

## **Binding Theory and a Closer Look at the Anaphoric Expression *Kendisi* in Turkish**

Burcu GÖKGÖZ KURT\*

### **Abstract**

Turkish has two forms to express reflexivity in the third person singular: uninflected *kendi* and inflected *kendi-si*. Depending on their theoretical position, researchers have proposed different approaches to account for the local and non-local binding properties of these two expressions. In fact, their binding interpretation is also very much dependent on syntactic, semantic as well as discourse features of the adjacent clauses. A number of studies have claimed that Turkish inflected reflexive does not constitute an exception to the universals as they are logophoric elements rather than true long-distance reflexives (LDRs) and heads of DPs with the specifier *pro*. In order to better understand 3rd person singular anaphoric binding in Turkish, the present study (a) reviews previous literature on Turkish as well as other languages in which we observe similar phenomena, and (b) provides further evidence to support how the inflected form in Turkish shows both local and non-local binding properties when the reduplication and the scrambling effects are considered.

**Keywords:** Anaphora, Binding, Long-Distance Reflexives (LDRs), Reflexivity, Reduplication.

---

\* Assist. Prof. Dr., Kutahya Dumlupınar University, Department of English Translation and Interpreting, Kutahya, Turkey.  
Elmek: burcugokgoz@gmail.com  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7169-2890>.

Geliř Tarihi / Received Date: 18.05.2020  
Kabul Tarihi / Accepted Date: 24.02.2021

DOI: 10.30767/diledeara.739168

### **Bağlama Kuramı ve Türkçedeki Kendisi Artgönderimsel İfadesine Yakından Bakış**

#### **Öz**

Türkçede, 3. tekil şahısta dönüşlülüğü ifade etmek için çekimsiz ve çekimli olmak üzere iki ayrı yapı kullanılır: *kendi* ve *kendi-si*. Araştırmacılar, kuramsal duruşlarına göre, bu iki ifadenin iç cümlecik ve ana tümcelerin özneleri ile bağlanabilme özelliklerini açıklamak için farklı yaklaşımlar öne sürmüşlerdir. Nitekim bu ifadelerin bağlayıcılığının yorumlanması, bitişik cümleciklerin sözdizimsel, anlamsal ve söylem özellikleri ile yakından ilgilidir. Bazı çalışmalar Türkçedeki çekimli dönüşlü adılının evrensel kurallar açısından istisna teşkil etmediğini öne sürer. Bunun sebebi ise bahsedilen dönüşlü adılların gerçek birer uzak-ara olmaktan ziyade tümce dışında bağlayıcıları olan öğeler olmaları ve bunun yanı sıra adıl belirtecini almış belirleyici öbeklerin tamlayanı olarak da bulunmalarıdır. Üçüncü tekil şahıs için kullanılan artgönderimsel ifadelerin bağlayıcılığını daha iyi anlayabilmeyi hedefleyen bu çalışma (a) Türkçedeki ve benzer dilbilimsel olayların olduğu diğer dillerdeki alanyazını gözden geçirir ve (b) ikileme ve çalkalama etkilerini inceleyerek Türkçedeki çekimli ifadenin iç cümlecik ve ana tümcelerinin özneleri ile bağlanabilme özelliklerini desteklemek için daha fazla bulgu sunar.

**Keywords:** Artgönderim, Bağlama, Uzak-Ara Dönüşlü Adılları, Dönüşlülük, İkileme.

## Extended Summary

Long-Distance Reflexives (LDRs) have been claimed (a) to be morphologically simple, (b) subject-oriented, which means their binders are the subjects of their referent clauses, and (c) not to be in complementary distribution with either the local reflexives or the personal pronoun. Although these core features can account for the distribution of non-locally bound reflexives in various languages, such a typology falls short of providing a universal account for the diversity found across languages. Turkish, being one of the languages which do not conform to the characteristics a majority of LDRs share, expresses reflexivity in the third person singular in two different ways as shown in the following examples:

- (1) a. Ali*i* kendi ile gurur duyuyor-muş.  
 Ali self with pride feel-PROG-REP.PAST  
 ‘(They say that) Ali is proud of himself’
- b. Ali kendi-sii/j ile gurur duyuyormuş.  
 Ali self-3SG with pride feel- PROG- REP.PAST  
 ‘(They say that) Ali is proud of himself/him (him: Ali or someone else)’

Findings of the theoretical, as well as empirical studies, vary with respect to the anaphoric binding features of these two anaphoric expressions. It has been argued that the uninflected *kendi* (1a) is always locally bound, and *kendisi* as in the example (1b) may be both locally and non-locally bound. It should, however, be noted that a dual status for the uninflected form, *kendi* has also been proposed in later analyses, which evidences the interchangeable use of these two forms by certain users in certain discourse contexts. Several other studies have further claimed that Turkish inflected reflexive does not constitute an exception to the universals because they are logophoric elements rather than true long-distance reflexives, and that these complex reflexives are heads of DPs having the specifier *pro*. Therefore, the inflected reflexive has been proposed to extend its binding domain on the surface; however, this extension is not in the binding domain but rather in the pronominal ‘large domain.’

Some previous accounts of the inflected form *kendisi* show how reduplicated forms do not allow *kendisi* to appear as the head of the reduplicated form to carry a similar meaning to that of the uninflected form. However, the example below challenges this proposal:

- (2) Kişi bazen kendi kendi-si ile alay eder  
 Person sometimes self self -3SG with tease  
 ‘A person sometimes teases himself/herself.’

Furthermore, when the inflected form is scrambled with the use of certain postpositions, they seem to be equally acceptable as the uninflected form in the same position:

- (3) a. Kendisinei/j göre, Alpi çok ketum  
 Kendisi-DAT according to Alp very discreet-PRE  
 ‘According to her-him/himself, Ali is very hardworking’  
 b. Kendinei göre, Alpi çok ketum  
 Kendi-DAT according to Alp very discreet-PRE  
 ‘According to himself, Ali is very hardworking’

In this study, I propose a reconsideration of some evidence provided in previous work to take a closer look at the inflected 3rd person singular form expressing anaphoric binding through reduplicated forms and scrambling. Within this respect, the present study (a) reviews relevant literature on Turkish as well as other languages where we observe similar phenomena, and (b) provides further evidence to support how the inflected form in Turkish shows both local and non-local binding properties considering the reduplication and the scrambling effects.

