

Since D67's seminal paper introduced event quantification in the logical form of action sentences, the event analysis has gotten richer: ignoring tense, a traditional translation of (1a) like (1b) is often supplanted by (1c) (e.g. P90). However, the analysis of gradable property ascriptions hasn't changed in the same way: (2a) is still likely to be translated as (2b), or, in a degree semantics framework, as (2c). Yet, evidence is mounting that even apparently simple adjectival predications too involve eventualities (e.g. F06, H10, FK, W15). We use evidence from comparatives to suggest that (2a) can translate as (2d), expressing quantification over states s and events e .

- (1) a. Anne kicked Bill.
 b. **kick**(a, b)
 c. $\exists e[\text{Agent}(e)(a) \ \& \ \text{kick}(e) \ \& \ \text{Patient}(e)(b)]$
- (2) a. Anne was happy.
 b. **happy**(a)
 c. **happy**(a) \succ **standard**(**happy**)
 d. $\exists e \exists s[e \triangleright_{\tau} s \ \& \ \text{Holder}(s)(a) \ \& \ \text{happy}(s)]$ \triangleright_{τ} : 'is temporally constituted by'

Comparatives like (3) compare levels of happiness and tallness (e.g. C76, K99). That in (4a) is interpreted more like a verbal comparative (cf. WHP12), comparing numbers of occasions of being happy. I-level adjectives are odd in the latter frame, (4b); their 'once-only' lexical characteristic clashes with the implied numbers of occasions on which the property holds. Extending H10's account of adjectives, (3a) would compare degrees introduced by *happy*'s measure function, while (4a) would compare counts of states of happiness introduced by a verbal POS morpheme. W15's account involves states already in (3a), and it is unclear how that account would capture (4a).

- (3) a. Anne was **happier** than Bill was.
 b. Anne was **taller** than Bill was.
- (4) a. Anne was **happy more** than Bill was.
 b. ? Anne was **tall more** than Bill was.

We claim that both H10 and W15 posit one eventuality too few. One piece of evidence concerns comparatives with *for*-phrases. Imagine a context c_1 , in which Anne and Bill are guidance counselors whose schedules are divided into one hour slots. On Monday and Tuesday, 12/14 of Bill's were filled with meetings, but only 5/14 of Anne's were; (5a) captures c_1 . In a different context c_2 , Anne and Bill are contractors whose 6-day workweeks are divided into two day chunks. Last week, 3/3 of Bill's were booked, but only 1/3 of Anne's were; (5b) captures c_2 . Yet, (5b) cannot felicitously capture c_1 , nor (5a) c_2 . Such data minimally challenge H10 and W15 since the *for*-phrases in (5) would apply to the same states (cf. L03's account of *for*-phrases), predicting the sentences to be equivalent.

- (5) a. Anne was [**available** more than Bill was] **for 2 days**.
 b. Anne was [**available for 2 days**] more than Bill was.

On our account, both of (5) compare numbers of events, but these are constituted by states with different temporal profiles. The lack of equivalence exists because the *for*-phrase in (5a) applies to a plurality of events (via a covert 'eventizer' [cf. K05] and covert plural [cf. F05]), each of which is 'temporally constituted by' (generalizing a proposal from L83) states of being available, while it applies to those states directly in (5b). Abbreviating the *than*-clause degree as δ , (5) translate as in (6) on this proposal. The paper provides the compositional details, and further evidence from other adverbial modifiers (e.g. *when*-phrases, M78, M93; *every time*-phrases, R95).

- (6) a. $\llbracket(5a)\rrbracket = \exists E[\forall e \in E : \exists s[e \triangleright_{\tau} s \ \& \ \text{Holder}(s)(a) \ \& \ \text{available}(s)] \ \& \ |E| > \delta \ \& \ \tau(E) = \mathbf{2\text{-days}}]$
 b. $\llbracket(5b)\rrbracket = \exists E[\forall e \in E : \exists s[e \triangleright_{\tau} s \ \& \ \text{Holder}(s)(a) \ \& \ \text{available}(s) \ \& \ \tau(s) = \mathbf{2\text{-days}}] \ \& \ |E| > \delta]$

References. Cresswell 1976. Davidson 1967. Francez & Koontz-Garboden (in press) Semantic variation and the grammar of property concepts Ferreira 2005 *Event quantification and plurality*. Fults 2006 *The structure of comparison* Husband 2010 *On the compositional nature of stativity* Kennedy 1999 *Projecting the adjective* Kratzer 2005 Building resultatives Larson 2003 Time and event measure Link 1983. Mourelatos 1978 Events, processes, and states McNally 1993 Adjunct predicates and the individual/stage distinction Parsons 1990. Rothstein 1995 Adverbial quantification over events Wellwood 2015 On the semantics of comparison across categories Wellwood, Hacquard, Pancheva 2012 Measuring and comparing individuals and events