

TÜRKÇE ADIL BAĞIMLILIKLARI ÜZERİNE BAZI NOTLAR

Hasan Mesut MERAL*

ÖZET

Bu makalede Türkçedeki adılların tümce içerisinde kurduğu bağımlılıklar Chomsky (1980, 1982, 1986) tarafından ortaya atılan ve Üretici dilbilgisi çerçevesinde geliştirilen Bağlama kuramı ışığında tartışılmaktadır. Makalede Bağlama kuramı koşullarının Türkçenin kimi yapılarını açıklayamayacağı iki neden etrafında savunulmaktadır: (i) Türkçede Bağlama kuramının öngördüğü kişi adılı-dönüslü adıl ayrımı yerine üçlü bir ayırım göze çarpmaktadır. (ii) Türkçede dönüslü adılın işleneceği bir en küçük alan oluşturmak olanaksızdır. Makale bu anlamda sadece bağlı değişken okumasına sahip olan *kendi* ve sadece gösterici okumaya sahip olan kişi adılları arasında bir ayırım önermekte, *kendisi* adılının özel bir dağılıma sahip olup bu iki okumayı birleştirdiğini ve tümce içerisindeki bir işleyici tarafından işlendiğini savunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Bağlama kuramı, adıl bağılılıkları, *kendisi*.

SOME NOTES ON TURKISH PRONOMINAL ANAPHORA

ABSTRACT

This article discusses the distributional properties of the pronominal expressions in Turkish in light of the Binding theory proposed by Chomsky (1980, 1982, 1986) and developed in various dimensions throughout the Generative enterprise. The following questions are raised: (i) How are the anaphoric relations reflected in syntax? (ii) How does anaphora appear in Turkish? (iii) Can Binding theory explain the Turkish facts? I propose that the Binding theory Conditions A and B seem to be inadequate in explaining the anaphoric

* Dr. Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi İngilizce Öğretmenliği
mesut.meral@boun.edu.tr

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic*
Volume 5/4 Fall 2010

system of Turkish given that (i) Turkish seems to have a three-partite system instead of pronoun-anaphor complementarity, and (ii) the idea that Turkish has a specifiable minimal domain where the binding operation applies is problematic in a number of respects. I propose that Turkish distinguishes between forms which have only variable interpretation (*kendi*) and forms which have only deictic interpretation (personal pronouns). *kendisi* is a special form which combines these interpretations and licensed in accordance with the presence/absence of an A'-operator.

Key Words: Binding theory, pronominal anaphora, *kendisi*.

1. Introduction

Anaphora is related both to linguistics and philosophy in that the former attempts to explore the linguistic manifestation of the issue within syntax, semantics and pragmatics, the latter its reflections in mind. The common point however is that the interpretation of one category of expression is dependent on the interpretation of another. This possibly happens in language and in mind simultaneously, where the speakers of a language *L* avoid using the same linguistic item *LI* twice in a given domain *D*. As for the hearers, they tend to map two distinct linguistic items *LI₁* and *LI₂* and assign them the same referential value for interpretational purposes. This is given in (1a-b).

- (1) a. *_[Domain D1] LI₁.....LI₁
 b. _[Domain D1] LI₁.....LI₂

In (1a) the speakers of the language *L* avoid using the linguistic item *LI₁* twice in a given domain where the borders of the domain vary cross-linguistically. In (1b), on the other hand, the speakers of the language *L* tend to interpret the linguistic items *LI₁* and *LI₂* which are pronounced differently as having the same referent. The former type corresponds to pronoun using while the latter corresponds to anaphor using in language.

In linguistics, an anaphor refers to a relation between two linguistic expressions where the interpretation of one is in a way determined by the interpretation of the other Huang (2000:1). The former is called anaphor, the latter antecedent. Expressions which can be treated as an anaphor include syntactic gaps, pronouns, names, reflexives and descriptions.

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
 and History of Turkish or Turkic
 Volume 5/4 Fall 2010*

In this article we employ the basic tenets of Principles and Parameters approach to language, specifically Binding theory which is based on a universal distinction between pronouns and anaphors as indicated in (1a-b) above. In other words, while anaphors require a close linguistic element which is co-indexed with it, pronouns ban such co-indexed elements. A third type of category is referential (R-) expressions which do not allow any co-indexed linguistic expression in the structure. These three conditions are known as Binding theory Conditions which are given in (2a-c) below.

- (2) A. An anaphor is bound in a local domain.
 B. A pronominal is free in a local domain.
 C. An R-Expression is free (in the domain of the head of its maximal chain).

Chomsky (1986:166)

The theory attempts to provide the principles which regulate the different behavior and distributional properties of the anaphoric expressions in language. It basically formalizes the relationships between two linguistic items A and B as having the same reference, by using a structural definition *binding* which is based on the idea that the *binder* c-commands the *bindee*. Thus, the relationship between the two expressions with respect to their interpretation in a sentence has been defined as a *binding relation* where the linguistic item LI₁ binds the linguistic item LI₂, so that the two are interpreted as having the same referential value. This is illustrated in (3).

- (3) [Domain D₁ LI₁ LI₂ [Domain D₂ .. LI₂ [Domain D₃ ... LI₂]]]

In (3) there are three domains D₁, D₂, D₃ and D₁ contains LI₁ which binds LI₂ in (i) its own domain (D₁), or (ii) in different domains (D₂, D₃). Note that there may possibly be a linguistic item LI₃ in the Domain D₂ which cannot be interpreted as the same with LI₁ at all. The definition of Binding in (2a-c) involves two constituents LI₁ and LI₂ where LI₁ binds LI₂ if (i) LI₁ is in an argument (A-) position, (ii) LI₁ c-commands LI₂, and (iii) LI₁ and LI₂ are co-indexed. According to the Binding theory, anaphors (LI₂ in D₁) are subject to Condition A, pronouns (LI₂ in D₂ or D₃) are regulated by Condition B and R-expressions (LI₃ in any D which are not interpreted as the same with (LI₂ in D₁)) are subject to Condition C in (2a-c).

What is important for the principles in (2a-c) above is the presence of a local domain where the anaphor, pronominal or R-expression is (un)bound. The term local domain can be understood as

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
 and History of Turkish or Turkic
 Volume 5/4 Fall 2010*

clause borders, a main clause or an embedded clause (but, see Chomsky 1986 for the exact definition of the local domain).¹

The structure of the article is as follows: In section 2 I will provide a brief description on anaphoric dependencies in Turkish. Section 3 deals with the Binding theory conditions and how they work in Turkish. Section 4 provides a discussion on different functions of *kendi* in Turkish. In section 5 I will provide a discussion on the issue of binding in Turkish. Section 6 summarizes the article.

2. Anaphoric relations in Turkish

The term *anaphoric relation* is considered as referring to any kind of dependency relation between two linguistic items. Through the article, I use the term *pronominal* for the linguistic items which are/expected to be bound non-locally, the term *anaphor/reflexive* for the linguistic items which are/expected to be bound locally in the Chomskyan sense.

¹ Binding theory is not the only approach to anaphoric relations within Principles and Parameters approach. The earlier treatments of the issue focused on pronominalization vs. reflexivization phenomena for the interpretation of one linguistic item in terms of another. Lees and Klima (1963) (cited in Hornstein 2006) argues that reflexivization and pronominalization are two competing rules which operate on the NPs. The former cannot apply where the latter can. Accordingly, an NP receives a reflexive form whenever it is possible, i.e. it is bound within a certain domain. An NP receives a pronominal form when the use of the reflexive form is not possible.

