Bjorkman & Zeijlstra – Directions of Agree
EGG 2014 @ Debrecen

1. Downward Agree

Downward Agree is standardly defined as (1) (after Chomsky 2000, 2001).

(1) *Agree* α can agree with β iff:
- a. α carries at least one unvalued and uninterpretable feature and β carries a matching interpretable and valued feature.
- b. α c-commands β.
- c. β is the closest goal to α.
- d. β bears an unvalued uninterpretable feature.

(2) a.
[α	[β]]
[uF: __]	[iF: *val*]
	[uK: __]

b. Agree ⇒
[α	[β]]
[~~uF: *val*~~]	[iF: *val*]
	[~~uK: *val*~~]

(3) a.
[α	[β]]
[uF: __]	[iF: *val*]
[iK: *val*]	[uK: __]

b. Agree ⇒
[α	[β]]
[~~uF: *val*~~]	[iF: *val*]
[iK: *val*]	[~~uK: *val*~~]

Move is nothing but a superfunction of Agree. The schemata for Move based on the Agree configurations in (2) and (3) are depicted in (4) and (5) respectively.

(4) a.
[$\alpha_{[epp]}$	[β]]
[uF: __]	[iF: *val*]
	[uK: __]

b. Agree ⇒
[β	[$\alpha_{[epp]}$	[β]]]
[iF: *val*]	[~~uF: *val*~~]	[iF: *val*]
[~~uK: *val*~~]		[uK: *val*]

(5) a.
[$\alpha_{[epp]}$	[β]]
[uF: __]	[iF: *val*]
[iK: *val*]	[uK: __]

b. Agree ⇒
[β	[$\alpha_{[epp]}$	[β]]]
[iF: *val*]	[~~uF: *val*~~]	[iF: *val*]
[~~uK: *val*~~]	[iK: *val*]	[~~uK: *val*~~]

2. Problems for Downward Agree

Problems for the standard theory of Agree:

- The existence of Reverse Agree;
- The existence of Multiple Agree;
- The existence of Concord phenomena;
- The triggering of intermediate steps in successive cyclic movement;
- The fact that the existence of [EPP]-features themselves has remained unmotivated.

2.1 Parasitic Agree

The first problem to be discussed relates to the notion of Parasitic Agree, i.e. the fact that a goal can have its feature checked against the higher, c-commanding probe as a side-effect of Agree. Checking uninterpretable features of the goal is said to take place, for instance, in cases of nominative case checking by T° or when the clause-type feature of a *Wh*-term ([uQ]) is checked against [iQ] in C°, as is illustrated in (6) and (7) respectively.

(6) $[_{TP}\ T_{[iT][u\varphi]}\ [_{vP}\ DP_{[uT][i\varphi]}\ ]\ ]$

(7) $[_{CP}\ C_{[uWH][iQ]EPP}]\ [Wh_{\ [iWH][uQ]}]\ ]$

(8) $[_{TP}$ T $[_{vP}$ DP]]
[~~uφ: number~~] [iφ: number, person]
[uT: __]

Baker (2008): Niger-Congo languages the finite verb may agree with any DP. This means that in those languages there is no bidirectional Agree relation between T and some DP. This is illustrated for Chichewa and Kinande in (9) below:

(9) a. Ka-mu-dzi ku-li chi-tsîme — Chichewa
17-3-village 17-be 7-well
'In the village is a well'

b. Omo-mulongo mw-a-hik-a mukali — Kinande
LOC.18-village.3 18S-T-arrive-FV woman.1
'At the village arrived of woman'

2.2 Multiple Agree

(10) John-**ga** [yosouijouni nihonjin-**ga** eigo-**ga** hidoku] kanji-ta. — Japanese
John.NOM than.expected the.Japanese.NOM English.NOM bad.INF thought
'It seemed to John that the Japanese are worse at speaking English
than he had expected.'

