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The gist

- **Basic pattern:**
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subj</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Co-varying</th>
<th>Default 3SG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anaphor-like Pronoun</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Claim:** This pattern represents an instance of the Anaphor Agreement Effect that is...
  - Generalized: The class of non-agreeing NPs includes non-anaphors.
  - Relativized: Default agreement is triggered only in the nominal domain.

Basic data: Anaphors vs pronouns

- **Anaphoric subjects of normalized clauses** require 3SG agreement on the normalized verb.

  
  ‘We believed that each other passed the exam.’

  (Kornfilt 2007: 321)

- Pronominal subjects require co-varying (full) agreement.

  (2) (Biz) [biz-im / pro] sınav-ı geç-tiğ- {imiz / in} i-1 san-yor-du-k.

  ‘We believed that we passed the exam.’

  (Kornfilt 2007: 322-323)

- **In possessive constructions**, we find the same pattern. NB the agreement suffixes are the same!

  
  ‘We saw each other’s exam.’


  ‘We saw our exam.’

Generalization 1: Anaphor-like elements

> Default 3SG nominal agreement is also triggered by:

  - **‘Partitive’** NPs:

    (4) Çocuk [ikimiz-in] gel-diğ- {imiz / in} i-1 şöyle-di.

    ‘The child said that two of us came.’

- Adnominal Pronoun Constructions (APCs):

  (5) [Biz Türk-ler-in] çok çalıș-tığ- {imiz / in} i-1 bil-ir-sin.

  ‘You know that we Turks work hard.’

The inflected pronouns bizler and sizler, in contrast to regular pronouns:

  (6) a. [Biz-ler] oraya git-tığ- {imiz / in} i-1 doğru değil.

    ‘That we went there is not true.’

  b. [Biz-im] oraya git-tığ- {imiz / in} i-1 doğru değil.

  ‘That we went there is not true.’

Generalization 2: Nominal only

**Anaphor-like elements** trigger **co-varying** agreement in **verbal** clauses, thus patterning with pronouns.

(7) [Biz-ler] oraya git-tığ- {imiz / in} i-1 doğru değil.

‘We went there.’

(8) [Biz-ler] oraya git-tığ- {imiz / in} i-1 doğru değil.

‘We went there.’

Towards an analysis

A set of relevant observations: the Anaphor Agreement Effect (Rizzi 1990; Woolford 1999).

Two classes of analyses of the AAE:

(11) **Structural underspecification**

(12) **Structural opacity**

(8) Biz oraya git-tığ- [imiz / in] i-1 doğru değil.

‘We went there.’

‘Two of us came.’

(9) Biz oraya git-tığ- [imiz / in] i-1 doğru değil.

‘We went there.’

‘Two of us came.’

**Conclusion: Lessons from Turkish**

- The distribution of default agreement in Turkish is reminiscent of the AAE, but exceptional in two ways:
  - Default agreement is triggered by anaphors and non-referentially deficient NPs.
  - These NPs trigger default agreement only in the nominal domain.

- The facts can be accommodated under a structural opacity account, with a crucial role given to genitive case.
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