

ON THE PARTICIPLES IN OLD ANATOLIAN OGHUZ

Melike ÜZÜM*

Abstract: *Relative clauses in Old Anatolian Oghuz show significant differences from Turkish in terms of morphology, semantics, and syntax. Therefore, the results of studies on Turkish cannot be generalized for the written language between the 13th and 15th centuries. In this respect, it is necessary to investigate the construction types of subordination, strategies of relativization, aspect, tense, and modality values of participles in detailed research. To fill this gap, in this paper, I deal with participles forming nonfinite clauses in Old Anatolian Oghuz in terms of the semantic domains of grammatical categories based on the corpus after evaluating the types of relative clauses in the general aspect. The samples were selected from four texts that are representative of the language of the historical period.*

Keywords: *participles, relative clauses, modality, aspect, Old Anatolian Oghuz.*

Eski Anadolu Oğuzcasındaki Sıfat-Eylemler Üzerine

Öz: *Eski Anadolu Oğuzcasındaki sıfat işlevli yan cümleler şekil, anlam ve söz dizimi bakımından önemli ölçüde Türkçeden farklılıklar göstermektedir. Bu nedenle Türkçe üzerine yapılan çalışmaların bulguları 13. ve 15. yüzyıllar arasındaki yazı dili için genellenemez. Yapılan incelemeleri dikkate alarak sıfat-eylemlerin yapım biçimlerinin, sıfatlaştırma stratejilerinin, görünüş, zaman ve kiplik değerlerinin araştırılması gerekmektedir. Alan yazınındaki bu boşluğu doldurmak amacıyla bu yazıda, sıfat işlevli yan cümle türleri genel olarak değerlendirildikten sonra, Eski Anadolu Oğuzcasında bitimsiz cümle yapılarını oluşturan sıfat-eylemler, dilbilgisel ulamların anlam alanları açısından derlem temelli olarak ele alınmaktadır. Örnekler tarihsel dönemin dilini temsil eden dört metinden seçilmiştir.*

Anahtar Sözcükler: *sıfat-eylemler, sıfat işlevli yan cümleler, kiplik, görünüş, Eski Anadolu Oğuzcası.*

Introduction

Verbal adjectives in Turkish have been evaluated in terms of bound morphemes and marking tense on the predicate by these morphemes and also partially discussed from the point of modality and aspect categories (Özkan, 2000; Timurtaş, 2005; Yelten, 2007; Gülsevin, 2007; Şahin, 2015; Akar, 2018, etc.). In linguistic studies, these items modifying the head noun, called participles (or relativizers), and the clauses which they form, i.e. relative clauses, were examined in terms of syntax and morphology in detail (Underhill, 1972; Erguvanlı Taylan, 1981; Kornfilt, 1997a,1997b; Göksel & Kerslake, 2005; Karadoğan, 2009; Aydemir, 2010; Erkman Akerson & Ozil, 2015; Johanson,

*Assoc. Prof. Dr., Johannes Gutenberg University, ISTziB, Department of Turkology, GERMANY / Baskent University, Department of Turkish Language and Literature, Ankara/TÜRKİYE. E-mail: melikeuzum@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2338-8066.

Acknowledgment: The research for this paper was made possible by a grant from The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK) in 2022.

Makalenin Geliş Tarihi: 25.06.2023 - Makalenin Kabul Tarihi: 19.09.2023

DOI: turkbilg.1409709

2021). However, relative clauses and participles suffixes used in Old Anatolian Oghuz¹ show significant differences from Turkish concerning syntactic and morphosemantic features. In addition, modal markers used in main clauses can code different meanings on relative clauses (see Palmer, 2001, pp. 127). Therefore, the results of the studies on morphemes used in main clauses and relative clauses in Turkish cannot be generalized, because most of them are not valid for Old Anatolian Oghuz. In this respect, relative clauses used in written language during the 13th-15th century need further research in terms of syntactic properties, aspect, tense, modality, and types of markers of these categories.

In this paper, I discuss the relative clauses in Old Anatolian Oghuz in terms of semantics, morphology, types of subordination, and syntax by focusing on participle suffixes. Within this framework, the research questions are: how to compose relative clauses; how to mark aspect, tense, and modality in non-finite clauses; and what the distinguishing features of the participles are. Furthermore, as needed, this paper explores information about bound morphemes' functions used in finite and non-finite clauses, and the processes of acquiring different functions.

The context is used to identify types of relative clauses and examine them in the scope of the issues that are investigated in this research. For this reason, the focal topic of the paper is discussed based on the corpus. The samples were selected from four texts considered representative of the language of the historical period. In the creation of the corpus, the facts that the works written in prose are diachronic in themselves and that they differ in terms of subject were accepted as criteria. In order to make a detailed analysis, the study was limited to four works. The analysis of relative clauses was conducted synchronically; however, the data have been compared with Turkish in explaining the development of functions of certain morphemes.

With the usage examples from Old Anatolian Oghuz, the study contributes specifically to the evolution of *-mAlI* from a participle suffix with expectation meaning into the modality marker overlapping aspect and modality, the diminishing *-AsI* and its development as a modal marker from prospective marker, the use of *-(y)ICI* that indicates the content of propensity and that this meaning is the basis for today's deverbal noun function.

This paper is organized as follows: After giving an overview of the topic in the introduction, Section 2 provides information about the method and corpus used for this research. Section 3 discusses examples selected from the corpus by referring to their evolution and explains their functions in the historical period in light of literature. Finally, Section 4 concludes by presenting the table showing the functions of participles and the types of relative clauses determined in the corpus.

2. Method and Corpus

In the present study, participles are examined comparatively based on the corpus. Syntactic and semantic approaches determine the participles' functions in forming a relative clause. Then they are examined synchronically in terms of modality and aspect values within the framework of Johanson's (2000) views on aspect-tense and Rentzsch's

¹ There are different designations for this period. In this study, the Old Anatolian Oghuz is preferred, referring to the written language that developed on the basis of the Oghuz dialect under Middle Turkic (see Johanson, 2021, pp. 163-164).

(2015) classification of modality markers in Turkic languages. Moreover, diachronic evaluations are made as needed by considering the literature on Turkish. In this way, I provide preliminary findings about their evolution and evidence to explain their use on the predicate in finite clauses with different aspectual or modal values. Additionally, the difference between its usage in finite and nonfinite clauses is included regarding their functions.

