Referential Dependencies in Turkish: Some Novel Arguments on the Binding of *Kendisi*, *O* and *Pro**

Nazik Dinçtopal Deniz[1]

ORCID: [1]0000-0003-0673-1130

[1]Boğaziçi University, Department of Foreign Language Education & M.A. Program in Cognitive Science, Bebek, 34342, İstanbul

[1]nazik.dinctopal@boun.edu.tr

ABSTRACT: The Turkish reflexive *kendisi* (self-3SG.POSS) deviates from Principle A of the Binding Theory and from the Minimalist movement approaches to referential dependencies. This paper concurs with Kornfilt (2001) and provides further support that *kendi-si* is preceded by a null possessor (*pro*) which influences its binding but argues that *kendisi* is not a reflexive. *Kendisi*'s distribution changes when its possessor is a null pronominal (*pro*) or an overt pronominal (*o,* 'she/he/it'). It is claimed that *pro* and *o* are not the null and overt counterparts of the same pronominal. *Pro* and *o* show the same distribution only in (in)direct object positions. In possessive phrases and subject positions, their distributions differ. Following Cardinaletti and Starke (1999) and Safir (2004), it is argued that *pro* is a weak pronoun which only refers to an antecedent mentioned in the context. But *o* is a strong pronoun and can make independent reference and function as a topic shifter.

Keywords: Turkish, reflexives, pronouns, binding

Türkçede Göndergesel Bağımlılıklar: *Kendisi, O* ve *Adıl*'ın Bağlanması Üzerine Yeni Argümanlar

ÖZ: Türkçe dönüşlü adıl *kendisi* Bağlama Kuramı'nın A İlkesinden ve Yetinmeci Program'ın göndergesel bağımlılıklarına yaklaşımlarından sapar. Bu makalede sunulan analizler, Kornfilt (2001) makalesindeki gibi dönüşlü adıl *kendisi*'nden önce onun bağlanmasını etkileyen bir boş adıl (*adıl*) olduğu fikrini

---

savunur; ancak *kendisi*'nin dönüşlü adıl olmadığını öne sürer. *Kendisi*'nin bağlanması, öncesinde *adıl* veya *o* geldiğinde değişir. Bu çalışma, *adıl* ve *o*'nun aynı adılın örtük ve açık karşılıkları olmadığını iddia etmektedir. *Adıl* ve *o* aynı dağılımı yalnızca (dolaylı) nesne olarak kullanıldıklarında gösterir. İyelik ifadelerinde ve özne olarak kullanıldıklarında dağılımları farklıdır. Sunulan analizler, Cardinaletti ve Starke (1999) ve Safir'in (2004) savlarını takiben, *adıl*'ın zayıf adıl olduğunu ve yalnızca bağlamda belirtilen bir öncülü ifade ettiğini gösterirken *o*'nun güçlü adıl olduğunu, bağımsız referans yapabildiğini ve konu değiştirici olarak işlev görebildiğini işaret eder.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Türkçe, dönüşlülük, adıl, bağlama

1   Introduction

This paper examines the referential dependencies of Turkish noun phrases, *kendisi* (self-3SG.POSS), the null pronoun *pro* and the overt pronoun *o* (he/she/it). Turkish reflexive *kendisi* has been reported to deviate from the traditional Binding Theory (Principle A) as proposed within the Government and Binding framework since it could refer to an antecedent within and outside its local domain. It is argued in this paper that *kendisi,* marked with the third person singular possessive, is preceded by a null pronominal whose binding affects the interpretation of the antecedent(s) for *kendisi*. But *kendisi* does not show the same distribution when possessed by the overt pronoun *o* (he/she/it) and the null pronoun *pro*. Reviewing syntactic as well as pragmatic approaches to the distributions of null and overt pronouns, it is argued that the null pronominal *pro* and the overt pronoun *o* are not the null and overt counterparts of the same pronominal. Their distributions are the same only in (in)direct object positions; in possessive phrases and subject positions, they vary in their referentiality. It is proposed that *pro* is a weak pronoun which only refers to an antecedent mentioned in the context; but *o* is a strong pronoun and can make independent reference and function as a topic shifter.

The paper will examine the syntactic distribution of these noun phrases (NPs) under the Binding Theory (Chomsky, 1980, 1981, 1982).

1.1   The Binding Theory

Binding Theory (BT), developed by Chomsky (1980, 1981, 1982), is a module of the grammar that regulates referential dependencies between NPs such as follows:

(1)   John$_i$ thinks that Bill$_j$ hit himself$_{*i/j}$.
(2)   John$_i$ thinks that Bill$_j$ saw him$_{i/*j}$.
(3)   He$_i$ thinks that John$_{*i}$ is a student.

In sentence (1), the reflexive *himself* refers to the subject of the embedded clause *Bill* but not to the subject of the matrix clause, *John*. In sentence (2), on the other hand, the pronoun *him* cannot refer to the subject of the embedded clause *Bill* but it can refer to the subject of the matrix clause, *John*. In sentence (3), the proper name *John* does not refer to another NP within the complex sentence. Such distributional patterns resulted in classification of NPs according to their values of features [±anaphoric] and [±pronominal]:

  (i)   Anaphors [+anaphoric, -pronominal]: himself, herself, each other, one another, etc.
  (ii)   Pronominals [- anaphoric, +pronominal]: he, she, him, her, etc.
  (iii)   R-expressions [-anaphoric, -pronominal]: Bill, John, etc.

The distribution of NPs with the features above was hypothesized to be governed by three universal Binding Principles (Chomsky, 1981):

  (i)   Principle A: an anaphor must be bound in its governing category
  (ii)   Principle B: a pronoun must be free in its governing category
  (iii)   Principle C: an R-expression must be free

Where governing category is:

  (i) α is the governing category for β if and only if α is the minimal category containing β and a governor of β, where α = NP or S.
                                                    (Chomsky, 1981: 188)

And binding is:

  (i) α is X-bound by β if and only if α and β are coindexed, β c-commands α, and β is in an X-position.
                                                    (Chomsky, 1981: 184)

The governing category in the definition of binding is later replaced with local domain (e.g., Chomsky, 1986), which has also undergone several revisions. The initial formulation defined the local domain as the minimal clause (IP) which contains the bindee. In this definition, the local domain for the sentences above is the embedded *that*-clause and the binding phenomena such as those in (1-3) could be successfully explained. However, for this definition of the local domain, and for some later definitions, there were still some problematic cases as in (4).

  (4) $John_i$ read $Bill_j$'s description of $himself_{*i/j}/him_{i/*j}$.

In sentence (4) the only minimal clause is the sentence but as the indices on the anaphor himself and the pronoun him show, the matrix clause does not function as the local domain.

Such examples have led to the introduction of the terms governor and subject into the definition of the local domain. Local domain was then defined as the minimal maximal projection containing the bindee, the governor of the bindee, and a SUBJECT accessible to the bindee. Accessible means that the co-indexation of the SUBJECT and the bindee should not violate any principles of grammar. An accessible SUBJECT could be either a lexical subject or agreement (AGR) (Chomsky, 1986). But this definition of local domain could not explain the i-within-i filter cases such as (5) and (6).

    (5) John$_i$ thinks that [pictures of himself$_{i/*k}$ are hideous].
    (6) John$_i$ thinks that [pictures of him$_{*i/k}$ are hideous].

If the local domain includes an accessible subject which can be AGR or a lexical subject, then for (5) and (6) the embedded clauses would be the local domains. However, this would wrongly predict for the anaphor himself in (5) to not be able to co-index with an antecedent outside its local domain, i.e., John. Yet, it does. Furthermore, the pronoun him in (6) would be able to take John as its antecedent which is outside its local domain, which, again, is not the case.

