

ANNA PRAŻMOWSKA

## FULL AGREEMENT WITH COORDINATE SUBJECTS IN POLISH: GENDER RESOLUTION RULES REVISITED

**A b s t r a c t.** The aim of the paper is to propose a set of revised gender resolution rules for Polish, based on an interplay between gender and animacy features of conjuncts, which makes a coordinate subject eligible for a given variant of gender agreement with the predicate. Specifically, it is argued that both gender and animacy features of conjuncts can make a coordinate subject eligible for virile or non-virile agreement, or both. The resolution is achieved by the application of a set of four rules capitalising on certain semantic features of conjuncts and the interaction between them within a coordinate subject. The application of the rules restricts agreement possibilities to either virile or non-virile agreement, or makes both possibilities available for a given coordinate subject. In consequence, the proposed revised gender resolution rules have a capacity to capture data that are problematic under the traditional resolution rules for Polish.

**Key words:** agreement; animacy; coordination; gender; Polish.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

In Polish, there are two major coordinate subject-verb agreement strategies, namely full agreement and partial agreement. Partial agreement in Polish is essentially closest conjunct agreement, where the predicate agrees with the linearly closest conjunct with respect to all  $\phi$ -features, hence gender resolution is not an issue. In full agreement with coordinate subjects (also referred to as ‘resolved agreement’), the predicate is always plural and its person feature is resolved according to the universal person hierarchy (1<sup>st</sup> > 2<sup>nd</sup> > 3<sup>rd</sup>) (see, e.g., Corbett 1982, 348). As far as gender is concerned, it is generally assumed that, if at least one of the conjuncts is masculine personal, the predicate is virile, otherwise it is non-virile. This rule is at the core of gender

---

ANNA PRAŻMOWSKA, MA—PhD candidate, Department of Theoretical Linguistics, Institute of English Studies, John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin; address for correspondence: Al. Raławickie 14, PL 20-950 Lublin; E-mail: [anna.prazmowska@gmail.com](mailto:anna.prazmowska@gmail.com)

resolution in Polish and it holds in most cases. However, there are several exceptions to this principle, most notably those involving a virile predicate without a masculine personal conjunct, as well as those where both virile and non-virile agreement is available.

In this paper, I first analyse gender agreement patterns with Polish coordinate subjects and examine to what extent the traditional gender resolution rules for Polish are capable of capturing these patterns. In section 2, some relevant empirical data is brought to light, which reveals the limitations of the traditional gender resolution rules. In sections 2 and 3, gender and animacy features of nominal conjuncts are analysed to determine which features are most relevant from the perspective of full agreement with coordinate subjects. In section 3.1, it is argued that grammatical gender is relevant for gender resolution only if it corresponds to the semantic (interpretable) gender features of nouns, whereas uninterpretable gender plays no role in gender resolution. On the basis of the examined data, I propose that, in the case of nominal conjuncts with uninterpretable gender, it is the presence of a [+human] feature that is responsible for the fact that human-related nouns and human-denoting neuter nouns behave differently with respect to gender resolution than inanimate nouns. Taking these assumptions and observations into consideration, a set of four Revised Gender Resolution Rules for Polish is formulated, which strongly rely on the semantic features of conjuncts and the interactions between them within a coordinate subject. In section 3.2, the revised rules are tested against Polish data to demonstrate their potential to account for more data than the traditional rules. Section 4 concludes the paper.

## 2. GENDER RESOLUTION

### IN FULL AGREEMENT WITH COORDINATE SUBJECTS IN POLISH AND THE ROLE OF SOME ANIMACY FEATURES

The full array of subject-verb agreement morphology is displayed in Polish in the past tense (*on powiedział* ‘he said’), the conditional mood (*ona powiedziałaby* ‘she would say’) and in the analytical future tense (*dziecko będzie mówiło* ‘child will speak’). In general terms, Polish has a singular-plural number distinction with masculine, feminine and neuter genders in the singular and virile and non-virile in the plural.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> However, as one of the reviewers rightly pointed out, distinguishing two independent gender values for plural nouns is problematic from the learnability perspective, as it introduces two distinct forms of a single noun, which increases efforts required for language acquisition. For the purpose of

As has already been mentioned, gender resolution in full agreement in Polish is generally governed by the following two rules:

- (1) Traditional gender resolution rules in Polish:
- i. if at least one of the conjuncts is masculine personal (or is interpreted as such), the form of the verb is virile;
  - ii. if there is no masculine personal conjunct, the form of the verb is non-virile.

