

Werk

Titel: Reviews

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2017

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0021 | LOG_0031

Kontakt/Contact

[Digizeitschriften e.V.](#)
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Reviews

Bernt Brendemoen: Review of Silje Susanne Alvestad *The Uppsala manuscript of Muḥammed Hevā'ī Ūskūfī's Maḳbūl-i 'ārif (1631) from a Turcological perspective.* (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 105.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2016.

*Bernt Brendemoen, Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages, University of Oslo, Postbox 1010 Blindern NO-0315, Oslo, Norway.
E-mail: bernt.brendemoen@ikos.uio.no*

Writing rhymed dictionaries cannot be said to have been *en vogue* in the Ottoman empire (or elsewhere), but still, from the 16th century onwards, at least three have come down to us. The first one, which served as a methodological pattern for the subsequent ones, is Şāhidī Ībrāhīm Dede's Persian-Turkish versified glossary the *Tuḥfe-i Şāhidī* (1544); the second is a Bosnian-Turkish glossary, Muḥammed Hevā'ī Ūskūfī's *Maḳbūl-i 'ārif* from 1631, and the third one an Armenian-Turkish dictionary by Refī'i Kālāyī from around 1800. Of these, *Maḳbūl-i 'ārif* has received the most attention. Not long after it was written, it was mentioned by Evliyā Çelebī in the section of the *Seyāhatnāme* where he deals with Bosnia, and Evliyā gives long examples from the text. However, the text has experienced a revival in modern times, not only because it is the first "dictionary" of any South Slavic language, but also because Ūskūfī is one of the very first to name the language "Bosnian", a fact that without doubt has given the text high prestige in modern times. However, the claim that "Ūskūfī is to Bosnian what Dante is to Italian"¹ seems to be a gross exaggeration.

In 2011, the 380th anniversary of Ūskūfī's glossary and the 410th anniversary of the birth of its writer were celebrated in Bosnia. In that connection, a new edition was prepared, and it appeared in Tuzla the same year.² Some years previously, a manuscript of the text had been "rediscovered" at the University library in Uppsala. This manuscript is reproduced in facsimile in the Tuzla book, but the transcribed text is unfortunately not a transcription of this manuscript, but has been reproduced from earlier editions of the text based on different manuscripts. In some places, there are important divergences between the transcribed text and the Uppsala manuscript. What Silje Susanne Alvestad has now done, is to make a critical edition of the Uppsala manuscript, comparing it with earlier editions. She also gives the first English translation of the text, and addresses some important questions raised by the text itself.

1 Suggested by the Bosnian historian Enver Imamov; see p. 1 in the book under review.

2 Kasumović, Ahmet & Mønnesland, Svein: Bosansko-Turski Rječnik. Muhamed Hevai Uskufi, 1631 godine. Tuzla 2011.

Each line of the text is rendered first in transliteration, then in transcription (using Modern Turkish characters such as ç and ş) as well as in the transcriptions of earlier scholars such as Okumuş (2009) and Kadriç (2011), and finally in English translation. The author writes (p. 27) that her principles for transliterating and transcribing the text are inspired by Christiane Bulut's 1997 edition of the section of Evliyâ Çelebî's *Seyâhatnâme* that deals with the journey from Bitlis to Van, but she is obviously unaware of the (in my view, unjust) criticism Bulut received because her transliteration principles were so unorthodox, since she does not comment on it.

The rhymed glossary is the central part of the *Maḳbûl-i 'ârîf*, but it is preceded by a long introduction and followed by a short afterword, both written in versified high style Ottoman. (The afterword is missing from the Uppsala manuscript, but for the sake of completeness, the author has used the text from the Tuzla edition.) The Turkish language of the glossary part, however, is much simpler. Elaborating the views of Kerima Filan (p. 18), the author defends the (actually quite obvious) view that the target group of the book is not Bosnians who want to learn Turkish, but Turks who wish to learn Bosnian, since Bosnian, alongside the other South Slavic languages, was frequently heard in court circles in Istanbul, where it was spoken by the *devşirmes*, who almost exclusively came from the Balkans. The fact that the target group was Turks must be the reason why Turkish is the "meta language" not only in the glossary, but also in the introduction and the afterword. The Bosnian component consists entirely of independent words. Besides, the introduction and afterword, with their heavy literary style, would also be incomprehensible to anyone not very familiar with Ottoman Turkish. The author also holds the view that Üsküfî himself was a *devşirme* boy who was taken to Istanbul and received his education there, and she mentions the possibility, based on the introduction, that he wrote his glossary after returning to Bosnia as a pensioner (p. 11). (Üsküfî may still have been a Muslim by birth, since Muslim boys were also occasionally brought to Istanbul as *devşirmes*.)

