DİL ARAŞTIRMALARI
Journal of Language Studies
Yıl/Year: 19, **Dönem**/Period: 2025-Güz/Autumn, **Sayı**/Number: 37
ISSN 1307-7821 | **e-ISSN** 2757-8003

ARAŞTIRMA MAKALESİ
Research Article

Possessive Phrases in Old Anatolian Turkish Texts

Eski Anadolu Türkçesi Metinlerinde İyelik Öbekleri

Buğra Oğuzhan Uluyüz
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Anadolu Üniversitesi
Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, Eskişehir / Türkiye
e-posta bouluyuz@anadolu.edu.tr
orcid 0000-0001-6268-9753
doi 10.54316/dilarastirmalari.1631621

Atıf
Citation
Uluyüz, Buğra Oğuzhan (2025). Possessive Phrases in Old Anatolian Turkish Texts. *Dil Araştırmaları,* 37: 133-150.

Başvuru
Submitted
02.02.2025

Revizyon
Revised
27.05.2025

Kabul
Accepted
24.06.2025

Çevrimiçi Yayın
Published Online
07.11.2025

Bu makale en az iki hakem tarafından incelenmiş ve makalede intihal bulunmadığı teyit edilmiştir.

This article has been reviewed by at least two referees and confirmed to be free of plagiarism.

ABSTARCT

In this paper, I offer an analysis to explain the semantic and syntactic features of Old Anatolian Turkish possessive phrases based on a comparative approach with Standard Turkish. There are three types of possessive phrases in Standard Turkish, the first type of which expresses specificity and definiteness: "çocuğun kalemi", "çocuk kalemi", "çocuğun kalem". In Old Anatolian Turkish, while the first two types of possessive phrases above are frequently encountered, the third type, e.g."çocuğun kalem" is unavailable. What is more, the second type, e.g. “çocuk kalemi” can also express definiteness and specificity, which means that there is another type of standard possessive phrases, in addition to genitive-possessive construction. These two standard possessive phrases of the period can be used instead of each other. Morever, the data shows that there are syntactic constraints between the two variants of standard possessive phrases mentioned above, such as the fact that the first and second nouns can be replaced in the genitive-possessives, whereas the word order is fixed in the possessive constructions in addition to the the typical features they share.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Possessive Construction, Genitive-Possessive, Standard Turkish, Old Anatolian Turkish, Morphosyntax.

ÖZ

Bu yazıda Eski Anadolu Türkçesindeki iyelik öbeklerinin anlam ve sözdizimsel özellikleri Standart Türkçe ile karşılaştırmalı olarak açıklanmak üzere bir inceleme sunulmaktadır. Standart Türkçede üç tür iyelik öbeği mevcuttur; bunlardan ilki, belirlilik ve kesinlik ifade eder: "çocuğun kalemi", "çocuk kalemi", "çocuğun kalem". Eski Anadolu Türkçesinde yukarıdaki iyelik öbeklerinin ilk iki türüne sıklıkla rastlanırken, üçüncü tür olan

"çocuğun kalem"e rastlanmamaktadır. Dahası, ikinci tip yani "çocuk kalemi" aynı zamanda belirlilik ve özgüllük de ifade edebilmekte, yani ilgi-iyelik yapısının işlev ve anlamsal özellikleriyle eşleşen başka bir tür daha mevcuttur. Dönemin bu iki iyelik öbeği birbirinin yerine kullanılabilmektedir. Paylaşılan tipik ortak özelliklere ek olarak bu iki standart iyelik öbeği arasında, ilgi-iyelik yapılarında (belirtili isim tamlamalarında) birinci ve ikinci sözcüklerin yer değiştirebilmesine karşın iyelik yapılarında (belirtisiz isim tamlamalarında) sözsırasının sabit olması gibi sentaktik kısıtlılıklar olduğu, eldeki veri aracılığıyla anlaşılmaktadır. Ancak iyelik öbeklerinin yukarıda bahsedilen iki çeşidi arasında, paylaştıkları ortak özelliklerin yanı sıra sözdizimsel kısıtlamalar da tespit edilmiştir.

Keywords: İyelik öbekleri, İlgi durumu-İyelik, Standart Türkçe, Eski Anadolu Türkçesi, Morfosentaks.

