

Research Article

Federico Silvagni*

When *estar* is not there: A cross-linguistic analysis of individual/stage-level copular sentences in Romance

<https://doi.org/10.1515/ol-2022-0186>
received July 25, 2021; accepted March 14, 2022

Abstract: This article studies how Romance languages encode the individual-level (IL)/stage-level (SL) aspectual distinction in the domain of non-verbal predication. To this end, attributive copular clauses are considered, and those languages that mark the IL/SL paradigm by means of two different copulas (*ser* and *estar* ‘to be’, such as Spanish, Catalan, and Portuguese) are compared with mono-copular languages (such as French, Italian, and Romanian). On the basis of recent developments in the study of the IL/SL contrast and Spanish copulas, I propose that SL-ness is encoded in non-verbal SL-predicates as an uninterpretable instance of a [Stage] feature and that SL-copular sentences are derived by virtue of an agreement operation between the predicate and an Asp head that carries an interpretable instance of [Stage], which is realised as *estar* in languages such as Spanish, Portuguese, and Catalan. The conclusion is that the inventory of aspectual elements is the same across Romance languages, which differ one from another with respect to the presence of an SL-copula (namely, *estar*).

Keywords: *ser*, *estar*, copulas, individual-level, stage-level, aspectual agreement

1 Introduction

It is well known that copular structures (CopPs) in Spanish, Portuguese, and Catalan can be headed by two different copulas, namely, *ser* or *estar* ‘to be’. This phenomenon, also referred to as “copular alternation,” has largely been studied in the literature, and in the last decades, it has commonly been related to the individual-level (IL)/stage-level (SL) distinction. Under this approach, *ser*Ps are studied as IL-predications and *estar*Ps are considered SL-predications (1).

(1)

a)	<i>Ana</i>	{ <i>es</i>	<i>abogada</i>	/	<i>está</i>	<i>enfadada</i> }. (Spanish)
b)	<i>A Ana</i>	{ <i>é</i>	<i>advogada</i>	/	<i>está</i>	<i>chateada</i> }. (Portuguese)
c)	<i>L'Anna</i>	{ <i>és</i>	<i>advocada</i>	/	<i>està</i>	<i>enfadada</i> }. (Catalan)

“Ana {is_{ser} (a) lawyer/is_{estar} angry}.”

Oppositely, the IL/SL contrast in copular sentences has not received much attention in the case of mono-copular languages (such as French, Italian, or Romanian) due to the fact that they lack an SL-copula and therefore do not overtly display the IL/SL distinction (cf. [1] and [2]). Even though several linguists have

* Corresponding author: Federico Silvagni, Departamento de Lengua Española y Teoría de la Literatura, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid, 28040, Spain, e-mail: f.silvagni@ucm.es
ORCID: Federico Silvagni 0000-0003-1851-7449

observed that French and Italian, for example, display the IL/SL distinction with respect to phenomena such as secondary predication (Martin 2008, 2009, 153–210), the interpretation of the indefinite subject (Carlier 2005), or the movement of the adjective in the NP domain (Munaro 2016, Vinet 1991), when it comes to copular sentences, IL and SL structures have not been thoroughly analysed, even less from a cross-linguistic point of view.

(2)

a)	<i>Anna</i>	<i>è</i>	{ <i>avvocato</i>	/	<i>furiosa</i> }. (Italian)
b)	<i>Anne</i>	<i>est</i>	{ <i>avocate</i>	/	<i>fâchée</i> }. (French)
c)	<i>Ana</i>	<i>e</i>	{ <i>avocată</i>	/	<i>furiuoasă</i> }. (Romanian)

“Ana is {(a) lawyer/angry}.”

Assuming that the IL/SL contrast is a universal and cross-categorial aspectual distinction, and to reach a cross-linguistic comprehensive view of the IL/SL paradigm in the domain of non-verbal predication, this article studies the way the IL/SL distinction is encoded in mono-copular languages in contrast with bi-copular languages.

This article is organised as follows: in Section 2, I explore to what extent the IL/SL paradigm is encoded in mono-copular languages. With this aim, I take into account notorious evidence of the IL/SL distinction in the domain of non-verbal predication and I study CopPs in mono-copular languages going through these phenomena. As expected, it is observed that mono-copular languages show the IL/SL distinction despite their lack of copular alternation. In Section 3, I investigate how IL and SL-CopPs are derived in mono-copular languages and I put forward a cross-linguistic analysis of CopPs. On the basis of recent proposals in Spanish, I argue that SL-CopPs are AspPs derived by an agreement operation between a [uStage] feature on the non-verbal SL-predicate and an [iStage] feature on the Asp head, which is spelled out as *estar* in bi-copular languages. Therefore, from a cross-linguistic perspective, I conclude that the same formal feature drives the derivation of SL-CopPs across languages (and is thus responsible for the IL/SL distinction) and that the only difference between bi-copular and mono-copular languages depends on the presence or the lack of an SL-copula (namely, *estar*).

Before going any further, it is worth highlighting that this article is devoted to attributive copular sentences and the related phenomenon of copular alternation, which should not be confused with other possible manifestations of *ser* and *estar* in other constructions. In their use as copulas in attributive sentences, *ser* and *estar* link a non-verbal predicate with its subject, giving rise to a predication that describes a property (*ser*) or a condition (*estar*) of the subject (e.g., *Ana es {mi amiga/bailarina}* [Spanish] ‘Ana is_{ser} my friend/a dancer’; *Ana está {contenta/de vacaciones}* [Spanish] ‘Ana is_{estar} happy/on vacations’).¹ *Ser* and *estar* can also serve as auxiliaries with verbal participles (e.g., *La cartera fue robada* [Spanish] ‘The wallet was_{ser} stolen’) and gerunds (e.g., *Ana está bailando* [Spanish] ‘Ana is_{está} dancing’), in passive and progressive constructions, respectively. Obviously, there is no possible alternation between these two verbs in these constructions.

As it is well known, *ser* and *estar* are derived from Latin *esse* and *stare*, respectively. Latin *esse* resulted in a pure copula in all Romance languages (e.g., *essere* [Italian], *être* [French], *a fi* [Romanian]), while Latin *stare* resulted in a copular verb only in Catalan, Portuguese, Spanish, and Galician, leading to the aforementioned phenomenon of copular alternation.² In addition, the evolution of the original meanings of *esse* and *stare* has not been homogeneous across Romance languages, which means that the distribution of their derivates is not uniform when it comes to their non-attributive uses. As for Latin *stare*, while its original meaning of ‘to stand’ is completely lost today, the original meaning of ‘to stay’, ‘to remain’ is still found in

1 On the concept of “copular verb,” see Arche et al. (2019), Fernández Leborans (1999, 2359–65), Hengeveld (1992), Moro (1997), Roy (2013), Van Peteghem (1991).

2 In Catalan, the use of the copula *estar* is less homogeneous compared to Spanish and Portuguese. In fact, peripheral dialects such as Roussillonese and Algherese prefer *ser* in SL-contexts, that is, typical *estar* predictions. This phenomenon is attributable to the influence of French and Occitan (in the case of Roussillonese), and Italian and Sardinian (for Algherese) (Ramos 2001, 147, 151–2, Ramos 2002, 2010). See also footnote 22.

Italian *stare* (*Stasera sto in casa* ‘Tonight I remain/stay at home’, *Stai fermo!* ‘Don’t move’) and Romanian *a sta* (*Stai culcat!* ‘Stay lying down’, *Trebuie să stai nemîscat* ‘You have to stay still’).³ As for Latin *esse*, its existential meaning is still found across Romance languages (*Érase una vez* [Spanish] ‘Once upon a time’; *Dio semplicemente è* [Italian] ‘God simply exists’). The Romance derivates of *esse* also show a meaning that refers to the occurrence of a happening (‘to happen’, ‘to take place’): *La conferencia es {en la segunda planta/a las nueve}* (Spanish) ‘The conference takes place on the second floor/at nine’; *Això serà si tu vols* (Catalan) ‘This will happen if you want’ (Institut d’Estudis Catalans 2016, 861); *O jogo é amanhã* (Portuguese) ‘The meeting takes place tomorrow’ (Raposo 2013, 1328). Finally, the locative use of Latin *esse* is still found in all Romance languages (e.g., *Anna è in casa* [Italian], *Anne est à la maison* [French] ‘Anna is at home’), except in Spanish, where *ser* does not receive a locative interpretation (see also footnote 27).⁴

In sum, non-attributive predication do not come in a homogeneous shape across Romance languages, and the limits between copular and predicative constructions are neither clear-cut nor they coincide cross-linguistically.⁵ This article is devoted to attributive copular constructions, which show an extraordinary parallelism across Romance languages.

2 Evidence for the IL/SL distinction

The first step in studying mono-copular Romance languages with respect to the IL/SL distinction is to make sure that CopPs in these languages are divided into the IL and SL classes, that is to say, that the IL/SL paradigm is enclosed in non-verbal predication even though it is not overtly expressed through an SL-copula and the resultant phenomenon of copular alternation.

To this purpose, it is worth observing that the copular alternation is just one of the many syntactic and semantic phenomena related to the IL/SL aspectual distinction. Therefore, we can investigate to what extent the IL/SL dichotomy is encoded in mono-copular languages by testing them against the common IL/SL tests.

2.1 On the *ser*-IL/*estar*-SL relation

In the last decades, the *ser/estar* alternation in Spanish, Portuguese, and Catalan has been related to the IL/SL dichotomy (Arche 2006, 2012, Bosque and Gutiérrez-Rexach 2009, 313–20, Brucart 2005, Cunha 2011, 2021, 598–600, Escandell and Leonetti 2002, Fábregas 2012, Fernández Leborans 1999, Fernández

³ In Catalan and Spanish *estar* can also receive this interpretation. However, it seems that in this case the meaning of ‘to remain’, ‘to stay’ is not part of *estar*, but results from adding aspectual content in the structure. In fact, the clitic *se* can appear in these structures, highlighting a meaning of ‘control’ on the situation described by the *estarP*: *Quiero estar(me) a tu lado* (Spanish) ‘I want to remain/stay with you’, *¡Estoy quieto!* (Spanish) ‘Be quiet!’, (M)‘he estat tranquil tot el temps (Catalan) ‘I have kept calm all the time’, *Ell (s’)estará de guardia* (Catalan) ‘He will remain on guard’). See Ramos (2001, 140, 2002, 1995–2000) on Catalan durative *estar-se*. The verb *ficar* carries this meaning in Portuguese (Raposo 2013, 1332–3): *Hoje fico em casa, não vou sair com vocês* ‘Today I stay at home, I don’t go out with you’ (Raposo 2013, 1333). See also footnotes 14 and 29 and Section 2.2.

⁴ On the evolution of *esse* and *stare*, see Fernández Leborans (1999, 2367, 2421–5), Pountain (1982), Ramos (2001), Raposo (2013, 1326–36), and references therein.

⁵ The copular and predicative nature of *ser* and *estar* is controversial. For example, in traditional Spanish grammar, *estar* was conceived of as a predicative intransitive verb in locative predication. As for *ser*, in most formal approaches, the existence of a predicative *ser* is not taken into consideration; thus, *ser*-constructions with a locative complement are also analysed as copular sentences (see Fernández Leborans 1999, 2359–69, 2421–5, RAE and ASALE 2009, 2811–26 for an overall view). Similarly, in Catalan, locative predication have been considered intransitive structures by traditional grammarians (Ramos 2002, 1994 and references therein), whereas today they are described as copulative structures (Institut d’Estudis Catalans 2016, 867, 871–2). The same debate concerns also Portuguese data (see Raposo 2013, 1331–2, 1333–6).

Leborans and Sánchez López 2015, Institut d'Estudis Catalans 2016, 862–71, Leonetti 1994, 2015, RAE and ASALE 2009, 2811–15, Ramos 2002, 2005–17, Raposo 2013, 1304–12, Silvagni 2017a, 2018, a.o.).⁶ Under this analysis, *ser* and *estar* are studied as syntactic exponents of IL and SL-predications: on one side, *ser* heads IL-CopPs, that is, predications that describe a characteristic, an intrinsic quality, of the subject (3); on the other side, *estar* heads SL-CopPs, that is to say, predications that denote a situation in which the subject is involved (4). For this reason, focusing on the subject, in the literature, *estar*Ps are also referred to as structures that describe a condition, a state, or a manifestation of the subject.⁷

(3) Individual-level (*ser*):

a)	<i>Ana</i>	<i>es</i>	{ <i>abogada</i>	/	<i>parisina</i> }. (Spanish)
b)	<i>A Ana</i>	<i>é</i>	{ <i>advogada</i>	/	<i>parisiense</i> }. (Portuguese)
c)	<i>L'Anna</i>	<i>és</i>	{ <i>advocada</i>	/	<i>parisenca</i> }. (Catalan)

“Ana is_{ser} {a lawyer/Parisian}.”

