

УДК/UDC81:821.222.8

*Р.А. Низомиддинова (Худжанд, Республика Таджикистан)***Традиция составления предисловий к словарям в персидско-таджикской лексикографии XI–XV вв.**

Аннотация: Проанализированы предисловия к семи толковым словарям таджикского языка XI–XV вв. и критика в них предшествующих словарей, в том числе в уже первом толковом словаре таджикского языка – «Лугати фурс». Отмечается сходство критических замечаний авторов словарей «Маджмуат аль-фурс» и «Сихох аль-фурс». Указано, что авторы толковых словарей «Фарханги Каввос», «Дастур аль-афозил» и «Донишномаи Кадархон» в своих предисловиях не упоминают о предшественниках, чем обусловлено отсутствие в них критики лексикографических трудов, созданных ранее.

Ключевые слова: история таджикской лексикографии XI–XV вв., толковые словари, особенности предисловий, критика толковых словарей, толковые словари «Сихох аль-фурс», «Меёри Джамали», «Фарханги Каввос», «Дастур аль-афозил», «Донишномаи Кадархон»

*R.A. Nizomiddinova (Khujand, Republic of Tajikistan)***The Tradition of Composing Prefaces to Dictionaries in Persian-Tajik Lexicography Referring to 11th–15th Centuries**

Abstract: The article presents an analysis of the prefaces of seven interpretation dictionaries of the Tajik language appertaining to 11th–15th centuries in relation to the criticism of proceeding dictionaries and explication of linguistic ideas contained in the formers. It is marked that the inceptions of the criticism referring to the proceeding dictionaries can be found already in the first interpretation dictionary of the Tajik language “Lughati Furs”. In the introductions to the interpretation dictionaries of the 13th century “Madjmuat al-Furs” and especially to “Sihoh al-Furs” there are presented well-grounded and substantially argued considerations concerned with a necessity of adducing illustrative poetical material for a right reading of an interpreted word. Very interesting judgments in regard to the nature of Arabic and Tajik languages are adduced in the introduction to the dictionary “Meyori Djamali”. There is underscored a similarity of critical remarks between the authors of the dictionaries “Madjmuat al-Furs” and “Sihoh al-Furs” though you can affirm with an adequate share of assuredness that Hindushokh Nakhchuvani,

the author of the dictionary “Sihoh al-Furs” was not acquainted with the lexicographical work “Madjmuat al-Furs” by Khadjib Hayrot, just as the latter had no idea about the dictionary created by Nakhchuvani. It is marked especially that the authors of “Farhangi Kavvos”, “Dastur al-afozil” and “Donishnomai Kadarkhon” don’t mention the predecessors and, respectively, any criticism of the lexicographical productions created beforehand is absent in their works.

Key words: history of the Tajik lexicography referring to 11th–15th centuries, interpretation dictionaries, peculiarities of prefaces, criticism of interpretation dictionaries, “Sihoh-al-furs”, “Me’yori Jamoli”, “Farhangi Kavvos”, Dastur-al-afozil”, “Donishnomai Kadarkhon”

INTRODUCTION

Initializing of dictionaries with a preface is considered to be one of the long-standing traditions in the history of Persian-Tajik lexicography. Commonly, in the preface, the authors of dictionaries after praising a person to whom the dictionary is dedicated mentioned his full name. Namely, the author of the book indicates the reason for the creation of the dictionary, its purpose and task, sources in question, ways and methods of placing dictionary items and considerations beset with the previous ones. Into the bargain, the authors expressed their views of the language and the way of dictionary composition in the preface [1; 6; 7; 8; 9; 11; 17]. The given article dwells on the issue beset with critical considerations related to Persian-Arabic languages by the authors of lexicography of the first period of Persian-Tajik lexicographic studies appertaining to 11th–15th centuries.

The object of the study is to dwell on the prefaces of seven interpretation dictionaries of the Tajik language appertaining to 11th–15th centuries in relation to the criticism of proceeding dictionaries and explication of linguistic ideas contained in the formers and including series of lexical items of different aspects and notions.

The aims of the study are:

- to clear out the role and status of the preface of the dictionaries belonging to the relevant periods in terms of their functions and meanings;
- to correlate the actualness of the theme explored with MTL (Modern Tajik Literary Language);
- to consider certain distinctive peculiarities of the theme explored.

Scientific Novelty

The article under consideration dwells on the analysis beset with the tradition of composing prefaces to dictionaries in Persian-Tajik lexicography referring to 11th–15th centuries in Tajik lexicographic studies for the first time. It is worth stressing that the first and main objective of witnessing verses is to determine the way of pronouncing words correctly and properly, in order the readers did not confuse them.

Book Review

Our factual material is the following interpretation dictionaries entitled as “Sihoh-al-furs”, “Me’yori Jamoli”, “Farhangi Kavvos”, Dastur-al-afozil”, “Donishnomai Kadarkhon” and sentences from these dictionaries which are cited to prove our opinions and statements in certain cases. In this case number, volume and page of the dictionary are indicated separately.

