

UNIVERSITY OF SZEGED
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCE
DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF LINGUISTICS

GULDANA TOGABAYEVA

**FINITE VERB FORMS IN A 17TH-CENTURY TURKIC HISTORICAL
TEXT: QĀDIR ‘ALI BEG’S *JĀMI‘ AT-TAWĀRĪX* ‘COMPENDIUM OF
CHRONICLES’**

SUMMARY OF THE DISSERTATION

Supervisors
Dr. Balázs Danka
Prof. Dr. Mária Ivanics

Szeged, 2025

Introduction

This dissertation undertakes a comprehensive analysis of the linguistic characteristics of finite verbs in an early 17th-century Turkic historical text, *ǰāmiʻ at-Tawārīχ* ‘Compendium of Chronicles’ (hereafter the *Compendium*), written by Qādir ‘Ali Beg (hereafter QAB) in 1602. The text is composed in the literary Turkic language of Central Asia, or the so-called Chaghatay language, during the rule of Uraz-Muhammed Khan, most likely in the Qasym Khanate (1452–1681). In 1851, Berezin introduced it to the scholarly world in an article titled *Tatarskij letopisec. Sovremennik Borisa Fedoroviča Godunova* in the journal *Moskvitjanin*.

The main portion of the manuscript is an abridged Turkic translation of Rašīd ad-Dīn’s (1247–1318) Persian *ǰāmiʻ at-Tawārīχ* ‘Compendium of Chronicles’, which details the genealogy of Oghuz Khan, Genghis Khan’s ancestors, Genghis Khan himself, and his descendants. Since the manuscript’s first pages, where the title would have appeared, are missing, and as it is primarily a translation of the renowned Persian ‘Compendium of Chronicles’, Berezin conventionally attributed the same title to the Turkic manuscript. This title has remained in use to this day.

Currently, two manuscripts and three fragments of the *Compendium* are known. Two additional unconfirmed manuscripts are registered under the authorship of QAB. The two confirmed manuscripts are incomplete; however, they complement each other. Both manuscripts are later copies, likely derived from the same original source.

Aim of the study

The *Compendium* has previously been studied from the perspective of descriptive grammar. My focus is on alternative linguistic approaches, specifically through the analysis of finite verb forms. Currently, there are three Cyrillic (Syzdykova 1989; Syzdykova & ǰojgeldiev 1991; Xisamieva 2022) and one Latin (Alimov 2022) transcriptions, as well as partial and full translations of the *Compendium* into Kazakh (Syzdykova & ǰojgeldiev 1991; Mingulov et al. 1997) and Russian (Vel’jaminov-Zernov 1864; Valixanov 1961; Usmanov 1972; Alimov 2022; Xisamieva 2022). Because some parts of the text are difficult to understand, the translations are far from accurate and differ more or less from each other. Furthermore, only a small number of linguistic studies have investigated the language. As a result, the main aims of this dissertation are as follows:

1. To offer a modern, up-to-date linguistic analysis based on the theoretical framework of Lars Johanson and others for the sake of better understanding the text itself. This will be achieved by focusing on finite verb forms.
2. To analyze an important part of the grammar of the text with special respect to the historical morphology of the verb forms, in order to place the text in the continuum of the linguistic history of Turkic literary languages.
3. To enhance general knowledge on Turkic comparative and historical grammar by a detailed analysis of the finite verb forms in an early 17th-century Turkic text.
4. To investigate the Kipchak and Oghuz peculiarities of the *Compendium* to characterize its special status within the continuum of the literary texts of the same period.

Overall, the primary aim of this dissertation is to conduct an exhaustive exploration of the finite verb forms in QAB's *Compendium*, starting with finite verbs with thematic bases, such as terminals, intraterminals, postterminals, imperatives, voluntatives, and optatives, and progressing to copular devices, postverbial constructions, and verb stems.

Research methods

The methods used here are comparative, descriptive, and data-oriented. The finite verb forms in the *Compendium* are analyzed using a functional framework based on Lars Johanson's works (1971; 1976; 1995; 1999; 2000a; 2000b; 2009; 2014; 2020; 2021a; 2021b; 2022a; 2022b; 2022c). The framework defines the semantic notions of verbal categories from a functional and typological perspective, including an examination of the morphological, morphophonological, syntactic, and morphosyntactic features of the *Compendium*. These categories are compared with equivalent features found in the Kazakh, Tatar, Turkish, and Siberian languages. This approach has been used in the current research to investigate the devices QAB applies to express different finite verb forms in the *Compendium*. The dissertation's task is to apply these methodological approaches to the analysis of the language of the 'Compendium of Chronicles'.

