

764 As far as secondary predication is concerned, only events (e.g. *to talk*), but not states (e.g.  
 765 *to come from*), can function as secondary depictive predicates, as shown in (48) (Demonte,  
 766 1991a, 1991b; Hernanz, 1988; Higginbotham, 1983; Rapoport, 1993, 1991; a.o.).<sup>24, 25</sup>

767

768 (48) Spanish  
 769 *Ana preparó la tarta { hablando con su hermano / \*viniendo de buena familia}.*  
 770 Ana bake-PST.3SG the cake talk-GER with her brother come-GER from good family  
 771 'Ana baked the cake (while) {talking to her brother / coming from a well-to-do family}.'

772

773 As for quantification, only events, but not states, can be quantified, as shown in (49)  
 774 (Chierchia, 1995; De Hoop and De Swart, 1989; Farkas and Sugioka, 1983; Kratzer, 1995,  
 775 1988; a.o.).<sup>26</sup>

776

777 (49) Spanish  
 778 *Cada vez que Ana { come / \*sabe chino}, me sorprendo.*  
 779 Each time that Ana eat-PRS.3SG know-PRS.3SG Chinese CL.1SG surprise-PRS.1SG  
 780 'Whenever Ana {eats / knows Chinese}, I am surprised.'

781

782 Moreover, events are obviously interpreted as “happenings”, as opposed to states, which  
 783 are interpreted as generic statements, or qualities of the subject that are not restricted to a  
 784 specific spatiotemporal location. This distinction can be clearly appreciated by observing the  
 785 readings different predicates receive in different tenses (Author, 2017; Cunha, 2011). In the  
 786 present tense, events can be interpreted as occurring “here and now”, that is, as being  
 787 restricted to the time of the utterance (50a). In contrast, states lack the “here and now” reading,  
 788 and are interpreted as a general property of the subject (50b).

789

790 (50) Spanish  
 791 a. *Ana llora.* [= *Aquí y ahora*]<sup>27</sup>  
 792 Ana cry-PRS.3SG  
 793 'Ana is crying.' [= Here and now]  
 794  
 795 b. *Ana sabe búlgaro.* [*≠ Aquí y ahora*]  
 796 Ana know-PRS.3SG Bulgarian  
 797 'Ana knows Bulgarian.' [*≠ Here and now*]

798

<sup>24</sup> This test coincides with Milsark's (1974) observation that only SLPs can appear in the coda of a *there*-sentence.

<sup>25</sup> We illustrate this tests in Spanish, in order to maintain the connection with Romance.

<sup>26</sup> This is an extension of the test on *when*-conditionals proposed in Kratzer (1995, 1988) for SLPs.

<sup>27</sup> Event predicates can also be interpreted as generic statements under a habitual reading: e.g., *Siempre que ve una peli, Ana llora* ('Whenever she watches a movie, Ana cries') (see Carlson, 2012; Krifka et al., 1995; a.o.). This interpretation also differentiates events from states, which cannot receive the habitual generic reading. For the time being, we just focus on the default interpretation of events in the present tense as happening "here and now".

799 In the past tense, events can be interpreted as if they happened only once or on several  
 800 occasions (51a),<sup>28</sup> while states reject such possible interpretations (51b).

801

802 (51) Spanish

803 a. *La semana pasada, Ana lloró (solo una vez / varias veces).*

804 The week past Ana cry-PST.3SG (only a time several times)

805 'Last week, Ana cried (only once / on several occasions).'

806

807 b. *De joven, fue guapa (#solo una vez / #varias veces).*

808 Of young be<sub>ser</sub>-PST.3SG beautiful only a time several times

809 'When she was young, she was beautiful (only once / on several occasions).'

810

811 In the same vein, the "happening" interpretation of event predicates can be tested by  
 812 making reference to the predicate by means of an eventive verb such as *to happen, to occur*  
 813 (Cuartero Otal, 2011; De Miguel, 1999; Wanner, 1999; a.o.). As expected, these verbs can take  
 814 up only events (52a)-(53a), not states (52b)-(53b).<sup>29</sup>

815

816 (52) Spanish

817 - *¿Qué pasó?*

818 'What happened?'

819

820 a. *Ana llamó a la policía.*

821 Ana call-PST.3SG to the police

822 'Ana called the police.'

823

824 b. *#Ana adoraba el ballet.*

825 Ana love-PST.3SG the ballet

826 'Ana loved ballet.'

827

828 (53) Spanish

829 a. *Ana llamó a la policía; y eso pasó porque vosotros no*

830 Ana call-PST.3SG to the police and that happen-PST.3SG because you not

831 *la ayudasteis.*

832 CL.3SG help-PST.2PL

833 'Ana called the police, and it happened because you didn't help her.'

834

835 b. *Ana adoraba el ballet. #Eso { pasó / pasaba }*

<sup>28</sup> The possibility of having only one or both readings also depends on the outer aspect (i.e., imperfective / perfective), but this is not the focus here. What is important here is that only events can be interpreted as something that "happens".

<sup>29</sup> This last test has to be taken into account with extreme care, because some Romance languages also make use of verbs such as *to happen* or *to occur* in a more abstract way, in order to refer to unusual, unexpected, fun or problematic facts (i) (see Cuartero Otal, 2011).

(i) Spanish

- *¿Qué pasa?*

'What is happening?'

- *Lo que pasa es que eres tonto.*

That that happen-PRS.3SG be-PRS.3SG that be-PRS.2SGstupid

'What happens is that you are stupid.'

836 Ana love-PST.3SG the ballet That happen-PST.PFV.3SG happen-PST.IPFV.3SG  
 837 *porque...*  
 838 because  
 839 'Ana loved ballet. This happened because...'

840

841 If we apply all these tests in the domain of non-verbal predication, we will observe again a  
 842 clear split within these constructions. In regard to secondary predication, the same division that  
 843 was found in perceptual reports among non-verbal predicates (section 2.1) is maintained with  
 844 respect to depictives: some predicates (e.g., *a student, from the Canary Islands*) cannot  
 845 function as non-selected secondary predicates (54), contrary to predicates such as *alone, tired,*  
 846 *angry*, etc., which are perfect as depictives (55).

847

- 848 (54) a. \**Ana cocina el arroz { estudiante / de Canarias}*. (Spanish)  
 849 Ana cook-PRS.3SG the rice student of Canary Islands  
 850 b. \**A Ana cozinha o arroz { estudante / das Canárias}*. (Portuguese)  
 851 The Ana cook-PRS.3SG the rice student of.the Canary Islands  
 852 c. \**Anne prépare du riz { étudiant / des Canaries}*. (French)  
 853 Anne prepare-PRS.3SG of.the rice student of.the Canary Islands  
 854 d. \**Anna cucina il risotto { studentessa / delle Canarie}*. (Italian)  
 855 Anna cook-PRS.3SG the rice student of.the Canary Islands  
 856 'Anna is cooking the rice {a student / from the Canary Islands}.'

857

- 858 (55) a. *Ana cocina el arroz { sola / cansada / enfadada / de pie}*. (Spanish)  
 859 Ana cook-PRS.3SG the rice alone tired angry of foot  
 860 b. *A Ana cozinha o arroz { sozinha / cansada / chateada / de pé}*. (Portuguese)  
 861 The Ana cook-PRS.3SG the rice alone tired angry of foot  
 862 c. *Anne prépare du riz { seule / fatiguée / en colère / debout}*. (French)  
 863 Anne prepare-PRS.3SG of.the rice alone tired in anger standing  
 864 d. *Anna cucina il risotto { sola / stanca / arrabbiata / in piedi}*. (Italian)  
 865 Anna cook-PRS.3SG the rice alone tired angry in feet  
 866 'Anna is cooking the rice {alone / tired / angry / standing}.'

867

868 In the case of quantification, we observe, again, the same split: CopPs such as *to be a*  
 869 *student* or *to be from the Canary Islands* cannot be quantified (56), unlike CopPs such as *to be*  
 870 *alone, to be tired* or *to be angry* (57).

871

- 872 (56) a. \**Cada vez que Ana es { estudiante / de Canarias}*... (Spanish)  
 873 Each time that Ana be<sub>ser</sub>-PRS.3SG student of Canary Island  
 874 b. \**De cada vez que a Ana é { estudante / das Canárias}*... (Portuguese)  
 875 Of each time that the Ana be<sub>ser</sub>-PRS.3SG student of.the Canary Islands  
 876 c. \**À chaque fois qu' Anne est { étudiant / des Canaries}*... (French)  
 877 At each time that Anne be-PRS.3SG student of.the Canary Islands  
 878 d. \**Ogni volta che Anna è { studentessa / delle Canarie}*... (Italian)  
 879 Each time that Anna be-PRS.3SG student of.the Canary Islands  
 880 'Whenever Anna is {a student / from the Canary Islands}...'