Methodology

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

THE MAIN PART

The actualness of the corpus of our study lies in the fact that prefaces of the initial period of Persian-Tajik lexicography in general have not yet been a subject to special consideration. It is difficult to express a specific opinion dealing with the prevalence or absence of prologue writing in pre-Islamic Tajik dictionaries due to the scarcity of materials from the relevant eras that have preserved up to nowadays. In any case, scholars in lexicographic studies who are directly engaged in the analysis and research of pre-Islamic lexicography have not said a word about the former in question.

It is very difficult to express particular opinion concerned with the existence of preface in the dictionaries belonging to the pen of Abuhafs Sughdi and Qatron Urmavi or Tabrezi because they have not preserved for the present time. There is a strong probability that Abuhafs Sughdi's dictionary had a preface, because it is hard to imagine that the author did not write anything at the beginning of his dictionary, even if it were a brief outline with the suggestion of the aim and goal references to sources and backgrounds used for compilation of the dictionary. Qatron's dictionary certainly did not have a preface, because being based on the data dealing with the dictionary provided by Asadi and Hindushoh Nakhjuvoni it affords to conclude that Qatron compiled a brief commentary of about 300 words for a personal use in the form of an appendix which was later published and according to S.I. Baevsky "the former in question did not have an internal structure" [5: 25]. In other words, since there was no principle observed in the recording lexical items and it was not intended for readers it might not need a preface logically. Therefore, we will start our analysis from the preface of the first lexicographical edition entitled as "Lughati Furs" by Asadi Tusi that has been preserved to our time entirely.

Discussion

The preface of "Lughati Furs" preserved in certain copies of the relevant dictionary is an extremely abbreviated one. Abbos Iqbol Oshtiyoni spoke about the importance of the preface of the former in question and emphasized in his preface to "Lugati Furs": "...The copy of 'ain' has a preface that is not found in any of other copies, and that it is the best witness to the original or at least being the fact that the copy of 'ain' belongs to the author's original version" [3]. The length of the preface of the version published by Abbos Iqbol is not large, it counts only 10–12 lines. It is worth mentioning that at the beginning of the Cyrillic edition of "Lughati Furs" by Asadi Tusi [4] there existed also an incomplete preface consisting of seven lines, those ones, despite its imperfection, were included into Abbos Iqbal's printed preface complements in some respects [4: 43]. In the preface in question, we run into the information that in the following centuries they belonged to the main and mandatory parts of the introduction to the interpretive lexicography. In conformity with the opinion of the compiler of the Cyrillic edition of "Lughati Furs" – N. Ghiyasov: "The extraordinary importance of the relevant dictionary is also manifested in the fact that Asadi alongside with the compilation of his dictionary specified the rules and drills of Tajik-Persian lexicography for several centuries and brought it into a certain system" [4: 21].

There is no praise in the form that can be observed in other dictionaries in the preface of Abbos Iqbol's editions. Asadi Tusi lays an emphasis upon the ideas that at the beginning of the former's preface: "...people's pride over other animals is to speak and speech is the whole meaning and it comes in two forms, the first one is poetry and the other one is prose [3: 1].

Later on, the reason for the creation of the dictionary is mentioned: "Our preference in this Persian dictionary is that I saw poets who were virtuous, but knew little Persian lexicon, and Qatron was a poet who wrote a book and those dictionaries were more popular" [3: 1]. First of all, the phrase "I saw poets who were virtuous, but knew little Persian lexicon" and the mention of Qatron's name in every reader's outlook brings to mind the words of Nosir Khusrav in "Safar-Name": "And in Tabrez, I saw a poet named Qatron, he spoke good poetry, but he did not know the Persian language well [4: 18]. It should be underscored that Nosir Hisrav said these words in "Safar-Name" thirty years before the compilation of Asadi Tusi's dictionary. And the similarity between the words of these two famous writers is amazing. Specialists in the field of Tajik-Persian language and literature have sufficiently discussed the reason for "not knowing Persian well" by the poets of Azerbaijan, and there is no need to repeat them. It is enough to mention that, according to Abulhusayn Zarrinkub, Qatron claimed that he "opened the door of poetry to the poets of his country" [13: 271]. Proceeding from Asadi Tusi's words, our aim is to emphasize the fact that Asadi named the previous lexicographers and revealed the essence of Qatron's work with one phrase, namely, the popularity of dictionaries. Currently, it is quite clear that the lexical items of Qatron's dictionary were "known" to the bearer of the language – Asadi Tusi. However, for Qatron and the residents of Tabriz that period was not known because the Dari language was not their mother tongue. The second point that emerges from the preface of "Lughati Furs" is that Asadi was unaware of Abuhafs Sughdi's dictionary.

Then, Asadi mentioned the name of the person who inspired him to write the dictionary, the method of bringing poetic witnesses and lexical items transformation.

