# LingBaW

# Post-verbal agreement and obligatory presence of particle *to* in Polish dual copula clauses

Rafał Jurczyk WSB Merito University, Poland

# Abstract

This paper addresses the obligatory particle *to* in Polish dual copula clauses (DCCs) with post-verbal agreement and two 3<sup>rd</sup> person nominative expressions with  $\varphi$ -feature(s) mismatch. It argues that *to* must be present because the syntax cannot successfully establish the  $\varphi$ -Agree relation between T and the post-verbal nominative expression (NP<sub>NOM2</sub>). Two crucial premises are adopted. One is Zeiljstra's (2012) Upward Agree which requires ifeatures to c-command u-features and, hence, necessitates the closest NP<sub>NOM</sub> to T to SpecTP-move. The other is Vangsnes's (2002) obligatory TP identification by the Tense- (provided by T) and  $\varphi$ -features (provided by NP<sub>NOM</sub> controlling agreement) to anchor the subject to the eventuality denoted by the complex predicate Pred' [*be* NP<sub>NOM2</sub>] (Jurczyk 2021). The examination shows that T-NP<sub>NOM2</sub>  $\varphi$ -Agree in DCCs under consideration cannot be established as SpecTP-movement of NP<sub>NOM2</sub> is illegitimate; NP<sub>NOM2</sub> if formally and syntactically part of Pred' and is also farther from T than NP<sub>NOM1</sub>, the pre-verbal nominal expression. Consequently, T's  $\varphi$ -features remain unvalued, which makes TP formally unidentified. However, since some of T's NP<sub>NOM2</sub>'s specified features are specified as those on NP<sub>NOM1</sub>, T attracts NP<sub>NOM1</sub> to value them whereas features bearing NP<sub>NOM2</sub>'s specification get valued as default and lexicalised as the least-marked form in terms of feature specification (following Szucsich 2007), i.e., *to*<sub>[i-neut]</sub>. It is thus concluded that the obligatory presence of *to* is a means of formally identifying TP in case any of T's NP<sub>NOM2</sub>-specified  $\varphi$ -features cannot be successfully valued by the T-NP<sub>NOM2</sub> Agree relation.

Keywords: Polish dual copula clauses; post-verbal agreement; TP identification; pronominal clitic to

#### 1. Introduction<sup>1 2</sup>

In Polish verbal copula clauses, *be* usually agrees with NP<sub>NOM1</sub> as in NP<sub>NOM1</sub> *be* NP<sub>INSTR2</sub> structures ((1)), clauses with 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person NPs<sub>NOM</sub> surrounding *be* ((2)-(3)), or DCCs with 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person initial nominative pronouns ((4)).<sup>3</sup>

- (1) *Ci zawodnicy są drużyną piłkarską.* these players-NOM-3PL-VIR are-3PL team-INSTR-3SG-FEM football-INSTR-3SG-FEM 'These players are a football team.'
- (2) Ja jestem ty. I-NOM-1SG am-1SG you-NOM-2SG 'I am you.'
- (3) *Ty jesteś ja.* you-NOM-2SG are-2SG I-NOM-1SG 'You are me.'
- (4) Ja / Ty to jestem / jesteś gawędziarz.
   I-NOM-1SG / you-NOM-2SG COP am-1SG / are-2SG storyteller-NOM-3SG- MASC 'I/You am/are a storyteller.'

- <sup>2</sup> NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> in Polish DCCs may show gender-number misalignment ((i)), gender misalignment ((ii)), or φ-features matching ((iii)).
  - (i) *Te tereny to była puszcza.* these areas-NOM-3PL-N-VIR COP was-3SG-FEM forest-NOM-3SG-FEM 'These areas were a forest.'
  - (ii) Ona to było niezłe ziółko.
     she-NOM-3SG-FEM COP was-3SG-NEUT good-3SG-NEUT weirdo-NOM-3SG-NEUT 'She was a weirdo.'
  - (iii) Marek to był muzyk. Marek-NOM-3SG-MASC COP was-3SG-MASC musician-3SG-MASC 'Mark was a musician.'
- <sup>3</sup> There seems to be speaker variation regarding the acceptability of examples like (2)-(3), for unlike the present author, Reviewer 1 does not tolerate them. They, nevertheless, crop up in different sources as grammatical. Example (i) comes from Bondaruk (2013: 149), and (ii) is from the National Corpus of Polish (www.nkjp.pl).
  - (i) Ja jestem ty. I-NOM-1SG am-1SG you-NOM-2SG 'I am you.'
  - (ii) Ja jestem ty ty jesteś ja!
     I-NOM-1SG am-1SG you-NOM-2SG you-NOM-2SG are-2SG I-NOM-1SG
     'I am you you are me!' (IJPPAN\_k70A024)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Abbreviations: NP<sub>3NOM</sub> – third person nominative expression, NOM – nominative, GEN – genitive, DAT – dative, ACC – accusative, INSTR – instrumental, MASC – masculine, FEM – feminine, NEUT – neuter, VIR – virile, N-VIR – non-virile, SG – singular, PL – plural, COP – pronominal clitic *to*, i – interpretable feature(s), u – uninterpretable feature(s).

In DCCs with two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> and gender or gender-number mismatch, however, agreement is post-verbal and requires the particle *to*. If *to* is dropped in (5), the only way to make it grammatical is for NP<sub>NOM1</sub> to  $\varphi$ -Agree with *be* and for NP<sub>NOM2</sub> to assume instrumental case ((6)).

(5) Та okolica \*była / były to this neighbourhood-NOM-3SG-FEM COP \*was-3SG-FEM / were-3PL-N-VIR obrzeża miasta. outskirts-NOM-3PL-N-VIR of-city 'This neighbourhood was the outskirts of the city.' (6) Ta okolica była / \*były this neighbourhood-NOM-3SG-FEM was-3SG-FEM / \*were-3PL-N-VIR miasta / \*obrzeża obrzeżami miasta. outskirts-INSTR-3PL-N-VIR of-city / outskirts-NOM-3PL-N-VIR of-city 'This neighbourhood was the outskirts of the city'

The issue of why this requirement holds, has so far received very little attention. It is only cursorily mentioned in Bondaruk (2019: 112, fn.9) for whom post-verbal agreement seemingly depends on the presence of *to* because equatives, copular constructions expressing identity between two XPs surrounding the copula (Higgins 1979) and characterised by preverbal agreement (Bondaruk 2013), necessarily show post-verbal agreement when accompanied by to.<sup>4</sup>

(7) On to kiedyś \*był / była ona.
 he-NOM-3SG-MASC COP once was-3SG-MASC / was-3SG-FEM she-3SG-FEM 'He used to be her.'

Here, we claim that the obligatory presence of *to* in Polish DCCs under consideration results from derivational issues concerning the T-NP<sub>NOM2</sub>  $\varphi$ -Agree relation. Following Zeiljstra's (2012) Upward Agree whereby i-features must necessarily c-command u-features, and taking T in DCCs under consideration to carry NP<sub>NOM2</sub>-matching u $\varphi$ -features, we show that T-NP<sub>NOM2</sub>  $\varphi$ -agreement cannot be established as it requires the movement of the farther NP<sub>NOM</sub> which is not a grammatical-logical subject, the step violating Relativised Minimality and resulting in the illicit NP<sub>NOM2</sub> > NP<sub>NOM1</sub> > *be* word order. Nevertheless, T's u $\varphi$ -features have to be valued anyway as they are required, along with the T-feature provided by T, to formally identify TP in the sense of Vangsnes (2002), namely, to anchor the subject argument to the state-of-affairs denoted by the VP/event structure (here, Pred'). We therefore argue that having the same value on the two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub>, T's uperson<sub>3</sub>-feature is valued by NP<sub>NOM1</sub> once T attracts it to SpecTP whereas the remaining gender- and/or number-features carrying

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Bondaruk supports her claim highlighting that NP<sub>NOM2</sub> controls agreement also in Russian equatives involving the pronominal *èto* ('that<sub>neut</sub>'/'it<sub>neut</sub>') and the verbal copula *byt*' ('to be'):

 <sup>(</sup>i) Šaxmaty - èto \*byli / było / była ego strast'.
 chess-NOM-PL that/it were-PL / was-3SG-NEUT / was-3SG-FEM his passion-3SG-FEM 'Chess was his passion.'

NP<sub>NOM2</sub>'s specification are valued as default (following Szucsich 2009) and lexicalised as the morpho-phonologically least marked form in terms of its feature specification, i.e.,  $to_{[i-neut]}$ . To is thus a formal backup option to identify the TP-projection whenever (some of) T's  $\varphi$ -features cannot be valued. This observation simultaneously implies that another property should be associated with optional *to*, cropping up in DCCs with NP<sub>NOM1</sub>-agreement, i.e., those either involving two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> with matching  $\varphi$ -features or two non-third person NPs<sub>NOM</sub>. Following Seres and Espinal's (2019) examination of the Russian pronominal form *èto* ('that<sub>neut</sub>'/'it<sub>neut</sub>'), we associate this property with the presentational function, having to do with expressing the semantic connection between the pre-verbal and post-verbal NP<sub>NOM</sub>.

The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 briefly outlines technical assumptions on which our examination is based. Section 3 is the main point of the paper, focussing on determining the status of *to* and, hence, the reason for its obligatory presence in DCCs with NP<sub>NOM2</sub>-controlled agreement (Sub-section 3.1). Some space is also devoted to discussing the role of *to* in DCCs with NP<sub>NOM1</sub>-controlled agreement (Sub-sections 3.2 and 3.3). Section 4 concludes the paper.

#### 2. Post-verbal agreement and particle to in Polish DCCs: Preliminary considerations

Here, we briefly outline technical assumptions essential for developing the account on the correlation between NP<sub>NOM2</sub>-agreement and obligatory presence of *to* in Polish DCCs with two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub>. The material presented here is illustrative; the details on how these notions work on actual linguistic data, and how they jointly conspire to mandate post-verbal agreement and *to* in the construction under consideration, are offered in Section 3.

