

*К юбилею Н.И. Гиясова*

*М.О. Ходжаева (Худжанд, Республика Таджикистан)*

### **Отражение фонетических проблем в словаре в «Чароги хидоят» Алихона Орзу**

*Аннотация:* Статья посвящена анализу отражения проблем фонетики, в частности орфографии и орфоэпии, в лексикографическом труде первой половины XVIII в. «Чароги хидоят» Сироджуддина Алихона Орзу. На основе изучения фразеологического словаря «Чароги хидоят» автор статьи делает вывод, что Орзу ввел некоторые новые понятия в корпус грамматических, в том числе фонетических, терминов своего времени. Также утверждается и документированно подтверждается, что Орзу был первым лексикографом, внесшим в свой словарь орфоэпическое описание отдельных церебральных звуков индийского языка.

*Ключевые слова:* история таджикско-персидской лексикографии, историческая фонетика, вопросы орфографии и орфоэпии в средневековых словарях, «Чароги хидоят» Алихона Орзу

---

*М.О. Khojaeva (Khujand, Republic of Tajikistan)*

### **Reflection of Phonetical Problems in “Charoghi hidoyat” by Alikhon Orzu**

*Abstract:* The article dwells on the analysis of the reflection of the problems of phonetics, spelling and orthoepy in particular, in Sirojiddin Alikhon Orzu’s “Charoghi hidoyat” – the lexicographic production of the first half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Proceeding from the studied contents of “Charoghi hidoyat” phraseological dictionary, the author of the article comes to the conclusion that Orzu introduced some new notions into the stock of grammatical and phonetical terms of his time. He also asserts and confirms his assertions with documents running to the effect that Orzu was the first lexicographer who contributed orthoepic description of separate cerebral sounds of the Indian language into his dictionary.

*Key words:* history of Tajik-Persian lexicography, historical phonetics, issues of spelling and orthoepy in mediaeval dictionaries, “Charoghi hidoyat” by Alikhon Orzu

## INTRODUCTION

It is common-knowledge that one of the most important issues beset with historical linguistics, which dictionaries belonging to the Middle Ages can promote its recognition, including orthographic and orthoepic ones, because Tajik dictionaries are not only published in order to explain and preserve the language word-stock, but to maintain the rules and laws of the language, such as to record the correction of words, to correct their orthography, to show these words pronunciation correctly either [3: 12–13].

## MAIN RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Accordingly, the study and consideration of issues concerning the standard of certain words pronunciation and correction of their writing also serve to solve certain orthographical and orthoepic issues of the present-day Tajik lexicography. The authors of the dictionaries belonging to the Middle Ages paid special attention to specify and clarify by what letters to be written words. The analysis of the way to specify the letters in “Charoghi hidoyat” leads us to come to the conclusion that Alikhon Orzu, like most of the authors of other lexicographical productions classified the alphabet from several points of view.

Firstly, all letters are distinguished by the presence or absence of a dot (*nuqta*). The following terms *muhmala* (without dots) and *mujama* (dotted) are used to express a dot presence and absence. If there are two dotted or non-dotted letters in a word, it is called *muhmalatain* and *mu'jamatain*. Alongside with the term *muhmala*, the terms *ghairimu'jama* and *benuqta* (without dots) are also used to emphasize the non-dotted letters: ro-i muhmala, sin-i benuqta, zo-i mu'jama, sin-i muhmala, ghain-i mu'jama, sod-i muhmala, sin-i benuqta, to-i benuqta, ho-i benuqta, etc.

In conformity with professor M. Kosimova's opinion “the mu'jama letters consist of 17 ones, and the letter *yo* comes both at the initial and middle and is included into the mu'jama letters, and in that case the number of mu'jama letters reaches 18 ones” [5: 51]. The remaining fourteen letters of Tajik-Arabic alphabet contain the muhmala ones.

Secondly, Orzu, following other lexicographers who lived in Persian-Tajik Middle Ages separates the letters into Persian and Arabic (Tazi): jim-i Farsi, kof-i Farsi, ro-i Farsi, bo-i Farsi, bo-i Tazi, jim-i Tazi, kof-i Tazi etc.

Thirdly, in order to specify the separate letters, Orzu sometimes uses the separate terms consisting eight words that the Arabs created to remember their alphabet letters (Abjad, Hawwaz, Hutti, Kalaman, Safas, Karashat, Sahiz, Zazig) [2: 10], including: to-i karashat, ho-i hawwaz, ho-i hutti and to-i hutti.

