Linguistica Silesiana nr 46/2, 2025
ISSN 0208-4228
DOI: 10.24425/linsi.2025.157335

RAFAŁ JURCZYK
WSB Merito University Opole
ORCID: 0000-0002-0546-9321
rafal.jurczyk@opole.merito.pl

BI-DIRECTIONAL AGREEMENT IN POLISH DUAL COPULA CLAUSES WITH TWO THIRD PERSON NPS

This paper addresses pre-verbal agreement in Polish dual copula clauses with the verbal copula *być* 'to be', the pronominal copula *to* and two third person nominative expressions, one pre-verbal and one post-verbal. It first shows that despite the common consensus in the literature, this agreement is perfectly grammatical in the construction under consideration. Then, it briefly outlines problems this NP_{NOM1}-controlled agreement creates for the contemporary approaches to agreement in Polish dual copula clauses. Finally, it advances a way for the Agree relation to work in order to derive the pre-verbal agreement effect.

Keywords: bi-directional agreement, DCCs (dual copula clauses), Polish, pre-verbal agreement, NP (nominative expression)

1. Introductory remarks

Polish dual copula clauses (DCCs) with the verbal copula *być* 'to be', the pronominal copula *to* and two third person nominative expressions, a preverbal one (NP_{NOM1}) and a post-verbal one (NP_{NOM2}), are commonly believed (Rutkowski 2006; Citko 2008; Bondaruk 2012, 2013, 2019; Tajsner 2015; Jurczyk 2021) to only allow post-verbal agreement. Examples (1)-(2) illustrate.[1]

[1] Unless secondary/corpus sources are provided, the linguistic examples come from the present author. The NP label is used for simplicity and bears no theoretical significance. As for the particle *to*, it is taken here to represent a pronominal copula (following Citko 2008 and Jurczyk 2021) but its categorial status in the literature is controversial. It has been considered a demonstrative pronoun (Hentschel 2001; Rutkowski 2006), a conjunction-like particle (Błaszczak & Geist 2001), a predicator head (Tajsner 2015; Bondaruk 2012, 2013, 2019), or a verb (Linde-Usiekniewicz 2007), amongst others.

(1)

Ci	muzycy	to	był	/	*byli
these:$_{NOM;3PL;VIR}$	musicians:$_{NOM;3PL;VIR}$	PRON.COP	was:$_{3SG;M}$	/	were:$_{3PL;VIR}$
kwartet	Smyczkowy[2]				
quartet:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$	string:$_{ADJ;NOM;3SG;M}$				
‘These musicians were a string quartet.’					

(Bondaruk 2013: 144)

(2)

Ci	czterej	piłkarze	to	jest	/	*są
these:$_{NOM;3PL;VIR}$	four:$_{NOM;PL;VIR}$	players:-$_{NOM;3PL;VIR}$	PRON.COP	is:$_{3SG}$	/	are:$_{3PL}$
najlepsza	obrona	w	lidze			
best:$_{ADJ;NOM;3SG;F}$	defense:-$_{NOM;3SG;F}$	in	league:$_{INSTR;3SG;F}$			
‘These four players are the best defense in the league.’						

(Tajsner 2015: 37)

To the best of our knowledge, only Linde-Usiekniewicz (2007) provides an apparent counterexample to this pattern, shown in (3), thus considering leftward agreement in such DCCs legitimate.[3]

(3)

Jan	to	był	straszna	świnia
John:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$	PRON.COP	was:$_{PST;3SG;M}$	terrible:$_{ADJ;NOM;3SG;F}$	pig:$_{NOM;3SG;F}$
‘John was a real bastard.’				

(Linde-Usiekniewicz 2007: 86)

[2] Polish displays a three-way masculine ($_{M}$), feminine ($_{F}$), neuter ($_{N}$) gender system in the singular and a two-way virile ($_{VIR}$), non-virile ($_{NVIR}$) in the plural.

[3] For Linde-Usiekniewicz (2007: 88), it is legitimate in predicational DCCs like (3) where NP_{NOM1} is ascribed NP_{NOM2}’s semantic property, but unavailable in other DCCs like identificational (i) where NP_{NOM2} identifies/instantiates the place’s/person’s name, loosely paraphrasing Higgins (1979: 237).

(i) Cyganeria to są artyści
Bohemia:$_{NOM;3SG;F}$ PRON.COP are:$_{3PL}$ artists:$_{NOM;3PL;VIR}$
‘Bohemia are the artists.’
(Linde-Usiekniewicz 2007: 86)

Her observations, however, remain mostly omitted in the literature as only Rutkowski (2006: 159, 161) and Bondaruk (2013: 246) directly question her grammatical judgments regarding example (3), jointly admitting that it becomes grammatical once the verb agrees with NP_{NOM2}.

(4)

Jan	to	była	straszna	świnia
John:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$	PRON.COP	was:$_{PST;3SG;F}$	terrible:$_{ADJ;NOM;3SG;F}$	pig:$_{NOM;3SG;F}$
'John was a real bastard.'				

(Rutkowski 2006: 161)

Other sources (Bondaruk 2012: 63–64, 2019: 111; Tajsner 2015: 38, 59–60; Jurczyk 2021: 37, 2024: 67, 72), though do not address Linde-Usiekniewicz's (2007) observation explicitly, still tacitly hold the opposing stance, adopting different means to derive post-verbal agreement as the only one permissible. Notwithstanding, examples like (5)-(6) from the National Corpus of Polish (www.nkjp.pl) show that some DCCs with two third person NPs_{NOM} do tolerate pre-verbal agreement and, hence, agreement bi-directionality.[4]

(5)

Hitler	to	był	jedna	osoba
Hitler:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$	PRON.COP	was:$_{PST;3SG;M}$	one:$_{ADJ;NOM;3SG;F}$	person:$_{NOM;3SG;F}$
'Hitler was one person.'				

IJPPAN_PolPr_GKa01908

(6)

efekty	specjalne	to	były	ekstraklasa
effects:$_{NOM;3PL;NVIR}$	special:$_{NOM;3PL;NVIR}$	PRON.COP	were: $_{PST;3PL;NVIR}$	first class:$_{NOM;3SG;F}$
'The special effects were top class.'				

PELCRA_6203010001711

[4] Counterparts to (5) and (6) with post-verbal agreement are also licit.

(ii) Hitler to była jedna osoba
Hitler:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$ PRON.COP was:$_{PST;3SG;F}$ one:$_{NOM;3SG;F}$ person:$_{NOM;3SG;F}$
'Hitler was one person.'

(iii) efekty specjalne to była ekstraklasa
effects:$_{NOM;3PL;NVIR}$ special:$_{NOM;3PL;NVIR}$ PRON.COP was:$_{PST;3SG;F}$ first class:$_{NOM;3SG;F}$
'The special effects were top class.'

As will be shown, this bi-directionality is troublesome for contemporary approaches to how agreement in φ-features between T and NPs_{NOM} operates in Polish DCCs under scrutiny. In some approaches, this is because technicalities of the Agree relation only derive post-verbal agreement (Rutkowski 2006; Bondaruk 2012, 2013; Tajsner 2015) or account for DCCs where third person NPs_{NOM} must match in φ-features (Citko 2008), which leaves examples like (1) with NP_{NOM1}-agreement and (5) with NP_{NOM2}-agreement unaccounted for. In others (Bondaruk 2019), Agree in φ-features and SpecTP-movement are divorced, so even if T agrees in φ-features with NP_{NOM1}, it is NP_{NOM2} that satisfies T's EPP-feature, which still yields the post-verbal agreement effect.

This paper advances a theoretical model that accounts for DCCs that allow both NP_{NOM1}- and NP_{NOM2}-controlled agreement. To this end, it adopts Jurczyk's (2021, 2024) implementation of Rothstein's (2004) bi-partite predication structure into Polish (NP_{NOM1}=subject, *być* + NP_{NOM2}=predicate) and a modified version of Jurczyk's (2024) perspective on Agree between T and the two NPs_{NOM}.[5] We hold that T and the verbal copula are still Probes whose [φ]-features match the agreeing Goal, this Goal now being NP_{NOM1} rather than NP_{NOM2}. Notwithstanding, we still claim that the verbal copula and NP_{NOM2} locally agree as in DCCs with post-verbal agreement, though this Agree relation is now partial, either in the [gender]-feature or in the [gender]- and [number]-features, the remaining one(s) staying temporarily unvalued on NP_{NOM2}. Once NP_{NOM1} and T are merged into the structure, T enters into Upward Agree with NP_{NOM1} whereby the latter's [iφ]-features must necessarily c-command the former's, the requirement satisfied when T attracts NP_{NOM1} to SpecTP (after Zeiljstra 2012). This step produces NP_{NOM1}-controlled agreement, but also values NP_{NOM2}'s unvalued feature(s) due to the successful T-NP_{NOM1} Probe-Goal Agree relation (in line with Pesetsky & Torrego's 2007 feature valuation proposal). As for the remaining failed/unsuccessful valuation in the [gender]- or [gender]- and [number]-features between *być* 'to be' and NP_{NOM2}, we argue that it is 'lexicalised-as-default' in the form of the morphophonologically least marked lexical item/marker (after Szucsich 2007), the pronominal copula *to* with the [gender: iN] feature specification, base generated in T.