(11)

[	T°	DP	[…	DP	… […	DP …]]]
	[uφ]	[iφ]		[iφ]		[iφ]
	[iT]	[uT]		[uT]		[uT]

2.3 Concord phenomena

2.3.1 Negative Concord

(12) a. Non ha detto niente a nessuno — Italian
NEG has said n-thing to n-body
'He didn't say anything to anybody'
b. Nessuno *(non) ha detto niente
N-body NEG has said n-thing
'Nobody said anything'

(13) a. Dnes *nikdo* *(*ne*)volá — Czech
Today n-body NEG.calls
'Today nobody is calling'
b. Milan *ne*vidi *nikoho*
Milan NEG.sees n-body
'Milan doesn't see anybody'
c. Dnes *nikdo* *(*ne*)volá *nikomu*
Today n-body NEG.calls n-body
'Today nobody is calling anybody'

(14) *[Nessuno$_{[uNEG]}$ non$_{[iNEG]}$ canta]

(15) a. [Dnes [$_{TP}$ *nikdo*$_{[\sout{uNEG}]j}$ [$_{NegP}$ *ne*volá$_{[iNEG]}$ t$_j$ *nikoho*$_{[\sout{uNEG}]}$]]]
b. [Dnes *Op*$_{-[iNEG]}$ [$_{TP}$ *nikdo*$_{[\sout{uNEG}]}$ *ne*volá$_{[\sout{uNEG}]}$ *nikoho*$_{[\sout{uNEG}]}$]]

3.3.2 Sequence of Tense

(16) a. John said Mary was ill
b. Jan zei dat Marie ziek was — Dutch
John said that Mary ill was
'John said Mary was ill'

(17) Wolfgang played tennis on every Sunday
= 'For every Sunday in the past there is a time t at which Wolfgang plays tennis'
≠ 'There is a past time on every Sunday at which Wolfgang plays tennis'
≠ 'For every Sunday, there is time t before it is such that Wolfgang plays tennis at that time'

(18) [John T$_{[iPAST]}$ [said$_{[uPAST]}$ [Mary was$_{[uPAST]}$ ill]]]

(19) [[iF] … [[uF] … [[uF]]]]

2.4 Intermediate steps in successive cyclic movement

Bošković (2007, 2008), among many others, has shown that the traditional Agree scheme faces a serious look-ahead problem when applied to intermediate steps of successive cyclic movement.

(20) a. You think that Mary bought a car — Bošković (2007)
b. What$_i$ did you think that Mary bought t$_i$

Take CP to be a cycle/phase (cf. Chomsky 1977/2001). Now, it follows that *what* can only move out of the subordinate CP if moves to the phase edge first.

(21) $[_{CP}$ What$_i$ did you think $[_{CP}$ t_i that Mary bought $t_i]]$

But this means that it should somehow be encoded at the lower CP that *what* is forced to move to the higher Spec,CP, to fulfil some feature checking requirement of the higher C-head, something which is not known at that stage of the derivation. Hence, the question is: what triggers *what*-fronting in cases like (22)? And, moreover, why are non-*Wh*-terms not fronted in subordinate clauses headed by *that* (like in (23))?

(22) $[_{CP}$ what$_i$ that Mary bought $t_i]$

(23) $[_{CP}$ that Mary bought a car]

(24) [CP what$_{i[iWh][uQ]}$ that$_{[\sout{uWh}]}$ Mary bought t_i]

2.5 Motivation for Move

Before evaluating some previous proposals that aim at overcoming some of the above-mentioned problems for the standard theory of Agree, it should be noted that under the current version of Agree, no principled explanation has been provided for the existence of [EPP]-features either, as has been pointed out by many scholars, e.g. Epstein & Seely (1999), Bošković (2007) among many others.

2.6 Concluding remarks

To conclude, in the above subsections we discussed a number of problems for the standard theory of Agree, showing that what is still lacking is a theory of Move and Agree that: (i) allows for [iF]>[uF](>[uF]) Agree relations; (ii) explains intermediate steps in processes of successive cyclic movement; (iii) motivates the displacement property.

3. Previous solutions to (some of) these problems

3.1 Pesetsky & Torrego 2007 (problems 1-3)

Pesetsky & Torrego (2007) adopt Chomsky's distinction between LF-interpretability, they argue that if (un)interpretability and (un)valuedness are taken to be independent notions; actually, four kinds of features must be distinguished:

(25) a. [uF]-unvalued
b. [uF]-valued
c. [iF]-unvalued
d. [iF]-valued

(26) Tns: [iT]-unvalued
V_{fin}: [uT]-valued
Subject DP [uT]-unvalued

(27) Step 1: Agree between probe Tns and Goal DP, resulting in feature sharing (whatever the value of Tns, it will also be the value of DP)
$[_{TnsP}\ Tns_{iT[\ ]}\ [_{vP}\ DP_{uT[\ ]}\ v_{uT}\ \textit{val}]$

$[_{TnsP}\ Tns_{[iT][u\varphi]}\ [_{vP}\ DP_{uT[\ ]}\ v_{uT}\ \textit{val}]]$ →

$[_{TnsP}\ Tns_{iT[2]}\ [_{vP}\ DP_{uT[2]}\ v_{uT}\ \textit{val}]\ ]$

(28) Step 2: Agree between probe Tns and Goal v, resulting in feature sharing between Tns, DP and v, which leads to the valuation of T on Tns and DP, whereby T will only be interpreted on Tns. Since T is interpretable on Tns, it can and must be deleted on all other instances of T.

