

Additional evidence that the comparison class of the adjective is not behind the *ser/estar* distinction comes from gradable color adjectives. These don't always have comparison classes eg. *Blue books*, which do not form a kind (unlike, say, *red grapefruits*) (Graff 2000). As we can see in (6), both *ser* and *estar* can be selected despite the lack of a comparison class (as diagnosed by the fact that you cannot introduce it overtly via a *for*-PP).

- (7) a. Este libro es muy azul (#para ser un libro) b. El cielo está muy gris (#para ser el cielo)
 this book is_{SER} very blue for being a book the sky is_{ESTAR} very gray for being the sky

To sum up, both *ser* and *estar* can have a between-individuals comparison class, but only *estar* can have a within-individuals comparison class. Both copulas can also take non-gradable adjectives and gradable adjectives that lack a comparison class.

The analysis: We propose to derive *estar*-predicates morphosyntactically from *ser*-predicates, similar to Gallego & Uriagereka (2011) and Zagona (2010). The adjectival root starts out in aP. The subject is merged in (Spec,PredP), right above the aP. The adjective remains non-gradable up until this point. For the DegP, we follow the standard semantic analysis in Kennedy (1997, Heim 2000), where *G* is the gradable adjective meaning, *d* is the standard value, and *R* is the relation introduced by the degree morpheme. The semantics of DegP are illustrated in (8).

$$(8) \quad \llbracket \text{DegP} \rrbracket = \lambda G. \lambda d. \lambda x. [R (G(x))(d)]$$

We depart from GMP in that the comparison class is an argument of DegP. DegP merely creates a gradable adjective, which may or may not have a comparison class (cf. (7)). Overt comparison classes are adjuncts, and whether they are between or within-individuals will be an epiphenomenon of the aspectual properties of the copula, and of how compatible the lexical semantics of the adjectival root is with that comparison class.

For the temporal characterization of the *ser/estar* distinction, we adopt the framework developed in Demirdache & Uribe-Etxebarria (2000 et seq) that views T° and Asp° as predicates that order syntactically projected arguments that denote time intervals (ZeitPs), much like DPs denote individuals. Following these authors, we argue that DegP/AP have a ZeitP argument in their syntax (a State-Time argument ST-T), given that states are anchored in time. *Estar*-adjectives, however, are selected for by an aspectual PP that introduces an extra Zeit-P (a Situation-Time argument SIT-T). Its head P has a WITHIN meaning, i.e. it locates the SIT-T interval as being part of the super-interval denoted by the ST-T. This ST-T is later fed to T° and Asp° , and this is what it means to be predicating of a stage in an individual's existence that is characterized by having a particular property. On the other hand, *ser*-adjectives only have a ST-T, which denotes the whole interval in which the individual manifests a property. The different syntax is shown in (9).

- (9) a. *estar*: [...T/Asp/v [_{PP} SIT-T [_P P_{WITHIN} [_{DegP/AP} ST-T]]]] b. *ser*: [...T/Asp/v [_{DegP/AP} ST-T]]

Our aspect-based analysis, combined with the standard account of the syntax and the semantics of (un-)gradable adjectives, correctly predicts the possibility of having between-individuals readings with *estar*, as in (5). It also predicts that it is not necessary for an adjective to be gradable (cf. (6)), or to have a comparison class (cf. (7)), for it to appear with *estar*. We conclude that the gradability properties of the adjective are largely irrelevant for *ser/estar* selection: the crucial factor is aspect.

References: Arche, M. 2006. *Individuals in Time*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins ■ Demirdache, H & M. Uribe-Etxebarria. 2000. The primitives of temporal relations. *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, Cambridge: MIT Press, 157-186 ■ Fernández-Leborans, M. J. 1999. La predicación. Las oraciones copulativas, *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 2357-2461 ■ Gallego, A & Uriagereka, J. 2011. The lexical syntax of *ser* and *estar*, Ms. ■ Gehrke, B. 2012. Passive States. *Telicity, Change and State*, OUP: 185-211 ■ Graff, D. 2000. Shifting sands: An interest-relative theory of vagueness. *Philosophical Topics*, 20, 45-81 ■ Gumiel-Molina, S et al. 2015. Comparison Classes and the Relative/Absolute Distinction. *NLLT* 33:3, 955-1001 ■ Heim, I. 2000. Degree operators and scope, *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 10. CLC Publication Ithaca, NY, 40-64 ■ Kennedy, C. 1997. *Projecting the Adjective: The Syntax and Semantics of Gradability and Comparison*, PhD Thesis, UC Santa Cruz ■ Zagona, K. 2010. *Ser and Estar: Phrase structure and aspect*. *Cahiers Chronos*, 1-24.