## Introduction

An important goal of syntactic research is to bring evidence to prove the universality of phenomena across languages, and to account for the non-overlapping features between them. These have also been the foci of the growing body of linguistic research in Binding Theory (BT) especially in the last two decades (Cole et al., 2001; Koster & Reuland, 1991). Although considerable progress has been made regarding the contradictory aspects of Principles of Binding Theory, some of the elusive inconsistencies remain to be investigated. Long-Distance (LD) Binding phenomenon has been one of these anomalies which BT falls short of providing a full account within the general syntactic theory. Cole et al. (2001, p. xiv) suggested that this problem could be solved deeming those “exceptions” occurring either in an “arbitrary” fashion or in a “delimited domain”. While the former weakens the “universality of BT” without explaining the intricacies observed, the latter necessitates a “refinement and revision of BT rather than a total abandonment.”

In Turkish, where LDRs are claimed to occur, to express reflexivity for the third person singular, two forms may be used: *kendi* ‘self’ and *kendisi* ‘self-3sg’ (see Göksel & Kerslake, 2005, for other functions of *kendi* and *kendisi*). While we use the former as the standard form, the latter may differ in its usage depending on the context. Göksel & Kerslake (2005) described the usage of *kendisi* ‘self-3sg’ as follows:

The 3rd person form *kendisi* [...] can refer either to an antecedent in its own clause, in which it is used as a reflexive, or (much more freely than *kendi*) to an antecedent in the superordinate clause, in which case it is used as a simple personal pronoun. (pp. 235-6)

In fact, the use of *kendi* and *kendisi* to express reflexivity dates back to the 18<sup>th</sup> century (see Güven, 2004, for a complete chronological development), and historically it has been proposed to have the following derivation: (<*kentü*~*kensi*)~*kendözi* (*kendü* *öz+i*) (Temel, 2019, p.148). The word *kendi* has

an interesting status in Turkish, and Güven cites Csato as the first researcher to categorize *kendi* as a reflexive particle (Csato, 2002, as cited in Güven, 2004, p.63). Although *kendi* and *kendisi* may have different functions such as expressing respect or emphasis depending on the context (Özsoy, 1990), the primary focus of the research will be their binding features as in the following examples:

- (1) a. Ali      Canj'in              kendii/jnden korktuğunu              sanıyor.  
           Ali-NOM Can-GEN            self-from      scare- GER-3SG-ACC think-PROG  
           ‘Ali thinks that Can is scared of him (Ali)/himself’
- b. Ali      Canj'in              kendisii/jnden korktuğunu              sanıyor.  
           Ali-NOM    Can-GEN            self-from      scare- GER-3SG-ACC think-PROG  
           ‘Ali thinks that Can is scared of him/himself’

(adapted from Sezer, 1980, p. 751)

In an attempt to contribute to the existing literature on the status of anaphoric binding of reflexives, the present paper seeks (a) to review Binding Theory and previous research characterizing LD reflexives across languages, (b) to compare and contrast similar anaphoric binding phenomena in Turkish with those in other languages, and (c) to provide additional arguments to explain the status of reflexives in Turkish for further analysis of some specific features of anaphoric binding.

Therefore, in the sections to follow, after Principles of Binding Theory (BT) are briefly reviewed, an overview of LDRs across languages will be provided. Then, the final section will delve into various assertions regarding the status of the inflected form *kendi-si* in Turkish by presenting further evidence to support how the inflected form in Turkish shows both local and non-local binding properties through an analysis of the reduplication and the scrambling effects.

### Reflexivity and Binding Theory

Binding Theory, which is a sub-theory of Government and Binding (GB) Theory (Chomsky, 1981), specifically deals with the “indexing relationships between nominal expressions” (Harbert, 1995, p. 179). In its classical terms, BT has three basic principles which account for the possible conditions of binding (Chomsky, 1981, p. 188):

- (2) a. An anaphor is bound in its governing category  
 b. A pronominal is free in its governing category  
 c. An R-expression is free

Given that A-binding is dealt with in all three conditions (Chomsky, 1981, p. 188), principles may also be expressed in the following way to avoid ambiguity:

- (3) a. Principle A: An anaphor must be A-bound within its minimal governing category containing an accessible subject. (Cowper, 1992, p. 171)  
 b. A pronoun must be A-free within its minimal governing category.

In structures where both a pronoun and an anaphor are possible, the anaphor is preferable. (Cowper, 1992, p. 171)

c. Principle C: An R-expression is A-free (in the domain of the head of its maximal chain). (Chomsky, 1986, p. 98)

The principles described above define the conditions in which the pronouns and their antecedents are allowed to appear. Being the ‘module of grammar’ in charge of assigning appropriate interpretation to NPs, BT distinguishes between three types of NPs in the following way:

- |   |   |               |
|---|---|---------------|
| a. full noun phrases: Mary, John etc.   | E | [Principle C] |
| b. pronouns: she, him etc.              |   | [Principle B] |
| c. reflexives: himself, themselves etc. |   | [Principle A] |

(Haegeman, 1994, pp. 61-62)

While proper nouns (as in 4a) such as *Mary* can have a referent independently in the universe, pronouns (4b) are not as independent as full noun phrases are. The antecedents of type (4c) need to be present within the same clause or the discourse, constituting one of the distinctions between the type (4a) and type (4b) NPs. While NPs in type (4a) presumably follow Principle C of BT, the distribution of type (4b) NPs is regulated by Principle B as demonstrated in the following sentences:

- (5) a. Mary<sub>i</sub> is at home, and she<sub>i</sub> is tired.  
 b. \*Mary is angry with Mary’s teacher.  
 c. Mary<sub>i</sub> likes her<sub>\*i/j</sub>.  
 d. Mary thinks that Jennifer likes her.

