

# Anaphora in two Turkic languages:

## Condition A is not enough

Travis Major and Sozen Ozkan\*

University of California, Los Angeles

### Abstract

This paper investigates the properties of anaphora in two Turkic languages: Uyghur and Turkish. Prior literature has recognized that the anaphor in Turkish is non-standard and has an atypical distribution (Kornfilt 2001). We argue that both *kendi* (Turkish) and *öz* (Uyghur) are systematic and can be accounted for with the following two ingredients: a) classical Condition A when the antecedent-anaphor relation is local (Chomsky 1986); and b) logophoricity: non-local antecedents must be logophoric (Charnavel Zlogar, 2015; Charnavel & Sportiche, 2016).

## 1 Introduction

This paper investigates anaphora in two Turkic languages: Turkish (southwestern/Oghuz branch) and Uyghur (southeastern branch)<sup>1</sup>. Our goal is to account for the distribu-

---

\*tjmajor@ucla.edu, sozkan@ucla.edu.

<sup>1</sup>We would like to acknowledge and thank our language consultants: Akbar Amat, Gülnar Eziz, Abduqyum Mamet, Mahire Yakup (Uyghur); Mert Beşken, Betül Erbaşı, Oğuz Kaan Gündüz, Seren Özkan, Deniz Özyıldız (Turkish). We would also like to thank Dominique Sportiche, Harold Torrence, Anoop Mahajan and the audience of UCLA SynSem for their assistance with this project. This research is supported in part by the NSF under grants 1424054 and 1424336.

tion and licensing properties of Turkish *kendi-si* and Uyghur *öz-i*.

The first goal of this paper is to tease apart sentence-internal antecedents from discourse-salient antecedents. In other words, we suggest that the free *k* indices in both sentences<sup>2</sup> below are subject to different licensing conditions than the *i* and *j* indices:

- (1) a. Ali **kendi<sub>i/k</sub>-(sin)-i** sev-iyor.  
 Ali self-3S-ACC like-PRES.PROG.3S  
 ‘Ali<sub>i</sub> likes *self<sub>i/k</sub>*.’  
 b. Ali [Ahmet<sub>j</sub>-in **kendi<sub>i/j/k</sub>-sin-i** sev-diğ-i]-ni söyle-di.  
 Ali Ahmet-GEN self-3S-ACC like-DIK-3S-ACC say-PAST.3S  
 ‘Ali<sub>i</sub> said that Ahmet<sub>j</sub> likes *self<sub>i/j/k</sub>*.’<sup>3</sup> Turkish

In the Turkish literature, sentences like those in (1), are ambiguous as to whether the reflexive *kendi-si* is locally bound or co-refers with a discourse antecedent. We claim that *Ali* in (1-a) and *Ahmet* in (1-b) are derived through Condition A of Binding Theory. We show that ”long distance” antecedents, like *Ali* in (1-b) can only be licensed if they are logophoric centers.

Starting from the analysis of Charnavel and Zlogar (2016)<sup>4</sup> for English, which builds upon Sells (1987), we provide evidence that logophoric centers play a critical role in licensing the reflexive. We show that Attitude Holders can antecede the reflexive, and further suggest that all other potential antecedents are Empathy Loci. We make a further contribution that suggests that analyses of *kendi-si* that argue that its licensing conditions are identical to standard Condition B pronouns need to be broken down further. More specifically, we show that discourse antecedents are

---

<sup>2</sup>Following Turkicist tradition, we capitalize letters to indicate that the relevant segment is subject to vowel harmony or voice/place assimilation.

<sup>3</sup>We use the following abbreviations in this paper: 1 ‘first person,’ 2 ‘second person,’ 3 ‘third person,’ ABL ‘ablative,’ COMP ‘complementizer,’ COMPR ‘comparative,’ DAT ‘dative,’ FUT ‘future,’ GEN ‘genitive,’ LOC ‘locative,’ NEG ‘negation,’ NONPST ‘nonpast,’ PL ‘plural,’ PST ‘past,’ Q ‘question,’ REP ‘reportative evidential,’ S ‘singular.’

<sup>4</sup>Charnavel and Zlogar describe deictic centers as logophoric, but these types of sentences have confounds in Turkic and thus are not discussed here.

possible in only contrastive, emphatic, or corrective focus or honorific constructions (i.e. the “k” indices in (1).

We also illustrate that Uyghur does not exhibit the exceptional licensing conditions (i.e. where the reflexive is interpreted as “free”) for *öz-i*. Notice that only the local binding option is available in (2):

- (2) Ali **öz<sub>i</sub>/\*j-i-ni** yaxshi.kör-i-du.  
 Ali self-3S.ACC like-NONPST.3S  
 ‘Ali<sub>i</sub> likes *self<sub>i</sub>/\*j*’ *Uyghur*

We thus propose that Uyghur reveals the underlying system for reflexives shared by both languages (local binding and co-reference with logophoric antecedents), while the differences are attributable to focus and honorific uses that have arisen in Turkish.

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the puzzle in more detail, beginning with Kornfilt (2001). Section 3 discusses the justification for separating the licensing conditions of local antecedents, logophoric antecedents, and discourse antecedents. We will additionally discuss the differences between Turkish and Uyghur reflexives. Then we discuss local binding in Section 4, followed by logophoric licensing of reflexives in Section 5.

