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Abstract:
In this talk, I examine agreement in Polish postverbal relative clauses with coordinated heads. Building on the rich literature on agreement and multi-valuation in coordinate structures (Marušič, Nevins and Badecker 2015, Grosz 2015, Citko 2018, Shen 2019, among many others), I focus on the following questions: (i) what do such relative clauses tell us about the structure of coordination and the nature of agreement (i.e., the choice between so-called First Conjunct vs. Last Conjunct vs. Resolved Agreement), (ii) what do the available and unavailable agreement patterns tell us about the structure and derivation of relative clauses?, and (iii) what structural factors determine the choice between Resolved and Single Conjunct Agreement, and more generally, the morphological realization of an Agree relationship between a single Probe and Multiple Goals?

The Polish agreement patterns are schematized in (1) and exemplified in (2): the relative pronoun shows so-called Resolved Agreement, the Determiner Closest Conjunct Agreement, and the matrix verb either Resolved or Closest Conjunct Agreement.
(1) VERB_{SG/PL} [DP [DP D_{SG/*PL} NP_{SG} and NP_{SG}] [CP REL_{PL/*SG} [TP .... ]]]

(2) Na stole leżała/leżały ta/*te książka i gazeta, które/*które Maria przeczytała.

‘On the table lay this book and paper which Maria read.’

First, I show that relative clauses with the relative pronoun który ‘which’ involve Head Promotion (contra Szczegielniak 2004 and Hladnik 2015). Second, I show that coordination involves DPs (rather than NPs), in spite of the presence of a single determiner. This, I argue, follows from the derivation in which: (i) the conjunction head is merged late/after Head Promotion (cf. Chomsky’s (2013) approach to coordination); (ii) a single D is Parallel Merged with two NPs, which results in agreement with the Closest Conjunct.

I conclude by conjecturing that Closest Conjunct Agreement is the only option when a single Probe agrees with multiple Goals in a Parallel Merge structure. By contrast, if a single Probe agrees with multiple Goals in a non-Parallel Merge structure, the result can be either Resolved Agreement (i.e., agreement with multiple Goals) or Single Conjunct Agreement (i.e., agreement with a single Goal).