(4) Stage-level (*estar*):

a)	<i>Ana</i>	<i>está</i>	{ <i>cansada</i>	/	<i>tumbada</i> }. (Spanish)
b)	<i>A Ana</i>	<i>está</i>	{ <i>cansada</i>	/	<i>deitada</i> }. (Portuguese)
c)	<i>L'Anna</i>	<i>està</i>	{ <i>cansada</i>	/	<i>estirada</i> }. (Catalan)

“Ana is_{estar} {tired/lying down}.”

As it is well known, the IL/SL distinction is embodied in a large variety of syntactic and semantic phenomena, which go beyond copular alternation and mainly concern modification, secondary predication and quantification, together with discourse effects (see Fábregas 2012, Fernald 2000 for an overview of the IL/SL dichotomy). On these bases, the relation between the phenomenon of copular alternation and the IL/SL aspectual distinction has been established by observing that *ser*Ps and *estar*Ps behave as typical IL and SL-predications, respectively (Fernández Leborans 1999, Leonetti 1994, Silvagni 2017a, 2021a, a.o.).

More precisely, as far as modification is concerned, it is well known that only SL-predications, unlike IL-predications, can be modified by locatives and comitative event-related modifiers (Chierchia 1995, Kratzer 1988, Maienborn 2004, 2007, a.o.). In the case of *ser*Ps and *estar*Ps, only the latter, as typical SL-predications, can be modified by locatives and comitatives (cf. [5] and [6]).⁸

(5)

a)	* <i>Ana</i>	<i>es</i>	<i>abogada</i>	{ <i>en la biblioteca</i>	/	<i>con sus libros</i> }. (Spanish)
b)	* <i>A Ana</i>	<i>é</i>	<i>advogada</i>	{ <i>na biblioteca</i>	/	<i>com os seus livros</i> }. (Portuguese)
c)	* <i>L'Anna</i>	<i>és</i>	<i>advocada</i>	{ <i>a la biblioteca</i>	/	<i>amb els seus llibres</i> }. (Catalan)

“Ana is_{ser} a lawyer {in the library/with her books}.”

(6)

a)	<i>Ana</i>	<i>está</i>	<i>tumbada</i>	{ <i>en su habitación</i>	/	<i>con su peluche</i> }. (Spanish)
b)	<i>A Ana</i>	<i>está</i>	<i>deitada</i>	{ <i>no seu quarto</i>	/	<i>com seu ursinho</i> }. (Portuguese)
c)	<i>L'Anna</i>	<i>està</i>	<i>estirada</i>	{ <i>a la seva habitació</i>	/	<i>amb el seu peluix</i> }. (Catalan)

“Ana is_{estar} lying down {in her room/with her teddy bear}.”

6 The *ser/estar* distinction and its relation to the IL/SL contrast have been studied mostly for Spanish. As for Portuguese and Catalan, the phenomenon has been scrutinized with less emphasis and has generally been related to a more rudimentary understanding of the IL/SL distinction as a difference between permanent and transient (or resultant) qualities (see also Section 3.1).

7 For the sake of clarity, in order to focus on the default reading of the predicates, throughout the article, I use predicates that can hardly be coerced into other interpretations. Some notes on coercion can be found in Sections 3.1 and 3.2.

8 This has been clearly described for Catalan: only *estar* can appear when a locative is found after the attribute, e.g., {*Està/*és*} *d'excursió a Andorra* ‘She is on an excursion in Andorra’ (Institut d'Estudis Catalans 2016, 876, Ramos 2002, 2009).

An important issue must be clarified at this point: only event-related, not frame-setting, locative and comitative modifiers can function as SL-diagnostics. On the one hand, frame-setting modifiers are sentential modifiers that provide a domain to which the whole proposition is restricted (i.e., a “frame”). They are merged VP-externally, in a topic position; hence, they are not sensitive to the aspectual nature of the base predication (VP) (Maienborn 2001). For this reason, frame-setting modifiers can appear with any kind of eventuality, that is, as far as we are concerned, with both IL and SL-predications, and are not a useful test for SL-ness (7). These modifiers are interpreted as a context within which the base predication is inscribed, and such an interpretation helps to distinguish frame-setting from true event-related modifiers when they appear post-verbally (7).

(7) *David {es francés / está de vacaciones} en el espectáculo.* (Spanish)
 ‘David {is_{ser} French / is_{estar} on vacation} in the show.’

Frame-setting interpretation: “In that context (the show), David is {French/on vacation}.”

On the other hand, event-related modifiers are VP-adjuncts that specify where, with whom, how, etc. the event described in the VP-domain takes place: “there is an event, and that event happens in a place, in the company of someone, etc.” In other words, event-related modifiers are (non-selected) building blocks of the event that expand its denotation (see Maienborn 2001, Maienborn and Schäfer 2011 for a detailed analysis of the difference between frame-setting and event-related modifiers). Event-related modifiers are VP-adjuncts. Therefore, they are sensitive to the aspectual nature of the VP, and are licensed only by an SL-eventuality. This is the case of the examples in (6), where the modifiers receive the proper event-related interpretation: “there is a state of Ana lying down, and that state holds in her room/in the company of her teddy bear”. As expected, the same interpretation is ruled out with ILPs as in (5): # “there is a property of Ana being a lawyer, and this property holds in the library/with her teddy bear.” In fact, the grammaticality of sentences like (5) is bound to a frame-setting reading of the modifier: ‘whenever Ana is in the library/with her teddy bear, she says that she is a lawyer/she behaves as if she were a lawyer’ (see Maienborn 2004, 2011, 2019, Silvagni 2017a, 2021a for a detailed discussion on modification with IL and SL predicates).⁹

As for secondary predication, only SL-predications allow for non-selected predicates, also known as “depictives” (Demonte and Masullo 1999, Hernanz 1988, Rapoport 1991, a.o.). When it comes to *ser* and *estar*, *serPs* reject depictives (8), while *estarPs* allow them (9).

(8)

a)	* <i>Ana</i>	<i>es</i>	<i>abogada</i>	<i>contenta.</i>	(Spanish)
b)	* <i>A Ana</i>	<i>é</i>	<i>advogada</i>	<i>contente.</i>	(Portuguese)
c)	* <i>L’Anna</i>	<i>és</i>	<i>advocada</i>	<i>contenta.</i>	(Catalan)

“Ana is_{ser} a lawyer happy.”

(9)

a)	<i>Ana</i>	<i>está</i>	<i>con sus amigos</i>	<i>de vacaciones.</i>	(Spanish)
b)	<i>A Ana</i>	<i>está</i>	<i>com os seus amigos</i>	<i>de férias.</i>	(Portuguese)
c)	<i>L’Anna</i>	<i>està</i>	<i>amb els seus amics</i>	<i>de vacances.</i>	(Catalan)

“Anna is_{estar} with her friends on vacation.”

⁹ Maienborn (2004, 2011, 2019) shows that only eventive predicates allow for event-related locatives and comitatives, but she assumes a different interpretation of SL-ness, which is pragmatic in nature and restricted to copular structures; therefore, she denies that CopPs are sensitive to event-related adjunction. Conversely, Silvagni (2017a, 2021a) argues that eventivity and SL-ness are one and the same aspectual class (also Hoekstra 1992), pointing out that the domains of nonverbal and verbal predication are aspectual-symmetric and that CopPs, just as VPs, are sensitive to event-related modification. Despite the different approaches to eventivity and SL-ness, what is important here is that event-related locative and comitative modifiers are ruled out with ILPs.

In the same vein, only SL-predications, unlike IL-predications, can be quantified (Chierchia 1995, Cunha 2011, 47, De Hoop and De Swart 1989, Farkas and Sugioka 1983, Kratzer 1988, a.o.). As far as *ser* and *estar* is concerned, only *estar*Ps (11), unlike *ser*Ps (10), can be quantified.

(10)

a)	* <i>Cada vez que</i>	<i>Ana</i>	<i>es</i>	<i>parisina...</i>	(Spanish)
b)	* <i>De cada vez que</i>	<i>a Ana</i>	<i>é</i>	<i>parisiense...</i>	(Portuguese)
c)	* <i>Cada vegada que</i>	<i>l'Anna</i>	<i>és</i>	<i>parisenca...</i>	(Catalan)

“Whenever Ana is_{ser} Parisian...”

(11)

a)	<i>Cada vez que</i>	<i>Ana</i>	<i>está</i>	<i>enfadada,</i>	<i>llora.</i>	(Spanish)
b)	<i>De cada vez que</i>	<i>a Ana</i>	<i>está</i>	<i>chateada,</i>	<i>chora.</i>	(Portuguese)
c)	<i>Cada vegada que</i>	<i>l'Anna</i>	<i>està</i>	<i>enfadada,</i>	<i>plora.</i>	(Catalan)

“Whenever Ana is_{estar} angry, she cries.”

Moreover, SL-predications are interpreted as “happenings,” while IL-predications are interpreted as inherent characteristics (or properties) of the subject, which are not restricted to a specific spatiotemporal location. This can be appreciated by paying attention to the interpretation that predicates receive in different tenses (Cunha 2011, 51, Pereira Oliveira 2001, 72). In the present tense, SL-predications are interpreted as occurring “here and now,” that is, as being restricted to the time of the utterance, while IL-predications lack the “here and now” reading and are interpreted as a characteristic of the subject. The same happens among CopPs: *estar*Ps are interpreted as happenings restricted to the time of the utterance (13), while *ser*Ps are interpreted as properties of the subject and, as such, independent of the specific spacetime point at which they are uttered (12).¹⁰

(12)

a)	<i>Ana</i>	<i>es</i>	<i>abogada.</i>	[≠ <i>Aquí y ahora</i>]	(Spanish)
b)	<i>A Ana</i>	<i>é</i>	<i>advogada.</i>	[≠ <i>Aqui e agora</i>]	(Portuguese)
c)	<i>L'Anna</i>	<i>és</i>	<i>advocada.</i>	[≠ <i>Aquí i ara</i>]	(Catalan)

“Ana is_{ser} a lawyer. [≠ Here and now]”

(13)

a)	<i>Ana</i>	<i>está</i>	{ <i>tumbada</i> / <i>cansada</i> / <i>enfadada</i> }.	[<i>Aquí y ahora</i>]	(Spanish)
b)	<i>A Ana</i>	<i>está</i>	{ <i>deitada</i> / <i>cansada</i> / <i>chateada</i> }.	[<i>Aqui e agora</i>]	(Portuguese)
c)	<i>L'Anna</i>	<i>està</i>	{ <i>estirada</i> / <i>cansada</i> / <i>enfadada</i> }.	[<i>Aquí i ara</i>]	(Catalan)

“Ana is_{estar} {lying down/tired/hungry}. [Here and now]”

In the past tense, SL-predications can be interpreted as if they happened only once or on several occasions.¹¹ Oppositely, IL-predications can hardly be found in the past and, provided that they are appropriate in the past, they are interpreted as properties, which apply to the subject over the entire timespan referred to by the predication. Again, *ser*Ps behave as IL-predications (14) and *estar*Ps behave as SL-predications (15).

10 It is worth remembering that we are referring to the interpretation of the eventuality, not its possibility to be modified by a temporal adjunct (temporal adjuncts are allowed with both ILPs and SLPs, see Maienborn 2004, Silvagni 2017a, 458–74). In examples (12) and (13), *here and now* refer to the interpretation that arises when the sentence is uttered out of the blue.

11 The possibility of having only one or both readings also depends on the outer aspect (i.e., imperfective/perfective), but we do not address this topic here. What is important here is that only SLPs can be interpreted as something that “happens.”

(14)

a) *En su juventud, Ana fue abogada* (#solo / #varias veces). (Spanish)
 b) *Na sua juventude, a Ana foi advogada* (#só uma vez / #várias vezes). (Portuguese)
 c) *Durant la seva joventut, l'Anna va ser advocada* (#una vegada / #més vegades). (Catalan)

“In her youth, Ana was_{ser} a lawyer (only once/several times).”

(15)

a) *Durante nuestro último viaje, Ana ha estado* {triste / sola} (solo / varias veces). (Spanish)
 b) *Durante a nossa última viagem, a Ana esteve* {triste / sozinha} (só / várias vezes). (Portuguese)
 c) *Durant el nostre últim viatge, l'Anna ha estat* {trista / sola} (una / més vegada vegades). (Catalan)

“During our last trip, Ana was_{estar} {sad/alone} (only once/several times).”

The “happening” interpretation of SL-predications can also be tested by referring to the predicate through eventive verbs, such as *to happen*, *to occur* (Cuartero Otal 2011, 103, De Miguel 1999, 3011–2, Wanner 1999, 15). As expected, these verbs can take up only SL, not IL-predications. In the case of CopPs, *estar*Ps, as happening-descriptive (that is, SL) CopPs, can be easily referred to by event-denoting verbs (17), unlike *ser*Ps, because of their property-descriptive (IL) nature (16).

