In Turkish, genitive Case renders certain complex pronouns opaque for agreement. However, binding overrides this Case-induced opacity: these genitive-marked pronouns can agree even if they bind. We argue that these facts provide striking evidence in favor of binding as phi-feature transmission mediated by a functional head (Reuland 2001; Kratzer 2009 i.a.).

**Generalization 1: Genitive** Simple pronouns contrast with a set of structurally larger pronouns which we call *Default-Triggering NPs* (DTNs). DTNs include the reflexive *kendi* and reciprocal *birbir*; adnominal pronouns (e.g. *biz Türklер* ‘we Turks’); the *multi-plural* pronouns *biz-ler* ‘we-pl’ and *siz-ler* ‘y’all-pl’; and partitives (e.g. *ikimiz* ‘two of us’). In verbal clauses, both root and embedded, both pronouns (1) and DTNs (2) trigger co-varying verbal agreement. But in nominalized embedded clauses, pronouns continue to trigger full agreement (3), while DTNs trigger default 3sg agreement (4) (cf. Kornfilt 2007; Satık 2020).

1. Biz oraya git-ti- { k / *Ø }.
   *We went there.*

2. Iki-miz oraya git-ti- { k / *Ø }.
   ‘The two of us went there.’

3. Kemal [ biz-im oraya git-tiğ- { imiz / *in } ]-i san-di-Ø.
   ‘Kemal thought that we went there.’

4. Kemal [ ikimiz-in oraya git-tiğ- { *imiz / in } ]-i san-di-Ø.
   ‘Kemal thought that the two of us went there.’

The factor responsible for this asymmetry is genitive Case, which makes DTNs opaque for agreement. Consider the independent fact that the subjects of nominalized clauses must be nominative when the clause is an adjunct, (6) versus (5) (Kornfilt 2003). When a DTN is the antecedent; (9) versus (10). Crucially, the same pattern obtains with bound pronouns (11).

   *I knew when Ali broke the glass.* (argument)

   *I knew the truth when Ali broke the glass.* (adjunct)  
   (Aygen 2007: 2)

7. [ *imiz yemek pişir-diğ-  { imiz / *in } ]-den dolayı konser-e gidemedim.
   ‘Because the two of us cooked, I was unable to go to the concert.’

   *Ali said that the two of us like the book.*

   *Ali said that the two of us like each other.*

    *Ali said that the two of us like each other.*

**Generalization 2: Binding** Importantly, however, a genitive-marked DTN subject can trigger co-varying agreement in exactly one configuration, namely, when it is a binder; in such cases, default agreement remains possible alongside full agreement. Contrast (8), where the embedded object is non-anaphoric, with (9), where it is a reciprocal bound by the DTN subject (the same facts obtain with the reflexive). Note that, although agreement on the nominalized verb varies between 1pl and 3sg, the bound element itself always bears the phi-features of its antecedent; (9) versus (10). Crucially, the same pattern obtains with bound pronouns (11).
We also argue that the internal structure of pronouns vs DTNs interacts with genitive assignment to ensure that only DTNs become opaque when marked with genitive. Our analysis is based on two independently motivated assumptions. Firstly, number is bundled with person in pronouns, but placed on a separate head in DTNs (Ghomeshi and Massam 2020); and secondly, the genitive is the realization of a P head (Rezač 2008).

**Implications** These facts strongly support an Agree-based conception of the binding of anaphors and (some) bound pronouns (Reuland 2001; Reuland 2011; Hicks 2009 *i.a.*, and contra Carnap and Sportiche 2016; Preminger 2019). Importantly, binding must be mediated by a functional head, rather than being a direct DP-DP dependency: to account for the Turkish facts, binding must ‘leave its signature’ on a functional head, in a way that is visible for realization at PF. Our results also bear on the mapping between syntax and morphology with respect to case features; notably, the genitive on the subjects of Turkish nominalized clauses cannot be treated as the nominal spellout of nominative (*pace* Levin and Preminger 2015 for Sakha), as genitive and nominative have manifestly different effects on whether DTNs are able to agree. Finally, we address the apparent incompatibility between Agree-based binding and the observation that anaphors generally resist being agreed with (the Anaphor Agreement Effect; Rizzi 1990). We adopt Murugesan’s (2019) proposal that the AAE holds whenever a probe attempts to Agree with an anaphor before the anaphor’s antecedent has been merged. Turkish supports
this timing-based account, since it provides morphological evidence that the crucial step of ‘true’ agreement is between the mediating head and the antecedent, with phi-matching between antecedent and anaphor following only as a side-effect of this agreement relationship.

**Note:** data from 13 native speakers incl. the second author.
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