INTERPRETATIONS OF TURKISH REFLEXIVE PRONOUNS *KENDI* AND *KENDISI*

Türkçe *kendi* ve *kendisi* Dönüşlülük Adıllarının Yorumlanması

Aydın ÖZBEK[1], Barış KAHRAMAN[2]

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Tokyo Üniversitesi

Öz: Türkçede *kendi* ve *kendisi* olmak üzere iki farklı dönüşlü adılı bulunmaktadır. Teorik dilbilimi çalışmalarında bu adılların bağlama ilişkileri üzerinde farklı görüşler öne sürülmüştür. Bunlardan birincisi, hem *kendi* adılının hem de *kendisi* adılının iç ve ana tümcelerin öznelerine bağlanabileceğini öne sürer. Diğer bir görüş ise *kendi* adılının yalnızca iç tümceciğin öznesine bağlanabileceğini, kendisi adılının ise iç ve ana tümcelerin öznelerine bağlanabilen daha özgür bir adıl olduğudur. Ancak, her iki görüş de araştırmacıların veya sınırlı sayıdaki Türkçe anadili konuşurlarının dilsel kararları üzerine dayalı olup, sistemli bir şekilde deneysel açıdan incelenmemiştir. Bu çalışmada, dilbilim literatüründeki mevcut çalışmaların geçerliliğini test etmek amacıyla, 64 kişiden oluşan Türkçe anadili konuşurlarına yönelik olarak zorunlu tercih deneyi gerçekleştirdik. Çalışmanın sonuçlarından hareketle, Türkçe anadili

[1] Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Japon Dili Eğitimi, aydinozbek@gmail.com
[2] Tokyo Üniversitesi, Dil ve Bilgi Bilimi Bölümü, kahraman@phiz.c.u-tokyo.ac.jp

konuşurlarının *kendi* ve *kendisi* adıllarını farklı şekilde yorumladıkları ve *kendi*nin *kendisi*ne göre daha bağımsız bir şekilde yorumlandığı söylenebilir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: *Dönüşlülük, bağlama, Türkçe, kendi, kendisi*

Abstract: Turkish has two different forms of reflexive pronouns: *kendi* (self) and *kendisi* (self-3sg). In the field of theoretical linguistics, there are different views regarding the binding relations of these reflexives. One view is that *kendi* and *kendisi* can be bound with both the subject of the embedded clause and the subject of the matrix clause. According to another view, *kendi* is more likely to be bound with the subject of the embedded clause, whereas *kendisi* can be bound with either the subject of the embedded clause or the subject of the matrix clause. In order to provide evidence for the reflexive interpretation and confirm the validity of existing linguistic analyses in Turkish, we conducted a forced preference task with 64 native speakers of Turkish. Our findings suggest that the interpretations of *kendi* and *kendisi* are different in Turkish and that *kendi* is much freer than *kendisi*.

Key Words: *Reflexives, Binding, Turkish, Kendi, Kendisi*

1. INTRODUCTION

In Turkish, two types of reflexive pronouns exist, namely *kendi* (self) and *kendisi* (self-3sg). The former is the bare form, and the latter is the inflected form of the former marked with the third person singular suffix. In the linguistics literature, there are different views regarding the binding relations of these reflexives with their antecedents. For example, some researchers argue that both *kendi* and *kendisi* can take either the subject of the embedded clause or the subject of the matrix clause as its antecedent, as shown in (1) and (2)[3] (e.g., Sezer, 1980; Aydın, 1998; Cem Değer, 1996; Yakut, 2015).

1) Ali$_i$ Can$_j$-ın   kendi$_{i/j}$-nden   kork-tuğ-un-u   zanned-iyor.

    Ali-nom   Can-gen   self-from   scare-ger-3sg-acc   think-prog

    'Ali thinks that Can is scared of him / himself.'

---

[3] The examples are taken from Sezer (1980)

2) Ali$_i$ Can$_j$-ın   kendi-si$_{i/j}$-nden   kork-tuğ-un-u
    Ali-nom   Can-gen   self-3sg-from   scare-ger-3sg-acc

    zanned-iyor.
    think-prog
    'Ali thinks that Can is scared of him / himself.'

On the other hand, some researchers argue from the point of view of syntax that *kendi* and *kendisi* refer to different nouns in the sentence (e.g., Underhill, 1976; Enç, 1989; Göksel and Kerslake, 2005; Kornfilt, 2001; Meral, 2010). According to these studies, *kendi* is a strict local anaphor, and it is subject to Condition A of the Binding Theory (Chomsky, 1981). Thus, it must be bound in its governing category. Hence, it refers to the embedded (local) subject noun, whereas *kendisi* may refer to either the subject noun of the matrix clause (non-local subject) or to the embedded clause (local subject) due to its dual nature. In other words, both interpretations are acceptable in (2), and *kendisi* may refer to either the local or non-local subject. In (1), on the other hand, only the local subject interpretation is acceptable, and *kendi* cannot refer to the non-local subject *Ali* (Enç, 1989; Göksel and Kerslake, 2005; Kornfilt, 2001; Meral, 2010).

However, these generalizations were mainly provided from a limited number of linguistic analyses and/or the intuitions of researchers. To the best of our knowledge, a few studies attempted to investigate the reflexive preferences (interpretations) through experimental methods in Turkish (Aydın, 1998; Yakut, 2015). However, these studies contain some limitations, and there is still a need for more empirical and systematically collected data. In this regard, to provide more robust evidence for the reflexive interpretations and to confirm the validity of existing linguistic analyses in Turkish, we conducted two experiments by employing a forced preference task which was administered to 64 Turkish native speakers.

This paper is organized as follows: In the next section, we will introduce previous studies in more detail, and the predictions based on these studies. In Section 3, we will explain the details of the forced preference task and show the results. In Section 4, we will argue the fact that preferences for *kendi* and *kendisi* differ in Turkish, and in

addition to syntactic and pragmatic factors, lexical factors may also have an impact on reflexive interpretations to some extent. In Section 5, we will conclude that while Turkish speakers interpret that *kendi* can refer to either local or non-local subjects, *kendisi* is more likely to refer to a non-local subject.