## 2 Background and Puzzle

### 2.1 *Kendi vs. Kendi-si*

Kornfilt describes in detail the differences between agreeing *kendi-si* and bare *kendi*, focusing primarily on the fact that *kendi* requires a local antecedent, while *kendi-si* can be either bound locally or co-refers with a discourse antecedent:

- (3) a. Ali<sub>i</sub> **kendini**<sub>i/\*j</sub>-i sev-iyor.  
 Ali self-3S-ACC like-PRES.PROG.3S  
 ‘Ali<sub>i</sub> likes *self*<sub>i/\*j</sub>.’
- b. Ali<sub>i</sub> **kendi**<sub>i/j</sub>-sin-i sev-iyor.  
 Ali self-3S-ACC like-PRES.PROG.3S  
 ‘Ali<sub>i</sub> likes *self*<sub>i/j</sub>.’

*kendi* is unable to take a non-local antecedent, while *kendi-si* is able. These facts are exemplified by comparing the referential possibilities between the two sentences in (4) below:

- (4) a. Ahmet<sub>i</sub> kendini<sub>i/\*j</sub>-i çok beğen-iyor-muş.  
 Ahmet self-ACC very admire-PRES.PROG.3S-REP.PST  
 ‘(They say that) Ahmet admires himself very much.’
- b. Ahmet<sub>i</sub> kendi<sub>i/j</sub>-sin-i çok beğen-iyor-muş.  
 Ahmet self-3S-ACC very admire-PRES.PROG.3S-REP.PST  
 ‘(They say that) Ahmet admires himself/him very much.’
- (Kornfilt, 2001:198)

Kornfilt attributes the referential properties of *kendi-si* to the presence of the phonologically null element *pro*, which is motivated by its similarities to *pro-drop* of the possessor in possessive constructions:

- (5) **Ali-nin** araba-sı  
 Ali-GEN. car-3S.  
 ‘Ali’s car’

- (6) **on-un** araba-sı  
 s/he-GEN car-3S  
 ‘His/her car’

- (7) **pro** araba-sı  
 car-3S  
 ‘[His/her] car’

(Kornfilt, 2001:206-207)

Kornfilt proposes that the agreement marker in *kendi-si* (like possessives) projects an Agreement Phrase (AgrP) which has *pro* in its specifier. This analysis is shown below, which explains the pronominal-like behavior of *kendi-si*

- (8)    *pro* *kendi-si*  
          self-3S  
          ‘himself/herself’ (Kornfilt, 2001:207)

The consequence of this analysis is that we should expect no difference between the distribution of the pronoun and the reflexive. The next section demonstrates some of these differences.

### 3 Accounting for exceptional uses of *kendi-si*

Based on grammaticality judgments alone, Kornfilt’s analysis appears to adequately account for the distribution of *kendi-si*. However, not all binding possibilities are available when contexts are taken into consideration. More specifically, non-local antecedents have a much narrower distribution than local antecedents. Consider the cases below, where *kendi-si* can co-refer with a DP salient in the context under the right discourse conditions.

The first type of context involves contrastive focus of the reflexive. In cases such as (9), the reflexive can be licensed with or without an overt antecedent:

- (9)    **Context:** Your friend, Seren, is never able to lock the door. She usually needs assistance. For the first time, she locked the door without help. [=emphatic]
- a.    **(Seren)** *kendi-si* *kapı-yı*    *kilitledi*.  
          Seren    self-3S    door-ACC lock-PST.3S  
          ‘(Seren) herself locked the door.’ [= Seren locked the door on her own/without any help from anyone.]

In this context, the reading is roughly equivalent to the “by herself” reading in English emphatic reflexives. The speaker is emphasizing that the antecedent *Seren* did not need any assistance which is a surprise to those involved in the discourse. Similarly, if the focus is on the fact that the antecedent carried out an action on his/her own, the reflexive can be licensed with or without an overt sentence-internal antecedent (10):

- (10)    **Context:** You just heard from John that the door was wide open when he got to the office this morning. You are surprised, because you and Seren left the office together last night and you saw Seren locking the door. [=contrastive]  
           “Seren de oradaydı...” ‘Seren was there, too...’
- a.    **(Seren) kendi-si** kapı-yı    kilitle-di.  
       Seren    self-3S    door-ACC lock-PST.3S  
       ‘(Seren) herself locked the door.’ [=Seren locked the door in person.]

The critical data comes from the fact that the reflexive cannot be licensed in neutral contexts where the emphatic usage is not permitted regardless of whether or not the antecedent is pro-dropped (i.e. cases where the conditions that license emphatic reflexives in English are not met). This is shown for local and long-distance antecedents in (11) and (12) respectively:

- (11)    **Context:** Your roommate gets home and cannot open the door. He calls you to ask why he cannot get in[=neutral context]. You cannot say :
- a.    **#(Seren) kendi-si** kapı-yı    kilitle-di.  
       Seren    self-3S    door-ACC lock-PST.3S  
       ‘(Seren) locked the door herself.’
- (12)    **Context:** Your roommate gets home and cannot open the door. He calls you to ask why he cannot get in [=neutral context]. You cannot say:

- a. #Ben **kendi-si-nin** kapı-yı kilitle-diğ-in-i düşün-üyor-um.  
 I self-3S-GEN door-ACC lock-DIK-3S-ACC think-PRES.PROG-1S  
 ‘I think [Seren] herself locked the door.’

