

# LOCAL AND LONG-DISTANCE REFLEXIVES IN TURKISH

---

**JAKLIN KORNFILT**

*Department of Languages, Literatures,  
and Linguistics  
Syracuse University  
Syracuse, New York*

## 1. INTRODUCTION: TYPES OF MORPHOLOGICALLY FREE REFLEXIVES

Turkish has two types of reflexives: a bound morpheme, which is a verbal suffix, and a free morpheme. I will be concerned here with the free morpheme. Its shape is **kendi**, and it is inflected for person and number, agreeing in these features with its antecedent. This is illustrated in the following examples:

- (1) *Sen niye kendi -n -den nefret ed -iyor -sun?*  
you (sg.) why self -2.sg.-Abl. hate do-Pres.Pr. -2.sg.  
'Why do you hate yourself?'
  
- (2) *Biz kendi -miz -e kitap al -a -mi -yor -uz*  
we self -1.pl.-Dat. book buy -Abil. -Neg. -Pres.Pr.-1.pl.  
'We are unable to buy books for ourselves.'

As we shall see later on, however, the third-person singular can also show up in its bare form; the bare and the inflected forms of the third-person sin-

gular reflexive behave differently with respect to binding, as illustrated by the following examples.

- (3) a. *Ahmet<sub>i</sub> kendin-i<sub>i</sub> çok beğen -iyor -muş*  
 Ahmet self -Acc. very admire -Progr. -Rep.Past  
 '(They say that) Ahmet admires himself very much.'
- b. *Ahmet<sub>i</sub> kendi -sin -i<sub>i/j</sub> çok beğen -iyor -muş*  
 Ahmet self -3.sg. -Acc. very admire -Progr. -Rep.Past  
 '(They say that) Ahmet admires himself/him very much.'

Both the bare and the inflected third-person singular reflexive differ in their local binding properties from the regular pronoun, an element which cannot have a local antecedent:

- c. *Ahmet<sub>i</sub> on -u<sub>i/j</sub> çok beğen -iyor -muş*  
 Ahmet he -Acc. very admire -Progr. -Rep.Past  
 '(They say that) Ahmet admires him very much.'

Nonlocally, the bare reflexive and the pronominal differ, since the bare reflexive cannot be bound nonlocally, while the pronominal can; in turn, the pronominal cannot be locally bound:

- (4) a. *Fatma<sub>j</sub> [Ahmed -in<sub>i</sub> kendin -i<sub>i/j/k</sub> çok beğen -dig -in] -i bil -iyor*  
 Fatma Ahmet -Gen. self -Acc. very  
 admire -Ger. -3.sg. -Acc. know -Pres.Progr.  
 'Fatma<sub>j</sub> knows that Ahmet<sub>i</sub> admires self<sub>i/j/k</sub> very much.'
- b. *Fatma<sub>j</sub> [Ahmed -in<sub>i</sub> on -u<sub>i/j/k</sub> çok beğen -dig -in] -i bil -iyor*  
 Fatma Ahmet -Gen. (s)he -Acc. very  
 admire -Ger. -3.sg. -Acc. know -Pres.Progr.  
 'Fatma<sub>j</sub> knows that Ahmet<sub>i</sub> admires him/her<sub>i/j/k</sub> very much.'

On the other hand, the inflected reflexive and the pronominal appear to pattern together in their nonlocal binding properties (not, however, in their local binding properties):

- c. *Fatma<sub>j</sub> [Ahmed-in<sub>i</sub> kendi -sin -i<sub>i/j/k</sub> çok beğen -dig -in] -i bil -iyor*  
 Fatma Ahmet -Gen. self -3.sg. -Acc. very  
 admire -Ger.-3.sg.-Acc. know -Pres.Progr.  
 'Fatma<sub>j</sub> knows that Ahmet admires self<sub>i/j/k</sub> very much.'

While the uninflected reflexive (3a) in can only refer to 'Ahmet,' the inflected reflexive in (3b) can refer to either 'Ahmet' or to someone else mentioned in the discourse.

For the purpose of this chapter, it is the behavior of these two types of morphologically free reflexives that I shall mainly be interested in, and, in particular, in the properties of the inflected reflexive. The syntactic properties of non-third-person reflexive forms will be touched upon only in passing.

I claim that the inflected third-person reflexive in Turkish is actually a phrase in disguise—more specifically, it is an Agreement Phrase (AgrP) whose specifier is *pro*. That AgrP serves as the binding domain for both the reflexive and the *pro*. The reflexive is locally bound by *pro*, while *pro* is free within this domain and can therefore “pick-up” antecedents within the clause as well as outside of it, or even outside the utterance, i.e., in the discourse. I further claim that the bare reflexive is a genuine syntactic anaphor with local binding requirements, but that a stylistic level (which I call narrative style) exists, where the bare reflexive is used as a pronoun of empathy or point of view.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, I briefly illustrate and discuss complex, reduplicated reflexives which are strictly local for all speakers and in all stylistic levels, and I claim that this strict locality is due to the analysis of such reflexives, previously proposed in the literature for similar elements in other languages, as phrases which cannot undergo head movement at LF.

The chapter is organized as follows: The first section introduces the two main types of morphologically free reflexives. Section 2 discusses the differences between these two types. In the third section, the question is raised about the nature of the inflected reflexive. Two possibilities are considered: (1) that this element might be a LD-reflexive and (2) that this element might be a pronominal. The properties of the (at first glance) hybrid nature of the inflected reflexive are presented and discussed in separate subsections, and it is concluded that neither an extension of the binding domain for the inflected reflexive nor an analysis of that element as a LD-reflexive is an appropriate solution. Section 4 discusses various approaches to account for that hybrid nature. I discuss my own account in some detail, arguing for a phrasal analysis of the inflected reflexive. Section 5 discusses the properties of bare reflexives and distinguishes between a narrative stylistic level, where these elements are pronouns of empathy, versus a standard stylistic level, where the same elements are genuine syntactic, local anaphors. This characterization is further confirmed in subsection 5.2, where the bare and inflected reflexives and the overt pronoun are contrasted once again. In 5.3, some apparent counterexamples to the characterization of the bare reflexive as a locally bound anaphor are discussed, and the problem is resolved by proposing that possessor raising applies in the context of certain static predicates and certain unaccusatives. Section 6 illustrates complex, reduplicated reflexives and shows that they are strictly local. Section 7 offers the conclusions of the chapter.

## 2. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE BARE AND THE INFLECTED REFLEXIVE

For a majority dialect, the bare reflexive is locally bound in regular, nonnarrative style, as illustrated in (3). We shall talk about narrative style and some of its properties later on.

By being locally<sup>2</sup> bound, the bare reflexive in (3) is well-behaved syntactically: it obeys Binding Condition A. However, the inflected reflexive in (4) is problematic; we saw that while it can be understood as co-referential with a local antecedent, it does not have to be, since it can also refer to a nonlocal antecedent, indeed even to a discourse antecedent which is not part of the utterance. Thus, (3b) is well-formed in a discourse of the following sort:

- (5)A. *Ali, hakkında Ahmet ne düşün-üyor?*  
 Ali about Ahmet what think -Progr.  
 ‘What does Ahmet think of Ali?’
- B. *Ahmet kendi -sin -i<sub>j</sub> çok beğen -iyor -mus*  
 Ahmet self -3.sg. -Acc. very admire -Progr. -Rep.Past.  
 ‘(They say that) Ahmet admires him (i.e., Ali) very much.’

Not too surprisingly, the uninflected third-person reflexive would be ill-formed here, since it requires a local antecedent; therefore, B' is ill-formed as a reply to A, in contrast to the well-formed B; in B', the assignment of index *i* to the bare reflexive is grammatical but ill-formed in the discourse, since A is a question about Ali, not about Ahmet. Assignment of index *j*, on the other hand, is ungrammatical, due to the requirement that the bare reflexive be bound locally:

- B'. *Ahmet<sub>i</sub> kendin-i<sub>j/i</sub> çok beğen -iyor -mus*  
 Ahmet self -Acc. very admire -Progr. -Rep.Past.  
 Intended reading:  
 ‘(They say that) Ahmet admires him (i.e., Ali) very much.’

The reflexive can, of course, refer to the local antecedent ‘Ahmet’; this reading, however, is non-sensical in this particular discourse.

It is clear, then, that the reflexive which is inflected for third person is not a local anaphor. On the other hand, it is not a regular syntactic pronominal either, as I argue in the next section.