In the analysis, syntactic features are of great importance. For this reason, the corpus consists of four historical texts in prose: *Marzubân-nâme Tercümesi Destûr-ı Şâhî* (MB) published by Korkmaz (2017), *Ferec ba'd eş-şidde* (Ein frühosmanisches Geschichtenbuch) (FBS) published by Hazai and Tietze (2006), *Kıyas-ı Enbiya* (KE) published by Yılmaz, Demir, Küçük (2013) and *Dede Korkut Oğuznameleri* (DK) published by Tezcan and Boeschoten (2001). The works are briefly introduced below.

Marzubân-nâme was translated from Persian into Turkish in the 14th century by Sadrü'd-dîn Mustafâ Şeyhoğlu at the request of Süleyman Shah, the lord of Germiyans. This work, also known as *Destûr-ı Şâhî*, is not only a moral guide but, as Korkmaz states, a crucial “political treatise” for shahs (2017, pp. 53). *Marzubân-nâme* comprises prose stories and tales like *Kelile and Dimne* (Kalila and Demna), *Bahtiyâr-nâme*, *Tûtînâme*, and *Binbir Gece Masalları* (*One Thousand and One Nights*). It also includes animal stories. The edition used in this study, published by Zeynep Korkmaz based on the Berlin copy, contains 67 stories, with 14 taken from the *Süleymaniye* copy. Korkmaz expanded the *Marzubân-nâme Tercümesi*, which she initially published in 1973, and reissued it as *Marzubân-nâme Tercümesi Destûr-ı Şâhî* in 2017.

Ferec ba'd eş-şidde is a literary genre in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish literature that explores the concept of happiness and peace following adversity. Regarding the emergence of this style of writing in Turkish literature, Yılmaz (2014a, pp. 470) points out that this genre initially developed within Arabic literature and later entered Turkish literature through Persian translations. The Budapest copy examined in this study contains 42 stories, similar to other copies (Hazai & Tietze, pp. 2006; Parlatri & Hazai, 2007, pp. 218-225). While the work transcribed by Hazai and Tietze lacks a dictionary section, Tietze included its vocabulary in his *Historical and Etymological Turkey Turkish Dictionary* (see Yılmaz, 2014a, pp. 470). Furthermore, Yılmaz has discussed the vocabulary of *Ferec ba'd eş-şidde* not found in *Tarama Sözlüğü* and provided information for accurate interpretation of certain words (2014a; 2014b).

Kıyas-ı Enbiya, consisting of 95 chapters, is a translation of Salebi's work titled *El-keşfül beyan 'an tefsiri'l-kur'ân*, dated to have been created in the 14th century. With narratives covering pre-human existence to the era of Prophet Muhammad, this work offers novel insights into Old Anatolian Oghuz syntax and vocabulary, differing from previous studies on this historical language (Yılmaz, 2014a, 2014b). Some research reveals that it contributes unique lexemes not found in other historical texts (Yılmaz & Demir 2005, 2009). However, there remains a need for a comprehensive examination of KE across various aspects, including syntax, vocabulary, and morphology.

Dede Korkut Oğuznameleri consists of 12 different stories called “boy”. These stories encompass many themes, including wise teachings, praise for the virtuous, criticism for the wrongdoers, historical narratives about the Turks, eulogies dedicated to khans and lords, and insights into Turkish customs and daily life. This collection holds significant importance in linguistics, literature, folklore, history, and sociology as it provides

valuable insights into the Oghuz Turks. The narrative style of *Dede Korkut Oğuznameleri* marks a transition from epic to storytelling, with the composition of these stories dating back to the late 15th and early 16th centuries. Notably, there are 12 stories in the *Dresden* copy and 6 in the *Vatican* copy.

The corpus was created with specific criteria to achieve diachronicity², narrative diversity, and prose format. It serves as a representation of the language of the period. However, it is important to note that due to the absence of a standardized language, variations in usage may exist due to authorial or copyist preferences. The transcription signs used in the examples are taken directly from the works.

3. Finding and discussions

3.1. General features of relative clauses in Old Anatolian Oghuz

In Old Anatolian Oghuz, the two types of relative clauses are *nonfinite* and *finite* as known. Finite clauses include relative clauses formed with complementizer and without complementizer. Syntactically, if the main clause precedes the relative clause, the relative clause type determines the use of the complementizer *ki/kim*. These types of relative clauses are considered noncanonical developing under the influence of intensive contact with non-Turkic languages (Johanson, 2021, pp. 894-895). These constructions are right-branching, which makes them different from canonical relative clauses that are left-branching. Choosing a finite clause type mostly requires the complementizer, while a nonfinite relative clause does not need any additional items for the relativization with the main clause. Another type of finite relative clause is introduced with a question word that functions like a complementizer (see Rentzsch et al., 2020, pp. 83). In the literature, studies have been conducted on the complementizer *ki* forming finite relative clauses in detail (Tulum, 1978; Kornfilt, 1997b; Özkan, 2004; Karakoç, 2013; Üzüm, 2021). For this reason, finite clauses formed with interrogative pronouns will be shown below, and then I will discuss the suffixes used in nonfinite clauses.

- (1) *ecelin bilür misin yā anuñ rızkın virür misin yā ol ne yirleri Һarāb kıldı ve Һalan ömrinde [ne yirleri Һarāb kılasıdur] bilür misin* (KE 329)

‘Do you know its (the dragon’s) death? Or will you give its sustenance? Do you know the places it destroyed and the places it will devastate for the rest of his life?’

In example (1), God asks the prophet Ayyub about the dragon and the prophet says that he is incapable. The relative clause is the object of the main clause. Here, the item *ne* is the relative pronoun and it introduces the relative clause that modifies the pronoun *ol*. Relative clauses composed with question words are also seen in Old Uyghur because of language contact (von Gabain, 2007, pp. 124-125; Eraslan, 2012, pp. 529).²

² Erdal (2004, pp. 444, 447) gives similar examples introduced with the relative pronoun *kayu* “which” and he states that the particle *kim* might develop from interrogative-indefinite pronoun *kām*, *kimni* etc., whose nominative is in the form *kim* in Uyghur considering the particles *kim* and *kayu* under analytical relative clauses.

- (2) *Yūnus Şa'yā peygāmbara ve Hazkıya melige ve dahı kavmına kaçkıyup çıkdı hattā kim Rūm deñizine irdi [nekim aña olasıdur] oldı* (KE 865/7-8)
 ‘Jonah got angry with the prophet Shaya, the king Hazki and his community, and went as far as the Greek Sea, things that would happen to him have happened.’

In example (2), the relative clause is the subject of the main clause. In the forming finite relative clause with interrogative pronouns and *-AsI*, the copula *-dur* occurs. In this period, *-dur* functions as a marker that separates the clause from the items that follow it. Therefore, it is used in inflected finite clauses and main clauses.