2. PREVIOUS STUDIES

Previous studies have attempted to explain the binding relations of *kendi* and *kendisi* from different perspectives in Turkish. For example, some researchers assume that *kendi* is a strict local anaphor, and it must be bound with the local subject, whereas *kendisi* can be bound with either a local or non-local subject, due to its duality between anaphor and pronoun (Underhill, 1976; Enç, 1989; Göksel and Kerslake, 2005; Kornfilt, 2001). Meral (2010) states that *kendi* and *kendisi* are bound variables which are licensed in an operator-variable chain which shows us that the distributional properties of *kendi* and *kendisi* are similar but not same. İşsever (2015) also proposes the difference between kendi and kendisi comes from their agreement structure in which the bare pronoun *kendi* is an anaphor but *kendisi* which is AgrP headed by the agreement marker *–si* is a logophor. This phenomenon is also discussed by Cem Değer (1996) and Koşaner (2005). Some studies also assumed that *kendi* and *kendisi* behave differently and mainly focused on *kendisi* (e.g., Erguvanlı-Taylan, 1986; Dinçtopal-Deniz, 2009; Rudnev, 2011) On the other hand, some researchers argue that both *kendi* and *kendisi* can refer to either local or non-local subject (Sezer, 1980; Aydın, 1998; Cem Değer, 1996; Yakut, 2015). According to Sezer, the major difference between *kendi* and *kendisi* is empathy. Empathy indicates the speaker's attitude toward the person being described. Sezer points out that *kendi* is used to express the internal feelings of the persons being referred to. On the other hand, *kendisi* is used to put some psychological distance between the referents, but not to represent the internal feelings of the referents. For example, in (1), the event is being described from the point of view of *Ali*. In (2) only the event is being described and there is no particular empathy toward *Ali* or *Can*. Kornfilt (2001) also points out that *kendi* can be used as an emphatic pronoun and refers to the matrix subject only in the narrative context. However, Yakut (2015) argues that *kendi* has a stronger logophoric nature, and this is a broad property in Turkish. In other words, *kendi* can refer to the matrix

subject not only in the narrative context, but in more common contexts. The concept of logophoric pronouns shares similarities with empathic pronouns because they are also used to report the attitude and/or a mental state of the subject or other argument of the subordinate clause (Sells, 1987). In order to support her argument, Yakut conducted a study and collected data from 15 native speakers of Turkish. Based on her data, Yakut concluded that *kendi* in an embedded object position can refer to the matrix subject, or, in some instances, to the matrix indirect object, and the binding domain of the *kendi* can be extended by logophoricity. However, Yakut did not report the details of her study. In other words, the properties of the test sentences and the research design are very unclear. In addition, there is no report on the tendency of the answers provided by 15 Turkish speakers. Therefore, we can say that to lead more clear-cut conclusions, more systematically collected data is necessary.

In addition to Yakut's study, Aydın (1998) also employed an experimental method. Aydın (1998) aimed to test the acquisition of *kendi* and *kendisi* in Turkish as a second language, among native speakers of English and Japanese. In this study, Aydın used *kendi* and *kendisi* in various types of test sentences and also collected data from native speakers of Turkish as a control group. Some of the representative test sentences in Aydın (1998) are shown below.

3) Ali_i $Ayşe_j$-ye $kendi_i$-(si)ni   anlat-tı.
     Ali-nom   Ayşe-dat   self-3sg-acc   talk-past

   'Ali talked to Ayşe about himself'

4) Ali_i $Ayşe_j$-nin $kendi_i$-(si)-ni   sev-diğ-in-I   bil-iyor.
     Ali-nom   Ayşe-gen   self-3sg-from   love-ger-3sg-acc   know-prog

   'Ali knows that Ayşe loves him.'

In this study, Aydın asked participants who *kendi* and *kendisi* refer to. In the case of Turkish native speakers, all participants choose Ali in (3), and 92% of the participants choose Ali in (4). The results clearly show that *kendi* can also refer to a non-local subject in certain contexts. In this study, the main purpose was the second language acquisition of Turkish, and hence Aydın used strictly correct and incorrect answers. However, in some circumstances, *kendi* and *kendisi* may refer to both local and non-local subjects. In other words, the

references of *kendi* and *kendisi* may be ambiguous between the local and non-local subject as shown in (1) and (2). To the best of our knowledge, no study has reported about the preferences of Turkish native speakers in such ambiguous cases. Therefore, in the current study, one of our aims is to explore the preferences of *kendi* and *kendisi* in ambiguous cases by native speakers of Turkish too.

Based on the previous studies, the predictions regarding the reflexive interpretations in Turkish are as follows. According to researchers, such as Sezer (1980), Cem Değer (1996), Aydın (1998) and Yakut (2015), *kendi* and *kendisi* can refer to either the local or non-local subject. If Turkish native speakers interpret reflexives as argued by these studies, they would prefer the local and non-local subject at closer rates for both *kendi* and *kendisi*. In terms of statistics, there should not be a significant difference between the local and non-local subject preferences of *kendi* and *kendisi*. On the other hand, researchers, such as Enç (1989), Göksel and Kerslake (2005), Kornfilt (2001) and Meral (2010) argue that *kendi* refers to the local subject due to its strict local anaphor nature, while *kendisi* can refer to either the local or non-local subject due to its dual nature. The main difference between the two groups of these studies is the interpretation of *kendi*. While the former group argues that *kendi* can freely refer to either local or non-local subjects, the latter group argues that *kendi* must be bound in its governing category, and hence it can only refer to the local subject (Chomsky, 1981). If Turkish native speakers interpret the reflexives *kendi* and *kendisi* as described by Enç (1989), Göksel and Kerslake (2005), Kornfilt (2001) and Meral (2010), preferences would differ between *kendi* and *kendisi*. For *kendi*, Turkish native speakers would prefer the local subject over the non-local subject, and they would prefer the local and non-local at closer rates for *kendisi*. In terms of statistics, there should be a significant difference between the local and non-local subject preferences for *kendi*. However, there should not be a significant difference between the local and non-local subject for *kendisi*.

In addition to these different predictions, we would like to point out one important characteristic of Turkish. In Turkish, the subject of an embedded clause can take whether a nominative case that is phonetically empty or the genitive case that is explicitly attached to the subject NP, as shown below.

5) Ali$_i$ Can$_j$-ın   kendi$_{i/j}$-nden   kork-tuğ-un-u   zanned-iyor.
    Ali-nom   Can-gen   self-from   scare-ger-3sg-acc   think-prog
    'Ali thinks that Can is scared of him / himself.'

6) Ali$_i$ Can$_j$-ın   kendi-si$_{i/j}$-nden   kork-tuğ-un-u   zanned-iyor.
    Ali-nom   Can-gen   self-3sg-from   scare-ger-3sg-acc   think-prog
    'Ali thinks that Can is scared of him / himself.'