Another possible target group of the glossary, not mentioned by the author, could be Turks who were not at the court in Istanbul, but who lived and worked in Bosnia but did not know Bosnian.³ The Ottoman officials and clergy were probably not recruited from among the local Muslims, but were appointed from Istanbul and came from different parts of the empire. Although Turkish was the language of the rulers, most of the local population did not learn to speak it, although during the centuries of Ottoman rule their Slavic language was inundated by all kinds of Turkish terminology. In this respect, the high status enjoyed by the Turkish clergy and

3 Whatever the target group may have been, it should be pointed out that *Maḳbûl-i 'ârîf* has a weak pedagogical structure. Although the glossary starts with primary concepts such as "God" and "man", we soon find verses such as *Şo tuzdur, riç sözdür, susasın da muçi ti!* "So is salt, riç is word, and you shut up! is *muçi ti!*" (p. 59), where the logical consistency between the "entries" is rather weak.

officials should not be underestimated.⁴ This brings us into the question whether there has ever really been a Turkish dialect of its own in Bosnia. The Turkish vocabulary of *Maḳbūl-i ‘arīf* at least gives no indication of any Balkan Turkish element at all. There is a great difference between the Turkish in the introduction and the afterword on one side and the Turkish in the glossary on the other, but the difference has nothing to do with dialect differences. Based partly on the previous research by Kerima Filan and partly on her own investigations, Alvestad clearly shows that the highly literary language of the introduction and the afterword abounds in Arabic and Persian elements, while the language of the glossary is quite simple and unsophisticated, using almost entirely Turkish words (pp.116–119). There are phonological characteristics reflecting 17th century Turkish (pp. 120), such as lack of labial harmony in some suffixes, but similar forms are found all over the Turkish-speaking area.

In some manuscripts, *Maḳbūl-i ‘arīf* bears another title, *Potur Šahidija*. This enigmatic title is discussed at length in the book (pp. 21–25). The last element must refer to Šāhidī Ībrāhīm Dede, the writer of the Persian-Turkish versified glossary mentioned above, which also must have been widely known, since the meaning here must be “book in Šāhidī’s style”, i.e. “versified glossary”. The element *potur* means “Bosnian Muslim”, i.e. “convert to Islam”, especially from the rural areas of Bosnia, and has slightly pejorative connotations. The etymology, however, is not clear; either it comes from Slavic *poturica*, which would mean ‘little Turk’, or there is a connection with the designation of the special kind of baggy trousers used in the Balkans, where only the part from the waist to above the knees is baggy, while the lower part of the legs is very narrow. Such trousers are indeed called *potur*, which possibly has an Armenian etymology. Evliyā Çelebī states that the Bosnians were called *potur* because of the trousers they wore, but Dr. Alvestad indicates that it could also be the other way around. It is difficult to give a proper answer, but it should be kept in mind that using the name of a characteristic piece of clothing to refer to the whole group of people wearing it (by the way of *pars pro toto* or metonymy), especially in a pejorative meaning, is not uncommon, cf. *Blackshirt* or *Camicia nera*, ‘member of an armed squad of Italian fascists under Mussolini’, later used

4 In an (unfortunately) unpublished PhD thesis, *Turkish Loanwords in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Bosnian and Bulgarian Franciscan Texts*, Florence Graham (Oxford University) has shown the abundance of Turkish lexical elements in the kind of colloquial language in the two areas where one would expect the Turkish impact to be weakest. There seems, however, to be an important difference between the areas in that agricultural terminology is mostly found in Bulgaria. This could perhaps indicate that the contact between Turkish- and Bosnian-speakers was largely an urban phenomenon in Bosnia because the Turks there largely belonged to the clergy or administration, while there were considerable waves of Turkish immigration from Anatolia into Bulgaria from the 14th century onwards.

more generally with the meaning 'militant fascist', or *burqa* with the meaning 'woman wearing a burqa', etc.

Silje Susanne Alvestad has done a very thorough job indeed, studying the *Maḳ-būl-i 'ārif* with new both Turcological and Slavicist eyes, and without neglecting previous work on the field, thus making an important step forward in philology.