### 3. THE NATURE OF THE INFLECTED REFLEXIVE: A LD-REFLEXIVE OR A PRONOUN?

Offhand, the idea that a special form of the reflexive might actually be a syntactic pronoun in disguise is a reasonable one. As a matter of fact, it is claimed in some traditional grammars of Turkish that this form of the reflexive is a pronoun. Thus, the following quotation is typical of such claims:

**kendisi** and its plural **kendileri** are commonly employed as simple third-person pronouns with no reflexive or emphatic sense: **kendisi evde** ‘he is at home’; **kendilerini gördünüz mü** ‘have you seen them?’ (Lewis, 1985: 71)

However, if these elements were syntactic pronominals, they should be disjoint from a local antecedent. Yet, as the coindexation in (3b) shows, local binding indeed provides one of the possible interpretations for inflected third-person reflexives. Clearly, local binding is ruled out for genuine, syntactic pronominals, due to Condition B, as evidenced by the “regular” personal pronouns; (3c) illustrates this point and is repeated here as (6):

- (6) *Ahmet<sub>i</sub> on -u<sub>i/j</sub> çok beğen -iyor -mus*  
 Ahmet he -Acc. very admire -Progr. -Rep.Past.  
 ‘(They say that) Ahmet<sub>i</sub> admires him<sub>i/j</sub> very much.’

Not only do personal pronouns behave in predictable fashion locally, their syntactic behavior is predictable nonlocally, as well. In other words, these elements must be free locally, but they can be bound nonlocally. The nonlocal binder may be part of the utterance, as illustrated in (4b); (7) makes the same point:

- (7) *Ahmet<sub>i</sub> [Ali -nin<sub>j</sub> on -u<sub>i/j/k</sub> çok beğen -dig -in] -i*  
 Ahmet Ali -Gen. he -Acc. very admire -Ger.-3.sg.-Acc.  
*bil -iyor*  
 know -Progr.  
 ‘Ahmet<sub>i</sub> knows that Ali<sub>j</sub> admires him<sub>i/j/k</sub> very much.’

The nonlocal antecedent of the personal pronoun can also be a discourse antecedent. Thus, in the answer segment of the discourse in (5), a personal pronoun can be used instead of the inflected reflexive:

- (5)'A. *Ali<sub>j</sub> hakkında Ahmet ne düşün -üyor?*  
 Ali about Ahmet what think -Progr.  
 ‘What does Ahmet think of Ali?’

- B. *Ahmet on -u<sub>j</sub> çok beğen -iyor -mus*  
 Ahmet he -Acc. very admire -Progr. -Rep.Past.  
 '(They say that) Ahmet admires him (i.e. Ali) very much.'

In turn, an inflected reflexive can be used in the place of a personal pronoun in examples like (7), where a non-local antecedent is present in the utterance; this was illustrated in (4) and is further illustrated in (7)':

- (7)' *Ahmet<sub>i</sub> [Ali -nin<sub>j</sub> kendi -sin -i<sub>i/j/k</sub> çok beğen -diğ -in] -i bil -iyor*  
 Ahmet Ali -Gen. self -3.sg. -Acc. very  
 admire -Ger. 3.sg. -Acc. know -Progr.  
 'Ahmet<sub>i</sub> knows that Ali<sub>j</sub> admires him<sub>i/j/k</sub> very much.'

Descriptively speaking, we see that the inflected third-person reflexive is in complementary distribution with the corresponding personal pronoun in local contexts, while it appears to be in free variation with such a pronoun in nonlocal contexts. This descriptive fact is very difficult to capture in formal terms, for obvious reasons: If a given element is a pronominal, it has to obey Binding Condition B, which requires that the element be free in a specified domain. If that element is an anaphor, on the other hand, it has to obey Condition A, which requires that element to be bound in its binding domain (which is, in most accounts, the same domain which is relevant for Condition B, as well). The distribution of the inflected reflexive as just stated is obviously paradoxical, as long as we make the reasonable (and generally accepted) assumption that any given element has a fixed feature composition which is the same in all syntactic contexts. The inflected third-person reflexive, however, appears to have a dual nature in this respect: locally, it seems to act as an anaphor, while nonlocally, it seems to act as a pronominal.

### 3.1. The Binding Domain of Inflected Reflexives

One initial way out of this paradox might be to claim that the locality domain for binding is different for pronominals and for anaphors—or, more specifically, for certain anaphors. We saw that the uninflected as well as the inflected reflexive are, as predicted, in complementary distribution with personal pronouns in a local binding domain consisting of the minimal maximal projection that contains them and which is headed by strong AGR. Therefore, it would be misguided to give up our definition of this binding domain, at least for the uninflected reflexive and for the personal pronouns.

On the other hand, it might be the case that the inflected third-person reflexive requires a different, more extensive binding domain. Such an approach is conceptually not very appealing, because it would weaken the

explanatory power of a domain-based notion of binding that is valid for both anaphors and pronominals, while this extended binding domain would be relevant for these inflected reflexives only and would not have anything to say about any pronominal counterparts. Nevertheless, it would be useful to see if such a move introduces any insights into the syntactic nature of these inflected third-person reflexives.

### 3.2. Properties of LD-reflexives

One way out of this paradox might be to claim that the inflected third-person reflexive is a Long Distance (LD) reflexive, i.e., an anaphor which must be bound, but whose antecedent need not be contained within a limited binding domain. This would explain why these elements do behave like local anaphors, while being able to be bound long-distance, as well.

However, for this characterization not to be empty in the sense of simply giving a name to a puzzling fact, we must have clear differences between bound pronouns and LD-reflexives. I turn therefore to a discussion of LD-reflexives and their properties.

Two widely mentioned properties of LD-reflexives in the languages which have been claimed to have such elements are linked to each other in at least one account, namely, one based on LF-movement of anaphors: (1) LD-reflexives are subject-oriented (i.e. their binders must be subjects in their respective clauses); (2) LD-reflexives are monomorphemic—an observation due to Pica (1987). This latter property is seen clearly in languages which have both local and LD-reflexives. In such languages, the local anaphors are polymorphemic, while the LD-reflexives are monomorphemic.

The account in question (cf. Cole, Hermon, and Sung, 1990; Cole and Sung, 1994; Cole and Wang, 1996; Hermon, 1994) posits head movement of the LD-reflexive in LF; this movement would first target the INFL or AGR of the reflexive's own clause and would go from there to the higher INFL/AGR nodes, until it reaches the INFL/AGR of the matrix clause. The Binding Conditions are applied at LF, at which point the reflexive is locally bound. Since, in most instances, the only constituent which c-commands INFL/AGR (and thus the LF-moved reflexive) is the subject, the property of subject orientation observed with LD-reflexives becomes a consequence of this account. Another welcome consequence is the monomorphemic nature of LD-reflexives, since heads are monomorphemic. Polymorphemic reflexives, on the other hand, are viewed as nonheads, i.e., as phrasal elements. As such, they cannot undergo head movement, and therefore they cannot function as LD-reflexives; rather, they are local anaphors—a dichotomy first posited by Pica (1987).

### 3.3. The Turkish Inflected Reflexive is Not a LD-reflexive

Are the inflected third-person reflexives in Turkish LD-reflexives, then? If they are, they would pose a challenge to the generalization in Pica (1987), since they are clearly polymorphemic.

Perhaps we can get around this problem by hypothesizing that the relevant notion of being polymorphemic is not one of inflection, but one of compounding. As a matter of fact, most of the polymorphemic and locally bound anaphors mentioned in the literature consist of a sequence of free morphemes, forming compound-like entities, rather than consisting of inflected single morphemes.

It is more difficult, however, to get around the fact that the Turkish inflected third-person reflexives are not subject-oriented. Examples like (5), where, in the discourse portion of B, the inflected reflexive refers to an adjunct in A, illustrate the lack of subject-orientation very clearly. To maintain that these elements are LD-reflexives without exhibiting one of the most typical properties of such elements found in other languages would come close to emptying this characterization of any empirical content. Note, furthermore, that in the exchange of (5), the antecedent of the inflected reflexive is not even part of the same sentence. In other words, while the binder of the inflected reflexive is a discourse-antecedent, it is not a genuine syntactic antecedent of that inflected reflexive in the strict sense. Thus, the strongest condition for binding, namely c-command of the bound element by its antecedent, would obviously not hold here either. (Note also that the discourse-antecedent in this example is an adjunct.) Moreover, the lack of subject-orientation and of c-command can also be seen in examples where the antecedent of the inflected reflexive is syntactic:

- (8) [Oya -nin kendi -sin -i<sub>i</sub> beğen -me -si] Ahmed-in<sub>i</sub>  
     Oya -Gen. self -3.sg. -Acc. admire -Ger. -3.sg. Ahmet-Gen.  
     hos -un -a git-ti  
     liking -3.sg. -Dat. go-Past  
     ‘Oya’s admiring him was to Ahmet’s liking.’
- (9) a. [Oya -nin kendi -sin -i<sub>i</sub> beğen -dig̃ -i] Ahmet -çe<sub>i</sub>  
     Oya -Gen. self -3.sg. -Acc. admire-Ger.-3.sg. Ahmet-by  
     bil -in -iyor -du  
     know -Pass. -Progr. -Past  
     ‘Oya’s admiring him was known to Ahmet.’