881

- 882 (57) a. *Cada vez que Ana está* { *sola / cansada / enfadada / de pie*}, (Spanish)  
883 Each time that Ana be<sub>estar</sub>-PRS.3SG alone tired angry of foot  
884 *llora.*  
885 cry-PRS.3SG
- 886 b. *De cada vez que a Ana está* { *sozinha / cansada / chateada /* (Portuguese)  
887 Of each time that the Ana be<sub>estar</sub>-PRS.3SG alone tired angry  
888 *de pé}, chora.*  
889 of foot cry-PRS.3SG
- 890 c. *À chaque fois qu' Anne est* { *seule / fatiguée / en colère /* (French)  
891 At each time that Anne be-PRS.3SG alone tired in anger  
892 *debout}, elle pleure.*  
893 standing she cry-PRS.3SG
- 894 d. *Ogni volta che Anna è* { *sola / stanca / arrabbiata / in piedi*}, (Italian)  
895 Each time that Anna be-PRS.3SG alone tired angry in feet  
896 *piange.*  
897 cry-PRS.3SG  
898 'Whenever Anna is {alone / tired / angry / standing}, she cries.'

900 As for their interpretation in the present tense, those CopPs that fulfil the previous tests are  
901 interpreted as occurrences restricted, at least, to the time of the utterance (that is, "here and  
902 now") (59). On the contrary, those CopPs that do not satisfy the previous tests are not  
903 interpreted as happening at the time of the utterance; they describe properties, characteristics,  
904 of the subject, whose veracity, of course, does not depend on the specific spacetime point at  
905 which they are uttered (58).

- 906
- 907 (58) a. *Ana es* { *estudiante / de Canarias*}. [*≠ Aquí y ahora*] (Spanish)  
908 Ana be<sub>ser</sub>-PRS.3SG student of Canary Islands
- 909 b. *A Ana é* { *estudante / das Canárias*}. [*≠ Aqui e agora*] (Portuguese)  
910 The Ana be<sub>ser</sub>-PRS.3SG student of.the Canary Islands
- 911 c. *Anne est* { *étudiante / des Canaries*}. [*≠ Ici et maintenant*] (French)  
912 Anne be-PRS.3SG student of.the Canary Islands
- 913 d. *Anna è* { *studentessa / delle Canarie*}. [*≠ Qui e ora*] (Italian)  
914 Anna be-PRS.3SG student of.the Canary Islands  
915 'Anna is {a student / from the Canary Islands}.' [*≠ Here and now*]
- 916
- 917 (59) a. *Ana está* { *sola / cansada / enferma / sentada*}. [*= Aquí y ahora*] (Spanish)  
918 Ana be<sub>estar</sub>-PRS.3SG alone tired sick seated
- 919 b. *A Ana está* { *sozinha / cansada / doente / sentada*}. [*= Aqui e agora*] (Portuguese)  
920 The Ana be<sub>estar</sub>-PRS.3SG alone tired sick seated
- 921 c. *Anne est* { *seule / fatiguée / malade / assise*}. [*= Ici et maintenant*] (French)  
922 Anne be-PRS.3SG alone tired sick seated
- 923 d. *Anna è* { *sola / stanca / ammalata / seduta*}. [*= Qui e ora*] (Italian)  
924 Anna be-PRS.3SG alone tired sick seated  
925 'Anna is {alone / tired / sick / sitting}.' [*= Here and now*]

926

927 In the same way, in the past tense, the CopPs that are interpreted as happenings refer to  
928 an event that occurred only once or on several occasions (61). By contrast, the CopPs that

929 describe properties can hardly be found in the past (e.g. *to be from the Canary Islands*) and,  
 930 provided that they are felicitous in the past, they are interpreted as being true for the subject  
 931 over the timespan to which the predication is confined (60).

932

- 933 (60) a. *En su juventud, Ana fue { estudiante / de Canarias} (#solo* (Spanish)  
 934 *In her youth Ana be<sub>ser</sub>-PST.3SG student of Canary Islands only*  
 935 *una vez / #varias veces).*  
 936 *a time several times*
- 937 b. *Na sua juventude, a Ana foi { estudante / das Canárias} (Portuguese)*  
 938 *In her youth the Ana be<sub>ser</sub>-PST.3SG student of.the Canary Islands*  
 939 *(#só uma vez / #várias vezes).*  
 940 *only a time several times*
- 941 c. *Dans sa jeunesse, Anne a été { étudiante / des* (French)  
 942 *During her youth Anne AUX.3SG be-PTCP student of.the*  
 943 *Canaries} (#une seule fois / #plusieurs fois).*  
 944 *Canary Islands an alone time several times*
- 945 d. *Da giovane, Anna è stata { studentessa / delle Canarie} (Italian)*  
 946 *Of young Anna AUX.3SG be-PTCP student of.the Canary Islands*  
 947 *(#solo una volta / #varie volte).*  
 948 *only a time several times*  
 949 *'In her youth, Anna was {a student / from the Canary Islands} (only once / on several occasions).'*

950

- 951 (61) a. *Durante nuestro último viaje, Ana ha estado { sola / triste /* (Spanish)  
 952 *During our last trip Ana AUX.3SG be<sub>estar</sub>-PTCP alone sad*  
 953 *enferma / sentada} (solo una vez / varias veces).*  
 954 *sick seated only a time several times*
- 955 b. *Durante a nossa última viagem, a Ana esteve { sozinha / triste /* (Portuguese)  
 956 *During the our last trip the Ana be<sub>estar</sub>-PST.3SG alone sad*  
 957 *doente / sentada} (só uma vez / várias vezes).*  
 958 *sick seated only a time several times*
- 959 c. *Pendant notre dernier voyage, Anne a été { seule / triste /* (French)  
 960 *During our last trip Anne AUX.3SG be-PTCP alone sad*  
 961 *malade / assise} (une seule fois / plusieurs fois).*  
 962 *sick seated an alone time several times*
- 963 d. *Durante il nostro ultimo viaggio, Anna è stata { sola / triste /* (Italian)  
 964 *During the our last trip Anna AUX.3SG be-PTCP alone sad*  
 965 *malata / seduta} (solo una volta / varie volte).*  
 966 *sick seated only a time several times*  
 967 *'During our last trip, Anna was {alone / sad / sick / seated} (only once / on several occasions).'*

968

969 Finally, we can observe that, as expected, happening-descriptive CopPs can be easily  
 970 referred to by event-denoting verbs (62b)-(63b), unlike property-descriptive<sup>30</sup> CopPs (62a)-  
 971 (62b).

972

973 (62) Spanish

---

<sup>30</sup> The term *property* is used here as "intrinsic quality" of an entity. Therefore, *property-descriptive predicate* is synonym of *characterizing predicate*. See also section 3.

974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000  
1001  
1002  
1003  
1004  
1005  
1006  
1007  
1008  
1009  
1010  
1011  
1012  
1013  
1014  
1015  
1016  
1017

- ¿Qué pasó?

'What happened?'

a. #Ana fue muy guapa en su juventud.

Ana be<sub>ser</sub>-PST.3SG very beautiful in her youth

'Ana was beautiful in her youth.'

b. El perro estuvo { solo / tumbado } todo el día.

The dog be<sub>estar</sub>-PST.3SG alone lying.down all the day

'The dog was {alone / lying down} all day.'

(63) Spanish

a. Ana fue muy guapa en su juventud. #Eso pasó porque...

Ana be<sub>ser</sub>-PST.3SG very beautiful in her youth That happen-PST.3SG because

'Ana was beautiful in her youth. It happened because...'

b. El perro estuvo { solo / tumbado } todo el día. Eso pasó

The dog be<sub>estar</sub>-PST.3SG alone lying.down all the day That happen-PST.3SG

porque tú no volviste a casa.

because you not come.back-PST.3SG to home

'The dog was {alone / lying down} all day. It happened because you didn't come back home.'

To sum up, once we test non-verbal predicates and CopPs against other typical diagnostics for events, we find out, again, a clear split between those predicates (and their respective CopPs) that reject event tests and eventive interpretation, and those that pass the tests and are interpreted as situations, happenings, occurrences – that is, as events.

#### 2.4. Closure under negation

In a recent overview on event and state predicates, Maienborn (2019), following Herweg (1991) and Asher (2000, 1993), suggests that events and K-States differ with respect to closure conditions: only K-States are closed under negation.

Closure principles are related to fundamental ontological properties of types of objects in natural language metaphysics, therefore they help delimit domains of objects of a specific type. In the case of events, the investigation on closure principles answers the following question: if  $\delta$  denotes an object of type  $T$ , does  $\neg\delta$  also denote an object of type  $T$ ? If it does, the objects of type  $T$  are said to be closed under an operation of complementation, corresponding to the meaning of negation (Asher, 2000: 129).

