

## Reinstating the clausal analysis of first conjunct agreement: Evidence from complementizer agreement

Astrid van Alem (Leiden University)

A recurring debate regarding first conjunct agreement (FCA) is whether it should be analyzed as agreement with the first conjunct of a nominal coordination, or resulting from agreement with the subject of a clausal conjunct in which all elements but the subject are elided, only giving the impression of FCA (Aoun et al., 1994, 1999; Munn, 1999). This paper discusses this question in light of first conjunct complementizer agreement (FCCA). I argue, based on Frisian, that both the nominal and the clausal coordination analyses are required to account for the full array of agreement facts. I then show that this approach can successfully account for FCCA in Polish. The paper thus provides novel evidence in favor of the clausal analysis of FCA.

**FCCA in Frisian** Frisian has complementizer agreement (CA) for 2SG (1). When the subject is a coordination where the first conjunct is a 2SG pronoun, FCA is possible but optional (2). There is an asymmetry regarding FCA on complementizers and verbs, as verbs never allow FCA, even when they are in the same structural context as complementizers (3). The optionality of FCCA corresponds to an interpretative difference (2), illustrating that CA is not a phonological phenomenon (see van Alem (2020)).

- (1) dat-st-o [...] fegetarysk ytst. CA  
that-2SG-you vegetarian eat  
'that you eat vegetarian'
- (2) a. Ik tink dat-st-o en Jan de wedstriden winne sille. FCCA  
I think that-2SG-you and Jan the games win will.PL  
'I think that you and Jan will win the games.'  
(distributive reading preferred: you and Jan are each playing your own games)
- b. Ik tink dat do en Jan de wedstriden winne sille. no FCCA  
I think that you and Jan the games win will.PL  
'I think that you and Jan will win the games.'  
(collective reading preferred: you and Jan are a team)
- (3) \*Moarn giest-o en Jan de wedstriid winnen. \*verbal FCA  
tomorrow go.2SG-you and Jan the game win  
'Tomorrow you and Jan are going to win the game.'

**Analysis** I take the fact that verbal FCA is ungrammatical in Frisian to show that Frisian does not have 'real' FCA. Rather, I propose that FCCA comes about under clausal conjunction and Right Node Raising (RNR) (Aoun et al., 1994). More specifically, CP dominates a coordination of TPs, in which all elements but the subjects have undergone RNR. The complementizer Agrees with the closest Goal, i.e. the subject of the first conjunct TP, leading to FCCA. Embedded sentences with a nominal coordination as a subject do not trigger FCCA, because a Probe cannot Agree 'into' a Goal in Frisian.

This analysis derives the interpretative effect of FCCA as follows: because FCCA corresponds to a structure with clausal coordination where each of the conjunct subjects composes with a predicate individually, a distributive reading is the most natural.

The clausal analysis cannot derive verbal FCA, as this would require the verb to move out of one of the conjuncts to C, violating the Coordinate Structure Constraint (departing from Aoun et al. (1994)).

A remaining question is how agreement on the clause-final verb in embedded clauses with FCCA (and thus RNR) is resolved. Shen (2019) shows that languages vary in whether they allow closest conjunct agreement or resolved agreement (or both) under RNR. (4) shows that in other RNR contexts, Frisian only allows for resolved agreement. Resolved (plural) agreement on the verb in (2a) thus predicted.

- (4) Ik tink [dat-st-o —] en [dat Jan de wedstriden winne **sille**]  
 I think that-2SG-you and that Jan the game win will.PL  
 ‘I think that you and that Jan are going to win the game.’

**FCCA in Polish** While FCCA is a rather uncommon phenomenon cross-linguistically, it is also found in Polish (Citko, 2018). Of particular interest in Polish are the interactions between verbal agreement (VA) and FCCA: while resolved VA is possible both when there is FCCA (6) and when there is not (5), last conjunct agreement (LCA) on the verb is possible only in the context of FCCA (7) (all data from Citko (2018)).