The data above suggest that *kendi-si* should not be considered a run-of-the-mill Condition B pronoun. It appears that Turkish simply uses the same form of the reflexive in emphatic and neutral contexts. We suggest that these uses of the reflexive should be considered separately, due to these discourse facts.

### 3.1 Honorific Contexts

Another common context where the reflexive exhibits unexpected behavior is its use as an honorific form. This form allows for the reflexive to serve as a respectful reference to someone. However, by comparing (13) and (14) below, it is apparent that honorific licensing of the reflexive is distinct from normal binding and should receive its own treatment:

- (13) **Context:** *A new manager* has been hired for your department at work, and Ali wants to go see him with you; but you have already seen him the day he was hired.

- a. Ben **kendi-sin-i** gör-dü-m.  
 I self-3S-ACC see-PST-1S  
 ‘I saw self.’ [self=the manager]

- (14) **Context:** Your friend has just given birth to *her baby boy* and Ali wants to go see the baby with you; but you have already seen the baby at the hospital.

- a. \*Ben **kendi-sin-i** gör-dü-m .  
 I self-3S-ACC see-PST-1S  
 ‘I saw self.’ [self=baby]

In summary, we will adopt Kornfilt (2001)’s *pro* analysis to account for the emphatic

and honorific usages<sup>5</sup> of *kendisi*. However, we have shown that these usages of *kendisi* are crucially distinct from the local binding and logophoric cases.

### 3.2 Differences between Uyghur and Turkish Reflexives

Interestingly, reflexives in both languages behave roughly the same. The main difference between languages is that Uyghur only allows the agreeing version of the reflexive *öz-i* (i.e. there is no *öz*), as shown in (16)<sup>6</sup>:

- (15) Ali *öz*-(i)-ni ur-d-i.  
 Ali self-3-ACC hit-PST-3  
 ‘Ali hit self.’ *Uyghur*

As a result, Uyghur *öz-i* is more reminiscent of *kendi-si* in its distribution. However, it does differ in important ways. Take for instance the equivalent to (4), which illustrates that a discourse antecedent is not permitted in Uyghur <sup>7</sup>:

- (16) Ali *özi*/\*<sub>i</sub>-i-ni yaxshi.kör-i-du.  
 Ali self-3-ACC like-NONPST-3  
 ‘Ali likes self<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>’ *Uyghur*

Uyghur and Turkish look much more similar when it comes to sentence-internal long-

---

<sup>5</sup>Some speakers claim judge this sentence as grammatical. This suggests there may be some speaker variation and more research is necessary. It is also necessary to ensure speakers are not getting an emphatic interpretation.

<sup>6</sup>This has interesting consequences with regard to animacy. Assuming that the agreeing reflexive requires an animate/logophoric antecedent, its absence makes it possible for even inanimate antecedents in Turkish. Because Uyghur only has the agreeing anaphor, inanimates are not allowed.

\*Darex *öz*-i-ni ur-d-i.  
 tree self-3-ACC hit-PST-3  
 ‘The tree hit itself.’ *Uyghur*

Ağaç kendi-(??sin)-i döv-dü.  
 Tree self-3S-ACC hitPST.3S  
 ‘The tree hit itself.’ *Turkish*

<sup>7</sup>We were told that some speakers accept the honorific use of *öz-i* in Uyghur, but a more fine-grained dialectal investigation is necessary to determine its distribution.



distance antecedents and local binding. Both referential options are available in neutral contexts in both languages:

- (17) Tursun<sub>i</sub> [Ali<sub>j</sub>-ning öz<sub>i/j/\*k</sub>-i-ni tonu-ghan-liq]-i-ni de-d-i.  
 Tursun Ali-GEN self-3-ACC know-GEN-COMP-3-ACC say-PST-3  
 ‘Tursun<sub>i</sub> said that Ali<sub>j</sub> knows self<sub>i/j/\*k</sub>.’ *Uyghur*

The one exceptional usage shared between the languages is the emphatic construction in (9) (Turkish) provided in Uyghur below (assuming the same context), with the exception that the emphatic antecedent is obligatory<sup>8</sup>:

- (18) (Gül<sub>i</sub>nar) öz-i kitab-ni imzalat-t-i.  
 Gulnar self-3 book-ACC sign-PST-3  
 ‘Gulnar herself got the book signed.’ *Uyghur*

Uyghur allows for the emphatic use of the reflexive, but disallows the honorific use. We thus assume that Uyghur informs us about the Turkish system after the exceptional usages are peeled away. Furthermore, the examples that follow should be considered neutral utterances, which eliminate the emphatic/contrastive focus uses of each.

## 4 Local Binding

This section looks at cases involving local binding, which we claim can be accounted for exclusively by classical Condition A of Binding Theory. We adopt the following formulation of Condition A (Chomsky 1986):

- (19) Condition A: an anaphor must be bound within the smallest XP containing the anaphor and a subject distinct from it.

---

<sup>8</sup>The antecedent *Gül<sub>i</sub>nar* is optional for most of the speakers.