The local domain was then defined as the minimal Complete Functional Complex (CFC) which contains the bindee and a governor of the bindee in which the bindee's Binding Principle could, in principle, be satisfied (Chomsky, 1995). Although the final definition of the local domain was less restrictive than the earlier versions, pronouns and anaphors in several other languages such as Turkish, *kendisi*, Japanese, *zibun*, (Enç, 1989) Dutch, *zich*, Norwegian *seg*, and Italian *sè* (Reinhart & Reuland, 1993) and Icelandic *sig* (Wexler & Manzini, 1987) still posed a challenge. These observations have led to different versions of Binding such as parametric variation of governing category across languages and lexical parameterization within a specific language (Wexler & Manzini, 1987), the Reflexivity approach (Reinhart & Reuland, 1993), revision of features for NPs (Enç, 1989) or a movement analysis for anaphors as in the Minimalist Program (Hornstein, 2006).

This paper examines one such problematic case, i.e., the Turkish reflexive *kendisi* (self-3SG.POSS), within the framework of Government and Binding (Section 2). The paper also examines the referentiality of the overt and null pronouns in Turkish, whose distribution also poses a challenge to the Binding Theory (Section 3).

2 The Turkish Reflexive *Kendisi*

2.1 Problems with the Binding of Kendisi

The Turkish NP *kendisi* is often referred to as a reflexive despite its deviance from the traditional BT-A. Literature on Turkish reflexives reports that the bare form of the Turkish reflexive pronoun is *kendi* (e.g., Göksel & Kerslake, 2005). The English translation for *kendi* can be *self* or *essence*. The third person singular form of the reflexive is reported to appear in two forms: *kendi* and *kendi-si* since it can also receive the third person singular agreement marking *–sI* (Göksel & Kerslake, 2005). Analyzed as anaphors so far, both *kendi* and *kendisi* are predicted to refer to antecedents in their local domains due to their [+anaphoric] feature but it has been widely reported that *kendisi* can also bind non-locally (Enç, 1989; Kornfilt, 1997; Kornfilt, 2001).

> (7) Ali$_i$ [Ayşe$_k$'nin   kendi-ni$_{*i/k/*m}$ beğen-diğ-in]-i
>   Ali Ayşe-GEN   self-3SG.POSS-ACC like-NOM-3SG.POSS-ACC
>   düşün-üyor.
>   think-PROG
>   'Ali thinks that Ayşe likes herself.'

> (8) Ali$_i$ [Ayşe$_k$'nin   kendi-si-ni$_{i/k/m}$ beğen-diğ-in]-i
>   Ali Ayşe-GEN   self-3SGPOSS-ACC like-NOM-3SGPOSS-ACC
>   düşün-üyor.
>   think-PROG
>   'Ali thinks that Ayşe likes himself/herself.'

Sentence (7) is compatible with BT-A, when the local domain is taken to be the embedded clause in which the anaphor's binding principle could *in principle* be satisfied, i.e., it can be locally bound. The anaphor *kendi* is bound by the antecedent *Ayşe* within its local domain and it cannot refer to the matrix clause subject, *Ali*. [1]

Sentence (8), on the other hand, is problematic if we take the same CFC (i.e., the embedded clause) as the local domain. As the indices indicate, *kendisi* could refer to the subject of the embedded clause, *Ayşe* or the matrix subject *Ali* or it can take another antecedent outside the sentence within the discourse. If the embedded clause is taken as the local domain in Turkish as in (7), *k* and *m*

---

[1] Note that *kendi* has also been reported to deviate from BT-A (Kornfilt, 1984, 2001; Meral, 2010, 2013; Palaz, 2013) but since the focus of this paper is on the distribution of *kendisi* and overt and null pronouns in Turkish, the reader is referred to the relevant literature for the binding of *kendi.*

readings are predicted to be ungrammatical. If the embedded clause is not a good candidate for local domain in the sense that the BT principle of the anaphor could not be met in principle and the matrix clause is analyzed as the local domain, then at least the *m* reading is predicted to be ungrammatical. But in that case the matrix clause as the local domain will not meet the BT principles of the anaphor in (7). Since both *kendi* and *kendisi* are assumed to share the same nominal property, namely [+anaphoric], a local domain selected for one must also satisfy the other's BT principle.

In addition to their distributional differences, *kendi* and *kendisi* cannot always be interchangeably used:

(9) a. Cem Bey'le   konuş-abil-ir   mi-yim?
        Cem Mr.-WITH   talk-PSB-AOR   Cl-1SG
        'May I talk to Mr. Cem?'

     b. Kendisi / *kendi   henüz   gel-me-di.
        Self-3SG.POSS / self   yet   arrive-NEG-PAST
        'Himself has not arrived yet.'

Use of a bare form of reflexive would result in ungrammaticality in (9) as it is not bound by an antecedent within its local domain, i.e., the matrix clause. But the inflected from, *kendisi,* behaves as if it were a pronominal and can refer to an antecedent mentioned in the context outside its local domain. But the sentences (7) and (8) prevent a pronominal analysis of *kendisi* as it also has the capacity to refer to an antecedent within its local domain when there is one.

2.2   Previous Accounts for the Non-local Binding of Kendisi

Enç (1989) claimed that the feature system in the BT is not sufficient to capture the distribution of NPs observed in natural languages and it does not entail semantic binding. She proposed that other features such as *binder* and *licenser* are necessary to account for the distribution of NPs in natural languages. The binder feature is [+B] for NPs which need a sentence-internal antecedent that semantically binds it and [-B] for the ones which do not need a sentence-internal semantic binder. This feature is proposed to account for possible semantic as well as syntactic antecedents of a reflexive. The licenser feature is [+L] for the NPs that require a licenser and NPs with feature [+L] are subject to the BT-A. These two features are claimed to account for expressions such as Dogrib *ye* which share properties with both reflexives and pronominals. Such expressions would have [+L, -B] whereas a true reflexive would be [+L, +B]. *Kendisi* does not need a sentence-internal antecedent. Enç argues that it does not need a binder, at all. And if there is any possible binder in the context, there

is no locality or non-locality condition for that. Thus, *kendisi* would have the features [-B, -L, -pronominal]. But this proposition does not make a clear distinction between a referential expression, which can take a unique referent, and *kendisi*. *Kendisi* is at least semantically dependent on an antecedent for its interpretation. Enç mentions that the two features (i.e., [B] and [L]) do not cover the case of reflexives where the binder and the licenser are the same. Thus, she adds a further [±ID] feature. A pronominal is [+ID] if the pronoun's licenser and binder are co-indexed. But these features cannot account for the local, non-local and disjoint readings in (7) and (8) in Turkish. That is, Enç's proposal does not seem to explain all the possible readings of Turkish *kendisi* and differentiate it successfully from *kendi*.

Lewis (1985) argues that *kendisi* (and its plural form *kendileri*) are indeed pronouns with no reflexive or emphatic sense. But as Kornfilt (2001) notes local binding for genuine pronouns is not possible. A similar argument by Gürel (2002; 2004) maintains that the null pronominal, *pro*, shows a similar distribution to the reflexive, *kendisi*, rather than to its overt counterpart, *o* (he, she, it); and therefore, *pro* is indeed the null counterpart of *kendisi* rather than the overt pronoun *o* since both *pro* and *kendisi* show anaphoric and pronominal distribution and are unconstrained in their binding (also see Rudnev, 2011, for a similar argument).

The sentences below compare the distributions of *kendisi*, overt pronoun *o,* and *pro* in the possessor position of a genitive-possessive phrase (10), in the subject position of a non-finite embedded sentence (11) and a finite embedded sentence (12).

(10) Ali$_i$ [o-nun$_{*i/k}$ /*pro*$_{i/k}$ /kendi-si-nin$_{i/k}$ karı-sı]-nı
    Ali   she/he-GEN/*pro*/self-3SG.POSS-GEN wife-3SG.POSS-ACC
    ara-dı.
    call-PAST
    'Ali$_i$ called her/his$_{*i/k}$ / *pro*$_{i/k}$ /himself/herself's$_{i/k}$ wife.'