#### 2.1. Predication

We take Polish DCCs to encode predication through Pred(ication)P(hrase) with a syntactically and semantically complex [ $_{Pred'}$  be NP<sub>NOM2</sub>] predicate (following Rothstein 2004: 44-45, 259).<sup>5</sup> Pred' is inherently unsaturated, instantiating a Fregean function that must be completed by a saturated expression capable of standing on its own, i.e., a subject (NP<sub>NOM1</sub>).<sup>6</sup> The incomplete status of Pred' is a syntax-semantic primitive. Syntactically, it holds because the saturation of Pred' obtains whether verbs assign thematic roles (lexical verbs, e.g. \*visited John, '\*'=ungrammaticality) or not (e.g. the verbal copula be in \*is a tall man or raising verbs like seem in \*seems that John is late). Semantically-wise, it holds because unlike lexical verbs that introduce the eventuality and its property simultaneously (e.g. the verb read introduces the eventuality whose property is 'reading'), be introduces the eventuality whereas its property only crystallises once be combines with its complement (Rothstein 2004: 289), producing

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See Bailyn and Citko (1999), Citko (2008), Bondaruk (2012, 2013, 2019) for alternative approaches to predication in Polish copular clauses.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> For details, consult Frege (1891/1960), Mahjabeen (2012), Rothstein (2004).

Pred'. Pred' then merges with  $NP_{NOM1}$ , deriving PredP, the step establishing predication whereby  $NP_{NOM1}$  is ascribed the property of Pred'.

```
(8) [PredP NP_{NOM1} [Pred' be NP_{NOM2}]]
```

Because PredP is syntactically asymmetrical (following Kayne's 1994 Linear Correspondence Axiom, LCA), NP<sub>NOM1</sub> is always identified as a grammatical-logical subject, i.e., predestined to occupy SpecTP (NP<sub>NOM2</sub> is invariably part of the complex predicate Pred').<sup>7</sup> The formation of PredP along the lines just outlined obviates the Relativised Minimality problem (Rizzi 1990) typical for 'inversion accounts' (Moro 1997, Mikkelsen 2005, den Dikken 2006, Shlonsky and Rizzi 2018, Bondaruk 2019, Hartmann and Heycock 2019a, 2019b) where NP<sub>NOM2</sub> can SpecTP-move too, the operation that should be blocked by NP<sub>NOM1</sub> intervening between T and NP<sub>NOM2</sub>.<sup>8</sup>

# 2.2. (Upward) Agree

We take the configurational relationship between T and  $NPs_{NOM}$  to follow uniformly 'upstairs' according to Zeiljstra's (2012: 17) Upward Agree, summarised in (9a)-(9c) below.

(9) 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

Contra Chomsky (2000, 2001), in Upward Agree the Probe no longer has to c-command the Goal, the requirement now being that Agree terminates when i-features c-command u-features. Hence, SpecTP-movement of the subject is no longer triggered by the troublesome EPP-feature (as in e.g. Bondaruk 2013, 2019). (In Chomsky 2000, 2001, Agree is the only feature-valuation mode, so subject-movement needs an independent trigger). In the Upward Agree model, the T-NP<sub>NOM1</sub> Agree relation terminates only after T attracts NP<sub>NOM1</sub> to SpecTP so that NP<sub>NOM1</sub>'s i $\varphi$ -features can value T's u $\varphi$ -features in a c-command configuration ((9b)). This is especially important as it allows us to conflate NP<sub>NOM1</sub>'s now formally motivated, obligatory SpecTP-movement, with Vangsnes's (2002: 60) obligatory anchoring of the subject

(i) Linear Correspondence Axiom

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Assuming a simplified version of LCA (López 2009: 239):

Take X, Y, non-terminal nodes that dominate the terminals x, y, respectively. Assume that X c-commands Y, while Y does not c-command X (asymmetric c-command). Then x precedes y.

let X=NP<sub>NOM1</sub>, Y=NP<sub>NOM2</sub>, x=*ja* 'I', y=*profesor* 'professor'. Then, X c-commands Y, but Y does not c-command X, so x precedes y. Note that X also precedes *be* which is Y's sister when the two merge together. Accordingly, the sequence *ja jestem professor* ('I am a professor') will be PF-linearised as *ja* > *jestem* > *profesor* where '>' means 'precedes'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> The term 'inversion accounts' pertains to approaches arguing that specificational copular clauses are inverted predicational ones via the movement of the lower (predicative) nominal (NP<sub>NOM2</sub>) rather than the subject (NP<sub>NOM1</sub>) to SpecTP. Several proposals were advanced to circumvent the problem with the movement of the lower nominal. See e.g. Mikkelsen (2005), Shlonsky and Rizzi (2018), or den Dikken (2006). Cf. also fn.13.

with respect to the state-of-affairs denoted by the verb (here, Pred'), another important notion addressed in Sub-section 2.3. The other convenience of adopting Upward Agree is that it bypasses problems with multiple Agree couched within Chomsky's Downwards Agree model as in Bondaruk (2019: 127) where T probes both NP<sub>NOM1</sub> and NP<sub>NOM2</sub> and values their u-case features as nominative. More specifically, T lacks any intrinsic property motivating *multiple* Agree given that T-NP<sub>NOM1</sub> Agree, apart from valuing NP<sub>NOM1</sub>'s u-case feature, also values T's u $\varphi$ -features so T's needs have now been satisfied. That NP<sub>NOM2</sub> still needs to value its case feature thus rather implies Goal-centred multiple Agree (Zeiljstra 2012: 7). Accordingly, in Upward Agree the two NPs<sub>NOM</sub> carrying u-case features (here, the uT(ense)-feature after Pesetsky and Torrego 2004) count as Probes (Chomsky's 2000, 2001 Goals) due to (9a) and Agree upwards with T to value their uT-features against T's interpretable counterpart.<sup>9</sup>

Apart from the Upward Agree approach, we also assume that  $\varphi$ -features may probe independently (cf. e.g. Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008, Hartmann and Heycock 2019b, Coon and Keine 2021 for Icelandic and Faroese). Unlike in the above works, however, independent probing only constitutes a last resort option when the 'default', i.e., 'collective' probing mode, whereby all the Probe's u $\varphi$ -features are valued against the Goal's i $\varphi$ -features, becomes impossible on formal/derivational grounds (see Sub-section 3.1 for details).

## 2.3. T(P) identification

We assume after Vangsnes (2002) that a functional projection F must be identified by a constituent carrying at least one feature relevant for F. The functional projections relevant here are Vangsnes's (2002: 60)  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$ , namely, Agr(SP) and TP which we annotate collectively as TP.<sup>10</sup> According to Vangsnes, the former must be identified by at least one of the following features: deixis, Case and person, and the latter by at least one of the following: tense, number. Replacing the feature deixis, immaterial here, with the feature gender (the combination of NP<sub>NOM2</sub>-agreement and obligatory *to* concerns DCCs with two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> manifesting person, number and gender) as well as dispensing with the case-feature which equals the T(ense)-feature, TP will thus be identified by the following features: Tense, provided by T, and person, number, gender, provided by NP<sub>NOM1</sub>.

As for why TP needs to be identified, we follow Vangsnes (2002: 60) in that TP is the projection where the state-of-affairs denoted by the verb is anchored with respect to time (in this respect, cf. also Boeckx 2008: 152-155) and then, with respect to the subject. Since we are dealing here with DCCs, the state-of-affairs will not be denoted by the (lexical) verb, but as already indicated (Section 2.2), by the complex predicate Pred'. It is thus Pred' that will be

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Case valuation technicalities are of secondary importance here, but adopting Upward Agree, Pesetsky and Torrego's (2004) proposal can be applied straightforwardly as in other approaches the nominative case feature is either uninterpretable on the Probe and the Goal (Chomsky 1995) or absent on T (Chomsky 2000, 2001).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Vangsnes (2002) disambiguates between the two as he examines Icelandic Transitive Expletive Constructions (TECs) and distribution of different subject types therein. Icelandic TECs are often taken as hosting expletives in SpecAgrSP and subjects in SpecTP (e.g. Vangsnes 2002). This distinction is immaterial here.

anchored with respect to time once PredP merges with T and *be*'s uT-feature is valued by T's iT-feature (following Biberauer and Roberts 2010). Next, the state-of-affairs denoted by the temporally modified Pred' will be anchored with respect to the subject (NP<sub>NOM1</sub>) once T attracts it to SpecTP to have its u $\varphi$ -features valued (see Section 3 for details). We take this final step to instantiate the establishment of what Hinzen (2009) terms 'propositional thought', the construct in which the subject is asserted or denied, with the help of temporal modification, the property of the predicate (Woodard 2018: 43), namely, assigned the value 'truth' or 'false'.

# 2.4. Particle 'to'

We follow Bondaruk's (2019) proposal where *to* represents a pronominal clitic (on distribution of Polish clitics see e.g. Witkoś 1998) since it can be pre- or post-verbal (square brackets), the variation subjected to PF-movement.<sup>11</sup>

(10) Bolek [to] (jest) [to] uczeń.
 Bolek-NOM COP is COP student-NOM 'Bolek is a student.'

As for its placement, we follow Citko (2008), claiming that *to* is base-generated in T. We motivate our stance by examples like (10) where *be* is optional (round brackets) in the present tense, and (11) where it is obligatory (asterisk) in the past and future.

(11) Bolek to \*(był/będzie) uczeń. Bolek-NOM COP was/will-be student 'Bolek was/will be a student.'

Following our earlier observations (Jurczyk 2021), we treat past and future DCCs as carrying the past and the future tense specified for the verbal +V- and nominal +D-features, which necessitate the presence of the verbal and the pronominal copula. The present tense feature is specified as [+D, (+V)] so *be* is optional. Our reasoning reverberates Benmamoun (2008: 125), for whom the Hebrew pronominal copula which agrees in number and gender with the subject but lacks tense marking, manifests the nominal feature(s) +D, number, gender of the present tense. Accordingly, Hebrew present tense copular clauses as in (12) may do without the verbal copula.

(12) *dani (hu) rofe.* Dani SG-MASC doctor 'Dani is a doctor.'

We propose that Polish *to* plays the same role, manifesting the present tense's nominal feature. Unlike in Hebrew, however, we assume that the formal guise of this feature in Polish is [+D, gender] for reasons to be discussed in Sub-section 3.1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> The functional status of the Polish particle *to* is a highly debatable topic. See Rutkowski (2006), Citko (2008), Błaszczak and Geist (2001), or Tajsner (2015) for different takes on *to*.