$[_{TnsP}\ Tns_{iT[2]}\ [_{vP}\ DP_{uT[2]}\ v_{uT}\ \textit{val}]\ ]$ →
$[_{TnsP}\ Tns_{iT[2]}\ [_{vP}\ DP_{uT[2]}\ v_{uT\text{-}\textit{val}:[2]}\ ]\ ]$

But, first, the problems around the data around Multiple Agree still exist. Take the case of Japanese multiple nominatives, as first presented in (11), and represented here as (29) in Pesetsky & Torrego's terms.

(29) $[_{TP}$ T° $[_{vP}$ DP V_{fin} [… DP … […DP …]]]]
[iT:__] [uT:__] [uT: *val*] [uT:__] [uT:__]

Second, the claim that T is interpretable on (finite) Tns seems too strong, given the Sequence of Tense data (as in (16) repeated below).

(30) a. John said Mary was ill
b. Jan zei dat Marie ziek was — Dutch
John said that Mary ill was
'John said Mary was ill'

Third, the other Concord data also seem to run counter Pesetsky & Torrego's (2007) analysis in the sense that Negative Concord allows Agree to continue after valuation.

(31) a. Gianni non ha detto niente a nessuno — Italian
Gianni neg has called to n-body
'Gianni didn't call anybody'
b. *Nessuno non ha detto niente a nessuno
N-body neg has called to n-body

3.2 Bošković 2007 (problems 4-5)

Bošković, after discussing a number of prior analyses (Chomsky & Lasnik 1993, Takahashi 1994, Chomsky 2000, 2001) argues that it is not the feature [EPP] that encodes the information that some particular goal must be moved, but that it is rather the presence of an uninterpretable feature on the goal itself that drives this property.

(32) $[CP\ C°_{[uWH][iQ][EPP]}$ … $[CP$ … $DP_{[iWH][uQ]}\ ]]$

(33) *$Did_{[uWH][iQ]}$ you think $what_{i[iWH][uQ]}$ that Mary bought t_i

(34) What$_{i[iWH][uQ]}$ did$_{[uWH][iQ]}$ you think t_i that Mary bought t_i

Hence, once it is assumed that Agree always works in a unidirectional fashion (solving the problems addressed in 3.1), the triggering of intermediate steps in successive cyclic movement can be solved and movement is no longer dependent on the [EPP]-features. However, at the same time, this very strict [uF]>[iF] version of Agree seems to be contradicted by the Multiple Agree and Concord phenomena discussed in 3.2 and 3.3, which quite strictly exhibit [iF]>[uF] Agree.

Apart from these general problems, which do not affect Bošković's specific proposal but rather the general top-down scheme of the standard theory Agree that Bošković adopts, albeit it with a number of important modifications, Bošković's proposal leads to some particular questions.

First, the requirement would predict that in principle all *Wh*-terms should front across matrix C°. This is the case in Bulgarian, as shown in (35). However, for languages like English this is not true, as illustrated in (36).

(35) a. *Koj vižda kogo? Bulgarian
Who watches whom
b. Koj kogo vižda?
Who whom watches

(36) a. Who watches whom?
b. *Who whom watches?

(37) *John bought what

Second, a number of languages allow so-called postverbal nominatives, such as the Bantu languages described in secton 3.1 (cf. Baker 2008). If nominative case is indeed [uT], then it is predicted that universally all nominatives must raise at least to Spec,TP, although it is known that such a generalization is too strong. It thus remains an open question for Bošković how to account for the existence of postverbal nominatives in its various guises.

4. Proposal: Upward Agree

The crucial step in Bošković's analysis is the step from bidirectional Agree to unidirectional Agree. Once Parasitic Agree is no longer allowed, movement can be triggered to instantiate a proper Agree configuration. However, nothing principally depends on in which direction unidirectional Agree should take place. This would allow for so-called *Upward Agree* (Zeijlstra 2012):

(38) *Upward 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.