There are also post-Binding theory approaches to anaphoric relations where proposals which are based on *movement* and other narrow syntactic operations such as *Agree* have been made (Hornstein 2001, Kayne 2002, Reuland 2001, Dechaine and Witschko 2002). The elimination of D- and S- structures in Minimalist Program led to the idea that the Binding theory applies at C-I interface, that is to say LF. However, studies on binding showed that binding has properties such as locality, which are typical of narrow syntax. This causes researchers to consider binding principles as a result of the narrow syntax operations such as *Move*, *Agree* and *Merge*, but not the application in a separate grammar module. Safir (2008) is an exception to this generalization about studies on binding in Minimalism given that he argues for an interpretive component that exploits the structures, i.e. coconstrual relations (antecedent-anaphor and bound variable relations). Particularly, Safir (2008:346) proposes that narrow syntax treatments of coconstrual relations fail to explain unbounded dependencies, dependencies with non-local relations.

There are other approaches to binding which do not rely on movement. The approaches try to eliminate the Binding theory from UG and reformulate its principles in narrow syntax operations. Reuland (2001, 2005) provide a chain formation analysis to binding. Dechaine and Wiltschko (2002, 2004) reformulated the Binding theory principles as cross-over phenomena.

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 5/4 Fall 2010*

2.1. *kendi* and *kendisi*

kendi and *kendisi* are two forms of Turkish which are used for a number of purposes. The proper gloss for these two forms is subject to controversy. Throughout the article, I will use *self* as a gloss for it without any implication as to what it really means.² Özsoy (1983), Kornfilt (1997), Csató & Johanson (1998) and Göksel & Kerslake (2005) have pointed out that *kendi* in Turkish has a number of functions in sentences ranging from expressing reflexivity to having emphatic reading. Göksel and Kerslake (2005:265) point out that *kendi* and its inflected form *kendi-si* have one adjectival, four pronominal (emphatic, reflexive, resumptive and simple pronominal) functions in Turkish. However, there seems to be no agreement on the exact nature of the form *kendi* due to the fact that (i) its distributional properties cause problems for Binding theory, and (ii) the various functions of the form *kendi* make it difficult to analyze it under a single theoretical apparatus such as Binding theory or under a single taxonomic class such as reflexive pronoun.³ Kornfilt (1997:138-139) notes that the invariable reflexive element *kendi* is used as adjectival modifier and the variable one is used for reflexive and emphatic purposes.

Other studies have focused on the Binding theoretic implications of the form and assume that *kendi* is a reflexive pronoun which must be bound within a given domain in accordance with the Binding theory. For example, studies on exceptional case marking (ECM) clauses and finiteness in Turkish use reflexive binding across clauses as a test for the finiteness issue. Accordingly, finite clauses are opaque domains for binding and the unavailability of reflexive pronouns inside a finite clause supports this. Özsoy (2001) and Kornfilt (2007) are two studies which make use of the unavailability of reflexive binding as evidence for the finiteness status of the ECM clause. One point which is important for the previous studies is that they somehow combine the distribution and functions of the form *kendi* with its third person inflected version *kendi-si*. However, I distinguish between *kendi* and its third person inflected version *kendi-si* due to their different distributional and interpretational properties.

² Kornfilt (1997:302) notes the difficulty in labeling the form *kendi* and its possessive marker added variations as reflexive based on the fact that those forms have noun-like properties.

³ Another type of anaphoric expression i.e. reciprocal pronoun *birbiri* ‘each other’ is excluded from the discussion here. However, note also that its distributional properties cause problems for Binding theory too. See Özsoy (to appear) for the recent analysis of the reciprocal pronoun in Turkish.

2.1.1. Distributional properties of *kendi*

It has long been observed that the special form *kendi* has different functions in Turkish which can be listed as;

(i) reflexive: *Ben* 'I' *kendimi* 'myself' *seviyorum* 'like' means 'I like by myself.'. *kendim* 'myself' is used as a reflexive pronoun bound by the subject of the sentence.

(ii) adverbial: *Ben* 'I' *kendim* 'myself' *geldim* 'came' means 'I came by myself.'. *kendim* 'myself' in this context is used as an adverbial expression interpreted with the subject of the sentence.

(iii) adjectival: *Ali* 'Ali' *kendi* 'his own' *kitabını* 'book' *arıyor* 'looks.for' means 'Ali is looking for his own book.'. Here, *kendi* is used as adjectival modifier and it is not inflected by person or number.

(iv) logophoric: *Ali* 'Ali' *bütün* 'all' *bunların* 'these' *kendi* 'own' *hatası* 'fault' *olduğunu* 'as' *kabul ediyor* 'accepts' means 'Ali accepts all these things as his own fault.'. In this use *kendi* has a logophoric function indicating the self awareness of the subject.

(v) emphatic: *Bunu* 'this' *sen* 'you' *kendin* 'yourself' *anlamıyorsun* 'do not understand' means 'You yourself do not understand this.'. *kendi* functions as an emphatic pronoun emphasizing the subject of the sentence.

2.1.2. Distributional properties of *kendisi*

Göksel and Kerslake (2005) point out that *kendisi* can be used as a simple pronominal expression, as a reflexive or as a resumptive pronoun. I point out that *kendisi* can be used in the same contexts as *kendi* except in the adjectival function. That is to say, *kendisi* can also be used as adverbial and emphatic pronoun as well. Consider (4) which is taken from Göksel and Kerslake (2005:269) example (38).

(4) Erol [Ziya'nın *kendi-sin-e* bir araba
Erol Ziya-GEN self/s/he-3s.POSS-DAT a car
al-ma-sın]-ı söyle-di.
buy-VN-3sg.POSS-ACCtell-PF

(i) 'Erol told Ziya to buy a car for *himself*'

(ii) 'Erol told Ziya to buy *him* a car' (him=Erol or someone else)

In (4) above *kendisi* is used as the second complement of the embedded predicate. Note that it can be co-indexed with the subject of both the matrix clause, *Erol* and the embedded clause, *Ziya*. When it is

Turkish Studies

International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 5/4 Fall 2010

co-indexed with the embedded subject, it is interpreted as a reflexive pronoun, behaving in the same way with the true reflexive form *kendi*. This is given in (5).

(5) Erol_i [Ziyanın_k *kendine*_{k/?i} bir araba almasını]
söyledi.

Erol Ziya for himself a car to buy told
'Erol told Ziya to buy a car for himself.'

However, when it is co-indexed with the matrix subject, it is interpreted as a personal pronoun, behaving in the same way with regular third person pronoun *o* (he/she/it). That is to say, when we change the form *kendisi* with *kendi* in (5), we have only the reflexive interpretation. *Kendi* in (5) cannot act as a pronominal as the low acceptability of *i* reading indicates. Consider (6) next where *kendi-si* is replaced by *o* (she/she/it).

(6) Erol_i [Ziyanın_k *on-a*_{?*/i/*k /m} bir araba almasını]
söyledi.

Erol Ziya for him a car to buy told
'Erol told Ziya to buy him a car.'

(6) shows that personal pronoun *o* (he/she/it) cannot be used as antecedent by a proper name in the same clause, hence respecting Condition B of the Binding theory.⁴ It cannot take a distant antecedent in the same clause either, showing that its distribution seems to follow from a general ban on the occurrences of pronouns, rather than from Condition B.

Different from its reflexive and pronominal use, *kendi-si* also functions as a resumptive pronoun in relative clauses. In its resumptive use, it is co-indexed with the head noun and unlike its pronominal use; it cannot be replaced with a personal pronoun. Consider (7).

