Review by Vincent Krebs

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

This paper delves into a largely unexplored phenomenon in existing literature: the relationship between the semantic properties of deverbal nominals and the denotation of their verbal bases. It endorses a constructionist view of argument structure projection, aligning with recent scholarly perspectives. Notably, the paper challenges established views (Grimshaw 1990, Alexiadou 2001), and Borer (2013)), arguing that "Result" nominals, like "Event" nominals, are constructed within the syntax. It demonstrates that functional materials can combine in diverse ways to produce different denotations, with a focus on object-denoting variants like "construcao". These variants are shown to be complex, with the entity denotation fundamentally constructed atop the event denotation. The paper's bold assertion—contrary to current consensus—that result denotations stem from internal events, represents a novel contribution to our understanding of the topic. This courageous stance appears to be a step in the right direction.

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]

The data presented in this paper is based on an analysis of 69 examples, suggesting that the research is empirically motivated. However, I am not in a position to comment on the quality or correctness of these examples, as my expertise does not include Brazilian Portuguese.

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]

The paper's argument that result-denoting deverbal nominals imply an internal event is generally convincing. However, the methodology used for identifying Complex Event Nominals (CENs) raises concerns that could potentially weaken

the study if not addressed adequately. This concern primarily involves the tests employed to distinguish CENs.

The argument, as presented on page 13, suggests that some nominals can refer both to an event and an object within the same sentence (see example 17 on page 13). However, one could argue that such examples represent conceptual, rather than grammatical shifts, as they also apply to non-CENs like "movie" or "symphony", demonstrated in example (1):

(1) The movie that started 10 minutes ago is on the table.

Here, the ability of a movie to "start" at a specified time—unlike a book—is due to its temporal extension, a conceptual rather than grammatical property. This is similar to the observation made by Chomsky, where he notes an example involving a book: "This book, which weighs five pounds, was written in a hurry." (Chomsky, 1970:18,22). This conceptual ambiguity applies broadly to objects with temporal extensions, thus example (1) fails to provide a valid grammatical criterion for discriminating deverbal nominals.

The paper attempts to show grammatical ambiguity between the event of creation and the resulting object using examples like "painting" or "certificação" (page 56), which is typical for nominals that denote works (see example (3)):

(3) The translation of the text by John is on the table.

However, as noted on page 14, the term "construction", used in "Look at this beautiful construction." (where the object meaning is intended), does not exhibit argument structure projection (see example (2)):

(2) *The construction of the house by John is just in front of you.

Thus, object-denoting results and translation-type nominals represent two distinct categories that should be separately addressed.

Additionally, the use of temporal predicates such as "started x time ago" — introduced initially to identify a Simple Event Nominal — complicates the classification further, as it fails to serve as a reliable test for ASNs. This issue is compounded by the recurrent use of the predicate "lasted x time" to identify a CEN (see page 2), which is equally applicable to any nominal denoting a temporal object, as shown in example (4):

(4) The movie/earthquake lasted two hours.

The verb "happened" similarly lacks discriminatory power for CENs, as it can be applied to conceptual events such as earthquakes, shown in example (5):

(5) The earthquake happened last year.

Lastly, the ambiguous use of "careful" in example (50) raises doubts about its effectiveness in proving the presence of a CEN (see example (6)):

(6) A careful diet

For agent-oriented modification to serve as evidence, an internal reading of the modifier must be conclusively established. If this reading cannot be securely determined, the space opens up for intersective interpretations, which are undesirable as they would not effectively discriminate between CENs and typical nominals, such as 'earthquake' or 'tree.' These methodological and interpretative issues need clear resolution to strengthen the paper's arguments.

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

I suggest having a look at Krebs (2024), where Result nominals (manners in particular) are argued to be built in the syntax.

Krebs, Vincent (2024), The Syntactic Derivation of Event Nominals: Property Inheritance Beyond Lexicalization, Phd Thesis (Nantes-Université). https://osf.io/download/etupa

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.]

No.

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]

The issue regarding the tests, pointed out above, needs to be addressed: the tests should be clarified. It will make the argumentation more robust, thus considerably strengthening the claim.