

# Finite Verb Forms in a 17<sup>th</sup> Century Turkic Historical Text: Qādir ‘Ali beg’s ‘Compendium of Chronicles’\*

Guldana Togabayeva

## Introduction

The *Jāmi‘ at-Tawārīḥ* ‘Compendium of Chronicles’ was written by Qādir ‘Ali beg bin Hošum beg Jālāyirī in 1602, probably in the Kasim Khanate (1452–1681), vassal state of the Russian Tsardom during the rule of Uraz-Muhammed khan. The text is written in Turkī or Chagatay<sup>1</sup> literary language with Arabic script and is dedicated to the Russian tsar Boris Fyodorovich Godunov. In the following, I will refer to *Jāmi‘ at-Tawārīḥ* ‘Compendium of Chronicles’ shortly as ‘Compendium’ and Qādir ‘Ali beg bin Hošum beg Jālāyirī as QAB.

QAB’s manuscript was first published by Ilya Nikolayevich Berezin. It has an identical title with the work *Jāmi‘ at-Tawārīḥ* ‘Compendium of Chronicles’ written by the Persian historian Rašīd ad-Dīn (in the following, RAD) (1247-1318). The reason for this was that the main part of QAB’s work contained a translation of RAD’s work.

There are two known manuscripts and three fragments of QAB’s ‘Compendium’. Both of the manuscripts supposed to be later copies of the one written in 1602. Both of the manuscripts are incomplete, however, they complement each other.

The first copy was discovered by Ibrahim Khalfin, a lecturer of the Tatar language of the Kazan University. The circumstances of his discovery are unclear. The manuscript was preserved in the library of Kazan University under №10422. After the closure of the Eastern Faculty of Kazan University in 1854, the manuscript was taken

---

\* I would like to thank Dr. Balázs Danka for his comments and remarks on this paper.

1 The term *Čagatay* ‘Chagatay’ is traditionally used to define the literary written language of the Turks of Central Asia in the 15<sup>th</sup> – 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. Benedek Péri reviewed the sources that are called *Čagatay* and paid attention that authors of those works’ languages called them *Türkī*, *Türkçe*, *Türk dili*, *Türk elfāzi*. Even Abūl al-Ġāzī – whose works traditionally considered *Čagatay* – called the language *Türkī/ Turkī*. According to Péri’s investigation, the term *Čagatay* authors usually used for the exalted literary style (Péri 2002: 250–254). It was not merely written language by peoples who spoke very different Turkic languages and dialects, but was a *lingua franca*. There is a strong influence of local languages on *Čagatay* from the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Several modern Turkic languages consider *Čagatay* as their predecessor (Kincses-Nagy 2018). The question of naming the written Turkic manuscripts is still open nowadays.

to St. Petersburg (Rahim 2008: 195). It is preserved nowadays in the library of the Department of Oriental Studies of St. Petersburg University (MsO. 59), and is called St. Petersburg's manuscript. It contains 157 folios with 11 lines on each page. The date of compilation is 1051 by Hijra (1641–1642). The chapter titles are written with red ink. The proper names are also underlined with red.

The second copy was discovered by Muhammetgali Gabderahimov, more known as Gali or Ali Rahim in 1922 among the books bequeathed by the Kazan mullah Galeev-Barudi to the Central Eastern Library in Kazan. This manuscript likely belonged to the Shakulovs – an aristocratic family from the Kasim Khanate – and was brought from the city of Kasimov (Rahim 2008: 196–197). The manuscript consists of 81 folios with 17 lines on each page. The headings and some important proper names are written with red ink. The date of its compilation is 1144 by Hijra (1732). This manuscript is preserved in the Kazan library of Oriental books (T. 40). It is called Kazan manuscript. The last 20 folios of the Kazan manuscript are titled *Dāftār-i Čingiz-nāmā* (Rahim 2008: 199–200).

One fragment of 'Compendium' was found by Rahim in the Tatar village of Kyskary (Rahim 2008: 212–213). This folio contains a fragment about the life of Haji Giray (1397–1466), the first Crimean khan (1441–1466). Two other fragments are preserved in the British library. Charles Rieu – the compiler of the catalogue of British Library – mentions only about one fragment in British library under inventory number 11, 726 (Rieu 1888: 182–183). However, Rieu described another manuscript under the inventory number 11, 725 (Rieu 1888: 181–182), which is also a fragment of the translation of Rašid ad-Dīn's *Jāmi' at-Tawārīḥ* by QAB.

There are two more manuscripts registered under the authorship of Qādir 'Ali beg:

(1) A manuscript in Berlin (Hofman 1969: 115). The number of this manuscript was not indicated by Hoffman. After him researchers found it difficult to confirm its existence due to the lack of a manuscript's number. It is likely that Hoffman wrote about the manuscript, which is currently kept in Berlin State Library as *Historia Dschingischani* (Web1).