(Zbróg 2012, 131–132)

Although these rules seem to hold in Polish, Zbróg (2012) notes the presence of some exceptions that appear to be systematic, among which the most prominent group consists of cases where the verb is virile despite the absence of a masculine personal noun, as exemplified in (3):

- (3) a. z malutkim opóźnieniem mandolina, bas i gitara zaczęli [grać]  
with little delay mandolin<sub>Fem</sub> bass<sub>Masc</sub> and guitar<sub>Fem</sub> began<sub>Vir</sub> play  
'With a little delay, the mandolin, bass and guitar began [playing].'
- b. podkreślali zgodnie obrona i oskarżenie  
emphasized<sub>Vir</sub> in-unison defence<sub>Fem</sub> and prosecution<sub>Neut</sub>  
'...the defence and prosecution emphasized in unison.'
- c. Chelsea i Arsenal stracili punkty  
Chelsea<sub>Fem</sub> and Arsenal<sub>Masc</sub> lost<sub>Vir</sub> points  
'Chelsea and Arsenal (have) lost points.'

(Zbróg, 2012, 134)

- d. Kościół i mafia mieli więc wspólnego wroga. [NKJP]  
Church<sub>Masc</sub> and mafia<sub>Fem</sub> had<sub>Vir</sub> so common enemy  
'So the Church and the mafia had a common enemy.'

The example in (3a) illustrates the influence of a non-literal use of non-personal nouns. Here, the names of instruments (grammatically feminine, masculine and feminine, respectively) refer not to the instruments themselves but to the musicians, which results in the virile form of the verb, despite the absence of an explicitly personal masculine noun. The examples in (3b,c,d) involve essentially non-personal nouns whose referents are organisations, sports teams

---

the present discussion, where only interpretable gender of human-denoting nouns is argued to be relevant for gender resolution (see section 3.1), I assume a somewhat simplified array of nominal genders in Polish, including gender features of human-denoting nouns only, and reflected in five different forms of *l*-participles in singular and plural agreement (nouns with masculine animate (cf. ft. 8) and masculine inanimate gender, as well as plural non-coordinated nouns with virile and non-virile gender, are beyond the scope of the present study on gender resolution). For a discussion on the complex issue of the number of genders in Polish, see, e.g., Corbett (1983); Laskowski (1999); Mańczak (1956); Saloni and Świdziński (2007), among others.

and, in general, concrete nouns denoting certain (organised) groups of people. Although not strictly semantically personal (such as nouns denoting human individuals), they are also not absolutely inanimate (such as nouns denoting inanimate objects). Therefore, I assume that they are equipped with an inherent [+human] feature since they are comprised of humans and enable virile agreement, as opposed to other, often similar but non-human-related collective nouns that preclude this possibility, as illustrated in (4):

- (4) a. (*the groups are comprised of people*) [+human]  
 Grupa A i grupa B są już gotowe /gotowi do badania.  
 [group A]<sub>Fem</sub> and [group B]<sub>Fem</sub> are already ready<sub>NonVir</sub> /ready<sub>Vir</sub> for examination  
 ‘Group A and group B are already ready for the examination.’
- b. (*the groups are comprised of objects*) [–human]  
 Grupa A i grupa B są już gotowe /\*gotowi do badania.  
 [group A]<sub>Fem</sub> and [group B]<sub>Fem</sub> are already ready<sub>NonVir</sub> /ready<sub>Vir</sub> for examination

In the sentence in (4a), where the conjuncts are nouns denoting groups composed of humans, virile agreement is available,<sup>2</sup> as opposed to (4b), where the nouns denote groups of inanimate objects and, hence, only non-virile is possible. Since the only apparent difference between the conjuncts in (4a) and (4b) is the fact that only those in (4a) denote groups of humans, which has been associated with the presence of the [+human] feature, it seems reasonable to assume that the [+human] feature must play a crucial role in making virile agreement available, given the prevalence of this feature in all conjuncts of the coordinate subjects in (3), where, contrary to the traditional gender resolution rules, virile form of the predicate is available.<sup>3</sup> To distinguish this group of nouns from other non-personal nouns (i.e., inanimate nouns), they will be referred to as ‘human-related’ nouns.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> The availability of both virile and non-virile agreement in (4a) can in fact have two sources. On the one hand, it can be either a reflection of the effects of the [+human] feature of the conjuncts, as discussed above. On the other hand, it may be a reflection of the speaker’s awareness of the groups’ internal composition, in which case the non-virile form of the verb is available only if both groups are comprised exclusively of females. However, given the common availability of non-virile agreement with coordinate subjects with human-related nouns such as *Kościół* ‘Church,’ whose denotees can be safely assumed not to be composed exclusively of females, it is not always the awareness of the groups’ internal composition that licences the availability of non-virile agreement.