Fourthly, taking into account the graphic form of the Arabic alphabet, the letters are divided into *favqoni* (up dotted words) and *tahtoni* (down dotted words). The meaning of *favqoni* is from *to-i manquta*, and *tahtoni* is *yo*, and its dots are placed under the letter. In most cases, only the words *favqoni* or *tahtoni* are resorted to with the deletion of the letter name, which the relevant phonetical occurrence is also found in the previous lexicographical productions:

*Bozon* – ma'khuz az bokhtan ba manoi bokhta shuda va bar in qiyos tozon ba favqoni az tokhtan... [10: 1023];

*Chilim*... va chilim ba tahtoni jam' yo chilim mukhaffafi in va in az muhovara ba tahqiq rasid [10: 1080].

In most cases, it was used in the form of *by up-dotted fatha* “ba fathi favqoni” (marking a letter with the vowel-point in Arabic fatha) and *by up-dotted double consonant letter* “ba tashdidi favqoni”.

Fifthly, in regard to the names of separate letters. Depending on whether or not Hawwaz letters are pronounced, the following terms *ho-i mukhtafi*, *ho-i malfiz* and *ho-i ghairimalfiz* have been used in “Charoghi hidoyat”. As well as, in relation to the length of vowels, Alikhon Orzu resorted to the terms, such as: *yo-i ma'ruf*, *majhul*, *rasida*, *vov-i ma'ruf*, *majhul and rasida*, *alif-i kashida* so on.

One of the interesting terms found in the lexicographical production in question is *to-i mutabbaqa*. Orzu mentioned the following term *dasta-i to* in the entry: “The shape of alif to be written on the letter *to*’. And for this reason, they also say the former *to-i dastador* and this has been investigated by many scholars in linguistic studies: [10: 1110].

There is also a reference to the letter *to-i mutabbaqa* in the following entries *harrot* [10: 1094] and *futador* [10: 1182]. the name of the relevant letter is *to-i muallaf*, i. e. *dorot* is written by alif in “Farsi Lexicographical Production” [9, 3: 2651]. It is worth mentioning that the Arabic letter *izghi* is also called as *zo-i muallaf*.

Alikhon Orzu specified the way of writing the word *giranda* as follows: *gironda-giranda* – with *yo-i ma'ruf* and *ro-i muhmala* by *alif-i kashida* and *nun-i ghunna* and *dol-i maftuh*. The word *gunna* was explained by the authors of “Farsi Lexicographical Production” [9, 2: 1950] as follows: *gunna* (linguistics) – a sound emitted from the nasal passages. In “Persian Dictionary into Russian” [12, 2: 213] the relevant word is explained as nasal, nasal sound “n” (*nun-i gunna*). The same term is also found in the lexical entry entitled as *lulayin*.

One of the phonetic terms that was noticed in the dictionary in question and was not used in other ones – the term of *mulayyina*. The way of writing the word *lulayin* is given by the author as follows: “with two loms and *vov-i majhul* and the second lom is *maftuh*, *hamza-i mulaiyina* and *yo-i rasida*” [10: 1219]. The author of “Great Persian Dictionary” explained the word *mulayiina* with the sign of *qadimi* “ancient” and Shams Qaysi Rozi asserted as follows: “the phonetic feature between *hamza* and *yo*: *dono*, *bino*... when they are revised, of course there is a letter in the word that is wrong between them, and from this point of view I called it *hamza-i mulaiyina*” [1, 7: 7345].

In “Charoghi hidoyat”, two methods (descriptive method and comparative method) are used to specify the signs and skanot (Arabic sign above a line expressing the absence of a vowel) of the letter, i.e. the way of its pronunciation.

The usage of the first method differs in variety and abundance, and the reason for this is that the relevant method has traveled a long way from the period of its creation, i.e. from the dictionary referred to as “Sihoh-ul-furs” (15<sup>th</sup> century) to the century of Sirojuddin Alikhon Orzu. In “Charoghi hidoyat”, from the terms used in the descriptive method we can encounter the following notions: *ba zamm*, *ba qasr*, *ba fath*, *ba madd*, *ba fathatain*, *ba zammatain*, *ba kasratain*, *mazmum*, *maksur*, *maftuh*, *alifi mamduda*, *bi-l-fath*, *bi-z-zam*, *bi-l-qasr*, *mushaddad*, *mukhaffaf*, *sukun*, *tahfif*, *tashdid*.