(2) A manuscript in Paris. This manuscript is preserved under Suppl. Turc 758 in the National Library of France (Hofman 1969: 115). Edgar Blochet – the compiler of the catalogue of oriental manuscripts at the National Library of France – attributes that manuscript to QAB (Blochet 1933: 57–58), however, it is more likely that it belongs to another author (Alimov 2018: 256; Nagamine 2019: 119).

The high-resolution colored photographs of the St. Petersburg's manuscript I used for the present paper, are accessible in the Research Repository of St. Petersburg State University (Web2). The text of that manuscript can be divided into the following parts:

I. The introduction and dedication to Boris Godunov (1598-1605) (f.1r–6r).

II. An abridged Turkic translation of the Persian chronicle of the same title *Jāmi' at-Tawārīḥ*, written by and concentrated on the genealogy of Oghuz khan, ancestors of Chinggis khan, Chinggis khan himself and his descendants (f.6r–142r).

III. The last part of QAB's 'Compendium' consists of 9 autographic chapters, ranging from Urus khan to his descendant Uraz Muhammed khan (f.142r–157v). The folios of the third part are in the wrong order starting at a folio 148. These last nine chapters are based on the steppe oral historical tradition (Ivanics 2017: 43).

The text of St. Petersburg's manuscript was investigated better than Kazan's. The descriptions of these two works were made by Usmanov (1972). Another edition was published by Syzdykova (1989) with Cyrillic transcription. This work includes the description of historical and linguistic features of the text in Russian. Two years later one more edition was made by Syzdykova and Kojgeldiev (1991) in Kazakh. This latter includes a Kazakh translation of the first and third parts of the text. The most recent full translation into Kazakh is made by Mingulov, Komekov, Oteniyazov (1997).

There are several partial and a full translation of 'Compendium' into Kazakh, and a partial translation of several chapters into Russian. Since some parts of the text are difficult to understand, the translations are far from being accurate and more or less differ from each other. A detailed grammatical analysis is needed. As a first step, I will investigate viewpoint operators on finite verbal predicates which are presented in the past and non-past temporal strata in narration of the 'Compendium'. A similar investigation was carried out by Balázs Danka on – *The 'Pagan' Oguz-nāmā* (Danka 2019) – a text which represents an earlier variety of the language in 'Compendium'. In this paper, the finite verb forms will be used from the St. Petersburg's manuscript. The base of comparison for the corpus will be Eckmann's (Eckmann 1966) and Bodrogligeti's (Bodrogligeti 2001) grammars.

## 1. Theoretical framework

Finite verbal predicates are analyzed in the theoretical framework based on the works of Johanson (1971, 1999, 2000), Csató-Johanson (2020), Nevskaya (2005) and Danka (2019) in Turkic languages. The methodology is data-oriented. Lars Johanson's framework classifies viewpoint operators which are based on aspect and focality.

Aspect is a grammatical category of verbs displaying the internal temporal constitution of a situation in a different way (Comrie 1989: 3). Aspect characterizes the action itself or the state from the point of view of its course in time by regardless of the moment of speech. In Turkic languages aspect is expressed by analytic forms. It means that they are based on non-finite verbs and finite auxiliary verbs. Aspect in the 'Compendium' can be classified in the following:

### **Postterminality (±POST)**

Postterminality "focuses the attention on a situation obtaining beyond the relevant limit, where the event, whether totally or partially past, is still relevant in one way or another..." (Johanson 2000: 103). It means that the event is entirely or partly already out of sight, but have left traces observable in the moment of speech.

**Intraterminality (±INTRA)**

Intraterminality describes the event from the internal point of view, after its beginning and before its end. Nonintraterminality as opposed to intraterminality does not present the event from the inside point of view, but rather present it from outside, without special regard to its limits. Intraterminality signs an orientation interval for the event, while nonintraterminality denotes the very event (Johanson 2000: 76–77).

**Prospectivity (±PRO)**

‘Prospective’ is understood as a future action which is already presented in the moment of speaking before its occurrence. According to Nevskaya, “In modern linguistic literature, the term ‘prospective’ is met alongside the terms ‘immediate/imminent future’, ‘near/nearest future’ or ‘proximative’ referring to this category.” (Nevskaya 2005: 112).

**Focality (HF, LF and NF)**

Focality implies the state of being located around a focus and showing lower or higher degrees of inner notion of verb. Focality demonstrates the narrowness of the speaker’s viewpoint on the event. Focality may have Focal, i.e. High Focal (HF) and Low Focal (LF) as well as Non-Focal (NF) values (Johanson 2000: 38).