(11) Ali$_i$ [o-nun$_{*i/k/m}$/*pro*$_{i/k/m}$ /kendi-si-nin$_{i/k/m}$ yalancı
    Ali   she/he-GEN/*pro*/self-3SG.POSS-GEN   liar
    ol-duğ-u]-nu   düşün-üyor.
    be-NOM-3SG.POSS-ACC   think-PROG
    'Ali$_i$ thinks that she/he$_{*i/k/m}$/*pro*$_{i/k/m}$ /himself/herself$_{i/k/m}$ is a liar.'

(12) Ali$_i$ [o$_{*i/k/m}$/*pro*$_{i/k/m}$ /kendi-si$_{i/k/m}$ kazan-dı]   san-ıyor.
    Ali   she/he/*pro*/self-3SgPoss   win-PAST   think-PROG
    'Ali thinks that she/he$_{*i/k/m}$ / *pro*$_{i/k/m}$ /himself/herself$_{i/k/m}$ won.'

As the indices in the examples above show, in the possessor position of genitive possessive phrases, in the subject position of non-finite embedded sentences and in the subject position of finite embedded sentences, *pro* and *kendisi* show the same distribution and the overt pronoun *o*'s distribution is different. But if *pro* and *kendisi* were the null and overt realizations of the same NP type, we would expect to see *pro* and *kendisi* to be used interchangeably without any ungrammaticality. However, the use of *pro* but not that of *kendisi* makes the following sentence ungrammatical.

> (13)   a. Ali Kerem'in   kendi-si-ni   sev-iyor.
>   Ali Kerem-GEN   self-3SGPOSS-ACC   like-PROG
>   'Ali likes Kerem's self.'
>   b. *Ali Kerem'in *pro* sev-iyor.

Thus, the conclusion that *kendisi* is the overt counterpart of *pro* does not seem to be plausible. It also does not explain the question why *kendisi* and *pro* are unconstrained in their binding.

Kornfilt (2001) argues that the inflected form of the Turkish reflexive, *kendi-si* (self-3SG.POSS) is actually an Agreement Phrase (AgrP) in disguise whose specifier is a *pro* and the AgrP serves as the binding domain for the inflected reflexive. That is, *kendisi* is actually part of a possessive phrase in the form [AgrP *pro kendi-si]*. The possessive phrase, headed by an overt agreement inflection, 3SG.POSS, would serve as the local binding domain for the reflexive. *Kendisi* would therefore be bound by *pro* in its AgrP, local domain, and the *pro* in the phrase would behave similar to any pronoun and, in conformity with Principle B, would refer to an antecedent outside the AgrP, which can be an antecedent in the clause, outside the clause or outside the utterance in the discourse. This explains the seemingly local, i.e., within clause, and non-local binding of *kendisi*.

The present paper takes a similar approach in that it also argues that *kendisi* is preceded by a *pro* and is part of an AgrP. But instead of assuming *kendisi* to be a deviant reflexive as in previous research (e.g., Kornfilt, 2001), the present paper entertains the idea that *kendisi* could be a common noun marked for possession. It enters a possessor-possessee relationship with *pro* and receives its referentiality through this.

2.3   Kend-i-si *as Doubly Marked Possessive NP, and a Null Possessor, pro, Preceding* Kendisi

Turkish possessive phrases occur in the form of two NPs marked with genitive and possessive markers. The first NP carrying genitive case indicates the possessor and the second NP with the possessive marker indicates the possessed.

It is possible to omit the possessor in Turkish genitive-possessive constructions since the possessive suffix indicates the person and number of the possessor:

(14)(Ben-im)   ev-im
      I-GEN   house-1SG.POSS
      'My house'

(15)(Ali-nin)   araba-sı
      Ali-GEN   car-3SG.POSS
      'Ali's car'

Table 1 shows agreement in Turkish genitive-possessive phrases.

Table 1. Turkish nominal agreement for genitive-possessive phrases

Person	Genitive	Posessive	Examples with 'ev' (house)	
1Sg	-(I)m	-(I)m	(ben-im) ev-im	'my house'
2Sg	-(I)n	-(I)n	(sen-in) ev-in	'your house'
3Sg	-nIn	-(s)I	(o-nun) ev-i	'her/his house'
1Pl	-(I)m	-(I)mIz	(biz-im) ev-imiz	'our house'
2Pl	-(I)n	-(I)nIz	(siz-in) ev-iniz	'your (pl) house'
3Pl	-(I)n	-(lAr)I	(onlar-ın) ev-(ler)i	'their house(s)'

In Turkish, attaching a suffix to a root or a stem occasionally results in vowel or consonant deletion, or epenthesis since vowels do not occur in hiatus. The third person possessive suffix *-(s)I* exemplifies a case in which there is a deletable *s* (Göksel & Kerslake, 2005) as in (16a,b):

(16)a. Ali'*nin* silgi-*si*   vs.   b. Kerem'*in*   ev-*i*
     Ali-GEN eraser-3SG.POSS   Kerem- GEN house-3SG.POSS
     'Ali's eraser'   'Kerem's house'

Recall that there are two forms of reflexives in Turkish: the bare form, *kendi* and an *optionally* marked third person singular form, *kendi-si* (e.g., Göksel & Kerslake, 2005). Table 2 presents the nominal inflection for the reflexive *kendi*.

Table 2. Possessive agreement for kendi

Personal Pronoun	Genitive	Possessive	Kendi *in Gen-Poss constuctions*
1Sg	-(I)m	-(I)m	(ben-im) kendi-m
2Sg	-(I)n	-(I)n	(sen-in) kendi-n
3Sg	-nIn	**-(s)I**	(o-nun) kendi-**(si)**
1Pl	-(I)m	-(I)mIz	(biz-im) kendi-miz
2Pl	-(I)n	-(I)nIz	(siz-in) kendi-niz
3Pl	-(lAr)In	-(lAr)I	(onlar-ın) kendi-leri

Compare Table 2, which shows the nominal agreement on *kendi* as a possessed NP, to Table 1, which shows nominal agreement for *ev* (house) as a possessed NP. It is clear in Table 1 that there is a deletable *s* rather than an optional morpheme, *sI,* to mark third person singular possessive. And common nouns can only appear without overt possessive agreement when their possessor is overtly mentioned as in (17) because otherwise person agreement or possessive relationship cannot be shown.

(17) Ben-im / o-nun   ev
     I-GEN / she/he-GEN   house
     'My / her/his house'

Without its possessor, *ben-im* (my), *ev* would only mean *house* in (17). And the optional marking of possessive suffix when its possessor is overtly expressed is not restricted to the third person singular.

   This shows that the two forms of the Turkish reflexive, *kendi* and *kendisi,* cannot be explained with reference to nominal agreement in Turkish possessive phrases. If the bare form of the reflexive were *kendi*, it would not be able to indicate any agreement or possession relationship without its possessor overtly preceding it. The present paper argues that the bare form of the reflexive is not *kendi* as has been assumed in the literature so far. Rather, *kend* or *kent* (due to word-final devoicing in Turkish) is the bare form, *kend-i* is the 3SG.POSS marked form and *kendi-si* is a regular common noun marked for 3SG.POSS and receives its referentiality through *pro* that is in the specifier of the genitive-possessive phrase it is part of.

   The existence of these two forms could be related to the historical evolution of reflexives. Schaldt (2000) investigated the origin and evolution of reflexive markers in 150 languages and his analyses showed that the following lexical elements (in the order given) are the most likely to evolve into reflexive markers in a language: (i) body part names such as *head*, *arm*; (ii) nominal

sources denoting *person*, *self*, *owner*; (iii) emphatic pronouns; (iv) object personal pronouns; (v) verbs such as *return*, *come back*; (vi) the noun *reflection*; and (vii) locative prepositions.