3.2. Participle Suffixes

In the literature, suffixes that form relative clauses in Old Anatolian Oghuz have been listed as participles of past tense *-duk/-dük, -miş/-miş*; participles of present tense *-an/-en, -r, -ar/-er, -ur/-ür, -maz/-mez*, participles with future tense *-acak/-ecek, -ası/-esi, -malu/-melü* (Özkan, 2000, pp. 148-151; Gülsevin, 2007, pp. 123-124). Considering the corpus of this research, the suffixes *-DOK, -mXş, -An, -(X)r, -mAz, -AsI, -AcAk, -mAIU*, and *-(y)ICI* form relative clauses, and their properties in Old Anatolian Oghuz differ to a certain extent from Turkish syntactically and semantically. The findings of the analysis are presented with the usage examples below.

3.2.1. *-mAIU*

Most of the grammars on Old Anatolian Oghuz do not include the morpheme *-mAIU* under participles (Gülsevin & Boz, 2004; Timurtaş, 2005; Yelten, 2007; Şahin, 2015; Akar, 2018, etc.). However, its use has been testified in *Marzubân-nâme* written in the 14th century and *Ferec ba'd al-şidde* written in the 15th century. Taking it even further back, Adamović (1985, pp. 304-308) states that its use as an adjective verb with modal meaning was witnessed in the 14th century and gives an example from *Tanıklarıyla Tarama Sözlüğü VII: istisqā olmalu gişiye fā'ide eदे* ‘das wird wassersüchtigen Menschen nützen’ (that will benefit dropsy people); *şol asilmalu oyri gibi* ‘wie ein Dieb, der erhängt werden soll’ (like a thief about to be hanged). He also says that its function is ambiguous but is used for qualification in the first stage of its evolution.

The participle suffix *-mAIU* consists of *-mA* deverbal noun suffix and *-Ilg* denominal adjective suffix. The meaning “possessing or having something” or “possessing the denote of the base” that the *-IU < -Ilg* morpheme adds to the word (see Tekin, 1968, pp. 105-106; Erdal, 2004, pp. 149). In the semantic domain of necessity/obligation, *-Ilg* should have developed based on the meanings that emerge in the use of the participle. Rentzsch (2015, pp. 280) draws attention to the fact that this development path is seen in the languages of the world and exemplifies it with “to have to” (from “have” to “necessity”). Additionally, he associates the use of *mAIU ol-* with the root modality in Old Anatolian Oghuz (Old Ottoman Turkish) and states that it eventually developed into an emotive modality in Turkish (showing a more advanced stage than Chuvash and Turkmen) (2015, pp. 190). Here, the criterion to accept an emotive modality marker is the development of the morpheme used with *ol-* and aspect markers into a marker where aspect and modality overlap in the same layer in finite clauses and semantic change that includes the speaker’s attitude.

The root modality marker adds modal meanings such as wish, obligation, permission, ability, etc. to the verb related to the agent who performs it. As a modal marker *-mAIU* is future-oriented; it indicates that the event has not happened yet. Therefore, categories

of aspect and tense are open to interpretation. However, the marker is not associated with factuality (Declerck, 2011, pp. 27). Although the necessary conditions are met for the action to take place, it is uncertain whether the action will occur.

In the literature, Serebrennikov and Gadjeva (2011, pp. 185) are of the opinion that *-mAll* contains the meaning of possibility in the participle function related to its development, and that it evolved into necessity based on this meaning. According to the corpus for this research, the suffix *-mAll ol-* adds to a modified noun the meaning that the necessary conditions are met for the action to occur, and the actualizing of action is expected while *-mAll* modifies the certain features of the head noun referring to having (Rentzsch, 2015, pp. 190). The development path for *-mAll* as a modality marker on the predicate of the main clause can be drawn in Turkish diachronically: the participle *-mAllU* adds the meaning “having an operational characteristic, having the characteristics for the realization of the action” by modifying the noun, it can be paraphrased “to be expected to happen” > *-mAll ol-* (combining with aspect marker and transitional stage for overlapping two categories “modality and aspect”) adds the meaning “the actualization of the action is necessary” > optative marker *-mAll* under the emotive modality³ adds the meaning “speaker thinks that the actualizing of the action is necessary” according to the classification of Rentzsch (2015, pp. 190). Additionally, he states that the sense of necessity might develop via a gerundive meaning by showing a piece of evidence from other Turkic languages such as Old Uyghur *-GUIUK*, Uzbek *-arlı* (2015, pp. 280). Briefly, it evolved into an emotive necessity marker on this path: HAVE > *GERUNDIVE > ROOT NECESSITY > EMOTIVE.⁴ In the last stage of grammaticalization, it includes the subjective attitude of the speaker, therefore Rentzsch evaluates it as an optative marker while Kocaman (1996:107) claims that it is a subjective necessity marker by differentiating it from the marker *gerek*.

When *-mAll* is used, it indicates a meaning that the speaker’s attitude toward the actualization of the action is necessary, despite the use of the deontic marker *-mAsI gerek* (Rentzsch, 2015, pp. 17-18).⁵ The development process has partially changed from objectivity to subjectivity. While it has a meaning related to the outer world, it has also come to include the inner world of the speaker.

In the Old Anatolian Oghuz period, the participle refers to having the features for actualizing the action. In addition to the corpus, Aksoy and Dilçin (1998, pp. 198-203) provide many examples of the participle *-mAllU* used between the 14th and 20th centuries. These samples were evaluated to confirm the findings based on the corpus. In the attributive construction, *-mAllU* encodes the meaning “the actualization of the action is inevitable” by modifying the head noun (in which the action can take place). The structure *-mAllU ol-* in this utterance can be paraphrased as “if the necessary conditions have arisen for the event to occur, it is expected to occur”. In relative clauses, I have not discovered any example that includes the speaker’s evaluation. This development of *-mAllU* must have appeared in the main clause as the last phase of grammaticalization.

³ Emotive modality encodes the subject’s emotional, mental, or moral attitude toward the desirability, necessity, or permissibility of the realization of the action (Rentzsch, 2015, pp. 17).

⁴ The development of *-mAllU* as an optative marker under emotional modality is based on necessity (see van der Auwera & Plungian 1998, pp. 107).

⁵ Rentzsch (2015, pp. 31) classifies *-mAll* as an optative (MOD2) marker and *-mAsI gerek* as a grammatical marker of MOD-1 necessity.

