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

1 Introduction
This paper investigates anaphora in two Turkic languages: Turkish (southwestern/Oghuz branch) and Uyghur (southeastern branch)\textsuperscript{1} Our goal is to account for the distribu-
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The first goal of this paper is to tease apart sentence-internal antecedents from discourse-salient antecedents. In other words, we suggest that the free $k$ indices in both sentences below are subject to different licensing conditions than the $i$ and $j$ indices:

(1)  
       Ali self-3S-ACC   like-PRES.PROG.3S  
       ‘Ali likes self.$i$.’
   2
   b. Ali $[Ahmet$-in $k$endı/i/-$sin$-i sev-di$\bar{g}$-i$]-ni$ söyle-di.  
       Ali Ahmet-GEN self-3S-ACC   like-DIK-3S-ACC say-PAST.3S  
       ‘Ali said that Ahmet$_j$ likes self.$i$.’

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

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

---

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

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

4Charnavel and Zlogar describe deictic centers as logophoric, but these types of sentences have confounds in Turkic and thus are not discussed here.
possible in only contrastive, emphatic, or corrective focus or honorific constructions (i.e. the “k” indices in (1).

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

(2) Ali öz-i/*j-i-ni yaxshi.kö̅r-i-du.
    Ali self-3s.ACC like-NONPST.3s
    ‘Ali likes self/*j’

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

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

2 Background and Puzzle

2.1 Kendi vs. Kendi-si

Kornfilt describes in detail the differences between agreeing kendi-si and bare kendi, focusing primarily on the fact that kendi requires a local antecedent, while kendi-si can be either bound locally or co-refers with a discourse antecedent:
(3) a. Ali, kendini seviyor.
   Ali self-3S-ACC like-PRES.PROG.3S
   ‘Ali likes self.’

   b. Ali, kendi-si seviyor.
   Ali self-3S-ACC like-PRES.PROG.3S
   ‘Ali likes self.’

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

(4) a. Ahmet, kendini çok beğeniyor-muş.
   Ahmet self-ACC very admire-PRES.PROG.3S-REP.PST
   ‘(They say that) Ahmet admires himself very much.’

   b. Ahmet, kendi-si çok beğeniyor-muş.
   Ahmet self-3S-ACC very admire-PRES.PROG.3S-REP.PST
   ‘(They say that) Ahmet admires himself/him very much.’

   (Kornfilt, 2001:198)

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

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

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

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

   (Kornfilt, 2001:206-207)
Kornfilt proposes that the agreement marker in *kendi-si* (like possessives) projects an Agreement Phrase (AgrP) which has *pro* in its specifier. This analysis is shown below, which explains the pronominal-like behavior of *kendi-si*

(8)  
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{pro} & \text{kendi-si} \\
\text{self-3s} & \text{‘himself/herself’}
\end{array}
\]  
(Kornfilt, 2001:207)

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

3 Accounting for exceptional uses of *kendi-si*

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

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

(9)  
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Context: } & \text{Your friend, Seren, is never able to lock the door. She usually needs assistance. For the first time, she locked the door without help. [emphatic]} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
a. & (\text{Seren}) \text{ kendi-si kapı-yı kilitle-di.} \\
    & \text{Seren self-3s door-ACC lock-pst.3s} \\
    & \text{‘(Seren) herself locked the door.’ [Seren locked the door on her own/without any help from anyone.]} \\
\end{array}
\]
In this context, the reading is roughly equivalent to the “by herself” reading in English emphatic reflexives. The speaker is emphasizing that the antecedent Seren did not need any assistance which is a surprise to those involved in the discourse. Similarly, if the focus is on the fact that the antecedent carried out an action on his/her own, the reflexive can be licensed with or without an overt sentence-internal antecedent (10):

(10) **Context:** You just heard from John that the door was wide open when he got to the office this morning. You are surprised, because you and Seren left the office together last night and you saw Seren locking the door. [=contrastive] “Seren de oradaydı...” ‘Seren was there, too...’

   a. (Seren) kendı-si kapı-yı kilitle-di.
      Seren self-3s door-ACC lock-PST.3s
      ‘(Seren) herself locked the door.’ [=Seren locked the door in person.]