The fact that these examples involve a psych-verb and a passive, respectively, might be interpreted to mean that the antecedent does c-command the inflected reflexive at some level of representation. Other examples where the antecedent does not c-command the inflected reflexive might be

explained away by appealing to scrambling. But such a claim would be more difficult to maintain in examples like (9b) with an object orientation, where the matrix oblique (dative) object is a possible antecedent of the inflected reflexive (and, in certain discourse contexts, might even be the only possible one):

- b. *Ali<sub>i</sub> Ahmed -e<sub>j</sub> [Selim -in<sub>k</sub> kendi -sin -i<sub>i/j/k</sub> çok  
Ali Ahmet -Dat. Selim -Gen. self -3.sg. -Acc. very  
beğen -dig̃ -in] -i söyle -di  
admire -Ger. -3.sg. -Acc. say -Past  
'Ali<sub>i</sub> told Ahmet<sub>j</sub> that Selim<sub>k</sub> admires him(self)<sub>i/j/k</sub> very much.'*

Summing up, lack of subject-orientation remains a problem. Together with examples like (5) where the antecedent is provided by the discourse alone, all of these examples conspire to show that the inflected third-person reflexive in Turkish is not subject-oriented and that it does not have to be c-commanded by its antecedent.

We said previously that the inflected reflexive behaves like a pronominal in its nonlocal domain. Yet another property otherwise found with pronominals and not with reflexives is the ability of allowing for split antecedents; this, too, is a property we find with the Turkish inflected third-person reflexives:

- (10) *Ali<sub>i</sub> Oya-ya<sub>j</sub> [Ankara-ya kendi -lerin -in<sub>i+j</sub>  
Ali Oya-Dat. Ankara-Dat. self -3.pl. -Gen.  
gönder-il -eceğ -in] -i söyle -di  
send -Pass. -Fut. -3.sg. -Acc. tell -Past  
'Ali told Oya that THEY<sup>3</sup> would get sent to Ankara.'*

Summing up, then, we see that the inflected third-person reflexives in Turkish are neither genuine anaphors nor LD-reflexives.<sup>4</sup> While they do appear to have anaphoric properties, this is confined to local domains. Outside of that domain, they exhibit pronominal properties. We are back, then, to our initial dilemma of how to best give a formal account of one and the same element's different binding properties according to its binding domain.

## 4. ELEMENTS OF A THIRD (OR FOURTH?) KIND

### 4.1. Underdetermined Binding Features

Before offering my own solution to this dilemma, I would like to discuss one proposal for analyzing an element with similar binding properties in an-

other language, namely, Singapore Malay. Cole and Hermon (1998) discuss the element *dirinya*. This, too, is an element which behaves like an anaphor locally and as a pronominal nonlocally. Cole and Hermon treat this as an element whose features with respect to Binding Theory are underdetermined. The element *dirinya* takes on the values of an anaphor, i.e., [+ anaphoric, –pronominal], in a local domain, i.e., if its antecedent is contained within its local domain. If its antecedent is outside of the local binding domain of *dirinya*, the element takes on the values of a pronominal, i.e., it becomes [–anaphoric, + pronominal].

This proposal would, by and large, account for the Turkish facts. However, I would like to propose a different account—not for *dirinya*, which is, incidentally, also inflected (*diri* + *nya* ‘self + 3rd poss.’), but for the Turkish counterpart. (The question of whether my account for the Turkish inflected reflexive can carry over to *dirinya* is left open here, but future research on this topic should be conducted.) This alternative account is discussed in the following section.

#### 4.2. The Inflected Reflexive: A Phrase in Disguise

My proposal for solving the problem posed by the different properties of the Turkish inflected reflexive in local versus nonlocal domains is tied to the overt and strong nature of the inflectional element on the reflexive. By *strong*, I mean the fact that this agreement inflection is part of a paradigm in which every combination of the relevant φ-features (which are, for Turkish, person and number) has a distinct overt expression, i.e., the same notion of strength which is implicated in the identification of *pro*.

I assume here that the overt agreement element is the head of an Agreement Phrase (AgrP) whose specifier is the phonologically empty pronominal *pro*. The reflexive is locally bound *within* the AgrP, and its binder is the *pro*. This is in parallel to possessive DPs which are also headed by an overt Agr inflection and can have a variety of specifiers, with *pro* being one of the possibilities. A few representative examples for such possessive phrases, all of which I analyze as AgrPs,<sup>5</sup> follow:

- (11) *Ali -nin arabə -si*  
Ali -Gen. car -3.sg.  
'Ali's car'
  
- (12) *on -un arabə -si*  
s/he -Gen. car -3.sg.  
'His/her car'

- (13) pro *araba -si*  
           car     -3.sg.  
           '[His/her] car'

I claim, then, that the structure of the inflected third-person reflexive is similar to that of the possessive phrase in (13):

- (14) pro *kendi -si*  
           self   -3.sg.  
           '[His/her] self (i.e. himself/herself)'

The binding domain relevant for both the reflexive and the pronominal in (14) is the AgrP itself, since it is headed by a strong Agr element. In making this claim, I follow Kornfilt (1984, 1987, 1988) and related work, in which this claim included embedded clauses and possessive phrases. Here, I am extending it to the inflected reflexive element. As mentioned, I assume that the reflexive is locally bound, in conformity with Condition A, within the AgrP. The pronominal specifier is obviously free within that same domain; thus, Condition B is not violated.<sup>6</sup>

The antecedent of the pronominal specifier (i.e., of *pro*), if that pronominal is bound, can be in the same clause, but it can also be outside the clause, or even in the discourse. It is in the nature of a pronominal to be able to pick up binders in a variety of domains. What looks, then, like local binding of the inflected reflexive in examples like (4) (under the coreferential reading with a “clause-mate”), is actually one of the various possibilities for the pronominal to acquire a binder outside of its own local binding domain, i.e., outside of the AgrP that includes the reflexive.<sup>7</sup>

In such a constellation, i.e., one where the inflected reflexive appears to be locally bound within the clause (I would like to call this apparent binding a sort of “indirect binding,” since it would be a consequence of the fact that it is actually the pronominal that is bound by the “clause-mate”—but not “domain-mate”—antecedent), it appears that the inflected third-person reflexive and the bare, uninflected reflexive are in free variation:

Direct binding of the bare reflexive:

- (15) a. *Ahmet<sub>i</sub> bu kitab -i kendin-e<sub>i</sub> al -di*  
           Ahmet this book -Acc.self   -Dat. buy -Past  
           ‘Ahmet bought this book for himself.’

- (16) a. *Ahmet<sub>i</sub> ayna -da kendin-i<sub>i</sub> gör-dü*  
           Ahmet mirror -Dat. self -Acc. see-Past  
           ‘Ahmet saw himself in the mirror.’

Indirect binding of the inflected reflexive:<sup>8</sup>

- (15) b. *Ahmet<sub>i</sub> bu kitab-<sub>i</sub> [pro<sub>i</sub> kendi -sin -e<sub>i</sub>] al -di*  
 Ahmet this book-Acc. self -3.sg. -Dat. buy -Past  
 ‘Ahmet bought this book for himself.’
- (16) b. *Ahmet<sub>i</sub> ayna -da [pro<sub>i</sub> kendi -sin -i<sub>j</sub>] gör -dü*  
 Ahmet mirror -Dat. self -3.sg. -Acc. see -Past  
 ‘Ahmet saw himself in the mirror.’

However, while the binding facts are the same for the a.-sentences and the b.- sentences, it is not fully correct to say that these examples are in free variation. In such situations, the bare reflexive is preferred by most speakers. This might be due to a “squishy” preference of the pronominal to find its binder not “too close” in the syntactic structure. What is important for our purposes at this point is that the coreferential reading with the “local” antecedent is possible for the inflected reflexive as well as for the bare reflexive. However, in the account here, this similarity is superficial. The coreference of the bare reflexive with the clause-mate binder is due to Condition A, while the well-formed binding of the inflected reflexive is an artifact; it is its pronominal “possessor” which happens to be bound by that same antecedent. As we said before, this does not lead to a violation of Condition B, since the relevant binding domain for this pronominal is its AgrP, which “protects” it from such a violation.

Note that this analysis predicts straightforwardly and without taking recourse to any ad hoc stipulations that the bare reflexive cannot be bound by an antecedent outside its binding domain, namely, the sentence, while the inflected reflexive can be so bound:

Bare reflexives:

- (15) c. \**Ahmet<sub>i</sub> bu kitab -i kendin-e<sub>j</sub> al -di*  
 Ahmet this book -Acc. self -Dat. buy -Past  
 Intended reading: ‘Ahmet<sub>i</sub> bought this book for him<sub>j</sub> (i.e., someone mentioned in the discourse).’
- (16) c. \**Ahmet<sub>i</sub> ayna -da kendin-i<sub>j</sub> gör-dü*  
 Ahmet mirror-Dat. self -Acc. see-Past  
 Intended reading: ‘Ahmet<sub>i</sub> saw him<sub>j</sub> (i.e., someone mentioned in the discourse) in the mirror.’

