

Review by Antonio Fábregas

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

Yes. It provides an integrated theory about the position of causee arguments within Romance languages that addresses their position in the better understood varieties.

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, to the best of my knowledge the Spanish data are correct and I have no reasons to suspect the data from other languages.

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. My only worry is about the possible intervention effect in §4, where it is argued that '*¿Qué no le hiciste a nadie leer?' is out due to the 'a nadie' constituent being in spec, CauseeP. My worry comes from the idea that 'what' presumably has additional features (wh) that 'nobody' lacks, so in relativised minimality terms one should not intervene for the other. I guess the assumption that the author(s) make(s) is that negative indefinites contain the structure corresponding to wh pronouns or that wh and neg are non distinct for purposes of probing, but I think that assumption should be somehow motivated, particularly when proper names can also trigger it. Note that an alternative explanation could be that the preinfinitival position is informationally marked and that clashes with the all topic status of the non wh elements in an interrogative.

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

To the best of my knowledge, the DOM extension for preinfinitival causees was noted first by Torrego (Variability in the Case Patterns of Causative Formation in Romance and Its Implications (pp. 445-470), LI 41(3) <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40926388>).

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]

Cf. above.