So far, the development from the participle to the modality marker has been discussed considering literature and the corpus. Examples of usage in Old Anatolian Oghuz are given below. In the examples, *-mAIU* is glossed as “to be expected” referring to “the agent is expected to perform” while *-mAIU ol-* is glossed as “should” based on necessity.

(3) *ya sen gelmelü olursan, dutagelesin, dedi.*

‘If you should come, keep coming, he said.’ (FBS 323)

(The speaker thinks the action is necessary...)

(4) *Gülüşmelü hikayetidi. Gülüşdük.*

‘The story was expected to be laughed at. We laughed.’ (FBS 343)

(The story has the necessary features for the laughing action to take place.)

In example (4), the modifier adds to the noun the meaning “the story has the features to make the action of laughter happen (the necessary conditions for the action to take place are provided)”. In the second utterance, the expected action happens.

(5) *Bu zalimi, -öldürmelüdür - ne “alametile öldürsünler?” dedi.*

‘Which sign should they kill this cruel who should be killed?’ (FBS 329)

(the cruel has the necessary characteristics to be killed).

(6) *Kimse ‘avratına talak vèrmelü olıcak <vère>, kime ne, <baña ne>?*

‘When someone should divorce their spouse, divorce! It’s nobody’s business, it’s none of my business.’ (FBS 360)

(If the speaker thinks the action is necessary...)

(7) *Bu diyârdan gitmelü olup ve bu halkuñ naşihat taleb itdüklerin diyüp icâzet murâd idindi.*

‘He said that he should leave this place and that the people were requesting advice and asked for permission.’ (MB 171)

(The agent thinks the action is necessary...)

The participle *-mAIU* appears in FBS and MB in the corpus. In the examples given above, the actualization of the action is related to the agent, on the other hand, necessary conditions are met. Examples given above show the use of *-mAIU* in the nonfinite clause, except example (5) which is relative clause construction modifying the object of the main clause.⁶ The item qualified by the participle adjective is suitable for the realization of this action in examples (4) and (5). The participle suffix *-mAIU* can be interpreted as future-oriented because the action has not happened yet. Regarding viewpoint features of the participle, it doesn’t directly indicate prospectivity, but it may be read as “necessary conditions are met, but whether the event will occur or not is uncertain” because of its semantic domain.

It is important to point out that necessity can be marked with the lexical item *gerek* ‘necessary’ in Old Anatolian Oghuz. Evaluating the occurrence of *gerek* in the corpus schematized in Table 1, the following conclusions can be drawn for nonfinite and finite clauses:

⁶ It is seen as a modality marker on the predicate in 1730: *Kangı yolu tutmalu(y)ız?* “which way have to we go?” (Kartallıoğlu, 2021, pp. 34)

1. The use of *gerek* in the subordinating clause is not seen in FBS and MB in which *-mAIU* usage is determined. In these works, the conditional clause is formed with *-mAIU ol-* and the conditional suffix *-sA*.
2. In the FBS and MB used *-mAIU*, the use of *gerek* and past tense (*idi*) has not been determined.⁷
3. The combination of *-mAK gerek* and evidential *Imİş* is seen only in MB.

Marzubân-nâme (14 th century)	Kıyas-ı Enbiya (14 th century)	Ferec ba'd eş-şidde (1451)	The Book of Dede Korkut (15 th -16 th century)
<i>-mAK gerek</i>	<i>-mAK gerek</i>	<i>-mAK gerek</i>	<i>-mAK gerek</i>
<i>-mAK gerekdür</i>	<i>gerekdür</i>	<i>gerekdür</i>	<i>gerekdür</i>
<i>-mAK gerek imiş</i>			
<i>-sA gerek</i>	<i>-sA gerek</i>	<i>-sA gerek</i>	<i>-sA gerek</i>
	<i>gerek idi</i>		<i>-sA gerek idi</i>
	<i>gerek ise</i>		<i>gerek ise</i>

Table 1. Evaluating the occurrence of *gerek* in the corpus

This comparison provides an overview of marking necessity in this period. In the larger corpus, only these two options for the speaker/author need further investigation to clarify modal uses.⁸ While their syntactic features may vary, they should also have different meanings under necessity or obligation. Based on the limited data of this study, the use of *gerek* seems stronger than *-mAIU ol-* in terms of obligation.

-mAIU in Old Anatolian Oghuz occurs with different syntactic features. As a modifier, it adds the meaning to the noun “possess the characteristics necessary for the action to take place”. *-mAIU ol-* appears with two different meanings: 1. The speaker thinks that the action is necessary to have happened; 2. Having actional features. Moreover, *-mAIU* doesn't refer to any moral code or any authority (see van der Auwera & Plungian, 1998, pp. 95). In the 15th century, there were usages in the main clause related to the emergence and fulfillment of the necessity for the event to take place: *Ölüm karşuma gelmeli oldu*. “The necessary conditions emerged for me to die.” (Aksoy & Dilçin, 2009, pp. 200)

3.2.2. *-AsI* and *-AcAk*

In historical Turkic written languages, various morphemes such as *-DAçI*, *-çI*, *-GAy*, *-AsI*, *-IsAr*, *-AcAK* indicate future-oriented notification (see Tekin, 1968, pp. 192-193; Özkan, 2000, pp. 137-138; Erdal, 2004, pp. 290). These morphemes have changed to allow different modal readings not yet realized arising from their content and copying meanings through language contact (see Korkmaz, 1959; Demir & Aslan, 2010). Another situation seen in the historical process is the development of participles into modal or

⁷ Looking at the examples given by Aksoy and Dilçin (2009, pp. 199-200), *-meliyidi* is used in the main clause: *Bir nakkaş üstat kim âlem içinde suret yazmakta ve kalem urmakta parmak ile göstermeliyidi*. “He was a master miniaturist who should be pointed out with the fingers in drawing images and holding a pen in the world.”

⁸ Kamacı (2020, pp. 110-122) categorizes these structures given in Table 1 under obligation and necessity according to the power of enforcement and authority.

aspect markers used in main clauses (see Aksu & Slobin, 1986). To better understand the historical Turkic languages and how the situation in Turkish has developed, these participles should be investigated in terms of the relationship between modality, aspect, and tense considering their functions in relative clauses diachronically.

