Dear Atlantis Editors,

Below you will find a detailed account of how I have undertaken the changes suggested by the two reviewers in my article. I am very grateful for the insightful comments they both have made. Their suggestions have made the proposal much more solid in the new version. My commnets are in black.

Reviewer A:

------------------------------------------------------

On the topic

• The topic is located within the field of English studies [5/5]

• The topic is relevant to the present state of scholarship in the field

[5 /5]

The topic is highly relevant; questions concerning negative polarity are always a hot issue and negative preposing is even more. In addition, a contrastive English-Spanish approach is taken, which makes it even more interesting.

The author adopts a generative approach to the study of negative preposing which is not so common within the Spanish academic research community.

On the intellectual development

• The guiding hypothesis and the focus of the article are sharply defined [5/5]

• The hypothesis is original and, if substantitated, it makes a relevant contribution to the field of Anglo-American studies [5/5]

• The discussion leading to the demonstration of the hypothesis is

rationally organized and ultimately convincing [5/5]

• The handling of key concepts and ideas is precise and rigorous, and reveals a competent treatment of the topic being dealt with [4/5]

• The article shows sufficient awareness of the theoretical and

methodological aspects involved in the discussion [5/5]

The objectives of the paper are clearly stated. The general hypothesis is clearly formulated and hard empirical data are presented to support and verify the initial hypothesis. The author is highly aware of the theoretical and methodological aspects involved in the discussion. The paper combines a theoretical discussion with an experimental survey conducted with the aim of confirming the initial premise. The participants in the study can be regarded as highly educated respondents. It would be interesting to know

whether similar results would be obtained if the profile of the participants were different and ordinary speakers of English and Spanish were the addressees of the questionnaire.

It would perhaps make sense when describing the main features of negative preposing in English to distinguish between fully negative words such as ‘never’ and other partial or quasi negatives such as ‘seldom’, ‘hardly’, ‘only’ since they do not behave in the sentence in exactly the same way. Nothing is said about this.It could also be relevant to make a distinction between negative and non-assertive contexts since there seems to be some overlapping in the paper between these two categories.

Due to lack of space, I can’t address this issue but I have included a note (footnote 1) in which I make clear that though this forms are not negative in form, following Emonds and Bosque, among others, they have some negative flavour which make them patter with negative constituents.

On the knowledge and use of previous scholarship

•The article shows reasonable knowledge of previous scholarship with reference to the topic under discussion [4/5]

• The novelty and relevance of the guiding hypothesis is highlighted

against the background of existing scholarship [4/5]

The author shows a good knowledge of the literature connected with the field of study. However, there is very little reference to studies on Spanish negation which clearly contrast with the high number of papers and articles dealing with English negation or with negative polarity in general terms. In this respect, here is a list of additional references that could be consulted:

Bosque, Ignacio. 1980. Sobre la negación. Madrid: Cátedra.

Martínez Linares, María Antonia. La negación. Biblioteca de recursos electrónicos de Humanidades. Liceus, Servicios de Gestión y Comunicación.

Escandell Vidal, V., M. Leonetti and C. Sánchez (eds.) 2011. 60 problemas de Gramática. Akal, 253-260.

The work by Susagna Tubau from the Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona could also be interesting to have a look at.

In English I recommend the special issue on Polarity and Emphasis published in Lingua by Breitbarth and Haegeman in 2013 together with the paper by Karen De Clercq entitled "NEG-shift in English: Evidence from PP-adjuncts". In Proceedings of the 12th Seoul International Conference on Generative Grammar: 2010 Movement in Minimalism, edited by An, Duh-Ho & Kim, Joo-Tech.

I am most thankful to the reviewer for bringing this point to me. I wanted to put more emphasis on English because the journal is about English. However, given the unbalance between the two languages, I’ve decided to discuss Spanish in similar terms. Now the proposal is more solid since the two languages are compared in equal terms. The whole section 2 discusses some properties of Negative Preposing in the two languages under examination.

p. 7 Roussou (2010), not found in the final reference list.

p. 7. example (28). Maki et al's (1999). Year of publication is missing

p. 10. Meinunger (2004), not included in the final reference list.

On the use of language and formal layout

• The article is written clearly and correctly [5/5]

• The use of language is precise, coherent, and aids the logical

development of ideas [4/5]

• Quotation from previous scholarship is moderate and fulfills its

supportive role, without encroaching upon authorial discourse [5/5]

The paper is clearly written in good academic English.

