

The Emphatic Marker in Turkish: Two Readings

Demet Kayabaşı*

Abstract. This paper aims to show that the anaphor *kendi* in Turkish (i) functions as an emphatic marker as well as a reflexive, and (ii) that the emphatic marker *kendi* has two distinct readings, which hasn't been noted in the previous literature. Using diagnostic tests from Ahn (2010), I argue that the distinct readings of the emphatic marker *kendi* arise from occupying different sentential positions: one directly modifying a DP, and the other modifying the VP. Moreover, I show that the event modifying effects of the emphatic marker *kendi* differ from its English counterpart in terms of (i) the thematic roles allowed for the co-referents of the VP-modifying variety, and (ii) lack of obligatory stress on the DP-modifying variety. In addition, I document further nuances regarding the morphological varieties of the emphatic marker in Turkish.

Keywords. emphatic marker, emphatic anaphora, anaphora, event modification, reflexive, contrastive focus, contrastive topic

1. Introduction. Anaphoric items (i.e. items that require a co-referent to have referential content), are widely studied in relation to dependency phenomena like reflexivity (*compare* 1a-b). Reflexives interact with the argument structure and saturate A positions (Faltz 2016, Büring 2005).¹ However, the same anaphors in some languages also mark a relation that does not alter the argument structure while still maintaining a co-referential relationship with an argument (Dechaume & Wiltschko 2017 i.a.). In this paper, I will focus on one such function: *emphatic marking* (2a-b):

- (1) a. I_i saw myself_i in the reflection.
b. *I_i saw herself_i in the reflection.
- (2) a. The manager_i himself_i listened to our complaints.
b. I_i went through all the legal processes myself_i.

The anaphor *kendi* in Turkish also has both reflexive and emphatic functions (3):²

- (3) a. Doktor_i yanlışlıkla **kendi(-si)-ni** ara-dı (reflexive)
doctor.nom by.mistake **self(-3sg)-acc** all-past-3sg
“The doctor called herself by mistake.” (Interpretation: He dialed his own number.)
- b. Doktor(-un)_i **kendi(-si)**_i bütün hasta-lar-ı tek tek ara-dı. (emphatic)
doctor(-gen)_i **self(-3sg)**_i all patient-pl-acc one.by.one call-past-3sg
“The doctor herself called all the patients one by one.”

*Author: Demet Kayabaşı, University of Michigan (kayabasi@umich.edu)

¹In the case of logophors, the anaphor may not even saturate an A position:

(i) John_i was furious. The picture of himself_i in the museum had been mutilated. Büring (2005:226)
See Büring 2005 for a more detailed description.

²Sometimes also given as *kendi-si*. What exactly {-sI} marks in Turkish is an ongoing debate. Some consider it a compound marker, while some considers it possessive marking for 3rd person. For different perspectives see Göksel 1989, 1993; Göksel & Haznedar 2007 i.a. Also note that *kendi* obligatorily marks person, can mark number/plurality, but doesn't mark gender as Turkish does not have gender marking. Number/plurality marking on the 3rd person in Turkish is optional at first sight, though there are some restrictions based on interactions with animacy and locality. See Sezer 1978, Göksel & Kerslake 2005; Özsoy 2009; Bamyacı & Häussler 2014, Krause & von Heusinger 2019, i.a. for more detailed discussion on number and plurality marking on the 3rd person in Turkish.

The bulk of previous work on *kendi* focuses on its reflexive function (Sezer 1979, Özsoy 1983, Göksel 1993, Kornfilt 2001, Koşaner 2005, Koşaner & Oktar 2007, Dinçtopal-Deniz 2009, Palaz 2010, Kahraman & Özbek 2013, Özbek & Kahraman 2016, Gračanin-Yüksek et al. 2020 i.a), but there is limited discussion of *kendi* as an intensifier (König & Siemund 2000), or an emphatic (Özsoy 1983, Kornfilt 1997, Göksel & Kerslake 2005). These previous studies acknowledge that a non-reflexive version of *kendi* (*henceforth EK*) exists and provide description of its distribution. However, there is limited discussion on the EK, and on its contribution to the overall interpretation.

Özsoy (1983) notes EK is a postnominal adjunct to its host DP, documenting its DP-oriented position only. She further notes that EK is inflected with possessive agreement with the person and number features of its host DP, while the host DP can be marked with genitive optionally (4):

- (4) Müdür(-ün) **kendi-si** bu mektub-u yaz-dı.
 Principle.nom/(-gen) **self-3sg** this letter-acc write-past-3sg
“The principle himself wrote this letter.”

adapted from Özsoy (1983: 111)

In the case that the host DP isn't marked with genitive, it remains marked with its canonical grammatical case, which would be nominative in (4). (See Göksel & Kerslake 2005, and Öztürk 2000, 2005 for a more detailed description case marking in Turkish). The way genitive marking surfaces in (4) shows that the host DP and the EK are forming one complex DP together, and do not just happen to precede and follow one another.

Kornfilt (1997) considers EK a special type of reflexive pronoun, and documents a VP oriented use surfacing in surfaces in a pre-verbal position (5):

- (5) (Ben) bu kitab-ı **kendi-m** yaz-dı-m.
 I this book-acc **self-1sg** write-past-1sg
“I wrote this book myself.”

Kornfilt (1997:157)

Combining Özsoy's (1983) and Kornfilt's (1997) observation, we already know that EK surfaces in two different sentential positions. In this paper, I further explore EK, and I show that the two sentential positions in which EK surfaces give rise to two distinct interpretations, parallel to what Ahn (2010) has observed in English. In the following section, I summarize Ahn's (2010) diagnostics for distinguishing the two emphatic readings in English. Then I use the same diagnostics on Turkish data to show that the same two meaning distinction is present in Turkish (Section 2). Then I discuss what EK marks in Turkish with the two readings given the contexts in which it can and cannot exist (Section 3). Lastly, I discuss the implications of these findings and suggest avenues for future research (Section 4).

