

MORPHO-SYNTAX OF RELATIVE CLAUSES IN OLD ANATOLIAN TURKISH

Eski Anadolu Türkçesi Sıfatfiil Yancümlelerinin Biçim-Söz Dizimi

Buğra Oğuzhan ULUYÜZ*

ABSTRACT: Relative clauses, as being fundemantly a topic of morpho-syntax studies, are structures in which the trace of the deleted argument in the subordinate clause is relativised with the head noun. Although Standard Turkish relative clause structures have been extensively studied in modern syntax and semantics studies, Old Anatolian Turkish relative clause structures have been limited to semantic studies until recent times. The current study attempts to examine the historical development of these clauses by subjecting Old Anatolian Turkish relative clauses to morpho-syntactic analysis, and for this reason, it examines the clause structures of the period in comparison with their Standard Turkish equivalents. Although the clauses in Old Anatolian Turkish are mainly discussed in the study on the basis of the subject/object clause distinction, issues such as agreement patterns and relativised gap in the subordiante clauses are also included in the analysis. Accordingly, it is noteworthy that Old Anatolian Turkish relative clauses behave differently from Standard Turkish, especially in terms of the classification of the participle suffixes functioning to establish the above-mentioned clause types and the ability to fill the obligatory gap in the clause.

Keywords: Relative Clause, Old Anatolian Turkish, Standard Turkish, Morpho-Syntax, Subject Clause, Object Clause

ÖZ: Temelde biçim-söz dizimi çalışmalarının konusu olan sıfatfiil yancümleleri, yancümleden silinen ögenin izinin baş ad ile ilgilendirildiği yapılar olarak tanımlanabilirler. Standart Türkçe sıfatfiil yancümle yapıları, modern sözdizim ve anlambilim çalışmalarınca yoğun olarak konu edilmiş olsa da Eski Anadolu Türkçesindeki yapılar, son dönemlere kadar anlambilim çalışmalarıyla sınırlı kalmıştır. Mevcut çalışma da Eski Anadolu Türkçesi sıfatfiil yancümlelerini biçim-söz dizim incelemesine tabi tutup bu yancümlelerin tarihsel gelişimini incelemeye çalışmakta ve bu sebeple döneme ait yapıları Standart Türkçe karşılıkları ile karşılaştırmalı olarak ele almaktadır. Çalışmada Eski Anadolu Türkçesindeki yancümleler temel olarak özne/nesne yancümlesi ayrımı temelinde ele alınsa da

* Dr., Anadolu Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, Eskişehir, boulyuz@anadolu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0001-6268-9753



OPEN ACCESS

© Copyright 2023 Uluyüz

Geliş Tarihi / Received: 08.03.2025


Kabul Tarihi / Accepted: 20.05.2025


Yayın Tarihi / Published: 21.07.2025

yancümlelerdeki uyum örüntüleri ve yancümlelerde bulunan boşluk gibi konular da incelemeye dahil edilmektedir. Buna göre Eski Anadolu Türkçesi sıfatfiil yancümlelerinin özellikle yancümle tiplerini kurmakta kullanılan eklerin ayrışması ve yancümledeki zorunlu boşluğun doldurulabilmesi gibi bakımlardan Standart Türkçeden farklı davrandığı dikkat çekmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sıfatfiil Yancümlesi, Eski Anadolu Türkçesi, Standart Türkçe, Biçim-Söz Dizim, Özne Yancümlesi, Nesne Yancümlesi

Cite as / Atıf: ULUYÜZ, B. O. (2025). Morpho-Syntax of Relative Clauses in Old Anatolian Turkish. Trakya Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 15(30), 297-318. <https://doi.org/10.33207/trkede.1653467>

Yayın Tarihi	21 Temmuz 2025
Hakem Sayısı	Ön İnceleme: (Editör-Yayın Kurulu Üyesi) İçerik İncelemesi: İki Dış Hakem
Değerlendirme	Çift Körleme
Benzerlik Taraması	Yapıldı
Etik Bildirim	tuefdergisi@trakya.edu.tr
Çıkar Çatışması	Çıkar çatışması beyan edilmemiştir.
Finansman	Herhangi bir fon, hibe veya başka bir destek alınmamıştır.
Telif Hakkı/Lisans:	Trakya Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi'nde yayımlanan makaleler https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/ tarafından lisanslanır. 
Date of Publication	21 July 2025
Reviewers	A Internal (Editor board member) Content review: Two External
Review Reports	Double-blind
Plagiarism Checks	Yes
Complaints	tuefdergisi@trakya.edu.tr
Conflicts of	The Author(s) declare(s) that there is no conflict of

Interest	interest.
Grant Support	No funds, grants, or other support was received.
Copyright & License	Trakya University Journal of Faculty of Letters is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. 

Introduction

In the current study, the relative clause structures of Old Anatolian Turkish will be examined by comparing them with Standard Turkish.¹ It is thought that such a comparative study is necessary in order to understand the historical development of relative clauses. Although the historical development and qualities of relative clause structures have so far been limited to only some morphological descriptions, they have very interesting features in terms of syntactic point of view. Old Anatolian Turkish texts seem to contain examples that differ from Standard Turkish, especially in terms of the participle suffix variation, existence of agreement category and its position, and the gap obligatorily left inside the clause.