(16)

a) *Ana es abogada.* #*Eso pasa porque...*¹² (Spanish)
 b) *A Ana é advogada.* #*Isso acontece porque...* (Portuguese)
 c) *L'Anna és advocada.* #*Això passa perquè...* (Catalan)

“Ana is_{ser} a lawyer. It happens because...”

(17)

a) *El perro estuvo {solo / tumbado} todo el día.* *Eso pasó porque no lo sacaste a pasear.* (Spanish)
 b) *O cão esteve {sozinho / deitado} o dia todo.* *Isso aconteceu porque não passeou com ele.* (Portuguese)
 c) *El gos va {sol / estirat} el dia.* *Això va passar perquè no el vas treure a passejar.* (Catalan)

“The dog was_{estar} {alone/lying down} all day. It happened because you did not walk him.”

The fact that *ser*Ps behave as canonical IL-predications, while *estar*Ps behave as typical SL-predications, has served in the literature as empirical evidence that the copular alternation phenomenon is an overt manifestation of the IL/SL distinction.¹³ In other words, in Spanish, Portuguese, and Catalan *ser* and *estar* copulas can be taken as the ultimate instrument to grasp the IL or SL identity of non-verbal predications.

¹² The structure *Eso pasa porque* (‘It happens because’) can also introduce the explanation for a fact or a problem. In that case, the verb *pasar* (‘to happen’) loses its eventive interpretation (see also Cuartero Otal 2011, 103). We are not referring to these cases here.

¹³ An anonymous reviewer observes a connection between *estar* and those pseudo-copular verbs that express duration (e.g., *ir*, *andar*, *seguir* [Spanish]), because they appear in the same contexts of *estar* (also Morimoto and Pavón Lucero 2007, 9–16 on

2.2 The case of mono-copular languages: French, Italian, and Romanian

The clear-cut distinction between IL-CopPs (*serPs*) and SL-CopPs (*estarPs*) observed in Spanish, Portuguese, and Catalan is not shown in the case of mono-copular languages. Here, the lack of an *estar*-like SL-copula entails that all predicates are linked to one and the same copula: *essere* (Italian),¹⁴ *être* (French), *a fi* (Romanian) (cf. [18] and [3]–[4]).

(18)

- a) *Anna è {avvocato / parigina / stufa / stesa}.* (Italian)
- b) *Anne est {avocate / parisienne / fatiguée / allongée}.* (French)
- c) *Ana e {avocată / pariziană / obosită / întinsă}.* (Romanian)

“Ana is {a lawyer/Parisian/tired/lying down}.”

At this point, it is particularly important to keep in mind that the existence of derivates of Latin *stare* in Italian (*stare*) and Romanian (*a sta*) should not be confused with the existence of an SL-copula equivalent to Spanish, Portuguese, and Catalan *estar*. As mentioned in Section 1, *estar* is a fully grammaticalised form of Latin *stare* that behaves as a pure copula. In fact, *estar* is the verb that allows any SLP to be attributed to its subject (*estar/ser ebrio* [Spanish] ‘To be drunk’, see also Section 3.1). Neither standard Italian nor Romanian nor French have this kind of SL-copula. The derivates of Latin *stare* in Italian and Romanian are aspectual verbs, which could rather be analysed as pseudo-copulas. They are not on a par with the SL-Cop *estar*, mainly for two reasons: first, they add aspectual information to the predication (namely, control, action, duration, etc.), giving rise to predication that are aspectually more complex than pure attributive copular phrases; second, they are not compatible with any SLP. Like all aspectual verbs, they can only combine with a particular kind of SLPs (in this case, those predicates that denote a state that can be controlled by the subject): *stare tranquillo/seduto* (Italian) or *a sta liniştit/aşezat* (Romanian) ‘To stay calm/remain seated’, but not **stare sporco/pieno* (Italian) or **a sta murdar/plin* (Romanian) ‘To stay dirty/full’.

In standard Italian, *stare* means that the subject stops or controls his movement or behaviour, and the verb is interpreted as ‘to stay’, ‘to remain’ (see Catalani 2004, Frattegiani Tinca 1985, and Rainer 1984 for a detailed description of Italian *stare*). The same holds for Romanian, where *a sta* is a permanence verb equivalent to ‘to stay’, ‘to remain’ (Avram 1984, Mincă 2019, Pană Dindelegan 2013). Moreover, Romanian *a sta* differentiates from Italian *stare* in that it still has a locative meaning (‘to remain/to stand in a place’), which is typical of early stages of grammaticalisation of Latin *stare* (Copcea and Escudero 1966, 344–8) (see also Boioc Apintei and Dragomirescu 2021 for a general description of *a sta*).

In this scenario, in which the IL/SL distinction is not overtly marked in CopPs, it is necessary to study to what extent mono-copular languages are sensitive to the IL/SL paradigm: Do they lack the IL/SL distinction or is the distinction encoded in these languages despite the lack of copular alternation? Even though we expect mono-copular languages to possess the IL/SL distinction, as suggested by previous studies in the field (Carlier 2005, Martin 2008, 2009, Munaro 2016, Vinet 1991, a.o.) and taking into account the

Spanish and Cunha 2021, 599 on Portuguese). In this regard, it is worth noting that, unlike *estarP*, these verbs add aspectual information related to continuity and movement to the event, which is directly connected to their meaning as predicative verbs (see RAE and ASALE 2009, 2778, 2836–7). It means that the event structure of pseudo-copular constructions is more complex than that of *estarPs*, which is conceived here as the first building block of eventivity (see Section 3.1, also Morimoto and Pavón Lucero 2004, Van Peteghem 1991, 171 for a similar analysis). In sum, pseudo-copulas are similar, but not equivalent, to *estar* (see also the observations in section 2.2 on Italian *stare* and Romanian *a sta*).

¹⁴ This is the case of standard Italian and northern Italian dialects. Oppositely, a number of central and southern Italian dialects show the *essere/stare* alternation (see Bentley 2015, 106–7, Ciconte 2015, 229, 250, Renzi et al. 2001, 194, Serianni 1996, 277). Italian *stare* is equivalent to *estar* only in the locution *stare bene/male* (‘to feel good/bad’) and equivalents. Therefore, copular alternation is not found in Italian.

cross-linguistic scope of such a paradigm,¹⁵ it is worth investigating to what extent the IL/SL dichotomy is relevant for the non-verbal domain in these languages. As in the case of *ser* and *estar*, the aforementioned IL/SL-diagnostics can serve as a useful tool to test CopPs.

If we apply the tests to CopPs in French, Italian, and Romanian, we observe that the same difference examined between *serPs* and *estarPs* is found among CopPs in mono-copular languages. As far as event-related modification is concerned, only a group of CopPs allows locative and comitative modifiers, as typical SL-predications do (20). The other group rejects them (19).

(19)

- a) *Anna è {avvocato / parigina} {in biblioteca / con i suoi libri}. (Italian)
- b) *Anne est {avocate / parisienne} {à la bibliothèque / avec ses livres}. (French)
- c) *Ana e {avocată / pariziană} {în bibliotecă / cu cărțile sale}. (Romanian)

“Ana is {a lawyer/Parisian} {in the library/with her books}.”

(20)

- a) Anna è {stesa / da sola} {nel suo letto / con il suo peluche}. (Italian)
- b) Anne est {allongée / seule} {dans son lit / avec son nounours}. (French)
- c) Ana e {întinsă / singură} {în patul ei / cu ursulețul de plus}. (Romanian)

“Ana is {lying down/alone} {on her bed/with her teddy bear}.”

The same happens with secondary non-selected predicates, as shown in (21) and (22).

(21)

- a) *Anna è {avvocato / parigina} contenta. (Italian)
- b) *Anne est {avocate / parisienne} contente. (French)
- c) *Ana e {avocată / pariziană} fericită. (Romanian)

“Ana is {a lawyer/Parisian} happy.”

(22)

- a) Anna è stesa in silenzio. (Italian)
- b) Anne est allongée en silence. (French)
- c) Ana e întinsă în tăcere. (Romanian)

“Anne is lying down in silence.”

In the case of quantification, the group of CopPs that allow event-related modifiers and secondary non-selected predicates can be quantified (24), unlike those CopPs that reject locatives and comitative modifiers and depictives (23).

(23)

- a) *Ogni volta che Anna è {avvocato / parigina}...
- b) *À chaque fois qu' Anne est {avocate / parisienne}...
- c) *De câte ori Ana e {avocată / pariziană}...

“Whenever Ana is {a lawyer/Parisian}...”

(24)

- a) Ogni volta che Anna è {arrabbiata / sola / triste}, piange. (Italian)
- b) À chaque fois qu' Anne est {fâchée / seule / triste}, elle pleure. (French)
- c) De câte ori Ana e {furioasă / singură / tristă}, plânge. (Romanian)

“Whenever Ana is {angry/alone/sad}, she cries.”

¹⁵ The description of the IL/SL paradigm as a common property of natural languages was first promoted by Carlson (1977), who predicted the existence of languages with specific copulas for IL and SL-predications. Later on, the IL/SL distinction has been described in a wide range of languages, for example, Becker (2002) on English, Eguren (2012) on Basque, Greenberg (1994) on Hebrew, Larson and Lefebvre (1991) on Haitian Creole, Mahapatra (2002) on Odia, Yavaş (1980) on Turkish, a.m.o.

When it comes to the interpretation of CopPs in the present tense, those CopPs that allow for event-related modifiers, depictives, and quantification are interpreted as occurrences restricted, at least, to the time of the utterance (i.e., “here and now”) (26). On the contrary, those CopPs that do not pass the previous tests are not interpreted as happening at the time of the utterance: they describe properties, characteristics, of the subject (25).

(25)

- a) *Anna è {avvocato / parigina}.* [*# Qui e ora*] (Italian)
- b) *Anne est {avocate / parisienne}.* [*# Ici et maintenant*] (French)
- c) *Ana e {avocată / pariziană}.* [*# Aici și acum*] (Romanian)

“Ana is {a lawyer/Parisian}. [*Here and now*]”

(26)

- a) *Anna è {stesa / stanca / arrabbiata}.* [*Qui e ora*] (Italian)
- b) *Anne est {allongée / fatiguée / fâchée}.* [*Ici et maintenant*] (French)
- c) *Ana e {întinsă / obosită / furioasă}.* [*Aici și acum*] (Romanian)

“Ana is {lying down/tired/hungry}. [*Here and now*]”

In the past tense, CopPs that refer to a happening are interpreted as occurred only once or on several occasions (28). By contrast, CopPs that describe properties are interpreted by default as being true for the subject over the timespan to which the predication is confined (27).

(27)

- a) *Da giovane, Anna è stata avvocato (#solo una volta / #varie volte).* (Italian)
- b) *Dans sa jeunesse, Anne a été avocate (#une seule fois / #plusieurs fois).* (French)
- c) *În tinerețe, Ana a fost avocată (#doar o dată / #de mai multe ori).* (Romanian)

“In her youth, Ana was a lawyer (only once/several times).”

(28)

- a) *Durante il nostro ultimo viaggio, Anna è stata {triste / da sola} (solo una volta / varie volte).* (Italian)
- b) *Pendant notre dernier voyage, Anne a été {triste / seule} (une seule fois / plusieurs fois).* (French)
- c) *În timpul ultimei noastre călătorii, Ana a fost {tristă / singură} (doar o dată / de mai multe ori).* (Romanian)

“During our last trip, Ana was {sad/alone} (only once/several times).”

Finally, happening-descriptive CopPs can be replaced by happening verbs (30), unlike property-descriptive CopPs (29).

(29)

- a) *Anna è avvocato.* *#Questo succede perché...* (Italian)
- b) *Anne est avocate.* *#Cela se passe parce que...* (French)
- c) *Ana e avocată.* *#Este aşa pentru că...* (Romanian)

“Ana is a lawyer. This happens because...”

(30)

- a) *Anna è {triste / arrabbiata}.* *Questo succede perché non la chiami mai.* (Italian)
- b) *Anne est {triste / fâchée}.* *Cela se passe parce que tu ne l'appelles jamais.* (French)
- c) *Ana e {tristă / furioasă}.* *Este aşa pentru că nu o suni niciodată.* (Romanian)

“Ana is {sad/angry}. This happens because you never call her.”

The aforementioned data show that CopPs in mono-copular languages are split into two groups: one group complies with all the tests for SL-predications (e.g., *to be tired*, *to be alone*, *to be sad*, *to be angry*, *to be lying down*), while the other group does not show any SL-property (e.g., *to be a lawyer*, *to be Parisian*). In conclusion, the lack of copular alternation does not prevent the IL/SL distinction: mono-copular languages do encode the IL/SL paradigm, and a distinction between IL-CopPs and SL-CopPs can be drawn.