The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 shows that the claim that NP_{NOM2}-controlled agreement in DCCs with two third person NPs_{NOM} is the only one licit does not scale with the evidence, which also poses problems for theoretical approaches based on it that exclusively derive either full post-verbal or restricted person-NP_{NOM1} and number-/gender-NP_{NOM2} agreement. To obviate these problems, Section 3 first outlines the reasoning behind and

[5] The NP_{NOM1}-controlled agreement is also underivable along the lines proposed in Jurczyk (2021, 2024). However, since his proposals will be used to provide means of doing so, we address the two accounts separately in Section 3 to maintain the consistent flow of information.

technicalities of bipartite predication (after Jurczyk 2021) and the working of Jurczyk's (2024) modified Agree relation encompassing T, *być* 'to be', NP_{NOM1}, and NP_{NOM2}. These two issues are tackled in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, respectively. Based on these observations, Section 3.3 then shows how the approach advocated here captures agreement bi-directionality in Polish DCCs with two third person NPs_{NOM} in a natural and straightforward way. Section 4 concludes the paper.

2. Initial remarks on pre-verbal agreement in DCCs with two third person NPs_{NOM}

In Section 2.1 we first provide corpus- and Internet-based data that challenge the assertion held in the contemporary literature, whereby leftward agreement in Polish DCCs with two third person NPs_{NOM} is ungrammatical. In Section 2.2, we discuss the problem this finding creates for most approaches in the literature as regards the working of the Agree relation between the relevant Probe (T, verb) and the NPs_{NOM} in DCCs under consideration.

2.1. Grammaticality status

As mentioned in Section 1, the universally held consensus is that Polish DCCs with two third person NPs_{NOM} invariably manifest post-verbal agreement. The reasoning behind this claim is, however, scarcely addressed and substantiated, Rutkowski (2006) being, apparently, the only source arguing in some detail why Linde-Usiekniewicz's (2007) stance that DCCs as in (7)=(4) do allow for pre-verbal agreement, is improper.[6]

(7)

Jan	to	był	straszna	świnia
John:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$	PRON.COP	was:$_{PST;3SG;M}$	terrible:$_{ADJ;NOM;3SG;F}$	pig:$_{NOM;3SG;F}$
'John was a real bastard.'				

(Linde-Usiekniewicz 2007: 86)

The argument that Rutkowski advances is that in (7) NP_{NOM2} represents the nominal class showing the natural-grammatical gender mismatch. More specifically, just as *babsko* 'old bag (about woman)' is grammatically N but naturally F and *kurwa męska* 'male prostitute' is grammatically F but naturally

[6] Bondaruk (2013), mentioned in Section 1 as another source arguing against Linde-Usiekniewicz's (2007) reasoning, actually merely concurs with Rutkowski's (2006) observations. Thus, in this section we only tackle Rutkowski's (2006) considerations.

M, *świnia* ‘bastard (literally pig)’ may also alternate between F (natural gender) and M (grammatical gender). This allows him to claim that in (8), an adjective-less counterpart of (7), the verbal copula agrees in φ-features with NP_{NOM2} because *świnia* is M.

(8)

Jan	to	był	świnia
John:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$	PRON.COP	was:$_{PST;3SG;M}$	pig:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$
‘John was a real bastard.’			

(Rutkowski 2006: 159)

It also explains why (4) which shows NP_{NOM2}-agreement and where *świnia* is clearly F as witnessed by the adjective *straszna* ‘terrible$_{3SG;F}$’, is more grammatical than (7) with NP_{NOM1}-agreement. This is because despite allowing for gender variation, nouns as *świnia* ‘pig’ or *babsko* ‘old bag (about woman)’ must necessarily trigger matching gender agreement on its modifiers and/or the verb (Rutkowski 2006: 160). Otherwise, examples such as (9) should be grammatical.

(9)

*Wanda	to	była	stare	babsko
Wanda:$_{NOM;3SG;F}$	PRON.COP	was:$_{PST;3SG;F}$	old:$_{ADJ;NOM;3SG;N}$	bag:$_{NOM;3SG;N}$
‘Wanda was an old bag.’				

(Rutkowski 2006: 162)

(10)

Wanda	to	było	stare	babsko
Wanda:$_{NOM;3SG;F}$	PRON.COP	was:$_{PST;3SG;N}$	old:$_{ADJ;NOM;3SG;N}$	bag:$_{NOM;3SG;N}$
‘Wanda was an old bag.’				

(Rutkowski 2006: 161)

This reasoning is, however, problematic. First, Anna Bondaruk (personal communication) highlights that it is impossible to determine agreement direction in DCCs with two third person NPs_{NOM} that match in gender. In (11), the morpho-phonological form of the verbal copula is compatible with two φ-features Agree scenarios: *być*-NP_{NOM1} and *być*-NP_{NOM2}. If so, the same agreement indeterminacy must characterise (8) which, as Rutkowski (2006) claims, also features two NPs with the same gender specification.

(11)

Janusz	to	był	professor
Janusz:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$	PRON.COP	was:$_{PST;3SG;M}$	professor:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$
'Janusz was a professor.'			

Second, even assuming that agreement in (8) and (11) is indeed post-verbal, there are DCCs which clearly make Rutkowski's proposal untenable. They involve NP_{NOM1} and NP_{NOM2} that show gender mismatch but lack the natural-grammatical gender distinction and, hence, unambiguously manifest agreement direction. In (12)-(18), agreement is clearly controlled by NP_{NOM1}.[7] This is pronounced even more in examples (12) and (14)-(15) where *być* 'to be' agrees in gender with NP_{NOM1} and the adjectives agree in gender with NP_{NOM2}.

(12)

Baśka	to	była	taki	chłopak	w	spódnicy
Baśka $_{NOM;3SG;F}$	PRON.COP	was:$_{PST;3SG;F}$	such:$_{ADJ;}$ $_{NOM;3SG;M}$	boy:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$	in	skirt:$_{INS;3SG;F}$
'Baśka was a tomboy.'						

IJPPAN_k0RLG346

(13)

Pierwsze	tygodnie	to	były	okres	wchodze-nia	w	trening
first:$_{ADJ;}$ $_{NOM;3PL;NVIR}$	weeks: $_{NOM;3PL;NVIR}$	PRON. COP	were:$_{PST;3PL;}$ $_{NVIR}$	period:- $_{NOM;3SG;M}$	entering:- $_{GEN;3SG;N}$	in	training: $_{ACC;3SG;M}$
'The first weeks were the period of entering training.'							

IJPPAN_DzP08a00010

(14)

Glany	to	są	najgorsza	rzecz
army boots:$_{NOM;3PL;NVIR}$	PRON.COP	are:$_{3PL}$	worst:$_{ADJ;NOM;3SG;F}$	thing:$_{NOM;3SG;F}$
'Army boots are the worst thing.'				

PELCRA_forumowisko.pl_3902

[7] Just as (5)-(6), examples (12)-(18) are also fully licit with post-verbal agreement.

(15)

A	ten	Clinton	to	był	straszna	świnia
and	this:NOM;3SG;M	Clinton:-NOM;3SG;M	PRON.COP	was:PST;3SG;M	terrible:ADJ;NOM;3SG;F	pig:NOM;3SG;F
'and Clinton was a real bastard.'						

https://media2.pl/media/14982/komentarz/18286.html

(16)

pierwszy	film	to	był	chyba	Przygody
first:ADJ;NOM;3SG;M	film:NOM;3SG;M	PRON.COP	was:PST;3SG;M	probably	adventures:NOM;3PL;NVIR
wesołego	diabła				
happy:ADJ;GEN;3SG;M	devil:GEN;3SG;M				
'The first film was probably 'Przygody wesołego diabła'.'					

PELCRA_6203010001715

(17)

Anastasia	to	była	niezłe	ziółko
Anastasia:NOM;3SG;F	PRON.COP	was:PST;3SG;F	good:ADJ;NOM;3SG;N	weirdo:NOM;3SG;N
'Anastasia was a real weirdo.'				

www.wattpad.com/amp/788138748

(18)

Takie	lekcje	to	są	klasa!
such:ADJ;NOM;3PL;NVIR	lessons:NOM;3PL;NVIR	PRON.COP	are:3PL	class:NOM;3SG;F
'Lessons like this are class!'				

https://kielce.tvp.pl/37909666/przyjechal-naukobus-takie-lekcje-to-sa-klasa-nawet-w-wakacje

The above examples show that Rutkowski's intuitions on (un)grammaticality of pre-verbal agreement in DCCs with two third person NPs_{NOM} are incorrect, i.e., counter to his (and also to other scholars') claims, such constructions seem to be fully licit in Polish.[8]

[8] Reviewer 2 raises some concerns regarding the acceptability of DCCs with pre-verbal agreement despite the fact that such constructions are attested in the corpus. It is, however, hard to provide an unequivocal resolve to this issue, for as Reviewer 2 himself/herself indicates, this concern seems to generally pertain to the way the corpus data are interpreted. For example,