7) Ali$_i$ Can$_j$ kendi$_{i/j}$-nden   kork-uyor   san-ıyor.
    Ali-nom   Can-nom   self-from   scare-prog   think-prog
    'Ali thinks that Can is scared of him / himself.'

8) Ali$_i$ Can$_j$ kendi-si$_{i/j}$-nden   kork-uyor   san-ıyor.
    Ali-nom   Can-gen   self-3sg-from   scare-prog   think-prog
    'Ali thinks that Can is scared of him / himself.'

Sentence (5) is semantically identical to sentence (7), and sentence (6) is identical to sentence (8). The difference between (5)-(6) and (7)-(8) is that the embedded subject *Can* is used with the nominative-case, and the embedded-verb *korkuyor* is used the same way as in the matrix-verb. Previous studies did not pay much attention to this difference. To the best of our knowledge, Aydın (1998) used both types of sentences in his study. However, Aydın used different forms in different test sentences with completely divergent verbs. In other words, the genitive and nominative case markers were not a minimal pair in Aydın (1998). Hence, it is not easy to make a clearer distinction between the impact of different morphologies of embedded subjects on the interpretation of *kendi* and *kendisi*. Thus it can be said that this issue remains inconclusive and needs to be answered. Therefore, we used the embedded subject with both the nominative and genitive cases in two experiments, which are described in detail below.

3. PRESENT STUDY

To test our predictions, we employed a forced preference task (Boothroyd, 1985), and conducted two experiments together with pragmatically neutral and pragmatically biased sentences. In the pragmatically biased test sentences, we used verbs and object sets that

have a very strong correlation with a certain gender (i.e. *to buy a mini skirt*). In the neutral test sentences, we used verbs that have no strong lexical or semantic bias to a certain gender, and the subject can do the action to him/herself or another person (i.e. *to blame*, *to hate*). Since we wanted to make a direct comparison of our participants' preferences in neutral and biased test sentences, we conducted the two experiments together with the same participants, instead of collecting data from different participant groups. By doing so, we also excluded the potential group effect on the results. The details of our test sentences are explained below.

3.1. EXPERIMENT 1

In Experiment 1, we used pragmatically biased sentences, as shown in (9). In these sentences, the events described in the embedded clauses were pragmatically biased to the matrix subject person in terms of gender. For example, it is very natural that one would buy a mini skirt for a woman, but not for a man. This kind of manipulation allows us to examine how pragmatic factors may affect the reflexive preferences, and examine the predictions above.

Biased test sentences

9)

a. Nom-kendi

Elif	Erkan	kendin-e	mini	etek	al-dı
Elif-nom	Erkan-nom	self-dat	mini	skirt	buy-past

zanned-iyor.
think-prog

b. Gen-kendi

Elif	Erkan-ın	kendin-e	mini	etek	al-dığ-ın-ı
Elif-nom	Erkan-gen	self-dat	mini	skirt	buy-ger-3sg-acc

zanned-iyor.
think-prog

c. Nom-kendisi

Elif	Erkan	kendi-sin-e	mini	etek	al-dı	zanned-iyor.
Elif-nom	Erkan	self-3sg-dat	mini	skirt	buy-past	think-prog

d. Gen-kendisi

Elif	Erkan-ın	kendi-sin-e	mini	etek
Elif-nom	Erkan-gen	self-3sg-dat	mini	skirt

al-dığ-ın-I	zanned-iyor.
buy-ger-3sg-acc	think-prog

Literally (9a)-(9d): 'Elif_{female} thinks that Erkan_{male} bought a mini skirt for her / himself^#.'

3.1.1. PROCEDURE AND PARTICIPANTS

In total, 48 sets of test sentences were prepared. Twenty-four sets were for Experiment 1 and 24 sets were for Experiment 2 (see Appendix). In addition to the test sentences, 52 filler sentences were also prepared. The order of test and filler sentences was pseudo-randomly changed, and then the experimental material was divided into eight lists by Latin Square design to exclude any potential order effect on the preferences. Every participant was assigned to one list and read 100 sentences in total. After reading each sentence, participants answered a yes-no question, such as "A mini skirt was bought for Elif. YES/NO." Moreover, to eliminate an order effect of the given nouns and to provide a counterbalance across the questions, we changed the order of the names in the questions. Based on the answers, we judged whether the participants preferred the local subject or non-local subjects.

Sixty-four participants participated in the two experiments. Their mean age was 21 (SD: 3.33); 25 were male, and 39 were female. They were all native speakers of Turkish from different cities and undergraduate students at a university in Turkey.

3.1.2. RESULTS

Participants answered questions 384 times for each condition, after reading the test sentences and the questions. In total, participants answered 1536 questions to choose their preferences between the local subject and non-local subject as the antecedents of *kendi* and *kendisi*. The distributions of the reflexive preferences in Experiment 1 are as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Reflexive preferences in the biased sentences

Conditions	Local subject	Non-local subject	Total
NOM-kendi	187 (11.85)	197(11.86)	384
NOM-kendisi	91 (9.8)	293 (9.9)	384
GEN-kendi	154 (11.48)	230 (11.35)	384
GEN-kendisi	79 (10.54)	305 (10.73)	384
Total	511	1025	1536

The numbers show the row preference cases, and the parentheses show the standard deviations

Reflexive preferences for the local and non-local subject were separately analyzed by the generalized linear mixed-effects model (GLMM) with a binomial function (Baayen 2008). We included the row preference numbers as a dependent variable, the case markers and reflexive type as the fixed effects, and participants and items as the random effects in the model. The analyses were conducted based on the optimal model obtained from backward selection. The results of statistical analyses showed that in the NOM-kendi condition that there was no significant difference between the local and non-local subject (β = -0.10, SE = .57, z = -0.17, p = .87). This suggests that there was no preference difference between the local and non-local subject in the NOM-kendi condition. On the other hand, in the NOM-kendisi condition, the difference between the local subject and non-local subject was significant (β = -2.26, SE = .38, z = -6.02, p = .001). This suggests that the participants preferred the non-local subject interpretation over the local-subject interpretation in this condition. Similarly, in the GEN-kendi and GEN-kendisi conditions, the difference between the local subject and non-local subject was significant too (GEN-kendi: β = -.91, SE = .43, z = -2.09, p = .04; GEN-kendisi: β = -3.06, SE = .48, z = -6.38, p = .000), suggesting that the participants preferred the non-local subject interpretation over the local subject interpretation.