Data

The data used in this dissertation mainly include the historical text of the St. Petersburg manuscript. In cases where examples are not available in the St. Petersburg manuscript, examples from the Kazan manuscript are provided. The St. Petersburg manuscript was chosen as the main source because it was scribed earlier and is closer in time to the original, unbound manuscript. In the hard-reading parts, the Persian 'Compendium of Chronicles' from the

appropriate parts are provided in Russian and English translations by Smirnova (1952) and Thackston (1998), respectively.

Research history

Overall, Berezin (1851, 1854), Valixanov,¹ Vel'jaminov-Zernov (1864), and Raxim (1927 [2008]; 1930 [2008]) were the earliest researchers of the *Compendium*. To date, Usmanov's work (1972) and several times republished work by Syzdykova (first publication in 1989) remain full-fledged sources and historiographical studies of the *Compendium*. Among the reviewed works, the most informative are the articles by Alimov (2015, 2016, 2018) and Nagamine (2019). In general, there is a limited amount of specialized literature on the *Compendium*. The circle of researchers is primarily limited to Kazakh and Tatar scholars, who, in their counties' manuals on history and literature, refer to the *Compendium* as a written monument to their people. The 'Compendium of Chronicles' is, so far, the only known historical work reflecting the history of Turkic (Kazakh-Tatar) aristocracy in the 16th–17th centuries. In the historiographical context, the first and final parts of the *Compendium* seem to be the most valuable. There is no consensus on the identity of QAB among scholars. His name no longer appears on other works' pages, and the question of his origin remains open.

Text

The *Compendium* can be divided into three parts: the introduction and dedication (a panegyric) to Boris Godunov, an abridged Turkic translation of the Persian *Ĵāmi' at-Tawārīḫ* 'Compendium of Chronicles', and a self-contained part.

The last part of the *Compendium* consists of nine chapters that provide information on rulers ranging from Urus Khan to his descendant Uraz-Muhammed Khan. The folios of the third part are in the wrong order, starting with folio 148. These last nine chapters are based on the oral steppe historical tradition (Ivanics 2017: 43). Some of these data cover information about the Crimean Khanate, which is unknown in modern Crimea (Zaatov 2015: 238). Furthermore, the chapter on *hājjī giray ḫān* seems to reflect the desire of representatives from the Volga's left-bank lands to call *hājjī giray ḫān* to the Kazan throne (Zajcev 2023). The order and the titles of the chapters are as follows (StP: f.142r/5–148r; K: f.60r/1–69r/17):

¹ There is no information on when exactly Valixanov (1835–1865) wrote his articles. They were published decades later, between 1961 and 1972.

1. *urus χān*. The full text is presented in the Kazan manuscript (K: f.60r/1–61r/5) and fragments in the St. Petersburg manuscript (StP: f.142r/5–142v/11);
2. *toqtamış χān*. The full text is presented in the Kazan manuscript (K: f.61r/5–61v/12). In the St. Petersburg manuscript, the beginning, end, and title of the chapter are absent; the text is adjacent to the chapter of *Bulyayır χān* (StP: f.145r/1–146r/5);
3. *temir kütlu χān*. The text appears in full in both manuscripts (K: f.61v/13–62r/8; StP: f.146r/6–147r/1);
4. *hājji giray χān*. The full text is contained in both manuscripts (K: f.62r/9–62v/6; StP: f.147r/2–147v/11) and in the fragment from Kyškary village;
5. *idige biy*. The full text is presented in the Kazan manuscript (K: f.62v/7–64r/10). In the St. Petersburg manuscript, the beginning, end, and title of the chapter are absent (StP: f.149r/1–143r/9);
6. *hājji muḥammād χān*. The text appears in full in both manuscripts (K: f.64r/11–64v/10; StP: f.143r/10–144r/9);
7. *bulyayır χān*. The full text is presented in the Kazan manuscript (K: f.64v/11–65r/6). In the St. Petersburg manuscript, the end is missing (f.144r/10–144v/11);
8. *yādigār χān*. The text is presented in full in the Kazan manuscript (K: f.65r/7–65v/5). In the St. Petersburg manuscript, there is only the last line (StP: f.152r/1);
9. *uraz muḥammād χān*. The text is shown in full in both manuscripts (K: f.65v/6–69r/17; StP: f.152r/2–148r/11).

Findings

The linguistic analysis of the *Compendium* begins with the finite verbal categories in Chapter 2.1, providing information on the key concepts of viewpoint aspect, imperative, and modality, including agreement markers.