Condition A handles all cases that are monoclausal and all cases where there is no (different) intervening subject, DO, IO, and benefactives are shown here. In (20), the reflexive is in the DO position and takes the subject as its antecedent:

(20) *Direct Object*

- a. Ali<sub>i</sub> öz-i/\*<sub>j</sub>-ni yaxshi.kör-i-du.  
 Ali self-3-ACC like-NONPST-3  
 ‘Ali<sub>i</sub> likes self<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>.’ *Uyghur*
- b. Ali<sub>i</sub> kendi/\*<sub>j</sub>-(sin)-i sev-iyor.  
 He self-3S-ACC like-PRES.PROG.3S  
 ‘Ali<sub>i</sub> likes self<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>.’ *Turkish*

(21) shows the reflexive in IO position and (22) shows it as a benefactive. (21) further illustrates that *kendi-si/öz-i* is not subject oriented:

(21) *Indirect Object Antecedent*

- a. Ali<sub>i</sub> Mahinur<sub>j</sub>-ge özi/\*<sub>j</sub>-i-ni körset-t-i.  
 Ali Mahinur-DAT self-3-ACC show-PST-3  
 ‘Ali showed Mahinur self.’ *Uyghur*
- b. Ali<sub>i</sub> Seren<sub>j</sub>-e kendi/\*<sub>j</sub>-(sin)-i göoster-di.  
 Ali Seren-DAT self-3S-ACC show-PST.3S  
 ‘Ali<sub>i</sub> showed Seren<sub>j</sub> self<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>.’ *Turkish*

(22) *Benefactive*

- a. Ali öz-i-ge bir kitab set-iwal-d-i.  
 Ali self-3S-DAT one book buy-IWAL-PST-3  
 ‘Ali bought a book for self.’ *Uyghur*
- b. Ali kendi-(sin)-e bir kitap al-dı.  
 Ali self-3S-DAT one book buy-PST.3S  
 ‘Ali bought a book for self.’ *Turkish*

Arguments in the matrix clause can serve as antecedents when there is no intervening subject. (23) shows this for the matrix subject, (24) illustrates this for indirect objects of verbs like “tell” and sources of “hear”:

(23) *Matrix subject antecedent*

- a. Ali<sub>i</sub> [özi-i-ning kelishken-lik-i]-ni oyla-y-du.  
 Ali self-3-GEN be.attractive-COMP-3-ACC think-NONPST-3  
 ‘Ali<sub>i</sub> thinks self<sub>i</sub> is attractive.’ *Uyghur*
- b. Seren<sub>i</sub> [kendi-si-nin çekici ol-duğ-un]-u düşün-üyor.  
 Seren self-3S-GEN attractive be-DIK-3S-ACC think-PRES.PROG.3S  
 ‘Seren<sub>i</sub> thinks that self<sub>i</sub> is attractive.’ *Turkish*

(24) *Matrix Subject/IO antecedent*

- a. Ali<sub>i</sub> Tursun<sub>j</sub>-gha [özi/j-i-ning ut-qan-liq-i]-ni eyt-t-i.  
 Ali Tursun-DAT self-3-GEN win-GAN-COMP-3-ACC tell-PST-3  
 ‘Ali<sub>i</sub> told Tursun<sub>j</sub> that self<sub>i/j</sub> won.’ *Uyghur*
- b. Ali<sub>i</sub> Dursun<sub>j</sub>-a [kendi<sub>i/j</sub>-si-nin kazan-dığ-ın]-ı söyle-di.  
 Ali Dursun-DAT self-3S-GEN win-DIK-3S-ACC say-PST.3S  
 ‘Ali<sub>i</sub> told Dursun<sub>j</sub> that self<sub>i/j</sub> won.’ *Turkish*

(25) *Matrix Subject/Source antecedent*

- a. Ali<sub>i</sub> Tursun<sub>j</sub>-din [özi/j-i-ning ut-qan-liq-i]-ni angli-d-i.  
 Ali Tursun-ABL self-3-GEN win-GAN-COMP-3-ACC hear-PST-3  
 ‘Ali<sub>i</sub> heard from Tursun<sub>j</sub> that self<sub>i/j</sub> won.’ *Uyghur*
- b. Ali<sub>i</sub> Dursun<sub>j</sub>-dan [kendi<sub>i/j</sub>-si-nin kazan-dığ-ın]-ı duy-du.  
 Ali Dursun-ABL self-3S-GEN win-DIK-3S-ACC hear-PST.3S  
 ‘Ali<sub>i</sub> heard from Dursun<sub>j</sub> that self<sub>i/j</sub> won.’ *Turkish*

All cases above are accounted for by Condition A and require no further discussion. The rest of our analysis involves cases of the non-exceptional uses of the reflexive, where a logophoric antecedent is required.

## 5 Exempt Anaphors and Logophoricity

When the subject of the matrix and embedded clauses differ, Condition A predicts that only the embedded subject should be possible as an antecedent. However, such cases are ambiguous:

- (26) a. Tursun<sub>i</sub> [Xemit<sub>j</sub>-ning **öz<sub>i/j</sub>-i**-ni ur-idighan-liq-i]-gha  
 Tursun Xemit-GEN self-3-ACC hit-IMP-IMP-3-DAT  
 ishin-i-du.  
 believe-NONPST-3  
 ‘Tursun<sub>i</sub> believes that Xemit<sub>j</sub> will hit self<sub>i/j</sub>.’ *Uyghur*
- b. Dursun<sub>i</sub> [Hamit<sub>j</sub>-in **kendi<sub>i/j</sub>-sin**-i vur-acağ-in]-a  
 Dursun Hamit-GEN self-3S-ACC shoot-IMP-3S-DAT  
 inan-iyor.  
 believe-PRES.PROG.3S  
 ‘Dursun<sub>i</sub> believes that Hamit<sub>j</sub> will hit self<sub>i/j</sub>.’ *Turkish*