#### 2.5. Post-verbal agreement and its derivational consequences

We take rightward agreement direction in DCCs to explicate Béjar and Kahnemuyipour's (2017: 485) person sensitivity/constraint given in (13) below (NP<sub>1</sub>=pre-copular NP, NP<sub>2</sub>=post-copular NP).

a. If NP<sub>1</sub> is 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> person, then it can and will agree thereby blocking NP<sub>2</sub> agreement
 b. Only if NP<sub>1</sub> is 3<sup>rd</sup> person, will NP<sub>2</sub> agreement be possible

Person sensitivity defined in (13a)-(13b) captures the correlation between  $\varphi$ -feature specification and agreement direction in Polish copular constructions. Examples (14)-(20) illustrate.

(14)  $[T_{[u\phi]} NP_{NOM[1SG]} być NP_{NOM[2SG]}] = (2)$ 

(15)  $[T_{[u\phi]} NP_{NOM[2SG]} by \acute{c} NP_{NOM[1SG]}] = (3)$ 

- (16)  $[T_{[u\phi]} NP_{NOM[1SG]} to być NP_{NOM[3SG-MASC]}] = (4)$
- (17)  $[T_{[u\phi]} NP_{NOM[2SG]} \text{ to być } NP_{NOM[3SG-MASC]}] = (4)$
- (18)  $[T_{[u\phi]} NP_{NOM[3SG-FEM]} \text{ to być } NP_{NOM[3SG-NEUT]}] = (ii, fn.2)$
- (19)  $[T_{[u\phi]} NP_{NOM[3SG-FEM]} \text{ to by } c NP_{NOM[3PL-N-VIR]}] = (5)$
- (20)  $[T_{[u\phi]} NP_{NOM[3PL-N-VIR]} \text{ to by c } NP_{NOM[3SG-FEM]}] = (i, fn.2)$

Post-verbal agreement crops up only in DCCs involving two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> which differ in gender ((18)) or in gender and number ((19)-(20)). Because in such DCCs each subject effect is taken care of by a different argument, SpecTP-movement by NP<sub>NOM1</sub> and verbal agreement by NP<sub>NOM2</sub>, we adopt other authors' claims (e.g. Bondaruk 2013, 2019 and Tajsner 2015 on Polish, Béjar and Kahnemuyipour 2018, Hartman and Heycock 2016, 2017, 2019b, 2022, Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008 on Romance and Germanic) that both NPs<sub>NOM</sub> are manipulated/targeted by the syntax during the derivation. To this end, we follow Jurczyk (2021) and propose that there are two Agree relations, the T-NP<sub>NOM1</sub> one and the *be*-NP<sub>NOM2</sub> one, initiated separately by the T and *be* Probes.

#### 3. Obligatory pronominal clitic to in Polish DCCs with post-verbal agreement: Examination

Here, we determine factors behind the mutually inclusive and obligatory presence of *to* and NP<sub>NOM2</sub>-agreement in Polish DCCs. To this end, in Sub-section 3.1 we scrutinise, resting on assumptions from Section 2, the derivational history of DCCs with NP<sub>NOM2</sub>-agreement, i.e., those whose two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> either differ in the gender specification or in the gender-number specification. As a follow up to this, in Sub-sections 3.2 and 3.3 we also examine DCCs where *to* is optional: those with two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> showing  $\varphi$ -features matching and those with only one or no NP<sub>3NOM</sub>, i.e., involving either one first person and one second person NP<sub>NOM</sub> or one non-

third person and one third person  $NP_{NOM}$ . The purpose is to find out whether different distributional patterns of *to* in these three types of DCCs could, nevertheless, point to a one universal property of the pronominal clitic *to* in all these constructions.

# 3.1. Derivation of DCCs with two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> showing $\varphi$ -feature(s) mismatch

DCCs in which two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> differ either in the gender or in the gender-number specification are crucial for examining the reasons pertaining to the mutual co-presence of post-verbal agreement and the pronominal clitic *to*, for as already noted, only in this type of DCCs is *to* obligatory. The representative examples of the said DCCs are (5) and (ii, fn.2), repeated as (21) and (22), respectively. We take both (21) and (22) to follow the same derivational scenario.

- Taokolicatobyłyobrzeżamiasta.thisneighbourhood-NOM-3SG-FEMCOPwere-3PL-N-VIRoutskirts-NOM-3PL-N-VIRof-city'Thisneighbourhood was the outskirts of the city.'
- (22)Onatobyłoniezłeziółko.she-NOM-3SG-FEMCOPwas-3SG-NEUTgood-3SG-NEUTweirdo-NOM-3SG-NEUT'She was a weirdo.''She was a weirdo.'weirdo-NOM-3SG-NEUTweirdo-NOM-3SG-NEUT

The first derivational step of (21) and (22) is (23), the merger of *be* and NP<sub>NOM2</sub> which results in the formation of the complex predicate Pred'.

# (23) $[Pred' be NP_{NOM2}]$

In (23), the *be*-NP<sub>NOM2</sub> Agree relation takes place. The verbal copula is non-defective, equipped with (the full set of) u $\varphi$ -features reflecting the i $\varphi$ -features on NP<sub>NOM2</sub>.<sup>12</sup> Since this Agree relation can take place without violating any derivational constraints (e.g. Relativised Minimality), *be*'s u $\varphi$ -features probe collectively downwards (see below for argumentation) and are valued against NP<sub>NOM2</sub>'s i $\varphi$ -features. As a result, verbal agreement is controlled entirely by NP<sub>NOM2</sub> (cf. Bondaruk 2019 for the same premise), the stance we base on the fact that it is manifested uniformly in clauses with only one NP<sub>NOM</sub> and in DCCs with two NPs<sub>NOM</sub>. Examples (24)-(25) illustrate.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> In Citko (2008), *be* is devoid of all  $\varphi$ -features in bi-nominative copular clauses, i.e., defective, because it cannot assign/value instrumental case to NP<sub>2</sub>. In Tajsner (2015), it is also defective, but only lacking the person feature, thus agreeing with NP<sub>NOM2</sub> in number and gender only (cf. also fn.13).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Alternatively, person, number and gender could be separate Probes and/or heads targeting different Goals, conforming to Rutkowski's (2006) claim that NP<sub>NOM2</sub>-controlled agreement in Polish DCCs is restricted to number and gender (with person agreeing with NP<sub>NOM1</sub>), and to phrase structure advocated by Sigurðsson and Holmberg (2008) in (i). In (i), person and number are separate heads and numbers represent potential landing sites for an NP<sub>NOM</sub>, thus creating different agreement configurations. In Hartmann and Heycock (2019b) for instance, person agreement with NP<sub>NOM2</sub> and number-agreement with NP<sub>NOM1</sub> in a specificational clause obtains if NP<sub>NOM2</sub> lands in [2] (recall that Hartman and Heycock 2019b adopt the 'inversion account' whereby

- (24)TesamochodybyłyMarka.these-NOM-3PL-N-VIRcars-NOM-3PL-N-VIRwere-3PL-N-VIRMark-GEN-3SG-MASC'These were Mark's cars.'
- (25) Ta okolica to były
   this-NOM-3SG-FEM neighbourhood-NOM-3SG-FEM COP were-3PL-N-VIR
   obrzeża miasta.
   outskirts-NOM-3PL-N-VIR of-city
   'This neighbourhood was the outskirts of the city.'

The *be*-NP<sub>NOM2</sub> Agree relation is shown in (26) whereas (27)-(28) illustrate its formal manifestation on the relevant parts of examples (21)-(22).

- $(26) \qquad [{}_{Pred'}be_{[u-person,\,u-number,\,u-gender]} >>> AGREE >>> NP_{NOM2[i-person,\,i-number,\,i-gender]}$
- (27)  $[Pred' by y_{[3pl, n-vir]} obrzeża miasta_{[3pl, n-vir]}]$
- (28) [Pred' było[3sg, neut] niezłe ziółko[3sg, neut]

 $NP_{NOM2}$  moves across  $NP_{NOM1}$  in specificational, i.e., 'inverted' predicational clauses). This is because in [2]  $NP_{NOM2}$  is closer for the person Probe, i.e., c-commanded by it (assuming Downward Agree as Hartmann and Heycock 2019b) than  $NP_{NOM1}$ , but not for the number Probe (it is directly above it).

(i)  $[P_{nP} [1] [P_{n'}Pn [N_{rP} [2] [N_{r'}Nr [TP [3] [T'T [VP [4] [V'be [FP NP_{NOM1} [F'F NP_{NOM2}]]]]]]]]]$ 

The cartography in (i) could be applied to Polish, with the additional separate gender Probe somewhere below person. However, unlike German, Dutch, Faroese, or Icelandic, Polish lacks, to the best of our knowledge, an extensive scrutiny on variability of agreement patterns in bi-nominative copular clauses. Postulating additional functional projections thus seems an ad hoc solution. Another problem concerns [2], the only position deriving 'person-first'- and 'number-gender(in Polish)-second' agreement. Given the commonly assumed (e.g. Mikkelsen 2005, Shlonsky and Rizzi 2018, Bondaruk 2019) fixed Information Structure of specificational clauses (topic-initial and focus-final) and, hence, taking NP<sub>NOM2</sub>'s SpecNrP-movement to be driven by its topic-related property, it is unclear what would motivate NP<sub>NOM1</sub>-movement to [2] in predicational clauses. If Nr attracts NP<sub>NOM2</sub> in specificational clauses due to the optional topic-feature but NP<sub>NOM1</sub> due to some other feature (possibly EPP and/or edge feature), then SpecNrP-movement is clearly an instance of 'anything goes', similar to the requirement that SpecTP host some lexical material (Holmberg 2000, Cardinaletti 2004). This, in turn, raises the question of NrP's ultimate (semantic) relevance, i.e., the role it plays in determining the interpretation of two different NPs<sub>NOM</sub> in two different copular clauses, each showing a different organisation of Information Structure. Most importantly, however, nothing seemingly requires movement to any of the positions above in the first place, especially if assuming Downward Agree, the only formally-motivated Probe-Goal operation.