2.2. Pre-verbal agreement or a problem for contemporary approaches[9]

Let us begin with Rutkowski's (2006) take on the syntax of Polish DCCs. In his proposal, NP_{NOM1} constitutes an external, left-dislocated topic, base-generated in the Topic Phrase (TopP) above TP, and NP_{NOM2} represents a VP-internal subject with which the verbal copula agrees. As for the particle *to*, he considers it a demonstrative pronoun, base-generated in the subject position, that is yet to be reanalysed as a (pronominal) copula once NP_{NOM1} turns into a grammatical-logical subject of the copular expression. Example (19) shows Rutkowski's (2006) simplified structure of a Polish DCC.[10]

---

assuming Bermel's (2010) *strong hypothesis* whereby the incidence of a particular construction/form directly reflects its level of acceptability, it could be assumed that those DCCs are in fact unacceptable. Quantitatively speaking, DCCs with NP_{NOM1}-agreement are much rarer than those with post-verbal agreement. In the entire National Corpus of Polish, we have only been able to locate two examples, (5) and (16), where in the collocation *to był* 'to$_{PRON.COP}$ was$_{PST;3SG;M}$' the verbal copula agrees with NP_{NOM1} and not with NP_{NOM2}. Contrastively, there are, respectively, 18, 27, and 29 instances of the following NP_{NOM1} *to był* NP_{NOM2} collocations with NP_{NOM2}-controlled agreement: *to był szok,* lit. 'to$_{PRON.COP}$ was$_{PST;3SG;M}$ horror:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$', *to był koszmar*, lit. 'to$_{PRON.COP}$ was$_{PST;3SG;M}$ horror:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$', *to był błąd*, lit. 'to$_{PRON.COP}$ was$_{PST;3SG;M}$ mistake:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$'. This contrast becomes pronounced even more given that our search for DCCs with NP_{NOM1}-controlled agreement encompassed both NP_{NOM1} *to być* NP_{NOM2} and NP_{NOM1} *to być* X NP_{NOM2} collocations (where 'X' stands for any number of modifiers), and the search for DCCs with NP_{NOM2}-controlled agreement only involved the NP_{NOM1} *to być* NP_{NOM2} sequence. For example, the number of instances of *to był błąd* 'to$_{PRON.COP}$ was$_{PST;3SG;M}$ mistake:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$' sequence surges to 49 if we include cases with just one pre-NP_{NOM2} adverbial/adjectival modifier. What Bermel & Knittl (2012) observe, however, is that Bermel's (2010) hypothesis does not scale with evidence, and the actual picture that seems to emerge from numerous examinations is that the higher frequency of some form/construction usually correlates with high acceptability readings (cf. also Divjak 2008), but the lower frequency does not necessarily mean lower accessibility judgments (Bader & Häussler 2009, Kempen & Harbusch 2008). Due to the complex nature of the relation between the frequency of corpus data and their accessibility and/or grammaticality, we will thus refrain from any decisive comments here, merely indicating that the problem with the acceptability status of DCCs with pre-verbal agreement could be speaker-oriented, perhaps along the same lines as the acceptability variation concerning Polish DCCs with first and second person pronouns as *my to jesteśmy złodzieje* 'we$_{NOM;1PL}$ to$_{PRON.COP}$ are$_{1PL}$ thieves$_{NOM;3PL;VIR}$', see Bondaruk 2012, 2019).

[9] For consistency's sake, we mostly discuss mechanisms responsible for establishing agreement with NPs_{NOM} that the relevant approaches advance. Any additional comments on syntactic/derivational aspects of DCCs with two third person NPs_{NOM} that they assume are reduced to the form of footnotes. See the works of the respective authors for details.

[10] In Rutkowski (2006), '...' is a placeholder for functional projections sandwiched between TP and VP and, quite possibly, the place where *być* 'to be' moves to produce the NP_{NOM1} > *to* > *być* > NP_{NOM2} word order, the mechanism and reasoning behind this movement being what Rutkowski (2006: 164), however, does not address. See also Bondaruk (2019) for critical remarks on the topic status of NP_{NOM1}.

(19) $[_{TopP}\ NP_{NOM1}\ [_{Top'}\ Top\ [_{TP}\ \textit{to}\ [_{T'}\ T\ \ldots\ [_{VP}\ NP_{NOM2}\ [_{V'}\ \textit{być}]]]]]]$

Though he does not provide any technical details of how Agree between the verbal copula and NP_{NOM2} works, the very fact that this agreement depends on NP_{NOM2} makes his account unable to derive NP_{NOM1}-agreement in examples (5)-(6) and (12)-(18).

In Citko (2008), NP_{NOM1} is the subject base-generated in SpecπP, the Predication Phrase (PredP), NP_{NOM2} is the complement of the predication head π, *być* 'to be' is an overt predicator encoding the predication relation between NP_{NOM1} and NP_{NOM2}, and *to* is an expletive copula base-generated in the T-head.

(20) $[_{TP}\ [_{T'}\ T\text{-}\textit{to}\ [_{\pi P}\ NP_{NOM1}\ [_{\pi'}\ \pi\text{-}\textit{jest}\ NP_{NOM2}]]]]$

For Citko (2008), T is the only Probe in (20) as π is defective, lacking [φ]-features. As a result, T with its uninterpretable [φ]-features probes down and enters into multiple Agree with the two NPs_{NOM}. This step values the uninterpretable [case]-features of the two NPs_{NOM} as nominative on the one hand, and the uninterpretable [φ]-features on T on the other.[11] And whilst Citko's (2008) proposal, unlike Rutkowski's (2006), allows T-NP_{NOM1} Agree, it only concerns DCCs where two NPs_{NOM} match in [φ]-features (e.g. *Warszawa to jest stolica Polski*, where both *Warszawa* 'Warsaw' and *stolica Polski* '(the) capital of Poland' are [3SG.F]). Consequently, it fails to account for DCCs where two NPs_{NOM} show a different φ-features specification, thus triggering either post- or pre-verbal agreement.

A somewhat similar proposal is advanced in Bondaruk (2012, 2013) who adopts the same predication structure and the order of NPs_{NOM} within it, with NP_{NOM1} base-generated in SpecPredP (Citko's 2008 πP), and NP_{NOM2} base-generated as the complement of the Predication head (Pred). Unlike Citko (2008), however, Bondaruk (2012, 2013) considers *być* 'to be' a raising verb located under *v*, and associates *to* with the role of an overt predicator encoding the predication relation between NP_{NOM1} (subject) and NP_{NOM2} (predicate).

(21) $[_{TP}\ [_{T'}\ T\ [_{vP}\ \textit{być}\text{-}v\ [_{PredP}\ NP_{NOM1}\ [_{Pred'}\ \textit{to}\text{-Pred}\ NP_{NOM2}]]]]]$[12]

[11] In Citko (2008), T carries the EPP-feature that attracts the closer nominal expression (NP_{NOM1}) to SpecTP. As for T-NPs_{NOM} feature valuation, she follows Chomsky's (2001) reasoning, i.e., the nominative case on the two NPs is a reflex of valuing T's uninterpretable/unvalued [φ]-features against the NPs' interpretable/valued ones. This is the only option for Chomsky (2001) who takes the [case]-feature on the Goal to be uninterpretable and, at the same time, disallows the valuation between two uninterpretable/unvalued features.

[12] Bondaruk's (2012, 2013) T has the EPP-feature which attracts NP_{NOM1} as in Citko (2008). A different derivational scenario is assumed for specificational DCCs where NP_{NOM1} is specified by the post-verbal one. As many scholars (e.g. Hartman and Heycock 2019, Coon

Since there are two NPs_{NOM}, Bondaruk (2012, 2013) claims that they both play some role in determining agreement. In doing so, she adopts a selective version of Hiraiwa's (2002) multiple Agree whereby T first agrees in the [person]-feature with NP_{NOM1} and then values its unvalued/uninterpretable [number]- and [gender]-features against the interpretable counterparts on NP_{NOM2} (in line with Rezac's 2008 remarks).[13] Note, however, that despite allowing for (partial) [person]-agreement between the verbal copula and NP_{NOM1} and, hence, accounting for the derivation of examples such as (11) where two NPs_{NOM} carry the matching set of [φ]-features, Bondaruk's (2012, 2013) approach cannot handle examples (5)-(6) and (12)-(18) where NP_{NOM1} and *być* 'to be' agree in the [number]- and/or [gender]-features.

Tajsner (2015) adopts a different approach to the syntax of Polish DCCs. He takes *to* to head the Specificational Predication phrase (SPredP), annotating the NP_{NOM2} in its c-commanding domain as a specificational predicate and the NP_{NOM1} in SpecPredP as a subject, the two NPs_{NOM} then interpreted in the Conceptual-Intensional system(s) as focus and topic, respectively. The verbal copula is a linking verb that selects for a nominal small clause ('SC') annotated here as [$_{SC}$ NP_{NOM1} [$_{NPNOM2}$ NP_{NOM2}]] for simplicity's sake. The derivational mechanisms that Tajsner (2015) assumes ultimately produce (22).[14]

& Keine 2021), Bondaruk (2013) adopts the inversion account whereby specificational DCCs are inverted predicational ones derived by NP_{NOM2}'s movement across NP_{NOM1}. In Bondaruk (2013), this derivation is obtained by the parallel probing (Chomsky 2008) of T (which agrees with NP_{NOM1} in the full set of [φ]-features and attracts it to SpecTP to satisfy the EPP-feature) and C (that targets NP_{NOM2} and attracts it to SpecCP, an A' position, which erases C's edge feature). The remnant (T') that remains after those operations then moves to the outer SpecTP to yield the expected NP_{NOM2} > to > być > NP_{NOM1} word order (see Bondaruk 2013: 303–305 for details). Note crucially that even though T agrees in [φ]-features with NP_{NOM1}, NP_{NOM2}-movement across NP_{NOM1} still produces the post-verbal agreement effect.