Bert Fragner: Review of Éva Á. Csató, Lars Johanson, András Róna-Tas, and Bo Utas (eds.) *Turks and Iranians. Interactions in language and history*. (Turcologica 105.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag 2016, 296 pp. ISSN 0177-4743. ISBN 978-3-447-10537-8.

Bert Fragner, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Dr. Ignaz Seipel-Platz 2, 1010 Wien, Austria. Email: bert.fragner@oeaw.ac.at

This volume is published on the occasion of The Gunnar Jarring Memorial Program at the Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study—a very appropriate setting for a project dealing with Turko-Iranian historical and linguistic interactions. It ought to be added that such “interactions” in history and linguistics/philology almost automatically include aspects of cultural studies as well. There are scholars for whom this goes without saying; particularly regarding Turkic and Iranian peoples it is worth stressing that in many cases different linguistic conditions do not immediately indicate analogous diversity in cultural matters. There is too much evidence throughout history of the fact that linguistic domains are not at all congruent with cultural domains; in many cases the overlapping aspects are much more significant than those of separation.

It is this perspective that is scrutinized by the contributors to this exceptional volume. The initiative to compile such a volume was presumably taken by Éva Á. Csató and Lars Johanson, but there is no doubt that an active part was also taken by scholars deeply rooted in Iranian Studies, such as Bo Utas, Prods Oktor Skjærvø, the late Werner Sundermann, Judith Josephson and Donald Stilo. Readers of the contributions to this volume may repeatedly be reminded of the famous saying *tatsiz türk bolmās bašsiz bōrk bolmās* ‘There is no Persian except in the company of a Turk, (just as) there is no cap unless there is a head to put it on’⁵ preserved by Maḥmud Kashghari’s *Dīvānū l-lūgati Türk*.

Historically, cases of Irano-Turkic interaction are focused on two main areas, the steppe regions of Central Asia and the Plateau of Iran, both understood broadly so as to include Eastern Europe, Anatolia and the Balkans, not to mention the Subcontinent. Some appetizers deserve to be mentioned: Peter B. Golden offers an excellent historical framework for the basic concept of the volume (*The Shaping of the Turks in Medieval Eurasia*) as something like a thematic overture; Skjærvø and the late professor Sundermann offer case studies concerning what I call the “Turfan complex”. Shifting topographically toward the Iranian Plateau, Bo Utas places the quest for differences between Middle Persian and New Persian onto the Turko-Iranian grid, and Judith Josephson does something similar for middle Persian verbal struc-

⁵ Dankoff, Robert & Kelly, James (eds.) 1984. *Maḥmūd al Kāšgarī. Compendium of the Turkic dialects. (Dīwān Luḡāt at-Turk)*. Washington, D.C.: Harvard University. Vol. 2: 103.

tures. András Róna-Tas offers *Nine notes on Turks and Iranians in Eastern Europe*, and Golden contributes an intrinsic study concerning Türk and Khazaro-Iranian interaction in the Middle Ages.

Lars Johanson touches explicitly on the quest for convergences between Turkic and Iranian languages quoting Gerhard Doerfer's hyperbolic *aperçu*, according to which northern vernacular Tajik from the vicinity of Tashkent can be perceived as something like a "Turkish language *in statu nascendi*". This is probably not a scholarly definition, but it may serve as a plausible illustration of the close and tightly interwoven relationship between Turkic and Iranian languages—not only in a strict linguistic sense but also in a cultural and historical sense. It seems to me that there is a particular and even delicate problem here: in a cultural and historical perspective the "Iranian" and the "Turkic" realms cannot practically be separated, and most scholars concerned with these topics will immediately agree with such a statement. Nevertheless, it seems difficult to subordinate theoretically diverse phenomena to the domains of one or the other of these two disciplines. It seems to me that the problem is rooted in the traditions of the two disciplines themselves; for generations, Turkic/Turkish Studies and Iranian Studies were primarily defined by (historically comparative) linguistic criteria. There were also, however, closely related researchers who might have perceived themselves as at home in something vague like "Oriental" or "Islamic" studies, and more recently "Middle Eastern" Studies, and who cared much less about this kind of taxonomical subordination.