Following the grammatical analysis, it is evident that both intraterminals and postterminals in the *Compendium* are introduced by low-focal and high-focal degrees of focality, resulting in wide range of interpretations in translation. It is known that a new viewpoint operator appears when the previous one has undergone the defocalization process. Intraterminals in the *Compendium* have only two forms, showing the perfectly symmetric system of non-focality and focality in the non-past and past stratum by representing one form for each. In contrast, the postterminal viewpoint operators appear to be much more complex. Postterminals illustrate one form that is non-focal and asymmetric in the non-past and the past, along with two competing forms of focality that involve various interpretations of copular

verbs. The symmetric system of non-past and past forms with the remote copular *erdi* has been attested to focal degree; however, two more forms have not been presented in the non-past.

Four different forms of postterminals-in-past, {-GAN} *erdi*, {-I)p} *erdi*, {-DI} *erdi*, and {-mIš} *erdi*, were attested. It was shown that {-DI} *erdi* appeared as the furthest form from the crucial limit of the event and, therefore, was classified as non-focal, while three others indicated a closer distance to the orientation point compared to the crucial limit. Furthermore, these three, {-mIš} *erdi*, {-I)p} *erdi*, and {-GAN} *erdi*, semantically exhibit the same resultative meaning when applied to the verb *tuy-* ‘to be born’ and are not opposed to focal meanings. Notably, {-DI} *erdi* and {-mIš} *erdi* appear exclusively in the second part of the *Compendium*, translated from Persian, whereas {-I)p} *erdi* and {-GAN} *erdi* are found in both the second/translated and third/original parts of the *Compendium*. This distribution suggests that {-I)p} *erdi* and {-GAN} *erdi* were actively used as postterminal-in-past, while {-DI} *erdi* and {-mIš} *erdi* were considered archaic.

The negated converb in the postterminal form {-I)p} *turur* and in the intraterminal form {-A} *s^on*, reduced from the second person singular of {-A} *turur*, took the same form as {-ma-y}, appearing as an ambiguous interpretation. However, they were differentiated into their defined aspect categories in the *Compendium*.

This study included optative and voluntative in the modality section, while categorizing imperative as a separative entity. In addition to voluntative and optative, the definition of modality was employed for expressions of necessity, potentiality, and prospective. The *Compendium* mainly expressed the {-GII} and {-I)η-Iz} ~ {-Uη-uz} markers for the imperative category, while using the imperative based on the stem of the bare verb in only one example. Additionally, the enclitic particle {jI} was also observed in a single example. The imperative only referred to second persons. Voluntative usage was presented in the first and third persons. Usually in Turkic languages, there is only one form for the first person singular voluntative and the other one for the first person plural voluntative. However, the *Compendium* illustrated two forms for the first person singular voluntative and four forms for the first person plural voluntative, i.e. {-AyI-m}, {(A)yI-n} and {-AII}, {-AII-m}, {-AII-η}, {-AII-K} ({-AyI-K}), respectively.

The contexts in which first person voluntatives are used in the *Compendium* allow for both inclusive and neutral readings. However, there is no morphologically marked distinction between inclusive and neutral forms. The use of several different markers for singular and plural voluntatives indicates dialectal variation.

Optative performed a wide range of modal functions in the *Compendium*, such as wish, desire, or hope; command and directive; necessity; probability; potentiality; prediction and expectation; purpose, and rhetorical question. Additionally, the optative marker {-GAy} exhibited interpretations of probability as well as the interpretation of the general truth.

Voluntative, optative, and imperative appeared in the non-main clauses (purposive clauses), which were developed under the influence of the Persian language.

After examining the finite verbal categories, I moved on to the copular devices. In general, observations in Chapter 2.2 yielded anticipated results and followed the rules of Chaghatay. These included the sporadic appearance of the plural marker {+lAr} in copular verbs. Copular particles did not exhibit any specific features in the non-past, as they coincided with the form of the copular verbs. However, in the past, the plural marker {+lAr} appeared both in the terminal base before the copular particle and in the copular particle itself. Furthermore, the study of third person non-past copular verbs revealed that the verb *tur-* ‘to stop, stand’ in the aorist form *tur-ur* is the most elaborated, almost in the full paradigm. Statistically, it is much more frequently utilized, i.e. two hundred and seventy-five times in the third person singular marker alone. Additionally, this verb is the most frequently used auxiliary verb in different categories in the *Compendium*. In comparison, synonymous copular verbs are attested less frequently: *er-ür* occurs twelve times and *bol-ur* occurs nine times. Other copular verbs are attested in much smaller numbers.

Chapter 2.3 examines postverbial constructions, which involve the use of two verbs: a lexical verb and an auxiliary verb. These constructions commonly feature approximately twenty auxiliary verbs. The actional phrase can convey more than one meaning, depending on the context, a phenomenon also attested in the *Compendium*. For example, the construction *ket-* in the *Compendium* functions as a phase specification, emphasizing its transformativizing meaning. Additionally, it conveys spatial orientation, specifically denoting movement away from a deictic center as a secondary implication.