Instead, one could assume the models advocated by Coon and Keine (2021) and Bondaruk (2019). Although the two differ considerably, their crux is that person and number are still separate Probes, but located under T (and/or  $\nu/V$ ), with person probing before number, thus again agreeing with the higher NP<sub>NOM</sub>, and number (along with gender in Polish) agreeing with the lower NP<sub>NOM</sub>. The problem is that apparently, there are DCCs with two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> as in (ii), where *be* clearly agrees with NP<sub>NOM1</sub> in number and gender, so person cannot probe first.

(ii) Hitler to był jedna osoba
 Hitler-NOM-3SG-NOM COP was-3SG-MASC one-3SG-FEM person-3SG-FEM
 'Hitler was one person.' (IJPPAN\_PolPr\_GKa01908)

The reason this Agree relation follows downwards (contra to what we assumed in Sub-section 2.1) is because it does not satisfy the subject requirement - NP<sub>NOM2</sub> must remain post-verbal as it is part of Pred' (cf. Sub-section 2.1). Thus, it is not subject to requirement (9b) that the Goal's i-features c-command the Probe's u-features. Observe also that one cannot assume T to agree with NP<sub>NOM2</sub> instead of *be* since when T merges with PredP, NP<sub>NOM2</sub> is not the closest Goal to T as examples (29)-(30) illustrate. Thus, even if T were to agree with it, NP<sub>NOM2</sub> would have to SpecTP-move ((9b)), deriving the illicit NP<sub>NOM2</sub> > NP<sub>NOM1</sub> > *be* word order.

Going back to our examination, the next derivational step involves the merger of  $NP_{NOM1}$  with Pred', deriving PredP. This is schematised in (29), with (30)-(31) showing how it is reflected in examples (21)-(22).

- (29)  $[_{PredP} NP_{NOM1} [_{Pred'} be NP_{NOM2}]]$
- $(30) \quad \left[ {}_{\text{PredP}} \text{ ta okolica}_{[3\text{SG-FEM}]} \left[ {}_{\text{Pred'}} \text{ by} \frac{1}{3\text{PL-N-VIR}} \text{ obrzeża miasta}_{[3\text{PL-N-VIR}]} \right] \right]$
- (31) [PredP ona[3SG-FEM] [Pred' było[3SG-NEUT] niezłe ziółko[3SG-NEUT]]]

Next, T merges with PredP, with two Agree relations following. In one, T agrees with *be* and the two value their uV- and uT-features, respectively. This step makes Pred' anchored with respect to time, i.e., temporally modified (Sub-section 2.3). In the other, NP<sub>NOM2</sub> and NP<sub>NOM1</sub> probe upwards to value their uT-features against T's iT-feature (Sub-section 2.2). Crucially, this is also the moment we take to require the presence of *to* in DCCs under consideration. Our reasoning is as follows. In clauses such as the (mono)transitive (24) or binominative ones (2)-(3), TP identification results from the syntactic manipulation of one nominative argument (in the former case) or the higher one (in the latter), by T. Hence, T probes and then attracts NP<sub>NOM1</sub> to SpecTP from where NP<sub>NOM1</sub>'s i $\varphi$ -features value T's u $\varphi$ -features by virtue of (9b). In other words, a single nominative argument participates in two TP-based operations, SpecTP-movement and  $\varphi$ -feature valuation, which produce two subject effects, the initial *nominative argument* that *controls agreement*. This is schematised in (32) which represents example (24) ('1' on T signals its agreement in  $\varphi$ -features with NP<sub>NOM1</sub>).

(32)  $\left[ {}_{TP}NP_{NOM1} \left[ {}_{T'}T_{[\varphi 1]} \left[ {}_{PredP}t_{NPNOM1} \left[ {}_{Pred'}be NP_{GEN} \right] \right] \right] \right]$ 

Assume now, in accordance with our previous assumptions (Sub-section 2.5), that in DCCs with non-canonical, NP<sub>NOM2</sub>-agreement, each NP<sub>3NOM</sub> is responsible for the separate subject effect, namely, NP<sub>NOM1</sub> for SpecTP-movement and NP<sub>NOM2</sub> for  $\varphi$ -feature valuation. For TP identification to obtain, T thus has to engage in the syntactic manipulation of two nominative arguments. In this respect, let us then propose that in such DCCs T's  $\varphi$ -features match those on NP<sub>NOM2</sub> whereas NP<sub>NOM1</sub> SpecTP-moves.<sup>14</sup> This may seem problematic as in our approach it is *be* that agrees with NP<sub>NOM2</sub>, which means that NP<sub>NOM2</sub>'s  $\varphi$ -features would have to crop up on

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> This proposal differs from that we assumed in Jurczyk (2021) where T's  $\varphi$ -features match those on NP<sub>NOM1</sub> and *be*'s  $\varphi$ -features reflect those on NP<sub>NOM2</sub>. In Jurczyk (2021), the two matchings instantiated two Agree relations, the T-NP<sub>NOM1</sub> one and the *be*-NP<sub>NOM2</sub> one, advanced to dispense with the problematic EPP-driven SpecTP-movement of NP<sub>NOM1</sub> and to simultaneously derive NP<sub>NOM2</sub>-controlled agreement.

T 'indirectly'. This contrasts with approaches adopted in other works on Polish (Bondaruk 2013, Tajsner 2015), Germanic (e.g. Hartmann and Heycock 2019b, 2022, Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008) or Armenian and Persian (Béjar and Kahnemuyipour 2017, 2018) where NP<sub>NOM2</sub>'s  $\varphi$ -features are always manifested on the Probe (T or *be*) as a result of the Agree relation between the two. Nevertheless, assuming that Vangsnes's (2002) formal identification of TP for reasons stated in Sub-section 2.3 holds universally, namely, that apart from the T-feature provided by T, TP must also be identified by  $\varphi$ -features of an argument that controls verbal agreement, then the presence of NP<sub>NOM2</sub>'s  $\varphi$ -features on T is actually expected regardless of what agrees with NP<sub>NOM2</sub> (T or *be*). Imposing the above considerations on the derivational step at which T merges with PredP, we obtain (33)-(34) reflecting examples (21) and (22) (strikethrough marks successful valuation of features).

 $(33) \quad T_{[iT, \, uV, \, u3PL-N-VIR]} \left[ {}_{PredP} NP_{NOM1[i-3SG-FEM, \, uT]} \left[ {}_{Pred'} be_{[iV, \, uT, \, u-3PL-N-VIR]} NP_{NOM2[i-3PL-N-VIR, \, uT]} \right] \right]$ 

 $(34) \quad T_{[iT, \, uV, \, u-3SG-NEUT]}\left[{}_{PredP} \, NP_{NOM1[i-3SG-FEM, \, uT]}\left[{}_{Pred'} be_{[iV, \, uT, \, u-3SG-NEUT]} \, NP_{NOM2[i-3SG-NEUT, \, uT]}\right]\right]$ 

As (33)-(34) show, the only remaining Agree relation involves T which carries up-features, and the Probe carrying the i $\phi$ -features that T needs. However, T's  $\phi$ -features reflect those on NP<sub>NOM2</sub> and so T-NP<sub>NOM2</sub> Agree is impossible as it would violate point (9c) pertaining to Upward Agree technicalities from Sub-section 2.2, i.e., Relativised Minimality, resulting in the movement of the farther nominative argument. Furthermore, recall from Sub-section 2.1 that NP<sub>NOM1</sub> is the only nominative argument annotated syntactically (by Kayne's 1994 LCA) to SpecTP-move (NP<sub>NOM2</sub> is syntactically and semantically part of the complex predicate Pred'). Nevertheless, since NP<sub>NOM2</sub>'s person-feature in (33) and its person- and number-features in (34) have the same specification as those on NP<sub>NOM1</sub>, namely, person<sub>3</sub> and person<sub>3</sub>-number<sub>3</sub>, respectively, we will assume after a number of scholars (e.g. Bondaruk 2012, Tajsner 2015, Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008, Coon and Keine 2021, Hartmann and Heycock 2019a, 2019b, 2022, Béjar and Kahnemuyipour 2017, 2018, 2023), that those features on T can actually be satisfied by NP<sub>NOM1</sub>. If so, only T's number- and gender-features in (33) and the genderfeature in (34) will have to be valued somehow. Since they cannot be valued by the T-NP<sub>NOM2</sub> Agree relation for reasons stated above, we will take them to be valued as default in the sense of Szucsich (2007) (but cf. also Preminger 2014 and López 2004 for similar proposals), namely, lexicalised by means of a morphologically least marked form in terms of its featural specification. In the case under consideration, we will conflate this least marked morphological property with the pronominal clitic to, associating it with the minimal  $\varphi$ structure [i: gender(neut)], following in this respect Seres and Espinal's (2019) considerations on the Russian pronominal particle *ėto*.<sup>15</sup> The merger of *to* under T is thus an auxiliary but

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> In Seres and Espinal (2019), *ėto* has this minimal φ-structure because it is a morpho-syntactically neuter invariant pronoun and, hence, defective in terms of its φ-feature composition. Though we do not associate Polish *to* with the pronominal constituent here, it is similar to Russian *ėto* in the sense discussed here, namely, morpho-phonologically identical to the third person singular neuter (demonstrative) pronoun *to* ('this<sub>neut</sub>'/'it<sub>neut</sub>)'. A similar point is noted in Bondaruk (2019: 118, fn.17) where *to* is taken to be homophonous with the (demonstrative) pronoun.

also an obligatory means of formally identifying TP given that T's u $\phi$ -features cannot be valued by the interpretable ones on NP<sub>NOM2</sub>.<sup>16</sup>

- (i) Marek<sub>i</sub> to jest swój<sub>i</sub> najlepszy przyjaciel. Marek-NOM COP is refl.cl best friend-NOM 'Mark is his own best friend.'
- (ii) Mimo częstego  $PRO_i$ słuchania wielu gatunków muzyki in-spite-of many frequent listening kinds music rock'a. Marek<sub>i</sub> zapalony fan to jest Marek-NOM COP rock great fan-NOM is 'In spite of frequent listening to many types of music, Mark is a great fan of rock.'

Reviewer 1 also notes that some DCCs with two  $NPs_{3NOM}$  and gender mismatch do not allow  $NP_{NOM2}$  agreement ((iii)) unlike others ((iv) or (7) above). The question then is how to account for this discrepancy.