The results show that Turkish native speakers almost equally preferred the local and non-local subject for *kendi* in the NOM-kendi condition. In other conditions, participants preferred the non-local subject over the local subject. In other words, Turkish speakers tended to bind *kendi* and *kendisi* with the matrix subject rather than with the embedded subject. This finding differs from the predictions of most of the previous studies in Turkish (Underhill, 1976; Sezer, 1980; Enç,

1989; Göksel and Kerslake, 2005; Kornfilt, 2001; Meral, 2010). These results are in line with the findings of Aydın (1998) for native speakers of Turkish. However, in this study we used pragmatically biased sentences with a non-local subject. One may suppose that this pragmatic bias might have influenced the preferences of our participants. In other words, due to a strong bias toward the non-local subject, the participants' local subject preference might have artificially shifted to non-local subject preference. If this is the case, we cannot simply conclude that Turkish speakers interpret *kendi* and *kendisi* in the way that previous studies have indicated. In order to test this possibility, we need to confirm whether our participants' behavior changes in neutral (pragmatically non-biased) sentences, and if so, how it changes. Therefore, we conducted Experiment 2 with the same participants. That is, instead of conducting Experiment 2 with different participants, we conducted it with the same participants because we wanted to directly compare the same participants in different test sentences.

3.2. EXPERIMENT 2

In Experiment 2, we used pragmatically non-biased sentences, as shown in (10). In these sentences, the events described in the embedded clauses were pragmatically neutral. In other words, one would blame him/herself or another person. In this regard, there is no strong bias to either the matrix subject or embedded subject, as shown in (10). By using these kinds of sentences, we can confirm whether the observed results in Experiment 1 were due to the pragmatic bias or were a reflection of a general preference for reflexives *kendi* and *kendisi* by Turkish native speakers. If the former is the case, the results should differ remarkably from Experiment 1. If the latter is the case, we should observe similar tendencies to those in Experiment 1.

Neutral test sentences

10)

a. Nom-kendi

Ali	Veli	kendi-ni	suçla-dı	san-dı.
Ali-nom	Veli-nom	self-acc	blame-past	think-past

b. Gen-kendi

Ali	Veli-nin	kendi-ni	suçla-dığ-ın-ı	san-dı.
Ali-nom	Veli-gen	self- acc	blame-ger-3sg-acc	think-past

c. Nom-kendisi

Ali	Veli	kendi-si-ni	suçla-dı	san-dı.
Ali-nom	Veli-nom	self-3sg-acc	blame-past	think-past

d. Gen-kendisi

Ali	Veli-nin	kendi-si-ni	suçla-dığ-ın-ı	san-dı.
Ali-nom	Veli-gen	self-3sg- acc	blame-ger-3sg-acc	think-past

Literally (10a)-(10d): 'Ali thought that Veli blamed him / himself'

3.2.1. PROCEDURE AND PARTICIPANTS

The procedure and the participants were identical to Experiment 1 (see 3.1.1).

3.2.2. RESULTS

In Experiment 2, participants answered questions 384 times for each condition. In total, participants answered 1536 questions to make their preferences between the local subject and non-local subject as the antecedents of *kendi* and *kendisi*. The distributions of the reflexive preferences in Experiment 2 are as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Reflexive preferences in the neutral sentences

Conditions	Local subject	Non-local subject	Total
NOM-kendi	190 (15.60)	194(15.59)	384
NOM-kendisi	91 (10.05)	293 (10.08)	384
GEN-kendi	150 (15.24)	234 (15.27)	384
GEN-kendisi	75 (12.36)	309 (12.49)	384
Total	506	1030	1536

The numbers show the row preference cases, and the parentheses show the standard deviations

The procedure for the statistical analysis was identical to that in Experiment 1. The results of statistical analyses conducted with GLMM showed that in the NOM-kendi condition, there was no significant difference between the local and non-local subject ($\beta =$ -0.03, SE = .27, z = -0.10, p = .92). This suggests that there was no preference difference between the local and non-local subject in the NOM-kendi condition, as in Experiment 1. In the NOM-kendisi condition, on the other hand, the difference between the local subject

and non-local subject was significant (β = -1.68, SE = .25, z = -6.64, p = .001). This suggests that the participants preferred the non-local subject interpretation over the local-subject interpretation in this condition. Similarly, in the GEN-kendi and GEN-kendisi conditions, the difference between the local subject and non-local subject was significant too (GEN-kendi: β = -.81, SE = .33, z = -2.48, p = .013; GEN-kendisi: β = -2.52, SE = .37, z = -6.83, p = .000), suggesting that the participants preferred the non-local subject interpretation over the local subject interpretation, as in Experiment 1.

The results show that participants almost equally preferred the local and non-local subject for *kendi* in the NOM-kendi condition, as in Experiment 1. On the other hand, in the other three conditions, participants preferred the non-local subject over the local subject. In other words, participants tended to bind reflexives *kendi* and *kendisi* with the matrix subject noun rather than with the embedded subject in the NOM-kendisi, the GEN-kendi, and the GEN-kendisi conditions. This pattern is also almost the same with the Experiment 1. The findings of Experiment 2 are quite different from the generalizations of previous studies in Turkish (Underhill, 1976; Sezer, 1980; Enç, 1989; Göksel and Kerslake, 2005; Kornfilt, 2001; Meral, 2010). Overall, this result indicates that the results of Experiment 1 were not due to a pragmatic bias, but reflect a general preference by Turkish native speakers. The overall results will be discussed in more detail in the next section.

4. GENERAL DISCUSSION

The aim of the present study was to examine the interpretations of the reflexives *kendi* and *kendisi*, and to confirm the validity of existing linguistic analyses in Turkish. In order to do this, we conducted two forced preference experiments with 64 Turkish native speakers. The major findings of the current study can be summarized as follows.

In the pragmatically biased test sentences, when the embedded subject was nominative, participants interpreted both the local and non-local subject as the antecedent of *kendi* at almost the same rates (local binding (LB) 49%; non-local binding (NLB) 51%). When the embedded subject was marked with the genitive case, participants

slightly tended to prefer the non-local subject as the antecedent of *kendi* (LB: 39%; NLB: 61%). In the case of *kendisi*, participants obviously interpreted the non-local subject as the antecedent of *kendisi* (76% for NOM-kendisi and 79% for GEN-kendisi). In the neutral test sentences, when the embedded subject was nominative, participants interpreted the short-distance and long-distance subject as the antecedent of *kendi* at very close rates (LB: 49%; NLB: 51%), as in the case of pragmatically biased sentences in Experiment 1. When the embedded subject was marked with the genitive case, preferences for the local and non-local binding slightly differed, and participants tended to prefer the non-local subject as the antecedent of *kendi* (LB: 39%; NLB: 61%). As for *kendisi*, on the other hand, participants overwhelmingly interpreted the long-distance subject as the antecedent irrespective of the case of the embedded subject (76% for NOM-kendisi and 80% for GEN-kendisi), as in the case of pragmatically biased sentences.