[13] As in Citko (2008), feature valuation in Bondaruk (2012, 2013) follows Chomsky (2001).

[14] The idea that *to* heads SPredP has to do with the discourse/specifying function it shows with respect to the following constituent. According to Tajsner (2015: 52), in (i) and (ii) *Janek* 'Janek' and *pomógł starszej pani* 'helped an elderly lady' are marked as, respectively, exhaustive and new, notions associated with focus (underlining original).

(i) To Janek zrobił. (exhaustive)
PRON.COP Janek:$_{NOM;3SG;M;FOC}$ did:$_{3SG;M}$
'It was Janek who did that.'
(Tajsner 2015: 52)

(ii) A: A co zrobił Janek?
And what did Janek?
'And what did Janek do?'
B: Janek to pomógł starszej pani. (new)
Janek:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$ PRON.COP helped:$_{3SG;M}$ elderly:$_{DAT}$ lady:$_{DAT}$
'As for Janek, he helped an elderly lady.'
(Tajsner 2015: 52)

(22) [$_{SPredP}$ NP_{NOM1} [$_{SPred'}$ SPred-*to* [$_{TP}$ t_{NPNOM1} [$_{T'}$ T [$_{VP}$ [$_{V'}$ V-*być* [$_{SC}$ t_{NPNOM1} [$_{NPNOM2}$ NP_{NOM2}]]]]]]]]

Regarding agreement in DCCs, Tajsner (2015) proposes that the raising verb *być* 'to be', equipped with the full set of uninterpretable/unvalued φ-features, agrees with the complement nominal (NP_{NOM2}), the operation following from the percolation of NP_{NOM2}'s φ-features to SC.[15] Notice that SpecSPredP-movement of NP_{NOM1} induced by *to*'s EPP-feature makes Tajsner's (2015) approach differ from the previous ones as the valuation of [φ]-features and the EPP-feature are now two separate operations, satisfied by NP_{NOM2} and NP_{NOM1}, respectively.[16]

The interpretation of NP_{NOM1} and NP_{NOM2} as topic and focus, respectively, follows from their structural relationship with the predicate head *to*. An NP_{NOM1} is interpreted as topic once it ends up in SpecSPredP (the movement induced by *to*'s EPP-feature) whereas an NP_{NOM2} within *to*'s c-commanding domain is interpreted as focus, the procedure secured syntactically by the valuation of *to*'s unvalued interpretable [+Specification]-feature against the appropriate feature of the Goal (NP_{NOM2}), i.e., the [+focal stress] property it carries (Tajsner 2015: 53).

[15] φ-features percolation is the property of an NP_{NOM} that projects, the projection procedure, in turn, taking place to break the symmetric {XP, YP} stage of the concatenation of the two nominative expressions.

[16] NP_{NOM2} only projects obligatorily in predicational copular clauses where the specific and non-specific (predicative) NPs_{NOM} have a different specificity status. In a nutshell, when a specific NP_{NOM} projects, the specifier position of its projection always features the specificity operator that blocks the internal merge of the predicative NP_{NOM}. Hence, the ungrammaticality of the inverted predicational copular clause (ii) with the predicative NP_{NOM} merging internally. This asymmetry is absent in specificational clauses since the two NPs_{NOM} have the same specificity status and either of these NPs_{NOM} is available for internal merge (Tajsner 2015: 56). Examples (iii)-(iv) illustrate (optional verbal copulas in (i)-(iv) added).

(i) Janek to (jest) harcerz (predicational)
Janek:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$ PRON.COP is scout:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$
'Janek is a scout.'
(Tajsner 2015: 29)

(ii) *Harcerz to (jest) Janek (inverted predicational)
scout:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$ PRON.COP is Janek:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$
'A scout is Janek.'
(Tajsner 2015: 30)

(iii) Najzimniejszy miesiąc to (jest) styczeń (specificational)
coldest:$_{ADJ;NOM;3SG;M}$ month:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$ PRON.COP is January:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$
'The coldest month is January.'
(Tajsner 2015: 29)

(iv) Styczeń to (jest) najzimniejszy miesiąc (inverted specificational)
January:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$ PRON.COP is coldest:$_{ADJ;NOM;3SG;M}$ month:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$
'January is the coldest month.'
(Tajsner 2015: 30)

This separation, however, again disallows the derivation of DCCs in which the NP_{NOM1} agrees with the verbal copula in [φ]-features, for agreement is still invariably controlled by the post-verbal NP_{NOM}.

The disjoint working of the agreement mechanism is also found in Bondaruk (2019) who follows Bondaruk's (2012, 2013) syntax of DCCs with two third person NPs_{NOM}. Thus, whilst T still probes both NPs_{NOM} and values their [case]-feature as [nominative], the satisfaction of T's EPP-feature and [φ]-features is divorced, namely, T can have its EPP- and [φ]-features satisfied by two separate NPs_{NOM}. These two agreement scenarios (represented by numerical indexes) are shown in (23)-(24) for, in turn, predicational and specificational DCCs.

(23) $[_{TP}\ [_{T'}\ T_{[EPP1;\ u\varphi2]}\ [_{vP}$ *być-v* $[_{PredP}\ NP_{NOM1}\ [_{Pred'}$ *to*-Pred $NP_{NOM2}]]]]]$

(24) $[_{TP}\ [_{T'}\ T_{[EPP2;\ u\varphi1]}\ [_{vP}$ *być-v* $[_{PredP}\ NP_{NOM1}\ [_{Pred'}$ *to*-Pred $NP_{NOM2}]]]]]$[17]

Observe that Bondaruk's (2019) proposal differs from Tajsner's (2015) in that scenario (24), involving a specificational DCC, actually allows T to value the full set of its uninterpretable/unvalued [φ]-features against the interpretable/valued counterparts on the NP_{NOM1}. This could potentially account for the derivation of specificational DCCs with NP_{NOM1}-controlled agreement such as (16) if it were not for the inversion account she adopts. Once (16) is imposed on her derivational model, T agrees in [φ]-features with NP_{NOM1}, *przygody wesołego diabła* 'adventures of the happy devil', but it is NP_{NOM2} *pierwszy film* 'first film' that moves to SpecTP to satisfy T's EPP-feature, thus yielding the surface effect of post-verbal agreement as (25)-(26) show.

(25) $T_{[EPP2;\ u\varphi1]}\ [_{vP}$ *być-v* $[_{PredP}$ *Przygody wesołego diabła* $[_{Pred'}$ *to*-Pred *pierwszy film*$]]]]$

(26) $[_{TP}$ *pierwszy film* $[_{T'}$ *to*-T $[_{vP}$ *były-v* $[_{PredP}$ *Przygody wesołego diabła* … $t_{pierwszy\ film}]]]]$[18]

As can be witnessed, none of the above approaches to agreement in DCCs with two third person NPs_{NOM} are able to account for the NP_{NOM1}-controlled agreement pattern. In Section 3, we attempt to rectify this problem by proposing a novel account of the Agree relation that, as we surmise, the DCCs under consideration may resort to.

[17] As Bondaruk (2012, 2013), Bondaruk (2019) too adopts the inversion account for specificational DCCs, though here, NP_{NOM2}'s movement is initiated by T and not by C, and so in (24) it lands in an A-position.

[18] To derive the order where the pronominal copula *to* precedes the verbal copula, Bondaruk (2013, 2019) assumes that being a predicator head, *to* also functions as the pronominal clitic and, hence, can assume a pre- or post-verbal position due to some sort of PF-movement.

3. Deriving bi-directional agreement in Polish DCCs with two third person NPs_{NOM}

Our solution mostly builds on two ideas from our previous works into the syntax of DCCs. The first, briefly outlined in Section 3.1, is Jurczyk's (2021) claim (originally advanced in Rothstein 2004 and substantiated by English and Hebrew data), that Polish DCCs with two third person NPs_{NOM} are built around the bi-partite predication relation in which the inherently unsaturated (complex) predicate [*be* + NP_{NOM2}] must be necessarily supplemented with the saturated subject argument NP_{NOM1}. The other which we discuss in Section 3.2, is the Agree model based on Zeiljstra (2012) that Jurczyk (2024) assumes to operate in those DCCs. In this model, the verbal copula's and T's [uφ]-features, though matching those on NP_{NOM2} due to NP_{NOM2}-driven agreement, are ultimately valued in TP partly by NP_{NOM1} (NP_{NOM2} being unable to SpecTP-move due to Relativised Minimality and because it is formally part of Pred') and partly as default, the latter operation lexicalised morpho-phonologically as the pronominal copula *to* (following Szucsich's 2007 proposal). Based on these considerations, in Section 3.3 we devise a slightly modified derivational model of DCCs with pre-verbal agreement. In this model, the T and the verbal copula Probes carry [uφ]-features matching those on NP_{NOM1} but still engage in two separate Agree relations with NP_{NOM1} and NP_{NOM2}, respectively. The 'valuation-as-default' procedure resulting in the lexicalisation of *to* still follows, being a formal rendition of a temporally failed/unsuccessful *być*-NP_{NOM2} feature valuation.