<sup>3</sup> Another possibility to account for the availability of virile agreement with coordinate subjects that do not contain masculine personal conjuncts is to assume that, due to mutual incompatibility of some of the features, gender resolution is unable to produce a satisfactory effect and a default virile gender feature surfaces on the predicate.

<sup>4</sup> Similarly, I assume that the conjuncts in the coordinate subject in (3a) are equipped with a comparable [+human] feature that enables human-denoting interpretation and licenses virile agree-

The examples in (3) and (4) show that grammatical gender of conjuncts cannot determine gender agreement with the verb on its own. It appears that the semantics of conjuncts (often quite complex, cf. (3a), ft. 4, ft. 8) plays a rather crucial role in gender agreement.<sup>5</sup> In particular, it seems that even an implicit [+human] feature on one of the conjuncts may indicate the availability of a virile form of the verb.

To sum up, virile form of the verb is obligatory when at least one conjunct is masculine personal, which is predicted by the traditional gender resolution rules. However, it has also been shown that, when at least one of the conjuncts is (interpreted as) human-related, the virile form of the verb is also an option, even in the absence of a masculine personal conjunct, which is not captured by the traditional rules. In the following section, I further examine those semantic features of conjuncts that are relevant from the perspective of gender agreement and, capitalising on these features, I propose a set of revised gender resolution rules for Polish, which have a capacity to account for all the data problematic for the traditional rules.

### 3. REVISING GENDER RESOLUTION RULES FOR POLISH

As has been shown in section 2, the traditional resolution rules correctly predict that the presence of a masculine personal pronoun within a coordinate subject makes virile predicate agreement obligatory. However, under the traditional rules, any coordinate subject that does not contain such a noun should make only non-virile agreement available, which is not the case. In particular, contrary to the traditional rules, it is possible for a predicate to have a virile form if the conjuncts are composed of non-personal but still human-related nouns or in combinations that involve human-denoting neuter or female-denoting noun(s). In order to account for these problematic data,

---

ment. However, it is worth noting that inanimate nouns used as human-denoting, as in (3a), are different from human-related nouns, in that they are not inherently [+human]. In this case, the presence of the [+human] feature appears to be contingent on the personification of such nouns in the mind of the speaker, which makes them more akin to personified animate nouns that license virile agreement, as in the example in (i) in ft. 8.

<sup>5</sup> This issue is also discussed in Willim (2012a), where the author observes that there are certain nouns whose syntactic gender differs from their semantic gender, e.g., *babsztyl* 'hag' (syntactically masculine, semantically feminine), *postać/osoba* 'person' (syntactically feminine, semantically either masculine or feminine, depending on the context). When such a conflict occurs in the context of coordination, according to Willim (2012a), it is the semantic gender that surfaces on the verb.

in the next two sections, I propose and test a set of four revised gender resolution rules based on certain semantic features of conjuncts that make a coordinate subject eligible for a certain variant of agreement. In section 3.1, the rules are spelled out and the motivation for the proposal and its core premises are discussed. In section 3.2, the revised rules are illustrated and tested against Polish data.

### 3.1. MOTIVATING, FORMULATING AND CONSOLIDATING THE REVISED RULES

I assume that only semantic gender is interpretable, that is gender that corresponds to the natural/biological gender of the noun's denotee, i.e., on male- and female-denoting nouns.<sup>6</sup> Consequently, neuter gender can never be interpretable as it has no natural/biological equivalent. The same applies to inanimate nouns, whose denotees cannot have a natural/biological gender. I also assume that human-related nouns (denoting groups comprising humans) have uninterpretable gender. Although humans that comprise groups denoted by human-related nouns have natural/biological gender, the gender of a human-related noun is not dependent on nor derived from the gender(s) of these humans but it is assigned arbitrarily in the lexicon.<sup>7</sup> In short, only male- and female-denoting nouns have interpretable gender, whereas the remaining nouns have uninterpretable gender.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> In the present approach, interpretable gender is understood as semantically interpretable, i.e., semantically substantiated. A semantically interpretable gender feature of a given noun does not have to correspond to the grammatical gender feature of that noun, as is the case of the noun *babsztyl* 'hag,' which is semantically interpreted as a female but its grammatical gender is masculine, which is reflected on a predicate in singular agreement, which always has a masculine form (cf. ft. 5; see, e.g., Rappaport 2011; Willim 2012a). For a detailed discussion on the issue of (un)interpretability of gender in Polish, see Willim (2012b).