Our findings extend the findings of experimental studies conducted by Aydın (1998) and Yakut (2015), and, more crucially, this study confirms some of the previous theoretical studies, whereas we disconfirm some other previous studies. To put it more explicitly, the syntax-based explanations cannot capture the entire results (Underhill, 1976; Enç, 1989; Göksel and Kerslake, 2005; Kornfilt, 2001; Meral, 2010). If the syntactic factors (i.e. Binding Theory Condition A) were the sole determining factor of reflexive binding in Turkish, participants would have interpreted the local subject as the antecedent of *kendi*. As for *kendisi*, they would have interpreted either the local or non-local subject as the antecedent. However, this was not the case. Turkish native speakers' reflexive interpretations differed from the predictions based on these studies. Therefore, it is safe to say that syntactic factors are not the only factors that determine the binding relationships of *kendi* and *kendisi* in Turkish. These results are in line with the findings of Aydın (1998) and Yakut (2015). Based on the observation made by Cem Değer (1996), Aydın (1998) assumes that *kendi* can refer to non-local subject due to agreement restrictions between the subject nouns and *kendi*. Moreover, Aydın (1998) showed that Turkish native speakers indeed preferred the non-local subject as the antecedent of *kendi* and *kendisi* in some cases. Yakut (2015) also reported, based on a survey, that Turkish speakers can interpret the matrix subject as the antecedent of *kendi* due to its logographic nature, and argued against strict syntax-based accounts.

We can say that the current study also provides important data and evidence against the strict syntax based accounts. Moreover, our results indicate that while *kendisi* is more likely to behave as a pronominal, *kendi* behaves freely as an anaphor or pronominal.

In addition, the results of pragmatically biased test sentences in Experiment 1 indicate that pragmatic factors alone cannot explain the results (Sezer, 1980). If the pragmatic factors were the main factors of the reflexive binding in Turkish, participants would have preferred the non-local subject as the antecedent of *kendi* and *kendisi* in each condition because the test sentences were pragmatically strongly biased to the long-distance subject (see Appendix 1). However, such a preference was not the case. In the case of *kendi*, participants preferred the local and non-local subject as the antecedent of *kendi* at closer rates. Therefore, we can say that that the pragmatic factors alone are not the decisive factors of the binding relationships of *kendi* and *kendisi* in Turkish. However, that is not to say that syntactic and pragmatic factors are irrelevant to interpretations of *kendi* and *kendisi* in Turkish. Rather, we would like to point out that both factors are related to interpretations of reflexives, but they are not the sole decisive factors.

For example, interpretations of *kendi* slightly differed between the NOM-kendi and the GEN-kendi conditions in two studies. Participants preferred the non-local binding over the local binding when the embedded subject was genitive. On the other hand, the local and non-local binding preferences did not differ when the embedded subject was nominative in the two experiments. This demonstrates that the case marking of the embedded subject somewhat influences the reflexive interpretation, suggesting that syntactic factors are not irrelevant to reflexive interpretation in Turkish (Aydın, 1998). Further evidence for some influence of syntactic factors in reflexive interpretation may be the result of the biased test sentences. It is conceivable that the participants would have overwhelmingly preferred the non-local subject as the antecedent of *kendi* and *kendisi* due to the pragmatic bias. However, participants preferred the non-local and local subject interpretations at close rates for *kendi*. This also suggests that syntactic factors are likely to have an impact to some extent on the reflexive interpretation in Turkish.

So far, we have argued the results from the point of view of syntactic and pragmatic factors and pointed out that they alone cannot explain the entire results of the current study. One question then is: what other factors might influence the reflexive interpretations in Turkish? We will speculate about four possibilities: lexical factors, semantic factors, personal factors, and the task used in the current study.

One possible factor might be the lexical properties of the embedded verbs. For example, in the case of some verbs, it might have been easier to bind reflexives with the non-local or local subject. To test this possibility, we confirmed each test sentences in the present study (see Appendixes 2). We found that participants consistently preferred the non-local binding when they read sentences including so called psychological verbs (Belleti and Rizzi, 1988). These verbs are *küsmek* (get cross with), *kaçmak* (escape/avoid) *hafife almak* (disregard), *saygı duymak* (respect), and *korkmak* (scare). In the case of these verbs, although the subject can semantically do these actions to him/herself or another person, our participants overwhelmingly tended to prefer the non-local subject over local subject. In the case of other verbs used in Experiment 2, there was no strong preference for either local or non-local subject. In other words, our participants interpreted that both *kendi* and *kendisi* can refer to local or non-local subject. On the other hand, there was no remarkable preference for the local subject over the non-local subject. This indicates that some types of verbs might have triggered non-local binding preference over local binding. However, even if we exclude the psychological verbs which might have triggered the preference for non-local subject due to a potential correlation with empathy and/or logophoracy, there is still no strong preference for the local binding. In other words, both local and non-local interpretation were possible in the case of verbs other than so-called psychological verbs. Therefore, we can say that in addition to syntactic and pragmatic factors, lexical factors might also have an impact to some extent on reflexive interpretations in Turkish. At this stage, however, we cannot provide empirical evidence for the correlation between lexical factors and empathy and/or logophoracy, but it can be said that this possibility needs to be examined more systematically in future studies.

Another possibility may be the properties of the matrix verbs.[4]   In the present study, we only used some variations of *to think* in Turkish. The use of these types of verbs might be problematic because the proposition of the sentence is not certain. For example, according to feedback from some of our participants, when they read a sentence such as *Demet Hacer kendine söz verdi zannetti* (Demet thought that Hacer promised her/herself), it can be interpreted in two ways, irrespective of binding relations. One interpretation would be "Demet thought so," whereas another interpretation would be "Demet thought so, but in fact it was not so." Consequently, this kind of semantic ambiguity might have somehow influenced the judgments of some participants. To eliminate this possibility, we need to use other types of matrix verbs, such as *to hear*, *to say*, *to tell*, *to see*, etc., in which the proposition has no ambiguity. We leave this issue for a future study.

In addition to these possibilities, personal differences such as working memory capacity or second language might have also affected the results. For example, 3 participants always consistently preferred the local subject, whereas 14 participants preferred the non-local subject. One possibility for this difference may be their working memory capacity. In future studies this possibility also needs to be tested.