The participles *-AsI* and *-AcAk* mark prospectivity and possibility in the corpus. Prospectivity, which is a viewpoint on events before they occur, tends to be interpreted with modal meaning such as intention, volition, or epistemic possibility (see Lyons, 1983, pp. 278). Therefore, prospective markers develop into modal markers indicating specific meanings like “wish”. In the 14th-century work, KE, *-AsI* primarily marks prospectivity, and was used in both relative and main clauses (see Üzüm, 2021). These uses can be interpreted pragmatically as unknown situations and expectations of occurrence. In the 15th-century work, FBS, I also identified examples where the analytical structure *-AsI gel-* was used. In DK, which is dated between the end of the 15th century and the beginning of the 16th century, the usage area has narrowed, and it was used to mark wishes in restricted cases. The fact that the *-AcAk* morpheme, which takes its place in Turkish, occurs in the same words also proves my view. The participle *-AcAk* gains functions of *-AsI* because of the narrowing functions of *-AsI* in the meaning “wish”.

The participle *-AsI* can form finite and nonfinite relative clauses and is also used in the main clause. These different types of clauses show particular syntactic properties. The complementizer in the finite and nonfinite relative clauses is not obligatory in certain cases. In the corpus, we see three types of finite relative clauses: 1. The subordinate clause introduced with “ne” or “nekim”; 2. The forming of the relative clause with complementizer *kim* (If the subordinate clause is composed without a question word and placed after the main clause); 3. The use of the relative clause following the main clause without the complementizer.

- (8) *iy çalabum benüm ölümimi cinnilerden gizlegil tā ādemiler bilsün kim cinniler gayb bilmezler ve cinnñler ādemilere eydüridi kim biz gaybı bilüriz ve [yarın ne iş olasıdur] bize ma lūmdur* (KE 680)

‘O! my prophet, hide my death from the gin-kind, so that humankind will know. The gin-kind does not know what is hidden, and the gin-kind used to tell humankind that we know the unseen and we know what will happen/will happen tomorrow.’

In example (8), the relative clause that is the subject precedes the main sentence and starts with the interrogative pronoun *ne*. The relative clause formed with the complementizer *kim* can modify an argument of the main clause or be descriptive by referring to the whole sentence. A notable usage example in the corpus is the hierarchical use of nonrestrictive clauses and restrictive clauses. In the following example, the syntax of the upper clause governed by *çıkasıdur* and the second one formed by *yıgasıdur* are different.

- (9) *ben bir ümmet buldum kim [kamu ümmetüñ yigregidür]¹ kim [çıkasıdur [eyü işe buyurup yavuz işden yıgasıdur]³]²*

‘I have found a religious community (umma) that is the best of all nations, that they will be one of those who enjoin good occupations and forbid bad occupation.’ (KE 429)

In example (9), while the first relative clause modifies an argument “bir ümmet” of the main clause, the second one modifies the whole sentence placed before it, and the third one modifies the subject of the main clause (*O çıkasıdır*).

Evaluating the uses of participles in general, the complementizer would be expected after *çıkasıdır* in example (9) for the relativization. As seen in the example, it cannot be used in the construction of nested relative clauses which is similar to multiple qualification (Mundy, 1955, pp. 282-283).

The fact that finite clauses can be transferred as non-finite clauses and the need for nominal agreement in the transfer of examples to Turkish shows the syntactic change, but also reveals stylistic differences.

- (10) *eyitdiler işbu bizden bir peygâmbar kanıdır kim bizi yavuz işlerden yıgarıdı işbu [siz kılduğuñuz işleri bize olası]sın habar virüridi biz aña inanmaduk ve anı depeledük*

‘They said: -This is the blood of a prophet among us who kept us away from bad deeds, he informed us beforehand about your deeds. We didn't believe him and we crushed him.’ (KE 719)

- (11) *Şaburı öğütlediler: “Vatana gidelüm, yetesi müdbirlik etdüng dediler.*

‘They gave advice to Shabur: They said, “Let's go home, you’ve had enough misfortune.’ (FBS 357)

The morpheme *-AsI* is multifunctional in the corpus: 1. It is used as a verbal noun (headless relative clause) by taking a case suffix as seen in example (10); 2. It forms a finite relative clause with *-DXr* given above examples (8) and (9); 3. It forms verbal adjectives without accepting any suffix to modify an argument as seen in example (11).

3.2.3. *-mXş*

In the literature on Old Anatolian Oghuz, the uses of *-mXş* in the relative clause and main clause are considered the same, and both of the uses are clarified with evidential contents.⁹ The postterminal participle *-mXş* does not have any evidential meaning in nonfinite clauses in Old Anatolian Oghuz (see Erdal, 2004, pp. 294; Csató & Johanson, 2022, pp. 208). In the corpus, determined uses of the participle suffix *-mXş* do not take any suffix and mark only postterminality. Postterminals attached to verbs indicate past events of present relevance with an aspectual way of envisaging events after the transgression of its relevant limit (Johanson, 2000, pp. 29, 32-33; 2018, pp. 513).

- (12) *evde bunca yıldan berü [bu tārīkile kazanılmıŝ mal]ı alam, seni çıkaram, bile gidevüz* (FBS 136)

‘I want to take the property at home that has been earned in this way for all these years, I want to get you out, I want to go together.’

- (13) *Anuñ dañı [bir anası ölmıŝ kız]ı, varıdı.* (FBS 245)

‘He also had a daughter whose mother has dead.’

- (14) *[bu işden kazanılmıŝ çok māl]ı varıdı.* (FBS 570)

‘He had a lot of property gained from this business.’

As seen in the examples, the participle *-mXş* marks the viewpoint after the transgression of the action’s relevant limit. In the examples, the relative clause is the

⁹ Erdal (2004, pp. 293-294), who discusses it under the perfect participle in Old Turkic, also points out that their usage (*-mXş*, *-DOK*, *-yOk*) and meanings are different in finite and nonfinite clauses.

direct object of the main clause. The participle *-mXş* relativizes the subjects of the modifying clause (see Kornfilt, 1997a, pp. 58).

3.2.4. *-DOK and -An*

In the corpus, the participles *-DOK*¹⁰ and *-An* are evaluated comparatively to reveal differences and common features. First, these two participles overlap in factuality. Both mark factual situations which means the action has happened or is happening at the time of speaking. The participle *-An* occurs with a head which is coreferent with the possessor of the first argument while *-DOK* is chosen when the head is coreferent with a nonfirst argument of relative clause: *kızı hasta olan kadın* ‘a/the woman whose daughter is ill’; *okuduğum kitap* ‘a/the book I read/have read/had read’ (Johanson, 2021, pp. 888). In comparison to two participles syntactically, *-DOK* accepts possessive suffixes while *-An* is not combined with any suffixes. Another criterion used to evaluate participles is actionality. In terms of crucial transformative limits of actions, aspect value acts on aktionart, so *-An* and *-DOK* indicate intraterminality with the initiotransformative verbs, while they mark postterminality with finittransformative verbs. The interaction of actional and aspectual categories determines the viewpoint value of these participles. However, factuality is the common feature to prefer these participles although they differ syntactically. In the literature on Turkish, the participle *-An* is preferred in two cases. First, when the item is modified, the relative clause is the subject or part of a larger subject. Second, when there is no subject in the superficial structure or where there is not subject with a thematic role.¹¹ This second situation is seen in passive constructions when the subject is not definite and is located just to the left of the verb (normally at the beginning of the sentence) (Kornfilt, 1997a, pp. 59-60). The corpus of this research shows us that these criteria are valid for Old Anatolian Oghuz as well.