2. The emphatic *kendi* in Turkish: Two readings. The two readings of the emphatic marker in English are described by Ahn (2010) as the event participant modifying emphatic marker (*henceforth*, _{DP}EM) (6a), and the event modifying emphatic marker (*henceforth*, _{VP}EM) (6b). Ahn (2010: 10) paraphrases the two distinct interpretations as the following:

- (6) a. John *himself* did it. (DP_{EM})
 ≈ “John (*not his mother*) did it”.
- b. John did it *himself*. (VP_{EM})
 ≈ “John was the sole agent doing it, (*in most cases didn't get any help*)”.

adapted from Ahn (2010:10)

The interpretations in (6) cast focus on a possible alternate agent other than “John” could have taken part in the same event either as a replacement of “John” as the doer or as another agent assisting “John”. Eckardt (2001) discusses similar effects with the EM *selbst* in German, following Rooth’s (1985, 1992) focus alternatives analysis. But she argues that *selbst* triggers a much more restricted set of alternates than Rooth’s (1985, 1992) account predicts, and this results in the elements in the said set of alternate entities being peripheral to what the EM co-refers to, hence the term *centrality effects*. These centrality effects that emphatic markers display by contrasting its co-referent with other potential event participants is discussed as a general property of emphatic markers (Eckardt 2001), and whether this effect remains the same or differs with the two readings is an ongoing discussion. It is also possible to give different paraphrases of EK as well, that are compatible with what Ahn (2010) observes in English, and surface sentential position: like English can distinguish them.

(7) Context A: *There is a doctor, working with an assistant who deals with phone calls with patients since she is too busy to make phone calls herself.*

a. Doktor(-un) **kendi(-si)** biz-i ara-dı. (DP EK)
 doctor(-gen) **self(-3sg)** us-acc call-past-3sg

“*The doctor herself called us.*”

Insuniated interpretation (i): “*The doctor herself and not her assistant called us.*”

(e.g. Because this phone call was extra important.)

Tacit interpretation (ii): “*#She finally managed to make phone calls without her assistant helping her.*”

Context B: *There is a doctor who is very old and not tech-savy at all, so she has an assistant helping her figure out how to make phone calls.*

b. Doktor>(*un) bu sefer hasta-lar-ı **kendi(-si)** ara-dı. (VP EK)
 doctor>(*gen) this time patient-pl-acc **self(-3sg)** call-past-3sg.

“*The doctor called the patients herself this time.*”

Tacit interpretation (i): “*#The doctor herself and not her assistant called us.*”

(e.g. Because this phone call was extra important.)

Tacit interpretation (ii): “*She finally managed to make phone calls without her assistant helping her.*”

Note that Özsoy’s (1983) post nominal adjunction analysis predicts the ungrammaticality on the genitive marking in (7b), in contrast with the grammaticality of (7a). EK in (7a) can participate in a genitive-possessive relation with its co-referent, while EK fails to do so despite being co-referent with the same nominal phrase in (7b), suggesting that it is outside of that nominal domain. This provides empirical evidence that the different readings that arise are connected to the sentential position of the EK. As for the context, both (7a) and (7b) are acceptable, when uttered out of the blue. The presence of context certainly makes them much more transparent. When presented *without* context, however, speakers seem to quickly and intuitively come up with a plausible context based on their world knowledge and shared experiences around similar events (e.g., being contacted by their doctor) rather than perceive the clause as uninterpretable due to contextual impoverishment. This “urge” to invent a context where one isn’t given affirms the contrastive meaning that is encoded with EK.

Ahn (2010:11) also suggests denying the denoted event as a diagnostic to distinguish the two readings, in addition to paraphrasing the sentences. He observes that the denial of $_{DP}EM$ leads to the cancellation of the originally intended doer of event (e.g. “X didn’t do Y.”), while the denial of the $_{VP}EM$ leads to being able to add another doer participant to the event (e.g. “X did Y but with the assistance of Z, and not on its own.”).

In (8), I use sentential negation to express event denial. The $_{DP}EK$, when negated, leads to an interpretation where the host DP is no longer the doer of the event (8a) and therefore it is like the specific event itself never took place, *i.e.*, never initiated by the relevant participant, whereas the event with the $_{VP}EM$ doesn’t seem to get negated or canceled entirely but gets modified regarding the implied event participants (8b):

- (8) a. Doktor(-un) **kendi(-si)** biz-i ara-**ma-dı.** (DP EK)
 doctor(-gen) **self(-3sg)** us-acc call-**neg-past-3sg**
 “The doctor herself didn’t call us.”

Interpretation (i): *The doctor didn’t call us. It is possible that someone called us, but if that’s the case, the caller cannot be the doctor.*

Interpretation (ii): *#The doctor called us, but not all by herself. She likely got some help to make the call.*

- b. Doktor-(***un**) bu sefer hasta-lar-ı **kendi(-si)** ara-**ma-dı.** (VP EK)
 doctor-(*gen) this time patient-pl-acc **self(-3sg)** call-**neg-past-3sg**
 “The doctor didn’t call the patients herself this time.”

Interpretation (i): *#The doctor didn’t call us. It is possible that someone called us, but if that’s the case, the caller cannot be the doctor.*

Interpretation (ii): *The doctor called us, but not all by herself. She likely got some help to make the call.*

Note that (8a) is *not* truth conditionally compatible with the possibility that the denoted phone call (to us) initiated by the participant “doctor” has taken place. However, (8b) *is* truth conditionally compatible with the said phone call having taken place, with the added nuance that the initiation of the phone call included assistance from another event participant. As for distinguishing the two readings further, Ahn (2010) observes some restrictions that apply to the one type of EM and not the other, which the next sub-section explores for the EK in Turkish.