As it is known, in Turkic languages, subordinate clauses are formed with nominalizers or participle suffixes. More than one participle is used for relative clauses. In summary, it can be said that the variation of participle suffixes is motivated by the type of the root clause's argument that is modified by the relative clause. Thus, if the argument being modified is the subject of the root clause, a different type of participle suffix is preferred, as in Standard Turkish (e.g. -An in Standard Turkish), while another type of participle suffix is preferred in structures where the object argument of the root clause is modified.

In line with the method mentioned above, the variation of participle suffixes on the basis of subject and object clauses in Old Anatolian Turkish will be discussed in the third section. In this regard, the issue of the existence of participle suffix variation, which occurs on the basis of relative clause type in Standard Turkish, in Old Anatolian texts will be tried to be pointed out.

¹ There are also significant studies focusing on the relative clause structures of Standard Turkish through Generative Grammar method by comparing them with that of Turkic languages. (Kornfilt, 1997; 2001; 2005; 2008; 2009 and Aygen, 2005).

The existence and position of the agreement category as a whole (e.g. genitive case and possessive suffixes) will be in question in the second part. It is understood that the agreement pattern can appear in various forms in participle clauses of Old Anatolian Turkish. Therefore, it is noteworthy that there are differences compared to Standard Turkish in terms of marking the agreement category in relative clauses. While Old Anatolian Turkish is similar to Standard Turkish in terms of the presence of possessive suffixes in object clauses, it differs in terms of case marking of the clause's subject. On the other hand, it should be said that there are also differences in terms of the position of the possessive suffixes. In fact, it seems that the possessive suffixes do not always have to be marked on the clause's predicate in the relative clause examples of Old Anatolian texts.

As a typological issue of Turkic languages, the gap left in relative clauses is the most striking syntactic feature of the structures in question. Additionally, the above-mentioned gap is the source of the general term "relative clause". Because the relativization process occurs via co-indexation of the gap in the clause with the argument modified by the clause itself. While this gap is generally obligatory for grammaticality in Turkic languages, it is noteworthy that such a gap seems not to exist in some examples of Old Anatolian Turkish. In such examples, a word or pronoun corresponding to the modified argument that is located at the end of the clause can also be overt inside the clause. In the third section, relative clause structures of Old Anatolian Turkish will be examined, highlighting their differences from Standard Turkish in terms of the aforementioned gap.

First of all, let's explain terms such as root clause, modifying clause, object clause, subject clause and modified argument through Standard Turkish examples. Then, we will mention some of the previous studies on Old Anatolian Turkish relative clause structures.

Theoretical Framework

The clause shown in square brackets in the Standard Turkish example below functions to modify the word in front of it. The clause shown in square brackets below is called the relative clause. On the other hand, the word modified by the relative clause is called modified argument.

1. [Ahmet'-in _i gör-**düğ**-ü] resim
 Ahmet-gen. see-ptpl.-3.poss. picture
 The picture that Ahmet saw

The -DXK suffix that forms the relative clause structure above is written in bold letters and is called participle suffix. It is also known that a coordinate clause is the source of the relative clause structure above. This coordinate clause is given below and is named as the root clause.

2. Ahmet resm-i gör-dü.
Ahmet picture-acc. see-past
Ahmet saw the picture.

The word "resim", which is the object argument of the root clause above, is removed from its original position and added to the very end of the relative clause so as to be modified. The original position of the object argument in the relative clause is preserved as an obligatory gap, which is shown as underscore “_” in 1 above. A relativisation relation is established between the gap and the argument moved to the end of the clause.

We saw that the relative clause structure was formed by the relativisation relation of the word "resim", which is the object argument of the root clause, with the gap left behind in the subordinate clause. Relative clauses in such structures where the object argument is modified are named as “object clauses”. These object clauses in Standard Turkish get possessive suffixes. The possessive suffixes are inflected on the clause’s predicate (after the participle suffix). On the other hand, the relative clause structure can also be formed by moving the subject argument of the root clause (the clause given as number 2 above) to the end of the clause so as to establish relativisation relation for the sake of modification:

3. _i resm-i gör-en Ahmet;
picture-acc. see-ptpl. Ahmet
Ahmet who saw the picture

Such structures in which the subject argument is modified are named as “subject clauses”. Subject clauses are obligatorily formed without possessive suffixes, that is to say these clauses are agreementless. Therefore, such types of clauses in question cannot get possessive suffixes.

The sections so far have summarized the theoretical approach of the current study. Now, let's briefly mention previous studies on Old Anatolian Turkish relative clause structure.

Previous Studies on Relative Clause Structure of Old Anatolian Period

Although a diachronic analysis was made in the grammar Lewis' (2000) grammar, mostly by describing the features of the pre-Standard Turkish period, the historical development of the relative clause structure was not discussed. In this study, extensive space is devoted to relative clauses with the -AsI suffix, which are noteworthy for being frequently used in Old Anatolian Turkish. On the other hand, temporal reference and phonological alternation of participle suffixes are emphasized rather than their syntactic properties.

Karabulut and Yıldız (2019) contains explanations that shed light on the historical functions of the participle suffixes of Old Anatolian period. The investigations focus on the syntax of relative clauses on the basis of the Generative Grammar method. In addition, it is emphasized that the -DIK and -An participle suffixes can both form subject and object clauses in Old Anatolian period and therefore they can replace each other.