As far as we are concerned, the preface of "Lughati Furs" despite its briefness the former in question can be divided into four parts: 1. The author's commentaries and considerations of the language which are expanded in the subsequent lexicographic studies of the first period of Tajik-Persian dictionaries referring to the 16th century and especially to the 17th century, in particular, "Farhangi Jahongiri", "Rashidi's Dictionary", "Burhoni Qote" turn into detailed grammatical essays [18], 2. The reason for the dictionary compilation. 3. Enumeration of dictionary sources and backgrounds and their criticism. 4. The principles used in the lexicography compilation, such as the placement of lexical items and the usage of adjectives, etc.

The compiler of the dictionary entitled as "Majmuat-ul-Furs", Dr. Atoullah Juvayni mentioned in the introduction to the book, as follows "it is clear from the introduction of the copy that at that time (namely, the time of the compilation of "Majmuat-ul-Furs" dictionary. – *R.N.*) other than Asadi's dictionary has not yet been written another one, and even if it has been written and not reached the border of popularity. Therefore, the time of writing of the relevant dictionary can be considered close to the time of writing of "Sihah-ul-furs" by Hindushoh Najuvoni" [21: 10]. He also laid an emphasis upon the idea of these considerations in certain places and points: "It is clear from the style of the book that it was created at the same time as the dictionary of "Sihah-ul-furs" by Hindushoh [21: 1].

The outstanding Soviet linguist S.I. Baevsky considered the time of the formation of the discussed dictionary to be the 14th century AD [5: 44]. Since the sequences expounded by the author of “Sihoh-ul-furs” in his preface, apart from Qatron’s dictionary and “Lughati Furs” by Asadi Tusi, it is difficult to draw a conclusion beset with the origin of one of the dictionaries [16: 119]. The preface to “Majmoat-ul-furs” is relatively detailed in comparison with the brief preface of “Lughati Furs”. And the second edition of the book contains almost three pages. The preface begins with praise after which the author gives his/her full name and explains the reason for writing the dictionary [6: 1].

Then, the author mentions the sources that he used in the preparation of the former in question, and at the same time, the criticism of the relevant sources was also made. The first source of the dictionary was according to the author: “in the beginning of some lines of “Shah-Name” I saw some words unorganized and incomplete” [21: 1]. Unfortunately, in describing the first source of his work, the author limited himself to this vague sentence. From what he said, it is impossible to determine which words were unorganized and incomplete. In the preface of the compiler of “Majmuat-ul-furs” Azizullohi Juvayni to the content of the dictionary the relevant issue is not clarified.

Safi Kahhol adduces more comprehensive information concerned with his second source, that is: “I also saw a book compiled by Abumansur al-Asadi al-Tusi and said that the ancient poets asked him for a dictionary, as is the case with any dictionary according to the words of a noble poet Persian and it should be a verse or two verses and make that book in conformity with the order of alif, bo, to so, je” [21: 1–2]. In the quotation of the author of “Majmuat-ul-furs” the phrase “and saying that ancient poets asked him for a dictionary...” is somewhat unclear, because as it is known, Asadi Tusi in his preface noted about a poet – his son or his son-in-law, Ardasher ibn Daylamsipar al-Najmi al-Shayir adamallahu izzuhu asked me...”. From the expressions “adamallahu izzuhu”, which is used in relation to a living person, and “he asked me” if it is clear that we are talking about a person and a living person at the same time, not previous poets [3: 1–2].

From the words of the author, we can confidently express our own opinion that Safii Kahhal was familiar with Asadi’s dictionary and its introduction, because the sentence of the author of “Majmuat-ul-furs” is in full agreement with the text of the preface of “Lughati Furs” by Abbas Iqbol. It is also possible to guess with certainty that Safii Kahhal was not aware of Qatron’s dictionary, otherwise he would have mentioned it in his preface. Perhaps the reason is that Qatron’s dictionary had a limited scope of publication.

Later on, Joruti criticizes “Lughati Furs” and makes several fundamental comments on Asadi’s work one of which is very similar to the comment expressed by Hindushoh Nakhjuvoni in the preface of “Sihoh-ul-furs”. We will express our opinion beset with the compatibility of Nakhjuvoni’s and Kahhol’s comments in the analysis of the section of the preface to “Sihoh-ul-furs”.

Joruti writes: But it (that is, “Lughati furs” by Asadi. – *R.N.*) was also incomplete one [21: 2]. Joruti sees the incompleteness of Asadi’s work in the fact that there are words whose meaning is incomprehensible in the verses of the witness given for lexical items, but those words are not explained. In other words, the reader needs another dictionary to understand some of its comments and interpretations.

Joruti’s second remark is a continuation of the first one. He underscores that Asadi Tusi “quoted a lot of verses from Firdawsi’s ones and left out many difficult passages that were in “Shah-Name”. As Unsuri said in the Battle of Mazandaron:

Ba nashtoku butu biparvarda mard,
Kujo tob dorad ba ruzi nabard [21: 2].