Typically, auxiliary verbs employing <A> and type converbs illustrate different meanings. For example, the verb *kal-* sets the critical initial boundary of the action phase in a singular instance in the *Compendium*, while the converb <A> *kal-* highlights the second phase (non initial), though this also occurs in only a single example. Postverbial forms with the verb *kel-* likewise appears with both <A> and type converbs. *kel-* expresses spatial orientation toward a deictic center while preserving the lexical meaning of the auxiliary *kel-*. In contrast, <A> *kel-* assumes a nontransformative, phase-defined function. The *Compendium* also conveys instances where the semantic distinction between postverbial constructions of <A>

and ⟨B⟩ type remains unclear, as seen in the constructions ⟨A⟩ *tur-* and ⟨B⟩ *tur-*. Moreover, it is sometimes difficult to determine whether a compound verb belongs to the category of postverbal construction or aspect. These ambiguities extend to ⟨B⟩ *tur-* as well as to ⟨B⟩ *oltur-* and ⟨B⟩ *yat-* constructions.

The study highlights peculiarities associated with both Oghuz and Kipchak forms within the postverbal construction inventory, such as ⟨B⟩ *öt-* ‘to pass’ and ⟨B⟩ *käč-* ‘id.’. These verbs, which have been described as postverbal forms relatively recently, exhibit the same postverbal characteristics as others, as they can be omitted with minimal impact on basic lexical semantics.

Illustrations from the *Compendium* also include examples of the lexical movement verb *kel-* ‘to come’ combined with the postverbal construction ⟨B⟩ *tüş-* ‘to fall, settle, descend’. These instances show that the two verbs cannot be separated, as their boundaries seem blurred. The definite semantic similarities suggest that they function as a single, unified verb.

And finally, Chapter 2.4 was focused on derivation, synthetic and analytic, including diathesis.

The analysis of denominal verbs shows that the majority of bases are formed from Turkic roots with only six foreign roots appearing in the markers {+lA-}, {+I-}, and {+(U)(r)ka-}. These include two Arabic (*hisāb* ‘counting’; *‘izzāt* ‘honor, dignity’), two Persian (*fārmān* ‘command’; *kām* ‘few, little’), one Chinese word (*tz’ü* ‘kind, merciful’), and an ambiguous one.

The functions of almost all denominal verb derivations presented in the *Compendium* indicate a different range of processes related to becoming what the base noun represents. These derivations include markers such as {+lA-}, {+A-}, {+I-}, {+(A)l-}, {+(A)y-}, {+(A)r-}, {+dA-}, {+(I)K-}, {+KAr-}. Only the denominal verb marker {+(U)(r)kA-} expresses emotions, attitudes, or opinions about its object.

Among the twenty-four finite verbs observed with the denominal verb formative {+lA-}, four (17%) are derived from deverbal nominals with markers such as {-(I)G} (*ba-y-la-* ‘to tie, fasten’), {-(°)K} (*kon-aḱ-la* ‘to entertain (a guest)’; *ḱuč-aḱ-la-* ‘to embrace’) and {-(°)r} or {-mUr} (*yuma-la-n* ‘to roll’ ← *yumar-la-* ‘to knead (dough) into a ball’ < *yumur-la-* ‘id.’). The remaining verbs are derived from nominal stems without any further derivation. Notably, the *Compendium* does not contain a single denominal verb derived from a denominal nominal.

The *Compendium* attests to Kipchak and Oghuz formatives {+(A)y-} and {+(A)l-}, respectively.

The verb *semür-* ‘to be(come) fat’ appeared twice due to the phenomenon of *rhotacism* vs. *zetacism* in connection with the denominal verbalizer {+I-}, where the consonant *z* changed to *r*. The presence of *rhotacism* and *zetacism* was also attested in the alternation of the causative marker {-GUr-} ~ {-GUz-}. The existence of this pair makes suggests that the causative marker {-GAR-} / {-GAz-} should be considered a practicable alternation rather than a scribal variant caused by the single dot difference between Arabic letters -z (ز) and -r (ر). However, no final conclusion can be drawn here.

In the *Compendium*, almost all available causative markers are attested. They are the following: {-DUr-} ~ {-Dür-}, {-GUr-} ~ {-GUz-} ~ {-GAz-} / {-GAR-}, {-Ur-} ~ {-ir-}, {-Ar-}, and {-t-}. The semantic range of these markers is the largest. They show varying degrees of productivity. However, only the markers {-DUr-}, {-Ur-}, {-Ar-}, and {-t-} proved to be productive, while the others are unproductive. In the case of the marker {-GUr-}, the function changes the distribution, as the suffix is used in a not a literal sense.