The idea that Agree applies in an upward fashion only has independently and partially on different grounds been developed and elaborated in Wurmbrand (2010, 2011, to appear). Wurmbrand's proposal is different from the proposal pursued here in taking valuation (albeit it in a different version that may overcome the problems discussed above) to be the trigger for Agree

instead of uninterpretability: Agree for her takes place only if a valued feature c-commands an unvalued one. Since, Wurmbrand follows Pestesky & Torrego (2007) in disentangling the Chomskyan bidirectional correlation between (un)interpretability and (un)valuedness, she argues that Agree can apply between a higher element carrying an uninterpretable feature that c-commands a lower element that is interpretable, provided that the highest feature values the lower one. Consequently, Agree for her cannot take place if a lower feature would value a higher one. In order to account for those phenomena, where at first sight the lower element is lexically valued, such as the Negative Concord or Sequence-of-Tense phenomena discussed in section 3.3, Wurmbrand, basing herself on a number of arguments involving mostly VP ellipsis, argues that actually the higher head is the valuer of the lower element, whose value later gets realized a an inflectional morpheme. Apart from Negative Concord and Sequence-of-Tense, Wurmbrand accounts for a number of other phenomena as well in terms of upward valuation, including binding, case assignment, control, polarity licensing, parasitic morphology, and Germanic verb clusters. Furthermore, she aims at explaining syntactic selection by arguing that Upwards Agree (Reverse Agree as she calls it) forms a condition on Merge. Given the novelty of her approach and the scope of this paper, I regret that I am not able to provide a fuller assessment of her proposal here, but rather refer the reader to her work for comparison and evaluation.

4.1 Parasitic Agree

(39) $[_{TP}\ T_{[iT][u\varphi]}\ [_{vP}\ DP_{[uT][i\varphi]}\ ]\ ]$

(40) $[_{TP}\ DP_{[\sout{uT}][i\varphi]>}\ T_{[iT][\sout{u\varphi}]}\ [_{vP}\ <DP_{[\sout{uT}][i\varphi]>}\ ]\ ]$

(41) $Mary_i$ seems to win t_i the race

But even stronger, even if T° does carries [uφ] it is not guaranteed that it is the subject that must raise to Spec,TP. This is exactly what happens in the cases described in Baker (2008).

(42) a. Ka-mu-dzi ku-li chi-tsîme — Chichewa
17-3-village 17-be 7-well
'In the village is a well'

b. Omo-mulongo mw-a-hik-a mukali — Kinande
LOC.18-village.3 18S-T-arrive-FV woman.1
'At the village arrived of woman'

4.2 Multiple Agree

(43) John-**ga** [*yosouijouni* nihonjin-**ga** eigo-**ga** hidoku] kanji-ta. — Japanese
John.NOM than.expected the.Japanese.NOM English.NOM bad.INF thought
'It seemed to John that the Japanese are worse at speaking English
than he had expected.'

(44) $[_{TP}$ T° $[_{vP}$ DP … V_{fin} [… DP … [… DP …]]]]
[iT] [uT] [uT] [uT] [uT]

However, there is one possible caveat in the sense that it must be ensured that the Agree relations do not violate any locality relation. If the lower DPs are part of CPs, the question arises as to

why the phase edge does not forbid Agree to apply across the clause boundary. This critique, however, can be circumvented by assuming that Agree, in general, may only apply across phase boundaries, provided that the phase edge itself also participates in the Agree relation, a corollary of phase theory (cf. Chomsky 2001). So the Agree configuration is licit in (45)a, but not in (45)b, XP being a phase.

(45) a. $[_{HP}\ H_{[iF]}\ [_{XP}\ WP/X_{[uF]}\ [_{ZP}\ YP_{[uF]}]]]$

b. $*[_{HP}\ H_{[iF]}\ [_{XP}\ WP/X\ [_{ZP}\ YP_{[uF]}]]]$

4.3 Concord phenomena

(46) a. Gianni non ha detto niente a nessuno — Italian
Gianni NEG has said n-thing to n-body
'Gianni didn't say anything to anybody'

b. [Gianni $non_{[iNEG]}$-ha [ditto $niente_{[uNEG]}$ a $nessuno_{[uNEG]}$]]

(47) a. Dnes *nikdo* *(*ne*)volá *nikomu* — Czech
Today n-body NEG.calls n-body
'Today nobody is calling anybody'

b. [Dnes $Op_{-[iNEG]}$ [$_{TP}$ $nikdo_{[\sout{uNEG}]}$ *ne*volá$_{[\sout{uNEG}]}$ $nikoho_{[\sout{uNEG}]}$]]

(48) a. John said Mary was ill

b. [$_{CP}$ John $Op_{[iPAST]}$ $said_{[uPAST]}$ [$_{CP}$ Mary $was_{[uPAST]}$ ill

4.4 Intermediate steps in successive cyclic movement

(49) What do you think that Mary bought?