In the text of the book “Majmuat-ul-furs” where the relevant verse appears as a witness of the word “nashtak”, instead of the word **butu – putu**, and instead of “Unsuri said” “Firdawsi said” is written, which is authentic. The word nashtok is interpreted as follows in the dictionary: “Let there be water, which, like rice, seeds are planted in the ground and watered, so that it comes to the head. They remove it from there and plant it in other lands. Water that remains in the first land is called nashtak” [21: 169]. In the footnote of this page, the editor of the dictionary – Azizullah Juwaini adduced the following explanation: “I did not find the words **nashtok** and **putu (butu** in the introduction of the book) anywhere, and the purpose of the author was not known” [21: 169]. Although it is not directly related to the theme explored it should be noted that there is a word **nashtak** in modern Tajik literary language: “**Nashtak** (colloquial) – degustation; to get degustation (for example, cutting a melon or watermelon for degustation) [19: 404]. The word **nashtak** is also used to mean a kind of rice paddy water channel or rice paddy drain which performs both the function of water intake and discharge in Khujand dialect.

As we can see, the pronunciation of the word “neshtak” is very close to “nashtok” found in “Majmuat-ul-furs”, although in the witness verse the words “nashtak” and “butu/putu” are used in the metaphorical sense of “nozprvard”.

Another remark of the author of “Majmuat-ul-furs” refers to the placement of lexical items in “Lughati furs”. Joruti says: “But it is not in order because he followed the end of the letter and created a chapter and wrote the alphabet in that chapter out of order. If someone asked you for a word, you should have asked from the beginning of that chapter to the end to find out if that dictionary is in that book or not” [21: 2–3].

The preface of “Sihoh-ul-furs” is the largest and most informative among the lexicographical editions pertaining to 11th–15th centuries, and it contains about eighteen pages in Abdulla Toati’s edition [15: 1–18]. On pages 1 to 7 there is placed a eulogy in the honour of the minister Ghiyasuddin whom the dictionary was presented. From the eighth page under the title of “**Mention the people who have made books for the relevant subject and the reason for writing this book and its definitions and the number of comments and testimonies**” directly the text is concerned with the dictionary and at the same time it adduces background criticism. The first source of “Sihoh-ul-furs” is Qatroni Tabrezi’s dictionary: “The first person who started to order “Lughati furs” and made it a book was Hakim Qatroni Urmawi, but he did not mention more than three hundred lexical items” [15: 8]. Several points can be determined from the above-mentioned statements: firstly, at the time of Hindushoh Nakhjuvani’s life Qatroni Tabrezi’s dictionary (Urmawi) still existed, and Hindushoh had this dictionary at his disposal. Secondly, Hindushoh’s words make Asadi Tusi’s statements more specific about Qatron’s dictionary and the popularity of its lexical items, as well.

Hindushoh names his second source and adduces its brief description in the relevant paragraph: “...after him (namely, after Qatroni Tabrezi. – *R.N.*) the learned thinker Abumansur Ali ibn Ahmad al-Asadi al-Tusi arranged, compiled and occupied it and he presented a great deal of knowledge and added a lot of lexical items to what Hakim Katron had collected, as his collection had nothing to do with Katron’s one” [15: 8].

Scholars in lexicographic studies of the subsequent centuries up to the 17th century mention Qatron’s dictionary [5: 25], but did not quote any words out of the author. From the dictionary that has not reached our days, referred to as “Risolai Abuhafs” there are quotations in the dictionaries belonging to the 17th century. Hereby, one can

assume that the lexical items included into Qatron's dictionary were really well-known and popular among those who knew Dari language. Designing on the premise of Nakhjuvani's information, S.I. Baevsky asserted that Asadi may have included the most important lexical items of Qatron's dictionary in his work [5: 26].

Then, Hindushoh has criticized "Lughati furs": "However, he did not follow to the chapters more and he divided them into paragraphs which is necessary in the relevant subject, so as to observe the rules of lexical items order. In this way, the former in question was fixed, and there were frequent differences between the copies, and because there was no common order and was very confusing and the needed content was missed..." [15: 8].

The first remark of the author of "Sihoh-ul-furs" is similar to Safii Kahhol's first remark, only the difference between them being that Hindushoh Nakhjuvoni took a deeper look at the issue in question. Safii Kahhol criticized the preparation of "Lughati furs" based only on the last letters of the lexical item and cited the first letter as a section and was satisfied with that. After emphasizing the paragraphs of "*zarur-ul-vujud*", Hindushoh Nakhjuvoni takes a so-called purely lexicographical approach to the relevant issue. After dividing the dictionary into chapters and paragraphs, **he raises the issue concerning the observation of the order of the word "alignment", namely, the observation of the alphabetical order of the lexical items within the dictionary** which was completely unprecedented. In reference to it, he applied the relevant principle in his dictionary. In "Sihoh-ul-furs", the last letter forms the chapter and the one forms the paragraphs and within the chapter the letters of the lexical items are arranged alphabetically. For instance, we take the *alif* chapter, the *hamza* paragraph: *azarfazo, oro, aso, oshno, ovo, abasto, ajdarho, asto*, etc. [15: 19–20]. Or the *alif* chapter and the *yo* paragraph: *yoro, yaghmo, yaldo* [15: 33].