One of the Russian ancestors of our studies, Vladimir Bartol'd, has never defined himself as a Turkologist or an "Iranologist"; he saw himself rather much more pragmatically, as belonging to the family of "Orientalists". Neither historians belonging to the "Turkic" side nor those from the "Iranian" side can refrain from identifying themselves as the scholarly descendants of Bartol'd among others. A similar pattern can be ascribed to Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall. His position as an ancestor of "Ottoman Studies" is undeniable, but he enjoys equal standing for having been at the forefront of the scholarly study of Persian Poetry and history as well.

This consideration is not very much questioned and reflected upon in the volume. Instead, it is dedicated to a large number of substantial case-studies of Turkic-Iranian interaction. Cases of linguistic interference, not to say convergence (reminding me of Gerhard Doerfer!), are treated in a masterly fashion by among others Donald Stilo and Christiane Bulut. There are two contributions which I especially appreciate, because they so intensely represent how Iranologists can benefit from Turkologist activities: Heidi Stein's "Persian Syntactic Influence on Irano-Turkic Texts (16th century)" and István Vásáry's "The Role and Function of Mongolian and Turkic in Ilkhanid Iran". They are relevant for themes and questions which I have tried to deal with for more than thirty years.

After so many attempts at thematic rapprochement and convergence, this volume is definitely a milestone, and we have to thank its editors and contributors for having presented such a beautiful specimen of intellectual and disciplinary cross-fertilization. The volume invited me to think more substantially about possibilities of estab-

lishing an institutional body (something like a “permanent conference”) to promote enduring contacts and exchange of perspectives between Turcologists and Iranologists. Referring to Vladimir Minorsky, Hans Robert Roemer once made the remark—with particular reference to the period of Timurid reign—that Turks and Iranians (in his wording “Tajiks”) are like oil and water, they do not mix. Flatly rejecting this statement, Beatrice Manz coined the beautiful bon mot that “Turks and Persians are not like oil and water; they are much more like oil and vinegar”. In my view this metaphor applies to Turcologists and Iranologists as well.

Saule Tazhibayeva: Review of Aynur Abish *Modality in Kazakh as spoken in China* (Turcologica 107.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 2016. 250 pp. ISBN: 978-3-447-10626-9

Saule Tazhibayeva, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Department of Turcology, K. Satpayev Str. 2, Astana 010008, Kazakhstan. E-mail: saulekazhibayeva@mail.ru

The reviewed book is a comprehensive study of the expressions of modality in Kazakh as spoken in China. The Kazakh population in China is about 20 million. The Kazakh language is used in a very wide area both in Kazakhstan and outside of it with little dialectal variation. The Kazakhs have a strong national and linguistic identity; all speakers throughout the world understand each other easily, and share similar national and cultural traditions. This became especially evident when repatriated Kazakhs began to return to their historical motherland from various countries. Although Kazakh varieties are quite similar in spoken communication, the language is currently written in three distinct alphabets: Cyrillic, Arabic and Latin. Kazakhs understand each other in oral speech, but the different writing systems cause problems, especially in scholarship. Because of this, it is especially important to study Kazakh varieties that became separated from the main ethnic area as a result of the deportation in the 1930s during the collectivization in the USSR and in the period of the famine. The variety of Kazakh spoken in China is preserved in the form in which it had existed before the Soviet era in Kazakhstan, when Kazakh was strongly dominated by Russian. At present, there are rapid processes of cultural assimilation of Kazakhs to Chinese culture. Therefore it is important to describe the language in a well-defined theoretical framework, as has been done in the reviewed monograph.

Abish's study begins with an introduction. Here she points out that she does not provide any systematic comparison with the Kazakh varieties spoken in Kazakhstan. This opens up a perspective for future comparative research on the Kazakh language in China and in Kazakhstan.

The volume is well structured and consists of five main chapters logically connected with each other. A detailed list of references and an appendix are added.

The linguistic data used in this study comes exclusively from Kazakh as spoken in China. In the introduction, Abish gives a brief review of research on Kazakh in China, including important sociolinguistic data such as number of speakers, education, institutions, publications, and broadcasting using Kazakh. This is an important contribution providing general information about Kazakh in China for English-speaking readers.

Modality, the main issue of the monograph, is analyzed in a framework based on the works of Lars Johanson, whose framework defines semantic notions of modality from a functional and typological perspective. Kazakh applies three formal devices, grammaticalized suffixes, particles, and lexical markers, to express various modal

notions. A great advantage of the work is that examples are presented in Turcological transcription with interlinear annotation and a free translation.