- (5) Maria chce, żebyśmy ja i mój sąsiad wyszli. resolved CA+VA  
 Maria wants that.COND.1PL I and my neighbor.M.SG left.VIR.PL  
 ‘Maria wants me and my neighbor to leave.’
- (6) Maria chce, żebym ja i mój sąsiad wyszli. FCCA, resolved VA  
 Maria wants that.COND.1SG I and my neighbor.M.SG left.VIR.PL  
 ‘Maria wants me and my neighbor to leave.’
- (7) Maria chce, żebym ja i mój sąsiad wyszedł. FCCA, verbal LCA  
 Maria wants that.COND.1SG I and my neighbor.M.SG left.M.SG  
 ‘Maria wants me (F) and my neighbor to leave.’

The analysis proposed for Frisian can be extended to Polish as follows. First, embedded sentences with conjoined subjects on the surface can be derived either via nominal coordination or by clausal coordination and RNR. The former does not require FCCA. Furthermore, the verb has to Agree with the whole coordination, since it is not in a structural configuration to Agree into the subject, resulting in resolved VA. This is what happens in (5). If the sentence is derived by clausal coordination and RNR, the complementizer has to Agree with subject of the first TP conjunct, since it is the closest Goal. This leads to the appearance of FCCA. Verbal agreement is resolved with the general rules for agreement under RNR. Shen (2019) shows that in Polish, agreement resolution under RNR always results in closest, i.e. last conjunct agreement. This derives sentence (7), and the dependence of verbal LCA on FCCA.

Finally, the pattern in (6) comes about as the result of an independent difference between Polish and Frisian. In contrast to Frisian, Polish allows for FCA on the verb when it precedes the subject. Note that resolved agreement is also possible:

- (8) Do pokoju weszła/weszli młoda kobieta i chłopiec.  
 to room entered.F.SG/entered.PL young woman and boy  
 ‘Into the room walked a young woman and boy.’ (Citko, 2004)

This shows that in addition to FCA derived by clausal coordination and RNR, Polish allows for (optional) real FCA where the Probe can Agree into the coordinated subject (cf. Mendes and Ruda (2019)). Applying this to CA, it follows that FCCA can result from Agreeing into a nominal coordination as well. If this is the case, verbal agreement can only be resolved agreement, since the verb is too low to Agree into the subject. This produces (6).

In contrast to the analysis of (5)–(7) by Citko (2018), the current analysis does not require the stipulation of restrictions on agreement interactions. Instead, all the facts are derived by independent principles of agreement, conjunction, and agreement resolution under RNR. Moreover, the fact that the FCCA patterns in Polish and Frisian are easily derived under the same analysis provides evidence in favor of its universality.

**Conclusion** In this paper, I show that the pattern of FCCA in Frisian and Polish can be successfully analyzed with clausal coordination and RNR (Aoun et al., 1994), and that this analysis does not require any stipulations about agreement or coordination. This paper thus provides novel support for the clausal analysis of FCA, in addition to the standard nominal coordination analysis.

## References

- Aoun, J., Benmamoun, E., and Sportiche, D. (1994). Agreement, word order, and conjunction in some varieties of Arabic. *Linguistic inquiry*, pages 195–220.

- Aoun, J., Benmamoun, E., and Sportiche, D. (1999). Further remarks on first conjunct agreement. *Linguistic inquiry*, 30(4):669–681.
- Citko, B. (2004). Agreement asymmetries in coordinate structures. In Arnaudova, O., Browne, W., Rivero, M. L., and Stojanović, D., editors, *Proceedings of FASL*, volume 12, pages 91–109. Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Citko, B. (2018). Complementizer agreement with coordinated subjects in Polish. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, 3(1):1–25.
- Mendes, G. and Ruda, M. (2019). First conjunct agreement in Polish: evidence for a mono-clausal analysis. *Snippets*, (36):3–5.
- Munn, A. (1999). First conjunct agreement: Against a clausal analysis. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 30(4):643–668.
- Shen, Z. (2019). The multi-valuation Agreement Hierarchy. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, 4(1):1–29.
- van Alem, A. (2020). Complementizer agreement is not allomorphy: A reply to Weisser (2019). *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, 5(1):1–10.