ABSTRACT

Turkish has two morphologically free reflexives; *kendi* ‘self’ and the inflected form, *kendi-si* ‘self. 3SG’. It has been previously claimed that *kendi* is a strict local anaphor which is subject to Condition A of the Binding Theory, as in the Example 1, while *kendisi* seems to have a dual nature, acting both as an anaphor and a pronominal, (Ex. 2a-b), (Kornfilt (2001)). In this paper, we mainly focus on Kornfilt (2001)’s analysis regarding the distribution of these reflexives. Kornfilt (2001) argues that *kendisi* is actually an Agreement phrase in disguise with a little *pro* in Spec position (Ex. 3). AgrP is suggested to be the relevant binding domain for both the pronominal *pro* and the so-called strict local anaphor *kendi* (Ex. 4). In the light of the recently collected data, this paper clearly shows that *kendi* does not behave as a strict local anaphor, but a logophor in complex sentences under logophoric verbs, and the previously argued complementarity between *kendi* and *kendisi* is lost in such contexts. To account for this structurally, we argue that *kendisi* is a referential anaphor which only lacks a coreferential index, in comparison, *kendi* needs to define both its phi features and its D feature (Ex. 5). As Kornfilt (2001) has pointed out, DP (AgrP) seems to be the relevant binding domain for the little *pro* and for the reflexive in *kendisi*, however, *kendi* does not have a null pronominal in Spec position, rather an undefined empty category occupying Spec, NP. The little *pro* in *kendisi* just needs to be coindexed with an antecedent in the clausal domain (CP), however, *kendi* needs an antecedent to define its uninterpretable D and phi features. Therefore, it can only be read coindexed with an argument antecedent implying that the relevant binding domain for *kendi* is TP. Hence, *kendi* can be either bound by an antecedent in the minimal (embedded) TP, or it can be logophor-licensed being bound by the subject in the matrix TP if the matrix verb expresses the point of view or state of consciousness of the individual in the subject position. In the example 6 (a) where the subject of the verb ‘şərmək’ to be surprised is SELF, and in 7 (a) and 8 (a) where the subjects of the verb ‘söylemek’ to tell can take a non-local antecedent, namely the matrix logophoric subject although it still cannot refer to a discourse antecedent. In addition, the example 7 (a) indicates that *kendi* cannot be read coreferential with an indirect object, indicating the subject orientation of the bare reflexive when functioning as a logophor. When it is in a non-argument position in the deepest embedded clause, it still takes the subject of the matrix clause as its antecedent (Ex. 8 (a)). Comparing the examples 6, 7, and 8 (a) with 6, 7, and 8(b), we see that the referential properties of *kendi* and *kendisi* are identical implying that just as *kendi*, *kendisi* cannot refer to a discourse antecedent. Adopting Frascarelli (2007)’s analysis of Aboutness-shift Topic (A-Topic), we argue that although in simple sentences, *kendisi* is coreferential with a discourse-antecedent which is represented as a null topic in the C domain, the logophoric matrix subjects do not seem to allow a disjoint reading from A-Topic. Therefore, the highest available antecedent for *kendi* and *kendisi* in such contexts end up being the same even though their binding domains differ.

EXAMPLES

(1)  Ali₁ Ayşe’nin₂ kendine₃ kızmasını şaşırdı.
    *Ali*₁ NOM *Ayşe* GEN *self* DAT get.angry MSD ACC be.surprised AOR
    ‘Ali₁ was surprised at *Ayşe*₂ getting angry at herself₃/*him₁=a₃’

(2)  a. Ali₁ Ayşe’nin₂ kendisine₃/₂₃ kızmasını şaşırdı.
    *Ali*₁ NOM *Ayşe* GEN *self* DAT get.angry MSD ACC be.surprised AOR
    ‘Ali₁ was surprised at *Ayşe*₂ getting angry at herself₃/him₁/him=her₃’

   b. Ahmet kendi-sin-i₁ çok beğen-iyor-muş
    *Ahmet* self₃.sg-ACC very admire Progr.-Rep.Past
    ‘(They say that) Ahmet admires (i.e., Ali) very much.’
A. Kendi (N-to-D Movement)  
B. Kendi (No N-to-D Movement)

Spec  pro  
\[ \text{DP} \]
\[ \text{NP} \]
\[ \text{D}^1 \]
\[ t_i \]
\[ N_i \]
\[ \text{spec} \]
\[ \text{-si} [+D] [+\phi] \]

Spec  e_i  
\[ \text{D} \]
\[ N \]
\[ \text{spec} \]
\[ [-D] [-\phi] \]


Ali Ayşe GEN self DAT get.angry MSD ACC be.surprised AOR

‘Ali, was surprised at Ayşe getting angry at herself/him/her.’
b. Ali[SELF] 1 Ayşe'nin 2 kendisini 1/2/3 kizmasına şaşırdı.

Ali Ayşe GEN self DAT get.angry MSD ACC be.surprised AOR

‘Ali, was surprised at Ayşe getting angry at herself/him/her’


Ali Ahmet DAT pro Ayşe GEN self ACC upset NOT MSD ACC tell PST

‘Ali, told Ahmet, that he does not want Ayşe to upset herself/him/her’

Ali Ahmet DAT pro Ayşe GEN self ACC upset NOT MSD ACC tell PST

‘Ali[SOURCE], told Ahmet, that he does not want Ayşe to upset herself/him/her’


Ali Ahmet GEN Ayşe GEN self for something do MSD ACC recognize MSD ACC say PST

‘Ali, said that Ahmet recognizes Ayşe’s doing something for herself/him/her’

Ali Ahmet GEN Ayşe GEN self for something do MSD ACC recognize MSD ACC say PST

‘Ali, said that Ahmet recognizes Ayşe’s doing something for herself/him/her’