

DOI 10.31029/vestdnc90/13

УДК 81:821.222.8

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF WORD-BUILDING POTENTIAL
OF THE NOMINAL SUFFIX -ZOR IN THE TAJIK LITERARY LANGUAGE
REFERRING TO THE XVIII AND XX CENTURIES**

B. P. Ashrapov, ORCID 0000-0001-8545-2329

Khujand State University named after Academician Bobojon Gafurov, Tajikistan Republic

**СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ СЛОВООБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНОГО ПОТЕНЦИАЛА
ИМЕННОГО СУФФИКСА -ЗОР В ТАДЖИКСКОМ ЛИТЕРАТУРНОМ ЯЗЫКЕ
XVIII и XX вв.**

Б. П. Ашрапов, ORCID 0000-0001-8545-2329

Худжандский государственный университет имени акад. Б. Гафурова,
Республика Таджикистан

Abstract. The article dwells on the issues beset with morphological peculiarities and the level of usage of the nominal suffix *-zor* in the Tajik literary language referring to the XVIII and XX centuries on the material of historical writings [2; 3; 13]. It is noted that the relevant suffix is one of the oldest and rarely used word-building elements in the language of the historical writings compared. It is concluded that the suffix *-zor* conduces to the formation of a series of derivative words denoting the notions of place and plurality, but the level of their usage is not identical. It is proven that the word *korzor* is used only as an underived one in “Tuhfat-ul-khoni”. One of the distinctive peculiarities of the nouns derived by means of the suffix *-zor* lies in the fact that they are pluralized by the suffix *-ho* in S. Aini’s works.

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются вопросы морфологических особенностей и продуктивности именного суффикса *-zor* в таджикском литературном языке XVIII и XX вв. на примере исторических произведений [2; 3; 13]. Отмечается, что соответствующий суффикс является одним из древнейших и редко употребляемых словообразовательных элементов в языке сравниваемых исторических сочинений. Делается вывод, что суффикс *-zor* участвует в образовании ряда производных слов, обозначающих понятия места и множественности, но их продуктивность неодинакова. Доказано, что слово *корзор* в «Тухфат-уль-хани» употребляется только как фразеологически связанное. Одна из отличительных особенностей существительных, образованных с помощью суффикса *-zor*, заключается в том, что они имеют множественное число с суффиксом *-ho* в произведениях С. Айни.

Ключевые слова: именной суффикс, производные слова, словообразовательный элемент, морфологические особенности, уровень употребления.

Keywords: nominal suffix, derivative words, word-building element, morphological peculiarities, level of usage.

Introduction

It is common knowledge that word-building is considered to be one of the ways aimed at the enrichment of the language word stock. Into the bargain, there are several ways of word-building in the modern Tajik literary language (MTLL). Nominal word-building based on morphological means is considered to be the most productive one in the works under comparison and discussion, like the MTLL. The majority of new lexical elements were derived in this way. As far back as the XIII century, one of the great scholars-Shamsi Qaysi Rozi, pointed out and analyzed a considerable number of word-building and formative elements and adduced many examples in order to strengthen his own statements and thoughts in his work entitled as “al-Mu`jam” [14, p. 177–198]. “It will not be an exaggeration, if we consider Shamsi Qaysi Rozi one of the founders of the grounds of word-building science in the Tajik language” [1, p. 210].

A researcher of the history of the Tajik language, Prof. A.V. Livshits asserts the following statement beset with word-building: “Word-building is considered to be one of the basic means of word-stock enrichment. Changes to both word-building and formative elements development and improvement occur in accordance with the requirements of the permanent rule of language and are of a very strong connection with the grammatical structure of language” [11, p. 87]. Since the 70-ies of the XX century, an outstanding

linguist S. Halimov underscored the importance of the study of the issue in question "... in the field of the word-building, there were not any works that have been created from written monuments and the peculiarities of word-building in the period proceed from a researched and explored work" [17, p. 283].

The object of the corpus of our study is the comparative analysis of word-building potential of the nominal suffix *-zor* in the Tajik literary language appertaining to the XVIII and XX centuries on the example of the historical writings entitled as "Tuhfat-ul-knoni" (the XVIII century) [13], "Ghulomon" (the XX century) [2] and "Ta'rikhi amironi manghitiyau Bukhoro, Isyoni Muqannna" (XX century) [3] depicting different events of the Tajik nation. The formers in question, considered to be one of the priceless and fundamental historical sources, contained numerous historical facts and evidence belonging to the periods under consideration.