Finally, we would like to point out that the task itself might have an impact on the participants' reflexive interpretations. In the forced preference task, we did not employ any time pressure. In this kind of study, participants can read the sentences many times and they can change their initial preferences (Marinis, 2010). To identify the participants' initial decisions about reflexive interpretations, we also need to use online methodologies, such as eye tracking studies. We also leave this examination for future studies.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The aim of the present study was to explore and provide evidence for the binding preferences of the reflexives *kendi* and *kendisi* in Turkish. The results two experiments revealed that Turkish native speakers preferred the local and non-local subject as the antecedent of *kendi* at

---

4 The matrix verbs were variations of *to think* such as *düşünmek*, *sanmak*, *zannetmek*.

close rates. On the other hand, Turkish native speakers overwhelmingly preferred the non-local subject as the antecedent of *kendisi*. These findings suggest that while Turkish speakers interpret *kendi* as referring to either the local or non-local subject, *kendisi* is seen as more likely to refer to the non-local subject. This is quite different from the linguistic generalizations made by strictly syntax-based theoretical studies, and indicates that *kendisi* is likely to behave as a pronominal, whereas *kendi* is likely to behave dually as an anaphor and pronominal. Moreover, the current study also suggests that either pragmatic or syntactic factors alone cannot explain the reflexive interpretations, and lexical factors are also likely to have an impact on reflexive interpretations in Turkish. Therefore, we can conclude that the current study also clearly shows the importance of systematically collected experimental data to support theoretical analyses which are based only on the intuitions of the researchers or a limited number of native speakers.

REFERENCES

Aydın, Ö. (1998) İkinci dil olarak Türkçe ediniminde dönüşlü adıllara ilişkin yorumlar. *XII.Dilbilim   Kurultayı Bildirileri* Mersin Üniversitesi pp.175-186

Baayen, R. H. (2008). *Analyzing linguistic data: A practical introduction to statistics using R*.   Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Belletti, A., & Rizzi, L. (1988). Psych-verbs and θ-theory. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 6,   291-352.

Boothroyd, A. (1985) Evaluation of speech production of the hearing impaired: Some benefits of forced-choice testing. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research* 28 (2), pp185-196

Cem Değer, A. (1996) Türkçedeki dönüşlü adılların yönetici ulamlarının tanımlanması. In L. Oktar, and A. Cem Değer (Eds.), X. Dilbilim Kurultayı Bildirileri (pp. 41-47)

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

Dinçtopal-Deniz, N. (2009). Anaphora in Turkish. *Linguistics in the Big Apple: CUNY/NYU Working Papers in Linguistics* (Ms: retrieved from http://web.boun.edu.tr/nazik.dinctopal 01/04/2016).

Enç, M. (1989) Pronouns, licensing, and binding, Natural *Language and Linguistic Theory*, Vol.7, pp.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: John Benjamins.

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

İşsever, S. (2015) Small pro as a defective binder: Anaphor binding in possessive structures, Poster presented at Turkish, Turkic and the languages of Turkey November 21–22, 2015 UMass Amherst

Kornfilt, J. (2001) Local and long-distance reflexives in Turkish. In P. Cole, G. Hermon & C.-T. J. Huang (eds.), *Long-distance reflexives, Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 33, pp.197–226. Academic Press

Koşaner, Ö. (2005) *Türkçede Dönüşlü Yapıların Biçim-Sözdizimsel Özellikleri*. M.A. Thesis, Dokuz Eylül University

Marinis, T. (2010). On-line sentence processing methods in typical and atypical populations. In: Unsworth, S. & Blom, E. (eds.). *Experimental Methods in Language Acquisition Research*. John Benjamins [Language Learning and Language Teaching], 139-162.

Meral, H.M. (2010). Some Notes on Turkish Pronominal Anaphora. *Turkish Studies*, 5(4), 535-563

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

Sells, P. (1987) Aspects of Logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18:445-479.

Sezer,E. (1980) On reflexivization in Turkish, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, vol.3/4, pp.748-759

Underhill, R. (1976) *Turkish Grammar*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Yakut, B. A. (2015) The logophoric behaviour of strict local anaphor kendi 'self' in Turkish. In A. Joseph and E. Predolac (eds.), *Proceedings of the 9th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics*, *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics #76*, Cambridge, MA: MITWPL.

APPENDIX 1: Test sentences of Experiment 1

1a)   Ayşe Ali kendine gelinlik aldı sandı.
1b)   Ayşe Ali kendisine gelinlik aldı sandı.
1c)   Ayşe Ali'nin kendine gelinlik aldığını sandı.
1d)   Ayşe Ali'nin kendisine gelinlik aldığını sandı.
2a)   Veli Fatma kendine damatlık aldı sandı.
2b)   Veli Fatma kendisine damatlık aldı sandı.
2c)   Veli Fatma'nın kendine damatlık aldığını sandı.
2d)   Veli Fatma'nın kendisine damatlık aldığını sandı.
3a)   Ayşegül Hüseyin kendine gerdanlık aldı sandı.
3b)   Ayşegül Hüseyin kendisine gerdanlık aldı sandı.
3c)   Ayşegül Hüseyin'in kendine gerdanlık aldığını sandı.
3d)   Ayşegül Hüseyin'in kendisine gerdanlık aldığını sandı.
4a)   Hasan Ayşen kendine tıraş takımı aldı sanıyor.
4b)   Hasan Ayşen kendisine tıraş takımı aldı sanıyor.
4c)   Hasan Ayşen'in kendine tıraş takımı aldığını sanıyor.
4d)   Hasan Ayşen'in kendisine tıraş takımı aldığını sanıyor.
5a)   Fatma Veli kendine eşarp aldı sanıyor.
5b)   Fatma Veli kendisine eşarp aldı sanıyor.
5c)   Fatma Veli'nin kendine eşarp aldığını sanıyor.
5d)   Fatma Veli'nin kendisine eşarp aldığını sanıyor.
6a)   Ali Ayşe kendine sünnet kıyafeti aldı sanıyor.
6b)   Ali Ayşe kendisine sünnet kıyafeti aldı sanıyor.
6c)   Ali Ayşe'nin kendine sünnet kıyafeti aldığını sanıyor.
6d)   Ali Ayşe'nin kendisine sünnet kıyafeti aldığını sanıyor.
7a)   Ayşen Hasan kendine makyaj çantası aldı sanıyormuş.
7b)   Ayşen Hasan kendisine makyaj çantası aldı sanıyormuş.
7c)   Ayşen Hasan'ın kendine makyaj çantası aldığını sanıyormuş.
7d)   Ayşen Hasan'ın kendisine makyaj çantası aldığını sanıyormuş.
8a)   Hüseyin Ayşegül kendine sakal bıçağı aldı sanıyormuş.
8b)   Hüseyin Ayşegül kendisine sakal bıçağı aldı sanıyormuş.
8c)   Hüseyin Ayşegül'ün kendine sakal bıçağı aldığını sanıyormuş.
8d)   Hüseyin Ayşegül'ün kendisine sakal bıçağı aldığını sanıyormuş.
9a)   Demet Necmi kendine tektaş yüzük aldı sanıyormuş.
9b)   Demet Necmi kendisine tektaş yüzük aldı sanıyormuş.
9c)   Demet Necmi'nin kendine tektaş yüzük aldığını sanıyormuş.
9d)   Demet Necmi'nin kendisine tektaş yüzük aldığını sanıyormuş.
10a)   Necmi Demet kendine slip mayo aldı sanmış.
10b)   Necmi Demet kendisine slip mayo aldı sanmış.
10c)   Necmi Demet'in kendine slip mayo aldığını sanmış.
10d)   Necmi Demet'in kendisine slip mayo aldığını sanmış.
11a)   Hacer Tolga kendine tektaş pırlanta aldı sanmış.
11b)   Hacer Tolga kendisine tektaş pırlanta aldı sanmış.