In sentence (5a), the identical index demonstrates that ‘Mary’ and ‘she’ co-refer; however, they cannot appear in the same local governing category as in sentence (5b), violating what Principle C requires. In the same vein, in example (5d), the pronoun ‘her’ cannot refer to ‘Mary’ because both the former and the latter must be A-free in their local governing categories in accordance with Principle B and C, respectively. Therefore, the pronoun ‘her’ can only have a non-local or an outside referent in sentences (5c) and (5d). These sentences are important in demonstrating to us the core of Principle B and C but not Principle A of the BT. Although all of these parameters form a part of a whole, they are in charge of specific operations in the BT (for a critical discussion, see Reuland, 2017). For the purposes of the present study, Principle A, which regulates the anaphoric relationships, will be extensively discussed in the following section with a specific focus on reflexives.

### **Local vs. Long-Distance Binding across Languages**

Following Chomsky (1982), NP types have been reconsidered and thus replaced by feature matrices. Under the assumption that anaphors, pronouns, and R-expressions are composed of smaller units, he proposes a categorization for the anaphora on the basis of the principles they are subject to. A consequence of this approach is that categories, which follow Principle A and Principle B, are characterized by [ $\pm$ anaphor] and [ $\pm$  pronominal] features, respectively. Following this, while NPs with pronominal features are specified as [+pronominal], NPs such as reflexives and reciprocals receive a [+anaphor] feature. These features only attach to NPs which abide by certain requirements. Suppose, for instance, that an NP needs to be co-indexed with a c-commanding element in an A-position within its minimal governing category containing an accessible subject in order to be specified with [+anaphor, -pronominal].

Regardless of the modifications in the BT, principles and features that are used to characterize NPs in natural languages have not yet been able to fully account for the diversity of binding operations in languages. One problem for BT has been the case of binding, which is found in a variety of languages. The following sentences display how local binding but not LD binding is possible in English:

- (6) a. Mark likes himself.  
b. \*Mark does not like herself.
- (7) a. Mark knows that [Mary likes herself]  
b. \*Mark knows that [Mary likes himself]

In sentences (6a) and (6b), ‘Mark’ is the only accessible antecedent being in the local domain of the reflexives. Note that, while in (6a) the anaphor can have ‘Mark’ as its antecedent, in (6b) ‘Mark’, being the only subject in the local domain, cannot be an antecedent for the reflexive as the reflexive and the antecedent do not share the same gender features. This makes the sentence ungrammatical. Analogously, in sentence (7b) the reflexive ‘himself’ cannot be co-indexed with the only accessible subject in the local domain, that is, ‘Mary,’ and thus the sentence is ungrammatical. By the same token, as the reflexive can be co-indexed with the antecedent in (7a), the sentence is grammatical. However, when we further consider the following sentences in (8), the principles of BT seem to be challenged.

- (8) a. Jess realized that [a picture of herself was hanging on the wall]  
b. Jess told that [it seems intimidating for herself to accept this]

The sentences in (8) are striking in that they prove how long-distance binding is allowed at the level of interpretation in English. In sentence (8a), ‘herself’ is in the embedded clause, but it can still be co-indexed with the specifier of the matrix clause in a non-local domain. This is true for sentence (8b) in that the intervening expletive subject which is not accessible for the reflexive does not prevent the application of binding principles, and thus the sentence is grammatical. This grammaticality is attributed to the lack of an accessible subject within the local domain. In other words, as there are no accessible subjects intervening between the reflexive and the antecedent, the sentences are still grammatical.

On the other hand, when there is an intervening accessible subject between the reflexive and the possible antecedent in the local domain of the reflexive as in (9b), then the sentence is ungrammatical. However, when there is an intervening subject between the reflexive and the possible antecedent, it does not necessarily cause the sentence to be completely ungrammatical (9a):

- (9) a. ?John says that you should blame only himself, and no one else.  
(Culicover, 1997, p. 52)



might lead to two possible readings depending on the nature of the subject in the elided clause. The strict reading, which requires the anaphor of the embedded clause to be co-indexed with the non-local subject, is not possible when this local subject is “[a] name, a pronoun or a demonstrative” (Kennedy & Lidz, 2001). However, it is possible to have a reading with non-local binding if the subject comprises a definite explanation proving the existence of long-distance interpretation in English.

So far, the assumption is that English shows long-distance interpretations of reflexives in several syntactic and discourse contexts; however, this long-distance interpretation differs from the LD binding in other languages which are idiosyncratically described as having true LDRs in the literature. The subsequent section details some of the characteristics of these types of LDRs together with the exceptions to those common features.

### Criteria for the Categorization of LD Reflexives

**Parameters of Governing Category & Proper Subject:** The characteristics of LDRs have been claimed to be determined by a variety of parameters. C-command, Governing Category Parameter, and the Proper Subject/Accessible Subject Parameter have been among some of those (Wexler & Manzini, 1987, p. 53). Although the features and terms previously used might have undergone several provisions in the more recent literature, the underlying core ideas have been similar. Being one of those parameters, Governing Category Parameter is defined as in the following:

- (12) Governing Category Parameter (Wexler & Manzini, 1987, p. 29)
- $\gamma$  is a governing category for  $\alpha$  iff  $\gamma$  is the minimal category that contains  $\alpha$  and a governor for  $\alpha$  and
- a. can have a subject, or, for  $\alpha$ =anaphor, has a subject  $\beta$ ,  $\beta \neq \alpha$ ;
  - b. has an INFL; or
  - c. has a Tense; or
  - d. has a ‘referential’ Tense, or
  - e. has a ‘root’ Tense

Reflexives in various languages vary for the domain values listed in (12). While English reflexives with the local binding requirements observe the features

in (12a), Danish reflexive *sig* is specified by the domain in (12c) as “it must be bound in the minimal Tense domain, but may be free in the domain of the subject of an infinitive clause” (Harbert, 1995, p. 196) as shown in the following sentence:

- (13) at Peter<sub>i</sub> bad Anne<sub>k</sub> om [PRO<sub>k</sub> at ringe til sig<sub>i</sub>]  
 That Peter asked Ann (for) to ring to self  
 ‘Peter asked Ann to ring self.’

(Vikner, 1985 in Harbert, 1995, example 17b)

Clearly, reflexives in non-finite clauses (13) can be bound by their local or non-local antecedents. In tensed clauses, however, they can only be bound by their local antecedents as shown in the following example from Finnish, which patterns the same way as Danish does:

- (14) Pekka<sub>i</sub> näki että Matti<sub>j</sub> katsoi itseään<sub>\*i/j</sub>  
 Pekka saw that Matti watched self-POSS  
 ‘Pekka saw that Matti watched himself.’