Notably, some analytic denominal verb derivation in the *Compendium* was influenced by the calque of Persian analytic denominal verb derivation, which involved Persian nouns of Turkic and Mongolic origin with {-mİš-ī} suffix and auxiliary verbs. The primary pattern of morphological integration of Turkic and Mongolic verbs into Persian via Turkic involved their postterminal participle form {-mİš}, combined with the Iranian abstract suffix {-ī} and a native Iranian auxiliary verb (such as *kardan*, *shurdan*, etc.).

Parallel analytic and synthetic derivations were attested in the *Compendium*; although they are very rare (*χān-la-* ‘to enthrone’ vs. *χān yasa-* ‘id.’; *hisāb-la-* ‘to count, calculate’ vs. *hisāb kīl-* ‘id.’; *yüz-lā-n-* ‘to face toward, turn towards’ vs. *yüz ur-* ‘id.’; *keḡä-š-* ‘to take counsel (together)’ vs. *keḡäš et-* ‘id.’, *keḡäš kīl-* ‘id.’, *keḡäšmišī et-* ‘id.’).

Analytic denominal verb derivation is utilized much more frequently than synthetic verb derivation, making it the primary method of verb formation in the *Compendium*. The analysis in this dissertation has shown that analytic denominal verb derivation was mainly achieved using light verbs *kīl-* ‘to do, make’, *et-* ‘id.’, and *bol-* ‘to be(come)’. This process predominantly employed with lexemes of non-Turkic origin, particularly Arabic vocabulary (via Persian), which accounts for more than 65% of the exams. In contrast, lexemes of Persian, Turkic, Mongolic, and Chinese origin were less significant. Furthermore, analytic denominal verbs formed with Arabic nouns exhibit all three types of transitivity, whereas others are not always.

In this dissertation, one hundred twenty-nine analytic denominal verb forms with the light verbs *kīl-* were discussed in detail. The highest number of analytic denominal verb derivations comes from nouns of Arabic origin (68%). The next widespread analytic denominal verb

derivations are from nouns of Persian origin (9%), followed by nouns of Turkic origin (8%), and Mongolic nouns, which account for a smaller proportion (1%). Furthermore, examples of analytic denominal verb derivation with the light verb *ķil-* were attested with derived nouns of Arabic and Persian origin, combined with the {+IİK} suffix (7%), Persian nouns of Turkic and Mongolic (via Turkic) origin with {-mİš-ī} suffix (5%), and finally, nouns of Chinese origin with Turkic derivational suffixes (2%).

A much smaller number of denominal verb forms with light verbs *et-* were attested. There were twenty-four nouns of Arabic, Turkic, and Persian origin, as well as Persian nouns of Turkic and Mongolic (via Turkic) origin with the {-mİš-ī} suffix, and denominal nouns derived from Turkic and Persian bases with the {+IİK} suffix. The highest number of analytic denominal verb derivations came from nouns of Arabic origin (67%). Due to the limited number of instances, other nouns were represented almost equally.

The next largest group of auxiliaries with light verbs was formed by the verb *bol-* ‘to be(come)’. Thirty-three verb forms were attested in the *Compendium*. The highest number of analytic denominal verb derivations comes from nouns of Arabic origin (70%), the next is nouns of Persian (12%), Turkic origin (15%), and Persian noun of Mongolic (via Turkic) origin with the {-mİš-ī} suffix (3%).

The study of the material showed nine verbs that produced the same final result (without semantic difference) with the same noun but interchangeable auxiliary verbs (verb heads) *ķil-* ‘to do, make’ and *et-* ‘id.’; three pairs of verbs by auxiliaries *er-* ‘to be’ and *bol-* ‘to be(come)’; a pair of verbs with the auxiliaries *er-* ‘to be’ and *ķil-* ‘to do, make’; and a pair of verbs with the auxiliaries *er-* ‘to be’ and *tur-* ‘to stand’. On the other hand, the *ķil-* ~ *et-* pair of auxiliaries was attested, where the final meanings of the analytic denominal verbs differ from each other (*inkār ķil-* ‘to retract’ and *inkār et-* ‘to refuse, deny’), indicating that the interchangeability of the auxiliary verbs does not work fully with the *Compendium*.

In the case where both the auxiliary verbs and the roots of the noun (with difference in NN {+IİK}, VN {-l}, VN {-mİšī}) of the pair are the same, the final meaning of all analytic verbs can be identical, i.e. *mülāzāmāt ķil-* ‘to serve diligently’ and *mülāzāmātlik ķil-* ‘id.’, *muwāfaqat ķil-* ‘to agree, consent’ and *muwāfaqatlik ķil-* ‘id.’, *sohuryal ķil-* ‘to favor, benefit, grant, bestow’ and *siyuryamišī ķil-* ‘id.’ (both go back to *soyurgya-*).