In certain cases, Orzu also emphasizes the doubling (tashdid) consonant letters and its shortening (mukhaffaf):

*Bachcha* – (mushaddad wa ba takhfif) – maruf; qisme az muhrahoi shatranji kabir... [10: 1027];

*Ughugh* – (ba zammi do alif va tashdidu takhfifi ghaini mujama) – ovoze, ki dar vaqti gharghara yo ghuta khurdan zohir shavad... [10: 1014].

Alikhon Orzu also mentions the deletion of certain elements of phrases or separate letters:

*Ba dast gardon giriftan* – dastgardon (ba khazfi bo) – karz giriftan... [10: 1028];

*Pushtibon* – pushtbon (biduni tahtoni niz) [10: 1048].

In “Charoghi hidoyat”, the existence of disagreement between lexicographers while recording the pronunciation of some words is specially emphasized:

*Kashtii (kishtii) langargir* – (ba fath yo bi-l-kasr alo ikhtilof-ul-qavlayn) – safina, ki... [10: 1196];

*Tunukat* – (ba zammatayn; wa ba fathi avval wa zammi nun (tanuka) alo ikhtilof-ul-qavlayn) – tanboni yaktahii pahlavonon [10: 1063].

It is well-grounded that in the Middle Ages, for obvious reasons, words and phrases were also included into lexicographical productions, the pronunciation of which was not clear in the same place, namely the place where the dictionary was compiled. Moreover, the appeal to previous dictionaries did not always give the desired results. In reference to it, there are many references in the lexicographical productions belonging to the Middle Ages. However, this practice in some cases did not promote the achievement of the set purpose, because none of the scholars in lexicographical studies could be fully aware of the entire word stock of the language, especially dialect ones.

It is for these reasons that a certain part of words is mentioned in the lexicographical productions belonging to the Middle Ages without specifying their pronunciation. Alikhon Orzu resorted to the term of *ba e’robi majhul* after bringing the words whose pronunciation was not possible.

*Laku lunch* – (bo erobi makhul) – kinya az labu dakhon [10: 1218].

Mansur Sarvat being the compiler of the dictionary wrote in the footnote that “the first *lom* is maftuh and the second one is mazmum” and showed the phrase pronunciation.

Since Orzu’s dictionary is considered to be one of the interpretational phraseological ones, in certain cases the author also mentions the reading of separate words of phraseological phrases with or without izofat: *Bargi nai* – (bo izofati barg wa fathi nun wa sukuni tahtoni) [10: 1033]; *Obi chashm giriftan* – (bo izofati ob) [10: 998]; *binii dar* (bo izofat) [10: 1042]; *tani khud* (bo izofat) [10: 1062]; *tahbozor-tahibozor* (bo izofat wa be izofat) [10: 1064]; *zangulapoy* (be izofat) [10: 1130]; *sarsukhan* (biduni izofat) [10: 1140]; *gulafsar* (ba zam wa be izofat wa sini muhmala) [10: 1209].

It is worth mentioning that in the corpus of our study mainly descriptive method is used. In spite of this assumption, in certain cases, the author also turned to the comparative method aimed at recording the words pronunciation:

*Bancha* – (ba jimi forsi va bar vazni panja) [10: 1038]; *ta’inot* (ba vazni tahqiqot) [10: 1058]; *tunda* (bizzam ba vazni gunda) [10: 1062]; *chira* (ba vazni tira) [10: 1074].

Orzu indicated the word weight with Arabic verb one, and its reason is from the author’s own explanation in one case:

*Sabil* – (bar vazni fail) – lafzi arabist – roh. Va forsiyon ba manoi burut va chise, ki dar roh sarf kunand... [10: 1134].

In another case, Orzu mentioned the Arabic mood:

*Ta'sir* – (ba sini muhmala va gaini benuqta, sigai ta'fil) – lafzi arabist wa ba manii narkh oyad [10: 1058].

“Charoghi hidoyat” has a significant difference from the previous dictionaries. In the history of Persian-Tajik lexicography, Alikhon Orzu is considered to be the first lexicographer who proposed the classification of Indian borrowed words [4: 96]. An outstanding scholar in linguistic studies V.A. Kapranov in his dissertation entitled as “Tajik-Persian Lexicography in India Referring to 16<sup>th</sup>–19<sup>th</sup> Centuries” investigated the interaction of the lexicon of Tajik and Indian languages and its reflection in the lexicographical productions belonging to the relevant period in details [4: 88–110], and came to the conclusions. In particular, he laid an emphasis upon the idea that the Indianized term *muhannad*, which is common in the lexicographical productions of Persian-Tajik works alongside with Arabic and *mufarras* belongs to Alikhon Orzu himself [4: 97].