11c)   Hacer Tolga'nın kendine tektaş pırlanta aldığını sanmış.

11d)   Hacer Tolga'nın kendisine tektaş pırlanta aldığını sanmış.

12a)   Tolga Hacer kendine tıraş köpüğü aldı sanmış.

12b)   Tolga Hacer kendisine tıraş köpüğü aldı sanmış.

12c)   Tolga Hacer kendine tıraş köpüğü aldığını sanmış.

12d)   Tolga Hacer kendisine tıraş köpüğü aldığını sanmış.

13a)   Aytaç Emine kendine kravat iğnesi aldı zannetti.

13b)   Aytaç Emine kendisine kravat iğnesi aldı zannetti.

13c)   Aytaç Emine'nin kendine kravat iğnesi aldığını zannetti.

13d)   Aytaç Emine'nin kendisine kravat iğnesi aldığını zannetti.

14a)   Emine Aytaç kendine bikini aldı zannetti.

14b)   Emine Aytaç kendisine bikini aldı zannetti.

14c)   Emine Aytaç'ın kendine bikini aldığını zannetti.

14d)   Emine Aytaç'ın kendisine bikini aldığını zannetti.

15a)   Erkan Elif kendine sünnet elbisesi aldı zannetti.

15b)   Erkan Elif kendisine sünnet elbisesi aldı zannetti.

15c)   Erkan Elif'in kendine sünnet elbisesi aldığını zannetti.

15d)   Erkan Elif'in kendisine sünnet elbisesi aldığını zannetti.

16a)   Elif Erkan kendine mini etek aldı zannediyor.

16b)   Elif Erkan kendisine mini etek aldı zannediyor.

16c)   Elif Erkan'ın kendine mini etek aldığını zannediyor.

16d)   Elif Erkan'ın kendisine mini etek aldığını zannediyor.

17a)   Aytaç Büşra kendine namaz takkesi aldı zannediyor.

17b)   Aytaç Büşra kendisine namaz takkesi aldı zannediyor.

17c)   Aytaç Büşra'nın kendine namaz takkesi aldığını zannediyor.

17d)   Aytaç Büşra'nın kendisine namaz takkesi aldığını zannediyor.

18a)   Büşra Aytaç kendine türban aldı zannediyor.

18b)   Büşra Aytaç kendisine türban aldı zannediyor.

18c)   Büşra Aytaç'ın kendine türban aldığını zannediyor.

18d)   Büşra Aytaç'ın kendisine türban aldığını zannediyor.

19a)   Ertan Aylin kendine gümüş tespih aldı zannediyormuş.

19b)   Ertan Aylin kendisine gümüş tespih aldı zannediyormuş.

19c)   Ertan Aylin'in kendine gümüş tespih aldığını zannediyormuş.

19d)   Ertan Aylin'in kendisine gümüş tespih aldığını zannediyormuş.

20a)   Aylin Ertan kendine baş örtüsü aldı zannediyormuş.

20b)   Aylin Ertan kendisine baş örtüsü aldı zannediyormuş.

20c)   Aylin Ertan'ın kendine baş örtüsü aldığını zannediyormuş.

20d)   Aylin Ertan'ın kendisine baş örtüsü aldığını zannediyormuş.

21a)   Emrah Yelda kendine smokin damatlık aldı zannediyormuş.

21b)   Emrah Yelda kendisine smokin damatlık aldı zannediyormuş.

21c)   Emrah Yelda'nın kendine smokin damatlık aldığını zannediyormuş.

21d)   Emrah Yelda'nın kendisine smokin damatlık aldığını zannediyormuş.

22a)   Yelda Emrah kendine sütyen aldı zannetmiş.

22b)   Yelda Emrah kendisine sütyen aldı zannetmiş.

22c)   Yelda Emrah'ın kendine sütyen aldığını zannetmiş.

22d)   Yelda Emrah'ın kendisine sütyen aldığını zannetmiş.

23a)   Namık Leyla kendine sünnet şapkası aldı zannetmiş.

23b)   Namık Leyla kendisine sünnet şapkası aldı zannetmiş.

23c)   Namık Leyla'nın kendine sünnet şapkası aldığını zannetmiş.

23d)   Namık Leyla'nın kendisine sünnet şapkası aldığını zannetmiş.

24a)   Leyla Namık kendine gecelik aldı zannetmiş.

24b)   Leyla Namık kendisine gecelik aldı zannetmiş.

24c)   Leyla Namık'ın kendine gecelik aldığını zannetmiş.

24d)   Leyla Namık'ın kendisine gecelik aldığını zannetmiş.

APPENDIX 2: Test sentences of Experiment 2

1a)   Ali Veli kendini suçladı sandı.

1b)   Ali Veli kendisini suçladı sandı.

1c)   Ali Veli'nin kendini suçladığını sandı.

1d)   Ali Veli'nin kendisini suçladığını sandı.

2a)   Ayşe Fatma kendine kızdı sandı.

2b)   Ayşe Fatma kendisine kızdı sandı.

2c)   Ayşe Fatma'nın kendine kızdığını sandı.

2d)   Ayşe Fatma'nın kendisine kızdığını sandı.