Some typos:

p. 1 abstract in Spanish distribucón> distribución.

p. 3. Spanish produce> Spanish produces

p. 7. What does Authier 1992 mean?

p. 7. Attention to the position of the note number.

The use of the acronym NP for Negative Preposing can be misleading for the

reader since this is generally associated with the abbreviation used to refer to the Noun Phrase.

Thanks! I’ve corrected the typos and included the missing references in the the Bibliography Section. Also, I definitely agree with the reviewer in considering NP confusing. In order to tear it apart from Noun Phrase, I replaced the acronym by NPr. I hope this is fine. Thanks!

------------------------------------------------------

Reviewer B:

------------------------------------------------------

On the topic

• The topic is located within the field of English studies [5/5]

• The topic is relevant to the present state of scholarship in the field

[5/5]

The topic is absolutely relevant and deserves serious investigation. Its study may provide us with valuable results for grammatical theory and comparative syntax.

On the intellectual development

• The guiding hypothesis and the focus of the article are sharply defined [4/5]

• The hypothesis is original and, if substantitated, it makes a relevant

contribution to the field of Anglo-American studies [4/5]

• The discussion leading to the demonstration of the hypothesis is

rationally organized and ultimately convincing [2/5]

• The handling of key concepts and ideas is precise and rigorous, and reveals a competent treatment of the topic being dealt with [3/5]

• The article shows sufficient awareness of the theoretical and

methodological aspects involved in the discussion [3/5]

The main hypothesis in the paper is clearly stated: due to variation in feature inheritance, in English discourse features are retained in C and fronting operations target Spec, CP, whereas in Spanish the same features are lowered onto T and fronting operations target Spec, TP. From a theoretical point of view, this may be correct. However, the proposal seems to me merely stipulative if no independent evidence is presented confirming that Negative Preposing targets different positions in English and Spanish.

The problem is that the author does not offer any argument in favour of this conclusion. As this kind of preposing operation triggers subject inversion in both languages, at first sight it looks like the same transformation in all respects. Why should we accept that the target position differs from one language to the other?

A number of points are in need of clarification.

-        Page 1: the author presents Negative Preposing as “a subtype of focus fronting”. This is in fact a common assumption in the literature (for instance, in Haegeman’s work). I am not sure that such characterization is accurate for English, but I am quite convinced that it is not for Spanish.

The problem with this point is that the whole proposal in the paper is built on the idea that a Focus feature is involved in the licensing of Negative Preposing. If Negative Preposing is truly a particular case of Focus Fronting, then the generalizations should concern Focus Fronting, and empirical evidence for this should be added.

Thanks for bringing this point to me. In the previous version, there was mention of a focus feature, but then Spanish Negative Preposing does not necessarily comply with the focus flavour advocated in my earlier analysis. In the new version, for English I have assumed a composition of the features [+focus, +negation], whereas for Spanish I propose the combination [+emphasis, +negation], trying to remain neutral with respect to whether focus is involved in NPr (as Hernanz and Batllori (2013) and Gallego (2007) believe), or not (as Leonetti And Escandell (2009) contend). It should be noted though that what is important for my analysis is that there is movement in both languages to the left periphery, and that in English this causes intervention, whereas no intervention is detected in Spanish.

-        Page 3: Example (14), which is ungrammatical, is claimed to be a counterexample for Emonds’ hypothesis. It is not clear why this should be so, as there is no indirect discourse embedding. A clarification would be welcome.

Thanks! Indeed, the example was incoherent with respect to what I asserted in the preceding paragraph. Now the possibility of having an adjective plus a subordinate clause where NPr has taken place is illustrated with this example. The result is an ungrammatical sentence, which tells us that not all adjectives allow Root Transformations, as opposed to what Emonds claimed.

-         Page 3: If we accept that example (15) is acceptable in Spanish –which

seems dubious to me-, it should in any case be described as an instance of

Negative Preposing. However, the author takes it as a case of “topic

preposing”, which clearly is not. In a paper that deals with Negative

Preposing, after several examples in English with the same expression (only

until five), this kind of mistake must be just a momentary distraction.

It is indeed a mistake. I am sorry for this. I wanted to say ‘Negative Preposing’ instead of Topic preposing. I have changed that and added a note to make clear that even constituents introduced by ‘only’ involves NPr, as claimed in the relevant literature.

Also, non-assertive elements are mentioned and I group them all under the concept of NPr. They may display differences but what is common, namely fronting and inversion, is what is important for my analysis.