Several discourse types are found in the manuscript with respect to temporal strata oppositions (Johanson 1971: 76–87). One of the main concepts observed by the discourse types in ‘Compendium’ is a minimal pair.<sup>2</sup>

**2. Preliminary notes**

The predicate is usually found at the end of the indicative sentence in Turkic languages. Nominal predicates are always provided with copula verb *ēr-di* in the past (ex.1). *-DI* is the base for narrative discourse type and is limited to a single event. The finite verb forms of nominal predicates are almost always provided by the copula *dur/turur* (ex.2-3) or on a similar form of *ēr-ür* ‘to be’ (ex.4) in the non-past. The former goes back to *tur-ur* ‘to stand, to stop’. According to Baskakov, the copulas *turur* and *ērür* can be synonymously interchangeable (Baskakov 1971: 49).

(1) f.143r/7 *musa begniñ oğli **ērdi***<sup>3</sup>  
 ‘[He] **was** the son of Musa beg.’  
*ēr[di]*  
*be[PAST]*

<sup>2</sup> Traditionally, a minimal pair is a concept used in phonology (Crystal 2008: 307). In this paper the term ‘minimal pair’ will be used to two finite verbal constructions where there is only one morphosyntactic and semantic difference between two forms.

<sup>3</sup> The predicates will be highlighted with bold letters in the example sentences and the translation to clarify which parts correspond to the parts.

(2) f.1r/6–7 *jümlet al-kristiān pādišāh hazretleri barış fyodorāvič uluğ beg aq hān d<sup>o</sup>r<sup>4</sup>*  
 ‘The majestic ruler of all Christians Boris Fyodorovich **is** the great lord and white  
 khan.’

*d<sup>o</sup>r*  
*stand[Ø]*

(3) f.144v/5–6 *šāh butaq sultānniñ oğli šeybaq hān turur*  
 ‘The son of Shah Butaq **is** Sheybaq khan.’

*tur[ur]*  
*stand[PRS]*

(4) f.157v/6–7 *aniñ oğli jalayir saba erür*  
 ‘His son **is** Jalayir Saba.’

*er[ür]*  
*be[PRS]*

Sometimes the copula can be dropped in the non-past. Although a nominal predicate is usually represented by copulas, zero copula construction is typical for most modern Turkic languages (Baskakov 1971: 49), e.g. in modern Kazakh, nominal predicates do not require a copula in the non-past (Balakayev 1954: 425). A nominal predicate in third person singular usually has a copula, in *Jāmi* ‘*at-Tawārīḥ*’s corpus, but can also be omitted:

(5) f.144v/6 *aniñ oğli tēmür*  
 ‘His son **is** Timur.’

Ø

The past tense expresses a completed action in the past which certainly happened. The grammatical marker of past is *-DI* (ex.6). The negation of past is expressed by marker *-MA-* before past tense marker *-DI* (ex.7) (Bodrogligeti 2001:186).

(6) f.144r/3 *hajī muḥammed ulanni manşur beg hānladi*  
 ‘Mansur Beg **enthroned** Hajī Muhammed Ulan.’

*hānla[dī]*  
*enthroned[PAST]*

(7) f.142v/11 *aniñ neslidin hič kim qalmadı*  
 ‘**None** of his descendant **remained**.’

*qal[ma][dī]*  
*remain[NEG][PAST]*

Non-past in Turkic languages is expressed by the Aorist. Aorist describes an action or a state which is not bound to a specific time or to a concrete location. This permits the speaker or the writer to use the Aorist in a great variety of functions. The Aorist is formed from verbal nouns in *-(<sup>o</sup>)r* and negation in *-mAs* (Bodrogligeti 2001: 203). Example (8) indicates present simple, while example (9) in negation indicates future:

4 I used the sign <sup>o</sup> for an unwritten vowel.

(8) f.143v/1–2 *andin üj börte çıqar*  
 ‘Three beams<sup>5</sup> **go out** from it (river).’  
*çıq[ar]*  
*go out[AOR]*

(9) f.5r/11–5v/1 *hazīneñde hiç mālīñ tügenmes*  
 ‘Your wealth **will not be depleted** in your treasury.’  
*tügen[mes]*  
*deplete[AOR NEG]*

### 3. Aspect

Tense combined with viewpoint operators create the finite verb forms. ‘Compendium’ is written predominantly in a narrative discourse type. The corpus is mostly presented in the past, usually based on the suffix *-DI*. Non-past is found in a smaller proportion. It expresses anything but past by the basic morpheme *-(°)r* and copula *-tur/ turur*. Past *-DI* and non-past *-(°)r* complement each other. These two together cover all the possible tense options, e.g. anteriority can be marked by past and/or postterminal aspect and non-past together with aspect can provide continuous or future meaning by intraterminality and prospectivity, respectively.

#### 3.1 Intraterminality

The intraterminal viewpoint operators in ‘Compendium’ are based on the participle form (Aorist) of the Turkic verb and its negation.