In 11<sup>th</sup>–12<sup>th</sup> centuries, in the majority of lexicographical productions written on Indian peninsula it became a tradition to use Indian words when explaining a word – an entry. In conformity with V.A. Kapranov’s opinion, the relevant phonetical peculiarity was a witness to the knowledge of the Indian language by their authors. On the other hand, if the author is of Indian descent, the number of hipped relations in dictionaries increases many times [4: 101].

The issue in question is beyond the scope of the corpus of our study. We are just going to express some of our thoughts on recording the way of writing Indian words that Orzu mentioned as synonyms in separate entries of “Charoghi hidoyat”. First of all, attention is drawn to the way of specifying these words writings.

*Jigarkhor* – mashur; digar shahse, ki ba zuri afsun va quvvati nafasi hobisi khud gigari bacheharo ba chashm khurad va bachcha bimirad [10: 1082].

*Ob shikastan dar gulu* – ... wa ba hindi onro uchchu ba zammi avval va himi mushaddadi makhluttalaffuz bo qo wa vovi rasida... guyand” [10: 1000].

*Ogo* – dallolzane, ki vositai korsozii zanhoi fohisha boshad va ba hindi kutni ba kofi tozi, ba to-i hidii rasida va nun bo yo-i maruf [10: 1003].

Seemingly, Orzu used the descriptive method in order to specify the way of writing and pronouncing letters without any hindrance to record Hindi words and, especially, to clarify the comma alphabet of the relevant language. Undoubtedly, the relevant phonetical peculiarity indicates the internal possibilities of this method. In “Charoghi hidoyat”, the following terms resorted to for writing and reading Indian synonyms: by mixed pronunciation *mim* with *ho*; Indian perfect *to* (in the footnote, the compiler of the dictionary gave the following explanation: mixed pronunciation *to* with muallaf by mixed pronunciation *bo* with *ho*; by mixed pronunciation *kof* with *ho*; mixed pronunciation *che* with *ho*).

In a nutshell, although it is beyond the scope of the corpus of our study, we decided to provide useful data concerning the etymology of the word *khichiri*, which is a very common and beloved dish in Khujand and its surrounding areas recorded in “Charoghi hidoyat”:

*Khichri* – (with Tozi *kof* and Persian *jim* and muhmala *ro* and with reached *yo*) Farsi *khichri* by mixed pronunciation *jim* with *ho*, which is Indians’ regular dish...” [10: 1193].

## CONCLUSION

Adducing the results of the conducted analysis beset with the theme explored one can come to the following conclusions.

1. Alikhon Orzu mainly resorted to the descriptive method and used rarely the comparative one to specify the way of writing and pronouncing words properly.

2. Among the common terms of his time, the author of “Charoghi hidoyat” has used new notions such as *ba tahrik*, *alo ikhtilof-ul-qavlayn*, *muhannad* and others ones in order to express phonetic peculiarities.

3. Alikhon Orzu is considered to be one of the first authors who introduced the way of writing and pronouncing Indian words in Tajik-Persian interpretational phraseological dictionary by means of the descriptive method, thereby introducing new terms while describing Indian letters, such as *jim* by mixed pronunciation with *ho*, *bo* by mixed pronunciation with *ho*, *kof* by mixed pronunciation with *ho* and Indian *to* has opened the way and so on.

4. The study and consideration the description of the way of pronunciation and writing of Indian words in Tajik-Persian interpretational dictionaries will undoubtedly help to reveal the still unknown aspects of the importance of our ancestors’ lexicographical creations.

## ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. *Анварӣ Ҳасан*. Фарҳанги бузурги суҳан. Дар ҳашт муҷаллад. Техрон: Суҳан, 1381. 430 с.

2. *Асадуллоев А., Оқилов М.* Абҷад ва таърихҳо. Душанбе: Дониш, 1972. 120 с.

3. *Баевский С.И.* Средневековая персидская литография. История лингвистических учений. Средневековый Восток. Л.: Наука, 1981. 166 с.