Furthermore, this chapter raises the question of the entire concept of analytically derived verbs, considering such examples as *toy ķil-*, which can be interpreted as both ‘to celebrate’ and ‘to make a feast’, and *sohuryal ķil-* ‘to favor, benefit, grant, bestow’ and ‘to make a gift’. It introduces the lexical verb *ķil-*, with direct objects *toy* ‘feast, celebration’ and *sohuryal* ‘gift,

award’, respectively. Additionally, there are verbs like *tokuš kıl-* ‘to wage war’ and *tokušlar kıl-* ‘to wage wars’; *nişār kıl-* ‘to scatter small coins’ and *nişārlar kıl-* ‘id.’, *niyāz e[t]-* ‘to make a request, entreat for, ask as a favor’ (with *niyāz kıl-* ‘id.’ in non-finite verb constructions) and *niyāz-lar kıl-* ‘id.’, *vaşiyyāt kıl-* ‘to make a testamentary arrangement’ and *vaşiyyātni kıl-* ‘id.’

Generally, the *Compendium* reflects a heterogeneous mix of features from the Kipchak and Oghuz branches of Turkic, exhibiting archaic and innovative characteristics.

REFERENCES

ALIMOV, Rysbek (2015), Kadir Ali Bek’in Cāmi‘ at-Tavārīḥ’i ve bu eserin Londra (I) nüshası. In: Kafadar, Cemal & Tekin, Gönül A. (eds.) *Çekirge Budu. Festschrift in honor of Robert Dankoff*. *Jornal of Turkish Studies* 44. Harvard University: Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations. pp. 61–83.

ALIMOV, Rysbek (2016), O dvux novyx sočinenijax Kadyr Ali-beka, *Rossijskaja tjurkologija*, 2(15). pp. 40–48.

ALIMOV, Rysbek (2018), Nekotorye zametki otnositel’no Kadyr Ali-beka i ego sočinenija “Jami at-Tavarix”, *Materialy vtoroj naučnoj konferencii srednevekovoj istorii Dešt-i Kypčak*. Pavlodar, pp. 251–258.

ALIMOV, Rysbek (2022), *Kadyr Ali-bek. Jami at-tavarix. Faksimile rukopisi*, Kazan’: Institut istorii im. Š. Mardžani AN RT.

BEREZIN, Il’ja (1851), Tatarskij letopisec. Sovremennik Borisa Fedoroviča Godunova. *Moskvitjanin*, no. 24. Book 2, pp. 543–554.

BEREZIN, Il’ja (1854), *Biblioteka vostočnyx istorikov. Sbornik letopisei. Tatarskij tekst s russkim predisloviem*. Vol. II Part. I. Kazan’: Tipografija Gubernskogo pravlenija.

BOESCHOTEN, Hendrik (2023), *A dictionary of Early Middle Turkic*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

BUDAGOV, Lazar (1869), *Sravnitel’nyj slovar’ turecko-tatarskix narečij I*. Sanktpeterburg: Tipografija imperatorskoj akademii nauk.

BUDAGOV, Lazar (1871), *Sravnitel’nyj slovar’ turecko-tatarskix narečij II*. Sanktpeterburg: Tipografija imperatorskoj akademii nauk.

CLAUSON, Gerard Sir (1972), *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

DANKA, Balázs (2019a), *The ‘Pagan’ Oguz-nāme. A philological and linguistic analysis* (Turcologica 113). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

ECKMANN, János (1966), *Chagatay manual*. Bloomington & The Hague: Indiana University & Mouton and Co.

ERDAL, Marcel (1991), *Old Turkic word formation I–II*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

ERDAL, Marcel (2004), *A grammar of Old Turkic*. Leiden: Brill.

GABAIN, Annamarie von (1941 [1974]), *Alttürkische Grammatik*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

IVANICS, Mária (2017), *Hatalomgyakorlás a steppén – a Dzsingisz-náme nomád világa* [Wielding power on the steppe – The nomadic world of Genghis-name]. Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont, Történettudomány Intézet.

IVANICS, Mária (2024), *The book of the Činggis Legend*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

JOHANSON, Lars (1971), *Aspect im Türkischen. Vorstudien zu einer Beschreibung des türkeitürkischen Aspektsystems* (Studia Turcica Upsaliensia 1). Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell.

JOHANSON, Lars (1976), Zum Präsens der nordwestlichen und mittelasiatischen Türkssprachen. *Acta Orientalia* 37. pp. 57–74.