- (iii) \*On to kiedyś była gawędziara.
   he-NOM-3SG-MASC COP once was-3SG-FEM storyteller-NOM-3SG-FEM
   'He was once a storyteller.'
- (iv) To miasto to kiedyś była wioska.
   this-NOM-3SG-NEUT city-NOM-3SG-NEUT COP once was-3SG-FEM village-NOM-3SG-FEM 'This city was once a village.'

A tentative solution we would like to propose is that this discrepancy is not formally/syntactically rooted but semantically-based. More specifically, DCCs as in (iii), i.e., predicative, are subject to a particular instance of 'human > animate > inanimate' hierarchy effects (cf. e.g. Silverstein 1976) whereby a (human) animate NP<sub>NOM1</sub> specified for one semantic gender cannot be ascribed a property of a (human) animate NP<sub>NOM2</sub> specified for another semantic gender. This would explain the difference between (iii) and (iv) (the NPs<sub>NOM</sub> in the latter example are inanimate) and between (iii) and (7) ((7) is an equative DCC so the relation between the two NPs<sub>NOM</sub> is identificational and not predicational). It would also account for the grammaticality of examples like *Wanda to było stare babsko* (lit. Wanda-FEM was-NEUT old-NEUT bag-NEUT, 'Wanda was an old bag.') or (ii) from fn.2 whose two NPs<sub>NOM2</sub>, *babsko* ('bag') and *ziółko* ('weirdo'), differ in gender from NPs<sub>NOM1</sub> but only grammatically, semantically-wise referring to feminine entities just as NPs<sub>NOM1</sub> do. Observe, however, that whilst NP<sub>NOM1</sub>-agreement does not seem, at least to our judgments, to improve (iii), example (v), coming from the National Corpus of Polish, allows it despite manifesting the same state-of-affairs as (iii). This could suggest that speaker-individual grammars or some other, perhaps syntactic or semantic issues may be at play here, although proving or disproving this premise and, hence, determining the theoretical/empirical adequacy of the above account would require a much more detailed scrutiny. We leave this issue for a future examination.

(v)	Baśka	to	była	taki
	Baśka-NOM-3SG-FEM	COP	was-3SG-FEM	such-NOM-3SG-MASC
	chłopak	W	spódnicy.	
	boy-NOM-3SG-MASC	in	skirt-INSTR-3SG-FEM	
	'Baśka was a tomboy.' (I)			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> Reviewer 1 proposes that *to* is present so that it marks NP<sub>NOM1</sub> as Topic, the merger of *to* under Top being then followed by NP<sub>NOM1</sub>'s SpecTopP-movement. A similar proposal has, in fact, been advanced by Rutkowski (2006) who takes NP<sub>NOM1</sub> as base-generated in SpecTopP, with *to* filling the SpecTP position. Despite certain differences between the two approaches, it is, nevertheless, doubtful that NP<sub>NOM1</sub> is a Topic, for as shown in Bondaruk (2019: 116), NP<sub>NOM1</sub> can bind subject-oriented anaphors ((i)) or control PRO ((ii)), the properties which suggest that it occupies an A-position.

The impossible to establish T-NP<sub>NOM2</sub>  $\varphi$ -Agree relations and the resulting from them 'valuation-as-default' procedures are schematised in (35)-(36), reflecting examples (21) and (22), respectively. Strikethrough marks features valued as default and underlining marks the aftermath of this valuation.

- $(35) \quad [{}_{T'}T_{[u-3PL-N-VIR]} \underline{to}_{[\underline{i-NEUT}]} [PredP NP_{NOM1[\underline{i}-3SG-FEM]} [Pred' be NP_{NOM2[\underline{i}-3PL-N-VIR]}]]]$
- (36)  $\begin{bmatrix} T^{T}_{u-3SG-NEUT} \underline{to}_{[\underline{i}-NEUT]} \begin{bmatrix} Pred^{P} NP_{NOM1[\underline{i}-3SG-FEM]} \begin{bmatrix} Pred^{P} be NP_{NOM2[\underline{i}-3SG-NEUT]} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$

At this point, there is one more Agree relation to be established, for as (35)-(36) show, T still has the uperson-feature or uperson- and unumber-features to value. As already implied, this valuation may, in each case, involve T and NP<sub>NOM1</sub> since the relevant features on NP<sub>NOM1</sub> and NP<sub>NOM2</sub> bear the same specification. In order to value its uperson<sub>3</sub>-feature in (35) and uperson<sub>3</sub>- as well as unumber<sub>3</sub>-features in (36), T attracts NP<sub>NOM1</sub> to SpecTP, thus satisfying all the requirements induced by Upward Agree in (9): (i) the T-NP<sub>NOM1</sub> Agree relation is triggered by at least one uninterpretable feature on the Probe ((9a)), (ii) NP<sub>NOM1</sub>'s relevant i $\varphi$ feature(s) c-commands T's u $\varphi$ -feature(s) from the SpecTP position ((9b)), (iii) NP<sub>NOM1</sub> is the closest nominative argument to T that SpecTP-moves. This is shown in (37)-(38) for the two examples under consideration.

- $(37) \quad \left[ {}_{\text{TP}} \text{NP}_{\text{NOM1}} \left[ {}_{\text{T}'} T_{[u-3PL-N-VIR]} \underline{to}_{[\underline{i}-\text{NEUT}]} \left[ {}_{\text{PredP}} t_{\text{NPNOM1}[\underline{i}-3SG-FEM]} \left[ {}_{\text{Pred}'} be \text{ NP}_{\text{NOM2}[\underline{i}-3PL-N-VIR]} \right] \right] \right]$
- $(38) \quad \left[ {}_{\text{TP}} \text{NP}_{\text{NOM1}} \left[ {}_{\text{T'}} T_{[u\text{-}3SG\text{-}NEUT]} \underline{to}_{[i\text{-}NEUT]} \left[ {}_{\text{PredP}} t_{\text{NPNOM1}[i\text{-}3SG\text{-}FEM]} \left[ {}_{\text{Pred'}} be \text{ NP}_{\text{NOM2}[i\text{-}3SG\text{-}NEUT]} \right] \right] \right]$

We associate this operation with the derivational moment when TP ends up being formally identified since all the features required for this identification have now been provided and satisfied: the T-feature by T, the  $\varphi$ -features provided by NP<sub>NOM2</sub>, with some of them ultimately satisfied by default valuation lexicalised as *to*, and some satisfied by NP<sub>NOM1</sub>.

In this sub-section, we have shown that in DCCs with post-verbal agreement and two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> characterised by  $\varphi$ -feature(s) mismatch *to* is always obligatory as it constitutes an auxiliary means of identifying the functional TP projection which would otherwise be impossible given that T is unable to value its u $\varphi$ -features against those on NP<sub>NOM2</sub> at a distance. In Sub-section 3.2 below, we examine whether this reasoning extends to DCCs with two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> that share the same  $\varphi$ -features specification.

# 3.2. Derivation of DCCs with two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> showing matching $\varphi$ -features

As examples (39)-(40) show, DCCs with two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> sharing the same  $\varphi$ -feature specification differ from those with two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> displaying  $\varphi$ -feature(s) mismatch in that they can drop the particle *to*.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> Since *to* is optional in such DCCs, its reverse distribution in examples (39)-(40) is also available and fully licit.

- (39)Marektobyłmuzyk.Marek-NOM-3SG-MASCCOPwas-3SG-MASCmusician-NOM-3SG-MASC'Mark was a musician.''Mark was a musician.''Mark was a musician.'
- (40) Oni byli prawdziwi komuniści.
   they-NOM-3PL-VIR were-3PL-VIR real-NOM-3PL-VIR communists-NOM-3PL-VIR
   'They were real communists.' (PELCRA\_1303919961002)

Consider first example (40) as here the situation appears quite straightforward. Since *to*'s presence has been shown to crucially depend on post-verbal agreement, its absence in (40) implies that agreement is entirely NP<sub>NOM1</sub>-controlled. Hence, unlike in (21)-(22) where T had to syntactically manipulate NP<sub>NOM1</sub> and NP<sub>NOM2</sub> to formally identify TP, in (40) it only manipulates NP<sub>NOM1</sub> for that purpose as illustrated in (41).

 $(41) \quad \left[ {}_{\text{TP}} NP_{NOM1[i \cdot 3PL - VIR]} \left[ {}_{\text{T}'} T_{[iT, \, uV, \, u \cdot 3PL - VIR]} \left[ {}_{\text{PredP}} t_{NPNOM1} \left[ {}_{\text{Pred}'} be_{\, uT, \, iV, \, NP_{NOM2[i \cdot 3PL - VIR]}} \right] \right] \right]$ 

After T merges with PredP and enters into the Agree relation with *be*, thus valuing its uV-feature and *be*'s uT-feature, it now has its u $\varphi$ -features to value which reflect those on NP<sub>NOM1</sub>. In compliance with constraint (9b) of Upward Agree, T attracts NP<sub>NOM1</sub> to SpecTP so that the latter's i $\varphi$ -features c-command the former's u $\varphi$ -features - the only configuration that allows feature-valuation to converge. Note that since NP<sub>NOM1</sub> participates in two TP-based operations, SpecTP-movement and  $\varphi$ -feature valuation, it will manifest two 'subject effects', being an initial nominative argument that controls agreement. Example (41) then represents the derivational moment when all features required to formally identify TP have been provided and satisfied: the T-feature by T, and the  $\varphi$ -features by NP<sub>NOM1</sub>. Notice further that since TP identification necessitates NP<sub>NOM1</sub>'s  $\varphi$ -features, the absence of the pronominal clitic *to* is actually expected in examples such as (40). Since T-NP<sub>NOM1</sub>  $\varphi$ -Agree relation can be established without any problems, satisfying all the Upward Agree requirements (9a)-(9c), no NP<sub>NOM1</sub>'s  $\varphi$ -feature will ever remain unvalued on T, which excludes the necessity of initiating the auxiliary means of TP identification, i.e., valuation-as-default ultimately lexicalised as the pronominal particle *to*.