⁴ The personal pronoun in (6) is not that bad when it is co-indexed with the matrix subject in (i) below.

(i) Erol_i [Ziyadan_k *ona*_{?i/*k /m} bir araba almasını] istedi.
Erol Ziya for him a car to buy wanted
'Erol wanted Ziya to buy him a car.'

The slight modification in (i) above results in grammaticality. This implies that the use of personal pronouns as co-indexed with the matrix subjects is acceptable. I will discuss this issue later in the article.

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 5/4 Fall 2010*

(7) [*kendisini*_i/ **onu* gördüğüm] adam_i
 self him that.I.saw man
 ‘The man that I saw (*him).’

What (7) shows is that *kendi-si* receives a special status with *-sI* in that it can occur inside the relative clause, where the Operator is assumed to be extracted. Neither *kendi* nor a personal pronoun can occur in this position.

As we have seen, the distributional properties of *kendi* and *kendisi* are similar but not identical. I propose that both *kendi* and *kendisi* are bound variables which are licensed (bound) not within a Binding theoretic system, but in an operator-variable chain. Their different distributional properties are a result of the chain they occur in, but not of their intrinsic syntactic properties.

3. Condition A and anaphors

In this section we focus on the problematic instances of anaphor binding in Turkish.⁵

3.1. *kendi* in simple sentences

In Turkish, anaphors can be bound by constituents other than the subject. Example (8) from Göksel & Kerslake (2005:268) example (34) illustrates that in Turkish *kendi* can be bound by the dative object as well.

⁵ Balkız Öztürk (p.c) pointed out to me that in some languages such as Georgian, Laz and Haitian, reflexives are formed via inalienable possessed nouns. This means that an expression such as *I love my head* is used to mean *I love myself*. Note that these nouns are bound forms and have to take possessive morphemes. Turkish might have that kind of noun (*kendi*) which is not subject to the Condition A or B, but Condition C. Note that this has been argued by Dechaine and Manfredi (1994) for Haitian. The parallelism between Haitian and Turkish in this respect is an issue which is worth discussing in the future studies. It might also be the case that overt pronouns in Turkish are more likely to be nominals as in the case of reflexives that I pointed out above following Kornfilt (1984). Note that personal pronouns in Turkish have topic/focus functions as has been observed by Enç (1986) and Erguvanlı-Taylan (1986). Moreover, they behave like nominals in many contexts.

- (8) Sanki *bana kendi-m-i* anlatıyorlardı.⁶
 I(dat) self-1sg.poss-acc
 ‘[It was] as if they were talking to *me* about *myself*.’

This implies that reflexive binding is not restricted to the subject position; a second complement as in the case of (8) can also bind the reflexive pronoun in the internal complement position. We argue that this example provides a counterargument for the applicability of the Condition A which predicts this example to be ungrammatical since the anaphor is bound in a domain where there is no co-referential subject. Note that a personal pronoun can also occur in these contexts. Consider the example (9).

- (9) Sanki bana_i beni_i anlatıyorlardı.
 as if to me me they.are.talking
 ‘It was as if they were talking to me about myself.’

In (9) a personal pronoun is used in a position where the reflexive pronoun is predicted, the structure is nevertheless grammatical. We argue that the grammaticality of this example is problematic for Condition B of the Binding theory in that the structure is expected to be ungrammatical since the pronoun is bound within its local domain.

One might think that *kendi* in (8) is not an actual anaphor, but a pronominal element. Hence, no Condition A violation arises. However, the grammaticality of (9) where a real pronominal element occurs in the position where the anaphor occurs in (8) refutes this option (see also footnote 6).

3.2. *kendi* in embedded clauses

In Turkish *kendi* can also occur in different types of embedded clause which do not contain the antecedent. Following Özsoy (1984) and Kornfilt (1984), I assume that the embedded clauses are local domains for the anaphors in that the anaphor within an embedded clause has to be bound within its own clause.

Before going into the details of the distributional properties of *kendi* and *kendisi* inside the embedded clauses, I would like to

⁶ The form *kendi* in this example might not be considered as a reflexive pronoun as pointed out to me by A. Sumru Özsoy (p.c). The form can be replaced by a personal pronoun. Here, I intend to show that the form *kendi* and personal pronouns are not in complementary distribution. Also, it is observed in *Tarama Sözlüğü* that personal pronouns are used in the context of reflexive pronouns in Old Anatolian Turkish period.

make one point. The availability of *kendi* which occurs inside an embedded clause and is co-indexed with an NP in the matrix clause is subject to a dialect split.⁷ According to Dialect A, 1st and 2nd person inflected reflexive forms *kendi-m* and *kendi-n* act as the true reflexives in that they cannot occur inside an embedded clause and cannot be co-indexed with a matrix NP. For the 3rd person reflexive use, Dialect A prefers *kendi-si* rather than *kendi*, i.e. while *kendi* cannot be bound non-locally, *kendisi* can do so. According to Dialect B, on the other hand, while the form *kendi-si* is preferred, 3rd person reflexive *kendi* can also occur inside an embedded clause and be co-indexed with a matrix NP, i.e. *kendi* can be non-locally bound. Moreover, for Dialect B the situation with 1st and 2nd person reflexive forms *kendi-m* and *kendi-n* is suspicious in that there are examples in which these forms can also be bound non-locally.⁸

3.2.1. Complement clauses

Complement clauses in Turkish are of two types: (i) nominalized complement clauses and (ii) finite complement clauses. Nominalized complement clauses consist of a genitive marked subject which agrees with the nominal agreement marker on the embedded verb which is nominalized by a number of morphemes. Finite complement clauses, on the other hand, consist of a nominative marked subject which agrees with the verbal agreement marker on the verb. We focus on the nominalized complement clause in this section.

I assume that the clauses in Turkish have a C domain. The support for the proposal comes with (i) the availability of having a

⁷ Note that the dialect split observed in the use of *kendi* in long distance contexts might correlate with other instances of dialect splits such as those observed in the use of personal pronouns inside the embedded clauses and ECM constructions. I leave this issue for further investigation.

⁸ The occurrence of *kendi* inside an impersonal passive structure as embedded clauses might be an example of this sort. Consider (ia-b).

(i) a. ??Ben [kendime yazar den(il)mesinden] hoşlanmıyorum.
I myself author be.called do.not.like
'I do not like that myself is called author.'

b. ?Sen [kendine mühendis den(il)mesinden] hoşlanıyor musun?
You yourself engineer be.called do.you.like
'Do you like that you are called engineer?'

In (ia-b) *kendi* seems to be bound non-locally given that the embedded clause functions as a minimal domain for the anaphor. However, we can also argue that the minimal domain is extended to the matrix clause in the above cases due to the fact that impersonal passive structures might not be sufficient for being a minimal domain.

Turkish Studies

variable like empty category within the clause, irrespective of being a complement, adverbial or relative clause, and (ii) the availability of scrambling. Variables require the presence of a CP domain where Spec positions host the empty operator which licenses the variable. The availability of post-verbal scrambling also supports the presence of CP projection given that postverbally scrambled constituents are CP adjoined *à la* Kural (1992).

Recall that nominalized clauses are argued to be a syntactic domain for the grammatical operations such as binding. In other words, anaphors must be bound within the nominalized clause. However, do we have anaphors or anaphor like elements which are bound outside of the nominalized clause? Consider (10a-c).

(10) a. Ahmet_i [pro_i *kendini*_i ihbar edeceğini] söyledi.

Ahmet himself that.he.will.denounce told
'Ahmet said that (he) will denounce himself.'

b. Ahmet_i [PRO_i *kendine*_i bir takım elbise almak] istiyor.

