

ЯЗЫКИ НАРОДОВ ЗАРУБЕЖНЫХ СТРАН (С УКАЗАНИЕМ КОНКРЕТНОГО ЯЗЫКА ИЛИ ГРУППЫ ЯЗЫКОВ)/LANGUAGES OF PEOPLES OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES (INDICATING A SPECIFIC LANGUAGE OR GROUP OF LANGUAGES)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.60797/RULB.2025.69.16>

TAJIK LINGUISTS' VIEWS ON THE LINGUISTIC VALUE OF 18TH-CENTURY HISTORICAL PROSE WORKS

Research article

Ashrapov B.P.^{1,*}

¹ ORCID : 0000-0001-8545-2329;

¹ Khujand State University, Khujand, Tajikistan

* Corresponding author (bahodur.ashrapov[at]mail.ru)

Abstract

The given article presents a theoretical analysis of the perspectives, views, and evaluations of Tajik linguists regarding the features and linguistic value of a series of important 18th-century historical works, including "Jahāngushā-yi Nādir" (World-Conqueror of Nādir), "Ālamārā-yi Nādir" (World-Adorner of Nādir), "Ubaydullāhnāma" (Book of 'Ubaydullāh), "Tārīkh-i Abulfayzkhān" (History of Abulfayz Khan), and "Tuhfat al-khān" (The Khan's Gift). The main body of the article analyzes scholars' views in three key areas:

- 1) evaluation of lexical features, particularly interpreting the role of Turkic-Uzbek borrowings and archaisms as reflections of political reality and cultural tradition;
- 2) views on the morphological and syntactic features of these works' language as indicators of a transitional period;
- 3) linguists' assessment of the significance of these monuments as crucial sources for historical prose language.

In conclusion, it is determined that contemporary Tajik linguistics evaluates the language of 18th-century historical texts not as a "decadent" language, but as a complex linguistic syncretic system reflecting the political, social, and linguistic realities of that era.

Keywords: Tajik linguistics, 18th-century historical works, linguistic value, comparative analysis, language contact, Tajik literary language.

ВЗГЛЯДЫ ТАДЖИКСКИХ ЛИНГВИСТОВ НА ЯЗЫКОВУЮ ЦЕННОСТЬ ИСТОРИЧЕСКОЙ ПРОЗЫ XVIII ВЕКА

Научная статья

Ашрапов Б.П.^{1,*}

¹ ORCID : 0000-0001-8545-2329;

¹ Худжандский государственный университет имени академика Бободжана Гафурова, Худжанд, Таджикистан

* Корреспондирующий автор (bahodur.ashrapov[at]mail.ru)

Аннотация

В данной статье представлен теоретический анализ взглядов, позиций и оценок таджикских лингвистов относительно особенностей и языковой ценности ряда важных исторических произведений XVIII века, включая «Джахангуша-йи Надири» («Покоритель мира Надира»), «Аламара-йи Надири» («Украшение мира Надира»), «Убайдуллахнама» («Книга Убайдуллы»), «Тарих-и Абулфайзхан» («История Абулфайз-хана») и «Тухфат ал-хани» («Дар хана»). Основная часть статьи посвящена анализу взглядов ученых по трем ключевым направлениям:

- 1) оценка лексических особенностей, в частности, интерпретация роли тюрко-узбекских заимствований и архаизмов как отражения политической реальности и культурной традиции;
- 2) взгляды на морфологические и синтаксические особенности языка этих произведений как индикаторов переходного периода;
- 3) оценка лингвистами значения этих памятников как важнейших источников для языка исторической прозы.

В заключение устанавливается, что современная таджикская лингвистика оценивает язык исторических текстов XVIII века не как «декадентский», а как сложную лингвистическую синкретическую систему, отражающую политические, социальные и языковые реалии той эпохи.

Ключевые слова: таджикское языкознание, исторические произведения XVIII века, лингвистическая ценность, сопоставительный анализ, языковые контакты, таджикский литературный язык.

Introduction

1.1. The Relevance of the Topic

The study of the language history involves not only the investigation of written monuments themselves, but also a deep analysis of what science has said about these monuments and how scholarly views have evolved over time. The historical works of the 18th century, created during a turbulent historical period in two major cultural and political centers — Iran and Transoxiana (Mawarannahr) — have been extensively studied by Tajik linguists. During the independence period (1990–2025), with the emergence of new research approaches such as sociolinguistics and language contact theory, the evaluation of these works has also reached a new qualitative stage. Therefore, systematizing, classifying, and analyzing the views of contemporary Tajik linguists in this context is an important and timely scientific task, allowing us to gain clear insights not only into the language of the 18th century but also into the evolution of Tajik linguistics itself [2, P. 42].

