Review by Anonymous

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

Yes, the paper analyses Spanish causatives adopting (i) Belletti's analysis of causatives and the proposal that the lexical verb and its object moves as VP, (ii) Baker and Vinokurova's (2010) proposal that case can be assigned in two different ways to explain Spanish-internal variation.

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]*

Data are rich and exhaustive. Most data are taken from Ordonez and Saab's recent work. It is however not clear in which respect the analysis proposed by the author differs from Ordonez and Saab's analysis.

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 paper is clearly written, and the argumentation is sound. There is however one major flaw in the argumentation. The possibility to display preverbal causees is related on page 16 to the VSO word order found in Spanish vs. the other Romance languages and on page 21 to the availability of assigning dative case by the Appl head (which however only holds in Catalonian Spanish). It is not clear how the construction is possible at all in general Spanish (which is the variety analysed in the paper, as in claimed on page 3). I think that correlating preverbal causees with VSO is a good move because this is a major difference between Spanish and the other Romance languages, but the proposal should be spelled out more clearly. Since VSO is also found in Romanian, it would be interesting to know if the word order in (7b) is also possible in Romanian.

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

I do not think so.

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]

Page 4: I wonder whether another analysis would be possible: the postverbal causee sits in specvP and the preverbal causee sits in specTP, with no need to assume PredP and CauseeP.

Page 6: "This suggest that dropping a is a sign of in situ": I would not use the term "dropping a" but rather the more neutral "lack of a".

Page 8: it is claimed that causeeP triggers a topicality effect but no evidence is provided that the relevant feature is indeed Topic.

Page 14: When the author analyses clitic climbing, he/she only mentions the object clitic, but the dative clitic also moves. Clitic climbing affects the clitic cluster "me lo". Furthermore, it is not clear that the ungrammaticality of (41b) is indeed due to intervention.

Page 16: Baker and Vinokurova's (2010) proposal about case assignment should be presented before applying it to causatives.

Page 17: The author suddenly starts analyzing Catalonian Spanish without having presented the data before. In addition, the Catalonian Spanish data can be presented as a further argument for the causee head.

Page 18: In (51a), it is not clear why le = a Juan. It should be le = a nadie. Or am I missing something here?

Page 19: "If agree is assigned by an applicative head": I guess that what is meant is "If case is assigned by an applicative head via Agree".