Ahmet himself a suit to.buy wants
'Ahmet wants to buy a suit for himself.'

c. Ahmet_i [pro_m *kendine*_i bir takım elbise almamı] istiyor.⁹

Ahmet himself a suit to.buy wants
'Ahmet wants me to buy a suit for himself.'

In (10a-c) above, the embedded verbs are nominalized with the nominalization morphemes *-(y)AcAK*, *-mAK* and *-mA* respectively. In all of the examples, *kendi* occurs in the complement position of the nominalized verb. Note also that *kendisi* is also available in these contexts with reflexive interpretation alongside a pronominal one. In (10a) *kendi* is bound by *pro*, and in (10b) PRO which occur in the subject position of the embedded clause. One can conclude from this discussion that *pro* and PRO in Turkish can antecede the reflexive in the complement position hence the structures are grammatical.

However, this explanation falls short when we consider the complement clauses with *-mA* in (10c) where the reflexive pronoun in the second complement position of the embedded clause seems to be bound by *pro* in the subject position within its local domain. However,

⁹ The grammaticality of this example is subject to the dialect split. Dialect A finds the use of *kendi* in these contexts also in (12b) ungrammatical and prefers *kendisi* instead of *kendi*. According to Dialect B, both forms are grammatical in these positions, but *kendisi* is more easily accepted than *kendi*.

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 5/4 Fall 2010*

pro in the embedded subject position is licensed by the first person agreement marker on the embedded predicate, a clear mismatch between the ϕ -features of the reflexive and *pro* subject. Hence, we expect the structure to be ungrammatical which is contrary to what we observe.

kendi in (10c) might not be a true anaphor in that it behaves in the same way as a regular pronominal expression. Therefore, there are two *kendis* in Turkish in that the first one behaves like a true anaphor and the latter behaves like a pronoun. Moreover, one can argue that in Dialect B *kendi* in (10c) is like *kendisi* in Dialect A. Note that this explanation finds support when we consider the fact that *kendi* can be substituted with a regular pronominal in this context. Consider the example below.

- (11) Ahmet_i [pro_k ona_i bir takım elbise almamı] istiyor.
 Ahmet him a suit to.buy wants
 ‘Ahmet wants me to buy a suit for him.’

Note that in (11) the pronominal expression *o* (he/she/it) is bound by the subject of the matrix clause, hence grammatical as the Condition B predicts. This shows that the anaphor like expression *kendi* in (10c) is not a true anaphor but a pronominal expression. That is to say, Condition A is not violated in (10c) since there is no context for it to apply.

However, I point out that this substitution is not always the case and the explanation falls short when we consider *kendi* within a postpositional phrase. A number of postpositions such as *için* ‘for’ in Turkish check genitive case on their complement NPs if the NP is a pronominal expression. We observe this in (12a) below where the pronominal expression *o* (he/she/it) is inflected with the genitive marker. However, *kendi* in the same position cannot be inflected with the genitive case as has already been observed by Kornfilt (1997:303).

- (12) a. Ali_i [pro_k [*o/onun_i için] bir paket sigara almamı_k] istedi.
 Ali for.him a.box.of.cigarette to.buy wanted
 ‘Ali wanted me to buy a box of cigarette for him.’

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
 and History of Turkish or Turkic
 Volume 5/4 Fall 2010*

b. Ali_i [pro_k[**kendinin*/*kendi*_i için] bir paket sigara almamı]
 Ali for.himself a.box.of.cigarette to.buy
 istedi.
 wanted
 ‘Ali wanted me to buy a box of cigarette for himself.’

I propose that the grammaticality contrast above is problematic if we assume that *kendi* behaves in the same way as pronominal expressions. If it were the case, we would not expect the contrast above.¹⁰ Note also that *kendisi* can also occur in these positions. This raises the question why we have another anaphoric expression *kendisi* in the same position if *kendi* is actually a pronominal expression rather than an anaphoric one? Recall that *kendisi* can be interpreted as both anaphoric and pronominal. In the anaphoric case, it is interpreted with the matrix subject while in the pronominal case it is interpreted with the matrix subject and a third party, just in the same way as a true personal pronoun. Thus, it seems that it is *kendisi* rather than *kendi* which has a dual status with respect to anaphoric versus pronominal interpretation.

Another important point in (12b) is that in Dialect B *kendi* in the complement position of the postposition is bound by a non-local antecedent, the subject of the matrix clause. This is an unexpected case for Condition A, yet the structure is grammatical. Be it due to the absence of a Condition A like condition on the distribution of anaphors in Turkish or not, the data show us that we are dealing with a different sense of distributional variation between pronouns and anaphors in Turkish.

The discussion above leaves us with three alternative statements suggested to me by Aslı Göksel (p.c): (i) the local domain

¹⁰ It can also be noted that *kendi-nin* may be a shortened form of *kendisi-nin* which needs a genitive head. Moreover, the form *kendi-nin* is not observed at all. However Kornfilt (1997:304) observes that the form *kendi-GEN* is available in the following context:

(i)bu kitap kendi-m-in-ki-dir
 this book self-1.sg.-Gen.-Poss.Pr/Rel.Cl.-Ep.Cop.
 ‘This book is the one which is my own’

Kornfilt (1997:304) Example (1087)

In (i) above the reflexive form is inflected with a genitive suffix followed by pronominal ‘-ki’ suffix. Note also that *kendi* in this context does not behave in the same way as pronouns. It has long been observed in Turkish that first person pronouns are inflected with genitive suffix in an irregular way (‘-im’ instead of ‘-in’). However, first person possessive inflected *kendi* as *kendi-m* is regularly inflected further with the genitive suffix (*kendim-in* instead of **kendim-im*).

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
 and History of Turkish or Turkic
 Volume 5/4 Fall 2010*

in Turkish is differently observed, (ii) there is no reflexive in Turkish, and (iii) there are reflexives, but reflexives can be bound non-locally.

Let us take the first option. If the local domain for the reflexive is not TP or CP, what is it? Can the minimal domain for the reflexives be DP? The D head licenses a *pro* in its Spec position and the reflexive sits in N head position. This might be motivated by the presence of the agreement marker on the reflexive form. Thus, the local domain for the reflexive is DP where all the grammatical functions are realized. However, the possible antecedent for the reflexive is outside of this local domain. To solve this problem, let us assume that *pro* in Spec-DP position assumes all the features of the antecedent, hence the reflexive in the N head is bound locally. The reflexive is interpreted with its antecedent via a pronominal chain. This explanation causes problems. First, it is not economical in that it needs to assume a DP projection which is problematic for many reasons (See Öztürk 2005, but Arslan 2006 for the opposite view). Second, if we are to make use of a pronominal chain whose tail is realized as *pro* and head as the antecedent, why do we need reflexives in our syntax? What is the nature of intermediary *pro*? Does it need its own local domain in order to be licensed as a pronominal? These are open questions for this alternative.

A similar hypothesis would be to assume that the local domain for the reflexives is extended to the matrix clause. Since the binding domain is the matrix clause, the reflexive in the subordinate clause can easily be bound by its antecedent in the matrix clause without violating Binding theory Condition A. I propose that this option does not work for a number of reasons. First of all, there are reflexives in Turkish which are bound by a syntactic category other than the subject as shown in the example (8). The definition of local domain would still be problematic for the reflexives which are bound in a domain where there is no subject. Second, extending the binding domain to the matrix clause would be problematic for the claim that subordinate clauses are opaque domains for binding. Third, this option requires a number of stipulations about the conditions which require the extension of the binding domain into the matrix clauses. Under what conditions is the binding domain extended to the matrix clause and under what conditions it is not? Recall that *kendi* in an embedded clause can be bound both by the matrix subject and the embedded subject in Dialect B. What would be the binding domain in this case? Given that different results are obtained in similar instances of reflexivization, i.e. binding *kendi*, extending the binding domain into the matrix clause would fail to account for the distributional facts.