Hence, Hindushoh Nakhjuvoni mentioned another source of his dictionary: "and after finishing this sentence, he added the relevant sentence to "Sihoh-ul-furs" according to "Sihoh-ul-lugha" by Javhari as "Sihoh-ul-lugha" depends on the correction of the Arabic tribal dictionary. The former in question is based on the correction of the Persian tribal dictionary [15: 9–10].

The reference is to "Sihoh-ul-lugha" is based on the correction of Arabic tribal dictionary of the famous dictionary belonging to the pen of Abunasr Ismoil ibn Hammod al-Javhari entitled as "Toj-ul-lughati va sihoh ul-arabiyyat" being Javhari's dictionary (Utror, 940-Nishabur, 1002 or 100 h) is known by the brief title of "as-Sihoh". Lexical items are arranged in alphabetical order and words more precisely are replaced by their last letter in the dictionary under study [8: 72]. Unfortunately, Nakhjuvoni did not adduce any other information concerning the methods used by Javhari followed in his dictionary preparation [8: 72]; so the solution of the issue in question requires a detailed comparative analysis beset with the principles of these two scholars' in lexicographic studies.

Hindushoh expressed several very interesting considerations in this part of the preface. In particular, he underscores that Asadi Tusi brought the lexical items out of the early poets (more than twenty poets, from Rudaki to Tayyan. – *R.N.*) in order to correct them: "This weakling wanted to delete the collection and to write a comprehensive dictionary, so that the composition does not become long and the volume of the book is not completed. He brought a few pages for his book. Later on, it became clear to the origin of the Persian word that it is necessary to mention the witnesses in order to correct the book, so that they do not use the dictionary in a way that is not familiar to the Persians" [15: 11].

It is common knowledge that in the first period of the Tajik-Persian lexicography appertaining to 11th–15th centuries, all dictionaries (“Lughati furs”, “Sihoh-ul-furs”, “Majmuat-ul-furs”, “Meyori Jamoli”, “Farhangi Fakhri Qavvos”, “Donishnomai Qadarkhon”) are witnessing ones. As far as we are concerned, the first un-witnessing dictionary is “Adot-ul-fuzalo” by Qozikhon Badr Muhammad Dehlavi, which was written in India, in 1419 [5: 63]. From Hindushoh Nakhjuvoni’s statement it is clear that the idea of the creation of such kinds of dictionaries existed as early as the 13th century. In conformity with the outlook of the author of “Sihoh-ul-furs” he prepared a part of his dictionary based on the relevant method and only because of “editing the book... so that they don’t tell about the correction of the dictionary the fact that was not heard by the Persians” he came out for this purpose. In other words, the reason for bringing witness in the dictionary was to determine the way of word pronunciation, and as at the time of the writing of the first dictionaries, the methods and ways of reading words were not yet fully formed and established [10: 62–63]. Hindushoh considered it necessary to bring the witnessing verses. Another important conclusion emerges from these Hindushoh’s words: **the first and main purpose of the witnessing verses is to determine the way of pronouncing words.**

In the next paragraph of the preface entitled as “**Mention of an Introduction, Explanation of which Precedes the Correction of the Dictionary**”, the author of “Sihoh-ul-furs” mentioned his thoughts about eight Arabic original letters and four Persian original ones, and he explained “the order of usage of lexical items” in today’s terms of lexicography.

In a nutshell, the preface of the dictionary of “Sihoh-ul-furs” besides being detailed contains many peculiar and remarkable considerations beset with lexicographic studies which were further used by the authors of other dictionaries.

The preface to the dictionary entitled as “Me’yori Jamoli” or rather the fourth stanza of “Me’yori Jamoli” by Shamsuddin Muhammad Fakhri Isfahoni is very brief and in the edition of Karl Zelman [20] which we used it contains only a little more than one page. At the beginning of the preface, the author spoke about differences between languages and laid an emphasis upon the idea that “the Arabic dictionary is the first criterion and it is a measure that if there is something in it, then it can be used, but the Farsi dictionary has neither a scale nor reference, then it is necessary to make it an example and make a symbol in which the person’s words and companions can trust in its imitation” [20: 3].

Then, he explains one of the reasons for the necessity of a witness in the dictionary: “And before this, poets and writers wrote a lot of summaries in the relevant chapter, and every dictionary quoted istishhod (witness) from the previous word, but it is not known whether it is correct or not...” [20: 3]. The above-mentioned words of the author of “Sihoh-ul-furs” run that “it became clear after the preface of the word ‘furs’ that it is necessary to mention the witnesses in order to revise the book, so that there is a dictionary for revision or based on that which is not heard by the Persians” and Fakhri Isfahani’s opinion is about the fact that “however, ‘Furs’ is a lexical item which has neither measure nor infinitive, that if they take initiative in its health and safety it will turn the former in question” and they indicated to one point: **the purpose of adducing the witnessing verses is to prevent incorrect recitation of the lexical items of the dictionary.**

Indeed, due to the fact that the types of the verb possess a key position and their influence and sway can be seen in almost all the words in the Arabic language, the pronunciation of words in dictionaries according to the order of lexical items does not need to be explained to some extent, usually they bring the root of the word and its

derivation in Arabic dictionaries. Spelling of words is not observed, because all words are made being based on certain weights, and if a mistake occurs, the reader will easily understand its incompatibility with the usual weights and will not accept it.