<sup>7</sup> As opposed to so-called pluralia tantum, such as *wujostwo* 'uncle and his wife,' *generalostwo* 'General and his wife,' etc., whose lexical form is derived from the noun denoting a male member of the group (Topolińska, 1984, p. 316), which, presumably, is reflected on the virile forms of verbs agreeing with such nouns.

<sup>8</sup> Animate (i.e., animal-denoting) nouns are excluded from the present discussion since determining whether gender features of animal-denoting nouns are interpretable or not is an exceptionally complex issue (e.g., Laskowski 1999). Moreover, interestingly, it appears that, apart from being animate and having some gender feature(s), animal-denoting nouns may have another feature that, in certain context, enables the availability of virile agreement with coordinate subjects composed of animal-denoting nouns, as shown in (i):

(i) (...) pies i kot doskonale rozpoznali hierarchię w stadzie (rodzinie),  
 dog<sub>AnimMasc</sub> and cat<sub>AnimMasc</sub> perfectly identified<sub>Vir</sub> hierarchy in herd (family)

Moreover, I assume that uninterpretable gender plays no role in gender resolution. Note that human-related nouns, as discussed in section 2, allow both virile and non-virile agreement, regardless of their grammatical gender. Similarly, agreement with coordinate subjects composed of inanimate nouns always produces a non-virile verb form, also regardless of the grammatical gender of conjuncts. Interestingly, a feature that appears to be relevant for gender resolution is the [+human] feature, which renders subjects with human-related conjuncts eligible for virile agreement. As will be shown in the following section, the [+human] feature seems to be also responsible for the availability of virile agreement with coordinate subjects composed of a female-denoting noun and a human-denoting neuter noun or two human-denoting neuter nouns, despite the absence of a personal masculine conjunct. In contrast, predicates agreeing with [–human] nouns (inanimate nouns) can have only non-virile form, again regardless of the grammatical gender of the nouns.

Therefore, for the purpose of the present discussion, two major groups of nouns are distinguished—those with interpretable gender features and those with uninterpretable gender features. In the case of nouns with interpretable gender features, I further distinguish between masculine and feminine nouns (both subgroups denoting humans). Nouns with uninterpretable gender features are further divided into nouns with the [+human] feature (human-related nouns and human-denoting neuter nouns) and nouns with the [–human] feature (inanimate nouns). Since I assume that both interpretable gender and animacy features of conjuncts are relevant in determining gender agreement with coordinate subjects, I propose that nominal conjuncts that bear certain features make a coordinate subject eligible for one of three possible variants of agreement: virile or non-virile, or both virile and non-virile. These “eligibilities” are spelled out in (5):<sup>9</sup>

---

choć próbowali walczyć (...) [NKJP]  
 although tried<sub>vir</sub> fight  
 ‘(...) the dog and the cat (have) perfectly identified the hierarchy in the herd (family), although they tried to fight (...)’

At this point, I may only hypothesize that the virile form of the verb in (i) is a result of indirect personification of the animals denoted by the subject, i.e., from the point of view of the speaker, in this context, these animals have some form of a [+human] feature, whose presence affects the form of the verb (cf. (3a) and ft. 4). Consequently, animate nouns are not included in the formulation of the revised gender resolution rules proposed herein, although I acknowledge that further inquiry should be made into the issue of a possible presence of a [+human] feature on Polish animal-denoting (and human-denoting inanimate) nouns in certain contexts.

<sup>9</sup> In the present paper, the proposed eligibilities in (5) and the RGRs in (6) are expressed in terms of grammatical gender features, which may or may not be interpretable, depending on their

- (5) *The eligibilities for a given agreement variant:*
- a. A conjunct with interpretable gender makes the subject eligible for either virile or non-virile agreement, i.e.:
    - i. masculine conjunct(s) for virile agreement;
    - ii. feminine conjunct(s) for non-virile agreement.
  - b. A conjunct with uninterpretable gender makes the subject eligible for both variants of agreement or only for non-virile agreement, i.e.:
    - i. [+human] conjunct(s) for both virile and non-virile agreement;
    - ii. [-human] conjunct(s) for non-virile agreement.