(15) *Seni bilen big oğulları ağ çıkardı kara geydi (bil- initiotransformative)*

‘The sons of the governors who knew you took off the white clothes and put on black clothes.’ (DK 109)

(16) *Māhyār Vāsīṭ dēdükleri gişi benem. (de- finittransformative)*

‘I am the one they call Māhyār Vāsīṭ’ (FBS 121)

Modifier clauses formed with *-An* and *-DOK* in these examples consist of a part of the subject of the main clause. However *-DOK* is followed by agreement morphology. In example (16), the head is coreferent with the nonfirst argument of the relative clause.

(17) *evvel Mekkeyi yurt idinüp oturan bularıdı*

‘These were the people who settled in Mecca in the past.’ (KE 162)

(18) *bişinci bāb tañrı ta ‘ālā gendü resūlı ve ħalīlı İbrāhīm ‘as oğlın boğazlamak buyurduğın yāz kıılır*

¹⁰ In the literature, Koç (2012) deals with the participle *-DOK* in terms of evolution and occurrence in historical Turkic languages. On the other hand, Yılmaz (2019) discusses the use of *-DOK* diachronically in the main clause in detail by evaluating the literature and providing evidence from Border Turkic languages. The examples they examined are not included here because it is outside the scope of this study.

¹¹ Similarly, Johanson (2021, pp. 890) states that *-An* is used in the condition that the referent of the circumstant is nontopical and nonspecific.

‘In the fifth chapter, it is written that God ordered his prophet and friend İbrāhīm pbuh (peace be upon him) to slaughter his son.’ (KE 180)

Examples (17) and (18) illustrate the headless relative clauses consisting of the modifier clause without the head noun. In other words, the head position is not filled with the lexical item (see Kornfilt 1997a: 62-63).

3.2.5. -(y)ICI

The participle -(y)ICI <-(I)Gçi is used to mark the potential of the performer. It shows us that propensity based on the potential is expressed by a subjunctive construction in Old Anatolian Oghuz (for uses of propensity in Turkish, see Rentzsch et al., 2018; Rentzsch et al., 2020). In Turkish, -(y)ICI is considered a derivational suffix forming the name of the profession in relation to the participant that performs the action. While the suffix -CI derives nouns, the suffix -(y)ICI is the derivational suffix forming nouns from verbs in relation to the action being performed by the agent referring to a particular function or a certain profession (Ergin, 2004, pp. 191; Göksel & Kerslake, 2005, pp. 55). However, the participle function of the suffix -(y)ICI continues in Turkish, especially in spoken language (see Günşen, 2006).

(19) *kulağı altun kübeli, kalın Oğuz biglerini bir bir atından yıkıçı¹² Kazılık Koca oğlu Beg Yëgenek çapar yëtdi.*

‘Yigenek, who is the son with golden earrings of Kazılık Koca and can destroy the mighty Oghuz lords, came at a gallop.’ (DK 64)

(20) *sen du ‘ayı işidici tanrısın*

‘you are the god who can hear prayer’ (KE 400)

(21) *dört ‘avrat almağdan sakıngil dahı erile barışmayıcı ve kâbinine diyici ve erile li ‘ân okuşıcı ve biyzâlık okuşıcı ‘avratdan sakıngil*

‘Avoid marrying the four types of women, protect yourself from a woman who tends not to get along with her husband, is inclined to ask for pre-matrimonial support, is inclined to curse her husband, and is inclined to utter bad words.’ (KE 540)

As shown above, the participle -(y)ICI forms attributive construction to clarify the performer’s potential. In the corpus, it occurs to qualify the animate nouns (see more examples Korkmaz, 2017, pp. 153) but inherent properties of the entity (inanimate nouns) also can be qualified in Turkish (Göksel & Kerslake, 2005, pp. 55).

The increase in the use of the suffix -(y)ICI in the historical process is associated with translations from Arabic and Persian. Balcı (2019, pp. 388) states that it is used to meet the verb performances expressed in Arabic, therefore its frequency level increased over time. This also supports its propensity marking functionality. Additionally, the derivation of the present participle (ism-i fail) and marking the meaning that animate or inanimate performers have the potential to realize the action are also clearly seen in the corpus-based studies on the -(y)ICI suffix (Kaya & Erdem, 2010, pp. 1612-1613).

¹² In DK, both the uses of “yıkıcı” and “yılan” are witnessed in the same expression: *kulağı altun kübeli, kalın Oğuz biglerini bir bir atından yıkan Kazılık Koca oğlu Big Yëgenek* (Ergin, 1964, pp. 24, 60; Tezcan & Boeschoten, 2001, pp. 64, 113)

3.2.6. *-(X)r and -mAz*

The oldest known participle, *-(X)r*, is used in finite and nonfinite relative clauses. In the corpus, the participle suffix does not accept any suffix and marks intraterminality (or present participle) which is the envisagement of an action within its limit as an aspectual value (Johanson, 2021, pp. 624, 736). The morpheme *-mAz* is the negative equivalent of the participle.

(22) *Delü Dumrulun görür gözi görmez oldı, tutar elleri tutmaz oldı.*

‘Deli Dumrul’s eyes which were capable of seeing became incapable of seeing, his hands which were capable of holding became incapable of holding.’ (DK 116)

In example (22), the relativized constituent by the participle is the part of the subject of the verb in the relative clause and marked 3rd person possessive suffix (forming a noun phrase).

(23) *eyitdiler geldük kim seni işitmez ve görmez kulluğundan işidür ve görür kulluğına kığıruruz*

‘They said: We have come to you to call you from your obedience who do not hear or see to your obedience whom you hear and see.’ (KE 859)

In example (23), positive and negative usage of the participles are given in the same context. Considering its uses in Turkic languages, Johanson (2021, pp. 736-737) describes it as a low focal item. However, it has a higher focality degree referring to participation in the action as ongoing in Old Anatolian Oghuz. During the historical process, it has defocalized by expressing a less narrow focus (see Johanson, 2021, pp. 625-626).