The Turkish reflexive *kendi* means *self* or *essence* (Türk Dil Kurumu - the Turkish Language Association) and would be a good candidate to evolve into a reflexive marker. The observation that it still indicates third person singular agreement suggests that it is indeed marked for third person singular in the form of *kend-i* (kend-3SG.POSS). After evolving into a reflexive marker in the language, *kend* presumably does not appear in the form of a common noun meaning *essence* anymore. And the third person singular form, *kendi* gains other uses such as an adjective meaning *own* (Lewis, 1967) as in (18) and (19).

(18) (Ben-im)   kendi   kitab-ım
     I-GEN   own   book-1SG.POSS
     'My own book'
(19) (O-nun)   kendi   kitab-ı
     She/he-GEN   own   book-1SG.POSS
     'Her/his own book'

It is likely that after gaining its reflexive use, the language may have marked the full form for 3SG.POSS as *kendi-si* with an intended meaning of *essence-3SG.POSS.*

Table 3 presents the possessive agreement proposed for *kend* and *kendi*.

Table 3. Kend- and kendi- as the root of Turkish reflexive marker

Personal Pronoun	Possessive	'kend' as the bare form	'kendi' as the bare form
1Sg	-(I)m	kend-im	kendi-m
2Sg	-(I)n	kend-in	kendi-n
3Sg	**-(s)I**	**kend-i**	**kendi-si**
1Pl	-(I)mIz	kend-imiz	kendi-miz
2Pl	-(I)nIz	kend-iniz	kendi-niz
3Pl	-(lAr)I	*kend-leri	kendi-leri

The assumption that the bare form of the reflexive is *kend-* is mostly compatible with nominal agreement in Turkish, except for the third person plural form of the noun **kend-leri*. But note that a bare form of an NP cannot mark for person in Turkish and *kendi* clearly refers to third person singular antecedents.

Furthermore, the distribution of *kendileri* (self-3PL.POSS) patterns with *kendisi* (local, non-local and disjoint reading) as in (20) rather than *kendi* or other forms of the reflexive.

(20) [Ali ve Ayşe]ᵢ   [on-lar-ınₖ   kendi-leri-niᵢ/ₖ/ₘ
     Ali and Ayşe   she/he-PL-GEN   self-3SG.POSS-ACC
     beğen-diğ-i]-ni   düşün-üyor.
     like-FN-3SG.POSS-ACC   think-PROG
     '[Ali and Ayşe]ᵢ think that theyₖ like themselves ᵢ/ₖ/ₘ.'

Thus, it appears and will be assumed in this paper that the deviant third person singular and third person plural forms indeed lack referentiality. They are used as common nouns (meaning *self* or *essence*) marked with 3SG.POSS after *kendi* has assumed a reflexive use. Thus, the main argument here is that all person forms of the reflexive in Turkish, including *kendi,* are morphologically marked for person and they are true anaphors. The true anaphor for the third person singular is the bi-morphemic form *kend-i*, which has the feature [+anaphoric]. Having gained its reflexive use, *kendi* as a root meaning *essence* provides input for *kendisi. Kendisi* and *kendileri,* the bi-morphemic third person forms, deviate from BT-A.

The referentiality of *kendi-si* is through the AGR relationship it engages in with its specifier *pro* (cf. Kornfilt, 2001). Just like any common noun phrase marked with possessive agreement in a genitive possessive construction, such as *ø ev-i* (house-3SG.POSS), it is proposed, as in Kornfilt (2001), that *kendi-si* is marked with third person singular possessive agreement and is preceded by a null pronominal in the form of a genitive possessive phrase. And *kendisi* receives its referentiality through this null form, namely, *pro*.

2.4 *Null Pronominal*, pro, *Preceding* Kendisi *as a Possessor*

Turkish is a *pro*-drop language allowing its subjects, objects and possessors in genitive possessive phrases to be null unless the overt mention of them would make an emphatic or contrastive function or convey new information (Erguvanlı-Taylan, 1986). When the possessor in a genitive possessive construction is dropped, i.e., replaced with *pro,* the possessed NP must indicate the number and person features of the possessor as in (21). Just like any other possessive-marked NP, it is possible to drop the possessor in a genitive-possessive construction involving *kendisi* as in (22).

(21) Ali   [*pro*   araba-sı-nı]   beğen-iyor.
     Ali   car-3SG.POSS-ACC   like-PROG
     'Ali likes her/his car.'

(22) Ali$_i$ [*pro*   kendi-si-ni$_{i/k}$]   beğen-iyor.
      Ali   self-3SG.POSS-ACC   like-PROG
      'Ali likes her/his self.'

There are two possible approaches to the binding of *kendisi* in this context. One approach is that *kendi-si* is a *common noun*, that lacks referentiality, possessed by a null pronominal. In this approach, *kendisi* is not considered to be a deviant reflexive as is presumed in the previous literature (e.g., Kornfilt, 2001). As mentioned in the previous section the third person possessive form of reflexive, *kend-i* is also realized as a mono-morphemic form *kendi* which means *own* after evolving into a reflexive marker. This mono-morphemic form would lack the [+anaphoric] feature and act as a common noun, perhaps with its original meaning *self* or *essence*. The mono-morphemic form would then be marked for third person singular similar to a common noun. It would be [-anaphoric] and only have a possession relationship with its null possessor. And the null possessor, *pro*, being a pronominal would be subject to BT principles, namely, BT-B. Consequently, binding of the whole phrase would be subject to BT-B and *kendisi* would receive non-local readings[2]. This approach would show the indices on *pro* but not on *kendisi* as in (24). In both (21) and (22), revised as (23) and (24) below, the possessor of both the noun *araba-sı* (car-3SG.POSS) and *kendi-si* (self-3SG.POSS) are understood to be either *Ali* or some other antecedent not mentioned in the sentence. This approach considers the root of *kendi-si* to be a regular noun without referentiality.

(23) Ali$_i$ [*pro*$_{i/k}$ araba-sı-nı]   beğen-iyor.
      Ali   car-3SG.POSS-ACC   like-PROG
      'Ali likes her/his car.'

(24) Ali$_i$ [*pro*$_{i/k}$ kendi-si-ni]   beğen-iyor.
      Ali   self-3SG.POSS-ACC   like-PROG
      'Ali likes her/his self.'

The second approach is what Kornfilt (2001) proposed previously. There, *kendisi* would carry [+anaphoric] feature and be bound by a null possessor. The null possessor would bind the anaphor within the genitive possessive phrase which bears person and number agreement. As a result, the genitive possessive

---

[2] This approach, alongside a strong and weak pronoun analysis for *o* and *pro* (see below), is also in line with a topic-oriented approach for *kendisi* as discussed by Özsoy (1990). In line with Özsoy's analyses whereas *o* can be used to introduce new topics (as a strong pronoun), *kendisi* cannot and refers to the main topic of the discourse as it would be preceded by a *pro* (a weak pronoun).

AgrP would qualify as a local domain for the anaphor *kendisi* as in (22). Abiding by the BT-A, *kendisi* would pick up the antecedent *pro* in the Spec position of the AgrP. The same AgrP would be the local domain for *pro*, which is a null pronominal bearing the features [+pronominal, -anaphoric]. Following BT-B, it would be free in its local domain and pick up an antecedent outside the AgrP, which can be *Ali* or another entity mentioned in the context.

Both approaches can solve the binding problem of *kendisi* equally well. But in previous approaches, including Kornfilt's, the language marks person on all forms of the anaphor, to convey a true anaphoric interpretation, except for the third person singular. But as shown above, in Turkish the person needs to be mentioned either overtly as in *benim araba* (my car) or marked through affixation *araba-m* (car-1SG.POSS). A bare form such as *araba* (car) cannot indicate any person. *Kendi* clearly has a third person singular referent. That makes the first approach, i.e., *kendisi* as a common noun (not a reflexive) entering a possession relationship with *pro,* more plausible.

This approach would also solve the puzzle in Kornfilt's analyses where only the third person deviant forms (but not the other inflected forms) would be preceded by *pro*. That is, Kornfilt considers *kendi* to be the bare, uninflected form and *kendisi* to be inflected; and *kendisi*'s deviance from BT-A is attributed to its morphological structure. But other forms of the anaphor (e.g., *kendi-m, kendi-n, kendi-miz*), which abide by BP-A, are also inflected and abide by BT-A. Examine (25a-b).