In the chapter *Modality*, the conceptual domain of modality is defined. Modality markers convey the expression of attitudes towards the proposition; these can be notions of volition, epistemic evaluation, and deontic evaluation. Notions of volition include demands, requests, directives, commands, impositions, entreaties, admonitions, warnings, exhortations, proposals, recommendations, advice, encouragement, incitement, etc. Epistemic evaluation covers various types of assessments of the propositional content that can reflect a commitment to the truth value of the proposition, i.e. to its certainty, probability, possibility, etc. Deontic evaluation expresses directives that impose or propose that an action should be carried out in order to compel, incite or encourage to action, in the sense of ‘should’, ‘ought to’ and the like. Further distinctions between subjective (p. 13) and objective modality (p. 14), personal and impersonal constructions (p. 16), and illocutionary modality are also discussed in the study. Some examples of non-modal notions, i.e. inherent properties, are also presented.

Three chapters describe modal notions that are conveyed by moods, modal particles, and lexical expressions respectively.

Turkic languages have rich and well developed systems of grammatical moods. This is well illustrated by the example of Kazakh as spoken in China. In the chapter *Moods* (pp. 18–69), grammaticalized suffixes expressing different modal notions are presented:

highly grammaticalized inflectional forms of verbs (imperative, voluntative, optative, hypothetical);
 the non-productive imprecative in $\{-G^4I^2r\}$;
 modal nuances expressed by the aorist $\{-(A^2)r\}$;
 periphrastic expressions of modality;
 $\{-G^4I^2\}$ + possessive personal markers + *kel-* or *bar*
 $\{-sA^2\}$ + *iygi* + *ʸedi*; $\{-sA^2\}$ + *deymın*; $\{-sA^2\}$ + *kerek*.

The forms, basic semantic and syntactic properties, and usages of moods, imperative, voluntative, optative and hypothetical are presented in detail. The author points out that imperative and voluntative are different paradigms. In some Turkic grammars, the paradigms are merged into a so-called “imperative” paradigm including the imperative and the third-person voluntative, or into a so-called “optative” paradigm that also includes voluntatives of the first persons.

In the chapter *Modal particles* (pp. 70–113), the author studies the peculiarities of modal particles in Kazakh expressing cognitive or affective attitude towards the events described. The particles dealt with include I^2oy , $šI^2$, *aw*, $ʷözi$, D^2A^2 , mI^2s , iya , *á*, *de*, *deši*, *desejši* and *bilem*. Abish describes their variants, their syntactic positions, their basic semantic properties, and their usages.

It is important to note that all the above-mentioned particles are treated in the academic grammar of modern Kazakh (Žanpejsov & Xusajnov & Oralbaeva eds. 2002). The particles play a significant role in spoken communication.

The chapter *Lexical expressions* (pp. 114–153) is devoted to lexical means of expressing modal notions with the help of adverbs and verbal and nominal constructions. The most frequently used lexical expressions of modality are classified according to their semantics.

The author classifies modal adverbs with respect to their modal meanings:

Possibility: *balkim* ‘maybe, perhaps’, *balkiy* ‘perhaps’, *mümkün* (МҮМКІН) ‘possible’;

Probability: *áytewir/áytew* ‘anyway’ or ‘anyhow’, *báribir* ‘all the same, nevertheless’, *čaması* ‘probably’, *siyaǵı* ‘seemingly’, *ásili* ‘actually’, *sıra* ‘apparently, probably’, *zadı* ‘essentially’, *tegi* ‘obviously, apparently’;

Certainty: *arine/álbette* ‘of course, certainly’, *sözsiz, sözjoq* ‘surely’.

Modal meanings of volition can be expressed by verbs of different semantics such as

bıyur- ‘to order to be done’, *ötin-* ‘to entreat, ask’, *sura-* ‘to beg’, *talap^yet-* ‘to request, ask’, *uşunus^yet-* ‘to suggest’, *qala-* ‘to want, wish’, *tile-* ‘to wish, desire’, *ümüt^yet-* ‘to hope’, *armanda-* ‘to hope, aim at’, *kökse-* ‘to wish, desire’.

Modal meaning of necessity can be expressed by nominals such as

qajet, kerek, tiyis ‘needed, necessary’, *lazım* ‘necessary, ought’, *jön* ‘right, correct, suitable’ or *abzal* ‘right, correct, admissible’, *durus* ‘right, true, correct’, *layıq* ‘suitable, appropriate’, *şart* ‘essential’, *mındetti* ‘obligatory’, *mázbür* ‘constrained, compelled’.

