

## Review by Monica Irimia

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

The paper does make a novel contribution to a better understanding of both the nature of clitics (in Romance languages) and the Italo-Romance varieties and dialects. It provides data which have not been discussed before regarding the alternation between accusative and dative morphology of clitics doubling direct objects. What we see in the paper are patterns of dative shift which have not been extensively discussed before.

### **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 of the paper is sound, the author has carefully explained how they have corrected the data, native speaker judgments have been used, the text is clear and well written, there do not appear to be spelling mistakes or grammar errors.

Some minor things:

- it would be better to keep the tables (for example, Table 2) on the same page
- page 3, above example 4 'its distribution with forms the verb' → 'its distribution with forms of the verb'
- page 9, paragraph 2. 'However, literature on Spanish.....' → 'However, the literature on Spanish'
- page 11, Section 4. ' the analysis proposed in this section builds various accounts' → 'builds on various accounts'
- page 12, under example (35). 'Such model' → 'Such a model'
- page 13, right under 4.2. Remove comma between dative clitics and are
- page 14, flush to the left 'In this section'

Various places in the paper 'allows to account' → 'allows one/us, etc. to account'

### **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 argument is coherent and sound, the literature is used well, the theoretical assumptions are well framed.

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

One aspect that could be discussed in further detail is the connection with animacy. The examples with doubling clitics provided in the paper contain animate objects. It is true that the

author mentions that there are no restrictions related to specificity, but less is said about animacy. This is important, because another robust pattern of leísta shift is restricted precisely to mainate objects, as discussed in various works by Ormazabal and Romero, starting with their 2007 paper on the Object Agreement Constraint (NLLT).

Also, the paper does not provide details about dative clitics with indirect objects under left dislocation. One would expect the presence of dative morphology on clitics in these contexts, but is this true?

**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]**

The minor revisions include the aspects mentioned in the previous sections.