Turan (1996) discusses the syntactic functions of participle suffixes in addition to their temporal reference. Accordingly, while the -DXK and -mXş suffixed clauses are classified as object clauses, the -An suffixed ones are kept separate from the two suffixes above as a subject clause. In addition, although the suffixes -Ar, -IcI, -AcAK, -AsI and -IsAr are also given under the chapter of participles, only the temporal references of these suffixes are emphasized.

Üzüm (2024) draws attention by only dealing with relative clause structures of the Old Anatolian period. This study examines -DOK, mXş, -An, -(X)r/mAz, -AcAK, -AsI, mAIU and -ICI suffixes as participles. The study in question not only extensively covers the tense and aspect values of participles, but also includes the syntactic features of the above-mentioned suffixes to a certain extent. It has been emphasized that the suffix -DOK can get the possessive suffixes, while the suffix -An cannot merge with any suffix. It is mentioned that the -an suffix is preferred in passive constructions and in cases where the subject is not present, as well as forming subject clauses just as in Standard Turkish. Compared to the other studies mentioned above, Üzüm (2024) contains very detailed descriptive data and analyzes.

In addition to the studies above, there are also general grammars of the period in which the phonetic and morphological features of Old Anatolian Turkish participial suffixes are briefly discussed (Timurtaş, 2005; Gülsevin, 2007; Akar, 2018).

Let us briefly mention the corpus. Relative clause structures of Old Anatolian Turkish were scanned in certain texts of the period. These selected texts constitute the source of the study. The texts that make up the corpus can be listed as *Kıyas-ı Enbiya* (Emine Yılmaz et al., 2013)², *Kitab-ı Gunya* (Muzaffer Akkuş, 1995), *Tuhfe-i Mübarizi* (Binnur Erdağı Doğruer, 2013), *Esrarü'l-Ârifin* (Mehmet Yastı, 2010) and *Sirâcü'l-Kulûb* (Yakup Karasoy, 2013). The texts were tried to be determined to cover different topics. In addition, it is thought that prose texts better reflect the linguistic reality of the period, since the morphosyntactic possibilities in verse texts are severely challenged by stylistic concerns. That's why all the selected texts are prose texts.

-DXK, -mXş, -Ar/-mAz, -An, -AsI suffixes function as participles forming relative clauses in Old Anatolian Turkish (Üzüm, 2024: 265). It can be said that the -AcAK suffix does not have a generalized use with its syntactic nominalization function. It is understood that the relative clauses with the -AsI suffix function as the equivalent of the Standard Turkish -AcAK suffixed clauses. In accordance with this observation, relative clauses with -AsI suffix are quite common. Let's exemplify the relative clause functions of the above suffixes through Old Anatolian texts:

4. Ni'metli yir âdemiler ol-duğ-ı yir-dür.
blessed place people be-ptpl.-3.poss. place-cop.
The blessed place is where people are (Erdağı Doğruer, 2013: 30)

5. Yaban-lar-a at-ıl-mış gövde
wild-plu.-dat. throw-pasv.-ptpl. body
The body thrown into the wild (Yastı, 2010: 217)

6. Bitüm-de yara-maz nesne-ler yaz-dur-ma-(y)ın.
book of deed-loc. court-ptpl. thing-plu. write-trans.-neg.-2.
pers. (plu.) imp
Do not write inappropriate things in my book of deeds. (Yastı, 2010: 249)

7. Bişik-de yat-an yazuksuzça oğlancuğ-ı ağla-t-dı.
cradle-loc. lie-ptpl.innocent baby-acc. cry-trans.-
past
He made the innocent baby lying in the cradle cry. (Yastı, 2010: 230)

8. Ten-de kal-ası ve gerekli nesne-yi sakla-mak

² Most of the examples referred in the current study are from *Kıyas-ı Enbiya* as it is way larger than all of the other three texts together in terms of its size and volume.

Body-loc. remain-ptpl. and necessary thing-acc. keep-nom.
Keeping the necessary thing that will remain in the body (Erdağı Doğuer, 2013: 82)

There are just a couple of examples where the -AcAK suffix forms a relative clause. This example is the equivalent of the participle function of -AcAK:

9. Var-acak yir-ün
go-ptpl. place-gen.
The place where you will go (Timurtaş, 2011:433)

10. An-uñ dölen-ecek yir-i Tedmürşehir-i-(y)i-di.
he-gen. settle-ptpl. place-3.poss. Tedmürşehir-3.poss.-cop.-
past
His place to settle down was the city of Tedmür. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 374)

It can be thought that the examples with -AcAK suffix are lexical nominalizations. It is seen that words with the -AcAK suffix do not often exist in clausal structure and are generally used as lexical entries:³

11. Odadap-ğıl sañ-a ve sen-ün
fire-dat.worship-imp. you-dat. and you-gen.
soy-uñ-a dap-acak ol-sun
descendant-gen.-dat. worship-ptpl. be-subj.
Worship fire and it will become a deity for you and your descendants.
(Yılmaz et al., 2013: 106)

12. Ay-uñ gün-ün ve ħunas-uñ yol-ı
moon-gen. sun-gen. and hunas-gen. way-3.poss.
ve yöri-(y)eceg-i ol deñiz üst-i-dür.
and orbit-ptpl.-3.poss. that sea top-3.poss.-cop.
The path and orbit of the moon, sun and other planets are above that sea.
(Yılmaz et al., 2013: 78)

On the other hand, it is noteworthy that the suffixes -mak and -maklık also form a relative clause:

13. Ol aru yir-dür ve diri olup
that clean place-cop. and alive be-adv.
küp-mak yir-dür.

³ Relative clauses with -AcAK suffix in Standard Turkish generally correspond to structures with -AsI suffix in Old Anatolian Texts.

come up-ptpl. place-cop.