##### 3.1.1 Intraterminality in the past +PAST(+INTRA)

Intraterminality is very commonly represented in ‘Compendium’. Intraterminal items may present different events in text. The most important event in the narrative discourse are used to describe overlapping events, denoting an event that has already begun and is taking place when another event begins (Johanson 2000: 80). Such verbal constructions are translated with English ‘Past continuous’. See examples (10, 12):

(10) f.142v/8–9 *toqtayğa alīb kèle turur érdi yolda oq öldi*  
 ‘While (he) **was just bringing** (him) to Tokhtay, (he) suddenly died on the way.’  
*alīb kél<sup>6</sup>[e tur][ur ér][di]*  
*bring[CONV.INTRA COP.PRS][AOR COP.][PAST]*

There are numerous number of actional meanings in Kipchak Turkic languages, which are expressed by converb markers and auxiliary verbs. In these languages the creation of viewpoint operators from the actional are observed, e.g. actional marker

5 Beam (geographical) is a dry valley with soddy slopes which form dry waterbeds.

6 Here *alīb kél-* is lexicalized construction: lit. ‘to take and come’ > ‘to bring’.

of continuation, constancy and durativity *-A tur/ -A turur* can be generalized to the intraterminality. Here is HF past intraterminal in *-A turur êrdi* ‘was just X-ing’ in the example (10) which corresponds to NF past intraterminals in *-A êrdi* (Johanson 1999: 173–177) and opposes to an assumed LF construction *-(°)r êrdi* as shown in the example below (ex.11).

(11) f.144v/3 *keseniñ bir yağidin bir[i] ‘eselni içer êrdi*  
 ‘One [of them] **drank** the honey from one side of cup.’  
*iç[êr êr][di]*  
*drink[AOR COP.][PAST]*

The negative counterpart of intraterminal viewpoint operator is *-mA-s êrdi*:

(12) f.156r/10–11 *dāyim keçe kündüz bir kese mey içse anı yād qılmay içmes êrdi*  
 ‘When(ever he) drank a cup of wine during the long days and nights, (he) **was not drinking** without remembering him (i.e. Godunov).’  
*iç[mes êr][di]*  
*drink[NEG. AOR COP.][PAST]*

### 3.1.2 Intraterminality in the non-past *-PAST(+INTRA)*

Intraterminality in the non-past describes the event’s internal point of view in the present and future tenses. The examples below (ex.13-14) are expressed by a simple *-(°)r*. But they are not just present simples, otherwise examples could not be intraterminal. So here verbs display focality degrees along with intraterminality. Examples are based on non-focal intraterminals in the non-past and are translated – among others – with English ‘Present simple’ (i.e. but not necessarily, because *tügenmes* for example, is translated with future (ex.9)).

(13) f.146r/7–8 *anıñ hikāyetleri öz dāstānıda her yerde kēlür*  
 ‘His stories **come** in every place in his own dastan.’  
*kēl[ür]*  
*come[AOR]*

In Qādir ‘Ali beg’s *Jāmi‘ at-Tawārīḥ* ‘Compendium’ the negative *-mA-s* marker was attested in third person singular.

(14) f.4v/10 *kim seni köre almas*<sup>7</sup>

‘Those who **envy** you.’

*kör[e al][mas]*

*see[CONV.INTRA AUX.al-][AOR NEG]*

*envy[AOR NEG]*

### 3.2 Postterminality

Postterminality is widely used in the ‘Compendium’. It shows events in the past that were completed up to a certain time in the past, while in the non-past, shows the relevant limit of the event before the time of speech. The minimal pairs of postterminality in ‘Compendium’ indicate Past perfect and Present Perfect, respectively.

#### 3.2.1 Postterminality in the past +PAST(+POST)

Postterminality in the past can be divided into two groups. The first one is based on the converb *-(l)p* and the past tense copula *érdi* (ex.15–16). The second group is based on past participle *-GAn* and the copula *érdi* (ex.17–18).

(15) f.145r/3–4 *özleri bir neçe nökerleri bilen **yatüb érdi***

‘They (themselves) **had layed** with some companions’

*yat[üb ér][di]*

*lay[CONV.POST COP ér-][PAST]*

(16) f.157v/2 *jeñgizdin bu zamānga dēg[g]eǰ ne jaqlı pādışāhlar hānlar **ötüb érdi***

‘Different padishahs and khans **had passed** from Genghis to this day.’

*öt[üb ér][di]*

*pass[CONV.POST COP.ér-][PAST]*

(17) f.143r/1–2 *musa bile yamğurǰı bir anadın **tuğ[ğ]an érdi***

‘Musa and Yamğurǰı **was born** from one mother’

*tuğ[ğan ér][di]*

*born[PART.POST COP ér-][PAST]*

(18) f.144v/4–5 *Bir vaqıt[da] biri hān biri beg **bolub yürügen érdi***

‘One of them **had been** a khan, the other one a beg in the same time.’