The aims of the corpus of our study are:

- to dwell on morphological peculiarities and the level of usage of the relevant suffix in terms of its function and meaning;
- to compare the relevance of the theme explored with the MTLT;
- to elicit certain distinctive peculiarities of the nominal suffix *-zor*.

Scientific novelty

The article under consideration dwells on the comparative analysis of morphological peculiarities and the level of usage of the nominal suffix *-zor* in the Tajik literary language referring to the XVIII and XX centuries on the material of historical writings [2; 3; 6; 13] in the Tajik linguistic studies, for the first time. It is worth mentioning that the suffixes denoting place and plurality in our factological material are not identical in terms of their usage and they are of great importance in the exploration of this category of noun.

Methodology

In order to make our study convincible a visual method of research was used; at the same time, comparative-historical methods, synchronic and diachronic analysis were resorted to as well.

The result and discussion

To begin with, we can confidently say that the following suffixes *-goh (-gah)*, *-sor*, *-zor*, *-iston (-ston)* and *-kada* are used in the derivation of a considerable number of nouns denoting place and plurality in both the language of the historical writings and in the MTLT [7; 4; 9].

It is well-grounded that the suffix *-zor* is considered to be one of the oldest and rarely used word-building elements [8, p. 221] which other scholars in linguistic studies considered the relevant suffix as one of the primogenital word-building elements and underscored that "the former in question was written with a letter that can be similar to *-čor*, *-jor*, *-zor* in Pahlavi: *koričor*, *corridor*, *korizor*, meant the place of battle which is *korzor* in Persian [5, p. 82–92]. Therefore, this word-building element is explained in "Ghiyas-ul-lughot" as follows: "*Zor* is the place of appearance and it means the abundance and plenty of everything..." [12, v. 1, p. 386].

In reference to it, one can assert that the relevant suffix conduces to the derivation of other lexical units from the nouns representing rusticity, fruit, plants and names of objects in the language of the historical writings belonging to the given periods. It is worth mentioning that the level of their usage is not identical. Therefore, in Karminagi's work, only the following derivative nouns were found: *gulzor* – 4 instances, *alafzor* – 4 instances, *lolazor* – once, *korzor* – 42 instances, *kišzor* – once and *namakzor* – once. However, the above-mentioned suffix is more productive in terms of word-building in S. Aini's works, including: *kišzor* – 26 instances, *regzor* – 9 instances, *gulzor* – twice, *sangzor* – 2 twice ba *anorzor*, *anjirzor*, *marğzor*, *oluzor*, *tokzor*, *xorzor*, *hezumzor*, *šūrazor*, *čamanzor*, *šabuškzor* once: "...ulus-i manqitiya amvol-i xud-ro az aspu gūsfand dar čarogoh-i *alafzor-i* on jamoa guzošta, ba ham ulfatu mux-olatat menamudand [13, p. 424]; ...ba onho libosho-i palosi-i ğulomi pūšonida dar *kišzor-i* xud ba kor andox... [3, p. 205].

Proceeding from the assumption of the adduced examples out of “Tuhfat-ul-khoni” one can assert that the underived word *korzor* being used 42 instances in the following meanings as in the MTL: a) **battle-field**: Dar in *korzor* teği zafar dar panja-e nusrat nayoft [13, p. 89]; b) **battle and war**: ...šu`la-i qahru *korzor*... [13, p. 50]; ...ba iste`dod-i olot-i *korzor* va tayyori-i asbob-i harbu paykor muqayadu mašğul šudand... [13, p. 166] which is the place of **people`s works and movements**, but this underived word was not resorted to by S. Aini entirely.

