

**Reviewed by Maria Aurelia Cotfas**

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

Yes. It looks at (double) se-constructions in Spanish via a comparison to similar examples in Romanian (analyzed in previous work), by emphasizing the differences between the two languages (while in Romanian only a double se construction is allowed in the relevant contexts, in Spanish it is disallowed (the single se variant is required) This forces a re-evaluation of the previous claims made for Romanian and the data is convincingly accounted for by reference to various passive voice structures in Legate (2014). This, together with empirical evidence ((im)possibility of a by-phrase or DOMed direct objects) allows the author to associate, on the one hand, the Spanish se-constructions to Legate's impersonal/object voice pattern (the null EA also bears a D-feature, besides phi-features, making it a good candidate for control) and the Romanian se-constructions, on the other, to Legate's object passive (here, the null EA is in the right position to control, too (Spec, Voice), and is equally endowed with phi-features, but it lacks the crucial D-feature and hence the control relation fails. The empirical support data from various languages apply to the (distinct) behaviour of the two constructions in Spanish vs Romanian.

**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]**

There are no experiments or statistics involved, and the examples are clearly glossed and explained.

A little remark ref ex (16), which to my ears sounds odd (it would sound better with a "de către" by-phrase, and with indefinite DPs (rather than the personal pronoun))

(în această unitate), Vesela se spală numai de către personalul autorizat /de către fiecare soldat în parte. / de către toți soldații  
(in this facility/unit) crockery-the se wash-3sg/pl only by personnel-the authorized / by each soldier in part / by all soldiers

**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, the argument is clear and coherent, especially so in the first part. However, a few observations would be in order regarding the (analysis of the) Romanian data in section 3.

The claim that „control verbs in Romanian may select subjunctive or infinitival complements” is only true in Contemporary/Modern Romanian about dynamic can 'a putea'. This is the only verb which still shows free alternation between the two structures, both of which are temporally anaphoric and disallow disjoint subjects. Moreover, the infinitive selected in this instance is the bare infinitive (Romanian also has an a-infinitive (to-Inf), as well as a „de a – Inf” (with an infinitival complementizer, 'de', which is very productive in adjuncts)).

Significantly, this bare infinitive displays clear properties of restructuring (clitic climbing)

Ion poate cânta cântecul / Ion îl poate cânta.

Ion can-3sg sing-Inf song-the / Ion it-Acc.cl can-3sg sing-Inf

'Ion can sing the song.' / 'Ion can sing it'

As for the other so-called “control verbs” (attitude and non-attitude alike, i.e., volitional/desideratives (want, decide), as well as the semi-implicative 'try', the two-way implicative 'manage' AND aspectual verbs), they no longer (or very rarely) select the (a-)infinitive and, when they do, such instances are perceived as archaic or obsolete (even with aspectuals) Romanian Infinitives are highly productive as (temporal or purpose) adjuncts, as well as attributives (ideea de a pleca / idea-the de-Comp.Inf a-Inf go; 'the idea to go'), and in such contexts they do behave much like finite clauses, in that they can have their own subjects and display temporal independence.

In this respect therefore, Romanian behaves like other languages in the Balkan Sprachbund, which have lost the infinitive in complement position (to various extents, even completely) and unlike its West Romance sisters, which consistently select the infinitive exclusively in the relevant contexts.

Within the same logic, the claim in section 3.1. that “infinitival and subjunctive complements in Romanian are ambiguous in behaving as finite or non-finite” needs further clarification. In as much as the distribution of infinitives is restricted (as discussed above), this can be maintained for subjunctives, which do, indeed, display differences in point of how temporally independent they can be or whether they allow disjoint subjects (i.e., whether they can obviate control: the more independent they are, the more finite-like, the less

independent, the less finite like). This depends to a very large extent on the type of selecting verb. Cotfas (2011) showed that subjunctives selected by attitude verbs (volitional) as well as some implicatives and object control Vs can obviate control and display (various degrees of) temporal freedom. Conversely, subjunctives (and infinitives, when and if they do show up) selected by aspectual Vs are anaphoric both in terms of time and subject reference. While the former are dealt with as instances of No Control, cf. Landau (2013), the latter are analyzed as raising (Backward Agree) – due to the fact that Ro is pro-drop and does not require pre-verbal subjects or the raising of the post-verbal DP subject to sentence-initial position. As noted in fn 3 also, disjoint subjects are disallowed with aspectuals and modals

As such, (23) features a Free-subjunctive (selected by a volitional verb), where No Control is at stake so disjointedness is expected (and hence the behaviour of the infinitive complement more like a finite compl); likewise for (24).

In keeping with the above, the null subject analyzed as PRO in both (25a) and (25b) does not behave similarly in the two examples: the former is a control construction with an aspectual verb which selects controlled/anaphoric complements (infinitive or subjunctive). As such, the embedded subject does not allow alternation with lexical (disjoint) subjects and hence has to be a PRO (in as much as this is control and not backward raising/agree, in which case the unique/shared main clause subject could appear within the complement). The latter is null subject in an adjunct infinitival, which are known to be freer (temporally and in point of subject reference). This time a disjoint embedded subject could be merged, without obtaining ungrammaticality, which shows that the null embedded subject does not behave like a controlled PRO, but rather like a controlled pro.

