

Review by Lukas Denk

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

The paper makes a novel contribution to the field of nominal classification. The data supports the evidence that human unique nouns functionally behave like an intermediate category between human proper and common nouns.

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 author(s) back up their claims by giving cross-linguistic evidence. The evidence stems from reference grammars/descriptions of the languages. The language examples and surveys are sufficient to support the hypothesis for a preliminary cross-linguistic placing of human unique nouns.

Examples should be glossed consistently throughout (also the Romance examples, if the author(s) want to reach readers who are not familiar with Romance languages). Some abbreviations are missing (e.g. , SM1S; DJ, ...). The author(s) should revise the glossing accordingly. Here are the Leipzig Glossing Rules that could be consulted: <https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/pdf/Glossing-Rules.pdf>

The data in Table 2 suggests that the distinction between lack and presence of DOM is meaningful. Author(s) should justify this distinction or choose one column, either lack or presence of DOM.

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 arguments are soundly presented and justified by sufficient sources. I appreciate the typological introduction into the topic. While the interpretation of data in Balearic Catalan is novel and critical to the interpretation of the status of human unique nouns, I would recommend elaborating on why the author(s)'s analysis is better than the one provided by Ledgeway (2012). One solution would be to provide examples from Balearic Catalan that show this semantic behavior. Examples from Bernstein et al. (2021) could be also given at the end of Section 3.

The author(s) use the key term 'properhood', but I miss a definition in the introductory section. Please add an explanation of what the author(s) mean by 'properhood'.

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

No. This article provides, to my knowledge, sufficient references.

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 advise (you are not required to proofread the paper) [max 500 words]

I will list some suggestions that are peripheral to the main topic.

p. 2 line 15: please indicate the language of these examples. I'm assuming it is Frisian.

p. 8: Author(s) invoke Nichols and Bickel's (2013) distinction 'head vs. dependent marking'. I'm assuming this refers to the publication in WALS, because this reference is not listed. The author(s) characterize French possessive constructions as 'dependent marking' since 'the possessor noun carries the marker.' However, the prepositions *de/à* are not affixes that are attached to nouns. Yet Nichols and Bickel (2013) classify appositional marking as dependent marking. Therefore, I would suggest to write 'the possessor noun phrase exhibits the marker'.

p. 9: "This implies that in Old French, juxtaposition was obligatory not only with personal names but also with human unique nouns." If something is obligatory, one would expect a 100 % rate of instances in use. If the rate is very high (say, 99%), one would have to explain the outliers as 'mistakes' such as typos etc. I would suggest that the author(s) don't use 'obligatory' as an attribute but 'highly conventional' or a similar phrasing.

p. 11: I would cite a source for the following claim: "Unique nouns have lexical meaning while proper names are devoid of it". It seems that the author(s) introduce this claim in the discussion. I could imagine shifting this semantic explanation to the introductory section.

Finally, I would like to mention some minor inaccuracies that caught my attention.

Author(s) use the terms 'juxtaposition' and 'juxtaposition' interchangeably. I would suggest the use of the word 'juxtaposition' since this is the correct English spelling.

p. 10: 'article literary' > change to 'article literari'

p. 11 'has been in disputed issue' > change to 'has been a disputed issue'

p. 11: 'the morphosyntactic behavior in Old Spanish, Old French, and Romanian' > change to 'The morphosyntactic behavior in these languages.'