-        Page 4: Nine lines before the end, “compatible with asserted clauses in Spanish” should change to “compatible with non-asserted clauses in Spanish”.

This is my mistake, again. Sorry! It has been changed accordingly.

-        Page 5: The contrast in (17)-(18) shows that certain aspects of the grammar of negation are different in English and Spanish. It surprised me that almost anything from the literature on negation in Spanish is mentioned in the paper.

In the new version, negation is given a more prominent role and readers are referred to the relevant literature.

-        Page 6: It is a bit puzzling that, while a purely syntactic account of the facts is put forward, “assertedness” is still recognized as the crucial factor for the distribution of root phenomena, and Negative Preposing among them, in English –and by the way, shouldn’t the term be “assertiveness” instead of “assertedness”? As assertiveness is not a syntactic notion, how is it that it plays a decisive role and at the same time the whole account is built on formal notions like discourse feature and intervention? I think some comments on this issue would strengthen the author’s position. Moreover, the prominent role given to assertiveness –something I definitely agree with- is hardly compatible, in my view, with the idea that certain subordinate clauses behave as assertive in certain languages, but as non-assertive in others. Is there cross linguistic variation in assertiveness? This sounds quite bizarre to me. Again, the paper would benefit from some explicit comment on this point.

I am sorry for having caused some confusion about the terminology and the proposal. I’m following Hooper and Thompson (1973) and Haegeman in her numerous works in the use of ‘assertedness’. They keep the term ‘assertive’ for describing illocutioanry force.

In addition, I am not asserting that asserted clauses and non-asserted clauses behave differently in the two languages as far as the notion of assertedness is concerned. The different behaviour lies in connection between the event operator proposed by Haegeman and implemented here, and the syntactic position targeted by fronted constituents.

On the other hand, my analysis implies the so-called syntactization of semantics which is the key of current formal anlaysis within generative grammar. I have clarified this in the paper (new Section 3) so as to avoid any confusion.

Section 3

-        Page 8: Two points are in need of clarification. The first one is the motivation for classifying Spanish as a discourse-configurational language:

some brief remarks on this would help the reader to get a more precise view of the contrast with English.

-        The second point is that on page 8 it is claimed that CLLD-ed topics are moved to Spec, TP in Spanish. This is certainly not the standard analysis of CLLD in Romance, and it seems incompatible with the fact that CLLD allows for preverbal subjects, presumably raised to Spec, TP (cf. Siento que el artículo María no lo haya publicado en…). However, movement of the topic to Spec, TP is essential for the author’s proposal concerning feature inheritance to hold: otherwise, an intervention effect would arise due to

the operator in CP. This looks like a serious problem for the view defended in the paper, unless an analysis of CLLD as a base-generated construction is adopted in which movement is not involved. In any case, Negative Preposing is not concerned, since it can reasonably be treated as a case of movement to Spec, TP.

These two points have been clarified by adding some remarks on the notion of discourse-prominence and also by including evidence in favour of the analysis of CLLD as targeting Spec-TP in footnote 7. This evidence is based on binding, and it will also be used to support my view that NPr involves movement to Spec-TP (see bellow).

-        Another source of puzzlement for the reader is the nature of the discourse feature that triggers Negative Preposing. In section 1 it seems that the feature must be Focus (cf. my remarks above), but this is never mentioned again in the paper, and the examples in section 3 include cases of topic fronting, so that the precise identity of the discourse feature involved remains unclear. Moreover, the author seems to advocate a view in which all fronting transformations in English target the same position, and all

fronting transformations in Spanish also target the same position –a

different one-. If I understood this correctly, it calls for some

clarification in the text, since it represents an unorthodox hypothesis

about movement rules that involve the left periphery.

I am not adopting a cartographic analysis of discourse movement, according to which CP is split *sensu* Rizzi. Rather, my analysis is based on minimalist premises. Information structure has been addressed both in cartography (with designated heads) and in minimalism (with unsplit CP and TP). It is the latter that my proposal follows.

Regarding the use of examples involving topic fronting (CLLD), these are necessary to understand my proposal that discourse features other than [topic] are inherited by T in Spanish. In this connection, [+emphasis, +negation] are lowered onto T in Spanish, triggering movement of a negative constituent to Spec-TP.

On the knowledge and use of previous scholarship

•The article shows reasonable knowledge of previous scholarship with reference to the topic under discussion [4/5]

• The novelty and relevance of the guiding hypothesis is highlighted

against the background of existing scholarship [5/5]

The paper is built on a good knowledge of the previous literature. The problems I detect have to do with the formulation of the hypothesis and with the empirical basis of the study.