It is a clean place of resurrection. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 141)

14. Düşman-uñuz helāk ol-maqlıg-ı gün-dür.
enemy-2.pers.(plu.) destroyed be-ptpl.-3.poss. day-cop.

It is the day when your enemy will be destroyed. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 266)

The participles exemplified above are selected according to the relative clause type they form. Now let's examine which participle suffixes are preferred to form object and subject clauses. In this context, first subject clauses and then object clauses will be discussed.

Subject Clause

All of the above-mentioned suffixes (-mXş, -Ar/-Ur/-mAz, -An, -DXK) function to form subject clauses, just as in Standard Turkish. -AsI suffix, instead of Standard Turkish -AcAK, forms subject clauses on the other hand. Participles in clauses below all function to form subject clauses:

15. Beygâmbir biş-miş kabağ-ı sev-er-di.
Prophet cook-ptpl. squash-acc. like-aor.-past
The Prophet liked cooked squash. (Akkuş, 1995: 396)

16. Şol depren-ür endâm-lar
that tremble-ptpl. body-plu.
Those trembling bodies (Erdağı Doğuer, 2013: 37)

17. Yir-de bul-an gişi
ground-loc. find-ptpl. . person
The person who finds it on the ground (Akkuş, 1995: 376)

18. Ten-den çık-ası nesne-ler
body-abl. come out-ptpl. thing-plu.
Things that comes out of the body (Erdağı Doğuer, 2013: 82)

In addition, clauses that qualify words that are part of the subject phrase are formed with the suffix -An, just like in Standard Turkish:

19. Tañrı ta'ālā ay-uñ ol girü kal-an
God SWT moon-gen. that behind remain-ptpl
nūr-ın-dan güneş-i yarat-dı.
light-3.poss.-abl. sun-acc. create-past
God created the sun from the remaining light of the moon. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 78)

The suffix -An is preferred when both the root clauses "The man became ill" and "The man is ill" are transformed into a relative clause structure in which the subject is modified in Standard Turkish. It is noteworthy that the same is also valid for Old Anatolian Turkish. The -An suffix is preferred again in transforming the relative clause structures based on the above-mentioned root clauses (the first one meaning "to become" and the second one meaning "to be"):

20. Şüret-ler-i dön-üp maymūn ol-an-lar
face-plu.-3.poss. change-adv. monkey become-ptpl.-plu.
ol şehir-den çık-dı-lar.
that city-abl. leave-past-plu.
Those whose faces changed and turned into monkeys left that city. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 360)

21. Dünün oyanuk ol-an-lar
overnight awake be-ptpl.-plu.
Those who are awake at night (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 38)

It should be noted that relative clause structures, which are based on existential root clauses and modify the subject, are also formed with the -An suffix, as in Standard Turkish:

22. Balık deniz iç-i(n)-de ol-an
fish sea inside-3.poss.-loc. be-ptpl.
haber-ı aña söyle-r-di.
information-acc. 3.pro.-dat. tell-aor.-past
The fish would tell him what was happening in the sea. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 86)

It is understood that the -DXK suffix also forms subject clauses. It is noteworthy that the subject argument in these clauses is a generic word in terms of specificity, that is, it has an indefinite feature. Although -DXK can be used in similar contexts of Standard Turkish, clauses with -An suffix are generally preferred:

23. Halk-a ol-ma-duğ nesne-yi
people-dat. happen-neg.-ptpl. thing-acc.
eyd-ü vir-ür.
tell-adv. aux.-aor.
He tells people what has not happened to them. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 353)

24. Birisi gün doğ-duğ-ı yir-de-dür.

one of them sun rise-ptpl.-3.poss. place-loc.-cop.
One is where the sun rises. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 440)

25. Bir tã'ün gir-me-dük yir-e
artc. plague enter-neg.-ptpl. place-dat.
var-a-vuz.
go-subj.-1.pers.(plu.)

Let's go to a place where plague has not entered. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 321)

Clauses modifying indefinite subjects can also be interpreted as object clauses. As mentioned above, the fact that both types of clauses are formed with the -DXK suffix makes it difficult to interpret some structures as object or subject clauses in Old Anatolian texts:

26. Tañrı yüce kıl-duğ-ı ve
God supreme assign-ptpl-3.poss. and
halk-a rahmat viribi-dük gişi
people-dat. mercy send-ptpl. person

The person whom God exalted and sent as a mercy to the people (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 353)

There are two relative clause structures juxtaposed to each other in 26. The fact that the argument modified by the second relative clause is an object argument can be understood by the help of the first relative clause. Otherwise, the second clause could also be interpreted as a subject clause, because the structure of this clause is the same as the clauses in which the indefinite subject is modified, as in 23, at least in terms of the participle suffix.