Inflected reflexives:

- (15) d. *Ahmet<sub>i</sub> bu kitab-<sub>i</sub> [pro<sub>i</sub> kendi -sin -e<sub>j</sub>] al -di*  
 Ahmet this book-Acc. self -3.sg. -Dat. buy -Past  
 ‘Ahmet<sub>i</sub> bought this book for him<sub>j</sub> (i.e., someone mentioned in the discourse).’

- (16) d. *Ahmet<sub>i</sub> ayna -da [proj kendi -sin -i<sub>j</sub>] gör-dü*  
 Ahmet mirror-Dat. self -3.sg. -Acc. see-Past  
 'Ahmet<sub>i</sub> saw him<sub>j</sub> (i.e., someone mentioned in the discourse) in  
 the mirror.'

The ungrammaticality of the examples in (15c) and (16c) is due to violations of Condition A, while the grammaticality of (15d) and (16d) is due to the fact that *pro*, the pronominal specifier of the AgrP, can pick up an antecedent anywhere, as long as that antecedent is outside of the AgrP. Thus, it is that pronominal that determines the distribution of the inflected reflexive, and all the pronominal properties of the inflected reflexive are thus predicted.<sup>9</sup>

#### 4.3. Empirical Support for the Phrasal Analysis: Other Possessive Phrases

Additional empirical support for preferring this analysis of the Turkish inflected reflexive over one that posits underdetermined binding features is due to the fact that the inflected reflexive can also show up with an overt "possessor":

- (17) *[Ahmed -in<sub>i</sub> kendi -sin -i<sub>j</sub>] gör-dü -m*  
 Ahmet -Gen. self -3.sg. -Acc. see-Past -1.sg.  
 'I saw Ahmet himself.'
- (18) *kitab-i [Ahmed -in<sub>i</sub> kendi -sin -e<sub>j</sub>] ver -di -m*  
 book-Acc. Ahmet -Gen. self -3.sg. -Dat. give-Past -1.sg.  
 'I gave the book to Ahmet himself.'

The binding facts concerning the inflected reflexive here are just as I posited them before: the reflexive is bound locally, by the specifier of the AgrP. The only difference between these examples and all the previous examples involving inflected reflexives is that here, the specifier of the AgrP is an R-expression, while in the previous examples, that specifier was a pronominal, i.e., *pro*. What is important, however, is that the phrasal structure I posited for the inflected reflexive does, in fact, exist overtly.

One interesting question that arises at this point in the discussion is whether the specifier of such AgrPs can be an overt pronoun.

Such examples are possible, but they are marginal:

- (19) *?kitab -i [on -un<sub>i</sub> kendi -sin -e<sub>j</sub>] ver -di -m*  
 book -Acc. he -Gen. self -3.sg. -Dat. give-Past -1.sg.  
 'I gave the book to him himself'

The reason the overt pronoun is awkward and marginal here (while not being totally ungrammatical) is due to something like an "Avoid Pronoun"

principle of the kind first proposed in Chomsky (1981) and later adapted to Turkish in Kornfilt (1984, 1987, 1988, and 1991). This is not a fully formal principle, but rather a functional one; it says that in positions where a phonologically empty pronominal, i.e., *pro*, is licensed, an overt pronominal will either be ungrammatical (or disjoint in reference from a potential antecedent) or, at best, marginal. As a matter of fact, this marginality of the overt pronominal specifier deteriorates to full ungrammaticality in smaller domains:

- (20) \*Ahmet<sub>i</sub> kitab-<sub>i</sub> [on -un<sub>i</sub> kendi -sin -e<sub>i</sub>] al -di  
 Ahmet book-Acc. he -Gen. self -3.sg. -Dat. buy -Past  
 Intended reading: 'Ahmet<sub>i</sub> bought the book for him<sub>i</sub> himself<sub>i</sub>'.

The domain that includes the inflected reflexive, its pronominal specifier, and the antecedent of the pronominal is the sentence in (20); thus, it is smaller than the corresponding domain in (19), where the antecedent of the pronominal specifier is in the discourse.

This deterioration in acceptability, i.e., the difference between the marginality of (19) and the full ungrammaticality of (20), may be interpreted as a problem for the analysis proposed here, since in both examples, the pronominal should be bound from outside its local binding domain which, I claim, is the AgrP and not the sentence. Therefore, whatever the explanation is for the ungrammaticality of (20), that same factor should also render (19) ungrammatical. The fact that the two differ might suggest that the ungrammaticality of (20) is due to a violation of Binding Condition B, under the assumption that the AgrP does *not* protect the pronoun and that the relevant binding domain is the sentence rather than the AgrP.

I would like to suggest here that the problem is only apparent. First of all, the difference in acceptability between (19) and (20) is small. Second, and more importantly, the distinctions we see here between overt pronouns and *pro* in terms of their binding possibilities in various domains when either type of pronominal is "in construction with" a reflexive can also be found when the two pronominal types are "in construction with" other elements. Note the following contrasts and compare them to those just discussed:

- (21) \*Ahmet<sub>i</sub> kitab -<sub>i</sub> [on -un<sub>i</sub> baba -sin -a<sub>i</sub>] al -di  
 Ahmet book -Acc. he -Gen. father -3.sg. -Dat. buy -Past  
 Intended reading: 'Ahmet<sub>i</sub> bought the book for his<sub>i</sub> father.'

This example would be acceptable under a reading where the overt pronoun and *Ahmet* are disjoint and where the pronoun has a discourse antecedent. This, then, is similar to the contrast between the examples involving overt pronouns with "agreeing" reflexives.

Note also that the reading intended in (21) is expressed by the corre-

sponding construction where the specifier of the AgrP, i.e., the “possessor,” is nonovert, i.e., is *pro*:

- (22) *Ahmet<sub>i</sub> kitab-ı [pro<sub>i</sub> baba -sin -a] al -di*  
          Ahmet book-Acc. father -3.sg. -Dat. buy -Past  
          ‘Ahmet<sub>i</sub> bought the book for his<sub>i</sub> father.’

This example, then, would completely correspond to those with inflected reflexives. Furthermore, just like those examples, (22) is also open to an interpretation where the empty pronominal can be bound by an antecedent further removed or nonsyntactic, i.e., in the discourse. This, too, is a reading found with the inflected reflexive, as we saw previously.

What, then, explains the contrast between (21) and (22)? It cannot be Condition B, since the examples are completely parallel; they both have benefactive Dative AgrPs with pronominal specifiers. The only difference is that in (21), that specifier is overt, while in (22), it is nonovert, i.e., *pro*. If we make the assumption, as I have been making here, that it is *pro* which is the representative pronominal for the purposes of Binding Theory whenever it is licensed, rather than the overt pronoun (while the latter is the representative pronominal when the former is not licensed), we arrive at the result that the grammaticality of (22) is expected, if we make the additional assumption—again made throughout this chapter—that the smallest AgrP is the relevant binding domain for both pronouns and anaphors contained in the AgrP.

If this is correct, we have to explain the ungrammaticality of (21) under the intended co-referential reading, since it cannot be explained by Binding Condition B. Again, I claim that this is due to the Avoid Pronoun Principle. Thus, the contrast between (21) and (22) is entirely parallel to the one between (20) and (15b), repeated here for the reader’s convenience:

- (20) \**Ahmet<sub>i</sub> kitab-ı [on -un<sub>i</sub> kendi -sin -e<sub>i</sub>] al -di*  
          Ahmet book-Acc. he -Gen. self -3.sg. -Dat. buy -Past  
          Intended reading: ‘Ahmet<sub>i</sub> bought the book for him<sub>i</sub> himself<sub>i</sub>.’
- (15) b. *Ahmet<sub>i</sub> bu kitab-ı [pro<sub>i</sub> kendi -sin -e<sub>i</sub>] al -di*  
          Ahmet this book-Acc. self -3.sg. -Dat. buy -Past  
          ‘Ahmet bought this book for himself.’

The issue of how best to account for the differences in distribution between overt pronouns and *pro* in the language at large is a complex one; in addition to my work mentioned earlier (Kornfilt 1984, 1987, 1988, 1991), where this issue is addressed from the point of view of Binding Theory and binding domains, there is work that addresses this question in more general terms, e.g., Erguvanlı-Taylan (1986) and Enc (1986). To include a full discussion of

this issue here is impossible, due to space restrictions, and it is tangential to our main concerns. The important point here is that differences exist between overt third-person pronouns and *pro* in the language at large and they are not confined to the position of the “possessor” of the inflected reflexive, and that these differences are similar across the board.

My conclusion at this point, then, is as follows: In languages like Turkish which have a reflexive which appears to be locally bound yet nonlocally free and which displays properties different from those of genuine LD-reflexives, and where this element is inflected, the best analysis is one which analyzes these elements to be “in construction with” a pronominal specifier, where this pronominal is *pro* (provided, of course, that the inflection on the reflexive is of the kind which generally licenses *pro* in that language).