3a)   Ayşen Feride kendini seviyor sandı.

3b)   Ayşen Feride kendisini seviyor sandı.

3c)   Ayşen Feride'nin kendini sevdiğini sandı.

3d)   Ayşen Feride'nin kendisini sevdiğini sandı.

4a)   Ahmet Fatih kendine küstü sanıyor.

4b)   Ahmet Fatih kendisine küstü sanıyor

4c)   Ahmet Fatih'in kendine küstüğünü sanıyor

4d)   Ahmet Fatih'in kendisine küstüğünü sanıyor

5a)   Ayhan Faruk kendinden nefret ediyor sanıyormuş

5b)   Ayhan Faruk kendisinden nefret ediyor sanıyormuş

5c)   Ayhan Faruk'un kendinden nefret ettiğini sanıyormuş

5d)   Ayhan Faruk'un kendisinden nefret ettiğini sanıyormuş

6a)   Aynur Fatmagül kendinden kaçıyor sanıyor

6b)   Aynur Fatmagül kendisinden kaçıyor sanıyor

6c)   Aynur Fatmagül'ün kendinden kaçtığını sanıyor

6d)   Aynur Fatmagül'ün kendisinden kaçtığını sanıyor

7a)   Aydın Fuat kendini övdü sanıyormuş

7b)   Aydın Fuat kendisini övdü sanıyormuş

7c)   Aydın Fuat'ın kendini övdüğünü sanıyormuş

7d)   Aydın Fuat'ın kendisini övdüğünü sanıyormuş

8a)   Murat Kemal kendini kandırıyor sanıyormuş

8b)   Murat Kemal kendisini kandırıyor sanıyormuş

8c)	Murat Kemal'in kendini kandırdığını sanıyormuş
8d)	Murat Kemal'in kendisini kandırdığını sanıyormuş
9a)	Filiz Emel kendini aşağıladı sanmış.
9b)	Filiz Emel kendisini aşağıladı sanmış.
9c)	Filiz Emel'in kendini aşağıladığını sanmış.
9d)	Filiz Emel'in kendisini aşağıladığını sanmış.
10a)	Funda Cemile kendini kötüledi sanıyor.
10b)	Funda Cemile kendisini kötüledi sanıyor.
10c)	Funda Cemile'nin kendini kötülediğini sanıyor.
10d)	Funda Cemile'nin kendisini kötülediğini sanıyor.
11a)	Hasan Emin kendine güldü sanmış.
11b)	Hasan Emin kendisine güldü sanmış.
11c)	Hasan Emin'in kendine güldüğünü sanmış.
11d)	Hasan Emin'in kendisine güldüğünü sanmış.
12a)	Ceyda Semiha kendini hafife alıyor sanmış.
12b)	Ceyda Semiha kendisini hafife alıyor sanmış.
12c)	Ceyda Semiha'nın kendini hafife aldığını sanmış.
12d)	Ceyda Semiha'nın kendisini hafife aldığını sanmış.
13a)	Berk Eren kendine saygı duyuyor zannetti
13b)	Berk Eren kendisine saygı duyuyor zannetti.
13c)	Berk Eren'in kendine saygı duyduğunu zannetti.
13d)	Berk Eren'in kendisine saygı duyduğunu zannetti.
14a)	Ece Eda kendinden korkuyor zannetti
14b)	Ece Eda kendisinden korkuyor zannetti.
14c)	Ece Eda'nın kendinden korktuğunu zannetti.
14d)	Ece Eda'nın kendisinden korktuğunu zannetti.
15a)	Kemal Hakan kendinden şüphe ediyor zannetti
15b)	Kemal Hakan kendisinden şüphe ediyor zannetti.
15c)	Kemal Hakan'ın kendinden şüphe ettiğini zannetti.
15d)	Kemal Hakan'ın kendisinden şüphe ettiğini zannetti.
16a)	Kadriye Leyla kendini ayıpladı zannediyor.
16b)	Kadriye Leyla kendisini ayıpladı zannediyor.
16c)	Kadriye Leyla'nın kendini ayıpladığını zannediyor.
16d)	Kadriye Leyla'nın kendisini ayıpladığını zannediyor.
17a)	Namık Tevfik kendini eleştirdi zannediyor.
17b)	Namık Tevfik kendisini eleştirdi zannediyor.
17c)	Namık Tevfik'in kendini eleştirdiğini zannediyor.
17d)	Namık Tevfik'in kendisini eleştirdiğini zannediyor.
18a)	Esra Aysel kendini yerdi zannediyor.
18b)	Esra Aysel kendisini yerdi zannediyor.
18c)	Esra Aysel'in kendini yerdiğini zannediyor.
18d)	Esra Aysel'in kendisini yerdiğini zannediyor.
19a)	Necmi Togla kendini methetti zannetmiş

19b)   Necmi Tolga kendisini methetti zannetmiş

19c)   Necmi Tolga'nın kendini methettiğini zannetmiş

19d)   Necmi Tolga'nın kendisini methettiğini zannetmiş

20a)   Demet Hacer kendine söz verdi zannetmiş.

20b)   Demet Hacer kendisine söz verdi zannetmiş.

20c)   Demet Hacer'in kendine söz verdiğini zannetmiş.

20d)   Demet Hacer'in kendisine söz verdiğini zannetmiş.

21a)   Emine Ecehan kendinden tiksiniyor zannetmiş

21b)   Emine Ecehan kendisinden tiksiniyor zannetmiş

21c)   Emine Ecehan'ın kendinden tiksindiğini zannetmiş

21d)   Emine Ecehan'ın kendisinden tiksindiğini zannetmiş

22a)   Erkan Aytaç kendini abartıyor zannediyormuş.

22b)   Erkan Aytaç kendisini abartıyor zannediyormuş.

22c)   Erkan Aytaç'ın kendini abarttığını zannediyormuş.

22d)   Erkan Aytaç'ın kendisini abarttığını zannediyormuş.

23a)   Ertan Emrah kendini önemsiyor zannediyormuş.

23b)   Ertan Emrah kendisini önemsiyor zannediyormuş.

23c)   Ertan Emrah'ın kendini önemsediğini zannediyormuş.

23d)   Ertan Emrah'ın kendisini önemsediğini zannediyormuş.

24a)   Elif Aylin kendini küçümsüyor zannediyormuş.

24b)   Elif Aylin kendisini küçümsüyor zannediyormuş.

24c)   Elif Aylin'in kendini küçümsediğini zannediyormuş.

24d)   Elif Aylin'in kendisini küçümsediğini zannediyormuş.