

Review by Xavier Villalba

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

Not really. The paper makes a critical review of the problems of different analyses for accounting of the presence of exclamative 'que' and inversion, but offers no solution. Most of the problems had been already noted in the literature.

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 empirical content is sound, but the author should have considered other evidence for his/her arguments, like dislocates, which appear systematically before the wh-exclamative in Spanish (cf. data from Italian).

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 argumentation is weak, leaving aside technical possibilities that might prove relevant.

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

On the preverbal subject position: Fernández-Soriano, O. (1999). Two types of impersonal sentences in Spanish: Locative and dative subjects. *Syntax*, 2(2), 101-140.

On force markers, including que: Campos, Héctor. 1992. Enunciative elements in gascon. *Linguistics* 30(5). 911–940. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1992.30.5.911>.

Ribes Amorós, M Salomé & Jordi Suils. 2015. Modality markers in Gascon, between grammar and stylistic variation. *eHumanista/IVITRA*. University of

California: Department of Spanish & Portuguese 8. 544–576.
Pusch, Claus Dieter. 2002. Preverbal modal particles in Gascon Occitan. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*. Vol. 16. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/bjl.16.08pus>. <http://www.jbe-platform.com/content/journals/10.1075/bjl.16.08pus> (2 December, 2022).
Morin, Annick. 2008. The syntax of Gascon clause-type particles. *Linguistica Atlantica* 29(29). 137–155.
<https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/la/article/view/22536>.

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 reject the paper, do you have any suggestions for how to improve it? [max 500 words]

I suggest including a positive proposal, and widening the perspective to include more data.
