

Review by Alexandru Nicolae

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

Yes, it does. The paper proposes a well-grounded theoretical analysis of the difference in distribution of "se" in Spanish in Romanian. An account of the double "se" construction (grammatical in Romanian, ungrammatical in Spanish) also follows from this general analysis.

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, with respect to the Romanian data, the empirical content of the paper is sound. (I am not specialist in Spanish, I cannot evaluate how sound the Spanish data are, but I assume they are, as they are mostly drawn from reference works).

However, I have three observations on this point:

- 1) Translations are provided also for ungrammatical (starred) examples; I highly recommend adding "(intended)" / "(intended meaning)" in front of these translations. Here is a list: (2a), (3a), (4b), (18a), (19a), (21d), (22a), (28), (39b),
- 2) There are a series of typos and orthographic inconsistencies in the Romanian examples; I have attached a document with necessary corrections.
- 3) a and b are disarranged (b comes before a).

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 in the paper is fully coherent and sound.

Below I list a few points that can help improve or at least nuance some of the points in the paper.

- 1) I think that the raising analysis (pursued in Cotfas (2011) and in Nicolae (2013, 2016)) is too easily dismissed. Note that these authors make a division between raising and control on the basis of the nature of the selecting verb, and (Romanian) aspectual verbs come out as raising verbs. Not incidentally, the

double "se" construction is available only with aspectual verbs and it is interpreted (at least in Nicolae 2013) as a form of "solidarity" between the voice specification of the higher aspectual verb and the selected subjunctive. On this point, I suggest that the domain of the double "se" construction should be more clearly stated (it occurs with aspectual verbs).

2) Section 3. It is stated that "control verbs in Romanian may select a subjunctive or infinitival complement". This is an overgeneralisation; control is also found with indicative complements; note that verbs like "a părea" ('seem'), may select both an indicative and a subjunctive (indicative: "Ion pare că pleacă" / subjunctive: "Ion pare să plece"), with subtle interpretative differences.

3) Example (27a). Singular agreement is not the only option; there is variation here, and the verb can as well be in the plural ("Erau estimate"), agreeing with "demonstrații" (pl.). Note that failure in agreement might not actually have to do with the nature of the embedded clause at all, but rather with the postverbal position of "demonstrații". Although according to normative grammars subject-predicate agreement in number is obligatory, it has been observed that verbs do not always undergo number agreement when the subject is postverbal; agreement may fail with postverbal conjoined subjects or even with DPs in the plural (see the discussion in the chapter on agreement in Pană Dindelegan & Maiden 2013). To cut a long story short, the set in (27) should be used with caution as a test.

4) A suggestion: the fact that Romanian has both a present and a perfect/past infinitive can also be construed as an argument in favour of the "more finite"/"closer to finiteness" nature of Romanian infinitives.

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

Pană Dindelegan, G. and Maiden, M. (eds) (2013) *The Grammar of Romanian*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Nicolae, Alexandru. "Constraints on aspectual complement ellipsis. The view from Romanian" *The Linguistic Review*, vol. 33, no. 4, 2016, pp. 611-647.

<https://doi.org/10.1515/tlr-2016-0017>

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 highly recommend publishing the paper; it is a true piece of scholarship that advances our knowledge in the field of control and "se" constructions in the Romance languages.

I think some points in the paper may be improved (or, rather, more nuanced), but this remains to be decided by the authors themselves.