Object Clauses

The object argument will be examined under two subcategories. The direct object, which is syntactically linked to the predicate at deeper layers, will be treated in the first section. Arguments that have looser relation with predicate such as dative, locative, ablative and instrumental case will be examined under the second section as indirect objects.

Direct Object

Relative clause structures in which the direct object is modified are mostly formed with the -DXK and -AsI suffixes. No object clause formed with the suffix -An was encountered. Clauses below are given to exemplify the structures in which the direct object is modified:

27. Tañrı yarat-duğ-ı mañlūk-uñ 'arş-a

God create-ptpl.-3.poss. creature-gen. heaven-dat.
 bak-mağ-a güci yit-mez.
 look-nom.-dat. afford-aor.(neg.)
 Creatures created by God cannot afford to look at the skies. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 74)

28. Bu meclis (...) Şeddād yap-duğ-ı
 this chapter Şeddad build-ptpl.-3.poss.
 uçmak şıfat-ın yāz kıl-ur.
 paradise quality-3.poss. describe-aor.
 This section describes the qualities of the paradise built by Şeddad. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 211)

29. Degme bir cifne-(y)e biñ gişi
 each pot-dat. thousand person
 yiy-esi ta'ām sığar-ı-dı.
 eat-ptpl. food fit into-cop.-past
 Each container could fit food for a thousand people. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 377)

In addition to the -DXK and -AsI suffixes, other participles can function to form relative clause structures in which indirect objects are modified. Now let's examine these clause structures.

Indirect Objects

Arguments that get dative, locative, ablative and instrumental case suffixes are accepted as indirect objects. Although clause structures with -DXK suffix are generally preferred to modify above-mentioned arguments, it is notable that clauses with -mXş and -AsI suffix also fulfill this function:

30. İşbu dap-duğ-uñuz perākende
 this worship-ptpl.-2.poss.(plu.) various
 şanem-ler mi yigrek-dür?
 idol-plu. intr. better-cop.
 Are these various idols that you worship better? (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 190)

31. Evvelki bāb İbrāhim(as)
 previous chapter İbrahimpbuh
 doğ-duğ-ı yir-i beyān kıl-ur.
 be born-ptpl.-3.poss. place-acc. describe-aor.
 The previous chapter describes İbrahim's birthplace. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 134)

32. Şol aydıñ gel-düg-i daraca-yı dut-alum.
this light come-ptpl.-3.poss. window-acc. prefer-subj.
Let's go on with that window from which bright comes out. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 216)

33. Ol deve-nüñ suy-a gel-üp
that camel-gen. river-dat. come-adv.
girü dön-düg-i yol-uñ in-in
back return-ptpl.-3.poss. way-gen. width-3.poss.
ölç-dü-m.
measure-past-1.pers.
I measured the width of the path where that camel came to the water and returned. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 128)

34. Kanbulaş-mış ev kapu-sı(n)-dan
blood stain-ptpl. house door-3.poss.-abl.
içerü gir-me-ye-ler.
inside enter-neg.-subj.-plu.
They should not enter the door of a house stained with blood. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 409)

35. Ol et aş-ıl-mış ağac-ı
that meat hang-pasv.-ptpl. tree-acc.
aşağa döndür-di.
downward turn-past
He turned down that tree on which the meat was hanging. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 158)

36. Pes anuñ ayağ-ı dölen-esi dağı
then his foot-acc. stand-ptpl. even
yir ol-ma-dı.
place exist-neg.-past
Then, there wasn't even a place left for his feet to stand. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 63)

37. Ol gün arslan-lar suy-a
that day lion-plu. water-dat.
gel-esi gün-i-di.
come-ptpl. day-cop.-past
That was the day the lions would come to the water. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 251)

-DXK clause from 30 to 33 exemplify dative, locative, ablative and instrumental objects respectively. While clause structures with -DXK suffix exist for all indirect object types namely dative, locative, ablative, instrumental, examples of dative objects were only found for -mXş clauses as seen above in 34 and 35. On the other hand, clauses structures with -AsI in which dative and adverb arguments are modified as seen in 36 and 37 respectively.

It is noteworthy that relative clause structures, which are based on existential root clauses and modify the indirect object, are also formed with the -dXK suffix, as in Standard Turkish:

38. Tañrı zıkr-i ol-duğ-ı yir-e
 God remembrance-3.poss. be-ptpl.-3.poss. place-dat.
 dañı şeytān yol bul-maz.
 also satan step in-aor.(neg.)

The devil cannot enter a place where there is remembrance of God. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 456)

The examples given so far indicate that subject and object clauses generally differ from each other in terms of the participle suffix preference in Old Anatolian Turkish. Likewise, in parallel with Standard Turkish, it is understood that the -DXK suffix is also used in subject clauses where the subject is indefinite or generic. On the other hand, it is noteworthy that in clause structures where the subject is indefinite or generic as well, if object arguments are modified, the -DXK suffix is preferred, unlike the general tendency in Standard Turkish. Such clauses are generally formed with the suffix -An in Standard Turkish.

There are many examples indicating that the agreement pattern in Old Anatolian Turkish relative clause structures is different from Standard Turkish. Now let's examine the agreement pattern types in Old Anatolian Turkish relative clause structures by comparing them with possessive phrases.

