

Review by Astrid de Wit

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

This strongly empirically driven paper offers a robust contribution to the analysis of the perfect across languages. On the one hand, its use of Translation Mining constitutes a strong case for the potential of this budding research field. On the other hand, the theoretical contribution of the paper is undeniable, as it offers a detailed account of the meaning ingredients of perfect constructions across languages and provides strong evidence for the continuum of meaning types that perfect constructions can take on. The theoretical analysis would perhaps even have been stronger had the authors also tried to explain why Figure 1 looks the way it does (i.e. why do some languages have more "conservative" perfects than others). At this point, the language cut-off points seem a bit arbitrary - yet I guess these kinds of explanations lie beyond the scope of the paper.

When it comes to novelty, one thing needs to be said though: it seems like this paper basically does the same thing as what the 2022 paper does, yet this time only concentrating on Romance languages. The 2022 paper also concludes that a continuum approach is preferable to a binary approach. I think that, in the final version, it should be made very explicit in what way this paper does more than "simply" look at other languages (or, in other words, why the Romance focus has "added value").

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]*

Translation Mining is a very promising field, and the authors make this very clear in their paper. The data analysis is also presented in a very reader friendly and methodologically sound manner. Some comments nonetheless:

- One thing that the authors have undoubtedly had defend multiple times already on different occasions, but don't really go into now, is the fact that the analysis is based on only one novel, which is relatively old and is characterized by special tense usage. Extra corroboration from Harry Potter is introduced here and there, but not systematically (and the fact that such corroboration will be introduced is not announced in Section 2.1). I would again defend this choice properly.
- The translations are from different time periods, and, as mentioned before, the novel is relatively old as well. One might say that syntax isn't very "capricious", but nonetheless one might question to what extent the analysis is (still) relevant for present-day varieties of the languages under consideration.
- The analysis is based on a study of the first three chapters of *L'Etranger*. In Section 2.3 it is mentioned, however, that the dataset (of the exceptions) is too small to draw any definitive conclusions. Would it have been so much additional work to tackle more than the first three chapters? I'm not saying the authors should have done more, but it might be good to defend the restriction to three chapters in the methodology section.
- Section 2.1 seems to suggest that the present perfect will be analyzed only through the lens of the *Passé Composé*. Yet later it becomes clear that other perfects (that don't appear in the translated *Passé*

Composés) are also analyzed. I think this is an important addition that should be mentioned in Section 2.1.

- Perhaps I missed something, but if Table 5 is only based on Chapter 1, make this clear right away.
- In the discussion of Table 1, it is said that lexical aspect determines to a large extent whether the English translation contains a simple past or a past continuous. But there are 105 simple past translations: are these really almost all stative?

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]*

Overall, the argument is very clear and sound. A few comments though:

- It isn't really clear why English needs to be taken as a starting point. The discussion in Section 1 suggests that the analysis starts from the well-known English usage types, but doesn't this meaning driven approach go against the form driven approach that is advocated in the paper. One may also wonder why English is relevant in this paper on Romance languages in the first place.
- On page 15, the authors mention that hodiernal reference is viewed as the "as the first step along the aorist drift". I would be careful with such diachronic claims on the basis of purely synchronic data (the conclusion speaks of a synchronic mirror of diachronic claims made by others, which is, I think, more compelling).
- In Section 3.4. I would immediately explain what is covered under the umbrella of "hodiernality".

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

To my knowledge, this paper does justice to the existing scholarship.

I do wonder whether a reference could be added to the special status of the English present perfect and its use in continuative contexts. I know this is not the focus of the study, but if English is a cross-linguistic outlier (also beyond Romance), and someone has observed this before, then perhaps this could be mentioned.

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 really, but the authors refer quite extensively to their own paper from 2022 (see above).

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 think this very good paper can certainly be accepted with minor revisions. The suggestions for changes I have are all specified above. In the attached pdf I'm also adding some (very) minor stylistic remarks. Example (14): the authors mention the fact that these structures must necessarily refer to present situations. I wonder if it would be possible to alter the time reference by means of an adverbial, e.g. ¿ú'l coche ayeri?. If so, how would we reconcile that with the bare T^o with a [+present] feature in these structures?

Page 9, 3rd paragraph, 5th line: there's a typo, it should be "explanation."

Example (25): my understanding is that topicalization is not an issue in Asturian because "ú" is in FocP which is lower than ForceP, where "ú" originates in Galician. Perhaps this could be said more explicitly in the explanation.

Page (14): authors mention the nasalization of -n and the end of words in Galician; Asturian does so too, however, I am not sure syllabification would behave the same way as in Galician in contexts like (26b); it might be worth checking :)

Example (31): authors explain how "ú" moves to FocP to check the [uq] feature in that head. I am assuming this same feature exists in these structures in Galician; nonetheless, "ú" merges in situ in Force°; how does the [uq] feature get checked then? Via Agree? This should be explained.

Example (33b): it should be "quéxase", with enclisis. A more natural order would be "quéxase tolos días."

Example (33c): it should be "cuentas."

Example (39) is the one that puzzled me the most. I agree with the authors in that that cliticization in the cases shown appears to be purely phonological. However, in this case, the determiner surfaces in its neuter form, as if the gender feature had been elided. I don't think this would be the case if the determiner were feminine ("la botella, ¿ú-la?"); is that correct? The authors suggest this might be a case of syntactic cliticization, like in Galician. How does this process come about? In Galician, it is explained that the D° undergoes head movement to f° (FP) below ForceP. Where exactly is FP located? Inside or outside TP? Below or above FocusP? Where would this functional projection be in Asturian? Even if this is explained, I am still intrigued as to why the determiner surfaces in the neuter form, presumably only in the masculine context. I have an inkling that perhaps the D° doesn't have a pro as a complement; instead, I think the NP has undergone ellipsis and, somehow, the gender feature in D° gets elided somehow as well. I think adopting a DM framework to analyze this phenomenon might be a fruitful one.