Even more surprisingly, non c-commanding antecedents are permitted, which suggests these are not simply long distance anaphors. Even non-c-commanding antecedents are licit in both languages, as shown in (27):

- (27) a. **Ali-ning qarish-i-che**, Mahinur<sub>j</sub> **öz<sub>i/j</sub>-i**-ni yaxshi.kör-i-du.  
 Ali-GEN view-3-CHE Mahinur self-3-ACC like-NONPST-3  
 ‘According to Ali<sub>i</sub>, Mahinur likes self<sub>i</sub>.’ *Uyghur*
- b. **Ali-ye göre**, Seren<sub>j</sub> **kendi<sub>i/j</sub>-sin**-i sev-iyor.  
 Ali-DAT according.to Seren self-3S-ACC like-PRES.PROG.3S  
 ‘According to Ali<sub>i</sub>, Seren<sub>j</sub> likes self<sub>i/j</sub>.’ *Turkish*

Evidence that there is no c-command in (27) comes from the fact that there are no Condition C effects, as illustrated by the presence of *Ali* in the second clause not yielding it ungrammatical:

- (28) a. Ali-ning qarish-i-che, Mahinur **Ali-ni** yaxshi.kör-i-du.  
 Ali-GEN view-3-CHE Mahinur Ali-ACC like-NONPST-3  
 ‘According to Ali<sub>i</sub>, Mahinur likes Ali<sub>i</sub>.’
- b. Ali-ye göre, Seren **Ali-yi** sev-iyor.  
 Ali-DAT according.to Seren Ali-ACC like-PRES.PROG.3S  
 ‘According to Ali<sub>i</sub>, Seren likes Ali<sub>i</sub>.’

We propose that the non-local antecedents in (27) and (28) are permitted only when they are logophoric centers. In the following sections, we test exempt anaphors in

both Turkic languages and ultimately show that they require their antecedents to be Attitude Holders following Charnavel and Zlogar (2016)<sup>9</sup>. The definition is provided below:

- (29) **Attitude Holder: the intellectual type of perspective, which is licensed by intensional expressions such as *said,opined, and boasted***

We build the core of our analysis on Attitude Holders and present the diagnostics in 5.1. The aforementioned work by Charnavel and Zlogar (2016) also employs empathy loci to detect logophoric centers; thus, if their analysis is on the right track, we predict that Turkic data should behave accordingly.

## 5.1 Attitude Holders

Evidence that we are dealing with logophoricity rather than simply animacy comes from contrasts like (30) and (31) below, which both involve animate antecedents, but only (30) is logophoric<sup>10</sup>:

- (30) a. **Ali-ning qarish-i-che**, Mahinur<sub>j</sub> özi<sub>j</sub>-i-ni yaxshi.kör-i-du.  
 Ali-GEN view-3-CHE Mahinur self-3-ACC like-NONPST-3  
 ‘According to Ali<sub>i</sub>, Mahinur<sub>j</sub> likes self<sub>i/j</sub>.’ *Uyghur*
- b. **Ali-ye göre**, Seren<sub>j</sub> kendi-sin-i sev-iyor.  
 Ali-DAT according.to Seren self-3S-ACC like-PRES.PROG.3S  
 ‘According to Ali<sub>i</sub>, Seren<sub>j</sub> likes self<sub>i</sub>.’ *Turkish*

---

<sup>9</sup>Charnavel and Zlogar also demonstrate that deictic centers are logophoric, but it does not impact the Turkic data and thus is ignored here

<sup>10</sup>There are other cases of animate antecedents that or not logophoric, do not c-command, and thus cannot license the reflexive (e.g. possessors):

\*Tursun<sub>i</sub>-ing dost-i [Ali-ning öz-i-ni kör-gen-lik-i]-ge ishin-i-du.  
 Tursun-GEN friend-3 Ali-GEN self-3-ACC see-GAN-COMP-3-DAT believe-NONPST-3  
 ‘Tursun<sub>i</sub>’s friend believes that Ali saw self<sub>i</sub>.’ *Uyghur*

Dursun-un arkadaş-ı Ali-nin kendi-si-ni gör-düğ-ü-ne inan-ıyor.  
 Dursun-GEN friend-3S Ali-GEN self-3S-ACC see-DIK-COMP-3S-DAT believe-PRES.PROG.3S  
 ‘Dursun<sub>i</sub>’s friend believes that Ali saw self<sub>i</sub>.’ *Turkish*

- (31) a. \***Ali<sub>i</sub> toghrisida gep.ech-il-d-i,** Mahinur<sub>j</sub> öz\*<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>-i-ni  
 Ali about discussed-PASS-PST-3 Mahinur self-3-ACC  
 yaxshi.kör-i-du.  
 like-NONPST-3  
 \*‘Speaking of Ali<sub>i</sub>, Mahinur<sub>j</sub> likes self\*<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>.’ *Uyghur*
- b. \***Ali<sub>i</sub> de-miş-ken,** Seren<sub>j</sub> kendi\*<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>-sin-i sev-iyor.  
 Ali say-PERF-while Seren self-3S-ACC like-PRES.PROG.3S  
 \*‘Speaking of Ali<sub>i</sub>, Seren<sub>j</sub> likes self\*<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>.’ *Turkish*

### 5.1.1 The epithet test

Evidence that only (30) and not (31) is logophoric comes from similar examples in English based on the assumption that epithets are obligatorily anti-logophoric and failure to co-refer diagnoses attitude holders (from Dubinsky & Hamilton 1998; Charnavel & Zlogar 2016):

- (32) a. According to John<sub>i</sub>, Mary likes the idiot\*<sub>i</sub>/<sub>j</sub>.  
 b. Speaking of John<sub>i</sub>, Mary likes the idiot<sub>i</sub>/?<sub>j</sub>.