This analysis enables us to treat the inflected reflexive as just a special instantiation of AgrPs which are DPs with pronominal specifiers. The analysis captures the pronominal properties of the inflected reflexive as well as the similarities between that element’s binding properties and those of *pro*, in contrast to those of the overt regular personal pronouns. Furthermore, this analysis also enables us to continue viewing the reflexive itself as a locally bound anaphor.

I leave the question open here of whether in languages like Singapore Malay, where the apparent (but not genuine) LD-reflexive is inflected as the Turkish element under discussion here, an analysis such as the one in Cole and Hermon’s (1998) account, which posits an underlying undeterminacy of binding features is the more appropriate one.<sup>10</sup>

## **5. THE BARE REFLEXIVE: ANAPHOR OR EMPHATIC PRONOUN?**

### **5.1. Differences between Narrative and Standard Styles**

If this is so, let us turn now to the bare reflexive in Turkish and discuss to what extent it is indeed a locally bound anaphor, since I just claimed that preservation of this property for it is an advantage of my analysis for the inflected reflexive (which, under that analysis, crucially consists of the bare reflexive, together with the inflection viewed as the head of the AgrP, i.e., of the binding domain relevant for both the reflexive itself and the *pro* it is in construction with).

It has been claimed in some of the literature on this element that it is not a genuine syntactic anaphor. For example, in Sezer (1979–1980), it is claimed that the bare reflexive is a special element which expresses “the speaker’s

attitude towards the person(s) he is describing, rather than by the syntactic configurations that contain coreferential Noun Phrases" (Sezer, 1979–1980: 748) Some of the evidence he presents to strengthen his claim comes from literature (in the sense of *belles lettres*); a representative passage follows:

- (23) *Lâmia<sub>i</sub>, yüzbaşının elini, kolunu sallayarak birşeyler anlattığını, binbaşıının arasına başını çevirip vagona baktığını görüyordu. Genç kız<sub>i</sub> onların ne konuştuklarını işitmeyeceği halde kendinden<sub>i</sub> bahsettiklerini zannediyor, Makbule'ye söyleyeceği sözleri şaşıriyordu.*  
 (R. N. Güntekin, Dudaktan kalbe [From the lip to the heart], as cited in Sezer, 1979–1980: 750, without page reference to the novel)

'Lâmia<sub>i</sub> saw that the captain was telling something while gesticulating, and that the major was turning his head from time to time and was looking at the train carriage. The young girl<sub>i</sub>, even though she<sub>i</sub> did not hear what they were saying, was thinking that they were talking about her(self)<sub>i</sub> and was mixing up the words that she was saying to Makbule.'

The bare "reflexive" here seems to express a certain point of view, namely Lâmia's own. The inflected reflexive is always fine in these same contexts, but appears to reflect a more objective point of view, i.e., a point of view "from the outside," that of the speaker, narrator, writer, when s/he does not put herself or himself into the place of one of the participants in the narration. In narrative style, then, it might be true that Turkish has no form which is confined to genuine reflexives exclusively.

We find the extension of this narrative style in some idiolects to regular, colloquial discourse. However, the inflected reflexive is always preferred to the bare reflexive in the function of a logophor in colloquial style.

As for the "regular," standard, nonliterary, written style, i.e., the style which is, in general, the subject of formal syntactic analysis, the bare reflexive does have the properties imputed to it in general, i.e., it is indeed a locally bound anaphor.

## 5.2. Second Round: Contrasting the Bare and the Inflected Reflexives and the Overt Pronoun

The characterization of the bare reflexive as a local anaphor is shared (albeit implicitly) by some Turkish grammarians; the following example and discussion in Sinanoğlu (1967) is revealing in this respect.

The following example is taken by Sinanoğlu from Deny's (1921) grammar; what's interesting is the author's interpretation of the example and his

explanation of the usage of the inflected reflexive in this construction, since he contrasts this usage with that of the bare anaphor, on the one hand, and that of the regular personal pronoun, on the other:

- (24) [pro<sub>i</sub>] *Hiss -ed-er -di [ki [bu kadin kendi -sin -i<sub>i</sub> he feeling -do-Aor. -Past that this woman self -3.sg. -Acc. sev -mi -yor ]]*  
*love - Neg. -Progr.*

'He<sub>i</sub> felt that this woman does not love him<sub>i</sub>(self).'

(Sinanoglu, 1967: 207, without number,  
and without page attribution to Deny, 1921)

"*Bu cümlede başka bir zamirin kullanılamayacağı apaçiktır; kendini dense, yan cümlecığın öznesi yani kadın anlaşılacak, onu dense, hissedenden ve kadından başka bir kimse kastedilmiş olacaktır.*"

'It is totally clear that no other anaphoric form can be used in this sentence; if *kendini* (i.e., the bare reflexive—J.K.) were used, one would understand it to refer to the subject of the subordinate clause, i.e., the woman, and if *onu* (i.e., the personal pronoun—J.K.) were used, the person referred to would have been different from the one who feels as well as from the woman.'

This, then, shows that the inflected reflexive is, in fact, different from the bare reflexive, and that the latter must be locally bound here, while it cannot be bound by the subject of the matrix clause. Yet, if the bare reflexive were uniquely ruled by discourse considerations such as empathy and point of view, it should also have been possible to interpret it as coreferential with the subject of the matrix clause.

At the same time, the writer makes clear that the inflected reflexive is different from the overt personal pronoun. In this chapter, I have attributed this difference to the more general issue of the differences between the overt pronoun and *pro*, the nonovert pronoun. The *pro* which is the specifier of the inflected reflexive would be bound by the matrix subject—a perfectly expected reading. This *pro* could actually also be bound by a discourse antecedent, if such an antecedent were provided (thus resulting, indirectly, in the interpretation of the inflected reflexive as discourse-bound—a possibility not mentioned by Sinanoglu). But Sinanoglu is right that if a personal pronoun replaces the inflected reflexive, there is a strong tendency to interpret it as bound by a discourse antecedent rather than by a syntactic (albeit nonlocal) antecedent. The reason for this is probably a pragmatic principle that dictates use of the overt pronoun for switches of discourse topics in general (cf. Enc, 1986).

Summarizing the facts considered here, the differences in use between the overt pronoun and the inflected reflexive with respect to their use in nonlocal domains are really differences in preference, as to be expected, if

they are interpreted as resulting from pragmatic and functional principles like the topic-switch principle and the Avoid Pronoun Principle. On the other hand, the differences between the bare reflexive, the inflected reflexive, and the overt pronoun in local domains are much more clear-cut, which is, in turn, not surprising, if those differences result from formal, syntactic principles like the binding conditions.

I had mentioned previously that for many speakers, only the bare reflexive is well-formed in local domains, and the inflected reflexive is either rejected or is judged to be less well-formed. Some additional examples in Sinanoğlu (1967) illustrate this difference:

- (25) *Evlâd -m -i döv -me -yen (kisi<sub>i</sub>)*  
 child -3.sg. -Acc. spank -Neg. -Rel.Part. person  
*kendin-i<sub>i</sub> döv-er*  
 self -Acc. hit -Aor.

'He who doesn't hit his child hits himself.'

(Sinanoğlu, 1967: 205, without number;  
 taken from Deny, 1921, without page reference)

- (26) *Epikuros felsefe -si [insan-in<sub>i</sub> kendin-e<sub>i</sub>*  
 Epicure philosophy-Cmp.M. person-Gen. self -Dat.  
*kıy -ma -sin] -i yasak et-me -z*  
 kill -Subj.Ger. -3.sg. -Acc. forbid -Neg. -Aor.  
 'The Epicurean philosophy does not forbid for a person to kill him-self.'

(Sinanoğlu, 1967: 205, without number)

In both instances, the bare reflexive is used. Using the inflected reflexive would be rather strange for many speakers under the coreferential reading; the primary reading would be the nonsensical (or pragmatically infelicitous) readings where people outside the domain of the utterance are referred to.

For such speakers, two accounts come to mind: For the more tolerant of such speakers, for whom the inflected reflexive bound (indirectly, via *pro*) within the clause is possible, even if less preferred, I assume that there is a pragmatic, functional principle that dictates choosing a simpler form over a more complex form, when the simpler form is available with the same syntactic function.

For the less tolerant speakers (who would form, as far as I can observe, a minority), for whom the inflected reflexive cannot function as an anaphor bound within the clause, the restriction must be more strictly formal. For those speakers, I propose that the AgrP projected by the agreement inflection is defective and is therefore "transparent" for binding. Therefore, the *pro* is no longer "protected." The relevant binding domain becomes larger

than the possessive AgrP (in most instances, as large as the smallest IP) for such speakers, and the *pro* specifier of the inflected reflexive would be bound by a co-indexed, c-commanding DP, i.e., it would be no longer free. This would result in a violation of Binding Condition B, thus ruling out the inflected reflexive from functioning as an anaphor bound locally (i.e., within the IP).