(25) a. Sen$_i$ ayna-da   kend-in-i$_i$ gör-dü-n.
          You   mirror-LOC   self-2SG.POSS.ACC   see-PAST-2SG
          'You saw yourself in the mirror.'

      b. Sen ayna-da   [sen-in$_{i/}$ *pro*$_i$ kendi-n-i$_i$]
          You mirror-LOC you-GEN   self/essence-2SG.POSS.ACC
          gör-dü-n.
          see-PAST-2SG
          'You saw your self/essence in the mirror.'

Whereas the sentence in (25a) allows for a reflexive/anaphoric interpretation, the sentence in (25b) with an overt pronoun (or *pro*) preceding *kendi-n* sounds permissible only when *kendin* is narrowly focused, with an interpretation that the speaker is referring to the addressee's *self/essence*. In the alternative approach proposed here, the true anaphors, as in (25a) are not predicted to be part of genitive-possessive constructions, perhaps not anymore (although all are marked for person through possessive agreement). The acceptability of (25b) would be due to *kendi* functioning as a common noun.

But compare the sentence (26) with the overt possessor, *o,* to an equivalent sentence in (22) with a null possessor.

(26) Ali$_i$ [o-nun$_k$ kendi-si-ni]   beğen-iyor.
       Ali she/he-GEN self-3SG.POSS-ACC   like-3SG.PROG
       'Ali likes her/his self.'

The referentiality in (24) would also be expected in (26) if both the null and overt pronominals were [-anaphoric, +pronominal] and if the AgrP qualified as a local domain. But it is not the case. The overt pronoun in (26) cannot co-refer with *Ali*. This seems to indicate that the null and overt pronouns are not subject to the same local domain in their binding. Alternatively, they are not the null and overt counterparts of the same NP type. If overt and null pronouns differ in their distribution irrespective of being in the possessor position of *kendisi*, this would further support the hypothesis that *kendisi* is preceded by a null pronoun. The next section will examine the distribution of overt and null pronominals in Turkish to tackle this problem.

3   The Null and the Overt Pronoun in Turkish

Traditionally, it has been assumed that pro-drop languages have two forms of realizing subjects and objects: overtly and covertly. Although the use of overt and null pronouns depends on pragmatic and contextual factors such as avoiding ambiguities by using an overt pronoun, *pro* has been classified as a null element with the features [+pronominal, -anaphoric] just like its overt counterpart. This section compares the distribution of null and overt pronoun *pro* and *o* (he/she/it) in Turkish and shows that although they behave similarly in object positions of the matrix clauses and embedded sentences, their distribution differs for subject positions in embedded clauses and in the possessor positions of genitive possessive phrases. It will be argued that instead of entertaining different binding domains for *pro* and *o,* they will be assumed to be weak and strong pronouns with different syntactic projections that affect their distribution.

3.1   *Distribution of the Null and the Overt Pronoun in Turkish*

The examples below use *o* and *pro* in direct object positions in matrix sentences (27) and (28), and in an embedded clause (29):

(27) Ali$_i$ o-nu$_{*i/k}$ / *pro*$_{*i/k}$ sev-iyor.
       Ali   she/he-ACC   like-3SG.PROG
       'Ali$_i$ likes her/him$_{*i/k}$ / *pro*$_{*i/k}$.'

(28) [Ali'nin_i   baba-sı]_k   o-nu_{i/*k/m} / *pro*_{i/*k/m}   sev-iyor.
     Ali-GEN father-3SG.POSS she/he-ACC   like-3SG.PROG
     '[Ali's_i father]_k likes her/him_{i/*k/m} / *pro*_{i/*k/m.}'

(29) Ali_i [Ayşe'nin_k o-nu_{i/*k/m} / *pro*_{i/*k/m} sev-diğ-i]-ni
     Ali   Ayşe-GEN she/he-ACC   like-Nom-3SG.POSS-ACC
     söyle-di.
     say-3SG.PAST
     'Ali_i said (that) Ayşe_k likes her/him _{i/*k/m} / *pro* _{i/*k/m.}'

If we take the matrix clause in (27) and (28) and the embedded clause in (29) as local domains, both the overt and null pronouns conform to BT-B and they are free in their local domains.

The following example shows the distribution of *o* and *pro* in indirect object position of a non-finite embedded sentence:

(30) Ali_i [Ayşe'nin_k o-na_{i/*k/m} / *pro*_{i/*k/m} bak-ma-sı]-nı
     Ali   Ayşe-GEN she/he-DAT   look-NOM-3SG.POSS-ACC
     iste-m-iyor.
     want-NEG-3SG.PROG
     'Ali_i does not want Ayşe_k to look at her/him_{i/*k/m} / *pro*_{i/*k/m.}'

The distribution of *o* and *pro* does not differ as indirect objects, either. However, when *o* and *pro* are used in genitive-possessive constructions, their distribution differs as the indices in the following examples show:

(31) Ali_i   [o-nun_{*i/k} / *pro*_{i/k} kitab-ı]-nı   sev-iyor.
     Ali   she/he-GEN   book-3SG.POSS like-3SG.PROG
     'Ali_i likes her/his_{*i/k} / *pro*_{i/k} book'

(32) [Ali'nin_i   baba-sı]_k   [o-nun_{i/*k/m} / *pro*_{i/k/m} kitab-ı]-nı
     Ali-GEN father-3SGPOSS.   she/he-GEN   book-3SGPOSS
     sev-iyor.
     like-PROG
     'Ali's_i father_k likes her/his_{i/*k/m} / *pro*_{i/k/m} book'

For (31) and (32), the indices on *pro* are predicted. *Pro* picks up an antecedent, *Ali* in (31) and *Ali's father* in (32), outside its local domain, the genitive possessive AgrP. But assuming the AgrP as the local domain results in *o*'s binding to violate BT-B because although *o* can refer to an antecedent not

mentioned in the sentence it cannot refer to the antecedents mentioned in the sentence, i.e., *Ali* in (31) and *Ali's father* in (32).

O and *pro* also show different distributions when they are used as subjects of embedded sentences. This could be due to the structure of embedded sentences in Turkish. In Turkish, most (but not all) embedded clauses have the structure of genitive-possessive constructions. The subject of the embedded clause receives genitive case, and the embedded verb carries a possessive suffix (Erguvanlı-Taylan, 1986). The distributions of *pro* and *o* differ in the same way as in simple genitive-possessive constructions:

(33) Ali$_i$ [o-nun$_{*i/k}$ / *pro$_{i/k}$*   akıllı   ol-duğ-u]-nu
      Ali   she/he-GEN   intelligent be-NOM-3SG.POSS-ACC
      söyle-di.
      say-3SG.PAST
      'Ali$_i$ said (that) she/he$_{*i/k}$ / *pro$_{i/k}$* is intelligent.'

But this observation also holds true for embedded clauses which are not in the form of a genitive possessive phrase. The sentence in (34) has *o* and *pro* in the subject position of a finite embedded clause; and in (35) *o* and *pro* are the subjects of a non-finite embedded clause. Neither embedded clause is in the form of genitive-possessive construction:

(34) Ali$_i$ [o-nu$_{*i/k}$ / *pro$_{i/k}$*   çalış-tı]   san-ıyor.
      Ali   she/he-ACC   work-PAST believe-3SG.PROG
      'Ali$_i$ believes her/him$_{*i/k}$ / *pro$_{i/k}$* to have worked.'

(35) Ali$_i$ Ayşe'ye$_k$ [o-nun$_{*i/k}$ / *pro$_{i/k}$* gel-me-sin]-i
      Ali Ayşe-DAT she/he-GEN   come-NOM-3SG.POSS
      anlat-tı.
      tell-3SG.PAST
      'Ali$_i$ told Ayşe$_k$ that she/he$_{*i/k}$/*pro$_{i/k}$* should come.'