Using data from German, Maienborn (2019) observes that D-State verbs (65) match dynamic eventive predicates (64) in that the result of negating the event is no longer an event, but rather a state; that is to say, they are not closed under negation. In the data under discussion, for example, both the arrival of the train and the wait for the bus make reference to a happening, an event; by contrast, the non-arrival of the train and the non-wait for the bus do not denote an event: they do not tell us that a non-something happened, but rather that something did not happen (to use the example in Asher, 2000: 131). This can easily be checked, according

1018 to Maienborn (2019), by observing that a modifier (locative, manner or comitative) is allowed in  
 1019 affirmative sentences (64a)-(65a), but excluded under negation (64b)-(65b).

1020

1021 (64) Dynamic events:

1022 a. *Der Zug ist angekommen, und zwar auf Gleis drei / pünktlich.*

1023 'The train did arrive, in fact on platform three / on time.'

1024 b. *\*Der Zug ist nicht angekommen, und zwar auf Gleis drei / pünktlich.*

1025 'The train did not arrive, in fact on platform three / on time.'

1026 (Maienborn, 2019: 51)

1027

1028 (65) D-States:

1029 a. *Jane wartete auf den Bus, und zwar dort / unruhig / mit Kate.*

1030 'Jane waited for the bus, in fact there / restlessly / with Kate.'

1031 b. *\*Jane wartete nicht auf den Bus, und zwar dort / unruhig / mit Kate.*

1032 'Jane did not wait for the bus, in fact there / restlessly / with Kate.'

1033 (Maienborn, 2019: 51)

1034

1035 As for K-States, Maienborn observes that they are closed under negation, because their  
 1036 negation also refers to a K-State, and in fact, this type of predication does not allow for  
 1037 modifiers (66).<sup>31</sup>

1038

1039 (66) K-States:

1040 a. *\*Jane ist sehr groß, und zwar {im Bett / mit ihrem Vater}.*

1041 'Jane is very tall, in fact in bed / with her father.'

1042 b. *\*Jane ist nicht sehr groß, und zwar {im Bett / mit ihrem Vater}.*

1043 'Jane is not very tall, in fact in bed / with her father.'

1044

1045 If we assume this closure principle as a relevant eventivity test<sup>32</sup> and we take into account  
 1046 CopPs, we again observe a clear split between those CopPs that meet all eventive criteria and

---

<sup>31</sup> In (66), we use an unequivocal K-State (*to be tall*), because the data offered by Maienborn in this case cannot be taken as valid evidence (i). This is so because under the argumentation we put forward in this paper, a predication such as *to be in the studio* is a D-State; and, in fact, this particular predication allows for event modification, and under negation it leads to the same result as dynamic events (64) and D-States (65), as showed in (ii). Maienborn does not notice this evidence because in her original example (i) she makes use of a temporal modifier. Nevertheless, since temporal modification is allowed for any eventuality type (as also observed by Maienborn in many studies), the example in (i) cannot be taken as valid evidence to distinguish K-States from D-eventualities.

(i) a. *Jane war im Studio, und zwar eine Stunde lang.*

'Jane was in.the studio, in fact for one hour.'

b. *Jane war nicht im Studio, und zwar eine Stunde lang.*

'Jane was not in.the studio, in fact for one hour.'

(Maienborn, 2019: 50)

(ii) a. *Jane war im Studio, und zwar mit ihrer besten Freundin.*

'Jane was in.the studio, in fact with her best friend.'

b. *\*Jane war nicht im Studio, und zwar mit ihrerbesten Freundin.*

'Jane was not in.the studio, in fact with her best friend.'

<sup>32</sup> It is worth noticing that the test under discussion is not about the aspectual nature of predicates and predications (that is, inner aspect). More specifically, negation does not turn an eventive predicate into a stative one; in fact, under an aspectual point of view, the content of a verbal predicate is the same both in an affirmative and in a negative sentence. What we are referring to while talking about closure under negation are the inferential effects that negation of a predicate has on the world order, not on the predicate itself: if the train didn't

1047 those CopPs that reject them. Let us take a look at some examples from a mono-copular  
 1048 language, such as Italian, and a bi-copular language, such as Spanish (where non-eventive  
 1049 CopPs are headed by *ser*-copula and eventive CopPs are headed by *estar*-copula, see Section  
 1050 3). On the one hand, we find the group of property-descriptive CopPs, that do not make  
 1051 reference to an event, but rather to a characteristic of the subject, both with (67b) and without  
 1052 negation (67a). Therefore, they are closed under negation, just as K-States are.

1053

- 1054 (67) a. *Anna è spagnola.* (Italian)  
 1055 Anna be-PRS.3SG Spanish  
 1056 *Ana es española.* (Spanish)  
 1057 Ana be<sub>ser</sub>-PRS.3SG Spanish  
 1058 'Anna is Spanish.'
- 1059
- 1060 b. *Anna non è spagnola.* (Italian)  
 1061 Anna not be-PRS.3SG Spanish  
 1062 *Ana no es española.* (Spanish)  
 1063 Ana not be<sub>ser</sub>-PRS.3SG Spanish  
 1064 'Anna is not Spanish.'

1065

1066 On the other hand, happening-descriptive CopPs (68) make reference to an event in the  
 1067 affirmative (68a) (such as that Ana was sick), but not under negation (68b), in which case we  
 1068 infer that the situation of Ana being sick did not happen. Therefore, they are not closed under  
 1069 negation, just as D-States.

1070

- 1071 (68) a. *Anna è stata ammalata.* (Italian)  
 1072 Anna AUX.3SG be-PTCP sick  
 1073 *Ana estuvo enferma.* (Spanish)  
 1074 Ana be<sub>estar</sub>-PST.3SG sick  
 1075 'Anna was sick.'
- 1076
- 1077 b. *Anna non è stata ammalata.* (Italian)  
 1078 Anna not AUX.3SG be-PTCP sick  
 1079 *Ana no estuvo enferma.* (Spanish)  
 1080 Ana not be<sub>estar</sub>-PST.3SG sick  
 1081 'Anna was not sick.'

1082

1083 In this case, the different interpretations (eventive and non-eventive) of the CopP can be  
 1084 grasped by adding a resumptive comment about the happening: this is possible in the

---

arrive, we infer that the (event of the) arrival of the train did not happen, that is to say, there is no event of the train arriving in the world; and this is not about the inner aspect of the verb *arrive*, which is an eventive predicate, regardless of negation. In fact, negation does not alter the result of eventive tests. Eventive predicates allow for event-related modifiers independently of negation (e.g., *The train [did not] arrive[d] on platform three*); and actually, the previous examples by Maienborn (64)-(65) are not about event-related modifiers, but rather about sentential modification, as showed by the necessary use of the sentential adverb *und zwar*.

1085 affirmative (69a), which is about the happening of the event of being sick, but not under  
 1086 negation (69b), where the utterance is about a non-happening.<sup>33</sup>

1087

1088 (69) a. *Anna è stata ammalata; ed è successo varie* (Italian)  
 1089 Anna AUX.3SG be-PTCP sick and AUX.3SG happen-PTCP several  
 1090 *volte il mese scorso.*  
 1091 times the month past  
 1092 *Ana estuvo enferma; y esto sucedió varias veces* (Spanish)  
 1093 Ana be<sub>estar</sub>-PST.3SG sick and that happen-PST.3SG several times  
 1094 *el mes pasado.*  
 1095 the month past  
 1096 'Anna was sick. And this happened on several occasions last month.'

1097

1098 b. *Anna non è stata ammalata; #ed è successo* (Italian)  
 1099 Anna not AUX.3SG be-PTCP sick and AUX.3SG happen-PTCP  
 1100 *varie volte il mese scorso.*  
 1101 several times the month past  
 1102 *Ana no estuvo enferma; #y esto sucedió varias* (Spanish)  
 1103 Ana not be<sub>estar</sub>-PST.3SG sick and that happen-PST.3SG several  
 1104 *veces el mes pasado.*  
 1105 times the month past  
 1106 'Anna was not sick. And this happened on several occasions last month.'

1107

1108 To sum up, contrary to Maienborn's (2019) assertion, CopPs are not uniformly closed  
 1109 under negation: only property-descriptive CopPs (as K-States) are, while happening-descriptive  
 1110 CopPs are not, as typical events. We therefore can conclude that CopPs are split into two  
 1111 classes also with respect to closure under negation.

1112 However, some reservations regarding the validity of closure phenomena in the study of  
 1113 eventivity are worth pointing out, because under a more careful look, we observe that the  
 1114 closure test does not work as well as expected. This fact was already pointed out by Dölling  
 1115 (2005). Contrary to predictions, we can easily find eventive predicates (either D-States [70] or  
 1116 'traditional', that is, dynamic events [71]) that are closed under negation. In the affirmative, the  
 1117 sentences are about a happening (the dike blocking the water [70a] or Ana keeping silence  
 1118 [71a]), and curiously enough, their negation also refers to an event, that is, for example, that the  
 1119 dike broke (70b) and that Ana talked (71b).<sup>34</sup>

1120

1121 (70) a. *Der Deich widerstand dem Wasserdruck.*  
 1122 'The dike withstood the pressure of the water.'  
 1123 b. *Der Deich widerstand nicht dem Wasserdruck.*  
 1124 'The dike did not withstood the pressure of the water.'