The dictionary of “Fakhri Qavvos” is the first interpretative one written in India, and it is popular with the following titles, such as: “Farhangi panjbakhshi”, “Farhangi Fakhri Qavvos”, “Farhangi Qavvos”, Farhangi Qavvosi”. Mubarakshoh Ghaznavi did not mention his work sources, but most researchers following Nazir Ahmad [14: 5] emphasize that in the interpretation of words “and in the method of arrangement and organization of the book called “Muqaddimat-ul-adab” by Zamakhshari Lughati Furs” by Asadii Tusi was his predecessor [5: 50]. There is no reference in the preface of the previous dictionaries and it is natural that there is no criticism of dictionaries either.

In the preface to “Dastur-ul-afozil fi lughat-il-fazail” by Hojib Hayroti Rafe’ which was written in India, in 743/1342 during the reign of Muhammad ibn Tughluqshoh (725–752/1325–1352), we only see a hint concerning the corpus of our study. The author of the dictionary on behalf of hakim Bir who was his admirer mentioned that “Farhangi Qavvos” is at the limit of abbreviation” [12: 31]. However, in addition to “Farhangi Qavvos” by Hojib Khayrat used Asadi Tusi and “Sihoh-ul-furs” dictionaries by S.I. Baevsky [5: 58–59] who pointed out that the author of the dictionary did not comment on their mood.

The same situation can be observed in the preface of the dictionary referred to as “Donishnomai Qadarkhon” which is not so large. After praising, the author adduces his full name (Ashraf ibn Sharaf al-muzakkir al-foruqi as-sokin bi-l-misri al-ma’rufati bi chandiri), explains the reason for the formation of the work and praises Qadarkhan ibn Zufarkhon almost to the end of the preface. In the last two-three pages of the preface al-Faruqi mentions the history of the compilation of the dictionary, its name, certain structural specifications, such as the occurrence of names of months and days in one place without observing the alphabet, and the number of chapters of the dictionary [2: 2a–2b].

THE RESULTS OBTAINED AND CONCLUSION

Adducing the results of the conducted analysis beset with prefaces of lexicography referring to 11th–15th centuries one can come to the following conclusions:

- in all dictionaries from 11th–15th centuries that have reached our time there are prefaces that differ in terms of the volume and content of information discussed in the corpus of our study;
- the preface to “Lughati furs” by Asadii Tusi, despite its small size, contains several important points that have been expanded and consolidated in lexicographic studies of the following generations;
- in the preface of “Majmoat-ul-furs” which includes almost three printed pages, a relatively prefunded analysis of “Lughati furs” by Asadii Tusi can be observed;
- among the prefaces of the dictionaries referring to 11th–15th centuries, the preface of “Sihoh-ul-furs” has priority both in terms of volume [18 pages], depth of view and breadth of ideas. In the history of the Tajik-Persian lexicography the author of “Sihoh-ul-furs” himself pointed out the necessity of bringing witnessing verses and the observation of the standard composition of lexical items, for the first time;
- in the preface to “Me’yori Jamoli”, despite being a little more than one page, there are very interesting considerations concerned with the reason for the necessity of bringing witnessing verses which to some extent remind Hindushoh Nakhjuvoni’s arguments;