Agreement Patterns in Relative Clause Structures

The agreement pattern in Old Anatolian Turkish relative clause structures appears in several different ways.⁴ The first of these is the pattern in which the subject gets the genitive case and the subordinate predicate takes the

⁴ Since the agreement category is not marked in subject clauses, it is not included in this section.

possessive suffix. This pattern is a standard pattern used when the subject is not generic or indefinite, and is exactly the same as the pattern in Standard Turkish relative clause structures. The clause below exemplify this standard agreement pattern in relative clause structures:

39. Ol deve-nüñ su-ya gel-üp girü
that camel-gen. river-dat. come-adv. back
dön-düg-i yol-uñ in-in ölç-dü-m.
return-ptpl.-3.poss. way-gen. width-3.poss. measure-past-1.pers.
I measured the width of the path where that camel came to the water and returned. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 128)

As for the second agreement pattern used as standard in Old Anatolian Turkish, the subject does not get the genitive case. It should be said that relative clause structures mostly have this second agreement pattern:

40. Yiñ uşbu Tañrı vir-düg-i rızk-ı!
eat(imp.) this God give-ptpl.-3.poss. sustenance-acc.
Eat this God-given sustenance! (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 479)

In addition to the two agreement patterns above, it is noteworthy that there is no agreement suffixes (i.e. genitive and possessive suffixes) in the some examples formed with -AsI. These clause structures with the -AsI resemble finite clauses in a sense that they do not take either possessive or genitive suffixes:

41. Ol sen getir-esin ta'ām-dan ayruḡ dat-ma-yam.
that you bring-ptpl. food-abl. another try-neg.-aor.
I won't try any other food than the one you brought. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 230)

This harmony pattern mentioned only occurs in clauses with the -AsI suffix, so it should not be considered a generalized harmony pattern. There is a second variant of -AsI clauses in which the possessive suffix exists. This variant with possessive suffix is very rare and only available for the third person conjugation:

42. İşbusiz kıl-duḡ-uñuz iş-ler-i
this you do-ptpl.-2.pers(plu.) deed-plu.-acc.
bize ol-ası-sın ḡabar vir-ür-i-di.
us happen-ptpl.-3.poss. inform-aor.-cop.-past
This would inform us that the things you did would also happen to us.
(Yılmaz et al., 2013: 419)

The possessive suffixes are marked on the subordinate predicate in Standard Turkish relative clause structures. It has been determined that the possessive suffixes are marked on the modified argument in Old Anatolian Turkish -DXK relative clauses, although rarely:

43. Bularuñ doğ-duğ ata-lar-ı
 their born-ptpl. father-plu.-3.poss.
 The fathers whom they were born from (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 498)

Relative clauses and adverbial clauses formed with words such as time and time in Old Anatolian Turkish are also structurally the same and cannot be distinguished from each other as they can in Standard Turkish. Such that the clauses in the examples "Ali'nin geldiği zamanı hatırlıyorum" and "Ali gittiği zaman çok üzgündüm" are called relative clause and adverbial clause, respectively, in Standard Turkish. Although these clause structures seem to be equivalent, it is noteworthy that the agreement pattern is different in the relative clause structure. In other words, these two structures can be distinguished from each other thanks to their agreement patterns in Standard Turkish. On the other hand, it is understood that both types of clauses given above are morphologically constructed in the same way in Old Anatolian Turkish. For this reason, it is only possible to interpret the structures of clauses formed with words such as "zaman, vakit etc." as relative clauses or adverbial clauses, only through context information. The main reason why these two types of clauses are formally the same is the standard agreement pattern in Old Anatolian Turkish. In possessive phrases of Old Anatolian Turkish, the specifier can also be in the nominative case, as mentioned above. In subordinate clauses, which can be considered a reflection of the agreement pattern of possessive phrases, the subject can be in the nominative case, regardless of their specificity status. Therefore, the difference in subject case inflection that helps distinguish the two clause types mentioned above cannot exist in Old Anatolian Turkish:

44. Fülān gün içinde mübtelā ol-ur-sın
 Some day in troubled be-aor.-2.pers.
 hazır ol pes kaçan ol Tañrı va 'de kıl-duğ-ı
 ready be then that God promise-ptpl.-3.poss.
 gün ol-dı.
 day come-past
 You will be in trouble on someday, be ready, then the day that God promised has come. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 350)

45. Kimsene koyun boğuzla-duğ-ı vakt-in

someone sheep slaughter-ptpl.-3.poss. time-inst.
When someone slaughters a sheep (Akkuş, 1995: 355)

It has already been mentioned above that the agreement patterns in relative clause structures can be thought of as a reflection of possessive phrases. It has also been shown through the examples given above that the subject is mostly present in the nominative case in Old Anatolian Turkish relative clause structures. It is understood that the agreement pattern in relative clause structures (i.e., nominative case and possessive suffixes) is valid for possessive phrases. So much so that possessive phrases are often formed without genitive case:

46. Geçmiş-ler-ün	bezbaht-ırağ-ı	kim-i-di
antecedent-plu.-gen.	unfortunate-superl.-3.poss.	who-cop.-past
bil-ür	mi-sin (...)	peygāmbar eyit-di Şālih
know-aor.	intr.-2.pers.	prophet say-past Salih
deve-si	öldür-en-dür.	
camel-3.poss.	kill-ptpl.-cop.	