Sometimes, the suffix *-zor* is combined with the words contributed to the formation of new derivative words which are not used for the notion of place, but for the expression of an abstract notion [10, p. 205–206]. An example of such a derivative word *korzor* is explained in “Dictionary of the Tajik Language” as meaning “war, battle” [16, v. 1, p. 564]. In this regard, Prof. Sh. Rustamov spoke and asserted the fact that: “The word *korzor* is actually a derivative one as it consists of the root *kor* and the suffix *-zor*, but it is included into the list of the underived nouns, because its root is not used in its original meaning now. In the MTL, the word *kor* (*work*) does not mean an army, a soldier, or a war, only its originally derivative one and its underived form can mean “war and fight” [15, p. 68]. However, the author of “Tuhfat-ul-khoni” uses the derivative word *korzor* in the sense of *battlefield*, *war*, *battle* and *combat* and the relevant grammatical event indicates that the process of entering *korzor* into the list of underived nouns took place after the XVIII century and it is a relatively new event: Va az on rū firaq-i ašror niz mutašammir-i *korzor* šuda, piyodavu savor rūye-i jasorat ba ma`raka-i razmu paykor ovarand [13, p. 41].

Va avlod avlod-i ešon-ro batnan ba`da batnin ba šart-i qabul-i qobiliyat ba mansab-i obovu joda-i ajdod meguzaronidand va niz daleron-i kori va muborizon-i *korzori-ro*, ki dar maydon-i nabardu mizmor-i tarhu tard asarho namuda... [13, p. 453]; Agar inoyat-i šahriyori aroiz-i nekhohon-ro ba sam`i rizo izğo farmoyand, čand-e az sardon-i mu`tabar-ro bo favj-e laškar az *mardon-i korzoru* nahangon-i muhit-i razmu paykor firistand... [13, p. 482].

From the above-mentioned examples we noticed that Karminagi used *korzor* as an adjective by means of the suffix *-i* in the first example and he used the former in question as a synonym of the relative adjective of *jangi* in the other example, the relevant linguistic phenomenon is considered to be one of the distinctive peculiarities of the theme explored. However, we have not come across the derivative word *korzor* in S. Aini`s historical productions at all.

Himmat-i daryonavi-i umaro-i laškar poy-i qal`a-ro bo saron-i hazora va sarxaylon-i yuza va javonon-i jonsupor-i dar muhorobot *korzornamuda-ro* ba xil`atho-i foxir va tašrifot-i munosib sarafrozi baxšid [13, p. 526]. In the above-adduced example, Karminagi resorted to the derivative word *korzor* only once and it was based on the mixed method model, such as: *noun+suffix+participle II=korzornamuda*.

Designing on the premise of the comparative analysis beset with the relevant suffix we determined that one of the distinguishing peculiarities of the derivative nouns in the historical writings under comparison lies in the fact that in the compared works belonging to the XX century nouns derived by dint of the suffix *-zor* which indicates the name of the place and the notion of plurality of the main subject are pluralized with the plural suffix *-ho* in some cases. However, the relevant morphological phenomenon is not characteristic of the historical writing referring to the XVIII century (on the example of “Tuhfat-ul-khoni” by Muhammadvafoi Karminagi). For instance: *regzorho* [2, p. 278], *paxtazorho* [2, p. 454], *xorzorho* [2, p. 217], *saksavulzorho* [2, p. 3], *kišzorho* [2, p. 130], *marğzorho* [2, p. 453]; Ubaydulloh dehaho, *kišzorho* va boğho-ro vayron kard [3, p. 201]; Dar kanor-i rūd-i Jilvon az on *regzorho*, *sangzorho* va *šūrazorho*, ki az avval-i hikoyaamon boz tasvir karda omadem, aknun asar-e namonda bud [2, p. 346].

Conclusion

Adducing the results of the comparative analysis concerned with the theme explored one can come to the conclusion that the nominal suffix *-zor* is considered to be one of the oldest and unproductive word-building elements in the literary language of the XVIII and XX centuries. In most cases, the former in question conduces to the formation of a series of derivative words denoting the notions of place and plu-