(Steenbergen, 1995, example 6b)

The examples from Danish and Finnish demonstrate that long-distance binding is only possible in non-finite clauses. In Japanese, on the other hand, reflexives need to be bound only in the root clause, and thus they observe the value in (12e):

- (15) John<sub>i</sub>-wa [Bill-ga zibun<sub>i</sub> -o nikunde iru] -to omotte iru  
 John-TOP Bill-NOM self -ACC hates that thinks  
 ‘John<sub>i</sub> thinks that Bill hates him<sub>i</sub>.’

(Manzini & Wexler, 1987)

In sentence (15), reflexive form *zibun* allows both the local and non-local antecedents in a finite clause unlike Finnish (14) and Danish (13) reflexives which determine the locality conditions based on the Tense feature. This suggests, then, that languages such as Japanese (15) allow both local and non-local possibilities regardless of the Tense value. Japanese is not the only language that allows this, in fact, Korean and Turkish reflexives do the same. They fall into the category described in (12e) as the governing category for the reflexives in these languages is the whole sentence.

A comparison of these examples from each category yields one conclusion: while the languages sharing the value in (12a) seems to be highly restrictive in terms of the locality requirements of binding, the languages with the values in (12e) are among the most permissive as they allow local as well as non-local antecedents regardless of the Tense value.

Similar to Governing Category Parameter, Proper Antecedent Parameter has also been influential in distinguishing reflexives in various languages with regard to their local and long-distance binding possibilities:

- (16) Proper Antecedent Parameter (Wexler & Manzini, 1987)
- a. subject (e.g. typological true LDRs such as Japanese *zibun*, Chinese *ziji*)
  - b. any element (e.g. English *himself*, Turkish *kendisi*, Hungarian *ön maga*),

Based on the definition of Wexler and Manzini (1987), this parameter suggests that a proper antecedent for the reflexive is either a subject or a non-subject. When we consider the following sentence in (17), Japanese does not allow non-subject antecedents:

- (17) Kanja<sub>i</sub> ga kangofu<sub>j</sub> ni zibun<sub>i/\*j</sub> no koto nitsuite tazuneta  
 Patient -NOM nurse DAT self GEN matter about asked  
 ‘The patient asked the nurse about herself.’

(White, 2003, p. 44)

In sentence (17) while the reflexive form can have ‘kanja’ as its antecedent non-locally, having the object ‘kangofu’ as an antecedent would yield ungrammatical. On the other hand, when we consider the following sentence in Singapore Malay (18), the reflexive *dirinya* does not seem to have any restrictions regarding the subject orientedness of its antecedents:

- (18) Ali<sub>i</sub> memberitahu Fatimah<sub>j</sub> yang kamu menyukai diri-nya<sub>i/j</sub>.  
 Ali tell Fatimah that you like self-3SG  
 ‘Ali told Fatimah that you like him/her.’

(Cole & Hermon, 1998, example 10)

The LD-reflexive ‘diri-nya’ can take ‘Ali’ or ‘Fatimah’ as its antecedent, the latter being a non-subject. In other words, while LD-reflexive ‘zibun’ in (17) has the subject of the local clause or the matrix clause as its antecedent, the LD-

reflexive in (18) is not always subject-oriented. This is also true for Hungarian *önmaga* (Rakosi, 2009), Turkish *kendisi* as well as English *himself*.

As is obvious, these two parameters do not seem to provide a clear framework which can account for the diversity of reflexives with long-distance binding. On the basis of the assumptions made, Turkish seems to share some features with Japanese in Government Category Parameter; however, it diverges from Japanese in terms of Proper Subject Parameter. This inevitably calls for a closer consideration of the characteristics of reflexives with non-local binding features.

**Typological Characteristics of LDRs:** In addition to those parameters which were designed to reflect the diversity across languages, there have been subsequent attempts to find common features among long-distance reflexives. Following Pica (1987), LDRs have been shown to share several characteristics across languages, and these characteristics have been heretofore used as criteria to test the status of reflexives as true LDRs. Below is a recent summary of these characteristics (Cole et al. 2001, p. xiv):

- (19) Apparent Typological Characteristics of Long-Distance Reflexives
- a. Long-distance reflexives are monomorphemic
  - b. They take subject antecedents
  - c. Their occurrence can, in many languages, be restricted to environments in which the antecedent and the reflexive are found in specific domains (i.e., specific types of IPs such as infinitival or subjunctive).

Although these core features can account for the distribution of non-locally bound reflexives in a majority of languages, such a typology falls short of providing a universal explanation for some others. To exemplify, as we have already seen, the reflexives with non-local binding features such as *önmaga* in Hungarian and *dirinya* in Singapore Malay do allow subject-oriented antecedents violating what is claimed to be a requirement for being an LD-reflexive (Pica, 1987) following these characteristics. Analogously, note that Finnish and Danish reflexives are different from the ones in Japanese and Chinese in that while the former allow long-distance binding in non-finite clauses only, the latter do not have any such restrictions.

Such non-overlapping features of reflexives with syntactic long-distance binding have lead linguists to be skeptical about the nature of LDRs in various languages. In some languages, reflexives have the characteristics of bound anaphors (Japanese) while in others, they have been observed to show pronominal features (Turkish) in certain contexts. The attempts made to characterize long-distance reflexives (Pica, 1987; Wexler & Manzini, 1987) have not yet sufficed to account for the diversity due to the exceptions suggested by data coming from various languages.

Cole et al. (2001) suggest that “long-distance reflexives are, in fact, several different sorts of entities, which differ as to whether they have the distribution of bound anaphors or of pronouns” (p. xvi). It may be helpful to review some of the reflexives which allow non-local antecedents in order to better evaluate their pronominal and anaphoric status. Note that the reflexive in the following sentences can have non-local antecedents; however, there are several restrictions for this:

(20) Chinese *ziji*

a. Lao Zhang<sub>i</sub> ting shuo Xiao Li<sub>k</sub> ma ziji<sub>i/k</sub>  
 Lao Zhang hear say Xiao Li swear self  
 ‘Lao Zhang heard Xiao Li swore at himself/him.’

b. John<sub>i</sub> xiangxin Bill<sub>j</sub> dui Sam<sub>k</sub> shuo ziji<sub>ij/\*k</sub> taoyan Mary  
 John believe Bill to Sam say self hate Mary  
 ‘John believes that Bill said to Sam that he hated Mary.’