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 5/4 Fall 2010*

Thus, I propose that this option does not work for the facts we observed so far.

Second, let us take the ‘no reflexive’ option. This makes us consider the possibility of licensing reflexives with a special verbal morphology. Hence, the reflexive interpretation is mediated by the verbal morphology and the reflexives are just PF inserted items. If the complement position of the verb is empty, interpret it with the subject and fill the slot with a form *kendi* at PF. This option has problems too. First, recall that verb heads in Turkish do not carry agreement morphemes for their complements. Since there is ϕ -feature agreement between the antecedent and the reflexive, we need extra stipulations about how PF inserts the agreement markers to the empty slot in the clause structure. Second, taking reflexives out of the narrow syntax and putting them into the PF component would require LF transparency given that reflexives might contribute to the sentence meaning. Third, PF insertion can easily be extended to null object constructions and predicts all null arguments to be anaphoric in nature. This is contrary to what we observe in cases of null object constructions.

The third option seems to be the most representative for our data. There are reflexives in Turkish, but they can be bound non-locally. In this alternative, the reflexive is merged with its antecedent which is an empty operator. The empty operator moves to an A'-position and the reflexive strands, similar to resumptives (cf. Boeckx 2003, 2008). Meral (2010) proposes that reflexives in Turkish are licensed (bound) via a type of resumptive chain where the empty operator licenses the reflexive item inside the clause.

Let us continue with other contexts where the form *kendi* is bound across its own clause. *kendi* can be bound by a matrix subject while it occurs in a complement clause which involves a postpositional phrase. Consider (13a-c).¹¹

- (13) a. Ali_i [pro_k [*kendine*_i bađlı] olmamızı]
 istiyor.
 Ali to.himself to.be.loyal wants
 ‘Ali wants us to be loyal to him.’

¹¹ (13a) is grammatical according to both dialects. (13b-c) are grammatical for Dialect B, but not for Dialect A.

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
 and History of Turkish or Turkic
 Volume 5/4 Fall 2010*

b. Ben [herkesin_k [*kendime*_i bağlı] olmasını] istiyorum.
 I everyone to.myself to.be.loyal want
 ‘I want everyone to be loyal to me.’

c. Sen_i [herkesin [*kendine*_i bağlı] olmasını] istiyorsun.
 you everyone to.yourself to.be.loyal want
 ‘You want everyone to be loyal to you.’

The availability of *kendi* in this context shows that it can be bound across its own clause, i.e. it can be bound non-locally. This is intended to remark that the distribution of *kendi* and personal pronouns might not follow from Binding theory conditions.

One can argue that the nominalized complement clauses with *-mA* allow long distance binding of an anaphoric expression since they are not factive clauses (Kornfilt 2004). However, *kendi* can also be bound by an antecedent outside of its local domain in factive clauses which are nominalized with *-DIK*. Consider the example below.

(14) Ali_i [Ahmet’in_k *kendine*_{kT} güldüğünü] sandı.
 Ali Ahmet to.himself that.he.laughes thought
 ‘Ali thought that Ahmet has laughed at himself.’

Note that *kendi* in (14) can be bound by the matrix subject although a lexical NP is present in the embedded subject position. We argue that the grammaticality of this example indicates another problematic aspect of the Condition A: *kendi* is not a reflexive, but the same example shows that it cannot be a pronoun either. Thus, it does not fall into the types that are analyzed within the binding conditions.

In the discussion above, we have focused on the fact that anaphors can be bound outside of their local domain. However, there is one more point to make for the examples above. Recall that the Binding theory requires anaphors and pronouns to be in complementary distribution. In other words, they cannot occur in each other’s environment. However, our discussion concludes that this is too strong for Turkish in that anaphors can occur in pronominal environments (examples in 12-14). Let us now examine the relative clauses in light of Condition A.

3.2.2. Relative clauses

Relative clauses are structures where the different distributional facts of *kendi* and *kendisi* are realized. That is to say, while *kendi* cannot act as a resumptive pronoun, *kendisi* can do so as noted earlier. However, consider the example below where *kendi*

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
 and History of Turkish or Turkic
 Volume 5/4 Fall 2010*

occurs in the complement position of the relativized verb and interpreted with the head noun.

- (15) [_i *Kendini*_i seven] adam_i
 himself who.loves man
 ‘The man_i who loves himself_i’

In (15) *kendi* occurs in the complement position of the relativized verb. It is not a resumptive pronoun given that it does not occur in the relativization site. *kendi* in this example seems to be bound by an empty category in the subject position of the relative clause since the structure is a subject relativization example. Assuming that the empty category is in Spec-TP/AspP position, a resumptive pronoun counterpart of the empty category is expected to bind *kendi*, but this is not possible. Consider (16a-b) below.

- (16) a. * [_i *Kendisi*_i *kendini*_i seven] adam_i
 himself himself that.he.loves man
 ‘The man_i who (he_i) loves himself_i’

- b. [_i *Kendisi*_i hazırlanan programdan memnun kalan] Pamuk_i¹²
 himself that.prepared program be.happy
 Pamuk
 ‘Pamuk, who was happy about the prepared program’

(16a) shows that a true resumptive pronoun in the subject position cannot bind *kendi* in the complement position.¹³ As in the

¹² I thank Meltem Keleşir for providing me this example.

¹³ It can also be pointed out that the ungrammaticality of this example shows that the resumptive pronoun is not syntactically active since it cannot bind the reflexive from the subject position. A similar example is given in (i) below.

- (i) * [_i *Kendisine*_i *kendini*_i] anlat-tığ-ım adam_i
 to.himself himself that.I.told man
 ‘The man I told him about him.’

In (i) above, the resumptive pronoun in the second complement position cannot bind the reflexive. However, there are examples which constitute counter-evidence for our claim. Consider (ii).

- (ii) [_i *Kendisi*_i dün akşam meyhanede sarhoş olup kendin-i rezil eden] adam_i
 himself last.night in.the.pub be.drunk himself humiliated man
 ‘The man who (he) became drunk and humiliated himself in the bar.’

In (ii) the resumptive pronoun in the subject position seems to be able to bind the reflexive in the complement position of the relativized verb. I propose that the availability of (ii) results from the distance between the two pronominal items. That is to say, it is the distance between the resumptive *kendisi* and reflexive pronoun *kendi* which makes the structure available rather than the licensing capacity of the

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
 and History of Turkish or Turkic
 Volume 5/4 Fall 2010*

case of overt pronouns in the embedded subject position, a resumptive pronoun in the subject position cannot bind *kendi*. Recall that covert categories such as *pro*, PRO and *ec* can bind *kendi* but not overt categories.

