

## **Review by Javier Ormazabal**

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

This is an impressive piece of work both because of its empirical contribution to Romance micro-variation in clitic doubling, DOM, and the PCC and as a contribution to understand many of the theoretical issues involved.

Technical details aside, my personal impression is that their analysis has a broader projection than the one intended by the authors in this paper, and goes beyond the domain of DOM, dative constructions and the structure of vP, or even the PCC and other agreement restrictions. The proposed sensitivity of licensing domains connects with recent theoretical discussions that goes in a converging direction, not only Irimia's own work but also work on contextually determined domains in areas as diverse as islanhood and phases, subjecthood, agreement and the EPP, including issues related to A/A' and potentially mixed positions that also are important for this paper [see, for example—or, very especially—Bošković's recent work on the IP-domain (Agr phrases, TP, etc.) and references there].

### **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 discussion is an important contribution, very relevant concerning both the licensing co-occurrence restrictions and the repair strategies. With respect to the former, the evidence that those restrictions appear crosslinguistically settles the discussion on their existence, which has been repeatedly challenged in the literature (see, e.g. Pineda 2020, Syntax 23, fn. 13 and references there). It also presents very interesting properties of the restriction and its distribution from a comparative point of view. As for the repair strategies, the new data reveal an intriguing asymmetry among different Romance languages that is the basis for the authors' theoretical proposal and constitute a challenging problem for the analysis of agreement restrictions crosslinguistically. The authors' comparative discussion constitutes a puzzle that has a bearing on several issues related to DOM, clitic doubling, datives and their syntactic interaction that any future analysis will have to take into consideration. Moreover, their empirical contribution will hopefully help us understand where the Gordian not in the properties of the PCC and clitic doubling and its repair strategies lie (see below).

### **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 theoretical analysis is also well developed, generally very explicit in the details, and highly instructive. The proposal and its technical apparatus are aimed at getting the distribution of the repair strategies in Romanian and Galician as well as its unavailability in the different dialects of Spanish analyzed in the paper, and for the most part the system seems to fulfill its role quite effectively. That is an interesting trend insofar structurally more restrictive proposals will potentially fail to capture the cross-Romance differences.

The final discussion on possession raising and the new data they present are extremely interesting in the context of the paper. As could be expected, the discussion of the theoretical consequences these constructions suggest is a bit inconclusive, but it opens a very promising research-line for the future.

In the attached file, I present some potential shortcomings the analysis might have, but my comments should not be interpreted as a request for the paper to be revised accordingly, but rather as some thoughts to be considered for further research and a way to open a sensible channel of discussion on the issues involved.

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

NO.

**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]**

Stylistically, I see two hands through the paper, very especially when comparing sections 3 and 4. Part of the problem comes from the different level of detail and clarity in the description. On the other hand, the descriptive apparatus of Galician is a bit unbalanced: I am not sure the a + article contraction vs. Incorporation issue deserves more than a footnote, and it cuts off the connection between the short description and AUTHOR1's central assumptions somehow. In contrast, the main properties of the relevant phenomena in (17)-(18) may be explicated a bit more. I would recommend that the two authors go through those sections with an eye put on unifying styles a bit.

In the same vein, the discussion on word order and clitic doubling in p. 15 is extremely interesting, but I am not sure I understand its implications for clitic valuing and the general architecture. Perhaps, a slightly more elaborated discussion would eliminate the impression that section 4 ends up in a quite abrupt way.

Footnote 4 is a bit strange, since it seems to tell us that Author1 does not agree with the core of their analysis. I would rephrase it in somehow different terms.

The information for Sheehan (2020) is missing in the References section.