Returning to the bare reflexive, we had said that in narrative style (and certain colloquial uses), it does not act as a genuine, locally bound anaphor. There are, however, certain instances where even in a more standard, written, or careful stylistic level, the bare anaphor is felicitous where it does not appear to display the main anaphoric property of being bound, i.e., c-commanded, by a co-indexed antecedent; I now turn to such instances.

### **5.3. Possessor Raising and the Bare Reflexive: Possessor Raising Examples in Unaccusative Constructions**

It has been noticed (e.g., Underhill, 1976; Sezer, 1979–1980) that the bare reflexive is felicitous in a clause when it is bound by the possessor of a c-commanding DP; thus, the binder itself does not c-command the reflexive:



This example is ambiguous between a nonsensical interpretation, under which Orhan's son is taller than himself, i.e., the son, and a sensible reading, under which his son is taller than Orhan. It is under the sensible reading that the bare reflexive is not c-commanded by its antecedent.

Interestingly, this kind of example is well-formed even for less permissive speakers, and this is true even for “regular,” nonnarrative styles. Note, however, that this initially disturbing fact holds for certain static predicates only. Thus, in the following examples, the bare reflexive must indeed be c-commanded by its antecedent, and co-indexations parallel to the “sensible” one in the previous example are ill-formed:

- (28) [Orhan-in<sub>i</sub> oğl-u]<sub>j</sub> kendin-den<sub>\*i/j</sub> nefret ed-iyor  
     Orhan-Gen son-3.sg. self -Abl. hatred do-Progr.  
     '[Orhan's<sub>i</sub> son]<sub>j</sub> hates himself/\*him<sub>i</sub>.'

(29) [Orhan-in<sub>i</sub> ogl-u]<sub>j</sub> kendin-i<sub>\*i/j</sub> öл -dür -dü  
     Orhan-Gen son-3.sg. self -Acc. die -Caus.-Past  
     '[Orhan's<sub>i</sub> son]<sub>j</sub> killed himself/\*him<sub>i</sub>.'

My proposal for explaining the well-formedness of examples like (27) are, at this point, sketchy and only suggestive. There is some evidence for static predicates like the one in (27) showing that a particular instance of NP-movement takes place that has the effect of “possessor raising.” (In a nutshell, these arguments are based on the fact that, in general, a possessor within a DP in subject position of an embedded clause cannot undergo Exceptional Case Marking, but this is possible in certain constructions with Unaccusatives and static predicates; not all Unaccusatives allow this, but in order for this to be possible, the embedded predicate must be an Unaccusative or static verb). If this suggestion is on the right track, then possessor raising would take place in (27), resulting in the bare reflexive’s being c-commanded by the raised possessor.

## 6. COMPLEX REFLEXIVES

I turn now to another complex form involving the reflexive, namely, a reduplicated form. This form is very strictly local:

- (30) *Akrep kendi kendin -i sok -ar*  
scorpion self self -Acc. sting -Aor.  
‘The scorpion stings itself.’
- (31) *Kabahat-i (siz) kendi kendin -niz -de ara -ym!*  
fault -Acc. you(pl.) self self -2.pl. -Loc. search-Imp.2.pl.  
‘Look for the fault in yourselves!’

Thus, even for permissive speakers who extend the relevant properties of the narrative style to their colloquial speaking style, i.e., speakers that treat the bare third-person reflexive as an element of empathy<sup>11</sup>, reduplicated reflexives are strictly local:

- (32) *[Oya-nin<sub>j</sub> kendi kendin-den<sub>(??)ij</sub> hoşlan -ma -si] Ahmed-i<sub>i</sub>*  
Oya-Gen. self -Abl. like -Ger. -3.sg. Ahmet-Acc.  
*sevin -dir -di*  
happy -Caus.-Past  
‘That Oya likes herself/him made Ahmet happy.’
- (33) *[Oya-nin<sub>j</sub> kendi kendin-den<sub>\*ij</sub> hoşlan-ma -si] Ahmed-i<sub>i</sub>*  
Oya-Gen. self self -Abl. like -Ger.-3.sg. Ahmet-Acc.  
*sevin -dir -di*  
happy -Caus.-Past  
Only available reading: ‘That Oya likes herself/\*him made Ahmet happy.’ (Despite the nonsensical/implausible nature of this reading)

I would like to suggest that the strict locality of the reduplicated reflexive is, in fact, due to its genuine complexity (and, thus, phrasal nature). The locality of this element for the nonpermissive speakers does not need any special explanation, since the single bare reflexive is local for these speakers, as well; thus, Binding Condition A is sufficient to account for the distribution of both the single (bare) and the reduplicated forms. However, for the permissive speakers (especially given that the bare reflexive is treated by them as a LD-reflexive and not just as an emphatic pronoun), the phrasal nature of the reduplicated reflexive would preclude LF-movement of this element in the fashion sketched by Cole *et al.* (1990), Cole and Wang (1996), and related work, while the bare anaphor would, indeed, undergo such head movement at LF. For the less permissive speakers, this movement of the bare reflexive would be strictly confined to narrative, literary style.<sup>12</sup>

The difference between the reduplicated and the inflected reflexives is a structural one. The reduplicated reflexives are compoundlike, with the second reflexive as the head. The first (noninflected) part of the compound (within the phrasal reflexive) is bound by (and, in some sense, incorporated into) the second part, i.e., the head. The head, in turn, is bound by a local (i.e., essentially clause-mate) antecedent. While the head of the compound can be inflected, it is inflected for first and second persons—and we said previously that these forms behave like the bare reflexive for third-persons, i.e., they are genuine local anaphors. As a matter of fact, inflected third-person reflexives cannot be used here. Contrast the grammatical (30) with the ungrammatical (34):

- (34) \*Akrep *kendi kendi -sin -i sok -ar*  
 scorpion self self -3.sg. -Acc.sting -Aor.  
 Intended reading: 'The scorpion stings itself.'

In contrast, the inflected third-person reflexive, the topic of the largest part of this chapter has, I claimed, as its first part not an "incorporated" reflexive as part of a compound, but an independent pronominal specifier which determines the overall binding properties of the phrase.

The conclusion of this section, then, is that Turkish does obey the cross-linguistic generalization about morphologically complex reflexives being strictly local. Neither the reduplicated nor the inflected reflexives can undergo head movement at LF. However, because the inflected reflexives are associated with a *pro* specifier (and the reduplicated reflexives are not), it appears that the inflected reflexives can, impressionistically speaking, extend their binding domain. But as I hope to have shown in this chapter, this is not a real extension of the binding domain; rather, pronominal rather than anaphoric binding takes place in these "large domains."

## 7. CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I have looked at inflected third-person reflexives in Turkish and have characterized them as AgrPs, headed by a strong agreement element, and with an internal structure that includes a pronominal specifier, *pro*, and a bare reflexive. The AgrP is the binding domain for both elements, within which they obey Conditions B and A, respectively. The bare reflexive is a locally bound anaphor—here as well as in the language in general. The phonologically empty pronominal specifier can pick up antecedents anywhere in the syntactic structure (as long as they are outside the AgrP in question), as well as in the discourse. This analysis explains the initially puzzling fact that the inflected reflexive behaves like an anaphor in local domains but like a pronominal in nonlocal domains. I have also shown that the inflected reflexive does not have the syntactic properties of LD-reflexives observed in other languages.

In a rather sketchy fashion, I have also discussed the properties of the uninflected reflexive and have claimed that a narrative level must be distinguished from the standard style. While the bare reflexive does have the expected properties of a locally bound anaphor in the standard style, it has the syntactic properties of a LD-reflexive and the pragmatic properties of an empathic element in narrative style. Furthermore, I attributed the existence of some apparent counterexamples to this characterization as a syntactic anaphor to a phenomenon of possessor raising, restricted to certain predicates.

Another possible analysis for the inflected reflexives, based on underdetermined feature specification, namely, the one of Cole and Hermon (this volume) for a Singaporean Malay element with similar syntactic properties, was considered but rejected for the Turkish inflected reflexive. I claimed that while underdetermined feature specification is appropriate for such elements if they are not inflected, my analysis captures the more general properties of the inflected reflexives better, because it explicitly draws parallels between them and other possessive AgrPs in the language.

Finally, I briefly looked at complex, reduplicated reflexives and showed that these are strictly locally bound for all speakers and in all syntactic levels. This, I claimed, is due to previously proposed ideas about head movement of simple reflexives at LF in languages that have genuine LD-reflexives, whereby it is proposed that complex reflexives, due to their phrasal nature, cannot undergo such head movement and therefore cannot function as LD-reflexives and must consequently be bound locally.

There are a number of issues concerning various reflexive forms in Turkish which I have left undiscussed (e.g., interaction with scrambling, with argument structure and with case marking) or which I have only skimmed.