The implications for Binding theory raise some questions. First, assuming that *kendi* is bound by the *ec* in the subject position of (15), why can an *ec* bind the reflexive pronoun while a pronominal expression (resumptive) in the same position cannot do so in (16a) even though the latter has ϕ -feature agreement with *kendi*? Moreover, the resumptive in (16a) is interpreted as the subject of the relative clause. Second, assuming that *kendi* is bound by the head noun in (15), why would an *ec* in the subject position, hence within a relative clause domain (CP) not do it although it is closer to *kendi*? Third, assuming that *kendi* is bound by the empty operator in the C domain, would binding from an A'-position (Spec-CP) not be problematic for Binding theory? These questions raise problems for Condition A. Meral (2010) argues that the last question above has implications on binding phenomenon in Turkish in that binding is actually an A'-phenomenon by which a reflexive is bound by an empty operator in the C domain. Note that Meral's analysis predicts that reflexives are of variable nature. Indeed this prediction is borne out given that (16a) is ungrammatical and this ungrammaticality can be analyzed as an example of strong crossover effects which variables exhibit when a pronoun c-commands the trace of its antecedent. In (16a) the resumptive pronoun *kendisi* c-commands the trace of its antecedent which is the empty operator in the C domain.

3.2.3. ECM Clauses

Another context where Condition A is violated in Turkish comes with the possibility of anaphor binding into an ECM clause. I propose that ECM clauses have a C domain too. This implies that ECM clauses must be opaque domains for binding; hence the binding of an anaphor is not expected to be available as noted by Özsoy (2001). However, this is not what we observe in ECM clauses. Consider the examples below.¹⁴

resumptive. In other words, the resumptive and the reflexive forms independently occur in the structure.

¹⁴ The position of the ECM subject is a controversial issue. Following Aygen (2002), Meral (2005), Öztürk (2005), Oded (2006) and contra Zidani-Eroğlu (1997), Özsoy (2001) and Arslan (2006), I propose that the ECM subject stays in situ, i.e. it does not move to the matrix clause for case checking. See also İnce (2007) for the proposal that ECM subject is base generated in the matrix clause.

- (17) a. Ali_i [*kendini*_i İstanbul'a gidiyor] sanıyor.
 Ali himself to.Istanbul going thinks
 'Ali considers himself going to Istanbul.'
- b. Ali_i [*kendini*_i başbakan] sanıyor.
 Ali himself prime.minister thinks
 'Ali considers himself prime minister.'
- c. ?Ali_i [beni_k *kendine*_i gülüyorum_k] sandı.
 Ali me to.himself laughing thought
 'Ali considered Ahmet laughing at himself.'

All the examples in (17a-c) involve *kendi* inside the ECM clause. However, they vary with respect to the possibility of long distance binding of the anaphoric expression inside the ECM clause. In (17a) the ECM clause has a verbal predicate, and the anaphoric NP in the subject position of the ECM clause is bound by the matrix subject. Likewise, in (17b) the anaphoric subject of the ECM clause with a non-verbal predicate is bound by the matrix subject. However, in (17c) the anaphoric expression in the complement position of the ECM verb is bound by the matrix subject. The discussion concludes that ECM clauses are another contexts where an anaphor is bound outside of its own local domain.

3.2.4. Adjunct Clauses

In this section, we focus on the examples where the matrix subject binds the anaphoric expression inside the adjunct clauses. We argue that Condition A is problematic in terms of the grammaticality of the examples which involves binding into adjunct clauses. Consider the example below.

- (18) Ali_i [PRO_i *kendini*_i aynada görünce] şaşırdı.
 Ali himself in.the.mirror when.he.saw surprised
 'Ali was surprised when he saw himself in the mirror.'

In (18) the anaphoric expression within the adjunct clause is bound by the matrix clause. Assuming that the adjunct clause is a CP which constitutes a domain for binding, the structure should be ungrammatical in accordance with Condition A. However, the structure is grammatical, contrary to what Condition A predicts.

One possible argument for (18) is that there is PRO in the subject position of the adjunct clause which acts as an antecedent for the anaphoric expression, hence *kendi* is bound in its governing domain. I propose that this position is not filled by PRO, but an empty category which is interpreted as bound variable.

Turkish Studies

3.2.5. VP Ellipsis structures

This section argues that the ellipsis structures provide another support for the fact that anaphors can be bound outside of their local domain. Consider the example (19) below where the second occurrence of the verb is elided with its complement.

- (19) Ahmet_i kendini_i [Mehmet'ten_k *ec*_{i/k} daha iyi] savunuyor.
 Ahmet himself from.Mehmet better defenses
 'Ahmet defends himself better than Mehmet did.'

In (19) there is an elided part in the comparative clause with a null NP in the complement position of the elided material. Note that the null object in this structure receives both sloppy and strict identity readings. In the sloppy identity reading, the *ec* is interpreted as a pronominal. In the strict identity reading, on the other hand, it is interpreted as an anaphor. Note also that the complement position of the first clause involves *kendi*. This indicates that the strict identity reading of the complement in the second clause must be in a local relationship with the antecedent in the matrix subject position. However, the local domain of the null reflexive in the second clause does not include the antecedent. Thus, *kendi* in the first clause cannot be explained by Condition A.

One possible counterargument to the analysis proposed above is to assume that the null NP in the elided part is not of the anaphoric expression but of a pronominal category. Thus, the pronominal is bound outside of its local domain as predicted by Condition B. However, we note that both sloppy and strict identity readings are available for the null NP in the elided part. The sloppy identity reading of the null NP will be problematic for Condition B in that it must not be bound within its local domain. However, if it is a reflexive pronoun, no problems arise with respect to Condition B.

4. *kendi* in other contexts

This section discusses the form *kendi* in other grammatical contexts. We point out that *kendi* has a number of other functions in Turkish besides its reflexive function and it can be bound across its minimal domain in these functions too.

4.1. Emphatic function of *kendi*

Another use of *kendi* is its emphatic use given in (20). In its emphatic use, it can be co-indexed with the subject or the object of the sentence.

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
 and History of Turkish or Turkic
 Volume 5/4 Fall 2010*

- (20) Ahmet_i okula *kendi_i* gitti.
 Ahmet to.school himself went
 ‘Ahmet went to school by himself.’

In (20) *kendi* emphasizes the subject *Ahmet* denoting the way the subjects did the action of going. In (20) *kendi* can be interpreted as ‘the subject has done the action alone’ or ‘the subject is not taken to the school by someone else’. Note that the emphatic *kendi* does not participate in the argument structure of the predicate. It functions as the adverbial in the sentence and can be interchangeably used with the other adverbials with the same function. This is illustrated in (21a-c) below. But *kendi* can co-occur with the other adverbials given that it is used with intransitive verbs.

- (21) a. Ahmet_i toplantıya *kendi_i* gitti.
 Ahmet to.meeting himself went
 ‘Ahmet went to the meeting by himself.’

- b. Ahmet_i parayı *kendi_i bizzat* verdi.
 Ahmet money himself gave
 ‘Ahmet gave the money by himself.’

- c. Ahmet_i toplantıya *kendi_i şahsen* gitti.
 Ahmet to.meeting himself went
 ‘Ahmet went to the meeting by himself.’

In (21a) *kendi* occurs in a position which can also be filled by other adverbials with the same function as exemplified in (21b-c). Another property of the adverbial use of *kendi* is that it can target an inanimate antecedent. Consider (22).

- (22) Radyoyu ben bozmadım, *kendi* (*kendine*) bozulmuş.
 radio
 I did.not.break itself broken
 ‘I did not break the radio, it appears that it, itself is broken.’

4.2. Adjectival Function of *kendi*

Göksel & Kerlake (2005:264) point out that the bare form of *kendi* can be used as an adjectival modifier of a possessive marked NP. In this case, *kendi* means *own* and is not inflected with person or case morphemes. (23) below from Göksel & Kerlake (2005:264) example (14) shows the adjectival modifier use of *kendi*.