3.1. Bi-partite predication

The predication structure adopted here differs from the 'mainstream' ternary one with a semantically empty *be* as a predicator holding the relation between the subject (in the specifier position) and the complement (in the complement position).[19] Although still encoded via PredP, the predication relation advocated in Jurczyk (2021) is binary, involving two constituents, a syntactically and semantically complex predicate [$_{Pred'}$ *be* NP_{NOM2}] and a subject NP_{NOM1}. The syntactically complex status of [Pred'] stems from *be*'s semantic contribution to

[19] Apart from the works on Polish DCCs mentioned here, the ternary predication structure is adopted by, amongst others, Russell (1919), Bowers (1993), Déchaine (1993), den Dikken (2006), Heycock (2013), Hartmann & Heycock (2019). There are also alternative approaches to predication such as Russell's atomism. In this belief, the world consists of numerous independent and irreducible entities, capable of denoting atomic/simple facts or propositions, and yet, unlike in most other approaches to predication, lacking any internal relations to other things (e.g. Russell 1910, 2003). We thank the reviewer for bringing our attention to Russell's philosophical/ontological considerations.

the copular construction, the temporally determined eventuality *e* (Benveniste 1966, Rothstein 2004) it is endowed with and which establishes the relation between the speech time and event time, thus producing the narration sequence absent in verb-less expressions (Benveniste 1966: 159, 162-163). This temporal eventuality, however, lacks a property $P_{(e)}$ ('property of eventuality'), which is what ensures the formation of Pred', for it is only when *be* merges with its complement (here, NP_{NOM2}) that *e* becomes semantically specified (Rothstein 2004: 289).[20] Still, upon being formed, Pred' is, in and of itself, unsaturated and as such, it represents a Fregean function that must associate with a saturated expression, capable of functioning independently, namely, a subject NP_{NOM1}. The merger of NP_{NOM1} with [$_{Pred'}$ *be* + NP_{NOM2}] produces predication [$_{PredP}$ NP_{NOM1} [$_{Pred'}$ *be* NP_{NOM2}]] where the semantic content of the previously formed [Pred'] is ascribed to NP_{NOM1}. The asymmetric c-command relation (in line with Kayne's 1994 Linear Correspondence Axiom) between NP_{NOM1} and NP_{NOM2}, whereby the former c-commands the latter but not vice versa, in combination with the syntactically and semantically complex status of [PredP], ensure the interpretation of NP_{NOM1} as a grammatical and logical/semantic subject. Hence, unlike in predicate raising approaches, NP_{NOM1} is the only legitimate argument to SpecTP-move. NP_{NOM2}, on the other hand, is invariably rendered in the syntactic and semantic systems as part of Pred'.[21]

3.2. Upward T-NP_{NOM2} Agree and formally licensed TP

In DCCs with two third person NPs_{NOM} and NP_{NOM2}-driven agreement, it is NP_{NOM2}'s [φ]-features that crop up on two Probes – directly on *be* and indirectly on T. Their direct presence on *be* is because *be* and NP_{NOM2} enter into the Agree

[20] *Be* thus contrasts with lexical verbs such as *read* which, as Rothstein (2004) argues, introduce both the temporally determined eventuality and its property ('reading'). The simplified formal notation of this difference could be put as [verbal $copula_{(e)}$ [$complement_{(P(e))}$] and [lexical $verb_{(e\ P(e))}$]. See Jurczyk (2021) for details.

[21] The examination of copular constructions by numerous studies seems to lean towards the 'predicate raising' approach (see Bondaruk 2013 for an overview), the reasons being both semantic (e.g. the subject of specificational copular clauses is predicative) and syntactic (e.g. the well-formedness of predicational small clauses as opposed to specificational ones). Some of these issues are raised by Andrea Moro (personal communication) who questions Jurczyk's (2024) adoption of Rothstein's (2004) model. He notes, for example, that the preverbal position is not actually saturated since a predicate can raise there given the same theta-role assignment scheme in the specificational *a picture of the wall was the cause of the riot* and the predicational *the cause of the riot was a picture of the wall* (Moro 1997: 24–25). Though our model does not adopt the symmetric merge approach as Moro (1997) or Tajsner (2015), we continue to use the non-inversion account, based on, amongst others, discrepancies between the semantics of [Pred'] in predicational and specificational DCCs on the one hand, and the interpretation of the two types of DCCs themselves on the other (see Jurczyk 2021).

relation, the formal reflex of the fact that NP_{NOM2}'s nominal features become morphophonologically manifested on the verbal copula. Their indirect presence on T is a different matter, the fact that TP has to be formally identified or, alternatively speaking, the VP's (here, the complex predicate [Pred']'s) eventuality/semantic content has to be anchored with respect to time and the subject, i.e., the argument normally triggering subject-verb agreement (following Vangsnes 2002). [Pred']'s time anchoring is achieved by the mutual valuation of T's [uV]-feature and *be*'s [uT]-feature (see Jurczyk 2024 for details) whereas its anchoring with respect to the subject is obtained once NP_{NOM2} moves to SpecTP. This movement operates in an upward fashion (after Zeiljstra 2012) due to which the Goal's (NP_{NOM2}'s) interpretable [φ]-features must c-command the Probe's (T's) uninterpretable ones.[22] This movement is, however, illicit for two reasons. First, it violates Rizzi's (1990) Relativised Minimality, being blocked by NP_{NOM1} which is another potential Goal closer to T that intervenes between T and NP_{NOM2}. Second, NP_{NOM2} cannot SpecTP-move as it is syntactically and semantically a part of the complex predicate [Pred']. The solution which Jurczyk (2024) advances is to allow T's [uφ]-features to be valued by those on NP_{NOM1} instead, provided that they have the same value as those on NP_{NOM2}.[23]

---

[22] The technicalities of the Agree mode advanced in Zeiljstra (2012: 17) are given in (i).

(i) Agree: α can Agree with β iff:
  a. α carries at least one uninterpretable feature and β carries a matching interpretable feature.
  b. β c-commands α.
  c. β is the closest goal to α

In Jurczyk (2021, 2024), any Agree relation involving an NP_{NOM} and the finite T follows upwards. Following a number of authors (Roberts & Roussou 2002; Vangsnes 2002; Boeckx 2008; Biberauer & Roberts 2010; Roberts 2010), he claims this to be due to T's properties which are inherently verbal (T being 'extensional' with respect to the thematic *v*P domain by providing it with temporal denotation and being the position where auxiliary/lexical verbs merge/are moved), but not nominal. This is because V-to-T movement does not equal subject licensing, still requiring the presence of a lexical item bearing [D]- or [φ]-features (or at least a verb with D-features in pro-drop languages, for example), and the fact that T is invariably taken to be equipped with uninterpretable [φ]-features. Hence, the T-induced necessity of attracting an NP_{NOM}, an [iφ]-features-bearing lexical item. See also Section 3.3.

[23] He thus follows other scholars' observations (Béjar & Kahnemuyipour 2017; Bondaruk 2012, 2013, 2019) whereby in copular constructions with two third person NPs_{NOM} and post-verbal agreement both of the NPs_{NOM} are active Goals that need to value their [case]-features against the T Probe. The difference is that in Jurczyk's (2024) account the two NPs_{NOM}'s [ucase]-features are [uT]-features (after Pesetsky & Torrego 2007) and that, as already noted in fn.22, the Agree relation follows upwards as the two NPs_{NOM} are Probes rather than Goals (fn.22, point (a)). This basically shifts the motivation behind T-NPs_{NOM} Agree as T, in and of itself, lacks any intrinsic property to engage in a *multiple* downward Agree relation with the two NPs_{NOM}. More specifically, the T-NP_{NOM1} Agree relation is able to simultaneously value T's [uφ]-features and NP_{NOM1}'s [uT]-feature, so the valuation of the latter feature is, in fact, NP_{NOM2}'s 'responsibility'

In (27)=(1), for example, T can value its [uperson$_3$]-feature against NP$_{NOM1}$'s since both NPs$_{NOM}$ share the same value of this feature. This valuation is shown in (28) after NP$_{NOM1}$ SpecTP-moves (the agreeing features bolded).

(27)=(1)

Ci	muzycy	to	był	/	*byli
these:$_{NOM;3PL;VIR}$	musicians:$_{NOM;3PL;VIR}$	PRON.COP	was:$_{3SG;M}$	/	were:$_{3PL;VIR}$
kwartet	smyczkowy				
quartet:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$	string:$_{ADJ;NOM;3SG;M}$				

(28) [$_{TP}$ NP$_{NOM1}$[**i-3**;iPL;iN-VIR] [$_{T'}$ T[**u-3**;*uSG;uM*]-to$_{[i\text{-}N]}$ [$_{PredP}$ t$_{NPNOM1}$ [$_{Pred'}$ be NP$_{NOM2}$]]]]

Those of T's [uφ]-features that only match NP$_{NOM2}$'s, are valued as default (italicised in (28)), being lexicalised as a form least marked morphophonologically, (following Szucsich 2007), i.e., *to*, taken to instantiate the minimal [i: gender(N)] [φ]-feature structure (after Seres & Espinal's 2019 remarks on the Russian pronominal particle *ėto*).[24]

(cf. Zeiljstra 2012: 7). Note in passing that the valuation of the [uT]-features on the two NPs$_{NOM}$ against T's [iT]-feature requires no movement of either of the two NPs$_{NOM}$ since in this case the interpretable features c-command the uninterpretable ones (fn.22, point (b)).