Conclusion

In the literature, participles are considered in terms of marking the tense on the verb, taking the case suffixes, and deriving nouns in Old Anatolian Oghuz. However, investigating the participle suffixes with a syntactic and semantic approach contributes to a better understanding of the historical texts as well as determining the characteristics of the period. Additionally, stating *-mXş* as a participle in the meaning hearsay or reported in Old Anatolian Oghuz grammar contradicts the characteristics of the category of evidentiality. The participle suffix *-mXş* forming the subordinate clause reports postterminality in Old Anatolian Oghuz.

The functions and appearance of participle suffixes in the corpus are given in Table 2 below.

Participle suffixes	The Book of Dede Korkut (15 th -16 th century)	Ferec ba’d eş-şidde (1451)	Marzubân-nâme (14 th century)	Kıyas-ı Enbiya (14 th century)	
-DOk	x	x	x	x	factuality
-mXş	x	x	x	x	postterminality
-An	x	x	x	x	factuality
-(X)r/-mAz	x	x	x	x	intraterminality
-AcAk	x	x	x	x	prospectivity/possibility

-AsI	x	x	x	x	prospectivity/possibility
-mAIU		x	x ¹³		expectation and root modality
-ICI	x	x	x	x	propensity

Table 2. *Functions of Participles in Old Anatolian Oghuz*

-mAIU is coded with two different functions according to uses in relative clauses and attribution. These functions provide evidence for its development path into modality marker including the speaker's attitude.

In Turkish, the factual value (or truth value) of a proposition in relative clauses is marked with different participle suffixes. In terms of factuality, *-Dok* and *-An* have the same meaning that the action is happening or happened depending on the point of view marked on the predicate of the main clause. However, these participle suffixes differ syntactically. In the corpus, the first function of *-An* is subject relativization as in Turkish (see Kornfilt, 1997a, pp. 58-60). In other words, *-An* modifies the subject of the relative clause or a complement of the subject in the main clause. Another distinguishing feature is related to the agreement marker. While *-Dok* takes an agreement marker, *-An* does not accept it. In the examination of participles in terms of interaction between aspect and actionality, the action's crucial transformative limit and the predicate of the main clause should be taken into consideration. It is possible to determine the aspect value of some participles according to these criteria. For example, the participles *-An* and *-Dok* indicate intraterminality with the initiotransformative verbs, while they mark postterminality with finittransformative verbs.

The participle *-(X)r* and its negative equivalent *-mAz* mark intraterminality; however, they have defocalized throughout historical processes and they have lower focality degrees in Turkish.

Relative clauses are divided into three types: introducing a question word (relative clause-main clause order), finite clauses forming the complementizer *ki* (main clause-relative clause), and non-finite clauses without complementizer (relative clause-main clause). In the comparison of their syntactical features, they are opposites. While the relative clause starting with the question word is suitable for the Turkish syntax, the main sentence + finite relative clause sequence is seen in the clauses formed with the complementizer *ki*. If there is a nested relative clause construction, an example in which the complementizer is not used after the main sentence has also been identified. This situation does not lead to ambiguity.

References

- Adamović, M. (1985). *Konjugationsgeschichte der Türkischen Sprache*. Leiden: Brill.
- Akar, A. (2018). *Oğuzların dili-Eski Anadolu Türkçesine giriş*. İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları.
- Aksoy, Ö. A., Dilçin, D. (2009). *XIII. yüzyıldan beri Türkiye Türkçesiyle yazılmış kitaplardan toplanan tanıklarıyla tarama sözlüğü VII ekler*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Aksu Koç, A., Slobin, Dan I. (1986). Psychological account of the development and use of evidentials in Turkish. In: W. Chafe & J. Nichols (Eds.). *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology Volume XX* (pp. 159-167). USA: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Aydemir, İ. A. (2010). *Türkçede zaman ve görünüş Sistemi*. Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları.

¹³ *-mAIU ol-* is testified in this work and might be considered a further stage of grammaticalization.

- Balcı, M. (2019). Türkiye Türkçesinin yazı dili olarak kuruluşunda -İcI ekinin durumu. *Türkiyat Mecmuası-Journal of Turkology* 29, 2: 367-390. <https://doi.org/10.26650/iuturkiyat.658900>
- Csató, É., Johanson, L. (2022). Turkish. In: L. Johanson & É. Csató (Eds.). *The Turkic Languages* (pp. 195-223). New York: Routledge.
- Declerck, R. (2011). The definition of Modality. A. Patard, F. Brisard (Eds.), *Cognitive Approaches to Tense Aspect and Epistemic Modality* (pp. 21-44). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Demir, N., Aslan, S. (2010). Sıklık kopyası örneği olarak istek eki -(y)A. *Turkish Studies*, 5/4, 276-290.
- Eraslan, K. (2012). *Eski Uygurcanın grameri*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Erdal, M. (2004). *A grammar of Old Turkic*. Leiden: Brill.
- Ergin, M. (1964). *Dede Korkut kitabı*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Ergin, M. (2004). *Türk dil bilgisi*. İstanbul: Bayrak Yayınları.
- Erguvanlı Taylan, E. (1981). A case of syntactic change: Ki-constructions in Turkish. *Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Dergisi, Beşeri Bilimler*, Cilt 8, 111-140.
- Erkman Akerson, F., Ozil, S. N. Ş. (2015). *Türkçede niteleme: sıfat işlevli yan tümceler*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Göksel, A., Kerslake C. 2005. *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. New York: Routledge Publishing.
- Gülsevin, G. (2007). *Eski Anadolu Türkçesinde ekler*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Gülsevin, G., Boz, E. (2004). *Eski Anadolu Türkçesi*. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.
- Günşen, A. (2006). Anadolu ağzlarında farklı bir gelecek zaman eki ve çekimi: -ıca, -ıci, -ucu, ücü. *Turkish Studies*, 1/2, 54-84.
- Hazai, G., Tietze, A. (2006). *Ferec ba'd eş-şidde* (Ein frühosmanisches Geschichtenbuch), 1. Band, Text, Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag.
- Johanson, L. (2000). Viewpoint operators in European languages. In: Ö Dahl (Ed.) *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe* (pp. 27-187). Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Johanson, L. (2018). Turkic indirectivity. In: A. Y. Aikhenvald (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of evidentiality* (pp. 511-525). Oxford: University Press.
- Johanson, L. (2021). *Turkic*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Kamacı, D. (2020). Anlamsal bir fenomen olarak kiplik: Dede Korkut örneği. Ankara Nobel Bilimsel Eserler.
- Karadoğan, A. (2009). *Türkiye Türkçesinde kılınış*. Ankara: Divan Kitap.
- Karakoç, B. (2013). Types of copular clauses following ki in Old Ottoman Turkish. *Turkic Languages*, 17. 38-64.
- Kartallıoğlu, Y. (2021). *Osmanlı konuşma dili*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Kaya, İ., Erdem, M. (2010). Türkçede -AGAn ve -ICI ekleri ve Südi şerhindeki kullanımları. *Turkish Studies*, Volume 5/ 3, 1594-1617.
- Koç, M. (2012) Eski Anadolu Türkçesinde /dUk ekli geçmiş zaman çekimleri. *Türkbilgi*, 23, 11-18.
- Kocaman, A. (1996). The necessitative mood in Turkish. B. Rona (Ed.), *Current Issues in Turkish Linguistics* (pp. 104-110). Ankara: Hitit Yayınevi.
- Korkmaz, Z. (1959). Türkçede -acak/ -ecek gelecek zaman (futurum) ekinin yapısı üzerine. *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih- Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1-2, 159-168.
- Korkmaz, Z. (2017). *Marzubân-nâme tercümesi Destûr-ı Şâhî*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Kornfilt, J. (1997a). *Turkish grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Kornfilt, J. 1997b. On the syntax and morphology of relative clauses in Turkish. K. İmer, A. Kocaman, S. Özsoy (Eds.) *Dilbilim Araştırmaları* (Linguistic Investigations) (pp. 24-51). Ankara: Kebikeç Yayınları.
- Lyons, J. (1983). *Kuramsal dilbilime giriş* (A. Kocaman, Çev.). Ankara: TDK Yay.
- Mundy, C. S. (1955). Turkish syntax as a system of qualification. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 17, 279-305.
- Özkan, M. (20004). *Türk dilinin gelişme alanları ve Eski Anadolu Türkçesi*. İstanbul: Filiz Kitabevi.