- in the preface to “Farhangi Qavvos”, although the author mentions that “I looked through all the other dictionaries and brought some of them to the bookkeeper’s house” there is no information dealing with the lexicographical works belonging to the pen of the ancestors;
- the authors of some dictionaries of 11th–15th centuries – “Farhangi Qavvos”, “Dastur-ul-afozil” and “Donish-Name Qadarkhon” did not speak about their works backgrounds in the preface, it is impossible to determine their relationship to the previous ones, upon the whole.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. *Ashrapov B.P., Kurbonova S.* Morphological Peculiarities and the Level of the Preposition «bo = with» Usage in Tajik Literary Language Referring to the 18th Century (on the example of the historical writing entitled as “Tuhfat-ul-khoni” by Muhammadvafo Karminagi) // *Stephanos.* 2022. № 6(56). P. 29–35. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2022-56-6-29-35. EDN NMTDTU.
2. *ал-Форуқӣ Ашраф ибн Шараф ал-Музаққир.* Донишномаи Қадархон (Матни факсимиле) / Фароҳамоварандағони матн, муаллифони муқаддима ва тавзеҳот Н.И. Ғиёсов ва Р.А. Низомиддинова. Хучанд: Ношир, 2013. 300 с.
3. *Асадиш Тӯсӣ Абӯмансур Алӣ ибн Аҳмад.* Луғати фурс / Ба тасҳеҳ ва эҳтимоми Аббоси Иқбол. Техрон, 1319 ш. 400 с.
4. *Асадиш Тӯсӣ.* Луғати фурс / Муқаддима, тасҳеҳ, таълиқот, ҳошия, луғот ва феҳристи Нурулло Ғиёсов. Хучанд: Нури маърифат, 2015. 492 с.
5. *Баевский С.И.* Ранняя персидская лексикография. XI–XV. М.: Наука, 1989. 166 с.
6. *Giyosov N.I., Ashrapov B.P.* Morphological Peculiarities and Level of Usage of Composite Adverbs in Tajik Literary Language Referring to the 18th Century (on the example of the historical writing entitled as “Tuhfat-ul-khoni” by Muhammadvafo Karminagi) // *Stephanos.* 2023. № 3(59). P. 69–80. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2023-59-3-69-80. EDN GGWHXR.
7. *Giyosov N.I., Ashrapov B.P.* Brief Essay on Copies of Historical Production Entitled as “Tuhfat-ul-khani” by Muhammadvafo Karminagi // *Рефлексия.* 2021. № 5. P. 7–9. DN HXRDAH.
8. *Ғиясов Н.И.* О взаимовлиянии арабской и персидско-таджикской лексикографии // *Вестник Таджикского государственного университета права, бизнеса и политики. Серия гуманитарных наук.* 2019. № 3(80). С. 65–76. EDN OJMRXD.
9. *Ғиёсов Н.И., Ашрапов Б.П.* Вижағиҳои сарфӣ ва наҳви пайвандакҳо дар забони адабии тоҷикии қарни XVIII (дар мисоли «Тӯҳфат-ул-хонӣ»-и Муҳаммадвафои Карминағӣ) // *Ахбори Академияи илмҳои Ҷумҳурии Тоҷикистон. Шӯъбаи илмҳои ҷамъиятшиносӣ.* 2020. № 1(259). С. 280–287. EDN HXGIUY.
10. *Ғиёсова Ф.Н.* Усули ташреҳи шакли воҳидҳои лексикӣ дар фарҳангҳои қарни XVII. Хучанд: Нури маърифат, 2005. 68 с.
11. *Ғиясов Н.И., Низомиддинова Р.А.* Медицинская терминология в словаре «донишнамэ Қадархона» // *Вестник Таджикского государственного университета права, бизнеса и политики. Серия гуманитарных наук.* 2016. № 2(67). С. 64–74. EDN WEEXQZ.
12. *Деҳлавӣ Ҳоҷиб Хайром.* Дастур-ул-афозил / Ба эҳтимоми дуктур Назир Аҳмад. Техрон, 1352. 260 с.
13. *Зарринқуб Абулҳусайн.* Аз гузаштаи адабии Эрон. Техрон, 1375. 588 с.

14. *Қаввоси Ғазнавӣ Фаҳруддин Муборакишоҳ*. Фарҳанги Қаввос / Бо эҳтимоми Назир Аҳмад. Техрон, 1353. 280 с.
15. *Наҳҷувонӣ Муҳаммад ибни Ҳиндушоҳ*. Сихоҳ-ул-фурс / Ба эҳтимоми дуктур Абула-лои Тоатӣ. Техрон, 2535 х. 344 с.
16. *Низомиддинова Р.А.* Сохтори фарҳанги «Донишномаи Қадархон» ва таносуби он бо анъанаҳои фарҳангшиносии форсу тоҷик XI–XV // Ахбори Донишгоҳи давлатии ҳуқуқ, бизнес ва сиёсати Тоҷикистон. Силсилаи илмҳои гуманитарӣ. 2021. №1(86). С. 115–123. EDN UTKMCQ.
17. *Низомиддинова Р.А.* Толковый словарь «Донишномаи қадархон» и его свойства // Вестник Таджикского национального университета. Серия филологических наук. 2015. №4–2(163). С. 73–76. EDN UXACVN.
18. *Рауфов Ҳ.* «Фарҳанги Чаҳонگیرӣ» ҳамчун сарчашмаи лексикографияи тоҷику форс. Душанбе: Дониш, 1973. 180 с.
19. Фарҳанги тоҷикӣ ба русӣ / Зери таҳрири Д. Саймиддинов, С.Д. Холматова, С. Каримов. Душанбе, 2006. 784 с.
20. *Фаҳрии Исфохонӣ Шамсиддин Муҳаммад*. Меъёри Ҷамолӣ / Ба саъй ва эҳтимоми Карл Залеман. Қазон, 1303х/1885. 193 с.
21. *Ҷорутӣ Абӯало Абдулмуъмин маъруф ба Сафии Каҳҳол*. Маҷмуат-ул-фурс / Тасҳех ва шарҳи вожаҳои дуктур Азизуллоҳи Ҷувайнӣ. Техрон, 1378 х. 358 с.