JOHANSON, Lars (1995), On Turkic converb clauses. In: Haspelmath, Martin & König, Ekkehard (eds.) *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective. Structure and meaning of adverbial verb forms – adverbial participles, gerunds* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 13). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 313–347.

JOHANSON, Lars (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. pp. 171–184.

JOHANSON, Lars (2000a), Viewpoint operators in European languages. In: Dahl, Östen (ed.) *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 27–187.

JOHANSON, Lars (2000b), Turkic indirectives. In: Johanson, Lars & Utas, Bo (eds.) *Evidentials. Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 61–87.

JOHANSON, Lars (2009), Modals in Turkic. In: Hansen, Björn & de Haan, Ferdinand (eds.) *Modals in the languages of Europe. A reference work* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 44). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 487–510

JOHANSON, Lars (2014), A synopsis of Turkic volitional moods. *Turkic Languages* 18, pp. 19–52.

JOHANSON, Lars (2020), The classification of the Turkic languages. In: Robbeets, Martine & Savelyev, Alexander (eds.) *The Oxford Guide to Transeurasian languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 105–114.

JOHANSON, Lars (2021a), *Turkic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

JOHANSON, Lars (2021b), Grammaticalization in Turkic languages. In: Narrog Heiko & Heine Bernd (eds.) *The Oxford handbook of grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 754–763.

JOHANSON, Lars (2022a), The Structure of Turkic. In: Johanson, Lars & Csató, Éva Á. (eds.) *The Turkic languages*. London & New York: Routledge. pp. 26–59.

JOHANSON, Lars (2022b), The history of Turkic, In: Johanson, Lars & Csató, Éva Á. (eds.) *The Turkic languages*. London & New York: Routledge. pp. 83–120.

- JOHANSON, Lars (2022c), East Old Turkic. In: Johanson, Lars & Csató, Éva Á. (eds.) *The Turkic languages*. London & New York: Routledge. pp. 132–144.
- NAGAMINE, Hiroyuki (2019), Ešče raz o sočinenii Kadyr-Ali-beka («Džami at-Tavarix / Sbornik letopisij»). *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie=Golden Horde Review* 7 (1). pp. 115–130.
- RAXIM, Ali (2008), O novom spiske tatarskogo istoričeskogo sočinenija XVII veka.1927. *Gali Rähim*. Kazan: Žien. pp. 193–213.
- RAXIM, Ali (2008), Novye spiski tatarskix letopisei. 1930. *Gali Rähim*. Kazan: Žien. pp. 125–192.
- RD = Rashid ad-Din. 1313. *Djami-el-tevarikh: histoire générale du monde: par Rachid ed-Din Fazl Ollah Tarikhi mobareki ghazani: histoire des Mongols*. Téhéran: Kitābhānah-i Markazi.
- RENTZSCH, Julian (2015), *Modality in the Turkic languages: form and meaning from a historical and comparative prospective*. Berlin: Klaus Schwartz Verlag.
- SYZDYKOVA, Rabiga (1989), *Jazyk "Žami' at-tawārix" Žalairi*. Alma-Ata: Nauka.
- SYZDYKOVA, Rābiya & KOJGELDIEV, Mämbet (1991), *Ḳadiryali bi Ḳosimulī žāne oniḡ žilnamalar žinayī* [Qadyrghali bi Qosymuly and his Compendium of Chronicles]. Almatī: Ḳazaḡ universiteti.
- USMANOV, Mirkasym A. (1972), *Tatarskie istoričeskie istočniki XVII-XVIII vv.* Kazan': Izdatel'stvo Kazanskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta.
- VALIXANOV, Čokan Č. (1961), *Sobranie sočinenij v pjati tomax*. Vol. I. Alma-Ata: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk Kazaxskoj SSR.
- VALIXANOV, Čokan Č. (1962), *Sobranie sočinenij v pjati tomax*. Vol. II. Alma-Ata: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk Kazaxskoj SSR.
- VALIXANOV, Čokan Č. (1964), *Sobranie sočinenij v pjati tomax*. Vol. III. Alma-Ata: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk Kazaxskoj SSR.
- VALIXANOV, Čokan Č. (1968), *Sobranie sočinenij v pjati tomax*. Vol. IV. Alma-Ata: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk Kazaxskoj SSR.
- VALIXANOV, Čokan Č. (1972), *Sobranie sočinenij v pjati tomax*. Vol. V. Alma-Ata: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk Kazaxskoj SSR.
- VEL'JAMINOV-ZERNOV, Vladimir V. (1864), *Issledovanie o kasimovskix carjax i carevičax*. P. II. Sanktpeterburg: Tipografija imperatorskoj akademii nauk.
- XISAMIEVA, Zamzamija A. (2022), *Jazyk dastanov Kadyr Ali-beka*. Kazan': Institut istorii im. Š. Mardžani AN RT.
- ZAA TOV, Ismet A. (2015), Krymskotatarskaja istorija i «Džami at-tavarix» Žalairi v tvorčestve Čokana Valixanova. *Krymskoe istoričeskoe obozrenie=Crimean Historical Review*, No. 1, Kazan' & Baxčisarai. pp. 232–244.

