

## Review by Lucie Janku

---

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

Yes. The paper looks at a well-studied domain of null and overt subjects and extends the line of research by focusing on what we can learn from non-finite sentences. There is a lot of flexibility in the four languages discussed (Italian, European Portuguese, Galician, and Spanish). They all display the possibility of having preverbal or postverbal subjects or pro in finite sentences. However, looking into the non-finite domain (of adverbial clauses), the same languages start to differ in what is possible and what is restricted. This gives us a more fine-grained understanding of the topic and allows the author to suggest a more insightful analysis.

**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. My only minor suggestion is to add language names to the examples (next to the numbering or on the right side, not just in the text above) because it would be easier to navigate at a glance.

**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 very well organized, and the line of argumentation is clear and convincing. The author helps the reader to navigate step-by-step from issues to conclusions, presenting only relevant examples, and the discussion of the examples is easy to follow.

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

Not that I'm aware of.

**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]**

1) The paper works with European Portuguese and its inflected infinitives. If I haven't missed

anything, there is no mention of how the non-inflected infinitives work in the language. While that's probably because they do not bring anything new to the puzzle, I would still like to see a mention of how they pattern, even if just in a note.

2) The only problem with the line of argumentation I had was in section 2, around the examples 4 and 5. As far as I understand, the argument structure was:

- we don't see overt agreement on "haber" in finite sentences, hence no Agr head
- no use of "todo" with "haber" in finite sentences, hence "todo" needs the presence of Agr head
- "haber" in non-finite sentences can have "todo", hence Agr head \*even though we don't see overt agreement\* (which was the litmus test in the first step)

While this is not logically out, it is not fully convincing to me, and I wonder if there is a better way to present this section.

3) Page 4 might have a problem with section numbering. See the text "(see 2.3 below for examples in Galician)" - there is no section 2.3.

4) The argumentation sequence on page 4 is nice, but too many thoughts and steps are presented in a small space. I think it would be easier on the reader and, therefore, more persuasive if a small sum-up followed, saying that what we can see in these languages is (i) tense and agreement showing up alongside each other as separate morphemes, (ii) an agreement marking without tense marking, and (iii) tense marking without an agreement marking. Hence, the two seem independent. All of this information is contained in the text; my comment is just about making it cleaner and more accessible to read.

5) Page 5, example 4: I would add what the sentence (4b) without "todo" means. Does it simply mean there are \*some\* men in that office? Or does it mean that there are \*only\* men in that office? Or something else?

6) Page 8, example 12: As a reader, I would also like to see an example with one of the overtly marked inflected infinitives here to paint a more complete picture in my head. Is it possible to have, e.g., 1PL with an overt subject DP? Can we have just the agreement marking of 1PL without any overt DP? Can (12a), without an overt DP, be also interpreted as, e.g., 1SG? + Are there Spanish alternatives to English sentences like "After John's arrival..." (with the possessive phrase)? If so, what is the syntactic relationship (and difference) between those and the non-finite sentences with overt DPs, like in (12b,c)?