<sup>33</sup> This test is taken from Asher (2000) and can be an alternative evidence for the (non-)eventive interpretation of predications for languages other than German which do not have an *und zwar* or similar sentential adverbs.

<sup>34</sup> This is probably due to the fact that these verbs include negation in their lexical meaning: *widerstehen*, 'exert force such that something does not happen'; *tacere*, 'not talk'. Anyway, the problem is still there: if we assume that lexical negation is relevant, because it has impact on syntactic negation, why is it the case that in the lexicon we have negated events (*e.g.*, not talk) that still are events?

- 1125 (Dölling, 2005: 320)
- 1126
- 1127 (71) a. *Anna tacque.* (Italian)
- 1128 Anna shut.up-PST.3SG
- 1129 *Ana se calló.* (Spanish)
- 1130 Ana CL.3SG shut.up-PST.3SG
- 1131 'Anna shut up.'
- 1132
- 1133 b. *Anna non tacque.* (Italian)
- 1134 Anna not shut.up-PST.3SG
- 1135 *Ana no se calló.* (Spanish)
- 1136 Ana not CL.3SG shut.up-PST.3SG
- 1137 'Anna did not shut up.'
- 1138

1139 The observed facts undermine the relevance of the test on closure under negation when it  
 1140 comes to the aspectual nature of predicates, and more exactly, their stative/eventive nature. For  
 1141 this reason, from now on, we won't take into account closure phenomena as a reliable evidence  
 1142 of (non-)eventiveness. Anyway, as we saw, if we were to accept closure under negation as a  
 1143 relevant test, we would find the same split between K-CopPs and D-CopPs that we observed  
 1144 along the rest of the paper.

1145

1146 **2.5. Interim conclusion**

1147 Summing up all of the above, we conclude that non-verbal predicates, as well as the  
 1148 CopPs through which they are attributed to a subject in sentential predication, also split into two  
 1149 groups: one group lacks any eventive property, while the other group totally passes all the tests  
 1150 for eventivity. The distinction is summarized in (Table 3).

1151

Tests	CopPs	<i>(to be) a student, from the Canary Islands</i>	<i>(to be) tired, alone, angry, hungry</i>
Perceptual reports		*	+
Event-related modification		*	+
Function as depictive		*	+
Quantification		*	+
Happening reading: 'here and now' in the present		#	+
Happening reading: 'once' or 'on several occasions' in the past		#	+
Reference to an event ( <i>to happen, to occur...</i> )		#	+

1152 Table 3: CopPs and eventive tests: summary

1153

1154 On this basis, we can conclude that, as argued for verbal predication in the original K/D  
 1155 account and contrary to the widespread assumptions on copular constructions, CopPs also  
 1156 divide into pure stative (or non-eventive) CopPs and eventive CopPs, that is, under the K/D  
 1157 theory, between K-CopPs and D-CopPs. As we observed from perceptual reports and depictive  
 1158 secondary predication, such aspectual distinction is primarily rooted in non-verbal predicates

1159 and consequently maintained at the level of CopPs, as attested by event-related modification,  
 1160 quantification and the different readings CopPs receive in the present and in the past.<sup>35</sup>

1161 An additional (and very basic) observation that reinforces the idea that D-CopPs exist, and  
 1162 thus, CopPs also split into the K and D classes, is that prototypical D-verbs under the K/D  
 1163 account (namely, *sit, stand, lie*) correspond to CopPs in Romance languages (e.g., in Spanish,  
 1164 *estar {sentado / de pie / tumbado}*). In examples (27)-(29), (55), (57), (59) and (61) we have  
 1165 already observed the D-behaviour of these CopPs. Moreover, apart from the typical case of *sit,*  
 1166 *stand* and *lie*, it is worth observing that the correspondence between a CopP in Romance and a  
 1167 VP in English is a very frequent phenomenon, which suggests that the aspectual parallelism  
 1168 between CopPs and VPs is not only plausible, but real. Again, such a CopP - VP  
 1169 correspondence through languages can be clearly observed in many of the examples above:  
 1170 *estar de rodillas - to kneel* (30b), *estar de compras - to (be) shop(ping)*, *estar de fiesta - to (be)*  
 1171 *party(ing)*, *estar de viaje - to (be) travel(ling)* (31a), *estar asomado - to lean out* (31b).

1172 In the light of all of the above, we can conclude that non-verbal predicates and the  
 1173 corresponding CopPs are split into the K and D classes, thus we can modify the aspectual  
 1174 taxonomy in (Table 2) as represented in (Table 4), where Kimian and Davidsonian states are  
 1175 instantiated by both VPs and CopPs.

1176

Non-dynamic (States)		Dynamic (traditional Events)
Kimian	Davidsonian	
VPs <i>know, weigh, own...</i>	VPs <i>sit, stand, lie, gleam...</i>	VPs <i>run, talk, eat...</i>
CopPs <i>(to be) a student, from the Canary Islands</i>	CopPs <i>(to be) tired, alone, angry, hungry</i>	? <sup>36</sup>

1177 Table 4: VPs and CopPs over the aspectual classes: new taxonomy

1178

### 1179 3. On the analogy between the K/D and the IL/SL distinction

1180 Once we observe that non-verbal predication is in parallel to verbal predication in what  
 1181 concerns the K/D split, we are left with a second dilemma, that is the relation between this  
 1182 model (Kimian / Davidsonian) and the IL/SL distinction. That CopPs display the IL/SL distinction

<sup>35</sup> The compositional nature of inner aspect in CopPs is a common observation in the literature, which has led many scholars to analyse CopPs as the result of a concord phenomenon between the predicate and the copula (Author, 2017, 2015; Brucart, 2012, 2005; Fábregas, 2012; Gallego and Uriagereka, 2016; Zagana, 2012; a.o.). As attested by the references, the derivation of event structure in CopPs has been studied basically in Spanish, because of the *ser/estar* alternation, and recently Author (2018b) extended the analysis to mono-copular Romance languages, such as French and Italian.

<sup>36</sup> We leave open the question on whether dynamic CopPs exist (that is, 'eventive' in the traditional sense). Under the premise that non-verbal and verbal predication domains are aspectual-symmetric, dynamic CopPs should exist. In fact, it seems to be the case for activity-CopPs discussed in section 2.1 (e.g., *ser amable con sus abuelos, estar(se) quieto*). We refer the reader to Arche (2011, 2006), Author (2017), Fábregas and Marín (2016, 2015), Fernández Leborans (2007), García Fernández and Gómez Vázquez (2015), for a detailed study of these CopPs.

1183 is a well-established fact; therefore, once determined that the same constructions also split into  
1184 the K/D classes, for the sake of coherence, we are called to understand the connection (if any)  
1185 between these two close paradigms.

1186 The distinction between Individual-Level Predicates (ILPs, henceforth) and Stage-Level  
1187 Predicates (SLPs) finds its origins in Milsark's (1974) and Carlson's (1977) studies. During the  
1188 last forty years, linguists have incessantly tried to find out the conceptual foundations of the  
1189 distinction as well as a formal explanation of its grammatical encoding; however, we still lack a  
1190 broad consensus on this subject (see Fábregas, 2012; Fernald, 2000 for an overview). The  
1191 literature is full of "roughly speaking" descriptions of the IL/SL distinction, which has generally  
1192 been interpreted as an aspectual<sup>37</sup> contrast between permanent (IL) and transient (SL) qualities.  
1193 However, since Carlson (1977: 72-73), it is well known that the duration (permanent or  
1194 transient) cannot be taken as a defining feature of IL/SL-ness (see also Arche, 2012; Author,  
1195 2017, 2018a on this topic).<sup>38</sup> Therefore, nowadays the most appealing way to conceive the  
1196 distinction is still the classical understanding of ILPs as "property-descriptive" predicates and of  
1197 SLPs as "situation" or "happening-descriptive" predicates (see Carlson, 1977: 75; Milsark, 1974:  
1198 211).

1199 Before moving on, particular attention has to be paid to the term *property*, which is not  
1200 used here in the usual sense of the formal semantics framework, where *property* makes  
1201 reference to the meaning of a predicate. When it comes to aspect, and particularly to the  
1202 difference between IL and SL-predicates, the term *property* is used in its more general meaning,  
1203 as "intrinsic quality", "characteristic" of an entity. Therefore, the label *property-descriptive* makes  
1204 reference to predicates that describe a characteristic of the subject, that is, 'characterizing  
1205 predicates'. In this sense, *property-descriptive* predicates differ from *happening-descriptive*  
1206 predicates in that the latter do not describe a property of their subject, but an event in which the  
1207 subject is involved.