The assumptions presented in (5) reflect the effects of coordination of nouns with identical features. For instance, agreement with a coordinate subject composed of masculine personal nouns will always produce a virile form of the verb. Similarly, verbs agreeing with coordinate subjects composed of either female-denoting nouns or inanimate nouns will always have a non-virile form. Note that, at this point, it is already possible to account for two sets of data that the traditional resolution rules fail to capture. According to the traditional rules, only coordinate subjects with at least one masculine personal conjunct are eligible for virile agreement, which does not predict that agreement with subjects composed of human-related nouns or human-denoting neuter nouns can in fact produce a virile verb form. This is exactly what the assumption in (5b) predicts, i.e., if a coordinate subject is composed of conjuncts with uninterpretable gender and the [+human] feature (which includes human-related nouns and human-denoting neuter nouns), both virile and non-virile agreement is available.

Let us now turn to agreement with subjects whose conjuncts are composed of nouns with mixed features, which is an essential proving ground for any set of gender resolution rules. To provide a unified account of the problematic data presented in section 2 (and some more), I argue that it is the interplay between the eligibilities in (5), governed by the four Revised Gender Resolution Rules in (6) (henceforth, RGRRs), that enables particular agreement variations.

- (6) *Revised Gender Resolution Rules for Polish*
1. An interpretable masculine gender feature on any conjunct always makes a coordinate subject eligible only for virile agreement, regardless of the features of the other conjunct(s).

---

semantics. As one of the reviewers suggested, male-denoting nouns could be also reconsidered as a semantically distinguished class of masculine nouns (see Willim, 2006), and, consequently, the RGRRs in (6) might be reformulated and expressed in terms of precisely defined noun classes rather than configurations of grammatical gender features, which I leave for future research.



2. Subject to Rule 1, an interpretable feminine gender feature on any conjunct makes a coordinate subject eligible for non-virile agreement.
3. Subject to Rule 1, uninterpretable gender and the [+human] feature on any conjunct make a coordinate subject eligible for both virile and non-virile agreement.
4. Subject to Rule 1, uninterpretable gender and the [-human] feature on any conjunct make a coordinate subject eligible for non-virile agreement.

Rule 1 (which takes precedence over the remaining rules) predicts that no subject with a personal masculine noun is ever eligible for non-virile agreement, even in the presence of a noun with features that could make the subject eligible for non-virile agreement. Rule 2 predicts that female-denoting conjuncts do not produce virile agreement, unless they are accompanied by a masculine personal noun. Rule 3 predicts that conjuncts containing human-related nouns and/or human-denoting neuter nouns make both virile and non-virile agreement available. Rule 4 predicts that coordinate subjects with at least one inanimate noun enable the availability of non-virile agreement, unless one of the conjuncts is male-denoting.

In order to consolidate the RGRs given in (6), I posit that, if there are no eligibilities for virile within any of the conjuncts, the subject is eligible only for non-virile agreement. Analogously, if there are no active (i.e., not overridden by Rule 1) eligibilities for non-virile agreement within any of the conjuncts, the subject is eligible only for virile agreement. On the other hand, if any of the conjuncts is (actively) eligible for both virile and non-virile, both options are available with that subject. The outcomes of these interactions within coordinate subjects are summarised in Table 1 below, which represents conjuncts (of coordinate subjects with two conjuncts) with all possible configurations of the relevant features (16 configurations in total). If the combined features of two conjuncts (provided in the row and column headings) make a subject eligible only for virile agreement, the respective cell is marked with ‘Vir.’ Analogously, if the combined features of two conjuncts make only non-virile agreement available, it is indicated with ‘NonVir,’ whereas if both options are available, they are both indicated in the respective cell.

Table 1. Agreement variants resulting from the interactions between the proposed RGRRs

	interpretable masculine (Rule 1)	interpretable feminine (Rule 2)	uninterpretable [+human] (Rule 3)	uninterpretable [-human] (Rule 4)
interpretable masculine (Rule 1)	Vir	Vir	Vir	Vir
interpretable feminine (Rule 2)	Vir	NonVir	Vir NonVir	NonVir
uninterpretable [+human] (Rule 3)	Vir	Vir NonVir	Vir NonVir	Vir NonVir
uninterpretable [-human] (Rule 4)	Vir	NonVir	Vir NonVir	NonVir

Note that, as in the traditional resolution rules, the presence of a personal masculine conjunct in a coordinate subject makes virile agreement obligatory also under the RGRRs. However, due to the incorporation of the [+human] feature into the RGRRs, we are now able to account also for the availability of both virile and non-virile agreement with subjects composed of conjuncts with certain configurations of features, which is not predicted by the traditional rules. To substantiate the RGRRs and show that they have a wider scope than the traditional rules, in the following section, the RGRRs are tested against Polish data.