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Mevcut çalışma belirtili isim tamlaması, belirtisiz isim tamlaması ve kısaltma grubu olarak alan yazında adlandırılan tamlama yapılarını Eski Anadolu Türkçesi ve Standart Türkçe arasında karşılaştırmalı olarak incelemektedir. Bu karşılaştırma, yukarıda adı geçen tamlama yapılarının anlamsal ve sözdizimsel değişimlerinin yanında iki dönem arasındaki benzerlikleri de tespit etmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Standart Türkçede belirtili isim tamlamaları ve bu tamlamanın iyelik eki eksiltilmiş hâli olarak tanımlanabilecek karşılığı olan kısaltma grupları belirlilik ve özgüllük ifade etmeleri yönüyle belirtisiz isim tamlamalarından farklılaşmaktadırlar. Belirtili ve belirtisiz isim tamlamalarının anlamsal olarak birbirlerine alternatif olarak kullanılamamasının yanında belirtili tamlama ve kısaltma grupları arasında da sözdizimsel davranış imkânları bakımından farklılıklar bulunmaktadır. Öte yandan belirtili ve belirtisiz isim tamlamalarının Eski Anadolu Türkçesinde de sıkça kullanılmış olmasına karşın yukarıda kısaltma grubu olarak adlandırılan iyeliksiz isim tamlamalarının mevcut olmadığı dikkat çekmektedir. Belirtisiz isim tamlaması yapılarının ise işlevce, Standart Türkçe karşılıklarından önemli ölçüde farklılaştığı anlaşılmaktadır. Eski Anadolu Türkçesindeki belirtisiz isim tamlaması yapılarının en belirgin özelliği, belirtili isim tamlamalarının da yerine sıklıkla kullanılmış olmalarıdır. Buna göre Eski Anadolu Türkçesinde, Standart Türkçeden farklı olarak belirlilik ve özgüllük ifade etmek üzere (belirtili isim tamlamalarına ek olarak) kısaltma grupları değil belirtisiz isim tamlamalarının kullanıldığı sonucu ortaya çıkmaktadır. Yani, Eski Anadolu Türkçesindeki belirtisiz isim tamlamaları belirlilik ve özgüllük ifade edebilmektedir. Öyle ki belirlilik ve özgüllük ifade eden aynı belirtili tamlamalar, ilgi durum çekimsiz karşılıklarıyla değişmeli olarak kullanılmaktadır. Eski Anadolu Türkçesi belirtili ve belirtisiz isim tamlamaları Standart Türkçe karşılıklarıyla ilk bakışta yapıca aynı görünse de çekim, yapım ve sözdizimsel imkânlar bakımından da Standart Türkçe karşılıklarından farklı davranmaktadırlar. Standart Türkçe belirtili ve belirtisiz isim tamlamalarına yapım eki getirildiğinde, tamlanan ad üzerindeki iyelik eki zorunlu olarak düşürülürken Eski Anadolu Türkçesi isim tamlamalarında yapım eki iyelik ekinin üzerine gelebilmektedir. Standart Türkçe belirtisiz isim tamlamaları bir bütün olarak nitelenebilirken Eski Anadolu Türkçesi belirtisiz isim tamlamalarının yalnızca tamlanan adın da nitelenebildiği dikkat çekmektedir. Standart Türkçede tamlayan adın "ikimiz, birimiz" gibi parçalı zamir olduğu durumlarda bu zamirin zorunlu olarak ilgi durum çekimi almasına karşın Eski Anadolu Türkçesinde bu tür zamirler yalın çekimde de kullanılabilmektedir. Standart Türkçe belirtili isim tamlamalarındaki sözsırası değişken iken, belirtisiz isim tamlamalarında sabittir. Eski Anadolu Türkçesindeki belirtisiz isim tamlamaları da sözsırasının değişken olmasıyla Standart Türkçe belirtili isim tamlamalarına benzemektedir; öyle ki tamlayan ad, tamlananın sağında bulunabilmektedir.

Eski Anadolu Türkçesinde belirtisiz isim tamlaması yapılarının özgüllük ve belirlilik ifade etmek üzere belirtili isim tamlamalarının yerine kullanılabiliyor olması iki sonuca işaret etmektedir. Bunlardan birincisi, ilgi durumu çekimi Eski Anadolu Türkçesinde belirlilik ve özgüllük ifade etmek zorunda olmadığıdır. Öyle ki belirtili isim tamlaması yapısında kurulan öbekler, çoğu durumda ilgi durumu eki olmadan da kullanılıp belirlilik ve özgüllük anlamlarını koruyabilmektedirler. Eski Anadolu Türkçesindeki ilgi durumu ve iyelik ekleri arasındaki bağ zayıf olmak kaydıyla Standart Türkçeden ayrışmaktadır. Eski Anadolu Türkçesinde ilgi durumu ve iyelik eki arasındaki bağın zayıf olduğu çıkarımı yancümle yapılarınca da desteklenmektedir. Dönem metinlerinde geçen isim ve sıfat işlevli yancümle yapılarında, Standart Türkçeden farklı olarak çoğunlukla yalın öznelerin kullanılmış olduğu dikkat çekmektedir. Yani yancümlelerdeki iyelik ekleri, özne üzerinde ilgi durumu ekinin ortaya çıkmasına sebep olmamaktadır. İlgi durumu ve iyelik eki arasındaki bağın Eski Anadolu Türkçesinde daha zayıf olduğunu gösteren bir diğer konu da zincirleme isim tamlamalarıdır. Standart Türkçede, belirlilik ve özgüllük niteliklerinin mevcut olması kaydıyla, iki aitlik ilişkisinin kurulduğu bu tür tamlamalarda tamlayan adların her birinde ilgi durumu çekimi olması beklenir. Bu tür yapıların (belirlilik ve özgüllük niteliklerinin korunması kaydıyla) ilgi durumu eklerinden biri olmadan kurulabilmesi mümkün değildir. Eski Anadolu Türkçesindeki zincirleme isim tamlamalarının ise kimi zaman bir tamlayan üzerinde kimi zaman ise her iki tamlayan üzerinde ilgi durumu eki olmadan kurulabildiği dikkat çekmektedir. İlgi durumu eki olmadan kurulan bu tamlamaların özgüllük ve belirlilik de ifade ettiği anlaşılmaktadır. Özetle, Eski Anadolu Türkçesinde özelikle belirtisiz isim tamlamalarının Standart Türkçeden farklı anlamsal ve sözdizimsel niteliklere sahip olmasının temelinde ilgi durumu ekinin, yine Standart Türkçeye nazaran farklılaşmış olan nitelikleri bulunuyor olabilir.