Do you know who is the most unfortunate of the antecetends? (...) The Prophet said: He is the one who killed Salih's camel. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 134)

47. Semūd	ķavm-ı	‘ömür-ler-i
Semud	nation-3.poss.	lifetime-plu.-3.poss.
uzunluğ-ın-dan	ötürü	ķaya-dan
length-3.poss.-abl.	upon	rock-abl.
ev-ler	idin-di-ler.	
house-plu.	obtain-past-plu.	

The Semud people built houses made of rocks because of their long lifetime. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 128)

48. Ādemiler	ķāl-ı	şūr	ürül-düg-i	vakt-ın
people	state-3.poss.	sur	blow-ptpl.-3.poss.	time-inst.
nite	ol-a?			
how	become-fut.			

What will the state of the people be like when sūr is blown? (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 82)

It is seen that the phrases “Şālih devesi” in 46, “ömürleri uzunluğundan ötürü” in 47 and “ādemiler ķāl-ı” in 48, respectively, are formed without genitive case. These phrases would not be formed without the genitive suffix

in Standard Turkish. Because in both phrases, the heads (Şālih and 'ömürleri respectively) are a specific nouns, not an indefinite or generic one.

Another indication that the agreement pattern (e.g. the combination of nominative-possessive suffixes) in Old Anatolian Turkish relative clause structures is not a specific pattern caused by the clause structure is the nominal clauses. Old Anatolian Turkish nominal clauses are generally formed with the nominative subject. In other words, the agreement pattern in nominal clauses is similar to possessive phrases. That is to say, the assumption of possessive phrases as the source of the agreement pattern in relative clause structures is also supported by the agreement pattern in nominal clauses. Clauses below exemplify the above-mentioned nominal clauses with nominative subjects:

49. Ādem yarad-ıl-mağ-ın-dan hıkmēt ne-(y)i-di?
 Ādem create-pasv-nom.-3.poss.-abl. wisdom what-cop.-past
 What was the wisdom in the creation of Adam? (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 83)

50. Tañrı ta'ālā anı bu dünyā metā'-ın-dan
 God SWT him this world blessing-3.poss.-abl.
 doldur-mağ-ı soñ-a ir-miş-i-di.
 replenish-nom.-3.poss. end-dat. reach-perf.-cop.-past
 God's enrichment of him with worldly blessings has reached an extreme level. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 393)

Another syntactic feature of Old Anatolian Turkish relative clauses that differs from Standard Turkish is the "gap" in the clause. Now let's briefly examine the gap in Old Anatolian Turkish relative clauses.

Gap in Relative Clauses

It has already been mentioned in the above that the most striking feature of relative clause structures is the gap that is obligatory left behind as null inside the clause and is co-indexed with the modified element. Filling the gap with any morphological item makes the clause ungrammatical as the above-mentioned gap is syntactically an obligatory one in Standard Turkish. This obligatory gap is also valid for most of the Old Anatolian Turkish relative clauses. On the other hand, some examples were encountered where the gap mentioned above is filled with a pronoun. In the relative clauses below, it is seen that the syntactic positions that would correspond to the gap in Standard Turkish are filled with pronouns:

51. Evvel Tañrı-çun () od-a bırağ-ıl-an ve
 first God-for fire-dat. throw-pasv.-ptpl. and

od **añ-a** bostān ol-an ol-dı.
fire 3.pro.-dat. graden become-ptpl. he-past
He was the one who was thrown into the fire first and for whom the fire
became a garden. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 161)

52. Ol yüz yıl öl-üp girü Tañrı **anı**
that hundred year die-adv. again God him
diri kıl-duğ-ı **gişi** ‘Üzeyr-dür.
alive make-ptpl.-3.poss. person Uzeyr-cop.
The person who was dead for a hundred years and was resurrected by God is
Üzeyr. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 421)

53. Musa bin İmrān **anı** iste-meg-e ve
Musa bin İmran him search for-nom.-dat. and
andan ‘ilim öğren-meg-e
3.pro.-abl. wisdom learn-nom.-dat.
buyr-ul-duğ-ı **gişi** Hızır-dur.
order-pasv.-ptpl.-3.poss. person Hızır-cop.
The person Musa bin İmran was ordered to seek and learn knowledge from
was Hızır. (Yılmaz et al., 2013: 293)

In 51, it is seen that two relative clauses are juxtaposed to each other. Similar to Standard Turkish, there is a gap in the first clause with the predicate "bırakılan ". It is noteworthy that in the second clause with the predicate "olan", the syntactic position that would be expected to correspond to a gap in Standard Turkish is filled with the pronoun "aña". Likewise, in 52, it is seen that the gap, which is co-indexed with the modified argument "gişi", is filled with the pronoun "anı". In 53 likewise, modified argument "gişi" is co-indexed with clause-internal pronouns "anı" and "andan", which would be expected to be gaps in Standard Turkish. These examples would be interpreted as ungrammatical according to Standard Turkish because the gaps above cannot be filled with any morphological items.