REFERENCES

1. Ashrapov B.P., Kurbonova S. Morphological Peculiarities and the Level of the Preposition “bo = with” Usage in Tajik Literary Language Referring to the 18th Century (on the example of the historical writing entitled as “Tuhfat-ul-khoni” by Muhammadvafo Karminagi). *Stephanos*. 2022. No 6(56), pp. 29–35. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2022-56-6-29-35. EDN NMTDTU.
2. al-Farooqi Ashraf ibn Sharaf al-Muzakkir. (2013) Donish-Name by Qadarkhon (facsimile text) / Preparation of the text, authors of the introduction and explanations by N.I. Giyosov and R.A. Nizomaddinova. Khujand. Publisher Publ. 300 p.
3. Asadi Tusi Abumansur Ali ibn Ahmad (1319 Sh.) Lughati furs / Under the editorship of Abbas Iqbal. Tehran. 400 p.
4. Asadi Tusi. (2015) Lughati furs / Introduction, revision, commentary, margin, glossary and index by Nurullo Ghiyasov. Khujand. Light of Enlightenment Publ. 492 p.
5. Baevsky S.I. (1989) Early Persian Lexicography (11th–15th centuries). Moscow. Nauka Publ. 168 p.
6. Giyosov N.I., Ashrapov B.P. Morphological Peculiarities and Level of Usage of Composite Adverbs in Tajik Literary Language Referring to the 18th Century (on the example of the historical writing entitled as “Tuhfat-ul-khoni” by Muhammadvafo Karminagi). *Stephanos*. 2023. No 3(59), pp. 69–80. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2023-59-3-69-80. EDN GGWHXR.
7. Giyosov N.I., Ashrapov B.P. Brief Essay on Copies of Historical Production Entitled as “Tuhfat-ul-khani” by Muhammadvafo Karminagi. *Refleksiya*. 2021. No 5, pp. 7–9. EDN HXRDX.
8. Giyosov N.I. On Mutual Influence of Arabic and Persian Tajik lexicographies. *Bulletin of Tajik State University of Law, Business and Politics. Series of Humanitarian Sciences*. 2019. No 3, pp. 65–76.
9. Giyosov N.I., Ashrapov B.P. Grammatical and Morphological Peculiarities of Conjunctions in the Tajik Literary Language Referring to the 18th century (on the example of

- “Tuhfat-ul-khoni” by Muhammadwafo Karminagi). *Proceedings of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tajikistan. Department of Social Sciences*. 2020. No 1(259), pp. 280–287. EDN HXGIUY.
10. Ghiyosova F.N. (2005) The Method of Interpretation the Form and Meaning of the Word in the Dictionaries Belonging to the 17th century. Khujand. Light of Enlightenment Publ. 68 p.
 11. Giyosov N.I., Nizomiddinova R.A. Medical Terminology in the Dictionary Entitled as “Donish-name” by Qadarkhon”. *Bulletin of Tajik State University of Law, Business and Politics. Series of Humanitarian Sciences*. 2016. No 2(67), pp. 64–74. EDN WEEXQZ.
 12. Delhivi Hojib Khairot. (1352 H) Dastur-ul-Afozil / Under the editorship of Dr. Nazir Ahmed. Tehran. 260 p.
 13. Zarrinkub Abulhusayn. (1375 H) From the Literary Past of Iran. Tehran. 588 p.
 14. Qawvosi Ghaznavid Fakhruddin Mubarakshah. (1353 H) The Dictionary of Qawvos / Under the editorship of Nazir Ahmed. Tehran. 280 p.
 15. Nakhjuvoni Muhammad ibn Hindushoh. (1535 H) Sihah-ul-furs / Under the editorship of Dr. Abulala Toati. Tehran. 344 p.
 16. Nizomaddinova R.A. The Structure of the Dictionary of “Donish-Name” by Qadarkhon and Its Correlation with Persian-Tajik Lexicographical Traditions Referring to the 11th–15th centuries. *Bulletin of Tajik State University of Law, Business and Politics. Series of Humanitarian Sciences*. 2021. No 1(86), pp. 115–123. EDN UTKMCQ.
 17. Nizomiddinova R.A. Explanatory Dictionary “Donish-Name Qadarkhon” and Its Properties. *Bulletin of the Tajik National University. Series of philological sciences*. 2015. No 4–2(163), pp. 73–76. EDN UXACVN.
 18. Raufov H. (1973) “Jahangiri’s Dictionary” as a Source of Tajik-Persian Lexicography. Dushanbe. Knowledge Publ. 180 p.
 19. Tajik to Russian Dictionary. (2006) / Edited by D. Saymiddinov, S. D. Kholmatova, S. Karimov. Dushanbe. 784 p.
 20. Fakhri Isfahoni Shamsiddin Muhammad. (1303 H./1885) Me’yori Jamali / Under the editorship of Karl Zaleman. Kazan. 193 p.
 21. Djouruti Abu’alo Abdulmomin known as Safii Kahhol. (1378 H) Majmuat-ul-Furs / Edited and explained by Dr. Azizullah Juwaini. Tehran. 358 p.

Сведения об авторе:

Рухсора Абдуджамилевна Низомиддинова,
соискатель
кафедра грамматики арабского языка
Худжандский государственный университет
имени академика Б. Гафурова

Rukhsora A. Nizomiddinova,
Claimant for Candidate Degree
Department of Arabic Language Grammar
Khujand State University
named after academician B. Gafurov
grammatika-arab@mail.ru