It is also worth observing that the IL/SL-CopPs split of mono-copular languages coincides with the distribution of *ser* and *estar* in Spanish, Portuguese, and Catalan. This reinforces the idea that the IL/SL distinction is a universal, cross-linguistic paradigm, while the phenomenon of copular alternation is just typological evidence of it.

3 Towards a unified analysis

After observing that mono-copular languages encode the IL/SL distinction in the domain of non-verbal predication even though they do not mark IL and SL-CopPs by means of two different copulas, we are left with two main formal questions: First, how is the IL/SL distinction instantiated in mono-copular languages? Second, from a cross-linguistic point of view, how do bi-copular and mono-copular languages differ from one another?

3.1 Analytical grounds

The IL/SL distinction has been one of the most debated topics in Linguistics over the last forty years. Even if, at present, there is a broad consensus in the literature that the IL/SL paradigm is an aspectual contrast,¹⁶ linguists do not agree on the nature of the aspectual content involved in the distinction and its formal analysis (see Arche 2006, 2012, Fábregas 2012, Fernald 2000, Husband 2006, 2012 for an overview). The most common understanding of the IL/SL distinction is a vague description as a contrast between permanent (IL) and transient (SL) qualities. However, it is well known since Carlson's seminal work (1977, 72–3) that the "duration" (permanent or transient) cannot be taken as a defining feature of IL-hood and SL-ness (see Arche 2012, Silvagni 2018, 22–5 on this topic).

In this work, I assume a theory of the IL/SL distinction that has recently been put forward in Silvagni (2017a) on the basis of the classical understanding of IL-predicates (ILPs) as "property-descriptive" predicates and of SL-predicates (SLPs) as "happening-descriptive" predicates (see Carlson 1977, 75, Milsark 1974, 211),¹⁷ as well as the common view that the IL/SL dichotomy is aspectual in nature (Arche 2006, 2012, Chierchia 1995, Diesing 1992, a.o.).

As for the aspectual nature of the IL/SL dichotomy, here the distinction is conceived of as the first parameter of the inner aspect,¹⁸ that is, as the basic distinction between non-eventive predicates (or States) and eventive predicates (or Events). According to this view, ILPs and SLPs differ with respect to the presence (SLPs) or the lack (ILPs) of inner aspect: ILPs, as non-eventive predicates, lack any aspectual

¹⁶ Some linguists suggest that the IL/SL contrast is not aspectual, but pragmatic in nature and has no grammatical foundations (De Swart 1993, Jäger 2001, Maienborn 2005 et seq., a.o.).

¹⁷ The word *property* is not conceived here in the usual sense of formal semantics, where *property* refers to the meaning of a predicate. When it comes to aspect, and particularly to the difference between IL and SLPs, the term *property* is used in its more general meaning, as "intrinsic quality," "characteristic" of an entity. Therefore, the label *property-descriptive* refers to predicates that describe a characteristic of the subject, that is, "characterising predicates" (also Fernández Leborans 1999, 2366, 2426, Escandell and Leonetti 2002, 160). In this sense, *property-descriptive* predicates differ from *happening-descriptive* predicates in that the latter do not describe a property of their subject, but an event in which the subject is involved.

¹⁸ Inner aspect is also referred to as *lexical aspect*, *situation aspect* or *Aktionsart* in the literature, as opposed to *outer*, *grammatical* or *viewpoint aspect*. Aspect and the difference between the inner and the outer dimensions are one of the most debated concepts of Linguistics; for more information on these concepts, I refer the reader to Filip (2012), MacDonald (2008), Travis (2010), and also Bosque and Gutiérrez-Rexach (2009, 296–320), De Miguel (1999), Morimoto (1998) on Spanish.

content, while SLPs, as events, are characterised by inner aspect (also Hoekstra 1992).¹⁹ The aspectual primitive of SL-ness (or eventivity) is defined as a space-time point, understood as a non-discrete intersection of time and space,²⁰ and is labelled as *Stage* for the sake of coherence (also Silvagni 2017b).

Syntactically, SL-structures are studied as AspPs (also Becker 2002, Bosque and Gutiérrez-Rexach 2009, 313–20, Fábregas 2012, Hernanz 1991), unlike IL-structures, which lack the Asp projection. According to this proposal, the Asp head delimits the domain of inner aspect and is responsible for the grammatical effects of SL-predications that were shown in Section 2;²¹ it is located between vP and VP (also MacDonald 2008, Travis 2010) and carries a “Stage” feature [S]. In short, under this theory, the IL/SL distinction is defined as in (31).

(31) IL = property-descriptive = lack of inner aspect = VP
 SL = happening-descriptive = inner aspect: ‘spacetime point’ (*Stage*) = [AspP Asp_[S] [VP]]

As for copular structures, here the copula is analysed as a V-head (also Fernández Leborans and Sánchez López 2015, Gumié-Molina et al. 2015, Mikkelsen 2005, Heggie 1988) that selects for a PredP (Baker 2003, Bowers 1993, Svenonius 1994). Therefore, copular structures would be derived as follows (32):

(32) [TP DP [T T [VP t [v [v be] [PredP t [Pred' Pred [NP/AP/PP]]]]]]]]]

When it comes to *estar*, a doubling phenomenon with respect to SL-ness is found in the derivation of *estar*Ps. The first evidence is that lexical SLPs must appear with *estar* and are excluded from *ser*Ps, as shown in (33).²²

(33) a) *Ana* {*es / *está*} {*harta* / *enfadada* / *hambrienta*}. (Spanish)
 b) *Anna* {*é / *está*} {*farta* / *chateada* / *faminta*}. (Portuguese)
 c) *L'Anna* {*és / *està*} {*farta* / *enfadada* / *famolenga*}. (Catalan)
 “Anna {is_{ser}/is_{estar}} {fed up/angry/hungry}.”

Therefore, *estar*Ps are composed by two SL-elements: the SLP, which denotes a situation, and *estar*, which also denotes a situation (synonymous with *to feel, to find oneself*; also Roca Pons 1958, 371–4, Salvá 1830, 208–9). However, in *estar*Ps, the locus of interpretation of SL-ness does not correspond 1:1 with its morphosyntactic manifestations (i.e., the predicate and *estar*): if that were the case, we would interpret two events, one on *estar* and another on the predicate. Oppositely, a single event is interpreted in *estar*Ps from the two SL-positions in the structure (34).

(34) Ana *está* *harta*.
 [Stage] [Stage]

Based on the Flexible Formal Feature Hypothesis (Zeilstra 2008), according to which doubling effects with respect to a single semantic content involve formal features, *estar*Ps are analysed as an instance of syntactic agreement between an uninterpretable [Stage] feature located on the SLP and its interpretable counterpart on the Asp head, which is morpho-phonologically realised as *estar* (35).²³ The [uS] instance on

¹⁹ This theory introduces a new concept of “event” independent of dynamism, which is rather conceived as a secondary content of eventivity.

²⁰ The concept is taken from modern (post-Einsteinian/Minkowskian) physics and philosophy, which take reality as a four-dimensional continuum (three Space + one Time dimensions) (see Einstein 1916, Minkowski 1909, Sider 2001, a.o.).

²¹ See Silvagni (2017a, 457–525) for a formal analysis of the grammatical effects of the IL/SL distinction, such as modification and secondary predication.

²² This behaviour of SLPs has been described for Portuguese participles in Pereira Oliveira (2001, 77–8). As for Catalan, *ser* can arise in the attribution of an SL-adjective and an inanimate subject in northern and Balearic dialects, which are more conservative toward the use of the copula *estar* (Ramos 2002, 2011–2012). These areas are still living the transition from *ser* as a general copula to *estar* as an SL-copula (see Institut d'Estudis Catalans 2016, 870–1).

²³ Studying *estar* as Asp is motivated by independent facts: (i) *estar* is grammaticalized as a copula; (ii) *estar* is higher than *ser* and lexical verbs: *estar* *siendo* vs **ser* *estando*; (iii) any SL-VP (i.e., AspP) allows the progressive (*estar* + *-ndo*); (iv) *estar* is latent in secondary SL-predication (i.e., AspPs): *Ayudó a su padre (estando) muy enfadada* (Spanish) ‘She helped her father while being very angry’. See Silvagni (2017a) for a deeper study of *estar* as Asp.

the lexical SLP forces it to appear in a proper agree configuration with the [iS] instance on $\text{Asp}_{(\text{estar})}$, which satisfies [uS]s configurational needs.²⁴ In sum, the derivation of *estarPs* would be as in (35).

(35) *estarPs*:

[_{TP DP [_{T T [AspP t [Asp [Asp estar_[iS] [PredP t [Pred Pred [AP harta_[uS]]]]]]]]]]]²⁵}}

Therefore, the inventory of aspectual elements in *ser/estar* languages is argued to be as in (36).

(36) Spanish, Portuguese, and Catalan aspectual elements:

Asp (<i>estar</i>)	[iS]
SLPs	[uS]

In contrast, no formal aspectual features are found in the derivation of *serPs*, which are analysed as VPs, as typical IL-structures (37).

(37) *serPs*:

[_{TP DP [_{T T [VP t [V ser] [PredP t [Pred Pred [AP abogado]]]]]]]]}}

In the literature on Spanish *ser* and *estar*, it has been observed that the association of non-verbal predicates and copulas follows a specific pattern, which is summarised as follows: SLPs combine exclusively with *estar*, while ILPs combine with *ser* and, under a proper discourse situation, can be coerced to an SL-reading by combining with *estar* (38) (Gallego and Uriagereka 2016, Silvagni 2015).²⁶ The same distribution has also been indirectly described for Portuguese (Cunha 2021, 559, Raposo 2013, 1304–12) and Catalan (Institut d’Estudis Catalans 2016, 550–1, 867–71, Ramos 2002, 1960–6, 2005–17) (also Pérez-Jiménez et al. 2018, 160–71 on adjectives).

(38)

a)	<i>ser</i> + ILP: <i>estar</i> + ILPs:	<i>ser</i> <i>estar</i>	<i>{alto}</i> <i>{alto</i> ‘to be’	/	<i>guapo</i> <i>guapo</i>	/	<i>simpático</i> <i>simpático</i>
							‘nice’)
b)	<i>estar</i> + SLPs: <i>*ser</i> + SLPs:	<i>estar</i> <i>*ser</i>	<i>{harto}</i> <i>{harto</i>	/	<i>cansado</i> <i>cansado</i>	/	<i>tumbado</i> <i>tumbado</i>
							‘to be {fed up/tired/lying down}’

(Silvagni 2021a, 25)

²⁴ The study follows Zeijlstra’s (2008, 2012, 2014) version of Agree (i). In this model, (un)interpretability is taken as a mere syntactic requirement (ii).

(i) Agree:

α can agree with β iff:
(a) α carries at least one uninterpretable feature and β carries a matching interpretable feature.
(b) β c-commands α.
(c) β is the closest goal to α.
(Zeijlstra 2012, 514)

(ii) [uF] encodes a need to stand in a proper Agree configuration with [iF].

[iF] encodes the ability to satisfy [uF]s configurational needs.

(Zeijlstra 2014, 112)

²⁵ Following Silvagni (2017a, 335–6), VP is absent in *estarPs* (35) because the alternative possible structure [AspP [VP [PredP]]] would have the same interpretation with more syntactic structure, then it is ruled out for economy of representation (Chomsky 1991, 2000) (see also footnote 36).

²⁶ It is worth observing that this pattern is maintained from a variationist point of view. In fact, as expected, a widespread use of *estar* with prototypical *ser*-predicates (i.e., ILPs, e.g., *estar joven/alto/caro* ‘to be young/tall/expensive’) is typically registered across Spanish dialects (cf. Aguilar-Sánchez 2012, Alfaraz 2015, Brown and Cortés-Torres 2012, Cortés-Torres 2004, Díaz-Campos and Geeslin 2011, Jonge 1993, Juárez-Cummings 2014, Sánchez-Alonso, Deo and Piñango 2016, a.o.), contrary to the use of *ser* with prototypical *estar*-predicates (SLPs), which is not registered across dialects (e.g., **ser harto/lleno/ebrio* ‘to be fed up/full/drunk’). See Silvagni (2017a, 378, 2021b, 60) on apparent counterexamples to this generalization.