[24] As seen, Jurczyk's (2024) Agree model also cannot handle NP$_{NOM1}$-driven agreement. Even though some of T's [uφ]-features are valued by those on an NP$_{NOM1}$, this is only because the default/expected T-NP$_{NOM2}$ Agree relation cannot take place in TP the way it does in PredP between *be* and NP$_{NOM2}$. Pre-verbal agreement is also impossible to establish in Jurczyk (2021) whose approach too follows the technicalities sketched in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 and, hence, partially resembles Jurczyk (2024) in that *be* agrees in the full set of [φ]-features with NP$_{NOM2}$ due to post-verbal agreement. A slightly different Agree scenario pertains to TP though, where T's [uφ]-features entirely reflect and, hence, agree with those on NP$_{NOM1}$. Jurczyk's (2021) proposal thus leans more towards Tajsner (2015) or Bondaruk (2019) in that the satisfaction of the (verbal) agreement and EPP/subject requirement is inherently divorced, taken care of by two different NPs$_{NOM}$. The reason for the difference in how T values its [uφ]-features in Jurczyk (2021) and Jurczyk (2024) is that the mode advanced in the former gets rid of the troublesome EPP-driven movement of NP$_{NOM1}$ to SpecTP but leaves unanswered the obligatory presence of the pronominal copula *to*, unlike the latter mode. The rendition of how the Agree relations proceed in Jurczyk (2021) is shown in (i)-(ii).

(i) Ci muzycy to był kwartet
these:$_{NOM;3PL;VIR}$ musicians:$_{NOM;3PL;VIR}$ PRON.COP was:$_{3SG;M}$ quartet:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$
smyczkowy
string:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$

(ii) [$_{TP}$ NP$_{NOM1[i3;iPL;iVIR]}$[$_{T'}$ T$_{[u3;uPL;uVIR]}$ [$_{PredP}$ t$_{NPNOM1}$ [$_{Pred'}$ be$_{[u3;uSG;uM]}$ NP$_{NOM2[i3;iSG;iM]}$]]]]

3.3. A new derivational model of DCCs with two third person NPs_{NOM}[25]

With all the necessary formal background provided, let us now examine the Agree scenario(s) that we believe DCCs with two third person NPs_{NOM} and bi-directional agreement may employ.

The feature misalignment patterns leading to pre-verbal agreement we will be looking at are determined by the [gender]- as well as [gender]- and [number]-features, represented by examples like (5) and (13), respectively. Since, as already noted, DCCs allowing pre-verbal agreement are also perfectly fine with NP_{NOM2}-controlled agreement, let us first account for the latter, following Jurczyk's (2024) derivation model. Example (29) is the rightward-agreement variant of (5) in which two NPs_{NOM} only differ in the gender feature.

(29)

Hitler	to	była	jedna	osoba
Hitler:$_{NOM;3SG;M}$	PRON.COP	was:$_{PST;3SG;F}$	one:$_{NOM;3SG;F}$	person:$_{NOM;3SG;F}$
'Hitler was one person.'				

Leaving unnecessary details aside, the first Agree relation in (29) involves *be* and its complement NP_{NOM2} once the two merge and form [Pred']. As already noted, the agreement is controlled entirely by NP_{NOM2} so the *be*-NP_{NOM2} Agree relation involves the full set of [φ]-features:[26]

(30) $[_{Pred'}$ była$_{[u3;uSG;uF]}$ jedna osoba$_{[i3;iSG;iF]}]$

[25] There are obviously other ways of handling pre-verbal agreement, either utilising the reformulated approaches mentioned in Section 2.1 or those examining agreement patterns in copular constructions cross-linguistically (Sigurðsson & Holmberg 2008, Hartmann & Heycock 2019, Coon & Keine 2021). One could, for instance, follow the inversion account and enrich Hartmann & Heycock's (2019) approach to [φ]-features as separate heads/Probes with the [gender]-feature, thus obtaining $[_{P(erson)P}$ [1] $[_{Pn'}$ Pn $[_{N(umbe)rP}$ [2] $[_{Nr'}$ Nr $[_{G(ende)rP}$ [3] $[_{Gr'}$ Gr $[_{TP}$ [4] $[_{T'}$ T $[_{VP}$ [5] $[_{V'}$ *be* $[_{FP}$ NP_{NOM1} $[_{F'}$ F $NP_{NOM2}]]]]]]]]]]]$, and derive different agreement patterns depending on which NP_{NOM} moves where in the structure. Example (5) would then result from NP_{NOM1}-movement to SpecTP as from position [4] it would be a closer Goal for all Probes than NP_{NOM2}. The post-verbal version of (5) could be derived by moving NP_{NOM1} to position [2] so that Probes Gr and Nr would not find NP_{NOM1} but would NP_{NOM2}, resulting in NP_{NOM1}-person agreement and NP_{NOM2}-number-gender agreement. The same would pertain to 'inverse constructions', i.e., specificational clauses in which NP_{NOM2} would target different landing sites. We will not explore other options here, merely signaling that other modes of dealing with NP_{NOM1}-controlled agreement clearly exist.

[26] In (30), the [uφ]-features of the adjective *jedna* 'one:$_{3SG;F}$' are valued against the interpretable ones on the NP *osoba* 'person:$_{3SG;F}$', the step omitted for brevity. Note also that unlike the T-NP_{NOM1} Agree relation, the *be*-NP_{NOM2} one does not follow upwards but in a classic downward manner. Jurczyk's (2021, 2024) reasoning is that it does not satisfy the subject requirement, i.e., NP_{NOM2} has to stay in-situ as a part of [Pred'].

The next derivational steps involve the merger of NP_{NOM1} with [Pred'] which yields [PredP], and the merger of T with [PredP]. Leaving immaterial details aside again, we arrive at the step where T is supposed to value its [uφ]-features against those on NP_{NOM2}, though this operation is impossible ((31a)) for reasons discussed in Section 3.2. At this point, T's [uF]-feature which matches that on NP_{NOM2} is valued 'as default', namely, it ends up lexicalised as a morpho-phonologically least marked form in terms of its feature specification, the pronominal copula *to* whose formal structure is [i:N] ((31b), the relevant feature and valuation italicised). Contrastively, T's [u3]- and [uSG]-features are valued once T attracts NP_{NOM1}, an option available since they are carried by both NP_{NOM1} and NP_{NOM2} ((31c)).

(31) a. $[_{T'}\ T_{[u3;uSG;uF]}\ [_{PredP}\ Hitler_{[i3;iSG;iM]}\ [_{Pred'}\ była\ jedna\ osoba_{[i3;iSG;iF]}]]]$
b. $[_{T'}\ T_{[u3;uSG;\mathit{uF}]}\text{-}\mathit{to}_{[\mathit{iN}]}\ [_{PredP}\ Hitler_{[i3;iSG;iM]}\ [_{Pred'}\ była\ jedna\ osoba_{[i3;iSG;iF]}]]]$
c. $[_{TP}\ Hitler_{[i3;iSG;iM]}\ [_{T'}\ T_{[u3;uSG;\mathit{uF}]}\text{-}\mathit{to}_{[\mathit{iN}]}\ [_{PredP}\ t_{Hitler}\ [_{Pred'}\ była\ jedna\ osoba_{[i3;iSG;iF]}]]]$

The same derivational procedure pertains to DCCs with post-verbal agreement where two third person NPs_{NOM} differ in the [number]- and [gender]-features such as (32), a rightward-agreement variant of (6). This is until step (33a) where there are now two features on T that have to be valued as default. Thus, in step (33b) T only values its [u3]-feature against NP_{NOM1} once it SpecTP-moves.

(32)

efekty	specjalne	to	była	ekstraklasa
effects:$_{NOM;3PL;NVIR}$	special:$_{NOM;3PL;NVIR}$	PRON.COP	was: $_{PST;3SG;F}$	first class:$_{NOM;3SG;F}$
'The special effects were classy.'				

(33) a. $[_{T'}\ T_{[u3;\mathit{uSG};\mathit{uF}]}\text{-}\mathit{to}_{[\mathit{iN}]}\ [_{PredP}$ efekty specjalne$_{[i3;iPL;iN\text{-}VIR]}\ [_{Pred'}$ była ekstraklasa$_{[i3;iSG;iF]}]]]$
b. $[_{TP}$ efekty specjalne$_{[i3;iPL;iN\text{-}VIR]}\ [_{T'}\ T_{[u3;\mathit{uSG};\mathit{uM}]}\text{-}\mathit{to}_{[\mathit{iN}]}\ [_{PredP}\ t_{efekty\ specjalne}\ [_{Pred'}$ była ekstraklasa$_{[i3;iSG;iF]}]]]$

Let us now consider the scenario in which the verbal copula shows morpho-phonological agreement with NP_{NOM1}. To this end, let us first scrutinise example (5)=(34).