*bol[ub yürü][gen ér][di]*

*be[CONV.POST AUX. yürü-][PART.POST COP ér-][PAST]*

7 The predicate in the sentence is built by construction *-A al-* which belongs to modality and expresses possibility (Rentzsch 2015: 92). It is a language specific thing how the verb *köre almas* is expressed. In Kazakh it means ‘to envy’ (KED 2008: 416), therefore I use this translation for this verb. It is the combination *kör-* ‘to see’ and operator of modality, literally ‘cannot see’. This meaning is secondary in Turkic, and structurally it is a negative construction. However, according to Abish, the form based on a converb in *-A* and postverb *al-* ‘to take’ is an inherent property and expresses not only possibility but also ability in non-modal expressions, as it “does not correspond to the strict definition of modality used so far” (Abish 2016: 139).



### 3.2.2 Postterminality in the non-past -PAST(+POST)

Postterminality in the non-past can also be divided into two groups. The first group is expressed by the converb *-(I)p* with non-past copula *dur/turur* (ex.19). The second group is expressed by the past participle *-GAN* with non-past constructions of *dur/êrür* (ex.20–21).

(19) f.149v/4–5 *uzak çoranî ka 'ba-i šerîfge yiberib dūr*  
 'He **has sent** Uzak Chora to the holy Kaaba'  
*yiber[ib][dūr]*  
*send[CONV.POST][COP]*

(20) f.147r/6 *hajî girey sulţān kičig êkendūr*  
 'Haji Giray sultan **has been** young'  
*ê[ken][dūr]*  
*be[PART.POST][COP]*

(21) f.152v/4–5 *jağan begimdin tuğ[ğ]an êrür*  
 '[He] **was born** from Jağan begim<sup>8</sup>'  
*tuğ[ğan êr][ür]*  
*born[PART.POST COP êr-][AOR]*

### 3.2.3 Four forms of past: *-Gan êrdi*, *-Ip êrdi*, *-DI êrdi* and *-mİş êrdi*

The forms *-GAN êrdi* and *-(I)p êrdi* seem to belong to the same semantic domain, therefore may be competing forms. In the vast majority of cases *-GAN êrdi* and *-(I)p êrdi* are translated by English Past Perfect, however, there are nuances in the meaning of these constructions in Chagatay and, particular, in 'Compendium'.

The form in *-GAN êrdi* is one of the most common past tense forms in many Turkic languages. There are several definitions of this form. According to the most popular one, the form in *-GAN êrdi* is mainly used in combination with the form of the past categorical tense *-DI* and usually expresses precedence. This is basically called 'plusquamperfect' where something happened in the past, but the one in *-GAN êrdi* happened first. According to Yuldashev (1965: 168), the form in *-GAN êrdi* expresses any anteriority and refers to a completely expired action. In this case *-GAN êrdi* cannot interchange with any other forms in the past, e.g. *-(I)p êrdi*. Construction *-(I)p êrdi* itself denotes a typical single action (both one-time and repeated) (Yuldashev 1965: 188). Yuldashev also expresses some more ideas about the meaning of *-(I)p êrdi* constructions. According to his point of view, the form in *-(I)p êrdi* is a completed action by the time another action is performed, which does not necessarily indicate that the second action immediately proceeds after the first one. The form in *-(I)p êrdi* expresses the action which was happening before the eyes of the speaker (writer),

8 Begim is a title coming together with the names of sovereigns' daughters and wives (Syzdykova 1989: 75).

therefore cannot point on the long past event. In addition, *-(I)p érđi* may indicate an action that occurred literally just now (Yuldashev 1965: 191-193).

The aspect-temporal construction of (ex.18) is *bol[ub yürü][gen ér][đi]*. There is one more *[ub yürü]* unit compared to (ex.17). *Yürü-* expresses ongoing actionality (Erdal 2004: 252). So, the durative actionality in the postterminality in the past indicates continuousness together with completeness of action.

In Németh's investigation of Western Karaim language, *-(I)p edi-* was semantically very close to the pluperfect *-GAn edi-*, and to a lesser degree to the imperfect *-(<sup>o</sup>)r edi-*. Therefore, he suggested that the grammatical category in *-(I)p edi-* became redundant because of this semantic closeness of tenses and finally rarely used in Karaim (Németh 2015: 224). In our corpus *-(I)p érđi* is used much more often than *-GAn érđi*.

Lars Johanson points out that Postterminals may form language-specific oppositions with respect to the degree of focality and may be more or less focal (Johanson 2000: 120–121). Posttransformative state in *-(I)p érđi* is still prevailing at the moment of speech. That's why *-(I)p érđi* is often corresponded HF postterminality of the structure 'was in the state of having done' (Johanson 1999: 180), e.g. (ex.15) *yatib érđi* 'had layed, were layed' (initiotransformativity) or (ex.16) *ötüb érđi* 'had passed (died), were passed (died)' (initiotransformative). While the postterminality in *-GAn érđi* is focal opposed to the construction *-(I)p érđi* representing nontransformative phase structure and LF postterminality in Kipchak languages (Johanson 1999: 178. See ex.17).