### 3.2. TESTING THE REVISED GENDER RESOLUTION RULES

Let us begin the tests by first illustrating and testing the eligibilities in (5) and the corresponding RGRRs in (6) with coordinate subjects composed of conjuncts with identical uninterpretable gender features:<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> The grammatical examples in (8)–(12) were extracted from NKJP (Przepiórkowski et al., 2012), and the remaining examples in section 3.2 were constructed by the author.

- (7) Dziecko i niemowlę zamilkły/zamilkli.  
 child<sub>NP</sub> and infant<sub>NP</sub> went-quiet<sub>NonVir</sub>/went-quiet<sub>Vir</sub>  
 ‘The child and the infant went quiet.’
- (8) a. Policja i prokuratura ustalili, że lekarze brali pieniądze  
 police<sub>HR</sub> and prosecutor’s-office<sub>HR</sub> determined<sub>Vir</sub> that doctors took money  
 ‘The police and the prosecutor’s office (have) determined that the doctors took money’  
 b. Policja i prokuratura ustaliły, że udział w  
 police<sub>HR</sub> and prosecutor’s-office<sub>HR</sub> determined<sub>NonVir</sub> that participation in  
 porwaniu brał szef warszawskiej firmy  
 kidnapping took boss Warsaw company  
 ‘The police and the prosecutor’s office (have) determined that the head of a/the Warsaw company took part in the kidnapping’
- (9) Wojna i okupacja przerwały/\*przerwali funkcjonowanie  
 war<sub>IA</sub> and occupation<sub>IA</sub> disrupted<sub>NonVir</sub>/disrupted<sub>Vir</sub> functioning  
 polskiego przemysłu filmowego.  
 Polish industry film  
 ‘The war and occupation disrupted the Polish film industry.’

The sentences in (7) and (8) are examples of the application of Rule 3, which predicts that verbs agreeing with subjects whose conjuncts consist of nouns with uninterpretable gender and the [+human] feature can have either virile or non-virile form. Note that the grammaticality of the virile agreement in (7) and (8a) is not predicted under the traditional resolution rules for Polish as neither of them contains a personal masculine noun. Instead, it appears that it is the [+human] feature, present on the nouns, that is responsible for the availability of virile agreement. This possibility is precluded if conjuncts have uninterpretable gender and a [–human] feature, in which case, the agreeing verb is invariably non-virile, as predicted by Rule 4 and illustrated in (9).

As far as coordinate subjects with conjuncts composed of nouns with different gender/animacy features are concerned, the RGRs are consistent with Polish data in predicting both grammatical and ungrammatical configurations. The strongest and the most restrictive rule in (6) is Rule 1, which predicts that the presence of a masculine personal noun always makes a coordinate subject eligible only for virile agreement, which is caused by the interpretable masculine gender feature overriding the features of the other conjunct(s), as illustrated in (10)–(12):

- (10) Mężczyzna i kobieta siedzieli/\*siedziały razem w jednym przedziale.  
 man<sub>MP</sub> and woman<sub>FP</sub> sat<sub>Vir</sub>/sat<sub>NonVir</sub> together in one compartment  
 ‘The man and the woman were sitting together in one compartment.’
- (11) Lech Kaczyński i partia (...) podjęli/\*podjęły taktyczny wybór  
 Lech Kaczyński<sub>MP</sub> and party<sub>HR</sub> made<sub>Vir</sub>/made<sub>NonVir</sub> tactical choice  
 ‘Lech Kaczyński and the party (...) (have) made a tactical choice’
- (12) Kierowca i samochód zostali/\*zostały przekazani/  
 driver<sub>MP</sub> and car<sub>IA</sub> became<sub>Vir</sub>/became<sub>NonVir</sub> handed-over<sub>Vir</sub>/  
 \*przekazane komendzie policji w Zakopanem.  
 handed-over<sub>NonVir</sub> to-headquarters police in Zakopane  
 ‘The driver and the car were handed over to the police headquarters in Zakopane.’

In (10), the conjunct *kobieta* ‘woman’ has an interpretable feminine gender feature, which, under Rule 2, could make non-virile agreement available. However, since an interpretable masculine gender feature overrides the features of the other conjunct(s), as predicted by Rule 1, it is also the only feature relevant for gender resolution in this case. Similarly in (11), the conjunct *partia* ‘(political) party’ has uninterpretable gender and the [+human] feature (as a human-related noun denoting a group comprised of humans), which could make the subject eligible for both virile and non-virile agreement, according to Rule 3. Nevertheless, it is overridden by the interpretable masculine gender feature of the male-denoting proper name in the first conjunct, which results in the virile verb form being the only available option. The superior role of the interpretable masculine gender feature is also clearly visible in (12), where, under Rule 4, the conjunct *samochód* ‘car’ with uninterpretable gender and a [–human] feature should make non-virile agreement available but this possibility is precluded by the presence of a masculine personal conjunct that imposes virile agreement.