As we have already discussed, from a semantic point of view, ILPs can be described as those predicates that denote a property, while SLPs can be understood as predicates that refer to a situation. Some generalisations can also be made with respect to the relation between the IL/SL distinction and grammatical categories. Nouns and relational adjectives denote classes of entities; thus, they are exclusively ILPs; likewise, adverbs describe circumstances, hence attributive adverbs (e.g., *bien* ‘good’, *estupendamente* ‘very good’) are SLPs. Qualifying adjectives and PPs are split into the IL and SL classes. These predicates, in fact, can refer to a property (*alto* ‘tall’, *con botones* ‘with buttons’) or a situation (*borracho* ‘drunk’, *de vacaciones* ‘on vacations’). Most of SL-adjectives are participles, and in fact they have usually been referred to as ‘perfective’, or ‘resultative’, in the literature. As for SL-PPs, the majority are locative or positional PPs (*en casa* ‘at home’, *de espalda* ‘on his back’).²⁷ These distinctions among non-verbal predicates have been extensively observed for Spanish (Fernández Leborans 1999, 2428–34, RAE and ASALE 2009, 2811–26, a.m.o.) and also for Catalan (Institut d’Estudis Catalans 2016, 550–1, 867–71, Ramos 2002, 1960–6, 2005–17) and Portuguese (Raposo 2013, 1304–12).

Anyway, under this theory, IL-hood and SL-ness are understood as a formal property of predicates, namely, the lack or the presence of a [uS] feature: those predicates that are endowed with a [uS] feature are SLPs; all the rest are ILPs. Once we assume this characterisation, the ultimate manifestation of the IL or SL nature of predicates happens to be their distribution with *ser* and *estar*: a predicate that cannot appear with *ser* is an SLP, while a predicate that can appear with *ser* is an ILP.

When it comes to the aforementioned analysis, it is worth pointing out that it correctly grasps the whole distribution of non-verbal predicates with *ser* and *estar* copulas (38). First, this analysis correctly prevents SLPs from appearing with *ser* (see data in [33]): in that case, the configurational need of the [uS] feature on the SLP to stand in a proper agree configuration with [iS] would not be satisfied, as displayed in (39).

(39) * *<ser + SLP>*:
 $[\text{TP} \text{ DP} [T \text{ T} [\text{VP} \text{ t} [\text{V} \text{ [v ser]} [\text{PredP} \text{ t} [\text{Pred'} \text{ Pred} [\text{A} \text{ enferma}_{[\text{uS}]}]]]]]]]]]$

²⁸ Second, the analysis leaves open the possibility that the $\text{Asp}_{[\text{is}]}$ (*estar*) head merges on a *PredP* with an *ILP* (41), that is to say, it correctly predicts that *ILPs* could appear with *estar* (40).

(40) a) Ana está guapa. (Spanish)
“Anna is_{estar} beautiful.”

27 While locative predictions can be analysed as typical *estar* copular structures in Spanish (see Fernández Leborans 1999, 2421–5, 2432, Silvagni 2021b, 18–27), the case of Catalan and Portuguese is more complex. In Catalan, *ser* has not lost the locative meaning of Latin *esse*; thus, it is still found in locative predictions. The use of the *estar* copula at the expense of locative *ser* is found in Southern dialects and is increasing in youth speech (Institut d'Estudis Catalans 2016, 874, Ramos 2001, 136–41, Ramos 2002, 1995–2000). In Portuguese, when the subject is a place or an institution, *ser* or *ficar* (but not *estar*) arise in locative predictions: *O museu do Prado {é/fica/#está} em Madrid* 'The Pradum Museum is in Madrid' (Raposo 2013, 1334). It is also important to note that the coexistence of predicative and copulative uses of *ser* and *estar* can give rise to confusion as far as the *ser/estar* copular alternation is concerned. In Spanish, for example, copular constructions with *estar* and a locative attribute (e.g., *Ana está en la segunda planta* 'Ana is_{estar} on the second floor') should not be confused or compared with those structures with eventive *ser* and a locative modifier (e.g., *La reunión es en la segunda planta* 'The meeting is_{ser} on the second floor'). In the last example, a predicative intransitive *ser* that selects for an eventive subject heads a verbal predication; hence, it is not related nor does it alternate with the *estar* copula of locative predictions (Fernández Leborans 1999, 2366–8, 2421–5, Silvagni 2021b, 7–37). See also footnote 5.

28 It is worth pointing out that alternative analyses of copular alternation based on a downward agreement operation, where the uninterpretable instance of the relevant feature is located on *estar* and the interpretable instance is on the predicate (e.g., Camacho 2012, Zaguna 2012), cannot account for the whole distribution of *ser* and *estar*. First, the interpretable instance on SLPs predicts, contrary to evidence ([33] and [39]), that they could naturally appear with *ser*. Second, downward agreement cannot account for coercion of ILPs, because the uninterpretable instance on *estar* would remain unchecked when *estar* selects an ILP. (See Zeijlstra 2014 for a detailed description of upward and downward agreement. See also Brucart 2012 for an alternative analysis of the Spanish copular alternation as the result of upward agreement.)

b) El perro está insopportable. (Spanish)
"The dog is ^{estar} unbearable."

c) El libro está nuevo. (Spanish)
"The book is ^{estar} new."

(41) ⟨*estar* + ILP⟩:

$$[\text{TP} \text{ DP} [T \text{ T} [\text{AspP} \text{ t} [\text{Asp} [\text{Asp} \text{ estar}_{[\text{iS}]} [\text{PredP} \text{ t} [\text{Pred} [\text{Pred} [\text{A} \text{ guapa}]]]]]]]]]$$

Those constructions in which an ILP is attributed to a subject via *estar* have been studied as a case of “aspectual coercion,” because in these cases, a property-descriptive predicate is found in a situation-descriptive predication (Escandell and Leonetti 2002, Fernald 1999, a.o.).²⁹ In (40), for example, the group $\langle \text{estar} + \text{ILP} \rangle$ describes a condition of the subject, who “finds himself/looks” beautiful (40a), unbearable (40b), or new (40c). Under the analysis assumed here, IL to SL coercion is studied as the consequence of merging *estar_[iS]* (i.e., Asp) above a PredP that lacks aspectual features, that is to say that coercion is conceived of as a syntactic operation triggered by the [iS] feature on Asp.³⁰

It is worth pointing out that coercion with *estar* is subject to several grammatical and pragmatical restrictions. On the one hand, only qualifying IL adjectives and PPs can appear with *estar*, while nouns, relational adjectives, and relational PPs are excluded from *estar*Ps.³¹ Moreover, even if any qualifying ILP can be potentially coerced with *estar*, it has been observed that the degree of naturalness of the *<estar + ILP>* construction varies across Spanish dialects (Escandell and Leonetti 2016, see also footnote 26) and depends on speakers' conceptual restrictions and frequency (Escandell and Leonetti 2002, 167–8, Fernald 1999, 43, 59–61). On the other hand, the use of *estar* with ILPs is always subject to evidentiality, that is, the speaker's commitment to having direct perceptual evidence for the assertion made (Escandell 2018a, 2018b). In other words, using *estar* with ILPs always stems from an experiential act, which leads the speaker to describe a manifestation, a state, of the subject.

3.2 Analysis

In this article, I put forward the hypothesis that the same formal feature [Stage] is at play in the derivation of SL-CopPs in mono-copular languages.

In order to test this hypothesis, I take into account three sets of evidence. First of all, we can go back to the IL and SL grammatical effects discussed earlier (Section 2) and take the split observed among CopPs in mono-copular languages (18)–(30) as evidence for a structural difference between IL-CopPs and SL-CopPs. Within the theoretical framework assumed here, CopPs would therefore be distinguished by the presence or the lack of an Asp projection (42)–(43).

(42) IL-CopPs:

a)	<i>Anna</i>	<i>VP[è</i>	<i>avvocato].</i>	(Italian)
b)	<i>Anne</i>	<i>VP[est</i>	<i>avocate].</i>	(French)
c)	<i>Ana</i>	<i>VP[e</i>	<i>avocată].</i>	(Romanian)
	“Ana is a lawyer.”			

²⁹ Aspectual coercion is also found in agentive predications with *ser* and *estar*, where a predicate that describes a property or a situation that can be controlled by the subject is interpreted as an agentive event (e.g., *Ana es cruel con Pedro* ‘Ana is cruel with Pedro’, *Ana se estuvo tranquila* ‘Ana stayed calm’). These structures are not under discussion in this article. I refer the reader to Arche (2011), Fernández Leborans (2007), García Fernández and Gómez Vázquez (2015), and Morimoto (2008). The same phenomenon has been observed for Portuguese *ser* by Cunha (2021, 599–600) and for Romanian *a fi* by Avram (1984, 538–9). From a formal point of view, in Silvagni (2017a, 427–51), it is argued that an additional [Act] feature is at play in these structures.

³⁰ Following Escandell and Leonetti (2002) coercion is always triggered by an element in the structure that fulfills two conditions: (1) it imposes semantic or categorical restrictions on its complements and (2) it has scope over the coerced element.

³¹ See Silvagni (2017a, 294–427, 2021b, 59–63) for an in-depth discussion and a formal analysis of grammatical restrictions on coercion.

(43)	SL-CopPs:				
a)	<i>Anna</i>		<i>AspP[è]</i>	<i>stufa].</i>	(Italian)
b)	<i>Anne</i>		<i>AspP[est]</i>	<i>fatiguée].</i>	(French)
c)	<i>Ana</i>		<i>AspP[e]</i>	<i>obosită].</i>	(Romanian)
“Ana is tired.”					

Besides the evidence of a structural distinction at the VP level, we can analyse another set of data which tell us that, just as in *ser/estar* languages, in Italian, French, and Romanian SL-ness is rooted in non-verbal predicates.

As mentioned in Section 3.1, in the literature on *ser* and *estar*, it has been observed that SLPs can receive only the SL-reading (45), unlike ILPs, which can also be coerced into an SL-interpretation (44). This phenomenon implies the possibility of ILPs to appear with both copulas (44) and the impossibility of SLPs to appear with *ser* (45).

(44)						
a)	<i>Ana</i>	<i>es</i>	<i>preciosa</i>	<i>(como chica).</i>	(Spanish)	
	“Ana	<i>is_{ser}</i>	beautiful	(as a girl).”		
b)	<i>Ana</i>	<i>está</i>	<i>preciosa</i>	<i>(con ese vestido).</i>	(Spanish)	
	“Ana	<i>is_{estar}</i>	beautiful	(with that dress).”		
(45)	<i>Ana</i>	{ <i>está</i>	/	<i>*es}</i>	<i>harta.</i>	(Spanish)
	“Ana	{ <i>is_{estar}</i>	/	<i>is_{ser}</i> }	fed up.”	

It is worth observing that the same happens in the case of mono-copular languages: property-descriptive predicates, apart from their default reading as a characteristic of the subject (46), can also receive an SL-interpretation (47); conversely, those predicates that describe a situation in which the subject is involved cannot be interpreted as a property of the subject, that is, as an ILP (48).

(46)						
a)	<i>Anna</i>	<i>è</i>	{ <i>bellissima</i>	/ <i>elegante}</i>	<i>(come ragazza).</i>	(Italian)
b)	<i>Anne</i>	<i>est</i>	{ <i>merveilleuse</i>	/ <i>élégante}</i>	<i>(en tant que femme).</i>	(French)
c)	<i>Ana</i>	<i>e</i>	{ <i>superbă</i>	/ <i>elegantă}</i>	<i>(ca fată).</i>	(Romanian)
“Ana is {beautiful/elegant} (as a girl).”						
(47)						
a)	<i>Anna</i>	<i>è</i>	{ <i>bellissima</i>	/ <i>molto elegante}</i>	<i>(con quel vestito).</i>	(Italian)
b)	<i>Anne</i>	<i>est</i>	{ <i>merveilleuse</i>	/ <i>très élégante}</i>	<i>(avec cette robe).</i>	(French)
c)	<i>Ana</i>	<i>e</i>	{ <i>superbă</i>	/ <i>foarte elegantă}</i>	<i>(în rochia aceea).</i>	(Romanian)
“Ana is {beautiful/very elegant} (with that dress).”						
(48)						
a)	<i>Anna</i>	<i>è</i>	{ <i>stufa</i>	/ <i>stesa}</i>	<i>(#come ragazza).</i>	(Italian)
b)	<i>Anne</i>	<i>est</i>	{ <i>fatiguée</i>	/ <i>allongée}</i>	<i>(#en tant que femme).</i>	(French)
c)	<i>Ana</i>	<i>e</i>	{ <i>obosită</i>	/ <i>întinsă}</i>	<i>(#ca fată).</i>	(Romanian)
“Ana is {tired/lying down} (as a girl).”						