One additional issue of relevance to inflected reflexives, namely, differences between overt pronominals and *pro*, was discussed in some detail, but more work does need to be done in the context of a more general binding theory. This chapter has been an attempt to give an overview of some of the reflexive forms in Turkish, with an analysis that attempts to integrate them into other aspects of the language.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the audience at the presentation of this paper at the LD-reflexives workshop, held during the Linguistic Institute of 1997 at Cornell University, for helpful questions and comments, especially Peter Cole and Wynn Chao. I am particularly grateful to Gaby Hermon for interesting discussion before and after that presentation, as well as for constructive comments and criticism after a close reading of a preliminary version. I am furthermore indebted to Mehmet Yanılmaz and Çiğdem Balım for their native judgments (which differ in interesting and, mercifully, predictable, ways from mine). All shortcomings are my responsibility.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>There is a rich literature on the topic of empathy and anaphora (see, among others, Kuno (1987) and Kuno and Kaburaki (1977), and the references cited in these works) and on logophors (see, for example, Reinhart and Reuland, 1991; Thráinsson, 1991, and references cited in these articles).

<sup>2</sup>The local domain relevant for A-binding (i.e., for Binding Conditions A and B) of a constituent X is the smallest maximal projection which contains X and a SUBJECT accessible to X. The accessible SUBJECT is either the structural subject of that smallest maximal projection or a “strong AGR” element heading that projection, whereby “strong AGR” is understood to mean that the AGR element is part of a paradigm that fully and overtly distinguishes for all relevant φ-features. This approach to locality is, by and large, the one adopted in Chomsky (1981) and related work. The specific proposals for Turkish are discussed in Kornfilt (1984, 1988, and 1991).

<sup>3</sup>As with other instances in the language where *pro* could be used (because the position is licensed and identified by overt agreement) in the same position, an overt element has some emphatic or contrastive overtones. The example with *pro* is as follows:

- (i) *Ali<sub>i</sub> Oya-ya<sub>j</sub> [pro<sub>i+j</sub> Ankara-ya<sub>k</sub>]*  
 Ali Oya-Dat. Ankara-Dat.  
*gönder -il -ecek -ler + in ] -i söyle -di*  
 send -Pass. -Fut. -pl. + 3. -Acc. tell -Past  
 ‘Ali told Oya that they would get sent to Ankara.’

Here, there is no emphasis on the embedded subject. It is suggestive that the element which is in almost free variation with the inflected reflexive in such instances is a pronominal, and this fact goes along well with the analysis defended in this contribution that the inflected reflexive is in construction with a *pro* specifier, and that it is that *pro* which is bound nonlocally (points mentioned in the introduction and to be elaborated in Section 4.2.).

Incidentally, the attentive reader will have noticed that the agreement element in (10) is for third-person singular, while we find the form for third-person plural in (i). I have discussed elsewhere (e.g., in Kornfilt, 1984, 1988, 1991) the fact that the plural portion of the third-person plural agreement in both the verbal and nominal paradigms is optional and, in fact, is often elided when an overt subject is present, as is the case in (10). Thus, in (i), the third-person plural agreement form *-leri(n)* is actually *-ler + i(n)* 'pl. + 3.' Where the *overt* subject is a possessive (as I claim is the case with the third-person inflected reflexive), this elision is often preferred. However, where the subject is *pro*, as in (i), such elision is not possible, since the φ-feature content of *pro* must be identified by fully overt agreement morphology. This explains the difference in the agreement morphology between (10) and (i).

<sup>4</sup>Another property commonly observed with LD-reflexives in certain languages is blocking effects; when there is a type of reflexive which can undergo LD binding in general, all the subjects between it and all potential antecedents must share φ-features; if one potential antecedent does not share those features, then additional potential antecedents which are further removed from the reflexive cannot bind it, even if they do share its φ-features. (Discussion, overview and examples can be found in Cole and Hermon (1998), in Cole, Hermon, and Lee [this volume], in Hermon (1994), and in references cited in these works.) This property is not observed in Turkish. The following examples illustrate the lack of blocking effects:

- (i) *Hasan<sub>i</sub> [Zeyneb -in<sub>j</sub> [Ali-nin<sub>k</sub> kendi -sin -i<sub>ij/((??))k</sub> sev -dig -in] -i bil -dig -in -i] san -iyor*  
Hasan Zeynep -Gen. Ali-Gen. self -3.sg.-Acc.  
love-Ger.-3.sg. -Acc. know -Ger. -3.sg.-Acc. think -Progr.  
'Hasan thinks that Zeynep knows that Ali loves him/her/(??)himself.'
- (ii) *Hasan<sub>i</sub> [ben-im [Zeyneb-in<sub>j</sub> kendi -sin -i<sub>ij/((??))j</sub> sev -dig -in] -i bil -dig -im -i] san -iyor*  
Hasan I -Gen. Zeynep-Gen. self -3.sg. -Acc.  
love-Ger.-3.sg. -Acc. know -Ger. -1.sg. -Acc. think -Progr.  
'Hasan thinks that I know that Zeynep loves him/(??)herself.'

The lack of blocking effects observed here is, by itself, not damaging to a classification of the third-person inflected reflexive as a LD-reflexive, since the blocking effect (whether analyzed as a strictly grammatical phenomenon, as in Cole and Hermon (1998) and Hermon (1994) [among others] or as a combination of a logophoric and grammatical phenomenon, as in Cole, Hermon, and Lee [this volume]) is otherwise observed cross-linguistically with LD-reflexives that are not inflected. However, it is nevertheless important to show that inflected reflexives indeed do not exhibit blocking effects. The arguments given in the text against ana-

lyzing the Turkish inflected reflexives as LD-reflexives should suffice to make the point.

<sup>5</sup>These AgrPs are inserted in positions otherwise appropriate for DPs. It is not immediately obvious that this can be done, given that sentences are a type of AgrP, as well, yet do not necessarily appear exclusively in positions reserved for DPs. I follow a proposal advanced in Kornfilt (1984), where it was claimed that there is a distinction between verbal and nominal AgrPs; it is only the latter that are of the category DP. (For a somewhat different analysis of Agr in DPs and based on Hungarian data, see Szabolcsi, 1987.) The independent motivation for this claim rests on the fact that there are two main agreement paradigms: verbal and nominal. The former is found in fully finite clauses, while the latter is found with possessive DPs and embedded nominalized clauses. The inflected reflexive would be subsumed under possessive DPs. The nominal Agr element determines the nominal character of the phrases it heads. In the spirit of Grimshaw (1991), the extended projection of the DP to the level of the nominal AgrP enables this type of AgrP to appear in DP-positions.

<sup>6</sup>A similar analysis, involving internal structure for LD-reflexives in Chinese, was proposed in Chao and Yu (1997). In their analysis, there is a *pro* as part of that structure, as well, but it is analyzed as the D-head of a DP, rather than as the specifier of an AgrP, as in my analysis for the Turkish element. It would be interesting to analyze all (apparent) LD-reflexives cross-linguistically and to see if one and the same analysis might be able to account for all such elements, or if these are indeed different elements with different properties, requiring different analyses. The latter is more probable, since the Chinese elements are genuine LD-reflexives, while the Turkish inflected reflexives are not. Similar remarks would carry over to analyses like the one advanced in Reinhart and Reuland (1991 and 1993), where the pronominal determiner is overt, but where otherwise the analysis of the complex reflexive in languages like Dutch and German is rather similar to that of Chao and Yu (1997) for Chinese.

<sup>7</sup>The *pro*, as the specifier of the AgrP, is only c-commanded by the head of the phrase, i.e., by Agr. Since it is not c-commanded by the reflexive, the *pro* is A-free. On the other hand, as the specifier of the AgrP, *pro* does c-command the reflexive. Thus, both Conditions A and B are respected.

<sup>8</sup>In both of the examples that follow in the text, the inflected reflexive can also be coindexed with a discourse antecedent—of course, under the present analysis, this, too, would be via the *pro*, which would itself be bound by such a discourse antecedent. At this point in the discussion, however, we are interested in a “clause-mate” antecedent.

<sup>9</sup>The same analysis would not carry over to first- and second-person reflexives, since those, as remarked previously, cannot be nonlocally bound. Those reflexives, then, must be treated as nonphrasal. I surmise here that this is due to the fact that for third persons, there is a choice between two forms—bare and inflected—while for first and second persons there is no such choice. Thus, the paradigm of genuine reflexives consists of the inflected first- and second-person forms (whereby the inflection is purely morphological and does not project its own phrase in the syntax) and the bare third-person form.