0. Introduction

In this study, possessive phrases in Old Anatolian Turkish (henceforth OAT) and Standard Turkish will be compared in terms of the agreement patterns they are involved in. Standard Turkish possessive phrases can be formed through more than one different agreement pattern. On the other hand, there are some semantic differences between these possessive phrases with differentiated agreement patterns. In the literature, it is known that possessive phrases can be formed without the genitive suffix, which generally expresses uncertainty and categorical meaning in Standard Turkish. Possessive phrases can also be formed without possessive suffixes, at least in spoken language. In order to form this second type of possessive phrases, the possessed noun must correspond to a specific object that is already known to the speakers. The current study proposes that the phrases in the form of genitive-possessive suffixes as standard possessive phrases in Standard Turkish can also occur as non-genitive phrases (0-possessive, e.g. "possessive construction") in addition to the genitive-possessive structure in OAT, and this second type corresponds to genitive-possessive structures of both OAT and Standard Turkish in terms of their definiteness and specificity status. In addition to the data provided above, I argue that the genitive case is not a suffix that necessarily co-occurs with the possessive suffixes, unlike in Standard Turkish. In this regard, OAT possessive phrase types will first be exemplified and compared with Standard Turkish. The agreement patterns in possessive phrases are also reflected in clause structures. Therefore, secondly, the agreement patterns in nominal and relative clauses will be examined as a piece of evidence that

standard possessive phrases can be formed without genitive suffixes in OAT. The syntax and semantics of OAT possessive phrase types, which constitute the focus of the study, will be comparatively examined on the basis of Standard Turkish[1]. Unlike OAT, there is extensive morphosyntax literature on possessive phrases of Standard Turkish. Therefore, I will summarize previous studies in the first section. In the second and third section, I will discuss the theoretical background and provide information about the corpus of OAT respectively. Finally, I will review the characteristic features of OAT possessive phrases and finally give examples showing that the agreement patterns seen in possessive phrases are also present in subordinate clauses.

1. Previous Studies

As standard possessive phrases of Standard Turkish, genitive-possessive structures are generally discussed in the subchapters of grammar studies on the basis of semantic and morphological features (Swift 1963; Lewis 1967; Kornfilt 1997; Özsoy 1994; Göksel and Kerslake 2005).

In addition to general grammars, there are also independent studies that only investigate possessive phrases. One of them, Yükseker (1998), compared genitive-possessives and non-genitive possessive phrases (i.e. possessive compounds) and suggested that these phrases are the projection of two distinct functional heads. Accordingly, while genitive-possessive phrases (which are named as syntactic possessives in the study in question) are projections of POSS head, non-genitive phrases (which are named as possessive compounds) are that of abstract head G. The same study also included the difference between two types of possessive phrases in terms of definiteness.

Öztürk and Taylan (2016) compared genitive-possessive phrases (which are named as genitive phrases) with non-possessive phrases (which are named as possessive free genitives). The difference between the two types of possessive phrases is explained as the possessee noun being an argument in genitive phrases, while it is a modifier of the head noun in phrases called possessive free genitives. The establishment of two possessive phrases with different structures in Standard Turkish is based on the semantic qualities of possessee, the first noun of the possessive phrases.

Kunduracı (2013) analyses Standard Turkish noun-noun compounds (i.e. NNC) paradigmatically in her doctoral thesis. She proposed that NNCs such as "kar ışıltısı" are formed by the compound marker *-sI*, and *-sI* a derivational suffix in NNCs which is also competing with derivational suffixes. Kunduracı (2015) also

[1] Old Anatolian Turkish is the historical period in which the first written examples of Standard Turkish were given. Examining Old Anatolian Turkish in comparison with Standard Turkish is important in terms of understanding the historical change of the modern language. That is why Standard Turkish has been choosen as a basis for the comparison.

suggests that *-(s)I* suffix only expresses possession, excluding the person and number information on the other hand.

Bağrıaçık and Ralli (2014) examined the variations of phrases called nominal-nominal concatenations with *-(s)I(n)* and divided the phrases in this structure into two as those showing referential and modificational properties. Of these two variations, which have unique semantic and syntactic characteristics, the referential one is called Construct-State Nominal, while the modificational one is called the phrasal compound.

Satık (2024) states that the genitive suffix is assigned as an unmarked case based on the syntactic characteristics of the possessive phrase structures (kedinin resmi (the picture of the cat), kedi resmi (cat picture), kedinin resim (the cat's picture) respectively being named as genitive-possessive, possessive compound, possessive free in Öztürk-Taylan 2016 fashion) in Standard Turkish[2]. In order to support this hypothesis, possessive phrases in Turkic languages such as Yakut, Kyrgyz, and Altaic were also included in the comparison, and it was also emphasized that the possessive suffix does not always trigger the genitive suffix on the subject argument in the relative clause structures in the above-mentioned Turkic languages.

Çakır (2023) examined the asymmetry of the *-(s)I(n)* suffix appearing in the possessive phrases with 3rd person within the framework of the Minimalist Program. According to this study, when there is a compound in the possessor position of a large possessive phrase, the disappearance of the *-(s)I(n)* suffix is not a deletion but actually a ban on the re-occurrence of the above-mentioned morpheme.

Diachronic studies on possessive phrases and the genitive suffix are quite limited compared to Standard Turkish. Turan (1996) mentioned that the genitive suffix established a possessive relationship in OAT and stated that the genitive suffix was not present in some cases. In addition, it was emphasized that it was not known in which cases the genitive suffix was dropped.

I now turn to the theoratical framework conducted in the study.

2. Theoratical Framework

There are three different types of possessive phrases in Standard Turkish. I exemplify these phrases through (1), (2) and (3):

1. çocuğ-un kalem-i
   kid-GEN. pencil-3RD.POSS.
   kid's pencil

[2] Beyond the translations here, the meanings of the given phrases are open to interpretation. *Kedi resmi* can be ambiguous between ownership and depiction meaning. *Kedinin resim* is more likely to mean a picture of a particular cat. *Kedinin resmi*, on the otherhand, unambigiously means a picture showing the cat.

2. çocuk kalem-i[3]
   kid pencil-3RD.POSS.
   children's pencil

3. çocuğ-un kalem
   kid-GEN. pencil
   kid's pencil

The phrase structures given in (1), (2), and (3) will be named respectively as genitive-possessive, possessive construction, and possessive-free genitive in the current study[4]. Genitive-possessive is the most frequent and standard form of the possessive phrases. In genitive-possessives, the word order can be changed and the entity denoted by the phrases is definite and specific one. But, the word order is not free and the phrase express some kind of indefinite general meaning in the possessive construction in (2). Considering that the first two phrases have different features in terms of specifity and definiteness, (1) and (2) do not substitute for each other. The possessive-free in (3), on the other hand, can be used interchangeably with (1). These three phrases will be taken into consideration and OAT possessive phrases will be examined on the basis of the above-mentioned three types.