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
 and History of Turkish or Turkic
 Volume 5/4 Fall 2010*

(23) Semra Elif'e *kendi* anahtar-lar-ın-ı vermiş
 own key-pl-3sg.poss-acc
 'Semra gave Elif her own keys.'

In (23) *kendi* modifies the NP *key* and can be anteceded by both *Semra* and *Elif* in the sentence.

4.3. Logophoric Function of *kendi*

We propose that the bare form of *kendi* has a further function in that it expresses logophoricity in certain contexts. This use of *kendi* is identical with the adjectival modifier function of *kendi* in structural terms. That is, *kendi* as logophor occurs in the same environment as the adjunct *kendi*. However, its interpretation is different.

Some languages such as West African languages, Chinese and Japanese have been observed to have logophoric pronouns in the literature. With respect to their interpretation, logophors have been defined as 'pronouns implying a sort of *de se* reading i.e. self awareness' in Safir (2004). In Turkish, *kendi* is used as a logophor in certain cases. Consider (24).

(24) Ali bütün bunların *kendi* hatası olduğunu kabul ediyor.
 Ali all these his.own.fault to.be accepts
 'Ali accepts all these things to be his own fault.'

kendi in (24) expresses self awareness in that the subject of the sentence *Ali* is aware of his own faults. Note that *kendi* in (23) and in (24) are different with respect to their presence in the sentence. Although adjectival modifier *kendi* can be dropped in the structure, *kendi* as logophor cannot be. This is shown in (25a-b).

(25) a. Semra Elif'e anahtarlarını vermiş.
 Semra.Elif her.keys gave
 'Semra gave her own keys.'

b. ?*Ali bütün bunların hatası olduğunu kabul ediyor.
 Ali all.these his.own.fault to.be accepts
 'Ali accepts all these things as his faults.'

In (25a) adjectival modifier *kendi* is dropped and the structure is still grammatical. However, in (25b) the deletion of the logophor *kendi* causes ungrammaticality or at least the structure is semantically awkward. This shows that *kendi* in the two contexts are different.

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
 and History of Turkish or Turkic
 Volume 5/4 Fall 2010*

5. General discussion

We have shown in the previous sections that Condition A causes problems in explaining the distributional facts of reflexives. The discussion on anaphor binding across clauses reveals that classical Condition A is problematic for Turkish at least for its definition of ‘binding domain’. Turkish seems to have a pronominal system with binding conditions different from English. *kendi* and *kendisi* have different distributional requirements and functions from the reflexives in English. Thus, they do not seem to be like typical reflexives at all.

Another important aspect of Binding theory is the complementarity observed between pronouns and anaphors in a number of languages. That is to say, Binding theory conditions A and B require complementary distribution between where the pronoun is blocked and where the anaphor is licensed and vice versa. However, there are positions where the pronoun and the anaphor can occur together in Turkish. Consider the example in (26a-b).

(26) a. [Ali ile Veli]_i *birbirlerinin*_i resimlerini aldılar.
Ali and Veli each other’s picture took
‘Ali and Veli exchanged each other’s pictures.’

b. [Ali ile Veli]_i *pro*_i resimlerini_i aldılar.
Ali and Veli their.pictures took
‘Ali and Veli took their pictures.’

In (26a) the anaphor occurs where the *pro* is assumed to occur in (26b). Note that both structures are grammatical contrary to what Condition A and B predict. This shows that pronouns and anaphors can occur in each other’s environments, a fact showing the lack of pronoun-anaphor complementarity in Turkish.

Following Hornstein (2006:49), I propose that this results from the fact that Binding principles are morpheme specific in that the conditions are assumed to explain the particular property of a linguistic expression (morpheme) in a particular structure. If we consider pronominals in Turkish, one can reach a clear understanding of what Hornstein (2006) tries to argue for. Hornstein (2006) notes that the distribution of only a subset of pronouns is explained by Condition B, those which are bound/referential pronouns. There are many different types of pronouns which are exempt from the Binding theory: resumptives, expletives, deictic pronouns and intrusive pronouns. Looking from that angle, pronouns in Turkish seem a bit more complicated. Only personal pronouns in matrix clauses with the

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 5/4 Fall 2010*

antecedent outside of the sentence are correctly predicted by Condition B. Consider (27) where *kendisi* seems to be bound by more than one linguistic expression.

- (27) Ali_i Ahmet'e_k [Ayşe'nin_m kendisini_{i/k/m} sevdiğini] söyledi.
 Ali to.Ahmet Ayşe him/herself that.s/he.loves told
 'Ali told Ahmet that Ayşe loves him/herself.'

In this example the pronominal expression *kendisi* can take *Ali*, *Ahmet* or *Ayşe* as its antecedent. If *kendisi* is a pronoun, binding of it by the local NP *Ayşe* is an apparent violation of Condition B. If it is an anaphor, that the non-local NPs *Ali* and *Ahmet* bind the reflexive is a violation of Condition A. There is a clear violation of binding theory in either case given that a single expression has contradictory requirements to be licensed. This shows that Binding theory conditions are indeed morpheme specific as argued by Hornstein (2006) and *kendi* and *kendisi* do not seem to be categorized under taxonomic classes such as anaphor or pronominal. Thus, there seems to be no condition of Binding theory which explains the distribution of *kendisi* in (27).

I argue that both *kendi* and *kendisi* behave as variables in sentences. *kendi* is a variable which can only occur in the presence of an A'-operator. *kendisi*, on the other hand, is a multifunctional expression whose licensing differs with respect to the presence/absence of an A'-operator in the structure. In the presence of it, it acts as a variable while in the absence of it, *kendisi* acts as a deictic pronominal which takes its antecedent in the previous discourse. This implies that the licensing of these two forms is not done via morpheme specific binding conditions. Rather, the two forms are licensed via the structure where they occur in.

The discussion also pointed out the difference between *kendisi* and personal pronouns in that personal pronouns or *kendi* cannot occur in the positions where *kendisi* can do so. A typical example is given below.

- (28) a. *?Ali_i [o_i eve giderken] benim gelmemi istedi.
 Ali he to.home while.going I to.come wanted
 'Ali wanted me to come when he is going home.'

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
 and History of Turkish or Turkic
 Volume 5/4 Fall 2010*

b. Ali_i[*kendisi*_i eve giderken] benim gelmemi istedi.
 Ali himself to.home while.going I to.come wanted
 ‘Ali wanted me to come when he is going home.’

In (28a-b) personal pronoun and *kendisi* are used as the subject of the adjunct clause respectively. While the pronoun using in (28a) is ungrammatical, *kendisi* in (28b) is fine.¹⁵ This shows another contrast between personal pronouns and *kendisi*.

I argue that this is related to a general ban on the pronunciation of variables in sentences. I propose that the subject position of these clauses can be filled by a variable which is phonologically realized as *kendisi* (Note that NPs CAN occur in the embedded subject position- it is only when there is co-indexing between the subject position of the embedded clause and an NP in the higher clause that there is this restriction).

