

Werk

Label: ReviewSingle

Autor: Kirchner , Mark

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2005

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0009 | LOG_0046

Kontakt/Contact

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

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Review

Mark Kirchner: Review of Fuat Ašrafovič Ganiev. *Sovremennyy tatarskij literaturnyj jazyk. Slovoobrazovanie po konversii*. Kazan': Dom pečati. 2004. 159 pp.

Mark Kirchner, Institut für Orientalistik, Justus-Liebig-Universität, Otto-Behagel-Str. 10E, DE-35394 Giessen, Germany. E-mail: Mark.Kirchner@orientalistik.uni-giessen.de

The book under review is not only a valuable contribution to Tatar linguistics but also a guide to the eminent scientific work of one of the great contemporary Tatar scholars. In the appendix (pp. 114-157) the reader is provided with a chronological bibliography of Ganiev's works, an impressive list of publications to which Ganiev contributed as "redaktor", and other publications related to his scholarly activities. In the context of this review it may suffice to mention the author's lexicographical activities, namely his co-authorship of the Tatar-Russian dictionary (Moscow 1966), and his contribution to the monolingual dictionary of the Tatar language in three volumes (Kazan' 1977-1981). Closely related to lexicography are four monographs by Ganiev on different aspects of word formation in the Tatar language, published in the years between 1973 and 1982.

The book under review investigates Tatar word formation under the aspect of "conversion", a concept proposed by the author and others to describe lexicalization in context with the change of word classes. The concept of conversion is discussed thoroughly in a broader Turcological perspective giving much space to alternative models (pp. 8-33). One of the main points is the question of the definition of word classes in Turkic languages. Some of this discussion is documented and commented upon in the well-known article by Lars Johanson "Studien zur türkeitürkischen Grammatik" in "Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft" (ed. by Gy. Hazai, Budapest 1980, pp. 146-301).

Ganiev is aware of the theoretical implications of this problem and proposes a differentiated system of word classes from a typological-comparative point of view. Doing so he, for example, analyses adjectives as a word class distinct from nouns. Even if these and other delimitations are controversial among Turcologists, the results of this study are impressive and shed light on several topics of recent linguistic discussions.

Interesting results are presented in the chapter dealing with the formation of nouns via conversion (pp. 34-47). In several cases Russian language contact seems to be the reason for the lexicalization of prototypical Tatar adjectives as nouns, *xärbiy* 'military' cf. Russian *voennyj* → *xärbiy* 'member of the armed forces' cf. Russian *voennyj* (p. 35). This is especially true in the case of neologistic terminology (pp. 42-

43). Adjectivization (pp. 48-73) happens to be the most productive way of 'conversion' in the Tatar language.

Several of Ganiev's results are interesting when we compare Tatar with Turkish data. Is Tatar *yon külmek* 'woolen shirt' (p. 53) the result of the same processes as Turkish *yün gömlek* 'id.'? Are native structures reinforced by Indo-European categories? The case of adverbialization (pp. 74-86) is problematic to a certain degree since the morphologically distinct category of adverbs in Russian seems to exercise an influence on the description. In all chapters of his book Ganiev shows how lexicalization and the change of word classes are interrelated in the field of word formation.

Unfortunately post-Soviet Russian Turcological studies are often disregarded by western Turcologists. The reasons for this are manifold: lack of knowledge of Russian, which still is an important international language of scholarship, problems in the distribution of recently published books from Russia, the Caucasus and Central Asia, or simply a lack of information. In the years since the end of the Soviet Union, there has been a general impression that Turcology in the CIS countries was undergoing a severe crisis or had even come to an end. Studies such as the book under review show that continuity in the academic tradition and the revival of Turkic languages in the region form a firm base for interesting studies in the field of Turkic linguistics.

