

Review by Anonymous

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

This article presents an analysis of *fàchere* constructions in Sardinian, placing emphasis on a pattern which the author calls impersonal (weak) causatives. The topic is of considerable empirical and theoretical interest and therefore the article is in principle a welcome addition to the literature on *fàchere* in Sardinian, which, as the author states, is scarce. Although the topic is of great interest, my view is that the article needs major revision. Two kinds of problem motivate this evaluation, concerning exposition and argumentation, on the one hand, and content, on the other.

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]*

The evidence consists of second-hand data, whose sources are duly acknowledged. An issue that the author should bear in mind when rewriting the article is that they should not refer to Nuorese as Logudorese. This issue arises when they discuss Michael Jones' (1993) data. Some of the abbreviations in the glosses are not drawn from the Leipzig site or explained in the article. This is clearly necessary.

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]*

Starting with exposition, the article is fragmented, ridden with typos and peculiar expressions which do not work in idiomatic English, and simply not conceived of in a reader friendly way. To give one example, the reader is often asked to jump back and forth to (re)consider examples that are not instead given in the right place. Following the journal's instructions for reviewers, I will not say more on presentational issues. However, I recommend that once revised the article should be read by a native-speaker linguist (and proofreading before submission is courteous). A serious issue to do with exposition is that the article does not lay out the hypotheses and claims in a strong form: I will return to this point when I discuss the content.

Content wise, the core claim is that impersonal (weak) causatives with *fàchere* come in two guises: a properly impersonal structure with a "subject" (or argument?) CP, whereby *fàchere* figures in 3rd person singular, and another structure, which is not strictly speaking impersonal, in that the internal argument of the infinitival CP moves to a subject position of the main clause. In this case, *fàchere* agrees with the said internal argument. In both structures the internal argument of the infinitival clause ends up being dislocated in a Topic position in the left periphery of the main clause, as suggested by clitic resumption in the infinitival clause.

This analysis, expounded in section 5, is unfortunately rather rushed and leaves unexplained a few issues, which I list below. My main recommendation for revision is, therefore, that the paper should be entirely rewritten, placing more emphasis on the principal construction(s)

under investigation and explaining the syntactic analysis in more detail: the other parts can be shortened or left out altogether, not because they are devoid of interest, but because it is hard for the reader to see their relevance to the issue under discussion. This is the case with the short section on FACERE in Romance (§2) and the section on contact (§6, up to, but not inclusive of, 6.1).

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

Casti's analysis of the *fàchere* structures captures a larger number of patterns than this article. Even though the author duly acknowledges the provenance of the data and expresses their gratitude to Casti openly, the actual analysis that is proposed by Casti should be paid attention to in this article, and this is missing altogether. The author even states that Casti's framework is Relational Grammar (p. 9), and this detail is not only incorrect, but it shows that no attention has been paid to the insights that emerge from that analysis. I would thus urge the author to go back to Casti's papers and do them more justice in the revised version of their article.

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]

First, I should mention that the author takes for granted that the impersonal (weak) causative without agreement is the "base" structure (p. 15). This is not a trivial point, which should be explained and substantiated with evidence rather than being introduced as an a priori assumption. Assuming the derivation that is proposed in the paper (see Figures 1-4 and example (40)-(41)), neither impersonal (weak) causative is a base structure. So, this statement does not make much sense to me.

Second, the proposed analysis assumes that the presence of 'a' is an indication of biclausality. Now, the evidence presented in the article (and further evidence which Sardinian specialists are no doubt familiar with, viz. the Sardinian analytic tenses formed with 'àere a') suggest that 'a' cannot possibly be a complementizer: to mention but one issue, 'a' allows clitic climbing; another problem is posed by the structures which the author calls "fixed expressions" (*fàcher a ischire*, etc., cf. (46)) without explaining what a "fixed expression" is or how it differs from the canonical causatives in (47). This evidence casts serious doubts on whether the infinitival structure of the impersonal weak causative really is a CP. To be sure, the author acknowledges that 'a' may occur in monoclausal constructions, but they treat these cases as exceptional or belonging to other diatopic varieties. Why? This is another example of certain analytical assumptions being presented without proper explanation. I urge the author to spend more words on 'a' and on the other issues mentioned in this paragraph.

Third, if, as the author claims, the infinitival CP is a subject (an argument) in the construction without agreement and an adjunct in the structure with agreement, why is it that it can be omitted when it is an argument (cf. 39) but not when it is an adjunct?

It is quite possible that the above issues can be resolved by rephrasing the analysis and laying out the assumptions more clearly. A fourth issue seems to me to be more problematic, though: namely, the resumption with an accusative clitic (cf. 38b) of the subject of the structure with agreement. Assuming that subjects can be dislocated like objects, why would this dislocation result in resumption with an accusative clitic? Note that dislocation is the last step in the derivation, so clitic resumption must occur then, i.e., when the dislocated argument is a subject. (Incidentally, note that the clitic is reported as 'las' in all the figures, but its form is actually 'ddas'). This question must be addressed.

A fifth issue is that the author does not factor into their analysis the examples that are presented in section 6.2 (cf. 52a-b). They claim, against Casti 2012 (the source of the examples), that these structures are different because the infinitives that occur in them are not transitives. They analyse these structures as cases of subject control. A problem with this claim is that its corollary is that *fàchere* in Campidanese is both a raising and a control verb, whereas crosslinguistically verbs normally require either raising or control. Another problem is that the pattern in (52) is claimed to be a calque from Italian, due to contact, but, crucially, there is no equivalent of Italian 'la' in the structure in (52), in contrast with (54). I would suggest that these examples must be factored into the analysis proposed, which will become stronger, i.e., more explanatory, as a result.