2.1. RESTRICTIONS FOR THE $_{DP}EK$ AND THE $_{VP}EK$ (Ahn, 2010). Ahn (2010) observes three main restrictions on $_{DP}EM$ s in English. One of the restrictions is that $_{DP}EM$ s require shared world knowledge or a shared context between the utterer and the addressee, unlike $_{VP}EM$ s that he observes to be interpretable with sentence internal context alone. In other words, $_{DP}EM$ s uttered out of the blue, or uttered in a context where the addressee is unaware of relevant information, are infelicitous. Ahn (2010) proposes that this is a consequence of the semantic function of $_{DP}EM$ s, as they trigger a contrast between their associate DP, and other potential event doers. To interpret whether that contrast holds, both the speaker and the addressee need to share relevant background information about the possible event participants. Recall my earlier comment that both $_{DP}EK$ (7a) and $_{VP}EK$ (7b) appearing acceptable to speakers out of the blue, which is expected for $_{VP}EK$ in (7b) but surprising for the $_{DP}EK$ (7a). I argue that (7a)’s acceptability in fact, still in line with the requirement of shared context, which is why speakers immediately assume or fabricate a plausible context for (7a) based on their own world knowledge. This is possible for (7a) because the event (and its usual agents) is familiar to most people. Therefore, it is unsurprising that people *can* fill

in the blanks with their existing world knowledge about the activities of doctors and medical staff. We can see this much clearly in a sentence like (9) uttered out of the blue, to people who do not know “Baran”. Given the lack of information, the addressee has no way of restricting the suitable entities in the world to a set of potential participants to contrast with “Baran”, and tEK is rendered unacceptable:

- (9) #Baran(-ın) **kendi(-si)** yulaf süt-ü sev-iyor.
 Baran(-gen) **self(-3sg)** oat milk-acc like-prog-3sg.
“#Baran himself likes oat milk.”

The contrastive nature of _{DP}EK also means that it is infelicitous in contexts where there is no potential individual to contrast with its co-referent. We can use shared world knowledge to illustrate this as well, as in (10), where we assume that only Defne would be opening her presents at her birthday party:

- (10) Q: What happened at Defne’s birthday party?
 A: #Defne(-nin) **kendi(-si)** hediye-ler-i-ni aç-tı.
 Defne(-gen) **self(-3sg)** gift-pl-poss.3sg.acc open-past-3sg.
“Defne herself unwrapped her gifts.”

If there is further context that cancels our default perception of how a birthday celebration typically goes, then it is possible to use _{DP}EK as in (11):

- (11) Context: *Deniz is Defne’s older brother. Defne and he agreed that it’s best if he opens Defne’s presents while she’s playing with her friends or enjoying the cake, as Defne will already have a lot going on around her to interact with, and Deniz wants to help her not get overwhelmed.*

Q: What happened at Defne’s birthday party?

- A: Deniz Defne için bütün hediye-ler-i aç-acak-tı ama o geç kal-ınca,
 Deniz Defne for all gift-pl-acc open-fut-past but he be.late-when
 Defne(-nin) **kendi(-si)** hediye-ler-i-ni aç-tı.
 Defne(-gen) **self(-3sg)** gift-pl-poss.3sg.acc open-past-3sg
“Deniz was going to open all the gifts for Defne but since he was late, Defne herself opened her gifts.”

Another restriction that Ahn (2010:17) observes on _{DP}EM is that it requires a specific, but not necessarily definite referent. This restriction holds for the _{DP}EK in Turkish too, rendering the sentence infelicitous if it co-refers to a non-specific referent (12-13):

- (12) a. #Hangi müdür(-ün) **kendi(-si)** şikayet-iniz-le ilgilen-di?
 which manager(-gen) **self(-3sg)** complaint-poss.2pl deal.with-past-3sg
“#Which manager themselves dealt with your complaint?”
 b. Hangi şikayet-iniz-le müdür(-ün) **kendi(-si)** ilgilen-di?
 which complaint-poss.2pl manager(-gen) **self(-3sg)** deal.with-past-3sg
“Which complaint of yours did the manager themselves deal with?”
- (13) a. #Birisi(-nin) **kendi(-si)** biz-i ara-dı.
 someone(-gen) **self(-3sg)** us-acc call-past-3sg

in Turkish (*see* İşsever 2003, Güner 2020 i.a. for a more detailed discussion on default and information structure marking prosodic patterns or lack thereof in Turkish).

So far, we've seen not only that EK in Turkish leads to the same kind of contrastive reading both when it is _{DP}EK and _{VP}EK, but also _{DP}EK is restricted by all the restrictions that Ahn (2010) observes for its equivalent in English. As for the _{VP}EM, Ahn (2010) observes two main restrictions, one that has to do with the thematic role of its co-referent, and another that has to do with incompatibility with stative verbs. Essentially, his observations in English reveal that _{VP}EM, requires an agentive and volitional co-referent, unlike _{DE}PM which is compatible with any thematic role as its co-referent and is incompatible with stative verbs. And the _D, verb including stative verbs. The _{VP}EK in Turkish seems to show a slightly different acceptability pattern regarding the thematic roles' restrictions (16). It allows co-reference with a theme/patient argument where there is no causer/doer encoded in the event structure (16c).³

- (16) a. Ben kapı-yı **kendi-m** kır-dı-m. (*Agentive co-referent*)
 I door-acc **self-1sg** break-past-1sg
 "I broke the door myself."
- b. #Ben kol-um-u **kendi-m** kır-dı-m. (*Experiencer co-referent*)
 I arm-poss.1sg-acc **self-1sg** break-past-1sg
 "I broke my arm myself."
- c. #Bu ilaç beni **kendi(-si)** iyileştir-di. (*non-volitional co-referent*)
 this medication me **self(-3sg)** heal-past-3sg
 "This medication cured/healed me itself."
- d. Bu doktor beni **kendi(-si)** iyileştir-di. (*volitional co-referent*)
 this doctor me **self(-3sg)** heal-past-3sg
 "This doctor cured/healed me herself."
- e. Çocuk balkon-dan **kendi(-si)** düş-tü. (*theme/patient co-referent*)
 child.nom balcony-abl **self(-3sg)** fall-past-3sg
 "The child fell off of the balcony (all by) himself."

Whether this difference has to do with a difference the emphatics themselves in English, or from a broader difference in event structure requires further investigation. One insight I can provide is that (16e) is in fact not compatible a context in which there is *assumed* causer/doer, and it if the existence of a causer/doer is assumed by the addressee, (16e) can only end up acceptable if the assumed causer/doer denies causing the event (17a). It's not compatible with a context in which the existence of an external causer/doer is taken for granted (17b). Moreover, it's also compatible with a context that the patient themselves caused the event, not by agentively initiating it but by not taking the steps to prevent it (17c).

