

The Restrictive Nature of Binding Theory; Turkish Reflexive *kendisi*

Sena Kurnaz

Istanbul Aydın University

This paper aims to theoretically investigate the difference between the Turkish reflexive *kendi* and the inflected form *kendisi* (self/self3sg), as well as experimentally investigating the ambiguity caused by *kendisi* in Turkish by collecting data from 50 Turkish native speakers via online survey method. I hypothesize that Turkish native speakers will not be able to perceive 3 referees for the referent *kendisi*, in contrast to Dinçtopal-Deniz (2009), and Palaz (2010) by providing experimental evidence as well as theoretical discussion.

Pronominals and anaphors in several languages such as Chinese, Japanese, Norwegian posed a challenge for Binding Theory. Turkish reflexive “*kendi/kendi-si*” (self/self.3SG) also posed a challenge to the Binding Theory principles. While, *kendi* is only bound by the subject of its clause, *kendisi* can refer to an antecedent both within outside its local domain if it is to be the minimal clause, clashing with the Principle A of the Binding Theory (Enç, 1989; Gürel, 2002, 2004; Kornfilt, 1997). Palaz (2013) also suggested that *kendisi* is not a true anaphor.

- (1) Ali_i [Ayşe_j'nin kendi_j-ni sev-diğ-in-i] düşün-üyor.
Ali Ayşe-Gen self- 3SgPoss-Acc love-Nom-3SgPoss-Acc think-Prog
(Ali thinks that Ayşe loves herself.)

In (1), Ayşe binds *kendi-ni* in the embedded clause and Ayşe c-commands *kendini*. However there seems to be an ambiguity caused by *kendi*, since most of the Turkish native speakers believe *kendi* can also bind Ali.

- (2) Ali_i [Ayşe_j'nin kendi_{i/jk}-si-ni sev-diğ-in]-i düşün-üyor.
Ali Ayşe-Gen self-3SgPoss-Acc love-Nom-3SgPoss-Acc think-Prog
(Ali thinks that Ayşe loves himself/herself.)

In (2), indices on “*kendisi*” show that it can co-refer to both subject of the embedded clause, which is Ayşe, and the subject of the matrix clause, which is Ali; or it can pick up another antecedent within the discourse. Thus, it can be said that *kendisi* is discourse dependent.

References;

- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Dinçtopal-Deniz, N. (2009). Anaphora in Turkish. *Linguistics in the Big Apple: CUNY/NYU*.
- Enç, M. (1989). Pronouns, licensing, and binding. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 7(1), 51-92.
- Gürel, A. (2002). Linguistic characteristics of second language acquisition and first language attrition: Turkish overt versus null pronouns. Unpublished PhD dissertation, McGill University.
- Gürel, A. (2004). Selectivity in L2-induced L1 attrition: a psycholinguistic account. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 17, 53-78.
- Huang, C. J. (1983). A note on the binding theory. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 554-561.
- Kornfilt, J. (1997). *Turkish*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Nilsson, B. (1978). “Speaker, text and Turkish reflexive *kendisi*.” In Kirsten Gregersen, ed., *Papers from the Fourth Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*, pp. 255-261. Odense U. Press.
- Palaz, B. (2010). *On the nature of anaphoric expressions kendi/kendisi and the clause structure of Turkish* (Doctoral dissertation, MA Thesis. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University).
- Pan, H. (1998). Closeness, prominence, and binding theory. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 771-815.

Rudnev, P. (2011). Why Turkish kendisi is a pronominal. *Урало-алтайские исследования*, (01 (4)), 76-92.