- Özkan, M. (2004). Eski Türkiye Türkçesinde ki/kim bağlaçlarının kullanılışı üzerine. *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi*, 31, 243-255.
- Palmer, F. R. (2001). *Mood and modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Parlatır, İ., Hazai, G. (2007). *Macar Bilimler Akademisi Kütüphanesi'ndeki Türkçe el yazmaları kataloğu*. Ankara: TÜBA.
- Rentzsch, J. (2015). *Modality in the Turkic Languages: Form and Meaning from a Historical and Comparative Perspective*. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag.
- Rentzsch, J., Mitkovska, L., Nedelkoska, G. (2018). Turkish-Macedonian Language Contact in Ohrid: The case of propensity. In: Veton Latifi, Victor A. Friedman, Marjan Markovikj (Eds.), *Multiculturalism and Language Contact* (pp. 149-164). Tetovo: Scientific Institute "Max van der Stoel".
- Rentzsch, J., Mitkovska, L., Nedelkoska, G. (2020). Complementation strategies with the verb 'to know' in the Turkish dialect of Ohrid compared to standard Turkish and Macedonian, *Turkic Languages* 24, 78-109.
- Şahin, H. 2015. *Eski Anadolu Türkçesi*. Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.
- Serebrennikov, B. A., Gadjeva N. Z. (2011). *Türk yazılı dillerinin karşılaştırmalı tarihi*. (T. Hacıyev & M. Öner, Çev.). Ankara: TDK Yayınları.
- Tekin, T. (1968). *A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic*. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Tezcan, S., Boeschoten, H. (2001). *Dede Korkut Oğuznameleri*. İstanbul: YKY.
- Timurtaş, F. K. (2005). *Eski Türkiye Türkçesi IV. Yüzyıl Gramer-Metin-Sözlük*. Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.
- Tulum, Mertol (1978). *Macârif-nâme: ki'li birleşik cümle incelemesi*. [Habilitation thesis, İstanbul].
- Underhill, R. (1972). Turkish participles, *Linguistic Inquiry*, 3 (1), 87-99.
- Üzüm, M. (2021). -Asl biçimbirimin işlevsel yaklaşımla incelenmesi. N. Ergün Atbaşı & K. Üstün (Eds.), *Hacettepe Türkoloji 50. Yıl Armağanı* (pp. 133-164). Ankara Nobel Yayınları.
- van der Auwera, J., Plungian, V. A. (1998). Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology*, 2, 79-124.
- von Gabain, A. (2007). *Eski Türkçenin grameri*. (M. Akalın, Çev.). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Yelten, M. (2007). *Eski Anadolu Türkçesi ve örnek metinler*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Yılmaz, E. (2014a). Ferec ba'deş-şidde, Behcetü'l Hadâyık ve Kıyas-ı Enbiya temelinde Eski Anadolu Türkçesinin sözvarlığına katkılar: I. N. Demir, a. Menz, B. Karakoç (Eds.), *Eva Agnes Csato Armağanı, Tucology and Linguistics* (pp. 469-479). Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Yılmaz, E. (2014b). Ferec ba'deş-şidde, Behcetü'l Hadâyık ve Kıyas-ı Enbiya temelinde Eski Anadolu Türkçesinin sözvarlığına katkılar: II. F. Yıldırım, N. Demir (Eds.), *Prof. Dr. Mehmet Özmen Armağanı* (pp. 321-326). Adana: Çukurova Üniversitesi Basımevi.
- Yılmaz, E. (2019). /DOK/ ekli yüklem ve kıyı dilleri: Çuvaşça, Yakutça, Dolganca ve Halaçça. *İdil-Ural Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(2), 261-269.
- Yılmaz, E., Demir, N. (2005). Bir Sa'lebi çevirisi: Kıyas-ı Enbiya. *International Journal of Central Asian Studies* 10/ 1, *Mustafa Canpolat Armağanı* (pp. 1-8). Seoul.
- Yılmaz, E., Demir, N. (2009). Kıyas-ı Enbiya'dan Eski Anadolu Türkçesinin sözvarlığına katkılar I. *Festschrift to Commemorate the 80th Anniversary of Prof. Dr. Talat Tekin's Birth, International Journal of Central Asian Studies* 13. E. Yılmaz, S. Eker, N. Demir (Eds.), Korea: Korea University of International Studies.
- Yılmaz, E., Demir, N., Küçük, M. (2013). *Kıyas-ı Enbiya. Türk Dil Kurumu nüshası, metin-sözlük-dizin, notlar*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.