(17) Context: *The utterer of (17) was on the same balcony with the child before he fell down, along with a few other people there. When asked whether he caused this, or whether he has any idea who or what caused it, he utters the following sentences:*

³ Personal communication reveals that not all speakers of English shares Ahn's (2010) clear-cut judgment regarding the _{DE}PM in English being incompatible with a patient/theme co-referent in a sentence like (16c), however there seems to be a consensus that it is at least ? or ?? if not #.

a. Çocuk balkon-dan **kendi(-si)** düş-tü.
 child.nom balcony-abl **self(-3sg)** fall-past-3sg
 Ben bir şey yap-ma-dı-m.
 I one thing do-neg-past-1sg.
“The child fell off of the balcony (all by) himself, I didn’t do anything (to make him fall).”

b. Çocuk balkon-dan **kendi(-si)** düş-tü.
 child.nom balcony-abl **self(-3sg)** fall-past-3sg
 #Ama kim ittir-di bil-mi-yor-um.
 But who push-past-3sg know-neg-prog-1sg. .
“The child fell off of the balcony (all by) himself, #but I don’t know who pushed (him).”

c. Çocuk balkon-dan **kendi(-si)** düş-tü,
 child.nom balcony-abl **self(-3sg)** fall-past-3sg
 bütün gün kenar-da koş-up dur-uyor-du zaten.
 all day edge-loc run-mood mood-prog-past anyway.
“The child fell off of the balcony (all by) himself, he kept running at the edge (of it) all day long anyway.”

Note that the continuation sentence in (17b) is only infelicitous when the previous sentence contains the $_{\text{VP}^{\text{EK}}}$, yet it would be completely acceptable with a $_{\text{DP}^{\text{EK}}}$. Given that the follow-up sentence in (17b) is not acceptable while (17c) is, one can hypothesize that the $_{\text{VP}^{\text{EK}}}$ works in a way that *reflexives the event* so to speak and unites the patient/theme role with the causer role. While this is still different than what Ahn’s (2010) observes for the $_{\text{VP}^{\text{EM}}}$ in English, of which volition and agentivity seem to be an integral part, it also doesn’t stray too far away from it, as the $_{\text{VP}^{\text{EK}}}$ seems to be co-referring to a causer or an initiator in Turkish too, however the causer or the initiator in question isn’t necessarily agentive. Again, as for the $_{\text{DP}^{\text{EK}}}$, it is compatible with co-referents with any thematic role, the same way its English equivalent behaves. Moreover, is also not possible to interpret the co-referent of the $_{\text{VP}^{\text{EK}}}$ as a volitional or agentive doer/causer of the event of falling:

(18) a. #Çocuk balkon-dan **kendi(-si)** bilerek/isteyerek düş-tü.
 child.nom balcony-abl **self(-3sg)** on.purpose fall-past-3sg
“#The child fell off of the balcony himself on purpose.”
 b. Çocuk balkon-dan **kendi(-si)** kazara düş-tü.
 child.nom balcony-abl **self(-3sg)** by.accident fall-past-3sg
“The child fell off of the balcony himself by accident.”

The last restriction on the $_{\text{VP}^{\text{EM}}}$ that Ahn (2010:20) observes is that it is incompatible with stative verbs, as could be extrapolated from its “event modifying” description. Given that even semantically stative verbs can and very frequently do bear progressive morphology in Turkish, I use the aorist marking to make sure the event denoted by the verb is indeed a state, and we find that $_{\text{VP}^{\text{EK}}}$ is incompatible with a stative verb, in contrast to $_{\text{DP}^{\text{EK}}}$ (19b):

- (19) Context: *People are talking about a baby and who they think the baby resembles or will end up resembling in different aspects, following (18) with “but we cannot know to whom its temperament will resemble.”*

a. **Bebek-*/??in** bence anne-si-ne **kendi(-si)** benze-r, (vPEM)
 baby-gen in.my.opinion mother-poss.3sg-dat **self(-3sg)** resemble-aor.3sg
 ama karakteri-i başkası-na çek-ebil-ir.
 but character-poss.3sg someone.else-dat take.after-can-aor.3sg
“The baby (themselves) definitely resembles its mother, but their character might take after someone else.”

b. **Bebek(-in) kendi(-si)** bence anne-si-ne benze-r, (dPEM)
 baby-gen **self(-3sg)** in.my.opinion mother-poss.3sg-dat resemble-aor.3sg
 ama karakteri-i başkası-na çek-ebil-ir.
 but character-poss.3sg someone.else-dat take.after-can-aor.3sg
“The baby (themselves) definitely resembles its mother, but their character might take after someone else.”

To sum up so far, the EK in Turkish can modify in two kinds of domains, one being a nominal phrase which is an argument, and the other one being the VP.⁴ Moreover, I show that these two positions give rise to two different readings and are subject to different semantic restrictions depending on which domain it modifies, in line with its counterpart in English (Ahn 2010). However, unlike its counterpart in English, I also note that EK displays slight differences in co-referent thematic role requirements, and stress-bearing. In Section 2.2., I note some Turkish-specific observations that could be potential tests to distinguish the two types of the EK.

2.2. TURKISH-SPECIFIC OBSERVATIONS ON THE _{DP}EK AND THE _{VP}EK. In this section, I will first present some morphosyntactic observations on both types of EK, and its co-referent, and briefly discuss the possibility that EK is sensitive to animacy effects to some degree.

At this point, we already know that EK is obligatorily marked to match the person feature of its co-referent, regardless of whether it is a _{DP}EK or a _{VP}EK (except for 3rd person, which is overtly marked in Turkish optionally). In addition to that, genitive marking on the co-referent of a _{VP}EK is ungrammatical, regardless of whether the _{VP}EK itself is marked with a possessive {-s(I)} or not:

- (20) **Defne-(*/??nin)** ev-de-ki her şey-i **kendi(-si)** tamir ed-iyor.
 Defne-gen home-loc-rel everything-acc **self-3sg** repair do-prog.3sg
 Ev arkadaş-ı ise her seferinde tamirci
 house friend-acc on.the.other.hand each time repair.person
 çağır-mak isti-yor.
 call-vnom want-prog-3sg

“Defne repairs everything at home (all by) herself, while her roommate wants to call a repair person each time.”