6. Conclusion

In this article I discussed the anaphoric dependencies in Turkish in light of Binding theory conditions. The main conclusion of the article is that Turkish does not have pronoun-anaphor complementarity of the sort discussed in English. The pronominal system of Turkish seems to have a three partite system where not only the distribution of the personal pronouns and anaphors, but also that of a complex pronominal expression *kendisi* is crucial for the exact nature of the pronominal system. Turkish seems to have a pronominal system where the pronouns are employed for a restrictive set of functions which includes deictic use, but excludes bound variable anaphora, *kendi* is employed for a set of functions including the

¹⁵ Some native speakers find *kendi* in (28a-b) is grammatical, a fact which is contrary to what we argue for the phonetic realization of the variable positions. I propose that the use of *kendi* in that case involves a contrastive purpose. In other words, the structure in (28b) and one with *kendi* can be argued to be structurally different. In the former case, *kendisi* sits in the subject position of the embedded clause. In the latter, on the other hand, *kendi* is interpreted a special form of an anaphor which creates a contrastive interpretation. Note that it is not purely an emphatic use of it, but seems to be a new function which, to the best of my knowledge, is not documented before. *kendi* sits in an adverbial position akin to its emphatic use and *pro* subject occurs in the subject position of the embedded clause. The contrastive function of *kendi* is more obvious in the following example.

(i) Ali_i [kendi_i kebab yerken] misafirlerine çorba içiriyordu.
 Ali himself kebab while.eating his.guests soup makes.drink
 ‘Ali made his guests drink soup while (=in contrast) he ate kebab.’

In (i) above, *kendi* contrasts the subject of the embedded verb *Ali* with the subject of the matrix verb *iç-*, *misafirlerin* ‘his guests’.

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
 and History of Turkish or Turkic
 Volume 5/4 Fall 2010*

reflexive, the bound variable, but excluding the resumptive function, and *kendisi*, as a complex pronominal expression, is employed for a set of functions which combines the functions of the former two. Thus, the pronominal system of Turkish needs a three-partite system in order to explain the distribution of these grammatical formatives.

REFERENCES

- ARSLAN, Ceyda (2006) **Case as an Uninterpretable Feature**, Boğaziçi University, Ph.D. Dissertation.
- AYGEN, Gülşat (2002) **Finiteness, Case and Clausal Architecture**, Harvard University, Ph.D. Dissertation, 2002.
- BOECKX, Cedric (2003) **Islands and Chains: Resumption as Stranding**, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam and Philadelphia.
- BOECKX, Cedric (2008) **Bare Syntax**, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2008.
- CHOMSKY, Noam (1980) "On Binding", **Linguistic Inquiry**, 11, 1-46.
- CHOMSKY, Noam (1982) **Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding**, The MIT Press, Cambridge and Mass.
- CHOMSKY, Noam (1986) **Barriers**, The MIT Press, Cambridge and Mass.
- CSATÓ, Éva Ágnes, & JOHANSON, Lars (1998) "Turkish", (Ed.) Lars Johanson & Éva Ágnes Csató, **The Turkic languages**, Routledge, London & New York, 202-235.
- DECHAIINE, R-M. & MANFREDI, V. (1994) "Binding Domains in Haitian", **Natural Language and Linguistic Theory**, 12, 203-257.
- DECHAIINE, R-M. & WILTSCHKO, M. (2002) "Decomposing Pronouns", **Linguistic Inquiry**, 33, 409-442.
- DECHAIINE, R-M. & WILTSCHKO, M. (2004) "Dissolving Condition A", GLOW, April 2004. Thessaloniki.

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 5/4 Fall 2010*

-
- ENÇ, Mürvet (1986) "Topic Switching and Pronominal Subjects in Turkish". (Ed.) D. I. Slobin, and Karl Zimmer, **Studies in Turkish Linguistics**, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, 195-208.
- ERGUVANLI-TAYLAN, Eser (1986) "Pronominal versus Zero Representation of Anaphora in Turkish", (Ed.) D. I. Slobin, and Karl Zimmer, **Studies in Turkish Linguistics**, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, 209-231.
- GÖKSEL, Asli & KERSLAKE, Celia (2005) **Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar**, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- HORNSTEIN, Norbert (2001) "Control in GB and Minimalism", Ms., University of Maryland.
- HORNSTEIN, Norbert (2006) "Pronouns in a Minimalist Setting", **University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics**, 14, 47-80.
- HUANG, Yan (2000) **Anaphora: A Cross-linguistic Study**, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- İNCE, Atakan (2007) "Direct complement clauses as Object Control Structures in Turkish", (Ed.) Erin Bainbridge & Brian Agbayani, **Proceedings of the thirty-fourth Western Conference On Linguistics**, Los Angeles, 208-221.
- KAYNE, Richard (2002) "Pronouns and their Antecedents", (Ed.) Samuel D. Epstein & T. D. Seely, **Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program**, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, 133-166.
- KORNFILT, Jaklin (1984) **Case Marking, Agreement and Empty Categories in Turkish**, Harvard University, Ph.D. Dissertation.
- KORNFILT, Jaklin (1997) **Turkish**, Routledge, London.
- KORNFILT, Jaklin (2004) "Agr in Turkish as an Expression of Categorical Features", (Ed.) Meltem Keleşir and Balkız Öztürk, **MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 52, Proceedings of the Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics II**, The MIT Press, Cambridge and Mass.
- KORNFILT, Jaklin (2007) "Verbal and Nominalized Finite Clauses in Turkish", (Ed.) I. Nikoloeva, *Finiteness: Theoretical and*

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 5/4 Fall 2010*

-
- Empirical Foundations, Oxford University Press, Oxford, **305-332**.
- KURAL, Murat (1992) "V-to-I-to-C in Turkish", (Ed.) F. Beghelli and Murat Kural, **UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics**, 1-37.
- MERAL, Hasan Mesut (2005) "On Some ECM Constructions in Turkish", Ms. Boğaziçi University.
- MERAL, Hasan Mesut (2010) **Resumption, A'- Dependencies and Implications on Clausal Architecture**, Boğaziçi University, Ph.D. Dissertation.
- ODED, İlknur (2006) **Control in Turkish**, Boğaziçi University, M.A. Thesis.
- ÖZSOY, A. Sumru (1983) **Reflexivization in Turkish: A Syntactic, Semantic and Discourse Analysis**, University of Michigan, Ph.D. Dissertation.
- ÖZSOY, A. Sumru (1984) "On the Syntactic Properties of Empty Categories", (Ed.) Ayhan Aksu-Koç, and Eser, Erguvanlı-Taylan, **Proceedings of the Turkish Linguistics Conference**, Boğaziçi University Press, Istanbul, 101-111.
- ÖZSOY, A. Sumru (2001) "On 'Small' Clauses, other 'Bare' Verbal Complements and Feature Checking in Turkish", (Ed.) Eser Erguvanlı-Taylan, **The Verb in Turkish**, John Benjamins Amsterdam and Philadelphia, 213-237.
- ÖZSOY, A. Sumru (to appear) "*Birbirleri* as an (un)-anaphor", (Ed.) Éva Ágnes Csato, Birsal Karakoç and Astrid Menz, **Turcologica, The Uppsala Meeting: The Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics**. Harrassowitz Publishing House, Wiesbaden.
- ÖZTÜRK, Balkız (2005) **Case, Referentiality and Phrase Structure**, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam and Philadelphia.
- REULAND, Eric (2001) "Primitives of Binding", **Linguistic Inquiry**, 32, 439-492.
- REULAND, Eric (2005) "Binding Conditions: How are they Derived?" (Ed.) Stefan Müller, **Proceedings of the HPSG05 Conference**. University of Lisbon.
- SAFIR, Ken (2004) **The Syntax of Anaphora**, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
-

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 5/4 Fall 2010*

SAFIR, Ken (2008) "Coconstrual and Narrow Syntax", **Syntax**, 11/3, 330-355.

Tarama Sözlüğü, Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara 1996.

ZIDANI-EROGLU, Leyla (1997) "Exceptionally Case-Marked NPs as Matrix Objects", **Linguistic Inquiry**, 28/2, 219-230.

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 5/4 Fall 2010*