A brief overview of the corpus used to identify examples of OAT will be provided below.

3. The Corpus of OAT

Only prose texts were taken into consideration for OAT examples. Because, due to stylistic concerns, verse texts may contain structures that would not normally be possible. Taking such marginal structures into consideration, especially in syntax studies, creates a major handicap in terms of the accuracy of the results achieved.

The fact that the prose texts of OAT are written in a simple language is an important advantage for syntax studies. Because these texts are thought to reflect the structures and features of the period in a realistic manner. In the current study, Kısas-ı Enbiya (Yılmaz et. all 2013)[5], Kitâb-ı Gunya (Akkuş 1995), Risâletü'l-İslâm (1b-40a) (Mudara 2024) and Tuḥfe-i Mübârizî (Erdağı Doğuer 2013) which stand out as meticulous studies beyond reflecting the language use of the period more realistically, make up the corpus of OAT. In order to more accurately represent the OAT period, in addition to religious texts, a medical text were also

[3] These structures, namely possessive free genitives, appear only in a few examples where the head noun is actually a preposition such as "üzere". It is understood that these structures are specific only to prepositional phrases and are very rare.

[4] The phrases in 1, 2 and 3 are named as "belirtili isim tamlaması", belirtisiz isim tamlaması" ve "kısaltma grubu" in the literature, respectively. The grammatical terms that have been used in Öztürk, Taylan 2016 are preferred in the current study.

[5] Many of the crucial examples needed in the study have been found in "Kısas-ı Enbiya". This text is quite large in size and allows detailed inquiries.

included in the corpus. Since Kısas-ı Enbiya is a rich source for diachronic semantics and syntax studies, which is much larger in volume than the other texts in the corpus, most examples referred to in the current study are from it.

It appears that there is extensive research literature on Standard Turkish possessive phrases based on both functional and generative grammar. On the other hand, it is understood that possessive phrases have historically interesting semantic and syntactic qualities that differ from Standard Turkish. I now turn to types and functions of OAT possessive phrases.

4. Possessive Phrases in OAT Texts

The genitive-possessive structure as possessive phrases, which also exist in Standard Turkish, stand out as the most frequently encountered possessive phrases in OAT. First, I will examine the possessive phrase structures in Standard Turkish and then exemplify the structures in OAT:

4. kadın-ın çanta-sı
   woman-GEN. bag-3RD.POSS.
   woman's bag

5. kadın çanta-sı[6]
   woman bag-3RD.POSS.
   women pencil

6. kadın-ın çanta
   kid-GEN. bag
   woman's bag

The genitive-possessive structure given in (4), (5), and (6) will be named respectively as genitive-possessive, possessive construction, and possessive-free genitive in the current study. Especially the first two of the Standard Turkish possessive phrases given above, namely genitive-possessives and possessive constructions, stand out as the most frequent possessive phrases in OAT texts.

(7), (8), (9) and (10) exemplify possessive phrases in the genitive-possessive structure:

7. an-uñ iş-i
   3.PRO.-GEN. task-3RD.POSS.
   its task (Erdağı Doğuer 2013: 105)

8. bu(n)-uñ ḳuvvet-i
   PRO-GEN. effect-3RD.POSS.
   the effect of this (Erdağı Doğuer 2013: 123)
9. Ṣāliḥ devesin depele-(y)e

[6] These structures, namely possessive free genitives, appear only in a few examples where the head noun is actually a preposition such as "üzere". It is understood that these structures are specific only to prepositional phrases and are very rare.

Salih camel-3RD.POSS. beat-SUBJ.
He shall beat Salih's camel (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 130)

10. bu ḫabar Nūḥ ḳıṣṣa-sı-(n)-da yāẕ ḳıl-duġ-ı-dı
this word Nuh parable-3RD.POSS.-LOC. mention-PERF.-COP.-PAST.
We mentioned this word in Noah's parable. (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 473)

In OAT texts, there is not any possessive free genitive structure given as example (4).

It was mentioned above that the possessive phrase in (2) (possessive construction, namely "çocuk kalemi") has an indefinite and generic semantic content. The possessive construction structure, which is understood to be frequently used in OAT, can also be used to express definite and specific objects or situations in addition to its indefinite and generic semantic dimensions. The word "deve (camel)" mentioned in the possessive phrase given in (8) is not actually an indefinite or generic noun. The possessive construction "Sâlih devesi (Salih's camel)" in the current context above should be rendered as definite and specific one as the possessive construction in question can be translated into Standard Turkish as "Sâlih'in devesi". A possessive phrase with similar semantic qualities is also given in (11), (12) and (13):

11. Yaʿḳūb ve Mūsā tañrı-sı
Yakub and Musa god-3RD.POSS.
God of Yakup and Musa (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 321)

12. Mūsā tañrı-sı-n gör-e-m.
Musa god-3RD.POSS.-ACC. see-SUBJ.-1.PERS.
I shall see Musa's god. (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 260)

13. Yūsuf gevde-si-n
Yusuf body-3RD.POSS.-ACC.
Yusuf's body (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 268)

Similar to example (9), possessive constructions in example (11), (12) and (13) also correspond to specific and definite phrases. These possessive phrases, which are formally possessive constructions, can have a semantic content that corresponds to the genitive-possessive structures of Standard Turkish.

