

Review 1

Page numbering starts with the title page as page 1. This is a nice paper that discusses some interesting data and the analysis seems reasonable.

The main element for which I would suggest changes is the discussion of the tense-aspect model assumed (esp. pages 7 and following). The author defines "tense" as the relation between E and R, and "aspect" as the relation between R and S. As I recall Reichenbach '47 and Kamp and Reyle, this does not precisely correlate with the proposals made in either. For Reichenbach the E R relation was certainly temporal, but "aspect" in the most common sense in which it is used in linguistics, i.e. for the perfective/imperfective opposition, was a separate property of E (which is how you get the aspectual difference between "Alan has done" and "Alan has been doing", both E-R,S). And for Reichenbach the R S relation correlates with what we would now call tense (so the simple past in English is E,R-S, I believe). For Kamp and Reyle, "aspect" is the relation between E and R, and tense is the relation between R and S (or P, which does not get mentioned in this paper).

In any case, Kamp and Reyle's "Reichenbachian" model of Tense-aspect is not the same as Reichenbach's, and the author should make clear precisely how his model correlates with / differs from both R's and K&R's (and possibly others).

This is important given the author's analysis of -on as an aspectual marker, and a completive/perfective aspectual marker at that. The assumed t-a properties [E-R,S] (page 10) are not strictly speaking "perfective" under either Reichenbach's or Kamp/Reyle's models. In the latter model, "anterior" would be a better label. Under the author's assumption that the E R relation is tense, it would seem more like -on is a tense marker than an aspect marker, or in fact marking both tense(E-R) and aspect (R,S).

On page 12 the same properties [E-R,S] are called "stative", which is a bit confusing (also page 18). Also on page 12 it was unclear to me what the formal difference was between the "still" construction with =fa and mere absence of -on. From the discussion, they both seem to have the property [E,R,S]. On page 15 aspect is described as being about both the E R and R S relations, which doesn't fit with what is said elsewhere. In addition, the relevant features of -on are variously given as [E-R,S] and [E-S,R]; one should be consistent.

It would also be good to reference other LFG works that use a formal tense-aspect model; for example Haug's paper in LFG08, which adopts Wolfgang Klein's model (essentially the same as Kamp and Reyle's just with different labels, this should probably also be referenced). Other papers that could be referenced for formalizations of tense-aspect in LFG:

Bary, Corien and Haug, Dag. 2011. "Temporal anaphora across and inside sentences: the function of participles", *Semantics and Pragmatics* 4, article 8.

Fry, John. 2005. Resource-logical Event Semantics for LFG. Draft MS, based on a paper originally presented at LFG99, Manchester. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.84.6503&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Lowe, John. 2012. The Syntax and Semantics of Tense-Aspect Stem Participles in Early Rgvedic Sanskrit. D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford.

There are many more general discussions of Reichenbachian tense-aspect, some of which should be referenced, see the following with references: Kiparsky, Paul, 2002, "Event Structure and the Perfect", in *The Construction of Meaning*, edd. D. Beaver et al., CSLI, 113-136.

In addition, I would be wary of comparing the properties of -on too closely with the English present perfect, which is notoriously problematic. For example although "John has lived in Bali" can imply that the event of living has ceased (page 10), you can also say "John has lived in Bali for 5 years" with the implication that he still does. There are so many discussions of the English perfect and its many nuances that something ought to be referenced, at least. Or perhaps it would be better to omit comparison with such a controversial formation. In the same vein, I don't think the first sentence on page 18 is necessarily true: tense-aspect is pretty rich in English, actually ("I will have been working", and similar things).

Particularly given that almost no one knows anything about Marori, it would be really useful to have all the abbreviations used in the glosses and tables gathered in a footnote near the start of the document. Many of the glosses can be figured out, but some I have no idea what they might be. Some abbreviations are also used in the text without explanation. For example TNS on pages 2, 8 and 15 is not explained anywhere.

I didn't understand the sentence immediately before ex. (1). Should "Certain verbs" read "Certain lexical predicates", given that verb has just been used to refer to auxiliaries that are inflected for TAM anyway?

Some discussion of the allomorphs / allophonic realizations of -on would be helpful. So in ex. (12a) the form is -won, without explanation, while in (14) it is -en and -wen, again without explanation.

On p.19, I'm not sure whether making the IO equation optional is the way to go: how do you ensure it applies when -on is part of a PREDLINK and doesn't when it isn't? A disjunction might work better, i.e. saying "either I'm not the value of PREDLINK, or my PREDLINK's T-A must be etc etc."

The reference to Arka 2013 is not very helpful, unless there is a link to a handout or draft MS that can be added. The Arka 2011 reference isn't in standard form for an LFG proceedings reference, and Attia 2008, Dalrymple et al 2004 and Sadler/Nordlinger 2001 all appear in the respective proceedings, so should be referenced as such.