To summarize, so far, we have seen that *o* and *pro* show the same distribution in direct and indirect object positions where an overt pronoun is marked with accusative and dative cases, respectively. They differ in their distributions as possessors in genitive-possessive constructions and as subjects of finite and non-finite embedded clauses.

Kornfilt argues that the distributional properties of the null and overt pronouns in Turkish could be explained by the Avoid Pronoun Principle (APP) developed by Chomsky (1981) for PRO, later replaced with *pro* for non-infinitive cases in pro-drop languages (Chomsky, 1982; Kornfilt 1991):

(36) The Avoid Pronoun Principle: Avoid pronoun.

<div align="right">(Chomsky, 1981: 65)</div>

APP imposes a choice of a phonologically empty pronominal over an overt one. Kornfilt (1991) relates APP to agreement in Turkish embedded clauses. In her analysis, a clause has weak agreement when its finiteness does not express all the relevant features such as number, person and Case. In such clauses an overt pronoun is used as a subject to satisfy the Case feature only. When the clause has all the relevant features (i.e., number, person, and Case), the clause has strong agreement, which is spelt out at the phonological level. The use of a null pronoun is preferred over an overt pronoun in such cases. When the embedded clause has strong AGR, it can function as a governing category (GC) since AGR can qualify as an accessible SUBJECT as it has all the relevant features. A weak AGR is a pseudo-AGR which cannot play a crucial role in Binding. It is only necessary to check Case. Kornfilt (1991: 68-69) provides two examples to show how APP influences Binding:

(37) Askerler$_i$ [*pro*$_{i/j}$ öl-ecek-lerin]-e   inan-ıyor-lar.
     Soldiers$_i$ *pro*$_{i/j}$ die-Fut-3PL-DAT   believe-PROG-3PL
     'The soldiers$_i$ believe that they$_{i/j}$ will die.'

(38) Askerler$_i$ [onlar-ın$_{*i/j}$ öl-eceğ-in]-e   inan-ıyor-lar.
     Soldiers$_i$ they-GEN$_{*i/j}$ die-FUT-3SG-DAT   believe-PROG-3PL
     'The soldiers$_i$ believe that they $_{*i/j}$ will die.'

In example (37), *pro* has both a local and a non-local reading but *onlar* (she/he-PL) in (38), can only have a disjoint reading. In (38), the third person plural agreement is not marked overtly. Thus, the embedded clause has a weak AGR feature. Since the AGR is weak, the embedded clause does not have a SUBJECT and it cannot function as a governing category. Therefore, in (38) the governing category is not the embedded clause but the matrix clause and *onlar* cannot pick *askerler* (soldiers) as its antecedent since it is in the same GC with *onlar* (they). In (37) the GC would differ. There, the embedded clause has a strong AGR as it is marked overtly with a third person plural suffix. The strong AGR can function as SUBJECT and the embedded clause would be the GC. So, *pro* can pick *soldiers* as its antecedent which is outside its GC.

The following sentence is also from Kornfilt (1991: 67) and there is an overt pronoun despite the strong AGR, which would not be predicted by the APP:

(39) Askerler$_i$ [onlar-ın$_{*i/j}$ öl-ecek-lerin]-e   inan-ıyor-lar.
     Soldiers$_i$ they-GEN$_{*i/j}$ die-FUT-3PL-DAT believe-PROF-3PL
     'The soldiers$_i$ believe that they$_{*i/j}$ will die.'

In (39) the AGR is strong enough to impose a null pronoun as a subject over an overt one. But the subject is an overt pronoun. Furthermore, its binding is not influenced by the overtly marked, strong AGR. The verb in the embedded clause is marked for person, number and Case and therefore has a strong AGR which would provide a SUBJECT for the sentence. That would make the embedded clause the GC and the local domain for binding *onlar;* and *onlar* would be able to pick *askerler* (soldiers) as its antecedent, but that is not the case. Neither the GC, nor the binding properties of the overt pronoun change in an embedded clause with a strong AGR.

The APP approach also does not explain the use of *o* in the sentences (40) and (41). In these sentences AGR is predicted to be strong and a null pronominal would be preferred over an overt one. But both pronominals are perfectly acceptable and their bindings differ despite the embedded clause being the GC due to the strong AGR.

(40) Ali$_i$ [o-nun$_{*i/k}$/ *pro$_{i/k}$* akıllı   ol-duğ-u]-nu
Ali   she/he-GEN   intelligent   be-NOM-3SG.POSS-ACC
söyle-di.
say-3SG.PAST
'Ali$_i$ said (that) she/he$_{*i/k}$ /*pro* $_{i/k}$ is intelligent.'

(41) Ali$_i$ Ayşe'ye$_k$ [o-nun$_{*i/k/m}$/*pro$_{i/k/m}$* yalancı   ol-duğ-u]-nu
Ali   Ayşe-DAT she/he   liar   be-NOM-3SG.POSS-ACC
söyle-di.
say-3SG.PAST
'Ali$_i$ told Ayşe $_k$ that she/he $_{*i/k/m}$/*pro$_{i/k/m}$* is a liar.'

In addition, in cases where the embedded clause is finite as opposed to the non-finite examples provided in Kornfilt's analysis, *pro* patterns with the overt pronoun in its distribution in object positions and picks a non-local antecedent:

(42) Ali$_i$ [$_{TP}$ Ayşe$_k$ *pro$_{i/*k/m}$* / o-nu$_{i/*k/m}$ sev-iyor]   san-ıyor.
Ali   Ayşe   she/he -ACC like-3SG.PROG think-3SG.PROG
'Ali$_i$ thinks that Ayşe$_k$ likes *pro$_{i/*k/m}$*/her/him$_{i/*k/m.}$'

It appears that the distribution of *o* and *pro* cannot be accounted for with reference to the APP. The APP is not rejected here. Instead, applying the APP to the binding of *pro* in relation to strong and weak agreement in the clause seems not to explain the binding of *pro* and *o* in all cases. As mentioned by Dimitriadis (1996) and Enç (1986), overt pronouns are indeed not redundant or optional in pro-drop languages. Nor do they seem to be used due to the weaknesses in the

agreement paradigm in the sentence. Rather, they seem to play significant pragmatic functions in the discourse.

Erguvanlı-Taylan (1986) and Enç (1986) mention discourse dependent uses of overt and null pronouns in Turkish. Erguvanlı-Taylan (1986) argues that the overt pronoun is used to indicate emphasis or contrast and its occurrence is obligatory rather than optional under such discourse dependent conditions:

(43) Ben sinema-ya   zaman-ın-da   gel-di-m.
     I   cinema-DAT   time-3SG.POSS-LOC   come-past
     Ama **sen** gel-me-di-n.
     but   you   come-NEG-PAST-2SG
     'I came to the cinema on time but you didn't.'

(44) Ben sinema-ya   zaman-ın-da   gel-di-m.
     I   cinema-DAT   time-3SG.POSS-LOC   come-past
     *Ama ***pro***   gel-me-di-n.
      but   come-NEG-PAST-2SG
     'I came to the cinema on time but *pro* didn't.'

Similarly, use of an overt pronoun is dependent on the presence of a topic change in the discourse. The following examples from Öztürk (2002: 241) show this function:

(45) Ben ev-e   gel-di-m.   ***pro/*Ben*** kitap oku-du-m.
     I   house-DAT come-PAST-1SG   I   book read-PAST-1SG
     'I came home. I read a book.'

(46) Ben ev-e   gel-di-m.   *pro* kitap oku-du-m.
     I   house-Dat   come- PAST-1SG   book read-PAST-1SG
     Sen/ ***pro*** ara-dı-n.
     you call-Past-2Sg
      'I came home. I read a book. You called.'

As the examples in (45) show, when there is no topic shift in the context, the null pronoun is used and the use of an overt pronoun is ungrammatical. Not using an overt pronoun when there is a topic shift also results in ungrammaticality as shown in (46).