Conclusion

The basic syntactic qualities of Old Anatolian Turkish relative clause structures were examined in this study. The relative clause structures in question were compared with Standard Turkish. Accordingly, it has been observed that Old Anatolian Turkish relative clause structures have some characteristics that are different from Standard Turkish, even though they behave parallel in most points in terms of syntax. First of all, subject and object clauses are differentiated on the basis of the participial suffixes in Old Anatolian Turkish. On the other hand, Old Anatolian Turkish behaves

differently from Standard Turkish, especially in contexts where the subject is indefinite one, with the -DXK participle being preferred. It has been observed that the most striking difference of Old Anatolian Turkish relative clause structures is the agreement patterns. So much so that in these structures the subject generally differs from Standard Turkish by taking nominative case. In other words, the standard agreement pattern in Old Anatolian Turkish relative clause structures is the combination of nominative case and possessive suffix, which is thought to be a reflection of the possessive phrases in the texts of the period. In Old Anatolian Turkish relative clauses, the nominative case inflection of the subject causes ambiguity in interpreting clauses formed with words such as "zaman, vakit" as relative or adverbial clauses. Finally, it was seen that another striking difference of Old Anatolian Turkish relative clauses is the obligatory gap within the clause. It is understood that in a significant part of Old Anatolian Turkish relative clauses, these gaps can be filled with a pronoun. It is known that in Standard Turkish, relative clauses in which the gap is filled with a word are interpreted as ungrammatical. The syntactic differences mentioned above indicate that Old Anatolian Turkish relative clauses may differ from Standard Turkish in terms of deep structure. Therefore, the above-mentioned relative clauses need to be examined in terms of Generative Grammar as well.

REFERENCES

- AKAR, Ali (2018). Oğuzların dili-Eski Anadolu Türkçesine Giriş, İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları.
- AKKUŞ, Muzaffer (1995). Kitab-ı Gunya, Ankara: TDK Yayınları.
- AYGEN, Gülşat (2005), "The Contribution of Turkic Languages to Syntactic Theory: What Kazakh and Tuvan Indicate About Universal Grammar" talk presented at the panel "Paper notes presented at the panel The Contribution of Turkic Languages to Linguistic Theory, Central Eurasian Studies Society Annual Meeting, Boston. 1-16.
- ERDAĞI DOĞUER, Binnur (2013), Tuhfe-i Mübarizi: Metin-Sözlük, Ankara: TDK Yayınları.
- GÜLSEVİN, Gürer (2007), Eski Anadolu Türkçesinde Ekler, Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- KARABULUT, Ferhat ve YILDIZ, Medine (2019), "Eski Anadolu Türkçesinde Özne Sıfat-Fiilli Yapılar ve Nesne Sıfat-Fiilli Yapılar: Sıfat-Fiil Eklerinin Nöbetleşe Kullanımı Üzerine Kuramsal Yaklaşım", TÜRK Uluslararası Dil, Edebiyat ve Halkbilimi Araştırmaları Dergisi, 19: 128-148.

- KARASOY, Yakup. (2013), *Sirâcü'l-Kulûb: Gönüllerin Işığı*, Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- KORNFILT, Jaklin (1997), "On the Syntax And Morphology Of Relative Clauses In Turkish", *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*, 8: 24-51.
- KORNFILT, Jaklin. (2001), "Functional projections and their subjects in Turkish clauses", *The Verb in Turkish* (Ed. E. E. Taylan), Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 183-213.
- KORNFILT, Jaklin (2005), "Agreement And Its Placement in Turkic Non-Subject Relative Clauses", *Handbook of Comparative Syntax*. Oxford (Eds. G. Cinque, R. Kayne), Oxford University Press, 513–541.
- KORNFILT, Jaklin (2008), "Locality, Agreement, and Subject Case in Turkish and Beyond", https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277297710_11_Locality_Agreement_and_Subject_Case_in_Turkish_and_Beyond. (05.08.2024).
- KORNFILT, Jaklin (2009), "Subject-Agreement Correlations and Their Syntactic Effects in Some Turkic Relative Clauses", *Turkic Language*, 13: 70-96.
- LEWIS, Geoffrey (2000), *Turkish Grammar*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- TİMURTAŞ, Faruk Kadri (2005), *Eski Türkiye Türkçesi IV. Yüzyıl Gramer-Metin-Sözlük*, Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.
- TİMURTAŞ, Faruk Kadri (2011), *Tarihî Türkiye Türkçesi Araştırmaları: Osmanlı Türkçesi Grameri III*, İstanbul: Alfa.
- TURAN, Fikret (1996), *Old Anatolian Turkish: Syntactic Structure*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.
- ÜZÜM, Melike (2023), "On The Participles In Old Anatolian Oghuz", *Türkbilig*, 46: 261-276.
- YASTI, Mehmet (2010), *ESRARÜ'L-ÂRİFİN (İMLA-METİN-DİZİN)*, Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- YILMAZ, Emine, DEMİR, Nurettin, KÜÇÜK, Murat (2013), *Kıyas-ı Enbiya*, Türk Dil Kurumu Nüshası, Metin-Sözlük-Dizin, Notlar, Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.

ABBREVIATIONS

gen.	genitive case
poss.	possessive suffix
subj.	subjunctive
loc.	locative
perf.	perfective
cop.	copula
acc.	accusative
pers.	person suffix

dat.	dative
plu.	plural
ptpl.	participle
nom.	nominalizer
abl.	ablative
neg.	negation.
pasv.	passive
trans.	transitiviser
inst.	instrumental
fut.	future
superl.	superlative
intr.	interrogative
aux.	auxilliary verb
imp.	imperative
aor.	aorist
adv.	adverbial