⁴ So far all the DP modifying examples happened to be modifying subject DPs, but it is possible for it to modify an object DP:

- (i) Deniz kitab-ın **kendi-si-ni** oku-ma-mış, ama film-i-ni izle-miş.
 Deniz book-gen **self-3sg-acc** read-neg-evid but movie-poss.3sg-acc watch-evid-3sg.
“Deniz didn’t read the book itself but he watched its movie adaptation.”

The _{DP}EK, on the other hand, isn't restricted in terms of bearing overt genitive-possessive markers the same way⁵. Genitive-possessive marking on the co-referent and the _{DP}EK is optional in a way that allows both to be marked at the same time, one to be marked without the other, and neither being marked without changing the acceptability of the sentence:

- (21) a. Defne(-nin) kendi(-si) ev-de-ki her şey-i tamir ed-iyor,
 Defne-gen self-3sg home-loc-rel everything-acc repair do-prog.3sg
 ev arkadaş-ı ise her seferinde tamirci
 house friend-acc on.the.other.hand each time repair.person
 çağır-mak isti-yor.
 call-vnom want-prog-3sg

"Defne repairs everything at home (all by) herself, while her roommate wants to call a repair person each time."

(20)-(21) reveals that the _{DP}EM seems to behave like a nominal, whereas the _{VP}EM seems to behave like more of an adverbial. The morphological realization of this could potentially be used as a test to distinguish the two types of the EK in Turkish.

In addition to what could be a nominal-adverbial categorical difference, it is also the case that the genitive marking on the co-referent is barred when it is a pronoun as opposed to R-expressions or proper names (8, 21a), except for 3rd person (22):

- (22) a. Ben kendi-m/*Ben-im kendi-m kapı-yı kır-dı-m.
 I self-1sg/ I-gen self-1sg door-acc break-past-1sg
"I broke the door myself."
 b. Sen kendi-n/*Sen-in kendi-n kapı-yı kır-dı-m.
 You self-1sg you-gen self-2sg door-acc break-past-1sg
"I broke the door myself."
 c. O kendi(-si) /O-nun kendi-si kapı-yı kır-dı-m.
 S/he self-1sg /s/he-gen self-3sg door-acc break-past-1sg
"I broke the door myself."

This could be attributed to the subject position requiring nominative case, however a genitive-possessive marked phrase in the subject position can also be marked as a nominative, as indicated by the grammaticality of (23):

- (23) (Ben-im) araba-m sürekli bozul-uyor.
 [1sg-gen car-poss.]nom all.the.time break.down-prog-3sg.
"My car breaks down all the time."

Therefore, it is uncertain whether the inconsistent pattern shown in (22) strictly stems from referentiality differences of different kinds of nominals (proper names, R-expressions, pronominals), or whether it has to do with properties of the EK in terms of its requirements for a co-referent. It is also the case that possessive pronouns in Turkish are essentially pronouns with genitive marking (23), which can be the reason behind this pattern. Moreover, it is noteworthy to

⁵ This can also be interpreted as compounding the co-referent DP and the EK. See Göksel (1989, 1993) and, Göksel & Haznedar (2007) for a more detailed discussion on {-sI} and compounding.

add that the third person pronoun in Turkish has been debated on a great deal in terms of its pronominal properties, or lack thereof, due to lacking overt person agreement morphology, in addition to also being a demonstrative unlike 1st and 2nd person pronouns in Turkish (see Harley & Ritter 2002 i.a. for a more detailed discussion).

The morphosyntactic observations brought up in this section so far suggest that the EK might be displaying features of different syntactic categories when in different sentential positions. Surfacing as two different syntactic categories with the two different interpretations suggests having different merge sites. However, it still requires further investigation to determine whether the two readings stem from two separate semantic entries for two separate syntactic categories that morpho-phonologically overlap, or whether the EK is a single semantic entry that works differently in different syntactic environments. If the EK consists of one single formal semantic entry, then this could be accounted for by the merge site leading to different applications of the same function, resulting in different but semantically related interpretations. In that case, accounting for the EK would have larger consequences for the sentential derivation process, suggesting that syntactic category is determined by the merge site, rather than being an inherent property of the lexical item that the verb selects for, as proposed by theories such as Distributed Morphology (Halle & Marantz 1994 and on).

Another curious thing is that the genitive marking on the _{DP}EM seems to interact with animacy, or with agentivity as a greater concept that entails animacy. Göksel & Kerslake (2005:238) already show that _{VP}EK can have an inanimate co-reference (24a). This is also true for the _{DP}EM (24b). However, (24c) shows that the lack of genitive marking on the co-referent of the _{DP}EM leads to a significant decrease in grammaticality in (24a) where its co-referent is inanimate, but this is not an asymmetry we observe with animate (human or non-human) co-referents (20)⁶:

- (24) a. Bu ütü-ler bir süre sonra kendi **kendi(-leri)-ne** kapan-ıyor.
 these iron-pl a while later self **self(-pl)-dat** close-prog-3sg
“These irons switch themselves off after a while.”

Göksel & Kerslake (2005:238)

- b. Kapı-nın **kendi(-si)** sağlam ama kilid-i bozuk.
 door-gen **self** intact but lock-poss.3sg broken
“The door itself is intact, but its lock is broken.”

- c. ??Kapı **kendi** sağlam ama kilid-i bozuk.
 door **self** intact but lock-poss.3sg broken
“The door itself is intact, but its lock is broken.”

Number marking and agreement is documented to interact with animacy to some degree in Turkish (see Sezer 1978, Göksel & Kerslake 2005; Özsoy 2009; Bamyacı & Häussler 2014, Krause & von Heusinger 2019), which makes it not unlikely that (22) is a case of morphology interacting with animacy.

3.Preliminary discussion of what exactly the EK might be marking semantically and pragmatically. What exactly the two EMs mark is at the center of the discussion in Ahn (2010). Following (Rooth 1996, Eckardt 2001), he leans on a contrastive focus-like explanation for the semantic function of the _{DP}EM, and a volition introducer/licenser type of account for the _{VP}EM.

⁶ The discussion in Section 3 elaborates on the variety of the EK in (23a).