It is important to highlight that in the absence of an SL-copula (as in the case of mono-copular languages), evidentiality plays a decisive role in the IL/SL disambiguation of copular clauses with an IL attribute. In fact, coercion of an ILP into an SL-predication necessarily results from a speaker’s perception act. In addition, the SL-interpretation of the structure by the listener is subject to the correct retrieval of the relevant information about the same perception act. For example, the SL-reading of a predication like the one mentioned earlier (e.g., *Anna è bellissima/elegante* [Italian] ‘Anna is beautiful’) can be correctly grasped by the listener if and only if (s)he is able to link the assertion to a specific manifestation of the

subject (Anna) in the world (for instance, Anna dancing on a stage, or getting out of a car). At the same time, perceiving the aforementioned situation is what pushes the speaker to build an SL-predication out of an IL-predicate (“beautiful,” “elegant”). Conversely, the lack of a perception act blocks the possibility of having an SL-predication: if the speaker does not perceive a specific manifestation of Anna, or the listener is not able to link the predication to such a perception act, the IL-predication arises (i.e., “Ana is characterised by beauty/elegance”).³²

In sum, in both mono-copular and bi-copular languages, evidentiality is involved in the IL to SL coercion phenomenon. However, contrary to bi-copular languages (where SL-structures are overtly marked by the *estar* copula), in mono-copular languages, evidential effects play a key role in the building and the right interpretation of SL-copular structures with an IL attribute.

Additional evidence for an IL/SL distinction among non-verbal predicates comes from secondary predication phenomena. As it is well known, SLPs not only allow for secondary non-selected predicates (see Section 2) but they can also function as free predicative adjuncts. In the NP-domain, it is observed that only SLPs can serve as NP predicative adjuncts, while ILPs can only be complements of N (Leonetti and Escandell 1991 on Spanish). For example, only SLPs can modify a strong DP, which cannot be further restricted by N-complements and only allows for adjuncts (49)–(50).³³

(49)

a)	<i>El retrato de Ana</i>	{*abogada / *parisina / *políglota}.	(Spanish)
b)	<i>O retrato da Ana</i>	{*advogada / *parisiense / *poliglota}.	(Portuguese)
c)	<i>El retrat de l'Anna</i>	{*advocada / *parisenca / *poliglota}.	(Catalan)
d)	<i>Il ritratto di Anna</i>	{*avvocato / *parigina / *poliglotta}.	(Italian)
e)	<i>Le portrait d'Anne</i>	{*avocate / *parisienne / *polyglotte}.	(French)
f)	<i>Portretul cu Ana</i>	{*avocată / *pariziană / *poliglotă}.	(Romanian)

“The picture of Ana {a lawyer/Parisian/polyglot}.”

(50)

a)	<i>El retrato de Ana</i>	{furiosa / tumbada / borracha}.	(Spanish)
b)	<i>O retrato da Ana</i>	{furiosa / deitada / bêbeda}.	(Portuguese)
c)	<i>El retrat de l'Anna</i>	{furiosa / estirada / borratxa}.	(Catalan)
d)	<i>Il ritratto di Anna</i>	{furiosa / stesa / ubriaca}.	(Italian)
e)	<i>Le portrait d'Anne</i>	{fâchée / allongée / ivre}.	(French)
f)	<i>Portretul cu Ana</i>	{furioasă / întinsă / beată}.	(Romanian)

“The picture of Ana {angry/lying down/hungry}.”

The same happens in the case of VP-adjuncts: only SLPs (52), unlike ILPs (51), can function as depictives.

(51)

a)	<i>Ana ha ido a trabajar</i>	{*periodista / *inteligente / *honesta}.	(Spanish)
b)	<i>A Ana foi trabalhar</i>	{*jornalista / *inteligente / *honesta}.	(Portuguese)
c)	<i>L'Anna ha anat a treballar</i>	{*periodista / *intel-ligent / *honesta}.	(Catalan)
d)	<i>Anna è andata al lavoro</i>	{*giornalista / *intelligente / *onesta}.	(Italian)
e)	<i>Anne est allée au travail</i>	{*journaliste / *intelligente / *honnête}.	(French)
f)	<i>Ana a mers la lucru</i>	{*jurnalista / *intelligentă / *onestă}.	(Romanian)

“Ana went to work {a journalist/intelligent/honest}.”

³² The complements *as a girl* and *with that dress* in (46)–(48) serve to trigger the IL and SL readings, respectively.

³³ Of course, coercible ILPs can appear as NP-adjuncts if they are coerced to an SL-reading (e.g., *El retrato de Ana [estando elegante]*, ‘The picture of Ana being_{estar} elegant’).

(52)

a)	<i>Ana ha ido a trabajar</i>	{ <i>cansada</i> / <i>enferma</i> / <i>triste</i> }.	(Spanish)
b)	<i>A Ana foi trabalhar</i>	{ <i>cansada</i> / <i>doente</i> / <i>triste</i> }.	(Portuguese)
c)	<i>L'Anna ha anat a treballar</i>	{ <i>cansada</i> / <i>malalta</i> / <i>trista</i> }.	(Catalan)
d)	<i>Anna è andata al lavoro</i>	{ <i>stanca</i> / <i>ammalata</i> / <i>triste</i> }.	(Italian)
e)	<i>Anne est allée au travail</i>	{ <i>fatiguée</i> / <i>malade</i> / <i>triste</i> }.	(French)
f)	<i>Ana a mers la lucru</i>	{ <i>obosită</i> / <i>răcită</i> / <i>tristă</i> }.	(Romanian)

“Ana went to work {tired/sick/sad}.”

The same phenomenon has been observed for perception verbs, which exclusively allow for SLPs in the predicative position (53).

(53)

a)	<i>La he visto</i>	{* <i>abogada</i> / <i>triste</i> }.	(Spanish)
b)	<i>Vi-a</i>	{* <i>advogada</i> / <i>triste</i> }.	(Portuguese)
c)	<i>L'he vista</i>	{* <i>advocada</i> / <i>trista</i> }.	(Catalan)
d)	<i>L'ho vista</i>	{* <i>avvocato</i> / <i>triste</i> }.	(Italian)
e)	<i>Je l'ai vu</i>	{* <i>avocate</i> / <i>triste</i> }.	(French)
f)	<i>Am văzut-o</i>	{* <i>avocată</i> / <i>tristă</i> }.	(Romanian)

“I saw her {a lawyer/sad}.”

To sum up, the data above bring to light a clear distinction between IL and SL non-verbal predicates across languages. Therefore, we can observe that, just as in the case of bi-copular languages, in mono-copular languages SL-ness is not only syntactically derived in copular sentences, but it is also lexically encoded in predicates.

Finally, even though SL-CopPs in mono-copular languages lack a visible doubling phenomenon between *estar* and the predicate, we can take the distribution of SLPs as a clue of evidence that they carry a [uS] feature also in French, Italian, and Romanian. As observed for Spanish (Demonte 1999, 189–90, Picallo 2012, 277), SL-adjectives canonically occupy a postnominal position across Romance languages (54).³⁴

(54)

a)	<i>la</i>	(* <i>enferma</i>)	<i>niña</i>	(<i>enferma</i>)	(Spanish)
b)	<i>a</i>	(* <i>doente</i>)	<i>menina</i>	(<i>doente</i>)	(Portuguese)
c)	<i>la</i>	(* <i>malalta</i>)	<i>nena</i>	(<i>malalta</i>)	(Catalan)
d)	<i>la</i>	(* <i>ammalata</i>)	<i>bambina</i>	(<i>ammalata</i>)	(Italian)
e)	<i>l'</i>	(* <i>malade</i>)	<i>enfant</i>	(<i>malade</i>)	(French)
f)		(* <i>răcită</i>)	<i>fetiță</i>	(<i>răcită</i>)	(Romanian)
	the	sick	child	sick	

“The sick child.”

Cinque (2010) suggests that adnominal adjective modification comes in two forms: through direct modification or through a reduced relative clause. According to Cinque, prenominal qualifying adjectives can only be direct modifiers, whereas qualifying adjectives of a reduced relative source always occupy a post-nominal position. If we follow Cinque's (2010) proposal, we can interpret the necessary post-nominal position of SL-qualifying adjectives as a requirement to stand in a proper syntactic relation with a c-commanding element in the relative clause, that is, within the framework assumed here, as the consequence of an [iS]-[uS] doubling phenomenon (55).

³⁴ See Contreras and Zagona (2019) for an analysis of a small class of exceptions to this general pattern.

(55)	a)	<i>la</i>	<i>niña</i>	(<i>que está_[iS]</i>)	<i>enferma_[uS]</i>	(Spanish)
	b)	<i>a</i>	<i>menina</i>	(<i>que está_[iS]</i>)	<i>doente_[uS]</i>	(Portuguese)
	c)	<i>la</i>	<i>nena</i>	(<i>que está_[iS]</i>)	<i>malalta_[uS]</i>	(Catalan)
	d)	<i>la</i>	<i>bambina</i>	(<i>che è_[iS]</i>)	<i>ammalata_[uS]</i>	(Italian)
	e)	<i>l'</i>	<i>enfant</i>	(<i>qui est_[iS]</i>)	<i>malade_[uS]</i>	(French)
	f)		<i>fetiță</i>	(<i>care e_[iS]</i>)	<i>răcită_[uS]</i>	(Romanian)

Summing up all the above, when it comes to mono-copular languages (namely, Italian, French, and Romanian), even if they lack an SL-copula, a distinction between IL and SL-structures is found among CopPs. From a formal point of view, this means that a distinction between VPs and AspPs has to be drawn. Moreover, we see that, as in the case of *ser/estar* languages, such IL/SL distinction is lexically encoded in non-verbal predicates: SLPs are situation-descriptive predicates that differ from ILPs (property-descriptive) in that they carry a [uS] feature.

We can thus confirm the hypothesis that the [Stage] feature is at play in the derivation of SL-CopPs in mono-copular languages. Under this view, SL-CopPs in mono-copular languages would also result from a syntactic agreement operation between the SLP and an Asp head (56). Therefore, the only difference between mono-copular languages and bi-copular languages would lie in the lack of an SL-copula, that is, an overt morpho-phonological realisation of the Asp head of SL-CopPs (cf. [56] and [35]).³⁵

(56) SL-CopPs:

In sum, the inventory of aspectual elements in Italian, French, and Romanian would be as in (57).

(57) Aspectual elements in mono-copular languages:

Asp [iS]
SLPs [uS]

As for IL-CopPs, no aspectual heads nor features would be at play in these structures (58), exactly as in the case of *ser*Ps in Spanish, Portuguese, and Catalan (37).

(58) IL-CopPs:

[_{TP} DP [_T, T [VP t [v, [v essere/être/a fi] [PredP t [Pred, Pred [_{AP} avvocato/avocat/avocat]]]]]]]]]

As in the case of bi-copular languages, this analysis also justifies those cases in which an ILP is used to describe a stage (not an intrinsic quality) of the subject (examples in [47]). In these cases, the Asp head is merged in the structure as follows (59):

(59) SL-CopPs with ILPs:

[_{TP} DP [_{T'} T [_{AspP} t [_{Asp} Asp_[iS] [_{VP} t [_{v'} v essere/être/a fi] [_{PredP} t [_{Pred} Pred [_{AP} elegante/élégante/ elegantă]]]]]]]]]]]

³⁵ This conclusion is compatible with Zeijlstra's (2014) acquisition algorithm for formal features: "Assign [iF] to all morphosyntactic elements that introduce the semantic context that is manifested by [uF]. If no overt morphosyntactic element is responsible, assume some covert element to be present that carries the semantics of F and that therefore should be assigned [iF]" (Zeijlstra 2014, 125).

³⁶ In this case, contrary to the case of bi-copular languages (footnote 25), the [AspP [VP [PredP]] configuration is not ruled out because, due to the lack of an SL-copula, the presence of VP and the merging of Asp above VP is the only possible structure.

From a cross-linguistic point of view, we conclude that the IL/SL paradigm is equally encoded across languages, both lexically and structurally: non-verbal predicates are clearly divided into two classes and SL-CopPs differ from IL-CopPs by an additional Asp projection. Unlike IL-CopPs, a [Stage] feature drives the derivation of SL-CopPs. SL-CopPs with an SL-base predicate are derived by means of an agreement operation between the SLP and the Asp head: SLPs encode a [uS] feature, that is, a requirement to be c-commanded by an [iS] instance, and the Asp head, carrying [iS], satisfies these configurational needs. This phenomenon is clearly seen in the case of Spanish, Portuguese, and Catalan, where the Asp head is overtly realised as *estar*, and thus, the semantic doubling with respect to SL-ness between Asp(*estar*) and the predicate is visible (35). In contrast, Italian, French, and Romanian lack an *estar*-like copula and the agreement operation that drives the derivation of SL-CopPs is covert (56). As for SL-CopPs with an IL-base predicate, both in the case of bi-copular (41) and mono-copular languages (59), the Asp head (endowed with a [iS] feature) can be merged in the structure and coerce the ILP to an SL-reading.

We can thus conclude that the difference between bi-copular and mono-copular languages lies exclusively in the presence (Spanish, Portuguese, and Catalan) or the absence (Italian, French, and Romanian) of a morphophonological emergence of the Asp head, that is, an SL-copula (cf. [36] and [57]).

