

## Pronominal reflexives in Kumyk

Kumyk, a Turkic language spoken primarily within the Caucasus region of Russia, expresses reflexivization either by a verbal suffix or by the reflexive pronoun, *o'z* 'self'. The reflexive pronoun occurs in a variety of argument positions, including subject, direct and indirect object, and as a possessive pronoun. These forms exhibit both possessive suffixes which agree in person and number with the antecedent and case suffixes correlating with their argument function, as illustrated by the possessive reflexive in the genitive case highlighted in (1).

- (1) Bolat<sub>i</sub> **o'z-iu-niu<sub>i</sub>** k'oilaryn ashatdy.  
 Bolat self-3POSS-GEN sheep.PL.3POSS.ACC eat.CAUS.3S.PST  
 'Bolat<sub>i</sub> fed his<sub>i</sub> sheep.'

The coreferentiality properties of the Kumyk pronominal reflexive are of particular interest, given the fact that it does not clearly fit the syntactic distinction between anaphor and pronoun in terms of binding conditions. As illustrated in (2), a reflexive occurring in an embedded clause may have an antecedent in the local clause and is, therefore, not pronominal, or it may have a matrix clause antecedent which is not coreferential with the subject of the embedded clause and thus is not anaphoric.

- (2) Bolat<sub>i</sub> Pavelge<sub>j</sub> ol<sub>j</sub> **o'ziuniu<sub>i/j</sub>** k'oilaryn ashatsyn  
 Bolat Paul.DAT 3S self.3POSS.GEN sheep.PL.3POSS.ACC eat.CAUS.3S.IMP  
 dedi.  
 say.PST  
 Bolat<sub>i</sub> told Paul<sub>j</sub> he<sub>j</sub> should feed his<sub>i/j</sub> sheep.

The term 'long-distance reflexive' is used for similar cases in a number of languages, including the inflected reflexive *kendi* in Turkish (Cole et al. 2001, Kornfilt 2001). However, Kornfilt's analysis of the Turkish inflected reflexive demonstrates that it does not exhibit certain typological properties of long-distance reflexives suggested by Pica 1987, in particular, those of monomorphemicity and subject orientation. Likewise, the Kumyk inflected reflexive is polymorphemic and is not restricted to subject antecedents, whether across clauses, as in (3), or in the local domain, as in (4). In (3) the reflexive subject in the embedded clause may be interpreted as coreferential with the dative object of the matrix clause, while in (4) the reflexive is coreferential with the genitive argument within a locative phrase of the same clause.

- (3) Adamlaxa<sub>i</sub> [o'zi<sub>i</sub> Ø<sub>j</sub> sjujegen] adamyndanj  
 man.PL.DAT self.3POSS love.PR.PRT man.3POSS.ACC.ABL  
 airilmag"a bek k"yjyn.  
 be.separated.from.INF very difficult  
 'It is difficult for people<sub>i</sub> to be separated from someone they<sub>i</sub> love.'
- (4) K"yz<sub>i</sub> getip gechesinde [pajkhammarni; u'junde]  
 daughter/girl leave.GER that.evening prophet.GEN home.3POSS.LOC

o'ziuniu<sub>j</sub>                      k"zyyndan<sub>i</sub>                      da                      isbajy                      k"yz<sub>k</sub> bola.  
 self.3POSS.GEN                      girl.3POSS.ABL                      EMPH slendergirl                      be.PR  
 ‘After the daughter<sub>i</sub> leaves, that evening, in the prophet’s<sub>j</sub> home, besides his<sub>j</sub> own  
 daughter<sub>i</sub> there appears a slender girl<sub>k</sub>.’

Other work on long-distance reflexives discusses whether or not these forms are licensed by particular discourse contexts (Baker 1995, Zribi Hertz 1995, Cole et al. 2001). More specifically, these studies look at whether long-distance reflexivization is restricted to logophoric contexts, emphatic or contrastive usages or use with discourse-prominent antecedents. A study of naturally-occurring reflexives within a text corpus provides evidence against such restrictions. My analysis shows that reflexives are used in both logophoric and non-logophoric contexts, and that, while some usages may be clearly identified as contrastive or emphatic, other usages are not. The one common element of the cases in this study appears to be use with discourse-prominent referents. Using Gundel, Hedberg, and Zacharski’s (1993) hierarchy of cognitive statuses as a measure of discourse prominence, each referent of a reflexive form is shown to represent an entity “in focus” or at the highest level in the hierarchy.

Finally, in order to provide a more complete characterization of Kumyk reflexive forms, this study discusses their coreferentiality and pragmatic properties in relation to the referential properties of other pro-forms. For example, there are a number of cases in which a null argument and a reflexive are syntactically interchangeable, particularly in the case of possessives and subjects of conjoined clauses, while the use of the overt non-reflexive pronoun *o* in the same environment would likely signal topic shift or lack of coreferentiality with the matrix subject (Enç 1986, Humnick 2006). Given the fact that previous work demonstrates that null arguments, like reflexives, are restricted to discourse-prominent or “in focus” referents (Humnick 2006), there appears to be a degree of overlap in discourse function between these two types of proforms. I propose that, in contexts where either a null form or a reflexive is syntactically possible, the reflexive is used as a marked form which expresses an information component in addition to the accessibility of the referent—for example, for the purpose of expressing contrastive focus or point of view. In other contexts, where a reflexive would not be syntactically interchangeable with a null argument, however, its use is not considered pragmatically marked.

#### Selected References

1. Baker, C.L. 1995. Contrast, discourse prominence, and intensification, with special reference to locally free reflexives in British English. *Language* 71.63-101.
2. Cole, Peter, Gabriella Hermon, and C.T. James Huang, eds. 2001. *Syntax and semantics vol. 33: Long distance reflexives*. San Diego: Academic Press.
3. Enç, Murvet. 1986. Topic switching and pronominal subjects in Turkish. *Studies in Turkish linguistics*, ed. by Dan Isaac Slobin and Karl Zimmer, 195–208. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
4. Gundel, Jeanette, Nancy Hedberg, and Ron Zacharski. 1993. Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse. *Language* 69.274-307.
5. Humnick, Linda. 2006. Null arguments in Kumyk adverbial clauses. Paper presented at LENCA 3, Tomsk, Russia, June 27-30, 2006.
6. Kornfilt, Jaklin. 2001. Local and long-distance reflexives in Turkish. In Cole, P., Hermon, G., and Huang, C.T.J. eds., 197-226.
7. Zribi-Hertz, A. 1995. Emphatic or reflexive? On the endophoric character of French *lui-même* and similar complex pronouns. *Journal of Linguistics* 31.333-374.