

Review by Tim Diaubalick

Does the paper make a novel contribution to the understanding of the topic under investigation? [max 250 words]*

Yes, I would definitely say so. The syntactical arguments are clear and I can follow them very easily.

I think, the analysis really does contribute to a better understanding of some restrictions that, on first glance, seem illogical in Italian.

I have definitely learned something.

Is the empirical content of the paper sound (i.e. the data are collected and presented properly, the experiments are well designed, the statistics is well done, the examples contain no spelling mistakes, etc)? [max 400 words]*

While the syntactic analysis and argumentation is impressive, the methodological component of section 1 is somewhat weak and should be strengthened. As they represent the basis for the later analyses, it's important to point out their validity.

What is the evidence for the ungrammaticality status of the items that are said to be impossible (e.g. 15, 17, 19)? The article speaks of a "study", but we do not know in what this study consists in detail. What are the sources? Was an experiment conducted? The paper lacks notes on methodology.

Is the argument coherent and sound, with no major flaws and/or shortcomings, within the context of the theoretical assumptions made by the author? [max 500 words]*

This relates to my comment above. If we accept the alledgedly impossible items to be grammatical, the theoretical explanations are strong. We need all the data on methodology, and then we have a very strong and understandable reasoning.

There is however one detail, I am not sure about (see also comments on minor improvements): The paper claims aspectual elements of the venire passive to be one of the main reasons for its incompatibility with the Passato Prossimo. However, we then learn that the Passato Remoto is not equally incompatible. This makes me wonder if aspectuality is really relevant here. Given that Passato Remoto, other than e.g. in Spanish, is restricted to formal/literature contexts, I have doubts about Passato Prossimo really expressing always perfect aspect. It is rather perfective context. In any case, this opens a door which does not really seem relevant to the explanations given in this paper. Because all of the arguments relate do syntax, specifically the fact that

Passato Prossimo is a compound tense form. This argumentation works fully without the necessity to recur to aspectual features.

Since the distinction perfect vs. perfective aspect is not clear in all examples, I would recommend to leave aspectuality out of the arguments.

Are there any relevant scholarly works that have been overlooked by the author? If the answer is YES, please provide the full references.*

not that I am aware of

Have you seen this paper, its content, the proposed analysis, or the conclusions published in other venues? [If your answer is YES, please add the relevant reference.]*

not that I am aware of

If you accept the paper with minor revisions, please list the revisions you would advice (you are not required to proofread the paper) [max 500 words]

page 2: the translation of (2) should show its ambiguity. Maybe by introducing a progressive?

p2: What about "a tutti" in (5)? Isn't it a further proof of adjectivity?

p3: The comments on (12) and (13) include redundant explications of the aoristic meaning. This was explained before.

p5: What is the difference between 24b and 17? Why is one grammatical, but the other one isn't? The answer comes later from a syntactic perspective. But I think, a teaser should be placed here.

p6: According to the argumentation, the relevant feature is dynamicity. Why distinguish all four aspectual classes then? Seems irrelevant.

p7: What is the evidence for table 2 beside some of the examples discussed above?

p11: In the comment to (42), is the reason truly aspectual? Rather than aspect, it seems to me, the key you argue for is the tense's morphological composition.

p12: Also the explanation to (46) is syntactical, and does not have to do with aspect directly.

p12: In (49), what about the reversed order ("and so does Frank")?

p12/13: I do not follow how the argumentation on English transfers to Italian. How do the two languages relate to each other?