In sum, *pro* can refer to an existing antecedent within the context as well as in the sentence. However, the overt pronoun cannot refer to an entity mentioned in the context. If there is no topic shift, the use of an overt pronoun is ungrammatical. The overt pronoun shifts the topic and refers to an entity which is not mentioned within the sentence or the discourse. This difference in their

referentiality is presumably due to their being different types of pronouns rather than being the null and overt counterparts of the same NP type.

3.2   Pro *as a Weak Pronoun and* o *as a Strong Pronoun*

Cardinaletti and Starke (1999) categorize pronouns into three different categories: strong, weak, and clitic. They assume that nominals can have CP and IP projections just like sentences:

>   Strong pronouns: [$_{CP}$ [$_{IP}$ [$_{NP}$ pronoun]]]
>   Weak deficient pronouns: [$_{IP}$ [$_{NP}$ pronoun]]
>   Clitic pronouns: [$_{N}$ pronoun]

Cardinaletti and Starke (1999) argue that the typology of pronouns is a set of forms in competition and the form that is the most deficient is preferred over others since it has less (syntactic) structure. This would result in clitics to be preferred over weak pronouns and weak pronouns to be preferred over strong pronouns when available (cf. economy of representation, Chomsky, 1995). The order of deficiency and preference would be as follows:

>   clitic < weak < strong

In this categorization an overt pronoun is considered a strong pronominal; *pro* is a structurally deficient pronominal and belongs to the weak category and the clitic is the most deficient form with the least structure. If a deficient form is possible in a language, it will take precedence over a strong one. That is, *pro* would be chosen over a strong pronoun, which is an approach similar to the APP (Chomsky, 1981).

Safir (2004) argues that there is also a Weak Pronoun Competition (WPC) among pronominals. Accordingly, WPC selects the weakest pronoun as the optimal one to represent backgrounded, i.e., old, information. (Also see Ariel (1990) for antecedent NP's accessibility and Almor (1999) for processing load of referential expressions.)

What makes a pronoun weak or strong is related to their range (Cardinaletti & Starke, 1999). Weak pronouns are incapable of bearing their own referential index, what is referred to as deictic potential in Safir (2004). This referential index is some sort of a range restriction, which makes the pronoun either rangeless or it is associated with the range-restriction of an element prominent in the discourse. Only strong pronominals are full CPs (complement phrases) and only they contain [+human] specification under C, which gives them their referential index and they have the structure required for independent reference. However, deficient pronouns with no CP structure lack C and therefore the

[+human] specification. Thus, they lack referential index and cannot make independent reference. This way, they can refer to an antecedent prominent in the discourse.

The arguments by Cardinaletti and Starke (1999) and Safir (2004) are compatible with the null or overt subject selection in a consistent pro-drop language like Turkish. As reviewed above, unless there is a topic shift, a null pronominal is used and it can only refer to an antecedent mentioned in the context. Overt pronouns are used to change the topic and this results for the overt pronoun to have an independent reference.

But both in this paper and in previous work the differences between the distributions of the overt and the null pronoun have been observed in subject positions. The null and the overt pronoun in object and indirect object positions, both in embedded and matrix clauses, do not seem to differ. If Turkish null and overt pronouns are weak and strong pronouns respectively, we would expect their referentiality to differ in (in)direct object positions as well. This is not the case. The next section examines this issue.

3.3 Pro *as a Weak Pronoun in Need to Check Its Referentiality Feature*

Holmberg (2005) argues that, unlike partial pro-drop languages (e.g., Finnish and Brazilian Portuguese) in which a null pronoun use can have a generic meaning (as in (48)) as well as a referential interpretation (as in (47)), in consistent pro-drop languages such as Turkish a generic interpretation through pro-drop is not available. To deliver generic meaning, these languages resort to overt morphology (e.g., passive morphology in Turkish) or they use second person singular overt pronoun.

(47)	Pedro$_i$	disse	que	ele$_{i/j}$/*pro*$_{i/*j}$	gandou	na loto.
	Pedro	said	that	he	won	on-the lottery

(48)	Aqui	não	pode	nadar.
	Here	not	can	swim
	'One can't swim here'			

(Holmberg, 2005: 553)

Holmberg (2005: 556) argues that this is because "a definite null subject is a φP, a deficient pronoun that receives the ability to refer to an individual or a group from I containing D". Consistent null subject languages such as Turkish have a D-feature in I (cf. Chomsky, 1995) and hence, a generic interpretation is not available with a null subject. The null subject in Spec,IP can check the uninterpretable features of AGR similar to overt subjects as it is specified for φ-features. The relation between I and φP is an 'Agree' relation. Holmberg (2005:

556) maintains that a *pro* always checks its referentiality by moving from "their original θ-position to the specifier of a Case assigning head" and entering a specifier-head relation with AGR compensates for its lack of referentiality through I containing the D feature. As a result, it can refer to a prominent antecedent in the discourse or in the matrix clause. φP has an unvalued D ([uD]) feature which needs to get checked under I which has this feature. If *pro* does not check its [uD] feature this will result in a generic reading with a null pronoun.

Holmberg's (2005) arguments together with Cardinaletti and Starke's (1999) distinction between weak and strong pronominals can explain the referentiality of the null and overt pronoun in Turkish. Let us revisit the referentiality of *o* and *pro* as subjects of embedded and matrix clauses such as those below:

(49) [Ali$_i$ Ayşe'ye$_k$ [o-nun$_{*i/k}$ / *pro*$_{i/k}$ gel-me-sin]-i   anlat-tı].
     Ali Ayşe-DAT she/he-GEN come-NOM-3SG.POSS tell-3SG.PAST
     'Ali told Ayşe that she/he $_{*i/k}$ /*pro*$_{i/k}$ should come.'

(50) Ali$_i$ [o-nun$_{*i/k}$ / *pro*$_{i/k}$ nehir   kenar-ın-da
     Ali   she/he- GEN   river   side-3SG.POSS-LOC
     koş-ma-sın]-ı   sev-iyor.
     run-NOM-3SG.POSS-ACC   like-Prog
     'Ali likes her/his$_{*i/k}$ /*pro*$_{i/k}$ running by the river side.'

(51) Ali$_i$ [o$_{*i/k}$ / *pro*$_{i/k}$ iyileş-ti]   san-ıyor.
     Ali she/he   recover-3SG.PAST   think-3SG.PROG
     'Ali thinks that she/he$_{*i/k}$ / *pro*$_{i/k}$ has recovered.'

(52) Ali$_i$ [o$_{*i/k}$ / *pro*$_{i/k}$ nehr-in   kenarında
     Ali she/he   river-GEN side-3SG.POSS-LOC
     koş-uyor-du]   diye   düşün-üyor.
     run-PROG-3SG.PAST   SUB   think-3SG.PROG
     'Ali thinks that she/he$_{*i/k}$ / *pro*$_{i/k}$ was running by the river side.'

In sentence (49) and (50), *pro* and the overt pronoun occupy the subject position of a non-finite embedded clause. In (51) and (52), they are in the subject position of a finite embedded clause. In all cases, *pro* refers to the subject of the matrix clause, *Ali* as well as another antecedent in the context (e.g., *Ayşe* in (49)). Applying Holmberg's analysis to the differences observed in the sentences above, it could be argued that *pro* checks its [uD] feature with the embedded clause IP, which is the host for D feature and can check this feature, through an 'Agree' relation. As a result, it can refer to an antecedent above the IP, e.g., *Ali*. The overt pronoun, *o*, on the other hand, is strong and already bears the D feature.

It has the capacity to make independent reference and to introduce a new topic within the discourse. Thus, it does not refer to the most recent topic, *Ali*.

If we assume that a new clause sustains the topic of the discourse mentioned before, it makes sense for an IP to refer to an antecedent mentioned previously in the discourse. If *pro* checks this feature under an IP it will consequently refer to the topic of a clause mentioned before the IP it checks its [uD] feature with.