Language/typos:

Abstract, line 1: presents > discusses DONE

Abstract, line 3: local coding > coding local DONE

Abstract, line 4: to > on DONE

Abstract, line 11: is quite different > are quite different DONE

Page 2, lines 2 and 3 of main text: (Sadler and Nordlinger 2001) and (Nordlinger and Sadler 2004) > Sadler and Nordlinger (2001) and Nordlinger and Sadler (2004) DONE

Page 2, line 7 of main text: semantics the nominal > semantics of the nominal DONE

Page 3, line 11: -on should be italicized.DONE

Page 3: the footnotemark for footnote 1 is the wrong side of the full stop. DONE

Page 4, 3rd line after fig. 1: the dash between 2-3 should be an en-dash. Also page 8, line 8, and page 8, 3rd line from bottom, and between page numbers in the references on page 21.
DONE

Page 6, line 2 of section 3: obligatory > obligatorily
DONE

Page 6, line 3 of sec 3: imposes > impose
DONE

Page 7, line 1: Riechenbahcian > a Reichenbachian
DONE

Page 7, 6th line before fig. 2: nonsymmetrial > nonsymmetrical
DONE

Page 8, line 4: this line is hard to understand and should be reworded.

DONE

Page 8, line 7: diagrams > diagram

DONE

Page 8, line 11: using or the > using the

DONE

Page 8, line 14: use > used; on > one

DONE

Page 9, line 1-2 (after ex. (7)): comes from > is evidenced by

DONE

Page 9, line 3: becoming > coming

DONE

Page 9, line 5: delete "with"

DONE

Page 9, line 7: macro present > macropresent

DONE

Page 9, first line after ex. (8): (8)b > (8b). The same occurs repeatedly throughout.

DONE

Page 9, 3rd line after ex. (8): becoming > coming

DONE

Page 10, example (10b): something has gone wrong with the glossing in this example.

Done

Page 10, line 4 of sec 4: delete "marked"

DONE

Page 10, penultimate line: ny > by

DONE

Page 11, example (13a): beer used > beer that used

DONE

Page 11, example (14): -PST > -CPLT (x2)

DONE

Page 12, line 3: (E > (E)

DONE

Page 12, line 9: within NP > within the NP

DONE

Page 12, line 10: within NP > within an NP

DONE

Page 12, line 13: outline the > outline my

DONE

Page 12, line 14: finding > findings

DONE

Page 12, line 17: from > form

DONE

Page 12, line before (17): nominal > nominals

DONE

Page 12, footnote 4: -fa > =fa (x2) and the second of these needs to be italicized. Also in this footnote cominative > comitative / combinative??

DONE.

Page 12, footnote 5: full stop missing.

DONE.

Page 13, first sentence of sec 5: I suggest rewording the sentence to: "This section discusses the morphosyntactic constraints imposed by -on on clausal TAM in Marori."

DONE

Page 13, 4th line before ex. (20): -on needs italicizing

DONE

Page 14, sentence before ex. (23): with NP > with an NP

DONE

Page 14, last sentence: or it is > or is

DONE

Page 15, line 2: context > contexts

DONE

Page 15, line 5: is > are

DONE

Page 15, second paragraph of sec 6: most of this paragraph is a direct repeat of the first paragraph of section 1.

DONE: the paragraph has been revised.

Page 15, line 9: semantics the nominal > semantics of the nominal

DONE: the line has been deleted.

Page 15, line 10: Nordligner > Nordlinger and Norlinger > Nordlinger

DONE

Page 15, line 10: typology, > typology),

DONE: this line has been deleted

Page 15, line 9 of 3rd paragraph: categories in Marori is > in Marori is

DONE

Page 16, line 3: nominal > Nominal

DONE

Page 16, line 3 of 3rd para: exemplified Sadler > exemplified in Sadler

DONE

Page 16, line 6 of 4th para: state which example, it isn't obvious

DONE: examples (20a-b) are made explicit here

Page 17, 1st line after fig 3: stative-durative > stative durative
DONE

Page 17, line 11 of same para: Proposional > Propositional
DONE

Page 18: there is inconsistency between "sta-complt" in (25b), "sta-CPLT" in the text below (25b), and "sta-cplt" on page 19.
FIXED

Page 18, line 4 after (25b): E, S,R overlap > E, S and R overlap
DONE

Page 18, line 6 after (25b): its > the
DONE

Page 18, fn 7: delete 2nd "in Marori"
DONE

Page 19, line 1: the case the > the case where the
DONE

Page 19, line 4 after (26): (PREDLINK > ((PREDLINK
DONE

Page 19, example (28): the example number should be the same page as the example.
DONE

Page 20, 1st line of sec 7: interpretations > interpretation
DONE

Page 20, line 5 of sec 7: remains to be the > remains the
DONE

Page 20, line 14 of sec 7: former should be italicized
DONE

Page 20, line 15 of sec 7: noun > nouns
DONE

Page 20, line 19 of sec 7: account the > account for the
DONE

Page 21, Reichenbach reference: York:: > York:
DONE

Throughout:

Word (I assume) has "corrected" dashes to hyphens (or whatever) intermittently before suffixes. E.g. the first dash vs. the second and third in footnote 3, or the two occurrences of -on in the last paragraph of page 14 are particularly obvious.
DONE

There is inconsistency in using "and" or "&" in references: e.g. both "Nordlinger and Sadler" and "Nordlinger & Sadler" occur.
DONE

Formatting issues:

On the title page, I think the text should be larger and all the lines lower for the "standard" look.