This test operates under the assumption that epithets cannot co-occur with attitude holders. Thus, if attitude holders automatically qualify as antecedents for reflexives in Uyghur and Turkish, the prediction is that the reflexive (when co-indexed with a non-local antecedent) cannot be replaced by an epithet. This is borne out, as exemplified by the contrast between (33) and (34) below:

- (33) a. Ali-ning<sub>i</sub> qari-sh-i-che, Mahinur<sub>j</sub> u **hamaqet**\*<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>/<sub>k</sub>-ni  
 Ali-GEN view-GER-3-CHE Mahinur that idiot-ACC  
 yaxshi.kör-i-du.  
 like-NONPST-3  
 ‘According to Ali<sub>i</sub>, Mahinur likes that idiot\*<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>/<sub>k</sub>.’ *Uyghur*
- b. Ali-ye göre, Seren<sub>j</sub> o **idiot**\*<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>/<sub>k</sub>-u sev-iyor.  
 Ali-DAT according.to Seren that idiot-ACC like-PRES.PROG.3S  
 ‘According to Ali<sub>i</sub>, Seren<sub>j</sub> likes that idiot\*<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>/<sub>k</sub>.’ *Turkish*

- (34) a. Ali<sub>i</sub> toghrisida gep.ech-il-d-i, Mahinur<sub>j</sub> u **hamaqet**<sub>i/\*j/\*k-ni</sub>  
 Ali about discussed-PASS-PST-3 Mahinur that idiot-ACC  
 yaxshi.kör-i-du.  
 like-NONPST-3  
 ‘Speaking of Ali<sub>i</sub>, Mahinur<sub>j</sub> likes that idiot<sub>i/\*j/\*k</sub>.’ *Uyghur*
- b. Ali<sub>i</sub> de-miş-ken, Seren<sub>j</sub> o **idiot**<sub>i/\*j/\*k-u</sub> sev-iyor.  
 Ali say-PERF-while Seren that idiot-ACC like-PRES.PROG.3S  
 ‘Speaking of Ali<sub>i</sub>, Seren likes that idiot<sub>i/\*j/\*k</sub>.’ *Turkish*

Notice in (33), that the epithet cannot be co-referenced with *Ali*, while in (34), it is able. The prediction is that in (33), the reflexive should be able to co-refer with *Ali*, while it cannot in (34). This is exactly what was shown in (30) and (31) above.

### 5.1.2 The double orientation test

Another test that diagnoses attitude holders is the double orientation test<sup>11</sup>, which involves insertion of an evaluative expression in place of the exempt anaphor and then determining whether the speaker, attitude holder, or both are responsible for the judgment (Charnavel and Zlogar 2016):

- (35) a. Ali<sub>i</sub> [Tursun<sub>j</sub>-ning **öz**<sub>i/j-i</sub>-ni yaxshi.kör-gen-liq-i]-ni de-d-i.  
 Ali Tursun-GEN self-3-ACC like-GAN-COMP-3-ACC say-PST-3  
 ‘Ali<sub>i</sub> said that Tursun<sub>j</sub> likes self<sub>i/j</sub>.’ *Uyghur*
- b. Ali<sub>i</sub> [Dursun<sub>j</sub>-un **kendi**<sub>i/j-sin-i</sub> beğen-diğ-in]-i söyle-di.  
 Ali Dursun-GEN self-3S-ACC like-DIK-3S-ACC say-PST.3S  
 ‘Ali<sub>i</sub> said that Dursun<sub>j</sub> likes self<sub>i/j</sub>.’ *Turkish*

<sup>11</sup>Most speakers of Turkish and Uyghur (in addition to speakers of English) treat epithets as R-expressions, and thus this test can only be used to diagnose non c-commanding antecedents. We thus shift to the double orientation test.

- (36) a. Ali [Tursun-ning **yaxshi bir ayal**-ni yaxshi.kör-gen-liq-i]-ni  
 Ali Tursun-GEN good one woman-ACC like-GAN-COMP-3-ACC  
 de-d-i.  
 say-PST-3  
 ‘Ali said that Tursun likes a good woman.’ *Uyghur*
- b. Ali [Dursun-nun **iyi bir kadın**-ı beğen-diğ-in]-i söyle-di.  
 Ali Dursun-GEN good one woman-ACC like-DIK-3S-ACC say-PST.3S  
 ‘Ali said that Dursun likes a good woman.’ *Turkish*

*Ali* in the cases above is the only possible evaluator of ‘a good woman’, which predicts that Ali is a permissible antecedent due to its status as an attitude holder. *Tursun/Dursun* are possible due to locality (Condition A), but these local antecedents do not have to be logophoric centers.