ZAJCEV, Il'ja V. (2023), Byl li Xadži-Girej Kazanskim xanom? Popytki ob'jasnenija «Dastana o Xadži-Giree» «Sbornika letopisej» Kadyr Ali-beka. *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie=Golden Horde Review*. 11 (2), pp. 335–348.

PUBLICATIONS RELATED TO THE DISSERTATION

1. TOGABAYEVA, Guldana (2020), Regarding the celebration of the seventieth birthday of Mária Ivanics. *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie=Golden Horde Review*. 8 (4). pp. 838–843. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22378/2313-6197.2020-8-4.838-843>
2. TOGABAYEVA, Guldana (2021), Finite verb forms in a 17th century Turkic written historical text: Qādir 'Ali beg's 'Compendium of Chronicles'. In: Zimonyi, István (ed.) *Altaic and Chagatay lectures. Studies in honour of Éva Kincses-Nagy*. Szeged. pp. 401–415. <http://publicatio.bibl.u-szeged.hu/28997/1/Finiteverbformsina17thcenturyTurkicwrittenhistoricaltextQadirAlibegsCompendiumofChronicles.pdf>
3. TOGABAYEVA, Guldana (2022), Rukopisi istoričeskogo sočinenija Jāmi ' at-tawārīkh «Sbornik letopisej» Kadyr Ali beka. *Turkic Studies Journal*. 4 (2). pp.96–115. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.32523/2664-5157-2022-2-96-115>
4. TOGABAYEVA, Guldana (2024a), On voluntatives in *Jā:mi ' at-Tawa:ri:χ* 'Compendium of Chronicles' (1602). *Turkic Languages*. 28 (1). pp. 59–69. <https://tl.harrassowitz-library.com/article/tl/2024/1/6>
5. TOGABAYEVA, Guldana (2024b), Denominal verb derivation in *Jāmi ' at-Tawārīχ* by Qadir Ali Beg. *Turkic Studies Journal*. 6 (4). pp.168–190. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.32523/2664-5157-2024-4-168-190>
6. TOGABAYEVA, Guldana (in print), Ètnonimy vengerskogo naroda v postzolotoordynskix istočnikax. *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi*.

CONFERENCE SPEECHES ON THE TOPIC

1. "Near and Far" Conference on Oriental and East Asian Studies, Budapest, March 5–7, 2020.
The title of the presentation: *A Tatar mirror of princes from the year 1602*.
2. 24th National Conference of PhD Students in Linguistics (LingDokKonf24), Szeged, November 21, 2020.
The title of the presentation: *Finite verb forms in a 17th century Turkic variety: Qādir 'Alī Beg Jālāiri's 'Compendium of Chronicles'*.
3. 15th Faculty Doctoral Students' Conference of the Doctoral School in Linguistics, Szeged, June 23, 2021.
The title of the presentation: *Synonymous expressions of finite verb forms in a 17th century Turkic written historical text: Qādir 'Ali beg Jālāiri's 'Compendium of Chronicles'*.
4. 25th National Conference of PhD Students in Linguistics (LingDokKonf24), Szeged, November 18–19, 2021.

The title of the presentation: *Actionality as a converbial construction in a 17th century Turkic historical text*'.

5. 64th Annual Meeting of PIAC (Permanent International Altaistic Conference), Budapest, August 21–26, 2022.
The title of the presentation: *Names of Hungarians in Qādir 'Alī beg's 'Compendium of Chronicles' (1602)*.
6. The 6th International Congress of Turkology, titled *Studies on the Turkic World – Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, Warsaw, September 19–21, 2022.
The title of the presentation: *The 1st person voluntatives in Qādir 'Alī beg's 'Compendium of Chronicles' (1602)*.
7. The Kazak-Hungarian scientific conference, titled *Narratives of cultural, social, and economic diversity*, Debrecen, January 27, 2023.
The title of the presentation: *Turkic Jami at-Tawārīkh 'Compendium of Chronicles'*.
8. The Symposium, titled *Qazaq Word and Historical Sources*, Kokshetau, Kazakhstan, September 18, 2023.
The title of the presentation: *The postverbial constructions of Qādir 'Alī beg's 'Compendium of Chronicles' (1602)*.