In parallel with the existence of two types of possessive phrases that can express specificity and definiteness in Standard Turkish, it is understood that two different possessive phrase structures with the same semantic qualities are frequently used in OAT. It is noteworthy that in addition to the genitive-possessive structure in OAT, the phrase structure called possessive construction and (namely indefinite nominal compound in Standard Turkish) is also preferred to express specificity and definiteness. Remember that the possessive construction used in Standard Turkish in addition to the genitive-possessive structure (to express the semantic features of specificity and definiteness) is possessive free genitives.

OAT non-genitive definite phrases, that is, possessive constructions, have some remarkable inflectional characteristics indicating that they are different from the (indefinite) possessive phrases of Standard Turkish. These characteristics also indicate that OAT possessive constructions in question should be considered as a kind of equivalent of genitive-possessive construction of the same historical period. I will briefly examine these characteristics.

5. Distinctive Characteristics of OAT Possessive Phrases

Although OAT possessive phrases appear to be the same as their Standard Turkish counterparts, they present different features than their Standard Turkish counterparts. In this section, the distinctive features of OAT possessive phrases will be discussed.

I will first start by explaining the morphological constraints of Standard Turkish possessive phrases.

5.1 Derivational Suffixes

Whenever Standard Turkish possessive phrases take derivational suffixes, the third person possessive suffix on the second word must be dropped. In other words, 3rd-person's possessive suffix is inversely exclusive with some derivational suffixes. Below are examples of Standard Turkish possessive phrases and their counterparts with the suffixes -lX and -sXz:

14. kitap sayfa-sı
    book page-3RD.POSS.
    book page

15. diş doktor-u
    tooth doctor-3RD.POSS.
    dentist

Inflecting the Standard Turkish possessive phrases above with derivational suffix -lX and -sXz respectively causes ungrammaticality due to presence of 3rd-person possessive suffix:

16. *kitap sayfa-sı-lı
    book page-3RD.POSS.-DERV.
    with book page (Bağrıaçık and Ralli 2014: 4)

17. *diş doktor-u-suz
    tooth doctor-3RD.POSS.-DERV.
    without dentist (Bağrıaçık and Ralli 2014: 4)

Combination of 3rd. person possessive suffix and -sXz seems to be unproblematic within possessive phrases in OAT texts indicating that the OAT possessive phrases should be treated distinctly of their Standard Turkish equivalents. (18) is a possessive phrase from OAT. In addition to expressing definiteness and specificity in terms of semantics, this example also indicates that some of the OAT

possessive phrases behave differently from its Standard Turkish equivalents in that it also allows the combination of 3rd. possessive+derivational suffix:

18. Dāvūd buyruġ-ı(n)-suz
    Davud order-3RD.POSS.-DERV.
    without Davud's order (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 359)

Notably, the derivational -sXz can be added to genitive-possessive structures, which supports the assumption that some of the OAT possessive phrase structures are equivalent to genitive-possessive in terms of semantics and morphological aspects. Remember that the possessive phrase structure in (18) above also has the -sXz suffix. Similar to (18), genitive-possessive constructions given in (19)-(21) below can also get the suffix -sXz:

19. sen-üñ şefāʿat-(u)ñ-suz
    your-GEN. intercession-2.POSS.-DERV.
    without your intercession (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 328)

20. ben-(ü)m rıżā-m ve ṭanışıġ-(u)m-suz
    I-GEN. consent-1.POSS. and approval-1.POSS.-DERV.
    without my consent and approval (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 303)

21. ben-(ü)m buyruġ-(u)m-suz
    I-GEN. command-1.POSS.-DERV.
    without my command (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 528)

Another topic distinguishing OAT possessive constructions from their Standard Turkish equivalents is their possibility of genitive suffix inflection. I will briefly examine the genitive suffix alternation in possessive constructions of OAT.

5.2 Genitive Suffix Alternation in OAT Possessive Constructions

It is impossible to inflect the first noun with a genitive suffix, provided that the indefinite and generic semantic features of the possessive phrase are preserved in Standard Turkish possessive phrases. When it is done so, they turn into possessive phrases with their specific and definite semantics suitable for distinct context. On the other hand, it is noteworthy that the first noun of some possessive phrases (which also have definite and specific meanings such as the genitive-possessive structure) in OAT can also get the genitive suffix, which is not possible in Standard Turkish, as mentioned above. OAT examples between (19)-(24) show the dual variation of some possessive phrases, namely with the same phrases with bare and genitive specifiers respectively:

19. Mūsā ana-sı Mūsā-(y)ı gizlü doġur-dı.
    Musa mother-3RD.POSS. Musa-ACC. secret give birth-past
    Musa's mother gave birth to Musa in secret. (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 237)

20. Mūsā ana-sı ḳapu-sı(n)-a gel-di-ler
    Musa mother-3RD.POSS. door-3RD.POSS.-DAT. come-PAST-PLU.
    kim gir-e-ler **Mūsā-(n)uñ** **ana-sı** üzere.
    that enter-SUBJ.-3RD.PERS.PLU. Musa-GEN. mother-3RD.POSS. upon

They came to Musa's mother's door to enter after her. (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 239)

21. Tañrı buyruġ-ı-n dutup var-dı-lar.
God command-3RD.POSS.-ACC. fulfill go-PAST-3RD.PERS.PLU.
They went in accordance with God's command. (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 252)

22. **Tañrı-(n)ıñ buyruġ-ı-n** yirine getür-dü-ñ.
God-GEN. command-3RD.POSS.-ACC. fulfill-PAST-2.PERS.
You fulfilled God's command. (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 414)

23. Ṣāliḥ deve-si-n
Salih camel-3RD.POSS.-ACC.
Salih's camel (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 130)

24. **Ṣāliḥ-(ü)ñ deve-si-n**
Salih-GEN. camel-3RD.POSS.-ACC.
Salih's camel (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 131)

(19), (21) and (23) draw attention as examples where the possessive constructions written as bolt letters in (20), (22) and (24) can also take the genitive suffix while retaining their semantic and functional qualities.