## 5.2 Introducing a Puzzle

There are other permissible antecedents that are neither attitude holders nor local enough to be accounted for by Condition A. There are cases where there are three-way ambiguities<sup>12</sup> with regard to the referential possibilities. An example of this sort is provided in (37):

- (37) a. Ali<sub>i</sub> Tursun<sub>j</sub>-din [Ahmet<sub>k</sub>-ning **öz**<sub>i/j/k</sub>-**i**-ni ur-idighan-liq-i]-ni  
 Ali Tursun-ABL Ahmet-GEN self-3-ACC hit-IMP-IMP-3-ACC  
 angli-d-i.  
 hear-PST-3  
 ‘Ali<sub>i</sub> heard from Tursun<sub>j</sub> that Ahmet<sub>k</sub> will hit self<sub>i/j/k</sub>.’ *Uyghur*
- b. Ali<sub>i</sub> Dursun<sub>j</sub>-dan [Ahmet<sub>k</sub>-in **kendi**<sub>i/j/k</sub>-**sin**-i vur-acağ-in]-ı  
 Ali Dursun-ABL Ahmet-GEN self-3-ACC hit-IMP-3S-ACC  
 duy-du.  
 hear-PST.3S  
 ‘Ali<sub>i</sub> heard from Dursun<sub>j</sub> that Ahmet<sub>k</sub> will hit self<sub>i/j/k</sub>.’ *Turkish*

<sup>12</sup>Without any contexts provided, it is difficult for some native speakers to get this three way ambiguity.



In both languages, all three sentence-internal DPs are possible antecedents for the reflexive. We can see from Turkish that the embedded subject is local enough to bind the reflexive, because non-agreeing *kendi* is permitted. This is shown in4:

- (38) Ali<sub>i</sub> Dursun<sub>j</sub>-dan [Ahmet<sub>k</sub>-in **kendin**<sub>\*i/\*j/k</sub>-i vur-acağ-ın]<sub>-1</sub> duy-du.  
 Ali Dursun-ABL Ahmet-GEN self-3-ACC hit-IMPF-3S-ACC hear-PST.3S  
 ‘Ali<sub>i</sub> heard from Dursun<sub>j</sub> that Ahmet will hit self<sub>\*i/\*j/k</sub>.’ *Turkish*

Furthermore, we can apply the double orientation test to show that *Tursun/Dursun* (in (37)) is an attitude holder. In both (39) and (45), *Tursun/Dursun* is the only person capable of evaluating the truth of the expression ‘a good man’:

- (39) a. Ali Tursun-din [Ahmet-ning **yaxshe bir adem**-ni  
 Ali Tursun-ABL Ahmet-GEN good one man-acc  
 ur-idighan-liq-i]-ni angli-d-i.  
 hit-IMPF-COMP-3-ACC hear-PST-3  
 ‘Ali heard from Tursun that Ahmet will hit a great man.’ *Uyghur*
- b. Ali Dursun-dan [Ahmet-in **iyi bir adam**-ı vur-acağ-ı]-nı  
 Ali Dursun-ABL Ahmet-GEN good one man-ACC hit-IMPF-3S-ACC  
 duy-du.  
 hear-PST.3S  
 ‘Ali heard from Dursun that Ahmet will hit a great man.’ *Turkish*

Given the results of this test, we currently would predict that the matrix subject *Ali* should not be permitted as an antecedent. This is not the correct prediction, as shown in (37).

One potential solution would be to follow Charnavel & Zlogar by adopting Kuno (1987)’s empathy locus. In Japanese, the perspective by which an event is carried out is lexically encoded, which allows the participant with whom the speaker empathizes to be unambiguously highlighted. Take for instance the contrast between two verbs that mean ‘give’ below:

- (40) a. Boku-ga Hanako-ni okane-o \*kure-re/ya-ru.  
 I-NOM Hanako-DAT money-ACC give-PRES.  
 ‘I give money to Hanako.’
- b. Taroo-ga boku-ni okane-o kure-ru/\*ya-ru.  
 Taroo-NOM me-DAT money-ACC give-PRES  
 ‘Taroo gives me money.’ (Kuno 1987, 246)

*yaru* is solely compatible with contexts from the perspective of the nominative argument, while *kureru* is only compatible with contexts where the utterance is interpreted as from the perspective of the dative-marked argument. In other words, this indicates the event participant the speaker “takes the mental perspective of”, which is used by both Kuno and Charnavel & Zlogar as another type of logophoric center. However, the empathy locus is not lexically encoded in English, and thus a different tactic is necessary. As a result, they introduce “the beloved test”, which is sketched out below (Charnavel & Zlogar 2016: 9):

- (41) **Beloved test: Replace the exempt anaphor with *his/her beloved* + *Noun* and check to see if the sentence is acceptable under a non-ironic reading.**

- (42) a. Anonymous posts about her<sub>i</sub> beloved son on the internet hurt Lucy<sub>i</sub>’s  
 [feelings/self-image].
- b. \*Anonymous posts about her<sub>i</sub> beloved son on the internet hurt Lucy<sub>i</sub>’s  
 [popularity/public image].