(Hellan, 1991, example 26)

While reflexive *ziji* in (20a) can have the subject in the local and the non-local domain as its antecedent, it seems to be restricted in its selection of probable antecedents. Although the object of the embedded clause ‘Sam’ seems to be in the local domain of the reflexive, it is not possible to have the object as an antecedent. This is also borne out by the typological characteristics of LDRs reviewed by Cole et al. (2001) that they are subject-oriented. As we have already seen, Hungarian and Singapore Malay provide counter-evidence to Chinese.

However, an explanation for the subject orientation of LDRs has been provided in terms of Agr. Culicover (1997) suggests that if there is an agreement between Agr and the anaphor in a language, then the subject orientation will fol-

low either of the following options: anaphor will (a) move at LF to Agr (21), or (b) be bound to Agr at LF (22) (1997, p. 289), each of which is shown below:

(21)  $[_{IP} DP_i Agr_i [_{VP} \dots DP[anaphor] \dots]] \rightarrow [_{IP} DP_i Agr_i + DP[anaphor] [_{VP} \dots t \dots]]$

(22)  $[_{IP} DP_i Agr_i [_{VP} \dots DP[anaphor] \dots]] \rightarrow [_{IP} DP_i Agr_i [_{VP} \dots DP[anaphor]_i \dots]]$

Suggesting an  $X^0$  category to the anaphor, Culicover claims that the reflexive moves due to the lack of some functional features marking person or number. He further suggests that “an anaphor can have a long-distance antecedent just in case it can move from one Agr to another LF” (p. 289). Other similar accounts regarding the subject orientation of LDRs have left the researchers with the supposition that subject orientation solely applies to true LDRs.

As for the second characteristic summarized by Cole et al. (2001), LDRs are always monomorphemic, meaning that if a reflexive is not monomorphemic, then there should be some problem with the LDR status of the reflexive. Yet, examples such as Hungarian *önmaga*, Singapore Malay *dirin-ya*, and Turkish *kendisi* constitute problems for the universality of the characteristics proposed.

To solve this problem and categorize the long-distance reflexives in a way to encompass all, Cole et al. (2001) propose the existence of ‘at least’ (p. xviii) three major types of long-distance reflexives:

- (23)
- a. Long-distance bound anaphors, which show the distribution of bound variables (e.g. Chinese)
  - b. Forms which are used as reflexives locally and as pronominals non-locally (e.g. Turkish and Malay)
  - c. Forms that are ‘primarily’ bound anaphor reflexives, but which can be used non-locally in specific syntactic and discourse contexts (e.g. Icelandic subjunctives and long-distance uses of English reflexives)

### **Local and Long-Distance Reflexives in Turkish: Kornfilt’s (2001) “A phase in disguise”**

Reflexivity for the third person singular is expressed in two different forms in Turkish: (a) *kendi* and (b) *kendi-si*, both of which express ‘self’ in different ways:

- (24) Ayşe<sub>i</sub> kendin<sub>i</sub> -i hiç düşün -mü -yor -muş  
 Ayşe self -ACC at all think -NEG -PROG -REPPAST  
 ‘(They say that) Ayşe does not think about herself at all.’
- (25) Ayşe<sub>i</sub> kendi sin<sub>i/j</sub> -i hiç düşün -mü -yor -muş  
 Ali self 3SG -ACC at all think -NEG -PROG -REPPAST  
 ‘(They say that) Ayşe does not think about herself/her-him at all.’

The uninflected form *kendi* (24) has been claimed to be strictly locally bound being subject to Principle A of BT; however, according to the same accounts, the inflected form, *kendi-si* (25) does not necessarily have local antecedents and acts as either an anaphor or a pronominal (Enç, 1989; George & Kornfilt, 1981; Göksel & Kerslake, 2005; Kornfilt, 2001; Meral, 2010; Palaz, 2013). This is further observed in the following complex sentences where the uninflected reflexive *kendi* is a local anaphor only (26a), whereas the inflected form *kendi-si* (26b) has both local and non-local (long-distance and extra-sentential) antecedents.

- (26) a. Fatma<sub>j</sub> [Ahmet’in<sub>i</sub> kendin -i<sub>i/\*j/\*k</sub> beğendiğini] biliyor  
 Fatma Ahmet-GEN self. -ACC admire-GER know  
 ‘Fatma knows that Ahmet admires self very much.’
- b. Fatma<sub>j</sub> [Ahmet’in<sub>i</sub> kendi -sin -i<sub>i/j/k</sub> beğendiğini] biliyor  
 Fatma Ahmet-GEN self. -3SG -ACC admire-GER know  
 ‘Fatma knows that Ahmet admires self/him/her/Fatma.’

(adapted from Kornfilt, 2001)

Kornfilt (2001) claims the inflected third person singular reflexive to be in “complementary distribution with the corresponding personal pronoun in local contexts,” but non-locally, it seems to be in free variation with a similar type of pronoun. By the same token, if we consider that within the Government and BT, pronominals have to abide by Principle B, and reflexives by Principle A, then Kornfilt (2001) indicates that the inflected third person singular has a “hybrid” or “dual” nature patterning like a pronominal in nonlocal contexts, but like an anaphor in local ones. In fact, Turkish inflected reflexive does not conform to the characteristics of LDRs since it is neither monomorphemic nor subject-oriented. Based on the lack of such features, Turkish, she claims, should not be a challenge for the universality of LDRs. These features of Turkish LDR cast doubt on its status as a genuine LDR

(Kornfilt, 2001). Although Kornfilt claims that the uninflected form in (26a) cannot co-refer to the antecedent in the matrix clause, subsequent analyses have shown that it may do so only in the expression of the third person singular causing long-distance readings for the uninflected form, as well. In fact, the status of these two forms has been shown to pose a challenge for them to be evaluated under BT, given their distribution and function. (Aydn, 1998; Cem Değer, 1996; Meral, 2013; Özbek & Kahraman, 2016; Yakut, 2015). In this vein, various attempts have been made to account for these divergences of Turkish reflexives from the common characteristics shared by a majority of languages. Although Turkish LDRs' non-monomorphemic structure may be explained away appealing to compounding, it has been found difficult to corroborate the non-subject orientation of these reflexives. Regardless of the type of antecedent, be it a discourse or a syntactic one, there is a possibility of non-subject orientation as is displayed in the following sentence:

- (27) Ali<sub>i</sub> Ata -ya<sub>j</sub> [Cem -in<sub>k</sub> kendi -sin -i<sub>i/jk</sub> beğen -diğ -in] -i söyledi  
 Ali Ata -DAT Cem -GEN self -3SG -ACC admire -GER -3SG -ACC said  
 'Ali told Ata that Cem admires him(self) a lot.'

