

Nicolas Lamoure  
PhD candidate in linguistics  
Cecilia Poletto & Katharina Hartmann  
Goethe Universität Frankfurt  
[Nicolas.lamoure@live.de](mailto:Nicolas.lamoure@live.de)

## Abstract: Left conjunct and resolved “agreement” in S-selection

My research on nominal coordination has revealed that German differs from Italian with respect to agreement. While Italian exhibits *left conjunct agreement* with gender mismatches (1) German requires *resolved agreement* which can only be spelt out in case a syncretic form is available (3). In absence of such a form, an unacceptable utterance obtains (2):

- |     |                |                     |                    |                        |                   |       |              |
|-----|----------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|
| 1.) | Questa         | scuola di musica    | e                  | centro culturale       | è stata distrutta |       |              |
|     | This.fem       | school.fem of music | and                | center.masc of culture | was               |       |              |
|     | destroyed.fem  |                     |                    |                        |                   |       |              |
| 2.) | *Diese         | Musikschule         | und                | Kulturzentrum          | wurde zerstört    |       |              |
|     | This.fem       | school.fem of music | and                | center.neut of culture | was destroyed     |       |              |
| 3.) | Diesem Kind    | und                 | Messerstecher      | traue                  | ich               | nicht | über den Weg |
|     | This.neut/masc | and                 | knife-stabber.masc | trust                  | I                 | not   | over the way |

In this talk, I want to show that the same patterns can be found in cases of *coordination of unlike categories* (Zhang 2009):

- 4.) You can depend [<sub>PP</sub> on my assistance] and [<sub>CP</sub> that I will be on time]
- 5.) \*You can depend on my assistance and whether I will be on time
- 6.) \*You can depend that I will be on time and on my assistance and

Following Pesetsky (1982) I assume that (verbal) selection reduces to S(emantic)-selection and L(exical)-selection. Data as in 4.) then show that (i) S-selection targets resolved agreement (cf. 5), while (ii) L-selection targets the left conjunct (cf. 6). I claim that this can be accounted for by assuming the same set of assumptions that derive the data in 1.) – 3.): Interpretable features (the ones that S-selection is sensitive to) can be used as a label (Chomsky 2015), while uninterpretable ones (the ones that are relevant for L-selection) cannot.

Additional support for this type of analysis comes from Rizzi’s criterial freezing (Rizzi 2016). Combining both assumptions /approaches successfully predicts the Coordinate Structure Constraint (Smith in press).

## Literaturverzeichnis

Chomsky, Noam (2015): Problems of projection: Extensions. In: Elisa Di Domenico, Cornelia Hamann und Simona Matteini (Hg.): Structures, Strategies and Beyond. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company (223), S. 1–16. Online verfügbar unter <https://benjamins.com/catalog/la.223.01cho>.

Pesetsky, David Michael (1982): Paths and categories. Doctoral Dissertation (Ph.D.). Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Dept. of Linguistics and Philosophy. Online verfügbar unter <http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/15467>, zuletzt geprüft am 13.04.2019.

Rizzi, Luigi (2016): Labeling, maximality and the head – phrase distinction. In: *The Linguistic Review* 33 (1), S. 345. DOI: 10.1515/tlr-2015-0016.

Zhang, Niina Ning (2009): Coordination in syntax. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Cambridge studies in linguistics, 123).