4 Conclusions

In this article, I have studied the IL/SL dichotomy in the domain of non-verbal predication across Romance languages. Hence, I have compared those languages that overtly mark the IL/SL distinction by means of two different copulas (*ser* for IL-CopPs and *estar* for SL-CopPs, such as Spanish, Portuguese, and Catalan) with mono-copular languages, which lack a specific copula for SL-CopPs, namely, French, Italian, and Romanian. The need for this study derives from the lack of in-depth analyses of the IL/SL distinction in mono-copular languages.

I have observed that the lack of a copular alternation phenomenon does not block the IL/SL distinction in mono-copular languages, and thus, CopPs are equally split into the IL and SL classes across Romance languages. Syntactically, I have argued that the same formal feature [Stage] drives the derivation of SL-CopPs across languages, which are built upon an agreement operation between the SLP_[uS] and the Asp_[iS] head, spelled out as *estar* in Spanish, Portuguese, and Catalan. In a nutshell, the difference between bi-copular and mono-copular languages is reduced to a lexical condition, that is, the presence or the lack of an SL-copula (*estar*), which determines the overt, observable, nature of the aspectual agreement operation of SL-CopPs in bi-copular languages (namely, Spanish, Portuguese, and Catalan) as opposed to the covert nature of the same operation in mono-copular languages (Italian, French, and Romanian). Besides that, I have also observed that, as in the case of bi-copular languages, the proposed analysis can also account for the coercion of ILPs to an SL-reading in mono-copular languages.

The present proposal may have several implications, for both the study of copulas and feature theory, which are left to future assessment. Regarding copulas, it would be interesting to study to what degree this analysis can be extended or adapted to other (also non-Romance) languages and dialects, as well as other aspectual verbs. Other questions that arise from this proposal are why some languages haven't got an SL-copula, and additionally why (as in the case of Italian or Romanian, for example) *stare/a sta* is aspectually more complex than the *estar* of bi-copular languages. Diachrony would possibly help answer these questions. As for feature theory, the aspectual concord phenomenon observed in the derivation of SL-CopPs could serve as additional evidence in favour of the upward agreement, besides phenomena such as negative and modal concord (Biberauer and Zeijlstra 2012, Dekker and Zeijlstra 2012, Geurts and Huitink 2006, Zeijlstra 2012, 2014, a.o.). Likewise, some questions on the [Stage] feature arise. For example, as for the [uS] feature of complex SLPs, such as PPs, where is this feature located? Is it a property of P or the whole PP? As for adjectival participles, could the [uS] feature derive from the base-verb? Finally, provided that the IL/SL paradigm is not only a cross-linguistic but also a cross-categorical distinction, which is also rooted in

verbal predicates, it would be interesting to investigate to what extent this feature-based approach to eventivity can be applied to the domain of verbal predication.

Abbreviations

CopP	copular phrase
IL	individual-level
ILP	individual-level predicate
SL	stage-level
SLP	stage-level predicate
[S]	stage feature
[iS]	interpretable, stage
[uS]	uninterpretable, stage

Acknowledgments: I am very grateful to Elena Birmani, Elena Ciutescu, José María Escribano Angulo and Diana Gómez Vázquez for their fundamental support, comments and suggestions. I would also like to thank Lidia Bogatyreva, Silvia Serret, Celina Agostinho, Bruno Rafael Costa, Maxime Breisse, Camille Joubert and Elena Ciutescu for their help with Catalan, Portuguese, French and Romanian. I am also very grateful to three anonymous reviewers for their very helpful observations. Needless to say, all eventual errors are my own responsibility.

Funding information: This work is part of the project FFI2017-87140-C4-1-P, financed by the Spanish Ministerio de Economía, Industria y Competitividad.

Author contributions: The author has accepted responsibility for the entire content of this manuscript and approved its submission.

Conflict of interest: The author states no conflict of interest.

Data availability statement: All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this article.

References

Aguilar-Sánchez, J. 2012. "Formal instruction and language contact in language variation: The case of *ser* and *estar* + adjective in the Spanishes of Limón, Costa Rica." In *Proceedings of the 14th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, 9–25. Cascadilla Proceeding Project.

Alfaraz, G. G. 2015. "The status of the extension of *estar*." *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics* 5(1), 3–25.

Arche, María Jesús. 2006. *Individuals in time: Tense, aspect and the individual/stage distinction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Arche, María Jesús. 2011. "Las oraciones copulativas agentivas." In *60 problemas de gramática*, edited by Escandell, María Victoria, Manuel Leonetti and Cristina Sánchez López, p. 99–105. Madrid: Akal.

Arche, María Jesús. 2012. "On the aspectuality of the individual-level/stage-level dichotomy." *Borealis – An International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics* 1(2), 109–31.

Arche, María Jesús, Antonio Fábregas and Rafael Marín. 2019. "Main questions in the study of copulas. Categories, structures, and operations." In: *The grammar of copulas across languages*, edited by Arche, María Jesús, Antonio Fábregas, and Rafael Marín, p. 1–31. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Avram, Larisa. 1984. "A few remarks on tense and aspect in Romanian." *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 6, 537–45.

Baker, Mark C. 2003. *Lexical categories. Verbs, nouns, and adjectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Becker, Misha. 2002. "The development of the copula in Child English: The lightness of be." *Annual Review of Language Acquisition* 2, 37–58.

Bentley, Delia. 2015. "Predication and argument realization." In: *Existentials and Locatives in Romance Dialects of Italy*, edited by Delia Bentley, Francesco Maria Ciconte, and Silvio Cruschina, p. 99–160. New York: Oxford University Press.

Biberauer, Theresa and Hedde Zeijlstra. 2012. "Negative concord in Afrikaans: filling a typological gap." *Journal of Semantics* 29, 345–71.

Boioc Apintei, Adnana and Adina Dragomirescu. 2021. "Grammatical values of the verb a sta "stay" in Romanian. A comparative Romance perspective." *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 66, 37–48.

Bosque, Ignacio and Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach. 2009. *Fundamentos de sintaxis formal*. Madrid: Akal.

Bowers, John. 1993. "The syntax of predication." *Linguistic Inquiry* 24(4), 591–656.

Brown, E. and M. Cortés-Torres. 2012. "Syntactic and pragmatic usage of the [estar + adjective] construction in Puerto Rican Spanish: ¡Está brutal!" In: *Proceedings of the 14th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, p. 61–74. Cascadilla Proceeding Project.

Brucart, Josep María. 2005. "Las construcciones atributivas de localización." In: *Palabras, norma, discurso. En memoria de Fernando Lázaro Carreter*, edited by Luis Santos Río, Julio Borrego Nieto, Juan Felipe García Santos, José J. Gómez Asencio, and Emilio Prieto De Los Mozos, p. 185–204. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.

Brucart, Josep María. 2012. "Copular alternation in Spanish and Catalan attributive sentences." *Linguística. Revista de Estudos Linguísticos de Universidade Do Porto* 7, 9–43.

Camacho, José. 2012. "Ser and estar: the Individual/Stage-level Distinction and Aspectual Predication." In: *The handbook of hispanic linguistics*, edited by José Ignacio Hualde, Antxon Olarrea, Erin O'Rourke, p. 453–75. Malden-Oxford-West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

Carlier, Anne. 2005. "L'argument davidsonien: un critère de distinction entre les prédicts "stage level" et les prédicts "individual level"?" *Travaux de Linguistique* 50, 13–35.

Carlson, Gregory N. 1977. *Reference to kinds in English*. New York and London: Garland Publishing.

Catalani, Luigi. 2004. *Deutsch, Französisch und Spanisch im Kontrast mit dem Italienischen: vier Beiträge zum Sprachvergleich*. Frankfurt am Main/Berlin/Bern: Peter Lang.

Chierchia, Gennaro. 1995. "Individual-level predicates as inherent generics." In: *The generic book*, edited by Gregory N. Carlson and Francis Jeffry Pelletier, p. 176–223. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1991. "Some notes on economy of derivation and representation." In: *Principles and parameters in comparative grammar*, edited by Robert Freidin, p. 417–54. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2000. "Minimalist inquiries: The framework." In: *Step by step: Essays in minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, edited by Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, p. 89–155. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Ciconte, Francesco Maria. 2015. "Historical context." In: *Existentials and locatives in romance dialects of Italy*, edited by Delia Bentley, Francesco Maria Ciconte, and Silvio Cruschina, p. 217–70. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 2010. *The syntax of adjectives: A comparative study* (Linguistic Inquiry/Monographs). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Contreras, Heles and Karen Zagona. 2019. "Classifier phrase as host for stage-level spanish adnominal participial adjectives." In: *Contributions of romance languages to current linguistic theory*, edited by Deborah L. Arteaga, p. 13–37. Cham: Springer.

Copceag, D. and G. Escudero. 1966. "Ser y estar en español y en rumano." *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 4, 339–49.

Cortés-Torres, M. 2004. "¿Ser o estar? La variación lingüística y social de estar más adjetivo en el español de Cuernavaca, México." *Hispania* 87(4), 788–95.

Cuartero Otal, Juan. 2011. "Pero, ¿cómo podemos reconocer los estados?" In: *Sobre estados y estatividad*, edited by Ángeles Carrasco Gutiérrez, p. 99–121. Muenchen: Lincom.

Cunha, Luís Filipe. 2011. "Phase states and their interaction with individual-level and stage-level predicates." In: *Sobre estados y estatividad*, edited by Ángeles Carrasco Gutiérrez, p. 45–62. Muenchen: Lincom.

Cunha, Luís Filipe. 2021. "Aspetto." In: *Gramática do Português*, edited by Eduardo Buzaglo Paiva Raposo, Maria Fernanda Bacelar do Nascimento, Maria Antónia Mota, Luísa Segura and Amália Mendes, p. 583–619. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.

De Hoop, Helen and Henriette De Swart. 1989. "Over indefinite objecten en de relatie tussen syntaxis en semantiek." *Glot* 12, 19–35.

De Miguel, Elena. 1999. "El aspecto léxico." In: *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, edited by Ignacio Bosque, and Violeta Demonte, p. 2977–3060. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.

Dekker, Paul and Hedde Zeijlstra. 2012. "Concord and Doubling Phenomena: an Introduction." *Journal of Semantics* 29(3), 295–303.

Demonte, Violeta. 1999. "El adjetivo, clases y usos: a posición del adjetivo en el sintagma nominal." In: *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, edited by Ignacio Bosque, and Violeta Demonte, p. 129–215. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.

Demonte, Violeta and Pascual Masullo. 1999. "La predicción: los complementos predicativos." In: *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, edited by Ignacio Bosque, and Violeta Demonte, p. 2461–524. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.

De Swart, Henriette. 1993. *Adverbs of quantification: A generalized quantifier approach*. New York: Garland.

Díaz-Campos, M. and K. L. Geeslin. 2011. "Copula use in the Spanish of Venezuela." *Spanish in Context* 8(1), 73–94.

Diesing, Molly. 1992. *Indefinites*. Cambridge and London: MIT Press.

Eguren, Luis. 2012. "Predication markers in Basque." In: *Noun phrases and nominalization in basque: Syntax and semantics*, edited by Urtzi Etxebarria, Ricardo Etxepare, and Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria, p. 243–66. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Einstein, Albert. 1916. *Relativity: The special and general theory*. New York: H. Holt and Company.

Escandell, Victoria. 2018a. "Evidential commitment and feature mismatch in Spanish *estar* constructions." *Journal of Pragmatics* 128, 102–15.

Escandell, Victoria. 2018b. "Ser y estar con adjetivos. Afinidad y desajustes de rasgos." *Revista Española de Lingüística* 48, 57–114.

Escandell, Victoria and Manuel Leonetti. 2016. "Estar joven a los dos lados del Atlántico." In: *Geométrica explosión. Estudios de lengua y literatura en homenaje a René Lenarduzzi*, edited by María Eugenia Sainz González, Inmaculada Solís García, Florencio del Barrio de la Rosa, and Ignacio Arroyo Hernández, p. 65–78. Venezia: Edizioni Ca' Foscari.

Escandell, Victoria and Manuel Leonetti. 2002. "Coercion and the Stage/Individual distinction." In: *From words to discourse*, edited by Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach, p. 159–79. New York-Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Fábregas, Antonio. 2012. "A guide to IL and SL in Spanish: Properties, problems and proposals." *Borealis – An International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics* 1(2), 1–71.

Farkas, Donka F. and Yoko Sugioka. 1983. "Restrictive if/when-clauses." *Linguistics and Philosophy* 6, 225–58.

Fernald, Theodore B. 1999. "Evidential coercion: using individual-level predicates in stage-level environments." *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 29(1), 43–63.

Fernald, Theodore B. 2000. *Predicates and temporal arguments*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Fernández Leborans, María Jesús. 1999. "La predicción: las oraciones copulativas." In: *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, edited by Ignacio Bosque, and Violeta Demonte, p. 2357–460. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.