The examples in (10)–(12) are all predicted by the RGRs but they are also predicted under the traditional gender resolution rules. Therefore, a more challenging test would involve configurations of conjuncts with mixed features that produce grammatical sentences, which are not predicted by the traditional rules. Such cases are illustrated in (13)–(15):

- (13) Podczas wojny wojsko i śmierć chodzili/chodziły parami.  
 during war army<sub>HR</sub> and death<sub>IA</sub> went<sub>Vir</sub>/went<sub>NonVir</sub> in-pairs  
 ‘During war, the army and death went hand in hand.’

- (14) Dziecko i matka zginęli/zginęły na miejscu.  
 child<sub>NP</sub> and mother<sub>FP</sub> died<sub>Vir</sub>/died<sub>NonVir</sub> on place  
 ‘The child and the mother died on site.’
- (15) Królowa Elżbieta i Partia Pracy zgłosili/zgłosiły sprzeciw.  
 [Queen Elisabeth]<sub>FP</sub> and [Labour Party]<sub>HR</sub> reported<sub>Vir</sub>/reported<sub>NonVir</sub> objection  
 ‘Queen Elisabeth and the Labour-Party raised their objection.’

In (13), since both conjuncts have uninterpretable gender features, non-virile verb form is automatically available (and, under the traditional rules, it should be obligatory as there is no personal masculine noun). However, the presence of the [+human] feature on *wojsko* ‘army’ makes the subject eligible also for virile agreement, which is reflected in the availability of both verb forms in (13). In (14), the second conjunct has interpretable feminine gender and the first conjunct has uninterpretable gender and the [+human] feature. There is no masculine personal conjunct and the grammaticality of virile agreement is not predicted by the traditional rules. Even though the interpretable feminine gender feature on *matka* ‘mother’ alone does not make the subject eligible for virile agreement, according to the RGRs, the [+human] feature on *dziecko* ‘child’ makes the subject eligible for both non-virile and virile agreement. There is no interpretable masculine gender feature that could override the availability of non-virile agreement. Therefore, since one of the conjuncts makes the subject eligible for both virile and non-virile agreement, both options are available with the subject in (14). Similarly in (15), since the second conjunct *Partia Pracy* ‘Labour Party,’ having uninterpretable gender and the [+human] feature, makes the subject eligible for both virile and non-virile agreement, both verb forms are possible, even though the first conjunct *Królowa Elżbieta* ‘Queen Elisabeth’ on its own does not enable the availability of virile agreement.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Pending further inquiry, the proposed RGRs should allow for their incorporation into the syntactic structure of Polish coordination under the Minimalist Program and the premises of Distributed Morphology (for relevant discussions, see, e.g., Bogucka 2014; Despić 2016; Kramer 2015; Willim 2012a, 2012b, among others), with a working assumption that agreement, at least in Polish, is a syntactic mechanism, whose effects, including the direct effects of the interplay between the proposed RGRs (i.e., the resolution), are realized at PF. Due to space limitations, discussion of the mechanisms of the derivation of gender resolution in Polish is beyond the scope of this paper.

## 4. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, I have argued that, in order to comprehensively account for gender resolution effects on full agreement with Polish coordinate subjects, the traditional gender resolution rules needed revision. With this in mind, I have proposed a set of four Revised Gender Resolution Rules (in (6)) based on an interplay between certain semantic features of nominal conjuncts, which results in the availability of one of three possible variants of agreement (virile, non-virile, or both virile and non-virile). It has been proposed that only those gender features that are interpretable can play a role in gender resolution. As far as conjuncts with uninterpretable gender features are concerned, the most crucial role has been attributed to the [+human] feature, whose presence within a coordinate subject makes the subject eligible for both non-virile and virile agreement. The introduction of this feature into gender resolution has made it possible to distinguish nouns with uninterpretable gender that denote humans or groups comprised of humans (human-denoting neuter nouns and human-related nouns, respectively) from nouns with uninterpretable gender that are unambiguously inanimate. Since these two groups of nouns with uninterpretable gender behave differently with respect to gender resolution (see, e.g., (4)), this assumption has allowed us to capture the availability of virile agreement with subjects composed of human-related nouns, a female-denoting noun and a human-denoting neuter noun, or two human-denoting neuter nouns, which was not predicted under the traditional resolution rules. Therefore, although the formulation of the RGRs is more complex than the formulation of the traditional gender resolution rules, they are at the same time more comprehensive in scope and, hence, their incorporation into the syntax of Polish coordination (see ft. 11) may disambiguate many problematic issues associated with the derivation of full agreement with coordinate subjects in Polish.