rality. It is worth stressing that the word *korzor* is used only as an underived one in “Tuhfat-ul-khoni”. One of the distinctive peculiarities of the nouns derived by dint of the suffix *-zor* lies in the fact that they are pluralized by the plural suffix *-ho* in S. Aini’s works, while the relevant morphological phenomenon is not normative in “Tuhfat-ul-khoni”.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. *Абдуллоева З.С.* Нақши пешванди исмсоз дар зухури вожаҳои сермаъно дар осори Низомии Ганҷавӣ // Номаи донишгоҳ. Силсилаи илмҳои гуманитарӣ ва ҷомеашиносӣ. 2017. № 4(53). С. 210–215.
2. *Айнӣ С.* Ғуломон / С.Айнӣ. Роман. Душанбе: Адабиёти бачагона, 2019. 488 с.
3. *Айнӣ С.* Таърихи амирони манғитияи Бухоро, Исёни Муқаннаъ. Ҷ.10. Душанбе: Ирфон, 1966. 243 с.
4. *Аиранов Б. П.* Уровень употребления суффикса *-гоҳ* в «Гарджумай Тарихи Ямини» Джурфодикони // *Studia Humanitatis*. 2023. № 1. EDN URFOMX.
5. *Байзоев А.М.* Хусусиятҳои калимасозии аффиксалии “Донишнома”-и Ибни Сино // Баъзе масъалаҳои актуалии филологияи Эрон. 1990. С. 82–92.
6. *Giyosov N.I., Ashrapov B.P.* Brief essay on copies of historical production entitled as “Tuhfat-ul-khani” by Muhammadwafo Karminagi // *Рефлексия*. 2021. N 5. P. 7–9. EDN HXRDAХ.
7. Грамматикаи забони адабии ҳозираи тоҷик: дар се ҷилд. Ҷилди 1. Душанбе: Дониш, 1985. 355 с.
8. *Ефимов В.А., Расторгуева В.С., Шарова Е.Н.* Персидский, таджикский, дари // Основы иранского языкознания. Новоиранские языки. М.: Наука, 1982. С. 3–230.
9. *Исмоилов О.Б., Аиранов Б.П.* Вежагиҳои сарфӣ ва вачҳи қорбурди пасвандҳои исми маънисоз дар забони адабии тоҷикии қарни XVIII (дар мисоли асари таърихии «Тухфат-ул-хонӣ») // Паёми Донишгоҳи миллии Тоҷикистон. Бахши илмҳои филологӣ. 2022. N 5. P. 18–23. EDN VBSOKE.
10. *Қобилов А.* Қорбурди пасванди маконсоз (*-зор*) дар “Тарҷумаи “Тафсири Табарӣ” // Номаи ховаршиносон. 2015. № 9. С. 204–207.
11. *Лившиц В.А.* О внутренних законах развития таджикского языка // Известия ООН АН ТаджССР. 1954. Вып. 5. С. 87–102.
12. *Муҳаммад Ф.* Ғиёс-ул-луғот. Душанбе: Адиб, 1987, 1988. Ҷ. 1.2. 480 с.
13. *Муҳаммадвафои Карминагӣ.* Тухфат-ул-хонӣ / Муқаддима, таҳияи матн, нусхабадал, таълиқот ва феҳрастҳои Ҷамшед Ҷӯразода ва Нурулло Ғиёсов / *И.У. Раҳимов, Б.П. Аиранов.* Хучанд: Ношир, 2018. 390 с. + 586 сах. ф. = 976 с.
14. *Розӣ Шамси Қайс.* Ал-муъҷам: муаллифи сарсухану тавзеҳот ва ҳозиркунандаи ҷоп У. Тоиров. Душанбе: Адиб, 1991. 463 с.
15. *Рустамов Ш.* Калимасозии исм дар забони адабии ҳозираи тоҷик. Душанбе: Адиб, 1972. 77 с.
16. Фарҳанги забони тоҷикӣ. М., 1969. Ҷ. 1. 951 с.; Ҷ. 2. 949 с.
17. *Ҳалимов С.* Калимасозии исм дар забони адабии тоҷик аз рӯйи забони “Тулистон”-и Саъдӣ // Масъалаҳои забон ва адабиёт. 1975. Т. 2. С. 283–307.

Поступила в редакцию 06.07.2023 г.

Принята к печати 28.11.2023 г.

Аиранов Баходурдҷон Пулотович, старший преподаватель кафедры английского языка, Худжандский государственный университет им. академика Б. Гафурова; 735700, Республика Таджикистан; г. Худжанд, ул. Мавлонбекова, 1; e-mail: bahodur.ashrapov@mail.ru

Bahodurjon P. Ashrapov, senior lecturer of the Department of English language; Khujand State University named after Academician Bobojon Gafurov; 1, Mavlonbekov st., Khujand-city, Tajikistan Republic, 735700; e-mail: bahodur.ashrapov@mail.ru