Consider now a more problematic case, i.e., DCCs with two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> showing  $\varphi$ -features matching. As already shown, they can also do without the pronominal clitic *to*, which means that just as example (40) has been conflated with NP<sub>NOM1</sub>-controlled agreement, its counterpart with an overt *to* repeated in (42) should be, by virtue of our earlier considerations, taken to involve NP<sub>NOM2</sub>-controlled agreement, just as examples (21)-(22) or (39) from above. After all, both (39) and (42) involve the initial NP<sub>3NOM</sub> so they meet Béjar and Kahnemuyipour's (2017) person sensitivity/constraint requirement (13b) from Sub-section 2.5 for NP<sub>NOM2</sub>-driven agreement.

(i)	Marek	b	ył muzyk.						
	Marek-NOM-3SG-MASC COP musician-NOM-3SG-MASC								
	'Mark was a musician.'								
(ii)	Oni	to	byli	prawdziwi	komuniści.				
	they-NOM-3PL-VIR	COP	were-3PL-VIR	real-NOM-3PL-VIR	communists-NOM-3PL-VIR				

'They were real communists.'

(42) Oni to byli prawdziwi komuniści. they-NOM-3PL-VIR COP were-3PL-VIR real-NOM-3PL-VIR communists-NOM-3PL-VIR 'They were real communists.'

Thus, we basically expect NP<sub>NOM2</sub>-agreement whenever such examples involve to, and NP<sub>NOM1</sub>controlled agreement otherwise. The problem with this assumption is two-fold. First, it is impossible to determine, given the same  $\varphi$ -feature specification of the two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub>, which NP<sub>NOM2</sub>'s feature(s) in (42) agree with be and then, which one(s) remain unvalued on T, leading to the 'valuation-as-default' operation and the lexicalisation of to.<sup>18</sup> Second, given the observation in Sub-section 3.1, namely, that post-verbal agreement necessarily requires to as a formal means of valuing T's NP<sub>NOM2</sub>-related  $\varphi$ -features and, hence, identifying TP, the apparent optionality of to in examples like (39)-(40) is unexpected.<sup>19</sup> Consider then an alternative. Since to is obligatory only in DCCs where NP<sub>NOM2</sub>-controlled agreement is morpho-phonologically manifested, assume that only in such DCCs will the presence of to point to post-verbal agreement. This would mean that the optional presence of to in DCCs with two NPs<sub>NOM</sub> matching in  $\varphi$ -features would perhaps serve some other purpose (to which we go back in Sub-section 3.3). There is one crucial observation that makes us lean towards this proposal, namely, the fact that whereas DCCs such as (39)-(40) involve two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> just as DCCs in (21)-(22), the distribution of the pronominal particle to they show aligns them with DCCs to be discussed in Sub-section 3.3 which show canonical, pre-verbal agreement.

Based on the above considerations, we are going to assume that DCCs as in (39) and (42) show pre-verbal agreement just as those in (40), namely, T again attracts NP<sub>NOM1</sub> to SpecTP, the step that values T's features and, at the same time, formally identifies TP (T again provides the iT-feature whereas the i $\varphi$ -features come from NP<sub>NOM1</sub>. This is schematised in (43) which refers to example (42).

#### $(43) \quad \left[ {}_{\text{TP}} \text{NP}_{\text{NOM1}[i\text{-}3PL\text{-}VIR]} \left[ {}_{\text{T}'} T_{[iT, \, uV, \, u\text{-}3PL\text{-}VIR]} \text{-} to_{[i\text{-}NEUT]} \left[ {}_{\text{PredP}} t_{\text{NPNOM1}} \left[ {}_{\text{Pred}'} be_{\, uT, \, iV} \text{NP}_{\text{NOM2}[i\text{-}3PL\text{-}VIR]} \right] \right] \right]$

In the above examination, it has been concluded that DCCs with two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> that share the same  $\varphi$ -feature specification follow the derivational scenario whereby agreement is preverbal, determined by NP<sub>NOM1</sub>. This contrasts with DCCs which involve two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> that show  $\varphi$ -features misalignment and, coupled with the fact that the status of *to* in the former

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> Alternatively, we could follow Bondaruk (2012) in that T Agrees with NP<sub>NOM1</sub> in person and with NP<sub>NOM2</sub> in number and gender or follow a somewhat similar idea in Tajsner (2015) whereby *be* is person-defective. Hence, it would again only agree with NP<sub>NOM2</sub> in number and gender (in this respect, cf. also Rutkowski 2006). Though we remain open to this possibility, we leave it here for reasons discussed below (but cf. fn.19).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> In relation to that and to the remarks in fn.18, it could perhaps be assumed that the presence or absence of *to* in DCCs as in (39)-(40) does indeed signal NP<sub>NOM2</sub>- or NP<sub>NOM1</sub>-controlled agreement, respectively. The choice of either derivational mode could then instantiate the use of speaker-individual (sub)grammars, just as assumed in Hartmann and Heycock (2019b) in relation to speaker-variation regarding the acceptability/availability of NP<sub>1</sub> and NP<sub>2</sub> agreement in Icelandic, German and Faroese bi-nominative copular constructions. We leave this proposal for future study as its adoption should rest on a detail-oriented, quantitative and corpus-based study of agreement direction patterns in Polish DCCs, which is not the purpose of this paper.

DCCs is optional, suggests that the presence of *to* in clauses such as (43) must serve some other purpose than the formal identification of TP. We tackle the purpose of the optional presence of *to* in Sub-section 3.3 below where we address DCCs showing canonical, pre-verbal agreement, i.e., those with either one or no NP<sub>3NOM</sub>.

# 3.3. Derivation of DCCs with one or no NP<sub>3NOM</sub>

As examples (44)-(46) illustrate, the distribution of the pronominal clitic *to* in DCCs with one or no NP<sub>3NOM</sub> resembles that in DCCs with two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> and matching  $\varphi$ -features, namely, *to* can be dropped without causing ungrammaticality.

- (44) Ja (to) jestem ty. I-NOM-1SG COP am-1SG you-NOM-2SG 'I am you.'
- (45) *Ty* (to) jesteś ja. You-NOM-2SG COP are-2SG I-NOM-1SG 'You are me.'
- (46) Ty (to) byłeś wariat.
   You-NOM-2SG COP were-2SG madman-NOM-3SG-MASC
   'You were a madman.'

This optionality correlates with  $NP_{NOM1}$ -agreement, which is predicted given Béjar and Kahnemuyipour's (2017) person sensitivity whereby the presence of either first or second person  $NP_{NOM1}$  blocks  $NP_{NOM2}$ -agreement (cf. Sub-section 2.5). This is shown in (47)-(48).

(47) Ja (to) jestem / \*jesteś ty. I-NOM-1SG COP am-1SG are-2SG you-NOM-2SG 'I am you.'
(48) Ty (to) byłeś / \*był wariat. You-NOM-2SG COP were-2SG was-3SG-MASC madman-NOM-3SG-MASC 'You were a madman.'

Accordingly, the derivation of DCCs in (44)-(46) follows the same way as in DCCs with two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> that share the same  $\varphi$ -feature specification. Thus, T  $\varphi$ -Agrees with NP<sub>NOM1</sub> after attracting it to SpecTP in accordance with constraint (9b) of Upward Agree, the derivational step resulting in two subject effects (the initial nominative argument that controls verbal agreement) and formal identification of TP by means of T's iT-feature and NP<sub>NOM1</sub>'s i $\varphi$ -features. This derivational moment is schematised in (49), which pertains to example (44).

 $(49) \quad \left[ {}_{\text{TP}} \, NP_{\text{NOM1}[i\text{-}1SG]} \left[ {}_{\text{T'}} T_{[iT,\,uV,u\text{-}1SG]} \text{-} (to)_{[i\text{-}NEUT]} \left[ {}_{\text{PredP}} \, t_{\text{NPNOM1}} \left[ {}_{\text{Pred'}} \, be_{\,uT,\,iV,} \, NP_{\text{NOM2}[i\text{-}2SG]} \right] \right] \right]$ 

Since agreement direction and the resulting derivation of such DCCs seems rather straightforward, let us then readdress the question posed in Sub-section 3.2, namely, what determines the optional presence of *to* in DCCs with pre-verbal agreement in general. Recall

that this purpose cannot be the same as in DCCs with NP<sub>NOM2</sub>-controlled agreement, for in DCCs with NP<sub>NOM1</sub>-agreement all of T's  $\varphi$ -features are always valued once NP<sub>NOM1</sub> is attracted to SpecTP, which means that the valuation-as-default operation need not take place.

At this point, we would like to propose that apart from the TP-identifying function of *to* which shows up in DCCs with NP<sub>NOM2</sub>-agreement, *to* also serves the presentational function in the sense that Seres and Espinal (2019) (cf. also Padučeva 1985 for a similar proposal) assume for the Russian neuter pronoun *èto* ('that<sub>neut</sub>'/'it<sub>neut</sub>'). In a nutshell, they argue that in binominative copular clauses of the general structure [TopP [NP1] [PredP [*èto*] [Pred' [be] [NP2]]], NP1 is an aboutness topic (what the sentence is about, cf. e.g. Lock 1996, Krifka 2007) whereas PredP corresponds to the predicate/comment which provides the information about/defines the topic.<sup>20</sup> The pronoun *èto*, on the other hand, is a presentational device, introducing the identity referred to by NP2 and then associating it with the one introduced by NP1. We will assume that the same holds for Polish DCCs involving two NPS3NOM with the same  $\varphi$ -feature specification and those with one or no NP3NOM. More specifically, NPNOM1, which in our approach represents the grammatical-logical subject that SpecTP-moves, is also the aboutness topic, the claim we base on Mokrosz's (2022) observation that Polish subjects and topics appear to share the aboutness property:<sup>21</sup>

- (50) *Kiedy Jan*<sub>i</sub> *uderzył Piotra*<sub>j</sub> *pro*<sub>i/\*j</sub> *był pijany*. when John-NOM hit Peter-ACC was drunk 'When John hit Peter, he was drunk.'
- (51) *Piotr*<sub>i</sub>? *Kiedy Jan*<sub>j</sub> *go uderzył pro*<sub>i</sub>*i*\*<sub>j</sub> *był pijany*. Peter-NOM when John-NOM him hit was drunk 'Peter? When John hit him, he was drunk.'