## REFERENCES

- Bogucka, Jadwiga. 2014. "Feature resolution and agreement with coordinated subjects in Polish". In *Complex visibles out there. Proceedings of the Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium 2014: Language use and linguistic structure*, edited by Ludmila Veselovská and Markéta Janebová, 315–331. Olomouc: Palacký University.
- Corbett, Greville. 1982. "Resolution rules for predicate agreement in the Slavonic languages." *The Slavonic and East European Review* 60(3): 347–378.

- Corbett, Greville. 1983. "The number of genders in Polish." *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics* 16: 83-89.
- Despić, Miloje. 2016. "Coordinating gender: What can coordinate structure agreement tell us about gender?" *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 11(1): 1-25.
- Kramer, Ruth. 2015. *The morphosyntax of gender*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Laskowski, Roman. 1999. "Kategorie morfologiczne języka polskiego – Charakterystyka funkcjonalna." In *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Morfologia*, edited by Renata Grzegorzczkova, Roman Laskowski, and Henryk Wróbel, 151-224. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Mańczak, Witold. 1956. "Ile jest rodzajów w języku polskim?" *Język Polski* 36(2): 116-121.
- Przepiórkowski, Adam, Mirosław Bańko, Rafał Górski, and Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk. 2012. *Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Rappaport, Gilbert. 2011. "Toward a multi-level theory of morphology: How Polish gender works." In *Generative investigations: Syntax, morphology, and phonology*, edited by Piotr Bański, Beata Łukaszewicz, Monika Opalińska, and Joanna Zaleska, 166-197. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Saloni, Zygmunt, and Marek Świdziński. 2007. *Składnia współczesnego języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Topolińska, Zuzanna. 1984. "Składnia grupy imiennej." In *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Składnia*, edited by Zuzanna Topolińska, 301-393. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Willim, Ewa. 2006. *Event, individuation and countability. A Study with special reference to English and Polish*. Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press
- Willim, Ewa. 2012a. "Concord in Polish coordinate NPs as Agree." In *Slavic languages in formal grammar. Proceedings of FDSL 8.5, Brno 2010*, edited by Markéta Ziková and Mojmir Docekal, 233-253. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Willim, Ewa. 2012b. "On the feature valuation/interpretability biconditional in Minimalist Theory. The case of (un)interpretable gender." In *Sound structure and sense*, edited by Edmund Gussmann, Eugeniusz Cyran, Henryk Kardela, and Bogdan Szymanek, 761-806. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Zbróg, Piotr. 2012. *Składnia podmiotu szeregowego we współczesnym języku polskim*. Kraków: Libron.

#### NOWE UJĘCIE REGUŁ UZGADNIANIA RODZAJU ORZECZENIA Z PODMIOTEM SZEREGOWYM W JĘZYKU POLSKIM

##### Streszczenie

Celem niniejszego artykułu jest przedstawienie zbioru nowych reguł dotyczących uzgodnienia rodzaju podmiotu szeregowego z formą orzeczenia czasownikowego w języku polskim, opartych na wzajemnych oddziaływaniach wartości kategorii rodzaju i żywotności członów podmiotu, które odpowiadają za uzgodnienie danego podmiotu z określoną formą orzeczenia. Według przedstawionej analizy zarówno cechy kategorii rodzaju jak i kategorii żywotności decydują o uzgodnieniu podmiotu szeregowego z orzeczeniem w formie męskoosobowej lub niemęskoosobowej, bądź umożliwiają uzgodnienie podmiotu z obiema tymi formami orzeczenia, co jest efektem zastosowania czterech zaproponowanych reguł i interakcji pomiędzy nimi. W rezultacie omawiany zbiór nowych reguł oferuje możliwość stworzenia bardziej kompleksowego opisu i objaśnienia danych, które stanowią problem w ujęciu tradycyjnych reguł uzgodnienia podmiotu szere-

gowego z orzeczeniem, głównie z uwagi na uwzględnienie w prezentowanej analizie warunków występowania oboczności w badanych kontekstach w języku polskim.

*Streściła Anna Prażmowska*

**Słowa kluczowe:** akomodacja; język polski; podmiot szeregowy; rodzaj; żywotność.



