

Review by Alexandra Simonenko

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

Yes, the paper presents a very thorough and original study of non-maximal definites in a corpus of Old Spanish and a fieldwork-based corpus of Francoprovençal. The data are novel and important for the understanding of the typology of the semantics of definites in Romance. The main contribution is a careful application of a battery of tests to the data in order to distinguish the phenomenon in question from other types of definites.

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]*

Yes, as far as I can see the quantitative aspects are solid and the data provenance is carefully presented.

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]*

Yes.

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

This is not entirely central to the discussion, but I think that justice hasn't been done to the literature on (the Latin demonstrative) ille. The author only mentions Selig 1992, while there is a series of more recent important works on the subject by Carlier and De Mulder (I mention below only one, other papers should be easy to find). There is also a more recent paper by Danckaert, Haegeman, and Prévost discussing the semantics of ille. The discussion of ille in the paper is cursory and I'm afraid can be misleading, presenting it as a "textual relief" device, rather than a full-fledged long-distance anaphora/distal deixis demonstrative it appears to be based on the broader literature.

Carlier A, De Mulder W (2010) The emergence of the definite article in Late Latin: ille in competition with ipse. In: Cuykens H, Davidse K, de Lanotte LV (eds) Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization, Mouton De Gruyter, The Hague, pp 241–275
Danckaert, Lieven and Haegeman, Liliane and Prévost, Sophie (2021) How lexical merger can drive grammaticalization. Journal of Historical Syntax 5(16-25):1–34

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]

I suggest only very minor revisions, as the paper reads very well and makes an important contribution to the field as is.

In addition to a more careful discussion of *ille*, I think it is worth discussing explicitly the possibility of a partitive analysis for ROI. The author already mentions that there is a sort of alternation between ROI and DE nominals/partitive definites, so the question of whether ROI and partitives are amenable to the same analysis begs itself.