(34)

Hitler	to	był	jedna	osoba
Hitler:$_{\text{NOM;3SG;M}}$	PRON.COP	was:$_{\text{PST;3SG;M}}$	one:$_{\text{NOM;3SG;F}}$	person:$_{\text{NOM;3SG;F}}$
'Hitler was one person.'				

IJPPAN_PolPr_GKa01908

As in (29) with post-verbal agreement, we take the [φ]-features specification on the verbal copula to reflect that on the argument it agrees with, namely, NP_{NOM1}, though we claim that it still agrees locally with NP_{NOM2}.[27]

(35) [$_{\text{Pred}}$, był$_{[u3;uSG;\textit{uM}]}$ jedna osoba$_{[i3;iSG;iF]}$]

Note, however, that unlike in (30) where *być* 'to be' and NP_{NOM2} show [φ]-features matching that ultimately results in NP_{NOM2}-controlled agreement, [φ]-features matching in (35) is only partial as the verbal copula and NP_{NOM2} carry different [gender]-features. Consequently, the former only values the [person]- and [number]-features whereas its [gender]-feature remains unvalued at this point (italicised), the assumption we make loosely following Pesetsky & Torrego's (2007) feature valuation procedure.[28] Leaving for now the details of how this valuation works, let us consider derivational steps that follow. After

[27] One could ask why to assume the Agree relation between the verbal copula and NP_{NOM2} to take place in a DCC with NP_{NOM1}-controlled agreement. After all, allowing for just one Agree relation between T and NP_{NOM1} that fully match in [φ]-features would satisfy both subject effects, verbal agreement and SpecTP-movement. Though we concur with that observation, there are reasons we lean towards the way Agree works in (35). First, there is no reason to assume that DCCs with two third person NPs_{NOM} and pre-verbal agreement do not follow Béjar & Kahnemuyipour's (2017) *person sensitivity*, the fact that whenever NP_{NOM1} is third person, NP_{NOM2} always contributes to/determines agreement, taking part in Agree with T or *be*. We thus take two NPs_{NOM} to still jointly play a role in establishing agreement even in DCCs like (5)-(6) and (12)-(18), though NP_{NOM2}'s role in such clauses is 'toned down' as it does not agree with *być* 'to be' in all [φ]-features (see below). Second, and following from the first, taking pre-verbal agreement to be fully NP_{NOM1}-controlled would leave unaccounted for the obligatory *to* in DCCs with two third person NPs_{NOM} as opposed to the optional one in DCCs with one third person NP_{NOM} or one first person and one second person NP_{NOM} (see Bondaruk 2013 and Jurczyk 2024). As argued in Jurczyk (2024), the obligatory presence *to* in DCCs with two third person NPs_{NOM} is a formal necessity, an aftermath of NP_{NOM2}'s unvalued [φ]-feature(s) that always remain on T. See, however, the discussion below where we slightly reformulate this requirement to fit the derivation of DCCs under consideration here.

[28] The gist of Pesetsky & Torrego's (2007) proposal is that the Probe and the Goal may agree in the unvalued features provided that another Agree operation follows in which another lexical item values at least one of those features, thus valuing all other unvalued instances of this feature. This is represented in (i) where B (Probe) and C (Goal) Agree in some unvalued feature F, the two features remaining unvalued at this point. Then, A is merged into the structure,

[Pred'] is formed, NP_{NOM1} is merged, which produces [PredP] and then, T merges into the structure. We argue that just as in DCCs with NP_{NOM2}-agreement, T carries the same set of [φ]-features as the verbal copula since NP_{NOM1} that controls agreement is also expected to be anchored in TP with respect to [PredP]'s semantic content (cf. Section 3.2). Contrary to what we have seen in DCCs with post-verbal agreement, in (36) the [φ]-features T-NP_{NOM1} Agree relation proceeds without violating Relativised Minimality as T's [φ]-features fully match those on NP_{NOM1}. Thus, T can freely attract NP_{NOM1} to SpecTP, the position from which the latter's [iφ]-features c-command and, hence, value the former's.

(36) $[_{TP}$ Hitler$_{[i3;iSG;iM]}$ $[_{T'}$ $T_{[u3;uSG;uM]}$-*to*$_{[iN]}$ $[_{PredP}$ t_{Hitler} $[_{Pred'}$ był jedna osoba$_{[i3;iSG;iF]}]]]$

One issue to be determined at this point is what makes the pronominal copula *to* lexicalised in (36), for as already noted, there is no feature mismatch between T and NP_{NOM1} that would result in the 'valuation-as-default' option as in example (29) (step (31a)) or (32) (step (33a)). The solution we would like to offer relates to the unvalued status of the [gender]-feature on the verbal copula that, as discussed above, results from the partial [φ]-features Agree relation between the copula and NP_{NOM2}. More specifically, we claim that despite this feature being ultimately valued due to the successful valuation of the same [gender]-feature on T against NP_{NOM1}, the failed/unsuccessful *być*-NP_{NOM2} Agree relation in this feature still requires the same formal rendition as in DCCs with post-verbal agreement. There are, however, two differences in the lexicalisation of *to* that separate DCCs with post-verbal and pre-verbal agreement. Firstly, in the latter *to* is not a product of the 'valuation-as-default' last resort operation to value T's [uφ]-feature(s), but a pure lexicalisation-as-default means of manifesting a failed/unsuccessful Agree relation. Secondly, in the latter DCCs the unsuccessful/failed Agree and its formal rendition/manifestation in the form of the pronominal copula *to* take place at different derivational moments.[29] The derivational history

carrying the valued feature F. A then agrees with B, valuing its [uvalF]-feature, thus valuing C's [uvalF]-feature too at the same time (feature valuation marked in strikethrough). See Pesetsky & Torrego (2007) and Danon (2011) for details.

(i) $[A_{[valF]} > AGREE > \ldots \quad [B_{[\sout{uvalF}]} \ldots \quad [C_{[uvalF]}]]]$

[29] A question remains why this manifestation does not take place immediately within [PredP], but is instead postponed until TP is projected. Whilst we take this as an available and fully legitimate option, we nevertheless take the lexicalisation of *to* in TP as resulting from the compound nature of the verb in the sense of Biberauer & Roberts (2010). More specifically, we claim that verbs are categorially not simple Vs, but complex V+T constituents that first merge with the V-complement, forming *v*P/VP, and then with the T-complement, forming TP (Biberauer & Roberts 2010: 266-267). In claiming so, we follow a commonly accepted stance

just outlined extends to DCCs with pre-verbal agreement determined by the [gender]- and [number]-features misalignment pattern such as (37)=(6).

(37)

efekty	specjalne	to	były	ekstraklasa
effects:$_{\text{NOM;3PL;NVIR}}$	special:$_{\text{NOM;3PL;NVIR}}$	PRON.COP	were: $_{\text{PST;3PL;NVIR}}$	first class:$_{\text{NOM;3SG;F}}$
'The special effects were classy.'				

PELCRA_6203010001711

(38) a. [$_{\text{Pred}}$, były$_{\underline{[\text{u3;}uPL;uNVIR]}}$ ekstraklasa$_{\underline{[\text{i3;iSG;iF}]}}$]

b. [$_{\text{TP}}$ efekty specjalne$_{[\text{i3;iPL;iNVIR}]}$ [$_{\text{T'}}$ T$_{\underline{[\text{u3;uPL;uNVIR}]}}$-*to*$_{[iN]}$ [$_{\text{PredP}}$ t$_{\text{Hitler}}$ [$_{\text{Pred}}$, były ekstraklasa$_{[\text{i3;iSG;iF}]}$]]]

What distinguishes the derivation of examples like (37) and those like (34)=(5) is that in the former the partial Agree relation between the verbal copula and NP_{NOM2} is now only in the matching [3person]-feature as shown in (38a), the other two features, [number] and [gender], being again valued during the T-NP_{NOM1} Agree relation.

4. Concluding remarks

This paper addresses pre-verbal agreement in Polish DCCs with two third person NPs_{NOM}. It first shows that contrary to their ungrammatical status in the literature, such constructions are fully licit, thus making some DCCs capable of displaying bi-directional agreement. Given that, it then briefly demonstrates the inability of current approaches to account for NP_{NOM1}-controlled agreement and, finally, with regards to the above considerations, it advances a new derivational model that allows for two derivational modes, producing either pre- or post-verbal agreement. The main premise of this model, operating on Jurczyk's (2021) implementation of Rothstein's (2004) bipartite predication structure, is that T and *być* 'to be' are Probes whose [φ]-features always match the agreeing Goal (after

(Roberts & Roussou 2002; Vangsnes 2002; Boeckx 2008; Biberauer & Roberts 2010) that T is 'extensional' with respect to the thematic *v*P-/VP-domain (here, PredP, see Jurczyk 2021 for a details), providing the latter's event denotation with temporal determination. In this respect, we propose that the TP-confined external merger of *to* is constrained by the requirement that any failed/unsuccessful Agree relation that the V+T complex engages into in the syntax must be morpho-phonologically rendered in the highest (temporal) domain of that complex once it finally re-projects into TP.