In (50)-(51) *pro* is able to pick up the aboutness property from the subject in the previous clause ((50)) and from the discourse topic ((51)), i.e., it can either have the same referent as *Jan* ('John') or *Piotr* ('Peter'). As for the comment/predicate status of Pred', it follows rather straightforwardly from the remarks in Sub-section 2.1 where it was assumed to ascribe some property to NP<sub>NOM1</sub>. Coupled with the above proposal that *to* serves the presentational function, let us then see how this function is established in a bi-nominative DCCs with NP<sub>NOM1</sub>-agreement. We illustrate this on example (46).

First, *be* merges with NP<sub>NOM2</sub>, producing the complex predicate Pred'. Because in the example under consideration NP<sub>NOM2</sub> *wariat* ('madman') expresses some property, i.e., predicates some truth value(s) applicable to the set of all madmen, it is of type  $\langle e,t \rangle$ .<sup>22</sup> The

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> As can be seen, Seres and Espinal (2019) base-generate NP<sub>1</sub> in SpecTopP rather than in SpecTP as assumed here, but this will not hinge on our examination.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> In Mokrosz (2022), it is actually the aboutness-*feature* that the subject and topic share as she postulates the presence of the functional Aboutness Phrase to which (object) arguments specified for the [aboutness topic]- and [D(iscourse)-linking]-features move. This distinction is irrelevant for our considerations. See Rizzi (2018) or Rizzi and Shlonsky (2007) for further arguments that subjects show the aboutness property.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> Unlike Seres and Espinal (2019), we do not associate *be* with the f(x) = x identity function (but cf. the discussion below) which returns the same value as its input, i.e., NP<sub>NOM2</sub>. This is because Seres and Espinal

representation following the arrow shows, in a simplified form, the interpretation that this syntactic structure receives in the semantic component(s).

(52)  $[Pred' be wariat_{< e,t>}] \rightarrow [be wariat]:_{< e,t>}$ 

With the merger of NP<sub>NOM1</sub> and Pred' and then the merger of T with PredP, we end up with (53) at which point *to* is merged which denotes a two-place <e,<e,t>> relation between entities/individuals, i.e., the function that maps an individual onto a function from individuals into truth values. It takes the entity denoted by NP<sub>NOM1</sub> which, in the case of example (46) is referential (<e>), and returns a one-place function which relates/combines this entity with the second entity <e,t> denoted by NP<sub>NOM2</sub>.<sup>23</sup> Note that because at step (53) NP<sub>NOM1</sub> has not yet moved to SpecTP where it will be interpreted, the function takes as input the variable x to be left behind in SpecPredP. It will be replaced by the denotation of *ty* ('you<sub>2SG</sub>') once NP<sub>NOM1</sub> SpecTP-moves.

(53)  $[T^{T}-to_{\langle x,\langle e,t\rangle\rangle}[P^{redP}Ty_{\langle x\rangle}[P^{red'}bewariat_{\langle e,t\rangle}]]] \rightarrow [to [Ty [bewariat]]]:_{\langle x,\langle e,t\rangle\rangle}$ 

In the final derivational step in (54), T attracts NP<sub>NOM1</sub> to SpecTP where it becomes interpreted and anchored with respect to the state-of-affairs denoted by the temporally modified Pred'. This results in the variable x being replaced by the denotation of Ty ('you<sub>2SG</sub>'). The aftermath of these two operations is the formation of a (predicational) bi-nominative DCC in which the initial referential nominative argument NP<sub>NOM1</sub>, now interpreted as the grammatical-logical subject of the sentence, introduces an entity that is then associated, by means of the presentational two-place function of to, with a new entity introduced by the post-verbal predicative nominative argument, NP<sub>NOM2</sub>. The resulting structure thus receives the value <t>, i.e., 'truth'.

 $(54) \quad [{}_{\text{TP}} Ty_{<e>T'} T\text{-to}_{<e,<e,>}[{}_{\text{PredP}} t_{\text{Ty}} [{}_{\text{Pred'}} be wariat_{<e,>}]] \rightarrow [Ty [to [be wariat]]]: <_{\triangleright}$ 

We assume the establishment of the presentational relation to follow the same path in specificational DCCs as in (55), the only difference being that  $NP_{NOM1}$  now introduces an <e,t> type entity whereas  $NP_{NOM2}$  denotes the <e> type entity.

(55) *Mój kolega to jest Marek.* my-NOM friend-NOM COP is Marek-NOM 'My friend is Mark.'

The same would also hold of equative DCCs as in (56), yet because this type of copular sentences expresses the identity between NP<sub>NOM1</sub> and NP<sub>NOM2</sub>, we assume after Seres and Espinal (2019) that in such cases *be* also introduces the identity function f(x) = x mapping the

only focus on Russian definitional generic (copular) sentences which express the identity/identificational relation between two nominative, kind-referring expressions.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> In Seres and Espinal (2019), the order in which arguments are fed into this function is reversed given the structure these authors assume for bi-nominative copular clauses, i.e., [TopP [NP1] [PredP [èto] [Pred' [be] [NP2]]], with *èto* base-generated in SpecPredP below NP<sub>NOM1</sub> but above NP<sub>NOM2</sub>.

identity introduced by  $NP_{NOM2}$  onto itself. This mapping is shown in a simplified form in (57), with the following steps of the establishment of the presentational relation reflecting those for (46) and (55).

- (56) Kardynał Karol Wojtyła to jest Papież Jan Paweł II.
   cardinal Karol Wojtyła-NOM COP is Pope Jan Paweł II-NOM 'Cardinal Wojtyła is Pope John Paul II.'
- (57)  $[Pred' be_{f(e)=(e)} Papież Jan Paweł II_{<e>}] \rightarrow [be Papież Jan Paweł II]:_{<e>}$

With regards to the above remarks, a question would be in order though, namely, whether *to* in DCCs with NP<sub>NOM2</sub>-controlled agreement, already associated with an auxiliary means of formally identifying TP, could also introduce the presentational function as in DCCs with NP<sub>NOM1</sub>-controlled agreement. Despite the presence of *to* in the former DCCs being obligatory, determined by formal requirements (cf. Sub-section 3.1), and optional in the latter DCCs, this assumption seems reasonable in view of examples such as (58).

(58)	Marek	to	jest	dobry	lekarz	/*	dobrym	lekarzem.	
	Marek-NOM	COP	is	good-NOM	doctor-NOM		good-INSTR	doctor-INSTR	
	'Mark is a good doctor.'								

As claimed in Bondaruk (2013), such copular constructions with the instrumental NP<sub>NOM2</sub> predicate and the overtly manifested *to* are grammatical, yet only if the latter represents an emphatic marker and not the pronominal copula.<sup>24</sup> This is, as we surmise, expected given the fundamental difference between the nominative case on the one hand and the remaining, non-nominative cases on the other. Whereas the former case exposes an object in the state of being (e.g. *jest miasto*, '(there) is a town/city', Kopczyński 1778: 43) or names/enumerates those objects (Kempf 2007: 20), the non-nominative, oblique case forms expose an object in a grammatical relation to another object in an action/eventuality denoted by a verb (Kempf 2007: 20). That in (58) *to* cannot introduce the presentational function is thus because the two NPs are not named/enumerated and, hence, no identificational relation can be established between them in the sense that NP<sub>1</sub> could be interpreted, i.e., identified or presented as NP<sub>2</sub>

(i) *Wróbel* to (jest) ptak. sparrow-NOM-SG-M that is bird-NOM-SG-M 'A sparrow is a bird.'

- (ii) Wróbel jest ptakiem.
   sparrow-NOM-SG-M is bird-INS-SG-M
   'A sparrow is a bird.'
- (iii) \*Wróbel jest ptak.
  sparrow-NOM-SG-M is bird-NOM-SG-M 'A sparrow is a bird.'

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> Similar observations are found in Swan (1993: 154-156), who points out that the case form of NP<sub>NOM2</sub> depends on the presence of *to*, i.e., whenever *to* is present, NP<sub>NOM2</sub> takes the nominative case, but assumes the instrumental case otherwise (grammatical annotations of examples (i)-(iii) are Swan's).

(following here Seres and Espinal's 2019: 23 argumentation). Instead, the two NPs find themselves in a grammatical relation of predication whereby the non-nominative NP<sub>2</sub> predicates, along with *be*, some property on the nominative NP<sub>1</sub>, the grammatical-logical subject of the sentence.<sup>25</sup> If so, *to*'s presence, whether obligatory or not, is expected to serve the presentational purpose in all DCCs with two nominative arguments regardless of their  $\varphi$ -features composition and agreement direction.

To recapitulate, it has been proposed that apart from formally identifying the TP projection, *to* is also a presentational device, establishing the identificational relation between two NPs. This property is characteristic of all DCCs regardless of their  $\varphi$ -specification and stems from the fact that both NPs are in the nominative, the case form that names/enumerates entities, thus placing them in a semantically 'symmetrical' relation of identification, whereby the entity introduced by NP<sub>NOM1</sub> is identified or related/presented as the entity introduced by NP<sub>NOM2</sub>.

#### 4. Concluding remarks

This paper attempted to account for the interlaced presence of post-verbal agreement and the pronominal clitic *to* in DCCs with two NPs<sub>NOM</sub> manifesting gender or gender-number misalignment. To this end, several assumptions were made. First, the structure of predication is [ $_{Pred}$  NP<sub>NOM1</sub> [ $_{Pred'}$  be NP<sub>NOM2</sub>]] (Jurczyk 2021), comprising a grammatical-logical subject NP<sub>NOM1</sub> and a syntactically/semantically complex predicate Pred' [be NP<sub>NOM2</sub>]. Second, the T-NP<sub>NOM</sub>  $\phi$ -Agree proceeds upwards (Zeiljstra 2012), being successfully accomplished once i-features c-command u-features. This basically necessitates that NP<sub>NOM</sub> move to SpecTP as it is only from SpecTP that NP<sub>NOM</sub>'s i $\phi$ -features c-command T's u $\phi$ -features. Third, TP must be formally identified (basing here on Vangsnes 2002) by the features tense (provided by T) and person, number, gender (provided by NP<sub>NOM</sub> that controls agreement) in order to anchor the subject argument with respect to the state-of-affairs denoted by VP/event structure (here, Pred'). Following these assumptions, it has been shown that in DCCs with two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> This does not mean that predication is absent in DCCs with two NPs<sub>NOM</sub>. Nevertheless, the naming/enumerating property of the nominative case seems to contribute to differences in the status of predication in examples with two nominative arguments as opposed to those with only one nominative argument. Klemensiewicz (1926), for instance, observes that the predicate in  $by\dot{c}$  + NP<sub>NOM</sub> clauses defines the subject whereas the predicate in  $by\dot{c}$  + NP<sub>INSTR</sub> describes it (Klemensiewicz 1926: 127).