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

(11) **Context:** Your roommate gets home and cannot open the door. He calls you to ask why he cannot get in[=neutral context]. You cannot say:

   a. #(Seren) kendı-si kapı-yı kilitle-di.
      Seren self-3s door-ACC lock-PST.3s
      ‘(Seren) locked the door herself.’

(12) **Context:** Your roommate gets home and cannot open the door. He calls you to ask why he cannot get in [=neutral context]. You cannot say:
The data above suggest that *kendi-si* should not be considered a run-of-the-mill Condition B pronoun. It appears that Turkish simply uses the same form of the reflexive in emphatic and neutral contexts. We suggest that these uses of the reflexive should be considered separately, due to these discourse facts.

### 3.1 Honorific Contexts

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

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

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

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

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

In summary, we will adopt Kornfilt (2001)’s *pro* analysis to account for the emphatic
and honorific usages\(^5\) of \textit{kendisi}. However, we have shown that these usages of \textit{kendisi} are crucially distinct from the local binding and logophoric cases.

### 3.2 Differences between Uyghur and Turkish Reflexives

Interestingly, reflexives in both languages behave roughly the same. The main difference between languages is that Uyghur only allows the agreeing version of the reflexive \(\ddot{\text{o}}z\)-\(i\) (i.e. there is no \(\ddot{\text{o}}z\)), as shown in (16)\(^6\).

\begin{align*}
(15) \quad \text{Ali} & \overset{\ddot{\text{o}}z-\ast(i)-ni \ ur-d-i.} \quad \text{\textit{Uyghur}} \\
& \text{Ali self-3-ACC hit-pst-3} \\
& \quad \text{‘Ali hit self.’}
\end{align*}

As a result, Uyghur \(\ddot{\text{o}}z\)-\(i\) is more reminiscent of \textit{kendi-si} in its distribution. However, it does differ in important ways. Take for instance the equivalent to (4), which illustrates that a discourse antecedent is not permitted in Uyghur\(^7\).

\begin{align*}
(16) \quad \text{Ali} & \overset{\ddot{\text{o}}z_{/\ddot{\text{i}}}-\ddot{i}-ni \ yaxshi.k\ddot{o}r-i-du.} \quad \text{\textit{Uyghur}} \\
& \text{Ali self-3-ACC like-nonpst-3} \\
& \quad \text{‘Ali likes self_{/\ddot{\text{i}}}’}
\end{align*}

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

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

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

\(^7\)We were told that some speakers accept the honorific use of \(\ddot{\text{o}}z\)-\(i\) in Uyghur, but a more fine-grained dialectal investigation is necessary to determine its distribution.
distance antecedents and local binding. Both referential options are available in neutral contexts in both languages:

    Tursun Ali-GEN self-3-ACC know-GAN-COMP-3-ACC say-pst-3
    ‘Tursun said that Ali_i knows self_i/*k.’

Uyghur

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

(18) (Gülnar) öz-i kitab-ni imzalat-t-i.
    Gulnar self-3 book-ACC sign-pst-3
    ‘Gulnar herself got the book signed.’

Uyghur

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

4 Local Binding

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

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

8The antecedent Gülmar is optional for most of the speakers.
Condition A handles all cases that are monoclausal and all cases where there is no (different) intervening subject, DO, IO, and benefactives are shown here. In (20), the reflexive is in the DO position and takes the subject as its antecedent:

(20) **Direct Object**

   Ali self-3-ACC like-NONPST-3
   ‘Ali likes self,’
   Uyghur

b. Ali kendi/-/-i (sin)-i sev-iyor.
   He self-3S-ACC like-PRES.PROG.3S
   ‘Ali likes self,’
   Turkish

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

(21) **Indirect Object Antecedent**

a. Ali Mahinur-ge öz-i-j/-ni körset-t-i.
   Ali Mahinur-DAT self-3-ACC show-PST-3
   ‘Ali showed Mahinur self.’
   Uyghur

b. Ali Seren-ge kendi/-/-i (sin)-i göoster-di.
   Ali Seren-DAT self-3S-ACC show-PST.3S
   ‘Ali showed Seren self.’
   Turkish

(22) **Benefactive**

a. Ali öz-i-ge bir kitab set-iwal-d-i.
   Ali self-3S-DAT one book buy-IWAL-PST-3
   ‘Ali bought a book for self.’
   Uyghur