Jurczyk 2024), NP_{NOM2} or NP_{NOM1}. In the former case, the two Probes both agree with NP_{NOM2}; the local *być*-NP_{NOM2} Agree procedure in [Pred'] follows unhindered, producing NP_{NOM2}-controlled agreement. The T-NP_{NOM2} agreement, following in the upward manner (Zeiljstra 2012), whereby the Goal must move to a position c-commanding the Probe so that the former's [iφ]-features c-command the latter's, fails due to Relativised Minimality and because NP_{NOM2} is necessarily part of a complex [Pred'] predicate. Consequently, T has some of its [φ]-features valued once it attracts the closer NP_{NOM1} to [SpecTP], and some of them, namely, those whose value only reflects NP_{NOM2}'s specification, valued as-default in a least morphophonologically marked form (Szucsich 2007), the pronominal copula *to* with the [gender: iN] feature make up (Seres & Espinal 2019), base generated in T. In the latter case the two Probes carry NP_{NOM1}'s set of [φ]-features, though the verbal copula still agrees with NP_{NOM2} to contribute to the Agree operation, in line with Béjar & Kahnemuyipour's 2017 *person sensitivity*. The *być*-NP_{NOM2} Agree relation is partial, in the [gender]-feature or in the [gender]- and [number]-features, with the remaining one(s) being temporarily unvalued on the copula. Next, T and NP_{NOM1} enter the derivation and engage into Upward Agree, accomplished once NP_{NOM1} SpecTP-moves. This step yields pre-verbal agreement and simultaneously values the verbal copula's unvalued features since another instance of its features, the one on T, is subject to a successful valuation against NP_{NOM1} (Pesetsky & Torrego 2007). Finally, the failed/unsuccessful *być*-NP_{NOM2} Agree is subjected to a 'lexicalisation-as-default' formal rendition producing the pronominal copula *to* as in DCCs with post-verbal agreement.

References:

Bader, M, & J. Häussler 2009. Towards a model of grammaticality judgments. *Journal of Linguistics* 45: 1–58.

Béjar, S, & A. Kahnemuyipour 2017. Non-canonical agreement in copular sentences. *Journal of Linguistics* 53(3): 463–499.

Benveniste, É. 1966. *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, Vol.1. Paris: Gallimard.

Bermel, N. 2010. Variace a frekvence variant na příkladu tvrdých neživotných maskulin [Variation and the frequency of variants in hard masculine inanimate nouns]. In S. Čmejrková, J. Hoffmannová & E. Havlová (eds.), *Užívání a prožívání jazyka*, 135–140. Prague: Karolinum.

Bermel, N., & L. Knittl 2012. Corpus frequency and acceptability judgments: A study of morphosyntactic variants in Czech. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 8: 241–275.

Biberauer, T., & I. Roberts 2010. Subjects, tense and verb-agreement. In T. Biberauer, A. Holmberg, I. Roberts & M. Sheehan (eds.), *Parametric Variation: Null*

Subjects in Minimalist Theory, 263–302. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Błaszczak, J., & L. Geist 2001. Zur Rolle des Pronomens to/ėto in spezifizierenden Kopulakonstruktionen im Polnischen und Russischen. In G. Zybatow, U. Junghanns, U. Mehlhorn and L. Szucsich (eds.), *Current Issues in Formal Slavic Linguistics (Linguistik International 5)*, 247–257. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Boeckx, C. 2008. *Bare Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bondaruk, A. 2012. Person case constraint in Polish copular constructions. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 59(1–2): 49–84.

Bondaruk, A. 2013. *Copular Clauses in English and Polish: Structure, Derivation and Interpretation*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.

Bondaruk, A. 2019. Agreement with the post-verbal DP in Polish dual copula clauses. In M.J. Arche, F. Antonio & R. Marín (eds.), *The Grammar of Copulas Across Languages*, 107–129. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bowers, J. 1993. The syntax of predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 591–656.

Chomsky, N. 2001. Derivation by phase. In M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A life in Language*, 1–52. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. 2008. On phases. In R. Freidin, C.P. Otero & M.L. Zubizarreta (eds.), *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory*, 133–166. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Citko, B. 2008. Small clauses reconsidered: Not so small and not all alike. *Lingua* 118: 261–295.

Coon, J., & S. Keine 2021. Feature gluttony. *Linguistic Inquiry* 52(4): 655–710.

Danon, G. 2011. Agreement and DP-internal feature distribution. *Syntax* 14(4): 297–317.

Déchaine, R-M. 1993. Predicates Across Categories: Towards a Category-Neutral Syntax. Amherst, University of Massachusetts.

den Dikken, M. 2006. *Relators and Linkers: The Syntax of Predication, Predication Inversion, and Copulas.* Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Divjak, D. 2008. On (in)frequency and (un)acceptability. In B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (ed.), *Corpus Linguistics, Computer Tools and Applications – State of the Art*, 213–233. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Hartmann, J.M., & C. Heycock 2019. (Morpho)syntactic variation in agreement: specificational copular clauses across Germanic. *Frontiers in Psychology 10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02994

Hentschel, G. 2001. On the perspectivisation of noun phrases in copula sentences, mainly in Polish: (Y) to (jest) X and similar phenomena. In V.S. Chrakovskij, M. Grochowski & G. Hentschel (eds.), *Studies on the Syntax and Semantics of Slavonic Languages*, 161–213. Oldenburg: Bibliotheks- und Informationssystem der Universität Oldenburg.

Heycock, C. 2013. The syntax of predication. In M. Den Dikken (ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Generative Syntax*, 322–352. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Higgins, R. 1979. *The Pseudo-Cleft Constructions in English*. New York, NY: Garland.
Hiraiwa, K. 2002. Multiple Agree. *25th GLOW Workshop: Tools in Linguistic Theory*, Utrecht: Institute of Linguistics.
Jurczyk, R. 2021. Abandoning the EPP-feature in Polish dual copula clauses by redefining the predication relation. *Linguistics Beyond and Within* 7: 33–57.
Jurczyk, R. 2024. Post-verbal agreement and obligatory presence of particle to in Polish dual copula clauses. *Linguistics Beyond and Within* 10: 65–88.
Kayne, R. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
Kempen, G., & K. Harbusch 2008. Comparing linguistic judgments and corpus frequencies as windows on grammatical competence: A study of argument linearization in German clauses. In A. Steube (ed.), *The Discourse Potential of Underspecified Structures*, 179–192. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Linde-Usiekniewicz, J. 2007. Small clauses reconsidered revisited: Not so small and not so alike, and far fewer. *Lingua Posnaniensis* XLIX: 83–91.
Moro, A. 1997. *The Raising of Predicates: Predicative Noun Phrases and the Theory of Clause Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Pesetsky, D., & E. Torrego 2004. Tense, case and the nature of syntactic categories. In J. Guéron & J. Lecarme (eds.), *The Syntax of Time*, 295–537. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
Pesetsky, D., & E. Torrego 2007. The syntax of valuation and the interpretability of features. In S. Karimi, V. Samiian & W.K. Wilkins (eds.), *Phrasal and Clausal Architecture: Syntactic Derivation and Interpretation, In honor of Joseph E. Emonds*, 262–294. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Rezac, M. 2008. The syntax of eccentric agreement: The person case constraint and absolutive displacement in Basque. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26: 61–106.
Rizzi, L. 1990. *Relativised Minimality*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
Roberts, I. 2010. A deletion analysis of null subjects. In T. Biberauer, A. Holmberg, I. Roberts & M. Sheehan (eds.), *Parametric Variation: Null Subjects in Minimalist Theory*, 58–87. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Roberts, I., & A. Roussou 2002. The extended projection principle as a condition on the tense dependency. In P. Svenonius (ed.), *Subjects, Expletives and the EPP*, 125–155. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
Rothstein, S. 2004. *Predicates and their Subjects*. Dordrecht: Springer Science & Business Media.
Russell, B. 1910. *Philosophical Essays*. New York: Routledge.
Russell, B. 2003. The basis of realism. In S. Mumford (ed.), *Russell on Metaphysics*, 85–90. New York: Routledge.
Russell, B. 1919. *Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy*. London: Muirhead Library of Philosophy.
Rutkowski, P. 2006. From demonstratives to copulas: A cross-linguistic perspective and the case of Polish. *Journal of Universal Language* 7: 147–173.
Seres, D., & M. Teresa Espinal 2019. Russian definitional generic sentences. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 4(1): 59. 1–30. https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.760

Sigurðsson, H.A., & A. Holmberg 2008. Icelandic dative intervention: person and number are separate probes. In R. D'Alessandro, S. Fischer & G.H. Hrafnbjargarson (eds.), Agreement restrictions, 251–279. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Szucsich, L. 2007. Nothing wrong with finite T: Non-agreeing accusative impersonal sentences. In M. Gołędzinowska, U. Savchenko & R. Compton (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 15, The Toronto Meeting 2006*, 417–435. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Tajsner, P. 2015. On specification predication and the derivation of copular to-clauses in Polish. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 50(4): 25–66.

Vangsnes, Ø. 2002. Icelandic expletive constructions and the distribution of subject types. In P. Svenonius (ed.), *Subjects, Expletives and the EPP*, 43–70. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Zeiljstra, H. 2012. There is only one way to agree. *The Linguistic Review* 29: 491–539.