(50) 1. [$_{CP}$ that Mary bought $what_{[iWH][uQ]}$]
[uQ] forces movement of *what* to Spec,CP
2. [$_{CP}$ $what_{[iWH][uQ]}$ that Mary bought]
Now the matrix clause can be built
3. [$_{CP}$ [$C°_{[uWH][iQ]}$ did] you think [$what_{[iWH][uQ]}$ that Mary bought]]
Agree([iQ], [$\sout{uQ}$]) can take place
4. [$_{CP}$ [$C°_{[uWH][iQ]}$ did] you think [$what_{[iWH][\sout{uQ}]}$ that Mary bought]]
[uWh] forces movement of *what* to Spec,CP
5. [$_{CP}$ $what_{[iWH][\sout{uQ}]}$ [$C°_{[uWH][iQ]}$ did] you think [that Mary bought]]
Agree([iWh], [uWh]) can take place
6. [$_{CP}$ $what_{[iWH][\sout{uQ}]}$ [$C°_{[\sout{uWH}][iQ]}$ did] you think [that Mary bought]]

(51) a. Who watches whom?

b. [CP $Who_{i[uQ][iWH]}$ $C_{[iQ][uWH]}$ t_i watches $whom_{[uQ][iWH]}$]

(52) a. *Koj vižda kogo? Bulgarian
Who watches whom
b. Koj kogo vižda?
Who whom watches

(53) Who said that Mary ate what?

(54) *Who said what (that) Mary ate?

However, (54) is predicted to be grammatical under the presented proposal. At the same time, it is questionable whether the ungrammaticality of (54) should follow from the underlying Agree system. Note that in general *Wh*-terms are odd in Spec,CP if C is non-interrogative. This is shown for Dutch *wat* ('what'), which can be used as an indefinite (and should thus only optionally be equipped with a [uQ]-feature). However, in Spec,CP it may only survive in interrogatives. Even though in non-interrogative clauses elements may be fronted to Spec,CP to receive a topic or focus reading, *wat* may not.

(55) a. Hij heeft wat gegeten
He has what eaten
'He ate something'
b. Brood heeft hij gegeten
Bread has he eaten
'It was bread that he ate'/'He ate BREAD'
c. Wat heeft hij gegeten
What has he eaten
'What did he eat'
*'There is something that he ate'/'He ate SOMETHING'

(56) a. Ko <koga> vidi <*koga>
who whom sees
'Who sees who'
b. Šta <*šta> uslovljava šta?
What conditions what
'What conditions what?'

(57) a. Wer hat gesagt wo Hans hingegangen ist?
Who has said where Hans PRT.gone ist
b. *Wer hat gesagt wo dass Hans hingegangen ist?
Who has said where that Hans PRT.gone ist
c. Wer hat gesagt dass Hans wo hin gegangen ist?
Who has said that Hans where PRT gone ist
'Who said where Hans went'

4.5 Motivation for Move

Finally, and this the proposal inherits from Bošković's proposal, Move can be motivated in order to reverse c-command relations between possible probes and goals, so that they can further on undergo Agree. In this sense, Move is an operation that is supports Agree rather than the other way round (as is the case in the Standard version of Agree).

5. Further questions/problems

5.1 Expletive constructions

One of the first possible counter-examples against the upward-Agree only hypothesis are expletive constructions with unaccusative verbs as in (58).

(58) a. There seems to have arrived a student
b. There seem to have arrived some students

Here, the finite verb agrees with the lower DP *a*/*some student*(*s*), which is clearly equipped with interpretable φ-features. Since this DP is base-generated in a position where it could never have c-commanded V_{fin}, this looks like a counter example for the presented proposal.