5.3 Modification of the Head Noun

Another proof that some possessive phrases in OAT texts are different from their counterparts in Standard Turkish is the modification possibilities of the phrase. Standard Turkish possessive phrases can only be modified as a whole and the second noun cannot also get an adjective on its own, as shown in (25) and (26) below.

25. mavi çocuk kalem-i
blue child pen-3RD.POSS.
blue children's pen

26. çocuk *mavi kalem-i
child blue pen-3RD.POSS.
children's blue pen

On the other hand, in addition to the genitive-possessive structure, the second word of possessive phrases can also be modified independently. It is quite interesting that adjectives can intervene between first and second nouns of the possessive construction in OAT examples (27) and (28) as well as in (29). Note that the phrase in (29) differs from (27) and (28) as a genitive-possessive construction:

27. Ḳabil ḳız ḳardaş-ı[7]
Kabil female sibling-3RD.POSS.
Kabil's sister (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 103)

28. Habil kız karındaş-ı
Habil female sibling-3RD.POSS.
Habil's sister (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 103)

29. Mūsā-nuñ ḳız ḳardaş-ı
Musa-GEN. female sibling-3RD.POSS.
Musa's sister (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 239)

The possessive phrases given above can only be translated into Standard Turkish respectively as *Kabil'in kız kardeşi* and *Habil'in kız kardeşi* (namely as genitive-possessive structures).

OAT genitive-possessive and possessive constructions are similar in that they can be established with partitive pronouns as well. We can now turn to the phrases with partitive pronouns as being in possessor positions.

5.4 Phrases with Partitive Pronouns

As pronouns that express a distinctive part from whole, partitive pronouns are generally formed in Standard Turkish through numeric nouns and possessive suffixes, such as "ikimiz, birimiz". In Standard Turkish, phrases with partitive pronouns in the possessor position can only be formed as the genitive-possessive structure. The presence of such pronouns in the possessor position of Standard Turkish possessive constructions causes ungrammaticality, as shown in (30) and (31) below:

30. iki-miz-in ödev-i
two-2.POSS.(PLU).-GEN. homework-3RD.POSS.
homework of both of us

31. *iki-miz ödev-i
two-2.POSS.(PLU). homework-3RD.POSS.
homework of both of us

It is noteworthy that phrases with partitive pronouns, which are frequently used in OAT texts, can also be formed as possessive constructions, unlike Standard Turkish. It should also be considered as another indication that some possessive constructions of the OAT period can behave just like genitive-possessives in terms of some syntactic constraints at least. While a genitive-possessive structure is seen

[7] It can be said that the phrase here is not a rigid compound noun in OAT texts. It is thought that this phrase is an adjective phrase. In fact, similar to the phrase *ḳız ḳardaş*, there are also examples such as *er ḳardaş*. Additionally, adjective phrases such as *ḳız oğlan*, in which the word *ḳız* is used as an adjective, are also frequently encountered.

in (32); (33) and (34) exemplify the possessive construction structures formed with the partitive pronouns:

32. ol iki-(n)üñ göz-i
that two-GEN. eye-3RD.POSS.
the eyes of those two (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 97)

33. ol iki hazine-ler-i-n
that two treasure-PLU.-3RD.POSS.-ACC.
the treasures of those two (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 299)

34. siz iki ara-sı(n)-da
you two intermediate point-3RD.POSS.-LOC.
between you two (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 361)

So far, it has been emphasized that OAT possessive constructions show similar characteristics with genitive-possessives of the same period in terms of some inflectional and modificational possibilities. These characteristics of OAT possessive constructions also indicate that they should be considered different than that of Standard Turkish. On the other hand, some examples draw attention as arguments that OAT possessive constructions are not exactly the same as the genitive-possessives of the same period. Now I will briefly examine the word order variations of genitive-possessives and possessive constructions.

5.5 Word Order

One of the signs that possessive constructions expressing definiteness and specificity may be structurally different from genitive-possessive phrases comes from word order. It is understood that the positions of possessor and possessee in genitive-possessive structures can be replaced, that is, contrary to the standard of the period, the possessor can be moved to the right end of possessee in OAT texts[8]. No possessive construction with the above-mentioned inverted word order can be encountered in the OAT texts on the other hand. Genitive-possessive phrases with the above-mentioned inverted word order can be seen in (35), in which the possessee "yüzleri" comes before the multiple possessors with genitive suffixes. Note that there is no example of possessive construction with the same kind of word order in the same texts:

35. Yüz-ler-i ulu-sı-nuñ giçi-si-nüñ irkeg-i-nüñ
face-PLU.-3RD.POSS. elder-3RD.POSS. younger-3RD.POSS.-GEN. male-3RD.POSS.-GEN.

dişi-si-nüñ zaʿferān gibi ṣapṣaru ol-dı.
female-3RD.POSS.-GEN. saffron like very pale become-PAST

The faces of the elder, the younger, the male, and the female turned very pale. (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 132)

[8] It is noteworthy that in genitive-possessive structures, the possessee can be dropped, although rarely. Such phrases, which are not in possible with bare possessor, are often formed with the pronoun "bu".

In summary, although OAT possessive constructions can often express the same semantic features as genitive-possessive constructions of the same period, they behave more restricted than genitive-possessive phrases in terms of word order possibilities as seen in (35) above.

So far, it has been emphasized that some of the OAT Turkish possessive phrases are different from their Standard Turkish equivalents in terms of morphology and semantics. The fact that some of the possessive constructions (e.g. phrases such as "çocuk kalemi") in OAT can also express definiteness and specificity allows two interpretations of genitive inflection in the OAT texts. First, the genitive is not a suffix that functions to express specificity and definiteness, unlike Standard Turkish[9]. Secondly, the possessive suffix behaves differently from Standard Turkish as it does not trigger the genitive suffix. I will now briefly examine the complex possessive phrases, which is another evidence that the correlation between the possessive category and genitive inflection is very loose in OAT.