Among the viewpoint operators in 'Compendium', we can also find competing forms based on *-DI érđi* (ex.22) and *-mİš érđi* (ex.23). They correspond to the form *-GAn érđi*. These two forms are represented only in the second part, which is translated from Persian.<sup>9</sup> The forms *-DI érđi* and *-mİš érđi* are rooted into ancient forms of past tense and are not preserved in many modern languages. *-DI érđi* exists only in such modern Turkic languages as Gagauz, Turkish (Oghuz), Kyrgyz languages and in some dialects of the Tatar language (Kipchak) and *-mİš érđi* exists only in modern Turkish and Azerbaijanian languages (Oghuz) (Yuldashev 1965: 184, 198).

(22) f.63v/2–3 *mundin ilgeri ol vaqıtta kim ođlanlarığa vaşıyyet qıldı érđi*

'Before that time [he] **had remembered** his sons in [his] will'

*[N] qıl[đi ér][đi]*

*remember in will[PART.POST COP ér][PAST]*

(23) f.122v/10–11 *toqtay oljay hātundin tuđmuš érđi*

'Toqtay **was born** from Oljay khatun'

*tuđ[muš ér][đi]*

*born[PART.POST COP ér-][PAST]*

<sup>9</sup> The Russian translation of RAD's 'Compendium of Chronicles' was used for comparing it with QAB's second, so-called translated, part of his 'Compendium'. That part which we call translated in QAB's 'Chronicle' is actually a summary of RAD's work.

### 3.3 Prospectivity

The corpus of ‘Compendium’ demonstrates prospectivity only in non-past stratum. The prospective in the past wasn’t attested in the examined corpus. But, theoretically, it is possible that such a form existed in the language in which the ‘Compendium’ is written and could express an action that was planned in the past to be accomplished for sure at a later date.

The corpus demonstrates the prospectivity by construction of verbal noun formant *-GU*, the possessive suffix, and the copula *turur*. Here the prospectivity is used to express an imminent prospective that will definitely and unconditionally take place:

(24) f.1r/2–3 *inšā allāh ta ‘ālā her qaysisīni birer faşil beyān qilgum<sup>o</sup>z turur*  
 ‘According to the God’s will, we **are about to describe** every section one by one.’  
 [N] qil[gu][m<sup>o</sup>z][turur]  
 describe[VN][POSS IPL][COP]

Another form of prospectivity is expressed by the morpheme *-Gay*. The *-Gay* marker usually matches third person optative in Turkic languages but also presents the prospective meaning. According to Bodrogligeti, “The optative forms express an action or a state the occurrence of which is desired, expected, guessed, suggested or ordered. They fall in two full paradigms with a variety of alternate forms and are very frequent. They have two tenses, the future and the past” (Bodrogligeti 2001: 196). Eckmann provides four different meaning of future-optative: 1. future, 2. wish, require or command, 3. a gnomic future-optative usually translated by English present, and 4. guess (Eckmann 1966: 160–161). Rentzsch explains that an optative in *-Gay* has developed from the old prospective and in the early Middle Turkic era the meaning of the prospective shifted to emotive (Rentzsch 2015: 188).

In the corpus of ‘Compendium’ we found two meanings of morpheme *-Gay* given by Eckmann. The first form in *-Gay* expresses the gnomic future-optative in the example (25) but not related to prospectivity. The second one in the example (26) is under our consideration.

(25) f.146r/7 *edil haddında memlük-i hājī tarhānda bolgay*  
 ‘[He] **is** [khan] on the edge of the Volga in the state of Haji Tarhan.’  
 bol[gay]  
 be[OPT][3SG]

(26) f.122v/2–3 *anij oğlanların soñ ayğaymiz*  
 ‘We **will say (Let us talk)** [about] his sons later.’  
 ay[gay][miz]  
 say[OPT][IPL]

Another element can be interpreted as prospective: *-(<sup>o</sup>)r bol-*. Old Turkic *-(<sup>o</sup>)r bol-* ‘become doing’ signals the transition to an intraterminal state in focus and interprets as prospectivity (Johanson 1998: 42; Danko 2019: 242). In Bodrogligeti’s

terminology, it is the optative of Aorist which expresses anticipated future (Bodrogligeti 2001: 213).