(59) $\text{There}_{[i_\varphi]i}$ $\text{seems}_{[u_\varphi]}$ t_i to have arrived [a student t_i]$_{[i_\varphi]}$

(60) <a student>$_{[i_\varphi]}$ $\text{seems}_{[u_\varphi]}$ to have arrived <a student>$_{[i_\varphi]}$
→ there

(61) a. Parece haber llegado un estudiante
Seem.3SG have arrived a student
'There seems to have arrived a student'
b. Parecen haber llegado unos estudiantes
Seem.3PL have arrived some students
'There seem to have arrived some students'

5.2 Long-distance agreement

(62) a. Jóni líkuðu Tessir sokkar — Icelandic
Jon.DAT like.PL these socks.NOM — (Bobaljik 2009)
'Jon likes these socks'
b. Mér virdast hestarnir vera seinir
Me seem.PL the.horses be slow
'It seems to me hat the horses are slow'

(63) Það virðist/*virðast einhverjum manni hestarnir vera seinir
There seem.SG/seem.PL a man the.horses be slow
'It seems to some man that the horses are slow'

(64) TP > vP > VoiceP > TP > vP

(65) [$_{TP}$ Me Expl T [$_{vP}$ [$_{TP}$ [The horses]$_i$ T [$_{vP}$ seem [$_{TP}$ t_i to be slow]]]]]

(66) [$_{TP}$ Me [$_{T}$ seem_j] [$_{vP}$ [$_{TP}$ [The horses]$_i$ T [$_{vP}$ t_j [$_{TP}$ t_i to be slow]]]]]

5.3 Object agreement and flipping Agree

In a recent paper, Béjar & Rezac (2009) argue that φ-Agree is sometimes upwards and in other cases downwards. For them, upward probing is indeed a systematic property of language, but downward probing must be possible as well. To illustrate their point, they provide the following data from Basque:

(67) a. Ikusi n-ind-u-en — Basque
seen 1.X.have.PAST
'He saw me' — (Int. arg. controls Agree)
b. Ikusi n-u-en
seen 1.have.PAST
'I saw him' — (Ext. arg. controls Agree)

In Basque, generally, the internal argument controls agree on the finite verb (as in (67)a). However, in some configurations the internal argument is unable to Agree (as it lacks the relevant features; third person singular features cannot act as a goal in Basque). Then, the external argument controls agreement on the verb, as shown in (67)b. What the data in (67) show for them, then, is that in Basque the probe on v° first searches down in its c-command domain for a matching goal. Only if no matching goal is available may the Agree relation 'flip' and can the probe start to look upward to Agree with a proper goal.

(68) $EA_{[i\varphi]} > IA_{[i\varphi]} > V_{[u\varphi]}$

If the configuration in (68) is correct, on the other hand, that means the direction of Agree never has to flip. The pattern in (67) is then nothing but a relativized minimality effect *avant la lettre* (cf. Rizzi 1989).

5.4 Complementizer agreement

(69) Ik denk de-s doow Marie ontmoet-s — Limburg Dutch
I think that.2SG you Mary meets.2SG
'I think that you will meet Mary'

Complementizer agreement forms a problem for the proposal in (38), since the probe (i.e. the complementizer) appears to be in a higher position than the goal. However, this is only the case under the assumption that C's [uφ]-features originate in C°. But several scholars have argued that this is not the case and that these features (or even the complementizer itself) actually originate in T° (cf. Den Besten 1977, 1989; Zwart 1993, 1997; Hoekstra & Marantz 1989 and many others). If that is the case, then complementizer agreement no longer forms a problem for upward Agree as the relevant Agree configuration is Spec,TP > T°, with Spec,TP being the goal and T° the probe.

(70) a. Ik denk de-s doow en ich Marie ôs kenn-e treffe — Limburg Dutch
I think that.2SG you and I Mary meets.2SG
'I think that you and I can meet'
b. Omda-n André en Valerè tun juste underen computer kapot was — West Fl.
Because.PL André and Valerè then just their computer broken was.SG
Because André and Valerè's computer broke down just then

5.5 Movement-driven agreement

The final case to be discussed here is movement-driven agreement or agreement impoverishment. This concerns cases where agreement is richer if the goal appears in a higher position than the probe, but where agreement is poorer if the goal is in a lower position. Well-known cases are Arabic subject-verb agreement, Hungarian preposition/postposition agreement and French participle agreement. Let's look at Arabic subject-verb agreement.

(71) a. L-banaat-u darab-na/*-atl-?awlaad-a St. Arab
The-girls-Nom hit-PAST-3Fpl/*-3Fsg the-boys-Acc
The girls hit the boys
b. Darab-at/*-na ?al-banaat-u Zayd-an
Hit-PAST-3Fsg/*-3Fpl the-girls-Nom Zayd-Acc
The girls hit Zayd

(72) a. $[V_{fin\text{-}i}\ SUBJ\ [t_i]]$
b. $[SUBJ_j\ H_{[uPLUR]}\ [V_{fin\text{-}i}\ SUBJ_j\ [t_i]]]$