1208 As sketched out in the introduction to this paper, under the K/D theory, the IL/SL contrast is  
1209 considered an independent paradigm with respect to the K/D distinction. The reasons that lead  
1210 to this postulate are mainly two: first, Maienborn's claim that CopPs are homogeneously K-  
1211 states regardless of their IL/SL nature; second, the fact that the IL/SL contrast is understood as  
1212 a pragmatic (rather than a grammatical) distinction between permanent and transitory qualities,  
1213 and therefore not related to the K/D pattern. Nevertheless, under the evidence that CopPs  
1214 exhibit the K/D contrast, the first claim loses its validity, and we are now straightaway redirected  
1215 to explore the connections between the two distinctions (K/D and IL/SL) in the domain of non-  
1216 verbal predication. Likewise, the alleged pragmatic nature of the IL/SL contrast is not a piece of  
1217 empirical evidence that precludes the search for a deeper understanding of the concepts

---

<sup>37</sup> Some linguists reject the idea that the IL/SL distinction is aspectual and suggest that the contrast is pragmatic in nature and has no grammatical foundations (e.g., De Swart, 1993; Jäger, 2001; Maienborn, 2005a et seq.). We will address this point further on.

<sup>38</sup> The basic reason why the permanent / transient criterion is not relevant is that, although it probably works in many cases, a property (that is, an ILP) is not necessarily permanent and, vice versa, a situation or a happening (i.e., a SLP) is not necessarily transitory: on the contrary, a property is usually lost (e.g., to be a child, to be a student, etc.), and a situation can be maintained without an endpoint (e.g., to be forever {grateful / satisfied for...}).

1218 involved. Anyway, if we consider the IL/SL contrast as an aspectual distinction, then it is  
 1219 reasonable to wonder about its implications in a general aspectual taxonomy of predicates and,  
 1220 in the case under discussion, in the domain of Kimian and Davidsonian states.

1221 If we take into account the two groups of CopPs described above (see Table 4), we notice  
 1222 that the cleavage between the K and D-classes coincides with that of IL and SL-predications:  
 1223 those CopPs tagged as Kimian are characterizing predications (that is, property-descriptive),  
 1224 typically conceived of as ILPs, while D-CopPs are situation-descriptive predications, that is,  
 1225 ordinary SLPs (72).

1226

1227 (72) K-CopPs = IL-CopPs: *(to be) a student, from the Canary Islands...*

1228 D-CopPs = SL-CopPs: *(to be) tired, alone, angry, hungry...*

1229

1230 This link should not be surprising after all, considering that the analysis of SLPs as  
 1231 Davidsonian elements (that is, as predicates endowed with an event argument) had been put  
 1232 forward since the very first studies on the IL/SL contrast (Kratzer, 1995, 1988) and had been  
 1233 supported by a large tradition (Diesing, 1992; Fernald, 2000; Ramchand, 1993; a.o.). Moreover,  
 1234 even those studies that do not overtly commit to the presence of an extra e-position in SLPs,  
 1235 generally agree on the event-like nature of SL predications (Author, 2017; Fábregas, 2012;  
 1236 Hoekstra, 1992; Raposo and Uriagereka, 1995; a.o.). Therefore, despite the specific formal  
 1237 approaches adopted by the different studies on this subject, SLPs are usually considered  
 1238 eventive predicates, which is exactly the same idea that Maienborn expresses for D-States, as  
 1239 well as the same conclusion we reach above for a specific group of CopPs (that is, D-CopPs)  
 1240 while checking Maienborn's claim on the non-Davidsonian nature of CopPs.

1241 A third clue of the connection between the K/D and the IL/SL contrasts comes from the  
 1242 evidence that in Spanish and Portuguese the previously observed split among K- and D-CopPs  
 1243 coincides with the *ser/estar* alternation. We can observe, in fact, that K-CopPs are headed by  
 1244 the copula *ser*, while D-CopPs have the copula *estar* (73) (see also all the previous Spanish  
 1245 and Portuguese data).

1246

1247 (73) K-CopPs = *ser*Ps: *ser {estudiante / de Canarias}* (Spanish)  
 1248 *ser {estudante / das Canárias}* (Portuguese)  
 1249 'to be {a student / from the Canary Islands}'

1250

1251 D-CopPs = *estar*Ps: *estar {cansado / solo / enfadado / hambriento}* (Spanish)  
 1252 *estar {cansado / sozinho / furioso / faminto}* (Portuguese)  
 1253 'to be {tired / alone / angry / hungry}'

1254

1255 In at least the last twenty years, the *ser/estar* alternation in Spanish and Portuguese has  
 1256 been studied as an overt manifestation of the IL/SL distinction in the non-verbal domain:  
 1257 regardless of the different formal approaches we find in the literature, *ser* and *estar* copulas  
 1258 have been taken as syntactic exponents of IL- and SL-predications, respectively (Arche, 2012,

1259 2006; Author, 2018a, 2017, 2015; Bosque and Gutiérrez-Rexach, 2009; Cunha, 2011, 2007;  
 1260 Escandell, 2018; Escandell and Leonetti, 2002; Fábregas, 2012; Fernández Leborans, 1999;  
 1261 Gumiel-Molina et al., 2015; Leonetti, 2015, 1994; Leonetti and Escribano, 2018; RAE and  
 1262 ASALE, 2009; Raposo, 2013; a.o.). In sum, the fact that typical K-CopPs have the copula *ser*,  
 1263 while D-CopPs are headed by *estar* confirms our intuition in (72): what we are referring to as  
 1264 Kimian and Davidsonian is nothing more than the Individual-Level/Stage-Level distinction.

1265 In Maienborn's K/D proposal, the *ser/estar* alternation (just as the IL/SL contrast) is not  
 1266 considered as being related to the K/D distinction because it is argued to be a discourse-  
 1267 dependent phenomenon which, as such, does not correlate with the eventive nature of  
 1268 predicates (see especially Maienborn, 2005a). Such a view clearly derives from the idea we  
 1269 discussed above that CopPs resist the Davidsonian tests, and therefore, whatever distinction  
 1270 we find among them is not related to eventivity. However, again, this view collapses under the  
 1271 empirical evidence provided along this paper, which suggests that the K/D split exists in CopPs,  
 1272 and it is parallel to the *ser*-IL/*estar*-SL distinction.

1273 As for the alleged pragmatic nature of the IL/SL contrast and the phenomenon of copular  
 1274 alternation (*ser / estar*), we have many pieces of evidence that suggest these phenomena are  
 1275 not merely discourse-dependent. First of all, the vast majority of the previous tests (namely,  
 1276 event-related modification, secondary predication and quantification) are syntactic phenomena,  
 1277 which means that the IL/SL contrast and the phenomenon of copular alternation have a strong  
 1278 syntactic foundation, apart from their pragmatic implications and effects. Second, the parallelism  
 1279 we observed among languages suggests that the aspectual distinction under discussion (call it  
 1280 K/D or IL/SL) and its manifestation in some languages by means of specific syntactic exponents  
 1281 (e.g., *ser* and *estar* copulas) are well-codified phenomena across natural languages, which do  
 1282 not depend simply on discourse constraints. Finally, as for *ser* and *estar*, despite the classical  
 1283 debate on whether the copular alternation is a pragmatic or a syntactic phenomenon,<sup>39</sup> it has  
 1284 only recently been observed for Spanish that the distribution of *ser* and *estar* copulas follows a  
 1285 regular pattern that cannot be freely altered, no matter what the discourse constraints are. In  
 1286 particular, while ILPs combine with *ser* and, under a proper discourse-situation, can be coerced  
 1287 into a SL-reading by combining with *estar* (74a),<sup>40</sup> SLPs combine exclusively with *estar*, *ser*  
 1288 being impossible, even though the utterance of a property of the subject is required by the  
 1289 discourse (74b) (Author, 2015: 225-227, 2017, 2018a; Gallego and Uriagereka, 2016).

1290

1291 (74) a. *ser* + ILPs: *ser* {*alto* / *guapo* / *simpático*}  
 1292 *estar* + ILPs: *estar* {*alto* / *guapo* / *simpático*}  
 1293 'to be {tall / handsome / nice}'

1294

1295 b. *estar* + SLPs: *estar* {*harto* / *cansado* / *tumbado*}  
 1296 \**ser* + SLPs: \**ser* {*harto* / *cansado* / *tumbado*}

<sup>39</sup> See Author (2017), Leonetti (1994), and Fernández Leborans (1999) for a deep discussion on the discourse-based and the syntax-based studies of *ser* and *estar*.

<sup>40</sup> See Escandell and Leonetti (2002) and Escandell (2018) on coercion of ILPs to SLPs.