In (27), the inflected reflexive “kendi-sin-i” can have the dative object “Ata-ya” as a probable or even as the only antecedent in some “discourse contexts” (Kornfilt, 2001 p. 205). This is contrary to the generalization which suggests LD-reflexives are all subject-oriented. Therefore, rather than proposing a redefinition of the LDRs, Kornfilt maintains that these types of reflexives in Turkish are neither LD-reflexives nor real anaphors.

Kornfilt's solution to this problem is to give the inflected reflexive a “phrase in disguise” status since what makes it so “overt” and “strong” in local as opposed to non-local domains is the inflection it has. She further suggests that this power asserted by the inflected reflexive through person and number is similar to the strength asserted in the formulation of the *pro* specifier.

With this description, Kornfilt makes it clear that the structure of the inflected reflexive is very much similar to the possessive phrase. This suggests that the *pro* category for the inflected “kendisi” (28b) and “car” (29a) pattern the same (Kornfilt, 2001, pp. 206-7):

- (28) a. Ali -nin araba -sı                      b. on - un araba -sı  
       Ali - GEN car     -3SG                      s/he - GEN car     -3SG  
       ‘Ali’s car’                                      ‘his/her car’
- (29) a. pro araba -sı                              b. pro kendi -si  
       car     -3SG                                      self     -3SG  
       ‘[his/her] car’                                      ‘[his/her] self (i.e. himself/herself)’

The phrase “Ali’nin arabası” (28a) shows us how “Ali’s car” can be expressed in the form of pronominal “his/her” without changing the agreement features of the attached noun “car.” Similarly, in (29a) the replacement of “Ali’s” with a *pro* is an indication of how “kendi-si” (29b) could be preceded by a *pro* specifier. This also predicts that *onun kendisi* “him/her(self)” or *Ali’nin kendisi* “Ali [him] self” appear quite as likely. This time, the inflected reflexive *kendi-si* in (29b) appears as the head of the *pro* specifier similar to the case of the noun “araba-sı” in (28a). They both have the person and number agreement on the head noun meaning that with the replacement of the NP with its *pro* specifier, we would account for the inflection on the reflexive. Asserting that the AgrP is headed by a strong inflection, Kornfilt states that reflexive is not bound non-locally, which is required by Principle A within the AgrP. This means that although the *pro* specifier binds the reflexive in the local domain, due to the Avoid Pronoun Principle, the overt NP does not appear in the sentence. It is attributable to this inflection with pronominal status (Principle B of BT) that the inflected reflexive appears as an LDR.

Complex reflexives constitute the best data to show whether the reflexives are locally or non-locally bound. Turkish complex reflexive *kendi-si* has a phrasal nature and thus cannot undergo head movement as simplex reflexives do at LF in languages with true LDRs. This suggests that *kendi-si* is always locally bound (Kornfilt, 2001, p. 30).

- (30) Akrep            kendi kendi -n -i    /\*kendi kendi -sin -i    sokar  
       Scorpion     self self     -3SG -ACC    self self     -3SG -ACC    stings.

‘The scorpion stings itself.’

In example (30), the inflected reduplicated reflexive is “compound-like” having the second reflexive as its head. This head can be inflected for first and second persons. When they are inflected, they are always locally bound in first and sec-

ond persons, though. This means that the inflected form for the third person singular should be able to have non-local antecedents to prove a true long-distance status, which does not normally occur (Kornfilt, 2001).

### A closer look at the inflected form *kendi-si* in Turkish

**Reduplicated form of *kendi-si*:** So far, we have seen that *kendisi* has a dual status, and *kendi* is locally bound, although the latter has been challenged in more recent analyses. Also, in contrast to *kendi*, *kendi-si* can be co-indexed with a discourse antecedent, which is observed in (24) & (25). In the following sections, further evidence to support the local and nonlocal interpretations of *kendi-si* will be provided.

Kornfilt suggests that the inflected reflexive is not possible as a complex reflexive except for literary and narrative purposes. However, the examples below show that the accusative case marking on the inflected form (29) is not arbitrary nor is it restricted to a specific type of case marking (31b).

- (31) a. Halk kendi kendi -sin -i yönetmek istiyor  
 People self self -3SG -ACC to govern want.PROG.  
 ‘People want to govern themselves.’
- b. Kişi kendi kendi -sin -den kaçır  
 Person self self -3SG -ABL escapes  
 ‘A person escapes from himself/herself.’

The examples in (31) support the possibility of *kendi kendisi* to be co-indexed with a local antecedent. Note that, in these sentences (31) & (32), a replacement of inflected complex reflexive with its uninflected counterpart, *kendi kendine* is also possible. Besides, reduplicated reflexives have also been claimed to be locally bound, but the following example in (32) does not seem to support this claim.

- (32) Ege<sub>i</sub> Cem-e<sub>j</sub> kendi kendi -sin -e<sub>ij</sub> konuşarak  
 Ege Cem-DAT self self -3SG -DAT talk-CONJsleepPAST  
 uyuduğunu said  
 sleep-NM-3SG-ACC say-PAST  
 ‘Ege told Cem that he always sleeps by talking to him(self).’