<sup>(</sup>i) *Piotr* jest stolarz, ale u mnie przez ten rok cały musi być kołodziejem. Peter-NOM is carpenter-NOM but at me this year all cartwright-INSTR for must be 'Peter is a carpenter but at my place he must be a cartwright this year.'

Whereas the nominative 'definitional' predicate *stolarz* ('carpenter-NOM') only provides the subject with the properties related to its very nature and, hence, stable, the instrumental 'describing' predicate *kołodziejem* ('cartwright-INSTR') ascribes more subjective, temporary properties, less related to the nature of the subject. In other words, the nominative predicate 'carpenter' denotes Peter's usual profession and the instrumental 'cartwright' implicates the temporary status of Peter's job.

 $NP_{NOM2}$ -controlled agreement the T- $NP_{NOM2} \varphi$ -Agree relation is impossible to obtain, the step requiring the movement of NP<sub>NOM2</sub> which is not the grammatical-logical subject of the sentence and, hence, violating Relativised Minimality. This causes a number of interrelated derivational issues as the lack of NP<sub>NOM2</sub>'s SpecTP-movement leaves T's  $\varphi$ -features unvalued which, in turn, makes TP formally unidentified. To circumvent these problems, it has been proposed that T's up-features having the same specification on the two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub>, namely, person and/or number, can be valued by NP<sub>NOM1</sub> once T attracts it to SpecTP whereas the remaining gender and/or number features bearing NP<sub>NOM2</sub>'s specification are valued as default and lexicalised as the morpho-phonologically least marked form as regards its feature specification, i.e., to<sub>[i-neut]</sub> (in line with Szucsich's 2007 reasoning). It has thus been concluded that to's obligatory presence in DCCs with NP<sub>NOM2</sub>-agreement has to do with formally identifying TP whenever some  $\varphi$ -features bear the specification of NP<sub>NOM2</sub>, the argument that cannot Spec-TP-move in order to establish the Agree relation with T. This, in turn, allowed us to conflate the optional to in DCCs with two NPs<sub>3NOM</sub> and matching  $\varphi$ -features or DCCs with first or second person  $NP_{NOM1}$  with  $NP_{NOM1}$ -agreement, but at the same time suggested that the merger of to in such DCCs, apart from formally manifesting the TP projection, also serves some other function. Resting on Seres and Espinal's (2019) remarks on the Russian pronominal èto ('that<sub>neut</sub>'/'it<sub>neut</sub>'), it has been claimed that this function is presentational, applied to relate/present the entity introduced by NP<sub>NOM1</sub> as the entity introduced by NP<sub>NOM2</sub>, i.e., to place the two nominative arguments in a semantically symmetrical, identificational relation.

#### References

- Bailyn, J., and B. Citko. 1999. Case and agreement in Slavic predicates. In H. Coats, K. Dziwirek and C. M. Vakareliyska (eds.), *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Seattle Meeting*, 17–37. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Béjar, S., and A. Kahnemuyipour. 2017. Non-canonical agreement in copular sentences. *Journal of Linguistics* 53(3): 463–499.
- Béjar, S., and A. Kahnemuyipour. 2018. Not all phi-features are created equal: A reply to Hartmann and Heycock. *Journal of Linguistics* 54(3): 629–635.
- Béjar, S., and A. Kahnemuyipour. 2023. Agree and the subjects of specificational clauses. *Syntax* 26, https://doi.org/10.1111/synt.12256
- Benmamoun, E. 2008. Clause structure and the syntax of verbless sentences. In R. Freidin, C. P. Otero, and M. L. Zubizarreta (eds.), *Foundational issues in linguistic theory*, 105–131. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Błaszczak, J., and 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.
- 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 and R. Marín (eds.), *The grammar of copulas across languages*, 107–129. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cardinaletti, A. 2004. Towards a cartography of subject positions. In L. Rizzi (ed.), *The structure of CP and IP: The cartography of syntactic structures*, Vol. 2, 115–165. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Chomsky, N. 1995. The minimalist program. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

- Chomsky, N. 2000. The minimalist inquiries. In R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka (eds.), *Step by step. Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, 89–155. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 2001. Derivation by phase. In M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A life in language*, 1–52. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Citko, B. 2008. Small clauses reconsidered: Not so small and not all alike. Lingua 118: 261–295.
- den Dikken, M. 2006. *Relators and linkers: The syntax of predication, predication inversion, and copulas.* Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Coon, J. and S. Keine. 2021. Feature gluttony. Linguistic Inquiry 52(4): 655-710.
- Frege, G. 1891/1960. *Translations from the philosophical writings of Gottlob Frege*. P. Geach and M. Black. Blackwell: Oxford.
- Hartmann, J., and Heycock, C. 2016. Evading agreement: A new perspective on low nominative agreement in Icelandic. In C. Hammerly, and B. Prickett (eds.), *Proceedings of the Forty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS)*, 67–80. Vol.2. Amherst, MA: GLSA Publications.
- Hartmann, J., and Heycock, C. 2017. Variation in copular agreement in Insular Scandinavian. In in H. Thráinsson, C. Heycock, H. Petersen, and Z. Hansen (eds.), *Syntactic variation in Insular Scandinavian, Volume 1 of Studies in Germanic Linguistics (SIGL)*, 233–275. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hartmann, J., and C. Heycock. 2019a. Restrictions on low person agreement in Dutch copular constructions. *Linguist. Netherlands* 36, 131–147. https://doi.org/10.1075/avt.00028.har
- Hartmann, J., and C. Heycock. 2019b. (Morpho)syntactic variation in agreement: specificational copular clauses across Germanic. *Frontiers in Psychology* 10. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02994
- Hartmann, J., and C. Heycock. 2022. Person effects in agreement with Icelandic low nominatives: an experimental investigation. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 41(3): 1029–1090. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-022-09564-z
- Higgins, R. 1979. The pseudo-cleft constructions in English. New York, NY: Garland.
- Hinzen, W. 2009. Hierarchy, merge and truth. In M. Palmarini, J. Uriagereka, and P. Salaburu (eds.), *Of minds and language: A dialogue with Noam Chomsky in the Basque country*, 123–141. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holmberg, A. 2000. Scandinavian stylistic fronting: How any category can become an expletive. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31: 445–483.
- Jurczyk, R. 2021. Abandoning the EPP-feature in Polish dual copula clauses by redefining the predication relation. *Linguistics Beyond and Within* 7: 33–57.
- Kayne, R. 1994. The antisymmetry of syntax. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Kempf, Z. 2007. *Próba teorii przypadków*. Część 2 [The account of the theory of Cases. Part 2]. Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski.
- Klemensiewicz, Z. 1926. Orzecznik przy formach osobowych słowa *być* [Predication with finite forms of the word *być*]. *Prace Filologiczne* XI: 123–181.
- Kopczyński, O. 1778. *Gramatyka dla szkół narodowych* [Grammar for national schools]. Warszawa: Drukarnia ojców pijarów.
- Krifka, M. 2007. Basic notions of information structure. In C. Fery, and M. Krifka (eds.), *Interdisciplinary studies on information structure* 6, 13–56. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag.
- Lock, G. 1996. Functional English grammar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- López, L. 2009. Ranking the linear correspondence axiom. Linguistic Inquiry 40: 239-276.
- Mahjabeen, J. 2012. Frege's theory of sense and reference: a critical exposition. Ph.D. diss, Calcutta, University of Calcutta.
- Mikkelsen, L. 2005. *Copular clauses. Specification, predication and equation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Mokosz, E. 2022. The puzzles of topic dislocation in Polish. Studies in Polish Linguistics 17(4): 145–176.
- Moro, A. 1997. *The raising of predicates. Predicative noun phrases and the theory of clause structure.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Padučeva, E. V. 1985. *Vyskazyvanie i ego sootnesionnost's deistvitel'nost'u: Referentsial'nye aspekty semantiki mestoimenii* [Utterance and its relation to reality: Referential aspects of pronoun semantics]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Pesetsky, D., and Torrego, E. 2004. Tense, case and the nature of syntactic categories. In J. Guéron, and J. Lecarme (eds.), *The syntax of time*, 295–537. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Preminger, O. 2014. Agreement and its failures. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Rizzi, L. 1990. Relativised minimality. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Rizzi, L. 2018. Subjects, topics and the interpretation of Pro. In R. Petrosino, P. Cerrone, and H. van der Hulst (eds.), *From sounds to structures: Beyond the veil of Maya*, 510–529.
- Rothstein, S. 2004. Predicates and their subjects. Dordrecht: Springer Science & Business Media.
- 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., and M. Teresa Espinal. 2019. Russian definitional generic sentences. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 4(1): 59.
- Shlonsky, U., and Rizzi, L. 2018. Criterial freezing in small clauses and the cartography of copular constructions. In J. M. Hartmann, M. Jäger, A. Kehl, A. Konietzko, and S. Wienkler (eds.), *Freezing, studies in generative grammar*, 29–65. Berlin & Boston, MA: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sigurðsson, H. A., and A. Holmberg. 2008. Icelandic dative intervention: person and number are separate probes. In R. D'Alessandro, S. Fischer, and G. H. Hrafnbjargarson (eds.), *Agreement restrictions*, 251–279. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Silverstein, M. 1976. Hierarchy of features and ergativity. In R. M. W. Dixon (ed.), *Grammatical categories in Australian languages*, 112–171. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies and New Jersey Press.
- Szucsich, L. 2007. Nothing wrong with finite T: Non-agreeing accusative impersonal sentences. In M. Gołędzinowska, U. Savchenko, and 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.

Cite this article as:

Jurczyk, R. (2024). Post-verbal agreement and obligatory presence of particle *to* in Polish dual copula clauses. *LingBaW. Linguistics Beyond and Within, 10,* 65–88.