<sup>10</sup>There is yet another approach that could be adopted to account for the properties of the inflected third-person reflexive in Turkish, namely, that advanced in Enç (1989). I am indebted to Jim Huang for (indirectly) bringing this article to my attention. The Turkish inflected reflexive is characterized in this very interesting cross-linguistic article as an element which is, in a sense, the least restricted element among the three that we have seen, namely, bare reflexive, inflected reflexive, and pronoun: the bare anaphor must be locally bound by a qualifying antecedent, while the pronoun must be locally free. The inflected reflexive is, indeed, in a sense less restricted, since it can be locally bound as well as free, and it can be nonlocally bound. This (among other considerations) leads the author to posit a three-way distinction for these three elements among three distinct binary binding features—a system where the inflected reflexive has minus values throughout. In a sense, this account is diametrically opposed to Cole and Hermon's (1998) account, since it adds a feature with its own binary specifications, while Cole and Hermon retain a two-feature system and allow for these features to be underdetermined, with the values to be filled in by syntactic context (very much in parallel to underdetermined segments in phonology). My own account also does not add to the two features (i.e., anaphoric and pronominal). All else being equal, accounts with fewer features are obviously more explanatory than those with a larger number of features, provided all facts are explained. While Enç (1989) does achieve some economy by proposing to derive the third feature from certain values of the other two, it is still true that hers is a three-featured system. Furthermore, such an account cannot capture the parallels between the inflected reflexives and other possessive phrases in the language, nor does it address the issue of overt pronouns versus *pro*, especially in specifier position of such phrases as well as in the language at large, the way my analysis can, since the latter crucially imputes internal structure to the inflected reflexive. It is possible, of course, that the languages considered in Enç (1989) do ultimately necessitate a three-featured system; but it would be desirable to first attempt a cross-linguistic account that is more economical and that also seeks to integrate morphological properties into the syntactic explanation. Note that neither Enç's three-featured system nor Cole and Hermon's underspecification account has an explanation for why it is that, at least for Turkish and Malay, it should be an *inflected* reflexive that is the least restricted form. Mine, in contrast, addresses this property directly.

<sup>11</sup>From the limited field work I have conducted so far, it appears that this usage of the bare reflexive by certain permissive speakers as an element of empathy is actually a usage of that element as a genuine LD-reflexive with relevant properties like subject-orientation. In this respect, the “nonlocal” binding of the bare reflexive differs from the instances of nonlocal binding of the inflected third person reflexive. Thus, we have here, for this stylistic level and for these speakers, a syntactically well-defined element, whose syntactic properties have received satisfactory accounts in the literature (e.g., head movement at LF). These elements have, in addition to their well-defined syntactic properties, pragmatic functions. However, this fact does not challenge the syntactic nature of these elements as has sometimes been claimed in the literature (e.g., Sezer, 1979–1980), let alone the syntactic nature of reflexives in general.

<sup>12</sup>There are a variety of other interesting properties worth investigating concerning complex reflexives, for example, restrictions concerning Case, or thematic roles. Discussion of such properties would go far beyond the concerns of this chapter and I leave such investigation to future research. Another question left open here is why the uninflected reflexive does not function as a LD reflexive, especially in the nonpermissive dialect. This is particularly surprising in an approach based on head-movement of reflexives (at LF), since the bare reflexive should undergo such movement and thus exhibit properties of LD-reflexives. Claiming that the bare reflexive is not an  $X^0$  and that it projects an XP (I am grateful to Gabriella Hermon for pointing out this possibility to me) would not help solve this problem: while this analysis would, as required, preclude the bare reflexive from undergoing head-movement, it would analyze the element in a fashion similar to the inflected reflexive, since the specifier of the posited XP would need to be a phonologically null element, and thus, presumably, *pro*. I see two ways out of this dilemma: (1) One could claim that such a *pro* is indeed there, but that it is an expletive and therefore not able to be bound. Such an analysis has some independent motivation: *pro* has to be licensed and identified by overt as well as paradigmatic agreement, and the bare reflexive has no such agreement. However, the bare reflexive does have an alternating final *n* (which does not show up in the Nominative, nor does it appear before the third-person agreement form). This *n* might be sufficient to license an expletive *pro* without being able to identify a thematic *pro* fully. Therefore, an expletive *pro* is all that can be licensed (cf. Jaeggli and Safir, 1989); (2) Alternatively, one could claim that, while the “bare” reflexive does not project an XP, it is not a genuine  $X^0$  either, due to the aforementioned *n*. In other words, it carries defective inflection and can therefore not undergo  $X^0$ -movement. These sketchy remarks have to suffice at this point in time.

## REFERENCES

- Chao, W. and W. Yu. (1997). *Long-distance Reflexives and Logophoric Interpretations*. Paper presented at the Long-distance Reflexives Workshop. LSA Linguistic Institute, Cornell University, Ithaca, July, 1997.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Foris.
- Cole, P., and Hermon, G. (1998). Long distance reflexives in Singapore Malay: An apparent typological anomaly. *Linguistic Typology* 2(1), 57–77.
- Cole, P., Hermon, G., and Lee, C. L. (1999). Grammatical and discourse conditions on long distance reflexives in two Chinese dialects. This volume.
- Cole, P., Hermon, G., and Sung, L.-M. (1990). Principles and parameters of long-distance reflexives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21, 1–22.
- Cole, P., and Wang, C. (1996). Antecedents and blockers of long distance reflexives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27, 357–390.

- Deny, J. (1921). *Grammaire de la langue Turque (dialecte Osmanli)*. Paris: Leroux.  
[Reprinted in Wiesbaden: Dr. Martin Särdig, 1971.]
- Enç, M. (1986). Topic switching and pronominal subjects in Turkish. In *Studies in Turkish Linguistics* (D.I. Slobin and K. Zimmer, eds.), pp. 195–208. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Enç, M. (1989). Pronouns, licensing, and binding. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 7, 51–92.
- Erguvanlı-Taylan, E. (1986). Pronominal versus zero representation of anaphora in Turkish. In *Studies in Turkish Linguistics* (D.I. Slobin and K. Zimmer, eds.), pp. 209–231. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Grimshaw, J. (1991). *Extended Projections*. Unpublished manuscript. Waltham: Brandeis University.
- Hermon, G. (1984). Long-distance reflexives in UG: Theoretical approaches and predictions for acquisition. In *Syntactic Theory and First Language Acquisition: Cross-Linguistic Perspectives, Vol 2: Binding, Dependencies, and Learnability* (B. Lust, G. Hermon, and J. Kornfilt, eds.), pp. 91–111. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Jaeggli, O., and Safir, K. J. (1989). The null subject parameter and parametric theory. In *The Null Subject Parameter* (O. Jaeggli and K. J. Safir, eds.), pp. 1–44. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Kornfilt, J. (1984). *Case Marking, Agreement, and Empty Categories in Turkish*. Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University.
- Kornfilt, J. (1987). Beyond binding conditions: The case of Turkish. In *Studies in Modern Turkish*, (R. Boeschoten and L. Verhoeven, eds.), pp. 105–120. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.
- Kornfilt, J. (1988). A typology of morphological agreement and its syntactic consequences. In *Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 24, 117–134.
- Kornfilt, J. (1991). Some current issues in Turkish syntax. In *Turkish Linguistics Today* (H. Boeschoten and L. Verhoeven, eds.), pp. 60–92. Leiden: Brill Publishers.
- Kuno, S. (1987). *Functional Syntax: Anaphora, Discourse and Empathy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kuno, S., and Kaburaki, E. (1977). Empathy and syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8, 627–672.
- Lewis, G. L. (1985). *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Corrected reprint of 1967 original.]
- Pica, P. (1987). On the nature of the reflexivization cycle. In *Proceedings of NELS 17, Vol. 2*, 483–499. Graduate Linguistic Student Association, Department of Linguistics, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Reinhart, T., and Reuland, E. (1991). Anaphors and logophors: An argument structure perspective. In *Long-Distance Anaphora* (J. Koster and E. Reuland, eds.), pp. 283–321. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Reinhart, T., and Reuland, E. (1993). Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 657–720.
- Sezer, E. (1979–1980). On reflexivization in Turkish. In *Harvard Ukrainian Studies Eucharisterion: Essays Presented to Omeljan Pritsak on his Sixtieth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students*. III/IV(2), 748–759. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

- Sinanoğlu, S. (1967). Kendi kelimesinin kullanılışları. (The usages of the word kendi.) In *Dilbilgisi Sorunları* (Issues of Grammar); TDK Yayınları: 259. Dil Konuları Dizisi: 10; Ankara Üniversitesi Yayınevi (Publications of the Turkish Language Academy: 259. Series of Language Topics: 10; Publication House of Ankara University), 204–207. [First published in *Türk Dili* (The Turkish Language), vol. 79, 1959.]
- Slobin, D. I., and Zimmer, K. (eds.) (1986). *Studies in Turkish Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Szabolcsi, A. (1987). Functional categories in the noun phrase. In *Approaches to Hungarian, vol. 2: Theories and Analyses* (I. Kenesei, ed.), pp. 167–189. Szeged.
- Thráinsson, H. (1991). Long-distance reflexives and the typology of NPs. In *Long-Distance Anaphora* (J. Koster and E. Reuland, eds.), pp. 49–75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Underhill, R. (1976). *Turkish Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.