To conclude, the claim that „infinitival clauses do not display uniform behavior and may behave as a finite or nonfinite clause.” (pg14 of article) does not apply equally to all types of infinitives in Romanian. It might be true for those in adjunct positions or for subject clauses, but not for the (very) few occurrences in object positions to aspectual verbs or modal can. The former (a-infinitives) are temporally anaphoric and disallow disjoint subjects, the former (bare infinitives) yield restructuring structures, as already shown. So both display unambiguous and uniform non-finite-like behaviour.

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

NO

**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]**

Further clarification would be welcome, space allowing, w.r.t. to the following (3) aspects.

1.

Ref (18a), prima facie it would seem that its ungrammaticality results from lack of agreement between the singular verb and the plural theme, as argued is impossible in Romanian (which lacks impersonal passives)). However, even if plural agreement appeared on the verb, the DOMed direct object would still be ungrammatical, in conformity with the claim being made.

But the example becomes grammatical with non DOMEed DP themes (and plural agreement):

În această școală se pedepsesc elevi(i) / mulți elevi /elevii rebeli

in this school se punish-3.pl pupils(-the) many pupils / pupils-the rebellious-masc.pl

'In this school, they punish many pupils/rebellious pupils // many pupils/rebellious pupils are punished.'

The ungrammaticality of (18a) can also be accounted for along the lines adopted by Giurgea 2019 (also cited in G&C 2021): personal pronouns, proper names and some animate DPs are [+Person] and need to be DOMed (as well as Clitic Doubled) when used as objects. Giurgea 2019 uses such examples as an argument for the existence of a null EA in se-constructions in Ro, which is also endowed with [Person] specification. T on the verb checks the [Person] on the null EA, leaving the same feature on these DOMed Themes unchecked (hence their ungrammaticality)

So, is it then the case - under the adopted analysis - that only DOMed D.Os (i.e., their [+Person] feature) depend on saturated EAs (i.e., bearing a D-feature), whereas non-DOMed ones may appear with non-saturated EAs (ones bearing just phi-features, but not the D feature)?

2.

Ref claims made in Cotfas 2021, they were made for infinitive complements

functioning as subjects, not objects, and the property of being or not being endowed with phi-features (and thus behaving more or less like finite (subject) clauses) had to do with the necessity of matrix T to have both its [u-phi] and [uD] features checked. This could be achieved either via raising of the infinitive Subject (understood as Agreement, because raising per se is not at stake, as already observed) or via a (expletive) pro-CP chain. The former scenario describes the case of so-called Raising infinitives, devoid of phi-features; in these instances, both features on matrix T are satisfied by Raising (= Agreement) with the embedded DP). The latter scenario is at stake with Control infinitives, endowed with phi-features; these check u-phi on matrix T, whereas the null expletive checks [uD].

In the article, the broad claim is made that this could be adopted for all infinitive clauses, object ones alike.

However, object clauses (infinitival or otherwise) occupy a vP internal position and are arguably less nominal in nature or rather simply lack any such specification (empirical evidence for this is, for example, the presence of a determiner in Greek, with subject clauses, which is disallowed with clauses in object position, cf Roussou 1991); same goes for Russian, too, probably for other languages as well). With object clauses, matrix T has its features saturated by the matrix Subject DP.

So, it is not immediately straightforward how, why or under what exact conditions they (i.e., object infinitives) would (not) be specified differently (in terms of phi-features). Maybe this could be clarified a little bit better, if possible.

3.

Ref ex (32): according to the analysis adopted here, since both the matrix and the embedded clause have an unsaturated null EA, both should allow, in principle, their own (independent) by-phrase. That is, something along the lines if (i) below would be predicted or expected to be correct:

(i) S- a început de către guvern/guvernânți a se aduce/să se aducă îmbunătății de către specialiști.

se has begun by government /leaders to se bring /sbj se bring improvements by specialists

Are such examples possible/naturally occurring? Are they accepted by native speakers?

They sound odd, due to the semantics of the aspectual, which presupposes a single event across the two predicates (whose incipient part is asserted), hence the necessity of a shared/unique subject (like the non-se (control or raising – depending on the analysis adopted) counterparts)

Conversely, disjointedness (either with or without double se) is to be expected

in (38), with 'decide', which is not an OC/EC verb and freely allows its complements to obviate control.

If examples of the type in (i) are disallowed, how would "accidental co-reference" work here, more exactly, to make sure that the (two) by-phrases/the two null EAs denote the same set of (human) individuals?

The examples under analysis involve control verbs, whereas the co-reference in (37) is between a main clause and an adjunct, and co-reference is not obligatory, in as much as examples of the type in (37) freely allow disjointedness ("When people are hungry, prices soar/companies take advantage", etc.), whereas 32 does not.