6. Complex Possessive Phrases in OAT Texts

Complex possessive phrases can be defined as the name given to larger phrases that contain a possessive phrase.

Examining the genitive inflection in Yakut, Baker (2011:1175) emphasized that possessive phrases in Yakut can be formed without a genitive suffix and suggested that the genitive suffix is about to disappear in the above-mentioned Turkic language. He pointed out that the complex possessive phrases in Yakut, which are in the process of losing the genitive suffix, on the other hand, must have the genitive suffix.

OAT complex possessive phrases in which the first and second or only the second noun takes the genitive suffix are frequently encountered, as in Standard Turkish. In fact, what is remarkable in OAT texts is that complex possessive phrases in which both possessee nouns are bare are also notably common. In this respect, complex possessive phrases in OAT are quite interesting. OAT phrases between (36) and (38) exemplify the complex possessive phrases with genitive and bare possessees respectively:

36. maḫlūḳ-uñ cümle-si-(n)üñ beñdeş-i
creature-GEN. all-3RD.POSS.-GEN. match-3RD.POSS.
all of the creature's match (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 74)

37. Yūsuf-uñ yaş-ı giçilig-i-n
Yusuf-GEN. age-3RD.POSS. young-3RD.POSS.-ACC.
Yusuf's young age (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 193)

38. İbrahim ayaġ-ı iz-i-n
İbrahim foot-3RD.POSS. trace-3RD.POSS.-ACC.
İbrahim's footprint (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 146)

[9] Öztürk (2005) suggest that the genitive suffix is used with specificity and definiteness functions in Standard Turkish.

39. Birisi buġday ḫırmen-i yir-i düş-i(n)-e gel-di.
Someone wheat blend-3RD.POSS. place-3RD.POSS. across-3RD.POSS.-DAT. come-PAST
Someone came across the wheat blend place. (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 229)

There is a genitive suffix on both the first and second nouns in the complex possessive phrase in (36). On the other hand, while there is a genitive suffix only on the first noun in (37), there is no genitive suffix at all in the example in (38). It is interesting that although there is a possessive construction ("İbrahim ayağı" that can be translated as "İbrahim'in ayağı" in Standard Turkish) within the complex possessive phrase in (38), which should be translated into Standard Turkish with a genitive-possessive structure (just as mentioned above), there is no genitive suffix. The absence of a genitive suffix, especially in complex possessive phrases such as (38) and (39), indicates that the genitive suffix shows a very loose correlation with the possessive suffix in OAT. It should be noted that complex possessive phrases similar to (38) and (39) cannot be formed without the genitive suffix in Standard Turkish provided that the same semantic qualities are retained.

Another indicator that the correlation between possessive suffixes and genitive inflection as an agreement pattern is quite loose, that the possessive suffix does not trigger the genitive inflection, and that these uses are standardized is the subordinate clauses. So much so that the agreement patterns in possessive phrases are directly reflected in subordinate clauses. Now I will briefly examine the subordinate clauses in OAT in terms of agreement patterns.

6.1 Subordinate Clauses in OAT Texts

Clause types that present a more consistent structure of agreement patterns are nominal and relative clauses. For this reason, only nominal and relative clause examples will be included in this section.

The subject argument generally gets the genitive suffix in object relative clauses of OAT[10]. On the other hand, it is noteworthy that relative clauses in which the subject is bare encountered as common as clauses with genitive subjects:

40. sen-üñ işle-düg-üñ ʿamel
you-GEN. do-PTPL.-GEN. deed
the deed that is done by you (Mudara 2024: 109)

41. Tañrı taʿālâ yarat-duġ-ı ṭaʿām-lar
god swt create-PTPL.-3RD.POSS. food-PLU.
the foods that was created by god (Mudara 2024: 107)

42. müsülmân-lar boġuzla-duġ-ı
muslim-PLU. throttle-PTPL.-3RD.POSS.
the person who was slaughtered by muslims (Akkuş 1995: 355)

[10] The observation here is my own. I have not come across an information of a study devoted to the case inflection of the subjects of subordinate clauses. It is noteworthy that in OAT subordinate clauses, the subject can both get bare and genitive cases as well.

The subject of clause (40) gets the genitive suffix, just like in Standard Turkish. On the other hand, while the subject is bare in the full relative clause in (41), it is noteworthy that the subject is bare in (42), which is a headless relative clause.

Nominal clauses almost show the same characteristics as relative clauses in terms of subject inflection. (43)-(45) below exemplify OAT noun clauses.

43. bu ḳavm-uñ küfr-e dön-meg-i(n)-den
this nation-GEN. renunciation-DAT. return-NOM.-3RD.POSS.-ABL.

ḳork-ma-sa-du-m…
worry-NEG.-CON.-PAST-1.PERS.

If I wasn't afraid of this nation turning into unbelievers... (Yılmaz et al. 2013: 153)

44. kâbin ne kadar i-düg-i-n
dowry how much cop.-NOM.-3RD.POSS.-ACC.
how much the dowry is… (Akkuş 1995: 330)

45. İnan-du-m ʿamel-ler ṭart-(ı)l-duġ-ı-(n)a.
believe-PAST-1.PERS. action-PLU. weigh-PASV.-NOM.-3RD.POSS.-DAT.
I believe that deeds are weighed. (Mudara 2024: 104)

While the subject of the nominal clause in (43) is inflected with a genitive suffix, it is seen that the subjects of the clause in (44) and (45) do not receive any suffixes, that is, they are bare. The bare subjects in the examples from (40) to (45) are not marginal but are frequent examples that should be the reflection of general language use.