In the cases above, the speaker empathizes with *Lucy* in the case where her ‘feelings’ are hurt, but not when only her ‘popularity’ is at issue. It is difficult to create a perfect parallel in Turkic, but the same general fact seems to hold. Consider the case of experiencer subjects provided below:

- (43) a. [Ali-ning **öz<sub>i/j</sub>-i**-ni tenqidle-sh-i] Xemit<sub>j</sub>-ni achchiqlan-dur-d-i.  
 Ali-GEN self-3-ACC criticize-GER-3 Xemit-ACC anger-CAUS-PST-3  
 ‘That Ali<sub>i</sub> criticized self<sub>i/j</sub> angered Xemit<sub>j</sub>.’ *Uyghur*
- b. [Ali-nin **kendi<sub>i/j</sub>-sin**-i eleştir-me-si] Hamit<sub>j</sub>-i kızdır-dı.  
 Ali-GEN self-3S-ACC criticize-NOM-3S Hamit-ACC annoy-PST.3S  
 ‘That Ali<sub>i</sub> criticized self<sub>i/j</sub> annoyed Hamit<sub>j</sub>.’ *Turkish*

In both cases, the experiencer is marked with accusative case and is permitted as the antecedent. If we apply the beloved test here, by replacing the reflexive with ‘his/her beloved son’, we are able to evaluate the same set of facts in Turkic:

- (44) a. [Ali-ning **suyumluq oghul-i**-ni tenqidle-sh-i] **Xemit-ni**  
 Ali-GEN beloved son-3-ACC criticize-GER-3 Xemit-ACC  
 achchiqlan-dur-d-i.  
 anger-CAUS-PST-3  
 ‘That Ali criticized his beloved son angered Xemit.’ *Uyghur*
- b. [Ali-nin **kiymetli oğl-un-u** eleştir-me-si] **Hamit-i**  
 Ali-GEN valued son-3S-ACC criticize-NOM-3S Hamit-ACC  
 kızdır-dı.  
 annoy-PST.3S  
 ‘That Ali criticized his beloved son annoyed Hamit.’ *Turkish*

In the case above, *Xemit/Hamit* is able to receive empathy from the speaker, but it is not clear that the speaker is empathizing with or taking the mental perspective of the experiencer. For the present purposes, we suggest that with further testing, this could be a relevant factor, which seems to work toward evaluating (37) as well. We are able to apply the same test:

- (45) a. Ali<sub>i</sub> Tursun<sub>j</sub>-din [Ahmet<sub>k</sub>-ning **suyumluq oghul<sub>i/j/k-i</sub>**-ni  
 Ali Tursun-ABL Ahmet-GEN beloved son-3-acc  
 ur-idighan-liq-i]-ni angli-d-i.  
 hit-IMPF-COMP-3-ACC hear-PST-3  
 ‘Ali<sub>i</sub> heard from Tursun<sub>j</sub> that Ahmet<sub>k</sub> will hit his beloved son<sub>i/j/k</sub>.’ *Uyghur*
- b. Ali<sub>i</sub> Dursun<sub>j</sub>-dan [Ahmet<sub>k</sub>-in **kiymetli oğl<sub>i/j/k-un</sub>**-u vur-acağ-in]-1  
 Ali Dursun-ABL Ahmet-GEN valued son-3-ACC hit-IMPF-3S-ACC  
 duy-du.  
 hear-PST.3S  
 ‘Ali<sub>i</sub> heard from Dursun<sub>j</sub> that Ahmet<sub>k</sub> will hit his<sub>i/j/k</sub> beloved son.’ *Turkish*

In this construction, *Ali* is most naturally the person the speaker empathizes with if it is ‘his’ son that is being affected. This suggests that empathy loci are also permissible antecedents in Turkic. We suggest this is a worthwhile direction for future research, but more diagnostics for empathy loci and a clearer understanding of their distribution is necessary to clearly determine that the empathy locus status is responsible for the referential possibilities in (37).

## 6 Conclusion

We showed in this paper that Condition A is sufficient to account for all cases where the antecedent and the reflexive are in the same (binding) domain (regardless of whether the reflexive agrees with the antecedent or not). We introduced novel data that suggests there is more than one way to license *kendi-si*. In particular, we showed that focus and honorific uses do not obey the same requirements as neutral uses. In neutral contexts, the reflexive (when exempt) must have a logophoric antecedent (either an Attitude Holder or an Empathy Locus). The novel data presented in this paper showed that Uyghur *öz-i* only allows logophoric usage of exempt anaphora. In summary, we expand upon prior investigations of exempt anaphora, concluding that logophoricity plays an important role in determining the licensing of Turkic anaphors.

## References

- Aydin, O., Issever, S. (2013). Anti-subject orientation in Turkish. In 40. Yıl Yazıları 1972-2012, ed. Özyıldırım, I., Büyükkantarcıoğlu, N., Yazar, E., and Alpaslan, E. 42–63. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Charnavel, I., Sportiche, D. (2016). Anaphor binding: what french inanimate anaphors show. *Linguistic Inquiry*.
- Charnavel, I. & Zlogar, C. (2016). English reflexive logophors. In Proceedings of the 51st annual meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society (CLS51), 83-97.
- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origins, and use*. New York: Praeger.
- Dubinsky, S., & Hamilton, R. (1998). Epithets as antilogophoric pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 29, 685–693.
- Fiengo, R., May, R. (1994). *Indices and identity* (Vol. 24). MIT press.
- Kornfilt, J. (2000). Local and long-distance reflexives in Turkish. In *Long Distance Reflexives: Syntax and Semantics*. Vol.33, 197-226. Ed. Peter Cole, Gabriella Hermon, C.-T. James Huang. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Kuno, S. (1987). *Functional syntax: Anaphora, discourse and empathy*. University of Chicago Press.
- Sells, P. (1987). Aspects of logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 18(3), 445-479.
- Sezer, E. (1979). On reflexivization in Turkish. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 3, 748-759.
- Williams, E. S. (1977). Discourse and logical form. *Linguistic inquiry*, 101-139.