1297 'to be {fed up / tired / lying down}'

1298

1299 Additionally, it has been widely described in the literature that *ser* and *estar* also impose  
1300 strong categorical selection restrictions on the predicates. In particular, only adjectival  
1301 categories (that is, APs and PPs) can appear with both copulas, while NPs (and DPs of course)  
1302 are exclusively allowed with the copula *ser*, as well as AdvPs are allowed only with *estar*.

1303 Despite the obvious fact that the utterance of a property (with *ser*) or a stage (with *estar*)  
1304 has to be felicitous in the real world, these observations suggest that the copular alternation is a  
1305 syntactic phenomenon, which is not explained in the realm of discourse (see Author, 2017;  
1306 Cunha, 2011; Fernández Leborans, 1999 on this topic).

1307 In sum, both the IL/SL distinction and the *ser/estar* alternation seem to be syntactic in  
1308 nature (not merely discourse-dependent phenomena), just as the K/D distinction. Therefore, we  
1309 are facing three phenomena (namely, K/D, IL/SL and *ser/estar*) which, based on few essential  
1310 observations, do not seem as different as we were induced to think; but rather, they look as one  
1311 and the same thing. As we saw, in fact, K-CopPs and D-CopPs are semantically identical to IL  
1312 and SL-CopPs (respectively), the first group describing properties of the subject, and the  
1313 second group describing situations, happenings, in which the subject is involved. The formal  
1314 approaches to the study of IL and SL-predications also coincide with the Davidsonian account  
1315 of D-States, sometimes in a technical way (when studying SLPs as D-predicates) and  
1316 sometimes exclusively in a conceptual way (when describing SLPs as eventive predicates).  
1317 Finally, we have clear empirical evidence from Romance when we see that K-CopPs are  
1318 nothing more than *ser*Ps (that is, IL-CopPs) and D-CopPs coincide with *estar*Ps (that is, SL-  
1319 CopPs).

1320 On balance, everything suggests that when talking about Kimian and Davidsonian  
1321 predicates we are talking about the same thing as Individual-Level and Stage-Level predicates.  
1322 While at the beginning we wondered about the possible connections between the K/D and the  
1323 IL/SL distinctions, we have now reached the opposite question: are there any differences  
1324 between the K/D and the IL/SL classes? The data suggest that the answer is “no”.

1325 If we now expand our research from non-verbal to verbal predication, we observe two more  
1326 pieces of evidence in support of the parallelism between the IL/SL and the K/D contrasts. The  
1327 first one is that, as the K/D distinction, the IL/SL contrast also extends to the domain of verbal  
1328 predication, thus the coincidence K-IL/D-SL we observed among non-verbal predicates and  
1329 their respective CopPs is also attested among verbal predicates. Even though in the literature it  
1330 is usual to refer to the IL/SL distinction quite exclusively while talking about CopPs, it is worth  
1331 remembering that the Individual/Stage distinction is a cross-categorical distinction, which  
1332 applies also to verbs (see the original work by Carlson, 1977). Now, if we take into account  
1333 some Kimian and Davidsonian verbs (see Table 1), we will observe that, at the same time, they  
1334 are also canonical IL- and SL-verbs: *know*, *weigh*, *own* are property-descriptive (i.e., IL) verbs,  
1335 while *sit*, *stand*, *lie*, *gleam* describe situations (i.e., stages) of the subject they are predicated of,  
1336 and therefore are SLPs.

1337 Finally, it should be noted that the original tests proposed in the K/D theory in order to  
1338 distinguish D-states (namely, the ability to function as a complement of perception verbs and  
1339 the admission of event related modifiers, see [2]), are nothing more than a subpart of the  
1340 canonical tests of SL-ness, put forward since the initial studies on this subject (Carlson, 1977;  
1341 Chierchia, 1995; Kratzer, 1995, 1988; Milsark, 1974). This very basic observation serves as  
1342 ultimate evidence that while talking about Davidsonian predicates, we are talking about Stage-  
1343 Level predicates.

1344 In sum, on the basis of the above, we can conclude that the K/D and the IL/SL distinctions  
1345 are essentially one and the same thing. The practice of keeping the two notions apart can be  
1346 attributed to the fact that, as mentioned before, linguists are used to talk about the IL/SL  
1347 distinction in the non-verbal domain, while the K/D account was originally formulated for verbal  
1348 predicates. However, once we understand that what happens among non-verbal predicates is  
1349 the same that happens among verbal ones (as we tested along the previous sections), then  
1350 there is no reason to keep things apart: Kimian/Davidsonian and Individual/Stage are just  
1351 notational variants of the same aspectual distinction.

1352

#### 1353 4. Conclusions

1354 In this paper we put under scrutiny two fundamental principles of the K/D theory, namely,  
1355 the idea that the K/D distinction is a paradigm different from the Individual/Stage-Level  
1356 dichotomy, and that this distinction concerns only verbal predicates, because all copular  
1357 constructions are K-States.

1358 We took into account the linguistic tests proposed by K/D theorists, together with additional  
1359 well-established tests for eventive predicates and we applied them to non-verbal predicates and  
1360 copular constructions in Romance languages. As a result, we observed that not only do they not  
1361 behave as a uniform class of K-predications, but they also test positively for Davidsonian states;  
1362 that is to say, that non-verbal predicates and the respective CopPs are split between the K and  
1363 D classes just as verbal predicates and VPs are.

1364 For the sake of coherence, the observed contrast in the domain of non-verbal predication  
1365 triggers a direct connection to the IL/SL distinction, which has been typically studied for non-  
1366 verbal predicates and copular constructions. We observed that, once we compare the K/D and  
1367 the IL/SL classifications, they actually coincide. Semantically, K-States, as ILPs, are property-  
1368 descriptive predications, while D-States, as SLPs, are happening-descriptive (that is, eventive)  
1369 predications. No difference is found even syntactically, once we observe that the tests for D-  
1370 States are (just a part of) the traditional tests for SLPs. Conclusive evidence comes directly from  
1371 Romance languages, once we observe that the distinction between K and D-CopPs coincides  
1372 with the distribution of *ser* and *estar* copulas in Portuguese and Spanish, that is, with IL-CopPs  
1373 and SL-CopPs.

1374 We therefore conclude that, contrary to the fundamental principles of the K/D theory, the  
1375 Kimian/Davidsonian distinction coincides with the Individual/Stage-Level contrast and it is  
1376 equally relevant for the verbal and for the non-verbal domains, that is to say, non-verbal

1377 predicates and CopPs also split between the K (or IL) and D (SL) classes. In other words, the  
1378 Kimian/Davidsonian distinction turns out to be nothing more than a notational variant of the  
1379 Individual/Stage-Level distinction, whose original segregation results from considering the K/D  
1380 contrast as a typically verbal phenomenon, and the IL/SL distinction as a non-verbal one.

1381 At least two major aspects remain outstanding at this point: an ontological characterization  
1382 of the two objects under discussion (namely, K- or ILPs and D- or SLPs) and a formal linguistic  
1383 analysis. Both tasks have drawn the attention of theorists over decades and, curiously enough,  
1384 again, the IL/SL classification and the K/D theory share the same intuitions when it comes to  
1385 formal issues.

1386 As for the ontology, the existence of predicates that behave and are interpreted as events  
1387 (call them Davidsonian or Stage-Level) in all ways, except for the fact that they are non-dynamic  
1388 (that is, static), compels us to go over the traditional aspectual understanding of “event” as a  
1389 dynamic predicate and find out a new, wider, and more accurate notion.

1390 As for the formal analysis of K/ILPs and D/SLPs, again, we await an optimal solution, which  
1391 could justify both the interpretation and the syntactical behaviour of the two predicative classes.  
1392 The Davidsonian analysis of eventive predicates has been widely criticized by theorists, both for  
1393 the K/D and for the IL/SL theories. Essentially, distinguishing predicates on the basis of an extra  
1394 e-position is no longer convincing with the advent of neo-Davidsonianism; furthermore, the e-  
1395 variable has been proven to be an insufficient formal device to justify the syntactic behaviour of  
1396 event predicates when it comes to phenomena that exceed the domain of modification and  
1397 quantification. Moreover, the new, wider concept of “event”, which does not depend on  
1398 dynamism and encompasses both the verbal and the non-verbal predication, calls for a new  
1399 formal analysis.

1400 For the time being, we know that there is no reason to differentiate between K/D-States  
1401 and ILPs/SLPs, and that the distinction between the class of eventive (call it D or SL) and that of  
1402 non-eventive (K or IL) predicates is equally found in the verbal and in the non-verbal domain.  
1403 This can represent a new significant starting point for linguistic research on eventivity.