While a detailed discussion regarding the exact formal semantic function of the EK varieties is beyond the scope of this paper. In Section 3.1, I attempt to lay out the specific contexts with which the $_{DP}EK$, and the $_{VP}EK$ are compatible, and/or which contexts seem to trigger or require them to connect to their formal semantic functions. As for Section 3.2. I attempt to single out the different possible interpretations that each version of the EK allows or doesn't allow.

3.1. CONTEXTS COMPATIBLE WITH $_{DP}EK$. We've already seen that the $_{DPEM}$ requires some type of contrast and can trigger it by itself out of the blue within the limitations of the addressee's world knowledge (Eckardt 2001, Ahn 2010). It is also analyzed as some type of contrastive focus marker (Ahn 2010: 26-36). Similarly, EK could also be compatible with marking contrastive topic given that it often happens to be within the sentence initial phrase either as a part of the subject phrase, or as a part of the object phrase in a subject-drop environment (see İşsever 2003 for the sentential positions of information structural units in Turkish). I observe three main relations that it forms regardless of morphological marking, and regardless of the thematic role of its co-referent. The first one is triggering contrast between a whole and its parts

(25) *whole-part relation*

Pasta(-nın)	kendi(-si)	düzgün de	krema-sı	bozul-muş.
cake(-gen)	self(-3sg)	proper foc	frosting-poss.3sg	get.messy-evid-3sg.

"The cake itself is decent but its frosting is messed up."

Another contrast-building relation that keeps surfacing with the $_{DP}EK$ is perceived hierarchies, where it accentuates what's usually perceived as the highest end of said hierarchy (26):

(26) *perceived hierarchy/importance*

a.Müdür(-ün)	kendi(-si)	şikayet-imiz-le	ilgilen-di,
manager-gen	self(-3sg)	complaint-poss.1pl-with	deal.with-past-3sg

müşteri hizmetleri-ne bırak-ma-dı-Ø.
customer services-acc leave-neg-past-3sg
"The manager herself dealt with our complaint, (she) didn't leave (it) to the customer service."

b.Doktor(-un)	kendi(-si)	yok	mu?
Doctor(-gen)	self(-3sg)	exist.neg	Q?

Hemşire soru-m-un cevap-ı-nı bil-me-z.
Nurse.nom question-poss.1sg-gen answer-poss.3sg know-neg-aor-3sg.
"Isn't the doctor herself here? The nurse wouldn't know the answer to my question."

The third type of contrast that I observe with the $_{DP}EK$ is singling out a participant among two or more, but differently from (26), not based on a perceived hierarchy but based on difference or incomparability (27):

(27) A: Yarın	eş-im-le	birlikte	Ankara'ya	gidiyor-uz.
tomorrow	spouse-poss.1sg-with	together	Ankara-dat	go-prog-1pl

"Tomorrow we're going to Ankara with my spouse."

B: Ben	sen	kendi-n	Ankara-ya	gid-ecek-sin,
I	you	self-2sg	Ankara-dat	go-fut-2sg,

o İzmir-de kal-acak san-ıyör-du-m.
 he İzmir-loc stay-fut think-prog-past-1sg
"I thought you yourself were going to Ankara (as in only you, alone) and he was going to stay in İzmir."

Overall, (25)-(27) suggest that the _{DP}EK creates or marks some type of contrast by highlighting an event participant among other potential participants, which is also in line with (Eckardt 2001) whose analysis of centrality effects aren't restricted to alternate doers like Ahn (2010) implies, but they are discussed as alternate event participants, to unite _{DP}EMs and _{VP}EMs under the same core semantic function.

3.2. TEASING APART THE MANY FACES OF _{VP}EK:

In the literature there seems to be less emphasis put on pinpointing what exactly the _{VP}EM expresses, and it's often simply paraphrased as *without help* or *alone*. Ahn (2010) notes that the interpretation of the _{VP}EM in English is also often difficult to tease apart from its close variants *by xself* and *all by xself*, both of which can also be paraphrased as *without help* or *alone*, however hee also argues that the semantic contribution of the _{VP}EM in English isn't limited to those two interpretations. He suggests that _{VP}EM is in fact something that has to do with volition, and the co-referent of the _{VP}EM needs to be not just a causer but a volitional one in terms of its thematic role (Ahn 2010: 24-72). In Section 2.1., I showed that this is not the case with the _{VP}EK in Turkish (16, 17). We will return to that discussion at the end of this section. But before we do that, I will introduce two variants of the _{VP}EK: *kendi kendine* and *kendi başına*, which I will argue correspond exactly to the two interpretations *alone* and *without help*, respectively. However, just like their counterparts in English, both also seem to be compatible with a lot of the same contexts, and denote meanings that are difficult to tell apart (28):

- (28) a. Defne okul-a **kendi baş-ı-na** yürü-yör.
 Defne school-dat **self head-poss.3sg-dat** walk-prog-3sg
"Defne walks to school (all) by herself."
- b. Defne okul-a **kendi kendi-n-e** yürü-yör.
 Defne school-dat **self self-3sg-acc** walk-prog-3sg
"Defne walks to school (all) by herself."

Both are only available as _{VP}EKS (29)⁷:

- (29) a.*Defne-nin **kendi baş-ı** okul-a yürü-yör.
 Defne-gen **self head-poss.3sg** school-dat walk-prog-3sg
"Defne walks to school by herself."

⁷ *Kendi kendine* can also function as a reflexive as also noted by Kornfilt (1997):

(iii) (Siz) **kendi kendi-niz-i** tenkit et-me-yin.
 (2sg) **2pl-acc** critique do-neg-imp.2pl
"Don't criticize yourselves (yourselves)."

Kornfilt (1997:139)

However, *kendi başına* cannot:

(iv) #Siz hep **kendi baş-ımız-ı** eleştir-iyor-sunuz.
 you always **self head-poss.2pl-acc** criticize-prog.2pl
 Intended interpretation: *"You're always criticizing yourselves."*
 Literal interpretation: *"You're always criticizing your own heads"*

(iv) is well-formed, but the morphological components of *kendi başına* gets interpreted literally in a reflexive structure, straying away from its stand-alone meaning that is more metaphorical.

b.*Defne-nin **kendi kendi-si** okul yürü-yor.
 Defne-gen **self self-3sg-acc** walk-prog-3sg
 “Defne walks to school all by herself.”