Modal meaning of possibility can be expressed by verbs such as

boladı ‘to be possible’, *jolber-* ‘to allow’, *ruqsat^yet-* ‘to permit’, *joıyoı-* ‘to allow’, *tiyim sal-* ‘to forbid, prohibit’, *čekte-* ‘to forbid’, *teje-* ‘to restrict, limit’ or *jolberme-* ‘not to allow’, *ruqsat^yetpe-* ‘not to permit’.

The following constructions expressing probability are presented:

bolar ‘to become, be possible’, *çıyar* ‘can turn out to be’, *körinedi* ‘it seems’, *uqsaydı* ‘it looks like’, *siyaqtı* ‘like, similar’, *şıqıldı* ‘like, similar’, *sekıldi* ‘like, similar’, *álpetti* ‘like, similar’, *mümkün* ‘possible’, *ıktimal* ‘probable’, *kadık* ‘improbable’, *bolmasın* ‘it is hopefully not’.

Exactly parallel usages of the same verbs are also found in Modern Kazakh. Only a few of them are not preserved in modern Kazakh: *kökse-* 'to wish', *joıyoı-* 'to allow', *teje-* 'to restrict', *kadıık-* 'probability'.

The definition of modality employed in this research excludes the notions of ability and intentionality. They are not included among the modal categories dealt with. However, descriptions of some non-modal categories are given by the author in the chapter *Non-modal expressions* in which Kazakh data is compared to literary and colloquial Uyghur.

The Appendix contains nine texts recorded by the author in the Kazakh-speaking regions of Xinjiang. Examples from these texts are used to illustrate modal notions discussed in the study.

The author makes some comparisons between Kazakh, Uyghur, and Turkish. I think this is a valuable contribution to comparative Turkic linguistics. In the future it would also be important to compare Kazakh as spoken in China with modern Kazakh as spoken in Kazakhstan. This would be valuable for Kazakh linguistics, especially with regard to the theme of the monograph. In Kazakhstan, several dissertations have been defended on different aspects of modality: Žanpejsov (1958), Išanov (1968), Mamadilov (1996), Medetov (1982), and Ғұлманов (2004). Modality as a grammatical category, and modal expressions as a separate part of speech have only been included in academic grammars since Žanpejsov & Xusajnov & Oralbaeva eds. (2002). However, there is no specific research on modality from a functional typological perspective.

It is my conviction that the young scholar Aynur Abish has published a serious piece of research on a theoretically complicated problem. The analysis she has conducted is profound and deep. Her scientific background in German and Swedish academic traditions has helped Aynur Abish to conduct research which is also important for its practical applications. The results of the research can be used in teaching at Kazakhstani universities in the new Kazakhstani multilingual education. The results of the monograph are also important for Kazakh linguistics with respect to making Kazakh better known nationally and internationally.

Literature

- Išanov, K. 1968. *Povelitelnoe i želatel'noe naklonenie v sovremennom kazaxskom jazyke*. [Imperative and volitional mood in contemporary Kazakh]. Abstract of dissertation for the degree Candidate of Philology. Alma-Ata
- Ғұлманов, S. 2004. *Қазақ тіліндегі мүмкіндік модальдігінің функционалды-семантикалық өрісі* [The functional-semantic field of modality of possibility in the Kazakh language]. Abstract of dissertation for the degree Candidate of Philology. Almaty.
- Mamadilov, K. 1996. *Қазіргі қазақ тіліндегі етістіктің модальдік құрылымдары* [Grammaticalized modal devices in Modern Kazakh]. Abstract of dissertation for the degree Candidate of Philology. Almaty.

- Medetova, G. 1982. *Modal'nost' predloženiya i sredstva ee vyraženiya v turkskix jazykax* [Modality of assumption and ways of its expression in Turkic languages]. Abstract of dissertation for the degree Candidate of Philology. Alma-Ata.
- Žanpejsov, E. 1958. *Modalnye slova v sovremennom kazaxskom jazyke* [Modal words in contemporary Kazakh]. Abstract of dissertation for the degree Candidate of Philology. Alma-Ata.
- Žanpejsov, E. & Xusajnov, K. & Oralbaeva, N. (eds.) 2002. *Qazaq grammatikasi. Fonetika, söžžasam, morfologija, sintaksis* [Kazakh grammar. Phonetics, lexicon, morphology, syntax]. Astana: Astana poligrafija.