4. *Капранов А.В.* Таджикско-персидская лексикография в Индии XVI–XIX вв. Душанбе: Дониш, 1987. 224

5. *Қосимова М.Н.* Мухтасар оид ба истилоҳоти забоншиносии пешини тоҷик. Қисми 1. Душанбе: Дониш, 2003. 480 с.

6. *Муин Муҳаммад*. Фарҳанги форсӣ. Ҷилди 3. Техрон: Суҳан, 1375. 2775 с.

7. *Муҳаммадхусайн Бурҳон*. Бурҳони қотеъ / Таҳияи матн бо пешгуфтор, мулҳақот, тавзеҳот ва феҳристи Амон Нуров. Ҷ. 1. Душанбе: Адиб, 1993. 416 с.

8. *Муҳаммад Хусайн ибни Халафи Табрезӣ мутахаллис ба Бурҳон*. Бурҳони қотеъ: Дар 5 муҷаллад. Ба эҳтимоми дуктур Муҳаммад Муин. Техрон: Амири Кабир, 1357. 600 с.

9. *Садри Афшор*. Ғулом Хусайн. Фарҳангномаи форсӣ: Дар се муҷаллад. Техрон: Фарҳанги муосир, 1388. 3012 с.

10. *Сирочуддин Алихон ибн Ҳисомуддин ал-Ғаволирии Акбарободӣ*. Чароғи ҳидоят. Бо кӯшиши дуктур Мансури Сарват. Техрон: Амири Кабир, 1388. 400 с.

11. *Сирочуддин Орзу*. Чароғи ҳидоят / Таҳияи мати бо пешгуфтор, тавзеҳот, феҳрист ва луғатномаи Амон Нуров. Душанбе: Ирфон, 1992. 288 с.

12. Фарҳанги форсӣ ба русӣ / Таҳти назари Ю.А. Рубинчик: Дар ду ҷилд. Ҷилди 2. М.: Энциклопедияи советӣ, 1970. 847 с.

## REFERENCES

1. Anvari Hasan. (1381hijra) Great Encyclopedic Dictionary: In 8 vols. Tehran. Suhan Publ. 430 p.

2. Asadulloev A., Okilov M. (1972) Abjad and Histories. Dushanbe. Donish Publ. 120 p.

3. Baevsky S.I. (1981) Medieval Persian lithography. History of Linguistic Studies. Medieval East. Leningrad. Nauka Publ. 166 p.
4. Kapranov A.V. (1987) Tajik-Persian Lexicography in India in the 16<sup>th</sup>–19<sup>th</sup> centuries. Dushanbe. Donish Publ. 224 p.
5. Kosimova M.N. (2003) Brief on the Terminology of Ancient Tajik Linguistics. Part 1. Dushanbe. Donish Publ. 480 p.
6. Muin Muhammad. (1375 hijra) Persian Dictionary. Vol. 3. Tehran. Suhan Publ. 2775 p.
7. Muhammad Hossein Burhan. (1993) Burhan Kote' / Prepared, introduced, revised, interpreted and indexed by Amon Nurov. Vol. 1. Dushanbe. Adib Publ. 416 p.
8. Muhammad Husayn ibn Khalaf Tabrizi known as Burhan. (1357 hijra) Burhan Kote': In 5 vols. / Under the editorship of Muhammad Muin. Tehran. Amir Kabir Publ. 600 p.
9. Sadr Afshor. Ghulam Husayn. (1388 hijra) Persian Dictionary: In 3 vols. Tehran. Modern Culture Publ. 3012 p.
10. Sirojuddin Alikhon ibn Hisamuddin al-Ghavorli Akbarobodi. (1388 hijra) Charoghi hidoyat / Under the editorship of Dr. Mansour Sarvat. Tehran. Amir Kabir Publ. 400 p.
11. Sirojuddin Orzu. (1992) Charoghi hidoyat / Prepared, introduced, revised, interpreted and indexed by Amon Nurov. Dushanbe. Irfan Publ. 288 p.
12. Persian Dictionary into Russian / Under the editorship of Yu.A. Rubinchik: In 2 vols. Vol. 2. Moscow. Soviet Encyclopedia Publ. 1970. 847 p.

*Сведения об авторе:*

Мукаддас Олимовна Ходжаева,  
канд. филол. наук  
доцент  
кафедра таджикского языка  
Худжандский государственный  
университет имени академика Б. Гафурова

Muqaddas O. Khojaeva,  
PhD  
Associate Professor  
Tajik Language Department  
Khujand State University  
named after academician B. Gafurov

khochayeva@mail.ru