7. Conclusion

In this study, possessive phrase types in OAT were examined in comparison with Standard Turkish possessive phrases. Some possessive constructions in OAT (e.g. "çocuk kalemi") can also express specificity and definiteness, unlike Standard Turkish. Therefore, possessive constructions of the type mentioned above can often be used instead of genitive-possessive phrases in texts of the period. The basic figure below shows which structure of OAT emerged for Standard Turkish possessive phrases:

Standard Turkish genitive-possessives	**Standard Turkish possessive constructions**	**Standard Turkish possessive-free genitives**
OAT genitive-possessives	**OAT possessive constructions**	**-**
OAT possessive constructions		

The first two types of the phrases, which can be used interchangeably according to the above-given chart, share many points in common in OAT. Inflectional and modificational possibilities are among the features in which the two types of phrases show similar characteristics. Combination of 3rd. person possessive

suffix and -sXz seems to be unproblematic within possessive phrases in OAT. OAT possessive phrases show the dual variation in terms of their specifier case suffix, namely both the bare and the genitive specifiers being possible with same semantic and functional features. Moreover, that adjectives can intervene between first and second nouns is not only valid for genitive-possessives but also for possessive constructions. The above-mentioned classification of OAT possessive phrases refers to two additional conclusions. First, the existence of the possessive suffix does not necessitate the genitive suffix. The second, genitive suffix does not have a function of marking specificity. However, it is noteworthy that there are some differences between possessive constructions and genitive-possessive structures that can express definiteness and specificity. The most important of these differences is the word order possibilities. For instance, possessee noun cannot occur before possesser in possessive phrase while this is possible in genitive-possessive phrases, on the other hand. These phrases also need to be examined in more detail using the generative grammar method in order to understand their deep structures.

Abbreviations

1.PERS.	1. person suffix	GEN.	genitive case
3RD.PERS.	3rd. person suffix	LOC.	locative
3RD.POSS.	3rd. person possessive suffix	NEG.	negation.
ABL.	ablative	NOM.	nominalizer
ACC.	accusative	PASV.	passive
CON.	conditional	PERF.	perfective
COP.	copula	PLU.	plural
DAT.	dative	PTPL.	participle
DERV.	derivative	SUBJ.	subjunctive

Kaynakça

AKKUŞ, Muzaffer. (1995). *Kitab-ı Ġunya*. Ankara: TDK Yayınları.

BAGRIAÇIK, Metin; RALLI, Angela. (2014). "NN-sI concatenations in Turkish: construct state nominals and phrasal compounds". MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, 2014: 13-24.

BAKER, Mark; VINOKUROVA, Nadya. (2010). "Two modalities of case assignment: case in Sakha". Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, 28: 593–642.

ÇAKIR, Sinan. (2023). "Some Observations On The Nominal Compounds In Turkish". Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 19(1): 48-60.

ERDAĞI DOĞUER, Binnur. (2013). *Tuhfe-i Mübarizi: Metin-Sözlük*. Ankara: TDK Yayınları.

GÖKDAYI, Hürriyet. (2007). "Takısız ad tamlamaları". Turcology in Turkey: Selected papers (Edt. László Károly, Nurettin Demir, and Emine Yılmaz). Szeged: SzTE BTK Altjisztikai Tanszék, 243–252.

GÖKSEL, Aslı; KERSLAKE, Celia. (2005). Turkish Grammar. Routledge, London.

GÖKSEL, Aslı. (2009). "Compounds in Turkish". Lingua e Linguaggio, 8: 213–236.

KORNFILT, Jaklin. (1997). *Turkish*. London: Routledge.

KUNDURACI, Aysun. (2013). *Turkish Noun-Noun Compounds: A Process-Based Paradigmatic Account*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Calgary.

KUNDURACI, Aysun. (2015). "Türkçede Aitlik Ulamı ve Biçimsel İfadesi". Dilbilim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 26(1): 43-62.

LEWIS, Geoffrey. (1967). *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

MUDARA, Cansu Damla. (2024). *XIV. Yüzyıla Ait Risâletü'l-İslâm Adlı Eserin 1b-40a Yaprakları Üzerinde Dil İncelemesi (Giriş-İnceleme-Metin-Dizin)*. Master Thesis. İstanbul Üniversitesi.

ÖZSOY, Ayşe Sumru. (1994). "Türkçe'de Ortaç Yapısı". Dilbilim Araştırmaları 1994: 21-30.

ÖZTÜRK, Balkıs. (2005). *Case, Referentiality and Phrase Structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins-Linguistik Aktuell.

ÖZTÜRK, Balkıs; TAYLAN, Eser. (2016). "Possessive Constructions in Turkish", Lingua, 182: 88-108.

SATIK, Deniz. (2020). "Turkic Genitive Case and Agreement Asymmetries". Harvard University Manuscripts.

SWIFT, Lloyd. (1963). *A Reference Grammar of Modern Turkish*. Bloomington: Indiana University Publications.

TURAN, Fikret. (1996). *Old Anatolian Turkish: Syntactic Structure*. Ph.D. dissertation. Harvard University.

VAN SCHAAIK, Gerjan. (1992). "The treatment of Turkish compounds in FG". In Layered structure and reference in a functional perspective (Edt. Michael Foretscue, Peter Harder, and Lars Kristoffersen). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 231–252.

YILMAZ, Emine; DEMİR, Nurettin; KÜÇÜK, Murat. (2013). *Kısas-ı Enbiya, Türk Dil Kurumu Nüshası, Metin-Sözlük-Dizin, Notlar*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.

YÜKSEKER, Hitay. (1998). "Turkish Possessive Compounds", In Proceedings of the First Mediterranean Conference on Morphology (Edt. G. Booij, A. Ralli, S. Scalise). Greece: University of Patras. 153-164.

YÜKSEKER, Hitay. (1987). "Turkish nominal compounds". In Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics 7 (Edt. P. Avery, H. Yükseker). Toronto: Department of Linguistics, University of Toronto. 83-102.