   Ali self-3S-DAT one book buy-PST.3S
   ‘Ali bought a book for self.’
   Turkish

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

Ali self-3-GEN be.attractive-COMP-3-ACC think-NONPST-3
‘Ali thinks self is attractive.’  \(\text{Uyghur}\)

Seren self-3S-GEN attractive be-DIK-3S-ACC think-PRES.PROG.3S
‘Seren thinks that self is attractive.’  \(\text{Turkish}\)

(24)  **Matrix Subject/IO antecedent**

Ali Tursun-DAT self-3-GEN win-GAN-COMP-3-ACC tell-PST-3
‘Ali told Tursun that self/i won.’  \(\text{Uyghur}\)

b. Ali Dursun-a [kendi/i/-si-nin kazan-duğ-m]-1 söyle-di.
Ali Dursun-DAT self-3S-GEN win-DIK-3S-ACC say-PST.3S
‘Ali told Dursun that self/i won.’  \(\text{Turkish}\)

(25)  **Matrix Subject/Source antecedent**

Ali Tursun-ABL self-3-GEN win-GAN-COMP-3-ACC hear-PST-3
‘Ali heard from Tursun that self/i won.’  \(\text{Uyghur}\)

Ali Dursun-ABL self-3S-GEN win-DIK-3S-ACC hear-PST.3S
‘Ali heard from Dursun that self/i won.’  \(\text{Turkish}\)

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

5  **Exempt Anaphors and Logophoricity**

When the subject of the matrix and embedded clauses differ, Condition A predicts
that only the embedded subject should be possible as an antecedent. However, such
cases are ambiguous:
Evidence that there is no c-command in (27) comes from the fact that there are no Condition C effects, as illustrated by the presence of Ali in the second clause not yielding it ungrammatical:

Ali-GEN view-3-CHE Mahinur Ali-ACC like-NONPST-3 
‘According to Ali, Mahinur likes Ali.’

Ali-DAT according-to Seren Ali-ACC like-PRES.PROG.3S 
‘According to Ali, Seren likes Ali.’

We propose that the non-local antecedents in (27) and (28) are permitted only when they are logophoric centers. In the following sections, we test exempt anaphors in
both Turkic languages and ultimately show that they require their antecedents to be Attitude Holders following Charnavel and Zlogar (2016). The definition is provided below:

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

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

### 5.1 Attitude Holders

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

   Ali-GEN view-3-CHE Mahinur self-3-ACC like-NONPST-3
   ‘According to Ali, Mahinur likes self.’
   *Uyghur*

   Ali-DAT according.to Seren self-3S-ACC like-PRES.PROG.3S
   ‘According to Ali, Seren likes self.’
   *Turkish*

---

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

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

Tursun-GEN friend-3 Ali-GEN self-3-ACC see-GAN-COMP-3-DAT believe-NONPST-3
‘Tursun’s friend believes that Ali saw self.’
   *Uyghur*

Dursun-un arkadas-1 Ali-nin kendi-si-ni gör-dügü-ü-ne inan-iyor.
Dursun-GEN friend-3S Ali-GEN self-3S-ACC see-DIK-COMP-3S-DAT believe-PRES.PROG.3S
‘Dursun’s friend believes that Ali saw self.’
   *Turkish*
5.1.1 The epithet test

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

(32) a. According to John, Mary likes the idiot_{i/j}.

b. Speaking of John, Mary likes the idiot_{i/j}.

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

(33) a. Ali-ning, qari-sh-i-che, Mahinur, u hamaqet_{i/*j/*k}-ni
   Ali-GEN view-GER-3-CHE Mahinur that idiot-ACC
   yaxshi.kör-i-du.
   like-NONPST-3
   ‘According to Ali, Mahinur likes that idiot_{i/*j/*k}.’  

b. Ali-ye göre, Serenö o idiot_{i/*j/*k}-u sev-iyor.
   Ali-DAT according.to Seren that idiot-ACC like-PRES.PROG.3S
   ‘According to Ali, Serenö likes that idiot_{i/*j/*k}.’ 