In the following sentences, *o* and *pro* share the same distribution. However, this similarity does not make *pro* a strong pronominal in such positions. Instead, applying the same rationale to direct object positions will give us the conclusion that *pro* is still a weak pronominal and *o* is a strong pronominal in object positions as well.

> (53) Ali_i [Ayşe'nin_k   o-nu_{i/*k/m} / *pro*_{i/*k/m} sevdiğin]-i
>   Ali   Ayşe-GEN   she/he-ACC   like-NOM-3SG.POSS-ACC
>   söyle-di.
>   say-3SG.PAST
>   'Ali said that Ayşe likes her/him_{i/*k/m} / *pro*_{i/*k/m}.'

> (54) Ali_i [Ayşe_k o-nu_{i/*k/m} / *pro*_{i/*k/m} sev-iyor]   san-ıyor.
>   Ali   Ayşe   she/he-Acc   like-3SG.PROG   think-3SG.PROG
>   'Ali_i thinks that Ayşe_k likes her/him_{i/*k/m} / *pro*_{i/*k/m.}'

In the sentences above, *pro* checks its referentiality under the IP, as a result, it can refer to an antecedent above the IP (e.g., *Ali*) rather than an antecedent within the IP (*Ayşe*) as the IP under which its [uD] feature is checked is a continuation of the statement or the topic mentioned previously. This way *pro* can refer to an antecedent that the IP refers to. *O*, as a strong pronoun, has the referential index already, which gives it the capacity to shift the topic. So, it introduces a new topic which is not mentioned within the IP it is uttered in and therefore is independent in its referentiality in the IP it occurs in and refers to *Ali* which is outside the IP.

The following examples illustrate cases where *o* and *pro* cannot refer to the matrix subject of the matrix IP when they are used in direct and indirect object positions of a matrix clause:

> (55) Ali_i   o-nu_{*i/k} / *pro*_{*i/k}   sev-iyor.
>   Ali   she/he-ACC   like-3SG.PROG
>   'Ali likes her/him_{*i/k} / *pro*_{*i/k}.'

> (56) Ali_i   o-na_{*i/k} / *pro*_{*i/k}   bak-ıyor.
>   Ali   she/he-DAT   look-3SG.PROG
>   'Ali looks at her/him_{*i/k} / *pro*_{*i/k}.'

The same reasoning as in the direct and indirect objects in embedded sentences can be applied here. In (55) and (56) *pro* can refer to an antecedent after checking its [uD] feature under matrix IP. Therefore, it has to refer back to an antecedent mentioned before the IP it checks its features with. *O* has its referential index already and introduces a new topic. Thus, it does not refer to the most recent topic.

4   Summary and Conclusion

This paper has presented a problematic reflexive marker in Turkish, *kendisi*, which has been reported to deviate from the BT proposed in the GB Theory. It is proposed here that *kendisi* does not pose a challenge to the BT as it is considered to be marked with third person singular agreement and is preceded by the null pronoun *pro*. *Kendisi* is not a problematic reflexive, it is rather a common noun possessed by *pro* and gets its referentiality through that of *pro*. The true and only anaphor for third person singular in Turkish is considered to be *kendi* which conforms to the BT.

The present paper has also examined the referentiality of *o* and *pro* because *kendisi*'s referentiality changes when preceded by *o* and *pro*. The examples analyzed in the paper show that these two pronominals do not always show the same distribution although they have been considered to be the null and overt counterparts of the same NP type by traditional grammars which would consider them to be [-anaphoric, +pronominal] and subject to the BT-B.

It is proposed that *o* and *pro* are not the same NP types. There are pragmatic as well as syntactic factors that guide their distribution. The overt pronoun *o* is a strong pronoun with a referential index and can therefore have independent reference. *Pro,* however, is a weak pronoun which can only refer to an antecedent previously mentioned in the context. *Pro* has an uninterpretable D, i.e., [uD], feature that it can check under IP. Through feature checking, it can refer to an antecedent mentioned before the IP it checks its [uD] feature with.

References

Ariel, M. (1990). *Accessing noun-phrase antecedents*. London: Routledge.

Almor, A. (1999). Noun-phrase anaphora and focus: The informational load hypothesis. *Psychological Review, 106*(4), 748–765.

Cardinaletti, A. & Starke, M. (1999). The typology of structural deficiency. In H. van Riemsdijik (Ed.), *Clitics and other functional categories in European languages* (pp. 145-233). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chomsky, N. (1980). On binding. *Linguistic Inquiry, 11*, 1-46.

Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, N. (1982). Some concepts and consequences of the theory of Government and Binding. Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language, its nature, origin, and use*. New York: Praeger.

Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Dimitriadis, A. (1996). When pro-drop languages don't: overt pronominal subjects and pragmatic inference. *Proceedings of CLS, 32*.

Enç, M. (1986). Topic switching and pronominal subjects in Turkish. In D.I. Slobin & K. Zimmer (Eds.), *Studies in Turkish Linguistics* (pp.195-209). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: 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 D.I. Slobin & K. Zimmer (Eds.), *Studies in Turkish Linguistics* (pp. 209-231). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Göksel, A. & Kerslake, C. (2005). *Turkish: a comprehensive grammar.* London: Routledge

Gürel, A. (2002). Linguistic characteristics of second language acquisition and first language attritition: Turkish overt versus null pronouns. Unpublished PhD dissertatiton, McGill University.

Gürel, A. (2004). Selectivity in L2-induced L1 attrition: a psycholinguistic account. *Journal of Neurolinguistics, 17*, 53-78.

Holmberg, A. (2005). Is there a little pro? Evidence from Finnish. Linguistic Inquiry, 36, 533-564.

Hornstein, N. (2006). Pronouns in a Minimalist setting. In Kazanina, U., P. Minai, P. Monathan, & H. Taylor (Eds.), *University of Maryland working papers in Linguistics, 14*, (pp. 47-80). College Park, MD: UMWPiL.

Kornfilt, J. (1984). *Case marking, agreement, and empty categories in Turkish*. [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Kornfilt, J. (1991). Some current issues in Turkish syntax. In Boeschoten, H. & L. Verhoeven (Eds.), Turkish Linguistics Today, (pp. 60-92). Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Kornfilt, J. (1997). *Turkish*. London, New York: Routledge.

Kornfilt, J. (2001). Local and long-distance reflexives in Turkish. In Cole, P., G. Hermon & C.-T. J. Huang (Eds.), *Long Distance Reflexives (Syntax and Semantics,33)*, 197-226. San Diego: Academic Press.

Lewis, G. L. (1967). *Turkish grammar*. Great Britain: Oxford University Press.

Lewis, G. L. (1985). *Turkish grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Corrected reprint of the 1967 original.]

Meral, H. M. (2010). *Resumption, A'-chains and implications on clausal architecture*. (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation). Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, Turkey.

Meral, H. M. (2013). Binding as an A'-phenomenon? Some remarks from Turkish. *Iberia*, *5*(1), 45-68.

Özsoy, A. S. (1990). Söylemiçi dönüşlü yapı. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları-1990*, 35-40. Hitit Yayınevi.

Öztürk, B. (2002). Turkish as a non-pro-drop language. In Taylan, E. E. (Ed.), *The verb in Turkish* (pp. 239-259). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Palaz, B. (2013). *On the nature of anaphoric expressions kendi/kendisi and the clause structure of Turkish*. (Unpublished M.A. thesis). Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, Turkey.

Reinhart, T. & Reuland, E. (1993). *Reflexivity. Linguistic Inquiry, 24*, 657-720.

Rudnev, P. (2011). Why Turkish *kendisi* is a pronominal. *Ural-Altaic Studies, 4*(1), 76–92.

Safir, K. (2004). *The syntax of anaphora*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wexler, K. & Manzini, R. (1987). Parameters and learnability in Binding Theory. In T. Roeper & E. Williams (Eds.), *Parameter setting* (pp. 41-76). Dordrecht, Boston: Reidel Publishing Company.