(27) 4r/2 *fath ve nuşret bilen yeter bolğay*  
 ‘It is going to be enough about the victory’  
*yet[er bol][ğay]*  
*be enough[AOR become][ OPT][3SG]*

Prospectivity can also be expressed by the simple Aorist marker  $-(^{\circ})r$  (Danka 2019: 242). According to Abish, the Aorist marker  $-(^{\circ})r$  indicates prospectivity with a meaning of epistemic possibility (Abish 2016: 59). Thus, (ex.28) containing the Aorist  $-(^{\circ})r$  expresses the prospectivity:

(28) 146r/7–8 *anıñ hikāyetleri öz dāstānıda her yerde kélür*  
 ‘His stories might come in every place in his own dastan.’  
*kél[ür]*  
*come[AOR]*

## Conclusion

This paper is an attempt to give a grammatical analysis of viewpoint operators. According to all above-mentioned, we can conclude that the finite verb forms in Qādir ‘Ali beg’s ‘Compendium of Chronicles’ is written in a narrative discourse type predominantly in the past. The non-past finite forms are more limited. The competing forms of postterminality  $-(I)p\ ērdi$  and  $-GAn\ ērdi$  are extended by  $-DI\ ērdi$  and  $-mİš\ ērdi$  which correspond to the form  $-GAn\ ērdi$ . The inventory of finite verb forms can be considered as complete, except prospective in the past, which is not attested in the corpus.

The difference between postterminal constructions in the past, the focality degrees at the time of speech, aspectual and actional meanings are the most problematic in the corpus of finite verbal constructions and they need a more detailed and careful investigation, which will be the next step for the future research. It is also necessary to extend the investigation to the non-finite verbal constructions in Qādir ‘Ali beg’s ‘Compendium of Chronicles’.

## Abbreviations

1PL	first person plural
3SG	third person singular
AOR	aorist
AUX	auxiliary verb
CONV.INTRA	intraterminal converb

CONV.POST	postterminal converb
COP	copula
INTRA	intraterminal
N	noun
NEG	negation
OPT	optative
PART	participle
PAST	past tense
POSS	possessive
POST	postterminal
PRO	prospective
PRS	present tense
VN	deverbal noun

## References

- Abish, A. 2016. *Modality in Kazakh as Spoken in China*. (Turcologica 107). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Alimov, R. 2018. Nekotorye zametki otnositel'no Kadyr Ali-beka i ego sochineniya „Jami at-Tavarih” [Some notes on Qadyr Ali-bek and his work „Jami at-Tavarih”]. In: *Materialy II-y nauchnoy konferencii srednevekovoy istorii Desht-i Kypchak*. Pavlodar. 251–258.
- Baskakov, N.A. 1971. Priroda i funkcional'noe znachenie svyazki v sostave predlozheniya v tyurkskih yazykah [The nature and functional meaning of the copula in the composition of a sentence in Turkic languages]. In: Ligeti, L.(ed.): *Studia Turcica*. Budapest. 47–54.
- Berezin I. *Biblioteka vostochnykh istorikov. Sbornik letopisei. Tatarskii tekst s russkim predisloviem* [Library of Oriental Historians. “Compendium of Chronicles”. Tatar Text with Russian Preface]. Vol. II Part. I. Kazan, Tip. Gubernskogo pravleniya, 1854.
- Berezin I. *Tatarskii letopisets, Sovremennik Borisa Fedorovicha Godunova* [Tatar Chronicler, Contemporary of Boris Fedorovich Godunov]. Moskvitynin. 1851 [Muscovite. 1851], no. 24. Book 2, 543–554.
- Bloch, E. 1933. *Catalogue des Manuscrits Turc*. Tome II. Supplément nos 573–1419. Paris: Bibliothèque nationale.
- Bodrogligeti, A. 2001. *A Grammar of Chagatay*. Muenchen: Lincom Europa.
- Csató, É. – Johanson, L. 2020. On discourse Types and Clause Combining in Däftär-i Čengiz-nämä. In: Zimonyi, I. (ed.) *Ottomans – Crimea – Jochids. Studies in Honour of Mária Ivanics*. Szeged, 59–70.