(28) and (29) in comparison tells us that *kendi baş-I* and *kendi kendi(-sI)* are strictly adverbial in nature, unlike the EK which they derive from, which behaves like a nominal item when a _{DP}EK. However, it is possible to isolate the interpretations *alone*, and *without help*:

(30) Context A: Deniz recently learnt how to cook. He’s cooking a recipe while the rest of the household is hanging out in the kitchen. Everyone’s on their phones, so nobody is helping him.

Deniz mutfak-ta **kendi(-si)/kendi kendi(-si)-n** /#kendi baş-ı-na
 Deniz kitchen-loc **self(-3sg)/kendi kendi(-3sg)-dat**/#kendi head-poss.3sg-dat
 yemek pişir-iyor.
 food cook-prog-3sg.

“Deniz is cooking (by) himself/#all by himself_{ALONE}/all by himself_{WITHOUT.HELP}.”

(32) Context B: Deniz recently learnt how to cook. Ever since, he really likes cooking different recipes to try them out. He’s cooking a new recipe early in the morning while the rest of the household isn’t awake yet.

Deniz mutfak-ta **kendi(-si)/kendi kendi(-si)-n** /kendi baş-ı-na
 Deniz kitchen-loc **self(-3sg)/kendi kendi(-3sg)-dat**/kendi head-poss.3sg-dat
 yemek pişir-iyor.
 food cook-prog-3sg.

“Deniz is cooking (by) himself/all by himself_{ALONE}/all by himself_{WITHOUT.HELP}.”

(32) Context C: Deniz recently learnt how to cook, but he sometimes gets confused and needs some help with what to do with certain ingredients. He’s home alone cooking, but he really needed help with this one recipe, so he texted his sister. She’s texting back helping him with the instructions.

Deniz mutfak-ta **kendi(-si)/kendi kendi(-si)-ne** /?#kendi baş-ı-na
 Deniz kitchen-loc **self(-3sg)/kendi kendi(-3sg)-dat**/kendi head-poss.3sg-dat
 yemek pişir-iyor.
 food cook-prog-3sg.

“Deniz is cooking (by) himself/all by himself_{ALONE}/#all by himself_{WITHOUT.HELP}.”

Based on the contexts given in (30-33), *kendi başına* captures the components *without help* and *alone*. And *kendi kendine* captures *alone*, which entails *without help* under a lot of circumstances but not necessarily inherently so as (32) shows. And we’ve seen that _{VP}EM *kendi(-si)* is compatible with both interpretations.

Lastly, let’s look at the case in (16e) repeated here as (33a) using our new tools to attempt to isolate the meaning of the _{VP}EM *kendi(-si)*:

(33) a.Çocuk balkon-dan **kendi(-si)** düş-tü.
 child.nom balcony-abl **self(-3sg)** fall-past-3sg
 “The child fell off of the balcony himself.”

b.Çocuk balkon-dan **kendi kendi(-si)-ne** düş-tü.

child.nom	balcony-abl	self	self(-3sg)-acc	fall-past-3sg
"The child fell off of the balcony by himself _{ALONE} .				
c.#Çocuk	balkon-dan	kendi	baş-ı-na	düş-tü.
child.nom	balcony-abl	self	head-poss.3sg-dat	fall-past-3sg
"The child fell off of the balcony by himself _{WITHOUT.HELP} ."				

(33b-c) show that the $_{VP}EK$ in Turkish bears the meaning of *alone*, as in no other potential doer/causer being present to initiate the event. Recall that what (17) showed is also in line with this. To briefly remind the discussion under (17), it showed that the $_{VP}EK$ in an unaccusative clause such as (16e) is incompatible with an implied extra event participant as the causer of the event, and also incompatible with the patient argument itself to be rendered as a volitional agent/doer, however, compatible with reflexivization of the event structure in a way. Moreover, (18) showed us that the bare $_{VPEM}kendi(-si)$ isn't compatible with a volitional or agentive doer/causer reading. In this case, all the $_{VPEK}$ s in (16) would encode a causer or an event initiator. And the event initiator in (16e) would be co-referent to the undergoer of the same event, similar to how reflexives work ("x ended up causing xself to fall down"). It also might be the case that the way Turkish encodes event structure, specifically in terms of the difference between unaccusative and unergative events, has different properties compared to the process that's going on in English, or that the EK in Turkish is more underspecified in terms of thematic role requirements, or in terms of what it encodes in the event structure. Such an underspecificity would also cover cases like (28b) where the co-referent of the EK is inanimate. In that case, the potential analysis may lead to a "one EK to derive (them) all" type of unified account, at least in the case of Turkish (see Eckhardt 2001 for such a claim on *selbst* in German as an EK). Nonetheless, more data and research are required to arrive at clear-cut analyses of both the $_{VPEK}$ and the $_{DPEK}$ in Turkish.

4. Conclusion and questions for further exploration. In this paper, I argue that the anaphor *kendi* in Turkish not only functions as an emphatic marker apart from its reflexive anaphora form, but also there are two distinct readings available of that emphatic marker, in line with what's been observed with its counterparts in a very different language, English (Ahn 2010). I showed that most of the diagnostic restrictions that Ahn (2010) observes for the emphatic marker in English are also compatible with the EK in Turkish. However, I also document that the $_{VPEK}$ in Turkish is compatible with a non-agentive co-referent and hypothesized that the $_{VPEK}$ in Turkish merely requires an active participant in each event as opposed to requiring a volitional agent like its counterpart in English. A potentially fruitful next step might be doing an acceptability judgment task with more users of Turkish, and with sentences in more nuanced contexts to capture potential variation. A prosodic study could also be used to further explore the prosodic properties of the EK, especially to find out the difference between $_{DPEK}$ (15) and its counterpart in English in terms of morphophonological stress requirements.

Lastly, there are two bigger picture questions remaining: One is what exactly the EK denotes, and whether the $_{VPEK}$ and $_{DPEK}$ denote the same semantic function. Another question related to this is whether merge sites explain the difference in categorical behavior and interpretation, or whether we have two related but different linguistic items at hand. The second big picture question is why we observe a morpho-phonologic overlap between a reflexive anaphor and an emphatic marker in typologically unrelated languages? Note that this functional overlap is observed beyond Turkish and English, and observed even when reflexivity is expressed using strategies other than independent lexical items (Déchaine & Wiltschko 2017 i.a.). Both questions call for more new data, and more research.