Fernández Leborans, María Jesús. 2007. "Sobre la oposición "individuo/estadio" en los predicados nominales." In: *Ex admiratione et amicitia. Homenaje a Ramón Santiago*, edited by Delgado Cobos, Inmaculada, and Alicia Puigvert Ocal, p. 377–94. Madrid: Del Orto.

Fernández Leborans, María Jesús and Cristina Sánchez López. 2015. "Sentences as predicates: The Spanish construction <ser muy de + infinitive>." In: *New perspectives on the study of Ser and Estar*, edited by Isabel Pérez-Jiménez, Manuel Leonetti, and Silvia Gumié-Molina, p. 85–118. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Filip, Hana. 2012. "Lexical aspect." In: *The oxford handbook of tense and aspect*, edited by Robert I. Binnick, p. 721–51. New York: Oxford University Press.

Frattegiani Tinca, Maria Teresa. 1985. *Stare nell'italiano contemporaneo*. Perugia: Università Italiana per Stranieri.

Gallego, Ángel and Juan Uriagereka. 2016. "Estar = Ser + X." *Borealis – An International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics* 5(1), 123–56.

García Fernández, Luis and Diana Gómez Vázquez. 2015. "More than a copula: Complex predicates with *estar* and the clitic *se*." In: *New Perspectives on the Study of ser and estar*, edited by Pérez Jiménez, Isabel, Manuel Leonetti, and Silvia Gumié-Molina, p. 23–50. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Geurts, Bart and Janneke Huitink. 2006. "Modal concord." In: *Proceedings of the ESSLLI 2006 Workshop "Concord Phenomena at the Syntax-Semantics Interface"*, p. 15–20. University of Malaga.

Greenberg, Yael. 1994. *Hebrew nominal sentences and the stage/individual level distinction*. Phd Thesis. Bar Ilan University.

Gumié-Molina, Silvia, Norberto Moreno-Quibén and Isabel Pérez-Jiménez. 2015. "Comparison classes and the relative/absolute distinction: A degree-based compositional account of the *ser/estar* alternation in Spanish." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 33(3), 955–1001.

Heggie, Lorie. 1988. *The syntax of copular structures*. Phd Thesis. University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Hengeveld, Kees. 1992. *Non-verbal predication. Theory, typology, diachrony*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hernanz, María Lluïsa. 1988. "En torno a la sintaxis y semántica de los complementos predicativos en español." *Estudi General* 8, 7–29.

Hernanz, María Lluïsa. 1991. "Spanish absolute constructions and aspect." *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 1, 75–128.

Hoekstra, Teun. 1992. "Aspect and theta theory." In: *Thematic structure. Its role in grammar*, edited by I. M. Roca, p. 145–74. Berlin, New York: Foris.

Husband, E. Matthew. 2006. *Stage-level/Individual-level predicates and aspect*. Ms. Michigan State University.

Husband, E. Matthew. 2012. *On the compositional nature of states*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Institut d'Estudis Catalans. 2016. *Gramàtica de la llengua catalana*. Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans.

Jäger, Gerhard. 2001. "Topic-comment structure and the contrast between stage level and individual level predicates." *Journal of Semantics* 18, 83–126.

Jonge, B. 1993. "Pragmatismo y gramaticalización en el cambio lingüístico: "ser" y "estar" en expresiones de edad." *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* 41(1), 99–126.

Juárez-Cummings, Elizabeth. 2014. "Tendencias de uso de ser y estar en la Ciudad de México." *IULC working papers* 14(2), 120–37.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1988. "Stage-level and individual-level predicates." In: *Generativity in Natural Language: Proceedings of the 1988 Tübingen Conference*, edited by Manfred Krifka, p. 247–84. Tübingen: SNS-Bericht.

Larson, R. K. and Claire Lefebvre. 1991. "Predicate clefting in Haitian Creole." *Proceedings of NELS 21*, p. 247–61. University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Leonetti, Manuel. 1994. "Ser y estar: estado de la cuestión." *Barataria* 1, 182–205.

Leonetti, Manuel. 2015. "On word order in Spanish copular sentences." In: *New perspectives on the study of ser and estar*, edited by Isabel Pérez-Jiménez, Manuel Leonetti, and Silvia Gumié-Molina, p. 203–36. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Leonetti, Manuel and Victoria Escandell. 1991. "Complementos predicativos en sintagmas nominales." *Verba* 18, 431–50.

MacDonald, Jonathan E. 2008. *The syntactic nature of inner aspect. A minimalist perspective*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mahapatra, Bibhuti. 2002. *Stage level vs individual level predicates and the four copulas in Odia*. Hyderabad: English and Foreign Languages University.

Maienborn, Claudia. 2001. "On the position and interpretation of locative modifiers." *Natural Language Semantics* 9(2), 191–240.

Maienborn, Claudia. 2004. "A pragmatic explanation of the stage level/individual level contrast in combination with locatives." In: *Proceedings of the Western Conference on Linguistics (WECOL) 15*, edited by B. Agbayani, V. Samiian and B. Tucker, p. 158–70. Fresno: CSU.

Maienborn, Claudia. 2005. "On the limits of the Davidsonian approach: The case of copula sentences." *Theoretical Linguistics* 31(3), 275–316.

Maienborn, Claudia. 2007. "On Davidsonian and Kimian states." In: *Existence: Semantics and syntax*, edited by I Comorovski, and Klaus von Heusinger, p. 107–30. Dordrecht: Springer.

Maienborn, Claudia. 2011. "Event semantics." In: *Semantics. An international handbook of natural language meaning*, edited by Klaus von Heusinger, Claudia Maienborn and Paul Portner, p. 802–29. Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Maienborn, Claudia. 2019. "Events and states." In: *The oxford handbook of event structure*, edited by Robert Truswell. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maienborn, Claudia and Martin Schäfer. 2011. "Adverbs and adverbials." In: *Semantics. An international handbook of natural language meaning*, edited by Claudia Maienborn, Klaus von Heusinger, and Paul Portner. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Martin, Fabienne. 2008. "Deux types de stage level predicates." *Langages* 169, 111–28.

Martin, Fabienne. 2009. *Les prédictats statifs: Étude sémantique et pragmatique*. Louvain-la-Neuve: De Boeck-Duculot.

Mikkelsen, Line. 2005. *Copular clauses. Specification, predication and equation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Milsark, Gary Lee. 1974. *Existential sentences in English*. Phd Thesis. MIT.

Mincă, Nicoleta Florina. 2019. "Types of predicates in English and Romanian." *Studii de gramatică contrastivă* 32, 18–26.

Minkowski, Hermann. 1909. "Raum und zeit." *Physikalische Zeitschrift* 10, 104–11.

Morimoto, Yuko. 1998. *El aspecto léxico: delimitación*. Madrid: Arco/Libros.

Morimoto, Yuko. 2008. "Me estuve quieto: el concepto de estado y el llamado *se* aspectual." In: *Actas del XXXVII Simposio Internacional de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística (SEL)*, coords. Olza Moreno, Inés, Manuel Casado Velarde, and Ramón González Ruiz. Pamplona: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Navarra.

Morimoto, Yuko and María Victoria Pavón Lucero. 2004. "Aproximación semántica a la gramática de ponerse y quedarse." *Studia Românica Posnaniensis* 31, 385–92.

Morimoto, Yuko and María Victoria Pavón Lucero. 2007. *Los verbos pseudo-copulativos del español*. Madrid: Arco/Libros.

Moro, Andrea. 1997. *The raising of predicates: predicative noun phrases and the theory of clause structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Munaro, Nicola. 2016. "Verbless predicative structures across Romance." *Journal of Linguistics* 52, 609–37.

Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela. 2013. *The grammar of Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pereira Oliveira, Maria Do Carmo. 2001. *As frases copulativas com ser. Natureza e estrutura*. Phd Thesis. Universidade do Porto.

Pérez-Jiménez, Isabel, Silvia Gumié-Molina and Norberto, Moreno-Quibén. 2018. "Ser y estar en las lenguas romances ibéricas." *Revista española de lingüística* 48, 153–198.

Picallo, Carme. 2012. "Structure of the noun phrase." In: *The handbook of hispanic linguistics*, edited by J. I. Hualde, A. Olarrea and E. O'Rourke, p. 263–83. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Pountain, Christopher. 1982. "Essere/stare as a Romance phenomenon." In: *Studies in the Romance verb*, edited by N. Vincent and M. Harris, p. 139–60. London: Croom Helm.

RAE and ASALE. 2009. *Nueva gramática de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa Libros.

Rainer, Franz. 1984. "Stare + aggettivo in italiano." In: *Parallela 2: aspetti della sintassi dell'italiano contemporaneo*, edited by Susanne Knaller, Klaus Lichem, and Edith Mara, p. 227–36. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Ramos, Joan-Rafael. 2001. "Els derivats d'esse i stare en les llengües romàniques." *Caplletra* 30, 135–68.

Ramos, Joan-Rafael. 2002. "El SV, II: La predicació no verbal obligatòria." In: *Gramàtica del català contemporani*, edited by Joan Solà, Maria-Rosa Lloret, Joan Mascaró, and Manuel Pérez Saldanya, p. 1953–2046. Barcelona: Empúries.

Rapoport, T. R. 1991. "Adjunct-Predicate Licensing and D-Structure." *Syntax and Semantics* 25, 159–87.

Raposo, Eduardo Buzaglo Paiva. 2013. "Orações copulativas e predicações secundárias." In: *Gramática do Português*, edited by Eduardo Paiva Raposo, Maria Fernanda Bacelar do Nascimento, Maria Antónia Mota, Luísa Segura, and Amália Mendes, p. 1283–356. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.

Renzi, Lorenzo, Giampaolo Salvi and Anna Cardinaletti. 2001. *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Roca Pons, José. 1958. *Estudios sobre perifrasis verbales del español*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Roy, Isabelle. 2013. *Nonverbal predication. Copular sentences at the syntax-semantics interface*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Salvá, Vicente. 1830. *Gramática de la lengua castellana: según ahora se habla*, edited by Ll. Margarita. Madrid: Arco/Libros (1988).

Sánchez-Alonso, S., A. Deo and M. Piñango. 2016. “Copula distinction and constrained variability of copula use in Iberian and Mexican Spanish.” *U. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 23(1), 1–10.

Serianni, Luca. 1996. *Grammatica italiana. Italiano comune e lingua letteraria*. Milano: Garzanti.

Sider, Theodore. 2001. *Four-dimensionalism. an ontology of persistence and time*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Silvagni, Federico. 2015. “Ser-I, Estar-S.” *Lingue e Linguaggio* 14(2), 215–32.

Silvagni, Federico. 2017a. *Entre estados y eventos. Un estudio del aspecto interno del español*. Phd Thesis. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Silvagni, Federico. 2017b. “Spacetime in language.” In: *General relativity: 1916–2016*, edited by Marco Giovanelli, and Anguel Stefanov, p. 221–33. Montreal: Minkowski Institute Press.

Silvagni, Federico. 2018. “Sobre la distinción Individuo/Estadio y su relación con ser y estar.” *Revista Española de Lingüística* 48, 15–56.

Silvagni, Federico. 2021a. “Kimian/Davidsonian, individual/stage and non-verbal predication: a Romance perspective.” *Lingua* 250.

Silvagni, Federico. 2021b. *La gramática de ser y estar*. Madrid: Arco/Libros.

Svenonius, Peter. 1994. *Dependent nexus: Subordinate predication structures in english and scandinavian languages*. Phd Thesis. University of California, Santa Cruz.

Travis, Lisa de Mena. 2010. *Inner aspect: The articulation of VP*. Dordrecht, Heidelberg, London and New York: Springer.

Van Peteghem, Marleen. 1991. *Les phrase copulatives dans les langues romanes*. Heidelberg: Gottfried Egert Verlag.

Vinet, Marie-Thérèse. 1991. “French non-verbal exclamative constructions.” *Probus* 3(1), 77–100.

Wanner, Anja. 1999. *Verbklassifizierung und aspektuelle Alternationen im Englischen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Yavaş, F. 1980. *On the meaning of the tense and aspect markers in Turkish*. Phd Thesis. University of Kansas.

Zagona, Karen. 2012. “Ser and estar: Phrase structure and aspect.” In: *Cahiers chronos*, edited by Chiyo Nishida and Cinzia Russi, p. 303–27. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2008. “On the syntactic flexibility of formal features.” In: *The limits of syntactic variation*, edited by Theresa Biberauer, p. 143–74. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2012. “There is only one way to agree.” *The Linguistic Review* 29(3), 491–39.

Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2014. “On the uninterpretability of interpretable features.” In: *Minimalism and Beyond. Radicalizing the interfaces*, edited by Peter Kosta, Steven L. Franks, Teodora Radeva-Bork, and Lilia Schürcks, p. 109–29. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.