In (32), the inflected complex reflexive may be co-indexed with either “Ege” or “Cem.” This shows that the inflected complex reflexive form may be bound by the subject of the matrix clause (Ege) or the indirect object (Cem), which is the same in non-complex reflexives. In fact, Meral (2013) attributes the relatively free use of *kendisi* compared to *kendi* to dialect differences:

The availability of *kendi* ‘self’ in non-local contexts is subject to a dialect split in Turkish. According to Dialect A (Kornfilt 2001, Rudnev 2008), *kendi* [...] cannot be co-indexed with a matrix NP while *kendisi* “self-3sg” can be. According to Dialect B (examples in Sezer 1980, 1991; Meral, 2010), on the other hand, the form *kendi-si* is preferred but 3rd person reflexive *kendi* in an embedded clause can be co-indexed with a matrix NP, i.e. *kendi* can be non-locally bound. (p. 46)

However, it is important to note that in their empirical study, Özbek and Kahraman (2016) found that participants chose *kendi-si* as the form more likely to refer to a non-local antecedent. Other empirical studies reported no preference over *kendisi* in formal and informal contexts (Uzunca, 2018) or a relatively lower preference for extra-sentential and long-distance readings compared to local antecedents (Gračanin-Yukseş, 2017). The findings should be interpreted with caution, though, because the results of each of these studies approach the issue from a different angle using a variety of tools and methods.

**Scrambling:** Further examination of the following example in (37) suggests that when the complex reflexive *kendisi* appears as an adjunct, it is still possible to interpret it either referring to the subject or to an extrasentential referent depending on what follows or precedes it.

- (37) a. Kendisine<sub>ij</sub> göre, Ali<sub>i</sub> çok çalışkan.  
 Kendisi-DAT according to Ali very hardworking-PRE  
 ‘According to her-him/himself, Ali is very hardworking’
- b. Kendine<sub>i</sub> göre, Ali<sub>i</sub> çok çalışkan.  
 Kendi-DAT according to Ali very hardworking-PRE  
 ‘According to himself, Ali is very hardworking’

The inflected reflexive in (37a) might either be referring to “Ali” or someone else previously mentioned in the discourse who considers “Ali” very hardworking. While in (37b) uninflected reflexive *kendi* can only refer to its local

referent, “Ali.” In that sense, the complex reflexive *kendisi* has a less constrained distribution and interpretation even in a non-subject adjunct position. The postposition *-e göre* “according to” allows *kendi* and *kendisi* to appear as a complement of the Determiner Phrase (DP). The following examples from the *TS Corpus* (Sezer, 2017) further illustrate this point that even without scrambling, *kendisi* may be used to refer to a locally bound subject:

- (38) a. McNish kendisine göre en önemli gelişmenin [...] belirtti.  
 ‘McNish stated that according to self, the most important development is [...].’  
 b. Her ülkenin kendisine göre bir riski vardır.  
 ‘Each country has their own risks’  
 c. Bu yeni kuşak, cazı kendisine göre güncelledi.  
 ‘This new generation updated jazz according to himself/herself’  
 d. Herkes kendisine göre haklı olabilir.  
 ‘Everyone may be right according to themselves’

Although each of these examples may constitute a different context for the use of the inflected form and postposition *-e göre* “according to,” they show that the subject and the inflected form may be interpreted to refer to the subject within the same local domain. A further observation to be noted here is that sentences which involve reporting verbs (within the specific genre) as in (38a) were among the most common sentences the inflected form has appeared in. Uninflected reflexive can always be co-indexed with its local referent unless the meaning impedes their co-indexation as in the following:

- (39) a. Kendisinden<sub>i/\*j</sub> sonra, Burak<sub>i</sub> günüzü görmedi  
 Her/Him.OBL after Burak daylight not-see-PAST  
 ‘After him (her), Burak did not see daylight in his life.’  
 b. \*Kendinden sonra, Burak gün yüzü görmedi  
 ‘After self, Burak did not see daylight in his life.’

In these two sentences, it is clear that neither of the reflexives can semantically refer to “Burak” unless there is some poetic meaning intended since there is an implied meaning in the first part of the sentence referring to someone else other than Burak himself. When there is no possibility of being co-indexed with

the local subject, the uninflected reflexive is ungrammatical (39b). However, the inflected reflexive is grammatical in (39a) and appears in a non-subject position as an adjunct. In (39a), reflexive *kendisi* makes use of its long-distance binding feature when local binding is semantically impossible.

Further analysis of the inflected reflexive can be done by placing the subject of the main clause before the reflexive as in (40). When the possible antecedent is uttered before “itself,” the meaning of the sentence is interpreted in the same way as it is in the uninflected one (41b):

- (40) a. Burak<sub>i</sub> kendi-si-ne<sub>ij</sub> göre çok çalışkan.  
 Burak kendisi-DAT according to very hardworking-PRE  
 b. Burak<sub>i</sub> kendi-ne<sub>i</sub> göre çok çalışkan.  
 Burak kendi-DAT according to very hardworking-PRE  
 ‘According to him/himself, Burak is very hardworking.’

Scrambling the order of the subject constrains the interpretation of the inflected reflexive causing the outside referent interpretation much less probable albeit not impossible. However, the interpretation entailing an outside referent in (40a) in order to mean “according to someone (him/her) other than Burak” is still possible. In fact, the aforementioned restriction on the interpretation of example (40a) is not very surprising. As a pro-drop language, Turkish does not need an overt subject unless there is a special need to do so. In this respect, having the overt subject ‘Burak’ at the beginning of example (40a) might serve as a focus marker emphasizing it as the subject of the main clause, and thus empowering the subject over the inflected reflexive immediately following it as opposed to when it precedes it (39a).

## Conclusion

This paper aimed to review the LDRs across languages focusing specifically on the 3rd person singular anaphoric binding expressions *kendi* and *kendisi* in Turkish. Some previous studies suggests that the inflected form *kendi-si* is in complementary distribution with the personal pronoun in local contexts but is in free variation with it in non-local contexts. Turkish inflected reflexive is also claimed not to constitute a problem for the universal typology of LDRs. Within

this respect, by analyzing the use of the inflected reflexive form, the present study aimed at providing further evidence to suggest a reconsideration of some previous work. To achieve this goal, once the theoretical framework was briefly summarized, the relevant literature on Turkish and other languages with similar binding phenomena was reviewed. Finally, further data showing the reduplication and the scrambling effects supported the local and the non-local binding properties of the inflected form. Further theoretical and empirical research with a high number of participants from diverse geographical regions is encouraged. Finally, examining Turkish written and spoken corpora to reach a broader view of the functions and the uses of anaphoric binding expressions *kendi* and *kendisi* may also yield new insights and is very much needed.