References

- Ahn, Byron Thomas. 2010. Not just emphatic reflexives themselves: their syntax, semantics and prosody. Ph.D. Dissertation. UCLA.
- Bamyacı, Elif, Jana Häussler, and Barış Kabak. 2014. The interaction of animacy and number agreement: An experimental investigation. *Lingua*, 148, 254-277. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2014.06.005>
- Büring, Daniel. 2005. *Binding theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Déchaine, Rose-Marie, and Martina Wiltschko. 2017. A formal typology of reflexives. *Studia Linguistica*, 71(1-2), 60-106. <https://doi.org/10.1111/stul.12072>
- Dinçtopal-Deniz, Nazik. 2009. Anaphora in Turkish. *Linguistics in the Big Apple: CUNY/NYU*.
- Eckardt, Regine. 2001. Reanalysing Selbst. *Natural Language Semantics* 9:371–412.92 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014875209883>
- Faltz, Leonard, M. 2016. *Reflexivization: A study in universal syntax*. Routledge.
- Göksel, Aslı. 1988. Bracketing paradoxes in Turkish nominal compounds. In S. Koç (ed.) *Studies on Turkish Linguistics*, 287-298. Ankara: METU Press.
- Göksel, A. (1990). Semantic properties of Turkish nominal compounds. *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Conference on Greek Linguistics*, 379-398. Thessaloniki: University of Thessaloniki Press.
- Göksel, Aslı. 1993. Levels of representation and argument structure in Turkish. Ph.D. Dissertation. SOAS University of London.
- Göksel, Aslı. & Kerslake, Celia. 2005. *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. Routledge.
- Göksel, Aslı, & Haznedar, Belma. 2007. Remarks on compounding in Turkish. *MorboComp Project, University of Bologna*.
- Gračanin-Yuksekk, Martina, Sol Lago, Duygu Fatma Şafak, Orhan Demir, and Bilal Kırkıc. 2020. The interpretation of syntactically unconstrained anaphors in Turkish heritage speakers. *Second Language Research* 36, (4), 475-501. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658319841403>
- Gürer, Aslı. 2020. The Prosody of Aboutness and Contrastive Topics in Turkish. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi*, 60(2), 561-585.
- Halle, M., & Marantz, A. 1994. Some key features of Distributed Morphology. *MIT working papers in linguistics*, 21(275), 88.
- Harley, Heidi, and Elizabeth Ritter. 2002. Person and number in pronouns: A feature-geometric analysis. *Language*, 482-526.
- İşsever, Selçuk. 2003. Information structure in Turkish: the word order–prosody interface. *Lingua*, 113(11), 1025-1053. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841\(03\)00012-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841(03)00012-3)
- İşsever, S. (2008). EPP driven scrambling and Turkish. In (Ed. Tokusu Kurebito) *Ambiguity of morphological and syntactic analyses*, 390-398. The Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- İşsever, Selçuk. 2019. On the ban on postverbal wh phrases in Turkish: A syntactic account. In *Word Order in Turkish* (pp. 67-90). Springer, Cham.
- Kahraman, Barış. & Özbek, Aydın. 2013. Reflexive interpretations in Turkish. IEICE Technical Report. University of Tokyo & Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University.
- Konig, Ekkehard, and Peter Siemund. 2000. *Intensifiers and reflexives: A typological perspective*. Z: Frajzyngier and T. Curl, eds, *Reflexives. 'Forms and Functions*. Benjamins, Amsterdam, 41-74.

- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1997. *Turkish (Descriptive Grammars)*. Routledge.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 2001. Local and long-distance reflexives in Turkish. In (Eds. Peter Cole, Gabriella Hermon, C.-T. James Huang) *Long-distance reflexives*, 33, 197-226.
- Koşaner, Özgün. 2005. Türkçede dönüşlü yapıların biçim-sözdizimsel özellikleri [The morpho-syntactic properties of reflexive structures in Turkish] Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation. Dokuz Eylül University.
- Koşaner, Özgün. & Oktar, Leyla. 2007. Türkçede Dönüştürülük: Biçim-sözdizimsel bir çözümleme. [Reflexivity in Turkish: A Morpho-syntactic analysis]. *Journal Of Turkish Linguistics*, 1(1), 24.
- Krause, Elif, and Klaus von Heusinger. 2019. Gradient effects of animacy on differential object marking in Turkish. *Open Linguistics*, 5(1), 171-190.
- Kural, Murat. 1992. Properties of scrambling in Turkish. Ms., UCLA.
- Özbek, Aydın & Kahraman, Barış. 2016. Interpretations of Turkish reflexive pronouns kendi and kendisi. *Mersin University Journal of Linguistics & Literature*, 13(1).
- Öztürk, Balkız. 2004. Case, referentiality and phrase structure. [Ph.D. Dissertation]. Harvard University.
- Öztürk, Balkız. 2005. *Case, referentiality and phrase structure*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Özsoy, Ayşe Sumru. 1983. Reflexivization in Turkish: A Syntactic, Semantic and Discourse Analysis. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation. University of Michigan.
- Özsoy, Ayşe Sumru. 2009. Argument structure, animacy, syntax, and semantics of passivization in Turkish: A corpus-based approach. *Corpus analysis and variation in linguistics*, 259-279.
- Palaz, Bilge. 2010. On the nature of anaphoric expressions kendi/kendisi and the clause structure of Turkish. MA Thesis. Boğaziçi University.
- Rooth, Mats. 1985. Association with Focus. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation. University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Rooth, Mats. 1992. A Theory of Focus Interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1, 75–116.
- Rooth, Mats. 1996. Focus. In (Ed. S. Lappin) *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*, 271–297.
- Sezer, Engin. 1978. Eylemlerin çoğul öznelerle uyumu. *Genel Dilbilim Dergisi*, Ankara Dilbilim Çevresi Derneği Ankara, pp. 25-32.
- Sezer, Engin. 1979. On reflexivization in Turkish. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 3, 748-75