DONE

The footnotes, most of page 19, and the references are all flush left; they should be justified.

There are inconsistencies in the font used. A font that looks like Arial Unicode appears in the references, and some examples and tables: table 1, examples 2, 3, 4 (I think?), 20b, perhaps others. These should all be changed to the font used in the rest of the document.

DONE

Review 2

Review of "Nominal Aspect in Maori"

This is a nice paper which does a good job of describing a new

empirical phenomenon and providing a formal analysis of it.

p. 1 (title page) --- the author, affiliation etc information is too small. The font size needs to be bigger and the information should be further down on the page so it does not look quite so lop-sided.

DONE

p. 2 Abstract -- TAM --> TAM (Tense-Aspect-Mood)

DONE

p. 2 Acknowledgement FN -- put after first sentence of the paper.

KEEP IT AS IT IS: LOOK BETTER

p. 2 (Sadler and Nordlinger 2001) --> Sadler and Nordlinger (2001)

(Nordlinger and Sadler 2004) --> Nordlinger and Sadler (2004)

DONE

Note that you use "and" here, but "&" elsewhere. Please standardize.

DONE

p. 2 is debate --> is a debate

DONE

p. 2 FN right justify the footnote so that the right margin is not ragged. This also applies to the other footnotes in the paper.

p. 3 -on --> italices

p. 3 cut (i.e. intransitive subject (S) ...) and (S, object ...)

I find this very confusing since it collapses unergatives and unaccusatives and objects. I find FN 2 clearer. You could also say right here in addition that you will be differentiating between Sa and Sp.

DONE

p. 3 receives prefix --> receives prefixed

DONE.

p. 3 Footnote 1 mark should come after the period, not before.

DONE

p. 3 and onwards -- Things like "Figure 1" and "Table 1" appear to be in a different font than the rest of the text. Please go through your entire text and make sure it is all in the same font.

DONE

p. 5 Tables 2 and 3 -- these are too small

DONE

p. 5 S.p or Sp?

DONE: S.p

p. 5 (2) =i is sometimes glossed as U and sometimes as O. Which is right? And what does it mean anyway?

DONE, I have made it =U consistently.

p. 5 (2) Aux. --> Aux
DONE.

p. 5 S.a or Sa?

p. 6 Sa or S.a?
DONE: S.a

p. 6 obligatory --> obligatorily
DONE

p. 7 Riechenbahcian --> Reichenbachian
DONE

p. 7 Note that Kamp and Reyle rework Reichenbach's original proposal somewhat. You should be clear on which you are assuming.

DONE: a new footnote (i.e., footnote 4) is added.

p. 7 Figure 2 -- too small
DONE: I have made it bigger

p. 9 select with different --> select different
DONE

p. 10 (10b) -- fix the example
DONE

p. 11 (14a) fix the example
DONE

p. 12 - and on are separated
DONE

p. 12 There are formal ways of expressing "still" and "no longer".
Why not use these?
DONE: leave it informally like that

p. 12 (16) =fa is marked as a clitic, but STILL is marked as a morpheme. Fix.
DONE

p. 12 in nominal --> in nominals
DONE

p. 12 (18) extra space before CPLT
DONE

p. 13 - and on are separated
DONE

p. 13 presents morphosyntactic --> presents the morphosyntactic
DONE

p. 13 (19) fix example
DONE

p. 13 there is syntactic --> there is a syntactic

DONE

p. 13 -on in italics

DONE

p. 14 'dur', 'now' seem too informal -- can you use something more formal?

[???

p. 14 (21b) the single quotes are the wrong way on "dur" and "yesterday"

FIXED

p. 15 Sadler's typology --> Sadler's typology)

FIXED

p. 15 I thought tense was expressed by the relation between R and S? [???], ORIGINALLY IN REICH: PAST PERFECT IS PAST IN THE PAST

p. 16 Proposional --> Propositional

p. 18 I think it would be better to have the following attributes and values (this was discussed in ParGram many years ago and there is a blueprint available on the ParGram wiki)

TNS pres, past, fut

REMOTE +/-

AKTIONSART stative, dynamic

EVENT-EXECUTION dur, complete

That way you don't create singular values, but use a recurring feature space and combine it in different ways.

DONE: an additional footnote is given.

p. 18 (25) "is sick" is usually thought of as something stative, not something dynamic. How is this dynamic, exactly?

DONE: a footnote is added

p. 19 second paragraph -- ragged margins

FIXED

References -- these seem to be in a different font from the rest of the paper, please fix.

Please change all the references to the LFG proceedings papers to:

In Proceedings of LFGXX, M. Butt and T.H. King (eds)....

DONE

Take out the "no." from the journal references.

DONE

New York:: --> New York:

DONE