1404

#### 1405 **References**

- 1406 Alexiadou, A., 2011. Statives and nominalization. *Rech. Linguist. Vincennes* 40, 25–52.
- 1407 Arche, M.J., 2012. On the Aspectuality of the Individual-Level/Stage-Level dichotomy. *Boreal. –*  
1408 *An Int. J. Hisp. Linguist.* 1, 109–131.
- 1409 Arche, M.J., 2011. Las oraciones copulativas agentivas, in: Escandell, V., Leonetti, M., Sánchez  
1410 López, C. (Eds.), *60 Problemas de Gramática*. Akal, Madrid, pp. 99–105.
- 1411 Arche, M.J., 2006. *Individuals in Time: Tense, aspect and the individual/stage distinction*. John  
1412 Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- 1413 Asher, N., 2000. Events, facts, propositions, and evolutive anaphora, in: Higginbotham, J.,  
1414 Pianesi, F., Varzi, A. (Eds.), *Speaking of Events*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., pp. 123–  
1415 150.
- 1416 Asher, N., 1993. *Reference to Abstract Objects in Discourse*. Kluwer Academic Publishers,

- 1417 Dordrecht, Boston & London.
- 1418 Bach, E., 1986. The Algebra of Events. *Linguist. Philos.* 9, 5–16.
- 1419 Bennet, M., Partee, B.H., 1978. Toward the logic of tense and aspect in English. Indiana  
1420 University Linguistics Club, Bloomington, Ind.
- 1421 Bosque, I., Gutiérrez-Rexach, J., 2009. *Fundamentos de sintaxis formal*. Akal, Madrid.
- 1422 Brucart, J.M., 2012. Copular alternation in Spanish and Catalan attributive sentences.  
1423 *Linguística. Rev. Estud. Lingüísticos Univ. do Porto* 7, 9–43.
- 1424 Brucart, J.M., 2005. Las construcciones atributivas de localización, in: Santos Río, L., Borrego  
1425 Nieto, J., García Santos, J.F., Gómez Asencio, J.J., Prieto De Los Mozos, E. (Eds.),  
1426 Palabras, Norma, Discurso. En Memoria de Fernando Lázaro Carreter. Ediciones  
1427 Universidad de Salamanca, Salamanca, pp. 185–204.
- 1428 Carlson, G.N., 2012. Habitual and Generic Aspect, in: Binnick, R. (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook*  
1429 *of Tense and Aspect*. Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 828–851.
- 1430 Carlson, G.N., 1977. *Reference to Kinds in English*. Garland Publishing, New York & London.
- 1431 Casati, R., Varzi, A., 2014. Events. *Stanford Encycl. Philos.*
- 1432 Casati, R., Varzi, A., 2008. Event Concepts, in: Shipley, T.F., Zacks, J. (Eds.), *Understanding*  
1433 *Events: From Perception to Action*. Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 31–54.
- 1434 Casati, R., Varzi, A. (Eds.), 1996. *Events*. Dartmouth, Aldershot.
- 1435 Chierchia, G., 1995. Individual-Level Predicates as Inherent Generics, in: Carlson, G.N.,  
1436 Pelletier, F.J. (Eds.), *The Generic Book*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago &  
1437 London, pp. 176–223.
- 1438 Comrie, B., 1976. *Aspect. An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*.  
1439 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 1440 Cuartero Otal, J., 2011. Pero, ¿cómo podemos reconocer los estados?, in: Carrasco Gutiérrez,  
1441 Á. (Ed.), *Sobre Estados y Estatividad*. Lincom, Muenchen, pp. 99–121.
- 1442 Cunha, L.F., 2011. Phase states and their interaction with individual-level and stage-level  
1443 predicates, in: Carrasco Gutiérrez, Á. (Ed.), *Sobre Estados y Estatividad*. Lincom,  
1444 Muenchen, pp. 45–62.
- 1445 Cunha, L.F., 2007. *Semântica das predicacões estativas*. Lincom, Muenchen.
- 1446 Dalmi, G., 2016. What does it take to be a copula? *Yearb. Pozn. Linguist. Meet.* 2, 1–28.
- 1447 Dalmi, G., 2012. Copular sentences expressing Kimian states in Irish and Russian. *Can. J.*  
1448 *Linguist. / La Rev. Can. Linguist.* 57, 341–358.
- 1449 Davidson, D., 1967. The logical form of action sentences, in: Rescher, N. (Ed.), *The Logic of*  
1450 *Decision and Action*. University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, pp. 81–95.
- 1451 De Hoop, H., De Swart, H., 1989. Over indefinite objecten en de relatie tussen syntaxis en  
1452 semantiek. *Glott* 12, 19–35.
- 1453 De Miguel, E., 1999. El aspecto léxico, in: Bosque, I., Demonte, V. (Eds.), *Gramática*  
1454 *Descriptiva de La Lengua Española*. Espasa Calpe, Madrid, pp. 2977–3060.
- 1455 De Swart, H., 1993. *Adverbs of quantification: A generalized quantifier approach*. Garland, New  
1456 York.

- 1457 Demonte, V., 1991a. Temporal and Aspectual Constraints on Predicative AP's, in: Campos, H.,  
 1458 Martínez-Gil, F. (Eds.), *Current Studies in Spanish Studies in Spanish Linguistics*.  
 1459 Georgetown University Press, Georgetown, pp. 165–200.
- 1460 Demonte, V., 1991b. Tiempo y aspecto en los predicativos adjetivos, in: Demonte, V. (Ed.),  
 1461 *Detrás de La Palabra*. Alianza, Madrid, pp. 116–154.
- 1462 Diesing, M., 1992. *Indefinites*. MIT Press, Cambridge & London.
- 1463 Dölling, J., 2005. Copula sentences and entailment relations. *Theor. Linguist.* 31, 317–330.
- 1464 Dowty, D.R., 1979. *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar. The Semantics of Verbs and*  
 1465 *Times in Generative Semantics and in Montague's PTQ*. Reidel, Dordrecht.
- 1466 Escandell, V., 2018. Ser y estar con adjetivos. Afinidad y desajustes de rasgos. *Rev. Española*  
 1467 *Lingüística* 48, 57–114.
- 1468 Escandell, V., Leonetti, M., 2002. Coercion and the Stage/Individual distinction, in: Gutiérrez-  
 1469 Rexach, J. (Ed.), *From Words to Discourse*. Elsevier, New York-Amsterdam, pp. 159–179.
- 1470 Fábregas, A., 2012. A guide to IL and SL in Spanish: Properties, problems and proposals.  
 1471 *Boreal. – An Int. J. Hisp. Linguist.* 1, 1–71.
- 1472 Fábregas, A., Marín, R., 2017. On non-dynamic eventive verbs in Spanish. *Linguistics* 55, 451–  
 1473 488.
- 1474 Fábregas, A., Marín, R., 2016. Estarse = estar + se?, in: *Chronos XII*. Caen.
- 1475 Fábregas, A., Marín, R., 2015. Spanish estarse is not only agentive but also inchoative, in:  
 1476 *Paper Presented at Going Romance 29*. Radboud University, Nijmegen/Molenhoek.
- 1477 Fábregas, A., Marín, R., 2013. Differentiating eventivity from dynamicity: the Aktionsart of  
 1478 Davidsonian state verbs. *Manuscrito*.
- 1479 Fábregas, A., Marín, R., 2012. State nouns are Kimian states, in: Franco, I., Lusini, S., Saab, A.  
 1480 (Eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2010: Selected Papers from "Going*  
 1481 *Romance" Leiden 2010*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 41–64.
- 1482 Farkas, D.F., Sugioka, Y., 1983. Restrictive if/when-clauses. *Linguist. Philos.* 6, 225–258.
- 1483 Fernald, T.B., 2000. *Predicates and temporal arguments*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, New  
 1484 York.
- 1485 Fernández Leborans, M.J., 2007. Sobre la oposición "individuo / estado" en los predicados  
 1486 nominales, in: Delgado Cobos, I., Puigvert Ocal, A. (Eds.), *Ex Admirazione et Amicitia*.  
 1487 *Homenaje a Ramón Santiago*. Del Orto, Madrid, pp. 377–394.
- 1488 Fernández Leborans, M.J., 1999. La predicación: las oraciones copulativas, in: Bosque, I.,  
 1489 Demonte, V. (Eds.), *Gramática Descriptiva de La Lengua Española*. Espasa Calpe,  
 1490 Madrid, pp. 2357–2460.
- 1491 Folli, R., Harley, H., 2008. Teleology and animacy in external arguments. *Lingua* 118, 190–202.
- 1492 Folli, R., Harley, H., 2007. Causation, Obligation, and Argument Structure: On the Nature of  
 1493 Little v. Linguist. Inq. 38, 197–238.
- 1494 Gallego, Á., Uriagereka, J., 2016. Estar = Ser + X. *Boreal. – An Int. J. Hisp. Linguist.* 5, 123–  
 1495 156.
- 1496 García Fernández, L., Gómez Vázquez, D., 2015. More than a copula: Complex predicates with