- Comrie, B. 1989. *Aspect: an introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Danka, B. 2019. *The 'Pagan' Oguz-nāme. A Philological and Linguistic Analysis* (Turcologica 113). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Danka, B. 2020. A misunderstood passage of Qādir 'Alī-beg Jālāyirī' Jāmī at-Tawārīḫ. In: Zimonyi, I. (ed.) *Ottomans – Crimea – Jochids. Studies in Honour of Mária Ivanics*. Szeged: 71–80.
- Eckman, J. 1966. *Chagatay Manual*. Indiana University.
- Erdal, M. 2004. *A grammar of Old Turkic*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hofman, H.F. 1969. *Turkish Literature: A Bio-Bibliographical Survey*. Section III. Part 1. Vol. 5. Utrecht: The Library of the University of Utrecht.
- Ivanics M. 2017. *Hatalomgyakorlás a steppén – a Dzsingisz-nāme nomád világa* [Wielding Power on the Steppe – The Nomadic World of Chinggis-name]. Budapest, MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont, Történettudomány Intézet.
- Johanson, L. 1971. *Aspekt im Türkischen. Vorstudien zu einer Beschreibung des türkeitürkischen Aspektsystems*. (Studia Turcica Upsaliensia 1). Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell.
- Johanson, L. 1999. Typological notes on aspect and actionality in Kipchak Turkic. In: Abraham, Werner & Kulikov Leonid (eds.) *Tense-aspect, transitivity and causativity. Essays in honour of Vladimir Nedjalkov*. (Studies in Language Companion series 50.) Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins, 171–184.
- Johanson, L. 2000. Viewpoint operators in European languages. In: Dahl, Ö. (ed.): *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin–New York, 27–187.
- KED = *Kazakh Explanatory Dictionary* Қазақ тілінің түсіндірме сөздігі / Жалпы редакциясын басқарған Т. Жанұзақов. – Алматы: Дайк-Пресс. 2008.
- Kincses-Nagy, É. 2018. *Mongolic Copies in Chaghatay*. (Turcologica 115). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Nagamine H. 2019. Eshche raz o sochinenii Qadir Ali Bega (“Jami at-tavarikh”/Sbornik letopisei) [Rethinking Qādir ‘Alī Beg’s Historiography (Jāmī ‘ al-Tawārīkh)]. *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie=Golden Horde Review.*, vol. 7, no. 1, 115–130.
- Nevskaya, I. 2005. The Typology of prospective in Turkic languages. In: Gippert, J., Erdal, M., Voßen, R. (ed.): *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung*. Berlin, 111–123.
- Németh, M. 2015. A historical morphology of Western Karaim: the *-p edi-* Past Tense in the South-Western dialect. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hung.* Volume. 68, 215–228.
- Péri B. Notes on the Literary-Linguistic Term “Čaġatay”: Evaluating the Evidence Supplied by Native Sources. In: Sárközi, A. and Rákos A. (eds) *Altaica Budapestinensia MMII*. Budapest 2003, 248–255.

- Qādir ‘Alī Beg *Jāmi‘ at-Tavārīḥ*. Rukopis’. Vostochnyi otdel Nauchnoi biblioteki im. M. Gor’kogo Sankt-Peterburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, MsO. 59.
- Qādir ‘Alī Beg *Jāmi‘ at-Tavārīḥ*. Rukopis’. Otdel rukopisei i redkikh knig Nauchnoi biblioteki im. N.I. Lobachevskogo Kazanskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. T. 40.
- Qādir ‘Alī Beg *Jāmi‘ at-Tavārīḥ*. MS. British Library. Add. 11, 726.
- Qādir ‘Alī Beg *Jāmi‘ at-Tavārīḥ*. MS. British Library. Add. 11, 725.
- Qadīrghali Jalaīr 1997. *Shejireler Jinaghī* [“Compendium of Chronicles”]. Trs. By N. Mingulov, B. Komekov, S. Oteniyazov. Almaty, “Qazaqstan”.
- Rahim, A. 2008. O novom spiske tatarskogo istoricheskogo sochinenia XVII veka. In: Gosmanov, M. (ed.): *Gali Rahim*. Kazan, 193–213.
- Rentsch, J. 2015. *Modality in the Turkic Languages: Form and Meaning from a Historical and Comparative Prospective*. Berlin: Klaus Schwartz Verlag.
- Rieu, Ch. 1888. *Catalogue of the Turkish Manuscripts in the British Museum*. London: the British Museum.
- Syzdykova 1989. *Yazyk “Zhami‘ at-tawarikh” Zhalairi* [Language of Zhalairi’s ‘Zhami‘ at-tawarikh’]. Alma-Ata: Nauka.
- Syzdykova, R. – Kojgeldiev, M. 1991. *Kadyrgali bi Kosymuly zhane onyn zhylnamalar zhynagy* [Kadyrgali bi Kosymuly and his ‘Compendium of Chronicles’]. Almaty: Qazaq universiteti.
- Usmanov M.A. 1972. *Tatarskie istoricheskie istochniki XVII–XVIII vv.* [Tatar Historical Sources of the 17<sup>th</sup>–18<sup>th</sup> centuries]. Kazan, Kazan. Universitet. Publ.
- Yuldashev, A.A. 1965. *Analiticheskie formy glagola v tyurkskih yazykah* [Analytical verbal forms in Turkic languages]. Moskva: Nauka.

**References from the internet:**

- Web1: [https://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht/?PPN=PPN1029882991&PHYSID=PHYS\\_0005](https://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht/?PPN=PPN1029882991&PHYSID=PHYS_0005)
- Web2: <https://dspace.spbu.ru/handle/11701/15394>