## References

- Aydın, Ö. (1998). İkinci dil olarak Türkçe ediniminde dönüşlü adılara ilişkin yorumlar. *XII. Dilbilim Kurultayı Bildirileri* (pp. 175-186). Mersin Üniversitesi.
- Cem Değer, A. (1996). Türkçedeki dönüşlü adılların yönetici ulamlarının tanımlanması. In L. Oktar, and A. Cem Değer (Eds.), *X. Dilbilim Kurultayı Bildirileri* (pp. 41-47). İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi Basımevi.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Foris.
- Chomsky, N. (1982). *Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language*. New York: Praeger.
- Cole, P., & Hermon, G. (1998). Long distance reflexives in Singapore Malay: An apparent typological anomaly. *Linguistic Typology* 2 (1), 57-77.
- Cole, P., Hermon, G., & Huang, C.-T. J. (2001). Long Distance Reflexives -The State of the Art. In P. Cole, G. Hermon, & C.-T.J. Huang (Eds), *Long Distance Reflexives. (Syntax and Semantics 33)* (pp. 371-380). Academic Press: San Diego.
- Cowper, E. A. (1992). *A concise introduction to syntactic theory: the Government-Binding approach*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Culicover, P. W. (1997). *Principles and parameters: an introduction to syntactic theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Enç, M. (1989). Pronouns, licensing, and binding, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, Vol.7, 51-92.
- George, L., & Kornfilt, J. (1981). Finiteness and boundedness in Turkish. In F. W. Henry (Ed.), *Binding and filtering* (pp. 105-127). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT
- Göksel, A., & Kerslake, C. (2005). *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. New York: Routledge.
- Gračanin-Yuksek, M., Lago, S., Şafak, D. F., Demir, O., & Kırkıcı, B. (2017). The interaction of contextual and syntactic information in the processing of Turkish anaphors. *Journal of psycholinguistic research*, 46(6), 1397-1425.
- Güven, M. (2015). Türkiye Türkçesindeki Kendi Biçimbiriminin İşlevlerinin Tarihsel Gelişimi Üzerine. *Bilig*, 72, 43-72.
- Haegeman, L. (1994). *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.
- Harbert, W. (1995). Binding Theory, Control, and pro. In G. Webelhuth (Ed.), *Government and Binding Theory and the Minimalist Program* (pp. 176-240). Oxford: UK.
- Hellan, L. (1991). Containment and connectedness anaphors. In J. Koster & E. Reuland (Eds.),

- Long-Distance Anaphora* (pp. 27-48). Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Kennedy, C., & Lidz. J. (2001). A (Covert) Long Distance Anaphor in English. In K. Megardoomian & L. A. Bar-el (Eds.), *WCCFL 20 Proceedings* (pp. 1-14) Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Kornfilt, J. (2001). Local and Long-Distance Reflexives in Turkish. In Peter Cole, Gabriella Hermon & C.-T. James Huang (eds.), *Long Distance Reflexives (Syntax and Semantics 33)* (pp. 197-226). New York: Academic Press.
- Koster, J., & Reuland, E. (1991). *Long-Distance Anaphora*. Cambridge UP.
- Meral, H. M. (2010). Some Notes on Turkish Pronominal Anaphora. *Turkish Studies*, vol.5, 535-563.
- Meral, H. M. (2013). Binding as an A'- Phenomenon? Evidence from Turkish. *Iberia: an International Journal of Theoretical Linguistics*, vol.5, 45-68.
- Özbek, A., & Kahraman, B. (2016). Interpretations of Turkish reflexive pronouns kendi and kendisi. *Mersin University Journal of Linguistics & Literature* 13(1), 73-96.
- Özsoy, A. S. (1990). "Söylemiçi Dönüştürü Yapı." *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*, 35-40.
- Palaz, B. (2010). *On the nature of anaphoric expressions kendi/kendisi and the clause structure of Turkish* (MA Thesis, Boğaziçi University).
- Pica, P. (1987). *On the nature of the reflexivization cycle*. *NELS* 17 (2), 483-99.
- Rakosi, G. (2009). Beyond Identity: The case of a complex Hungarian Reflexive. In M. Butt & T. Holloway King (Eds.), *the Proceedings of the LFG09 Conference*. (pp. 459-497). CSLI Publications.
- Reuland, E. (2017). Why is reflexivity so special? Understanding the world of reflexives. *Studia linguistica*, 71(1-2), 12-59.
- Rudnev, P. (2008). *Some syntax and semantics of long-distance reflexives in Turkish and elsewhere*. Unpublished manuscript. University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.
- Sezer, E. (1980). On reflexivization in Turkish, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, vol.3/4, 748-759.
- Sezer, E. (1991). *Issues in Turkish Syntax*. (Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University).
- Sezer, T. (2017). TS Corpus Project: An online Turkish Dictionary and TS DIY Corpus. *European Journal of Language and Literature*, 9(1), 18-24.
- Steenbergen, M. van. (1991). Long-distance binding in Finnish. In J. Koster & E. Reuland (Eds.), *Long-Distance Anaphora*. Cambridge UP.
- Temel, E. (2019). 14.-16. Yüzyıl Doğu Türkçesinde "Öz" ile Kurulan Sözcük Öbekleri Üzerine. *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, 29(1), 147-162.
- Uzunca, A. (2018). The Influence of Locality or Intimacy? A Case Study on the Issue of Reflexivization in Turkish. *European Journal of Literature, Language and Linguistics Studies*, 2(4), 16-36.

- 
- Wexler, K., & Manzini, M. R. (1987). Parameters and Learnability in Binding Theory. In T. Roeper & E. Williams (Eds.), *Parameter Setting* (pp. 41-76). Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- White, L. (2003). *Second language acquisition and universal grammar*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP.
- Yakut, B. A. (2015). The logophoric behaviour of strict local anaphor kendi 'self' in Turkish. In A. Joseph & E. Predolac (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 9th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics, MIT Working Papers in Linguistics #76*, Cambridge, MA: MITWPL.