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

5.1.2 The double orientation test

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

\begin{align*}
\text{(35) a. Ali} & \text{ said that Tursun likes self.} \\
& \text{Ali Tursun-GEN self-3-ACC like-GAN-COMP-3-ACC say-PST-3} \\
& \text{‘Ali said that Tursun likes self.’} \quad \text{Uyghur} \\
\text{b. Ali} & \text{ said that Dursun likes self.} \\
& \text{Ali Dursun-GEN self-3S-ACC like-DIK-3S-ACC say-PST-3S} \\
& \text{‘Ali said that Dursun likes self.’} \quad \text{Turkish}
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{11}Most speakers of Turkish and Uyghur (in addition to speakers of English) treat epithets as R-expressions, and thus this test can only be used to diagnose non c-commanding antecedents. We thus shift to the double orientation test.
    Ali Tursun-GEN good one woman-ACC like-GAN-COMP-3-ACC
de-d-i.
say-PST-3
    ‘Ali said that Tursun likes a good woman.’ **Uyghur**

    Ali Dursun-GEN good one woman-ACC like-DIK-3S-ACC say-PST.3S
    ‘Ali said that Dursun likes a good woman.’ **Turkish**

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

5.2 Introducing a Puzzle

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

    Ali Tursun-ABL Ahmet-GEN self-3-ACC hit-IMPF-COMP-3-ACC
    anglı-d-i.
    hear-PST-3
    ‘Ali heard from Tursunᵢ that Ahmetₖ will hit selfᵢ/k,’ **Uyghur**

    b. Ali Dursun-dan [Ahmetₖ-in kendı/i/k-sin-i vur-acagaень]-i
    Ali Dursun-ABL Ahmet-GEN self-3-ACC hit-IMPF-3S-ACC
    duy-du.
    hear-PST.3S
    ‘Ali heard from Dursunᵢ that Ahmetₖ will hit selfᵢ/k,’ **Turkish**

---

12 Without any contexts provided, it is difficult for some native speakers to get this three way ambiguity.
In both languages, all three sentence-internal DPs are possible antecedents for the reflexive. We can see from Turkish that the embedded subject is local enough to bind the reflexive, because non-agreeing *kendi* is permitted. This is shown in (38):

(38)  Ali Dursun-dan [Ahmet-in *kendin-i/-i/-i/-i* vur-acag-m]-1 duy-du.
    Ali Dursun-ABL Ahmet-GEN self-3-ACC hit-IMPF-3S-ACC hear-PST.3S
    ‘Ali heard from Dursun that Ahmet will hit himself.’ Turkish

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

    Ali Tursun-ABL Ahmet-GEN good one man-acc hit-IMPF-COMP-3-ACC hear-PST-3
    ‘Ali heard from Tursun that Ahmet will hit a great man.’ Uyghur

    Ali Dursun-ABL Ahmet-GEN good one man-ACC hit-IMPF-3S-ACC hear-PST.3S
    ‘Ali heard from Dursun that Ahmet will hit a great man.’ Turkish

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

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

   b. Taroo-ga boku-ni okane-o kure-ru/*ya-ru.  
   Taroo-NOM me-DAT money-ACC give-PRES
   ‘Taroo gives me money.’ (Kuno 1987, 246)

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

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

(42)  a. Anonymous posts about her beloved son on the internet hurt Lucy’s [feelings/self-image].

   b. *Anonymous posts about her beloved son on the internet hurt Lucy’s [popularity/public image].

In the cases above, the speaker empathizes with *Lucy* in the case where her ‘feelings’ are hurt, but not when only her ‘popularity’ is at issue. It is difficult to create a perfect parallel in Turkic, but the same general fact seems to hold. Consider the case of experiencer subjects provided below:
In both cases, the experiencer is marked with accusative case and is permitted as the antecedent. If we apply the beloved test here, by replacing the reflexive with ‘his/her beloved son’, we are able to evaluate the same set of facts in Turkic:

In the case above, Xemit/Hamit is able to receive empathy from the speaker, but it is not clear that the speaker is empathizing with or taking the mental perspective of the experiencer. For the present purposes, we suggest that with further testing, this could be a relevant factor, which seems to work toward evaluating (37) as well. We are able to apply the same test:
In this construction, Ali is most naturally the person the speaker empathizes with if it is ‘his’ son that is being affected. This suggests that empathy loci are also permissible antecedents in Turkic. We suggest this is a worthwhile direction for future research, but more diagnostics for empathy loci and a clearer understanding of their distribution is necessary to clearly determine that the empathy locus status is responsible for the referential possibilities in (37).

6 Conclusion

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