On the use of language and formal layout

• The article is written clearly and correctly [5/5]

• The use of language is precise, coherent, and aids the logical

development of ideas [4/5]

• Quotation from previous scholarship is moderate and fulfills its

supportive role, without encroaching upon authorial discourse [5/5]

There are no problems with the use of language and the formal layout.

Additional comments

Though the paper shows positive qualities, it cannot be published in its current version. It needs an accurate revision in three aspects:

1. Several points have to be clarified, as indicated in the comments on section II.

2. It would be nice to add some kind of independent evidence that supports the idea that Negative Preposing targets different positions in English and Spanish.

3. A more detailed description of the facts in Spanish is needed to make the comparison more accurate. The weak points are the following ones.

All these problems have been tackled in the new version. In particular, evidence based on binding has been added at the end of the paper which supports movement to Spec-TP in Spaish for NPr. Also, in the new Section 2 a description of the properties of NPr in English and, more importantly, in Spanish has been included.

I fully agree with the reviewer that some evidence for positing that Spanish NPr is movement to Spec-TP should be included, and so I have done at the end of section

Section 3

After a brief presentation of Haegeman’s account of the distribution of Root Phenomena in terms of operator movement in non-root contexts, a modification of this account is introduced in order to explain why at least certain Root Phenomena are acceptable in non-root contexts in Spanish.

Let’s assume that Haegeman’s theory works, though it is not clear for the reader why she assumes that an event operator has to move in certain clauses (non-assertive contexts) but not in others. At this point, I think that a more detailed description of the facts in Spanish would certainly reinforce the author’s position. In the previous sections, only two Spanish examples were put forward to show how the effects of non-root contexts in this language differ from the effects traditionally noticed in English. The problem is that the first example is (15), which I do not find fully acceptable, as already mentioned, and the second one is (18), which I consider perfectly grammatical, but perhaps is not enough to justify jumping

to the conclusion that “…in Spanish, root transformations are compatible with presupposed clauses” (p. 5). Before looking for plausible accounts for the contrast between English and Spanish, the empirical basis for the contrast should be enlarged and strengthened, so that an answer can be provided for questions like the following ones: is Negative Preposing systematically acceptable in non-root contexts? Is it acceptable in any non-root context? Is this a peculiarity of Negative Preposing, or a common feature of all root transformations in Spanish? Thus, I suggest that additional evidence for the distribution of Negative Preposing in Spanish

subordinate clauses be integrated into the paper (not necessarily giving rise to a lengthy discussion).

Additional description of the data has been included at the end of section 3, to illustrate more cleary the empirical data concerning NPr in embedded contexts in Spanish.

Section 4

An experiment was created to test the hypothesis with data “from the real use of the language”. Actually, the test was meant to get acceptability judgements from native speakers, and the data were examples of argument fronting and adjunct fronting. I would not describe the experiment as based on “the real use of language”, but what worries me is not its capacity to get close to real, spontaneous use: it is rather the use of capital letters in the examples to indicate emphasis on the fronted constituents. If this means that the fronted element has to carry emphatic stress, then the examples in the test correspond to Focus Fronting, and possibly contrastive Focus Fronting, instead of Negative Preposing. As Negative Preposing does not require emphatic stress, it seems that two different constructions are being mixed up in the test, which casts serious doubts on its value and relevance.

In the Methodology section I have added that capital letters should mean emphasis, but no contrast. And of course this doesn’t mean that emphatic stress is involved. As I say in note 4, the type of fronting in NPr can be a case of Contrastive Focus (Leonetti and Escandell), and as such it will bear emphatic stress. We have two different constructions, as the reviewer rightly claims. In future research I will address the distinguishing properties of both types.

Furthermore, the results of the tests with Spanish informants show that Negative Preposing in Spanish –if it really is…- seems to be equally acceptable with arguments and with adjuncts. This may be right, but the acceptability rates for examples with factive and non-assertive predicates are surprisingly high, and lead me to suspect that the results of the test cannot be completely reliable, given that those examples are clearly deviant for me and for the speakers I consulted. In my opinion, a more accurate test and a wider empirical basis are needed in order to reveal the real nature of Negative Preposing in Spanish.

Thanks for this comment. The results of the test can’t be changed at this stage, and differences among speakers are expected to show up. I am not surprised that some examples might sound strange for some speakers. In my current surveys I am taking into account this point and am running the tests taking into account differnt varieties of both English and Spanish.