

-----  
Review 1

Paolo Acquaviva  
-----

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

Yes - but in part.

The theoretical reinterpretation is certainly novel. The idea that morphology needs a sharper integration into Parallel Architecture models, the implementation of the Slot Structure Model as a precise model to constrain the combinatorics of semantic, phonological, syntactic information in complex lexical items, and the detailed critique of a competing model of morphology withing PA (Relational Morphology) are novel contributions.

However, the empirical domain is not broadened, the central theoretical proposal (SSM) is adopted and discussed here but it is not newly introduced (according to the text itself), and the theoretical discussion is quite narrow, in two senses: it engages with very few phenomena, and it considers only rival theoretical interpretations that are closely related. In addition, the analysis does not seem very predictive (eg CORE, non-grammatical features are exactly those allowing for doubly-filled slots, but this does not descend from any principle; inflectional affixes obviously don't change lexical category, but nothing in the system makes this necessary; the fact that the features of the head cannot be overridden by those of the base (3.4.2.4) is certainly predicted by the general condition that the head determines the features of the word, but this is simply what is meant by "morphological head").

Overall, then, the paper cannot be faulted for not making a novel contribution; but the extent to which is actually breaks new ground is quite limited.

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 examples themselves are correctly presented and analyzed. The main shortcoming of the paper as a whole lies in its narrow focus. However, some

reservations arise also in connection with the presentation of the empirical base.

While there are no low-level inaccuracies in the way the data are presented (and incidentally the paper is remarkably free from typos and well edited, aside from the puzzling lack of page numbers), the way the phenomena are analyzed is sometimes problematic.

What is called the ARGUMENT slot refers in fact to properties of subevents as well as to those of their arguments; eg (14) specifies the two ARGUMENTS both as 'agent' and 'theme' and as 'activity' and 'change of state', where only the former two apply to the arguments because the latter two characterize the event type.

In Tree 3 A, the base 'moderno' is associated with a single ARGUMENT slot; I cannot see how this, being its only such slot, can be formally identified as ARGUMENT II. The only argument is also the most prominent, so it should be ARGUMENT I according to the relational, non-inherent definition of external arguments adopted. The point is substantive and not just notational, because the analysis aims at improving on arbitrary coindexations (indeed this is a strength of the approach), but calling the single ARGUMENT slot 'II' here amounts to coindexing with the head's ARGUMENT II. This is not so much a fault in the theoretical analysis, as in the interpretation of the data to be analyzed.

In Tree 2, it is puzzling to see 'demolición' analyzed as ending up as a single-argument nominalization, with the loss (actually in this framework, lack of projection) of the causer argument; surely the external argument can be expressed in cases like 'mi demolición de la nave'? ('demolición involuntaria' might also be viewed as evidence for the semantic if not syntactic projection of the agent event).

It is at this level that the paper can indeed be criticized for being inaccurate; not in matters of formal presentation, but in the shallow and sometimes downright inadequate way the data are presented to the theoretical interpretation.

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 argument is coherent and sound; it lends itself to conceptual objections, but within its theoretical assumptions, it is not particularly problematic, as there are no blatant contradictions or non-sequiturs.

However, it is unsatisfactory as a whole for two problems that compound each

other: empirically, it fails to engage with very relevant phenomena, and theoretically, it fails to engage with very relevant alternative approaches.

To illustrate the first shortcoming, there is first of all no discussion at all of Aktionsart and event types. This is a major gap given that this is one parameter distinguishing lexical items from each other ('write' - 'write up') but it is also determined by the grammatical structure ('run' - 'run oneself ragged') and even by encyclopaedic information ('push a button' - 'push a cart').

Besides, the paper does not discuss exocentric compounds, or compounds in general, only mentioning them in the close as a topic for further research; but this makes the whole theoretical proposal significantly weaker, since accounting for headless complex words is precisely what one would want to see explained by a precise account of how the meaning of a complex word arises from that of its parts.

Finally, the whole analysis seems to assume a 1-to-1 relation between the morphological constituents of a lexical item and an interpretation, ignoring the polysemy of forms like 'formation' (argument-structure nominal or result description of a concrete referent) or of participles ('my reading of the book / my reading the book / while reading / some readings'). (Incidentally, participles raise unanswered questions about the idea that a complex word ends up with only one categorial feature profile.)

The theoretical limitation is more serious. The paper argues for a specific variant of lexicalist and item-and-arrangement analysis, within a PA approach. What weakens it is not so much that it only mentions the existence of non-lexicalist alternatives without minimally engaging with them, as the fact that it does not engage with the whole empirical dimension that challenges a purely lexicalist approach. The polysemy of morphological elements (a fundamental motivation for Beard's Lexeme-Morpheme base Morphology, cited and briefly mentioned); the relative independence of morphosyntactic and morphological units (Aronoff 1976, 1994); the fact that the lexical choice of verb and theme underdetermines the Aktionsart of a VP (amply discussed in Borer 2005b and in much previous literature); the very existence of morphological operations across lexical items (cf. 4.1 'Morphology is what occurs inside the lexicon, below the word level') like case and agreement; these are just the most obvious challenges to a purely lexicalist perspective which are not addressed, indeed not even mentioned. Importantly, this does not mean that the paper should have provided a defense of lexicalism. Assuming one approach is perfectly legitimate. But inevitably the argument loses credibility if it does not address fundamental questions that have emerged in the scientific debate (something that lexicalist contributions can certainly do, as shown eg by Williams'

'Dumping lexicalism').

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

Borer, Hagit. 2005a. In name only. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Borer, Hagit. 2005b. The normal course of events. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Borer, Hagit. 2013. Taking form. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harley, Heidi. 2012a. Semantics in Distributed Morphology. In C. Maienborn, K. von Stechow and P. Portner (eds), *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning*, Volume 3. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Harley, Heidi 2012b. Lexical decomposition in modern generative grammar. In W. Hinzen, M. Werning and E. Machery (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Compositionality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harley, Heidi. 2015. The syntax-morphology interface. In A. Alexiadou and T. Kiss (eds), *Syntax, Theory and Analysis: An International Handbook*, Vol II. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Williams, Edwin. 2007. Dumping lexicalism. In G. Ramchand and C. Reiss (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Interfaces*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

(The author is certainly familiar with this and related literature; it is listed here to illustrate the kind of non-lexicalist literature alluded to.)

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]

- a more accurate description of the argument- and event structure (in particular what is meant by ARGUMENT), including Aktionsart
- at least some discussion of how compounds can be integrated in this analysis, most specifically exocentric ones;
- at least some discussion of systematically polysemous complex words (like

English gerunds, see above)

- a broader theoretical discussion that would place of the proposal in a context that includes constructionist as well as lexicalist approaches
- a more explicit account of how ARGUMENT slots are categorized as 'I' or 'II' (see above)

If you reject the paper, do you have any suggestions for how to improve it? [max 500 words]-----