1497           estar and the clitic *se*, in: Pérez-Jiménez, I., Leonetti, M., Gumiel-Molina, S. (Eds.), *New*  
 1498           *Perspectives on the Study of Ser and Estar*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 23–50.  
 1499   Gumiel-Molina, S., Moreno-Quibén, N., Pérez-Jiménez, I., 2015. Comparison classes and the  
 1500           relative/absolute distinction: A degree-based compositional account of the *ser/estar*  
 1501           alternation in Spanish. *Nat. Lang. Linguist. Theory* 33, 955–1001.  
 1502   Hernanz, M.L., 1988. En torno a la sintaxis y semántica de los complementos predicativos en  
 1503           español. *Estud. Gen.* 8, 7–29.  
 1504   Herweg, M., 1991. Perfective and imperfective aspect and the theory of events and states.  
 1505           *Linguistics* 29, 969–1010.  
 1506   Higginbotham, J., 2005. Event positions: Suppression and emergence. *Theor. Linguist.* 31,  
 1507           349–358.  
 1508   Higginbotham, J., 1983. The Logic of Perceptual Reports: An Extensional Alternative to  
 1509           Situation Semantics. *J. Philos.* 80, 100–127.  
 1510   Hoekstra, T., 1992. Aspect and Theta Theory, in: Roca, I.M. (Ed.), *Thematic Structure. Its Role*  
 1511           *in Grammar*. Foris, Berlin, New York, pp. 145–174.  
 1512   Jäger, G., 2001. Topic-Comment Structure and the Contrast Between Stage Level and  
 1513           Individual Level Predicates. *J. Semant.* 18, 83–126.  
 1514   Jaque, M., 2014. La expresión de la estatividad en español: niveles de representación y grados  
 1515           de dinamicidad. Doctoral dissertation, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.  
 1516   Kenny, A., 1963. *Action, Emotion and Will*. Routledge y Kegan Paul, London.  
 1517   Kim, J., 1976. Events as properties exemplifications, in: Brand, M., Walton, D. (Eds.), *Action*  
 1518           *Theory. Proceedings of the Winnipeg Conference on Human Action*. Reidel, Dordrecht,  
 1519           Boston, pp. 159–177.  
 1520   Kim, J., 1969. Events and their descriptions: some considerations, in: Rescher, N. et al. (Ed.),  
 1521           *Essays in Honor of Carl G. Hempel*. Reidel, Dordrecht, pp. 198–215.  
 1522   Kratzer, A., 1995. Stage-Level and Individual-Level Predicates, in: Carlson, G.N., Pelletier, F.J.  
 1523           (Eds.), *The Generic Book*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago & London, pp. 125–  
 1524           175.  
 1525   Kratzer, A., 1988. Stage-Level and Individual-Level Predicates, in: Krifka, M. (Ed.), *Genericity in*  
 1526           *Natural Language: Proceedings of the 1988 Tübingen Conference*. SNS-Bericht,  
 1527           Tübingen, pp. 247–284.  
 1528   Krifka, M., Pelletier, F.J., Carlson, G.N., ter Meulen, A., Chierchia, G., Link, G., 1995.  
 1529           Genericity: an introduction, in: Carlson, G.N., Pelletier, F.J. (Eds.), *The Generic Book*. The  
 1530           University of Chicago Press, Chicago & London, pp. 1–124.  
 1531   Leonetti, M., 2015. On word order in Spanish copular sentences, in: Pérez-Jiménez, I., Leonetti,  
 1532           M., Gumiel-Molina, S. (Eds.), *New Perspectives on the Study of Ser and Estar*. John  
 1533           Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 203–236.  
 1534   Leonetti, M., 1994. *Ser y estar: estado de la cuestión*. *Barataria* 1, 182–205.  
 1535   Leonetti, M., Escribano, G., 2018. El papel del aspecto gramatical en las construcciones con  
 1536           estar y adjetivos de propiedades. *Rev. Española Lingüística* 48, 115–152.

- 1537 Maienborn, C., 2019. Events and States, in: *The Oxford Handbook of Event Structure*. Oxford  
 1538 University Press, Oxford.
- 1539 Maienborn, C., 2011. Event semantics, in: von Heusinger, K., Maienborn, C., Portner, P. (Eds.),  
 1540 *Semantics. An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning*. De Gruyter Mouton,  
 1541 Boston, pp. 802–829.
- 1542 Maienborn, C., 2007. On Davidsonian and Kimian states, in: Comorovski, I., von Heusinger, K.  
 1543 (Eds.), *Existence: Semantics and Syntax*. Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 107–130.
- 1544 Maienborn, C., 2005a. A discourse-based account on Spanish “ser/estar.” *Linguistics* 43, 155–  
 1545 180.
- 1546 Maienborn, C., 2005b. Eventualities and different things: A reply. *Theor. Linguist.* 31, 383–396.
- 1547 Maienborn, C., 2005c. On the limits of the Davidsonian approach: The case of copula  
 1548 sentences. *Theor. Linguist.* 31, 275–316.
- 1549 Maienborn, C., 2004. A Pragmatic Explanation of the Stage Level / Individual Level Contrast in  
 1550 Combination with Locatives, in: Agbayani, B., Samiiian, V., Tucker, B. (Eds.), *Proceedings*  
 1551 *of the Western Conference on Linguistics (WECOL)*. CSU, Fresno, pp. 158–170.
- 1552 Maienborn, C., 2001. On the position and interpretation of locative modifiers. *Nat. Lang.*  
 1553 *Semant.* 9, 191–240.
- 1554 Maienborn, C., Schäfer, M., 2011. Adverbs and adverbials, in: Maienborn, C., von Heusinger,  
 1555 K., Portner, P. (Eds.), *Semantics. An International Handbook of Natural Language*  
 1556 *Meaning*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, New York.
- 1557 Milsark, G.L., 1974. *Existential sentences in English*. MIT.
- 1558 Moltman, F., 2019. Nominals and Event Structure, in: Truswell, R. (Ed.), *Oxford Handbook of*  
 1559 *Event Structure*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- 1560 Morimoto, Y., 2008. Me estuve quieto: el concepto de estado y el llamado se aspectual, in: Olza  
 1561 Moreno, I., Casado Velarde, M., González Ruiz, R. (Eds.), *Actas Del XXXVII Simposio*  
 1562 *Internacional de La Sociedad Española de Lingüística (SEL)*. Servicio de Publicaciones de  
 1563 la Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona.
- 1564 Partee, B.H., 1977. John is easy to please, in: Zampolli, A. (Ed.), *Linguistic Structures*  
 1565 *Processing*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, pp. 281–312.
- 1566 Pustejovsky, J., 1991. The Syntax of Event Structure. *Cognition* 41, 47–81.
- 1567 RAE & ASALE, 2009. *Nueva gramática de la lengua española*. Espasa Libros, Madrid.
- 1568 Ramchand, G., 2005. Post-Davidsonianism. *Theor. Linguist.* 31, 359–376.
- 1569 Ramchand, G., 1993. Aspect phrase in modern Scottish Gaelic, in: Schafer, A. (Ed.),  
 1570 *Proceedings of NELS 23. GLSA*, Amherst, pp. 415–429.
- 1571 Rapoport, T.R., 1993. Stage and adjunct predicates, in: Reuland, E., Abraham, W. (Eds.),  
 1572 *Knowledge and Language*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, pp. 157–182.
- 1573 Rapoport, T.R., 1991. Adjunct-Predicate Licensing and D-Structure. *Syntax Semant.* 25, 159–  
 1574 187.
- 1575 Raposo, E.B.P., 2013. Orações copulativas e predicacões secundárias, in: Raposo, E.P.,  
 1576 *Bacelar do Nascimento, M.F., Mota, M.A., Segura, L., Mendes, A. (Eds.), Gramática Do*

- 1577 Português. Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, Lisboa, pp. 1285–1358.
- 1578 Raposo, E.B.P., Uriagereka, J., 1995. Two Types of Small Clauses (Toward a Syntax of  
1579 Theme/Rheme Relations). *Syntax Semant.* 28, 179–206.
- 1580 Rothmayr, A., 2009. *The Structure of Stative Verbs*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- 1581 Rothstein, S., 2005. States and modification: A reply to Maienborn. *Theor. Linguist.* 31, 375–  
1582 381.
- 1583 Schmitt, C., 1996. *Aspect and the syntax of noun phrases*. Doctoral dissertation, University of  
1584 Maryland at College Park.
- 1585 Vendler, Z., 1957. Verbs and Times. *Philos. Rev.* 66, 143–160.
- 1586 Wanner, A., 1999. *Verbklassifizierung und aspektuelle Alternationen im Englischen*. Niemeyer,  
1587 Tübingen.
- 1588 Zagona, K., 2012. Ser and estar : Phrase structure and aspect, in: Nishida, C., Russi, C. (Eds.),  
1589 *Cahiers Chronos*. Rodopi, Amsterdam, pp. 303–327.
- 1590