1.2. The Scope of the Research

The initial foundation for researching these works was laid in the fundamental works of Sh. Rustamov [10], M.O. Beeman [13], S. Rakhmonov [14], and A. Schmidt [15]. However, the deep theoretical linguistic analysis of this period primarily stems from the achievements of linguists in the independence period. Among these, the contribution of A. Mirzoev in assessing the lexicographical value of these works [8], S. Nazarzoda's research on the socio-political terminology of this period [9], M. Imomov's analyzes on the status of this century's language in the general history of the literary language [8], and Sh. Rustamov's work in historical syntax [5, P. 112] deserve special mention.

Nevertheless, a comprehensive study that specifically analyzes the ideas and methodology of these scholars within a comparative framework, based on the extensive material of 18th-century historical works, has not yet been sufficiently undertaken.

1.3. Research Objectives and Tasks

The primary objective of this article is the systematization, analysis, and evaluation of the scholarly views of Tajik linguists (1990–2025) regarding the linguistic value of 18th-century historical works. To achieve this objective, the following tasks are outlined:

- to review linguists' views on the lexical features of these works, particularly their interpretation concerning the role of Turkic elements and the classical heritage;
- to dwell on scholars' perspectives on the grammatical features of these monuments' language as indicators of a transitional period;
- to determine linguists' views on the significance of these works as sources for historical lexicography;
- to demonstrate the evolution of research methods in Tajik linguistics from a prescriptive (normative) approach to a descriptive (explanatory) and historical-functional approach.

Research methods and materials

2.1. Research Paradigm and Methodological Framework

The present study is a theoretical-analytical investigation conducted within the paradigm of the historiography of linguistics. Its primary focus is not a direct linguistic analysis of 18th-century texts, but rather a meta-analysis of the scholarly discourse surrounding these texts within contemporary Tajik linguistics. Consequently, the methodological framework is qualitative and descriptive-analytical, aimed at systematizing, interpreting, and evaluating the existing body of scholarly opinion.

This approach is necessitated by the research objective: to understand how the linguistic value of 18th-century prose is constructed, debated, and conceptualized by Tajik specialists. The research does not seek to produce new data from the primary sources (the 18th-century chronicles) but to synthesize and critically assess the secondary literature, treating the works of modern linguists as the primary object of study. The study, therefore, operates at the intersection of historical linguistics, textual criticism, and the sociology of scientific knowledge.

2.2. Research Materials: The Corpus of Scholarly Works

The empirical basis, or the primary research materials, for this article consists of a curated corpus of scholarly publications authored by leading Tajik, and secondarily, other relevant Iranian and Western linguists. The 18th-century historical works ("Jahāngushā-yi Nādirī," "Ālamārā-yi Nādirī," etc.) serve as the object of analysis within these scholarly publications, but not as the direct material for this study.

2.3. Research Methods

A combination of methods from humanities and social sciences was employed to achieve the research objectives:

1. Descriptive-Analytical Method: This was the primary method used for the detailed examination of the arguments, evidence, and conclusions presented by each linguist. It involved the explication of their theoretical positions, their interpretation of linguistic data from the historical texts, and their overall assessment of the texts' linguistic value.

2. Comparative-Analytical Method: This method was applied to juxtapose the views of different scholars and academic traditions. It allowed for the identification of areas of scholarly consensus (e.g., the transitional nature of the language) and debate (e.g., the degree of Turkic influence or the evaluation of archaisms as "decadence" versus "tradition").

3. Historiographical Method: This method was used to trace the evolution of perspectives on the language of 18th-century texts, particularly comparing post-independence Tajik scholarship with earlier, Soviet-era evaluations where applicable. This helps to contextualize contemporary views within the broader development of Tajik linguistics.

4. Method of Systematization and Classification: This was crucial for organizing the extracted data. The scholarly opinions and evaluations were systematically classified into three primary thematic categories, which form the main analytical sections of this article:

- 1) views on lexical features;
- 2) views on grammatical (morphological and syntactic) features;
- 3) overall assessments of the texts' significance as historical monuments.

2.4. Stages of the Research Process

The research was conducted through the following sequential stages:

– Stage 1: Corpus Formation. This involved a comprehensive bibliographic search using academic databases, library catalogs, and lists of publications from key Tajik research institutions. A long list of potential sources was compiled and subsequently filtered based on the selection criteria outlined in section 2.2.

– Stage 2: Data Extraction and Explication. Each selected scholarly work was subjected to a close reading. Key passages containing direct evaluations, analyses, or interpretations of the language of the 18th-century texts were excerpted. This included direct quotes, summaries of arguments, and notes on the specific linguistic examples cited by the scholars.

– Stage 3: Thematic Analysis and Synthesis. The extracted data were then coded and organized according to the pre-defined thematic categories (lexicon, grammar, overall value). The views within each category were compared and contrasted.

The final stage involved the qualitative synthesis of these findings to construct a coherent narrative about the perspectives of Tajik linguists, which is presented in the main body of this article.

Main results

3.1. Linguists' Evaluation of the Lexical Features of 18th-Century Historical Works

A comparative analysis of Tajik linguists' views and the actual linguistic material of five major 18th-century historical works allows for an in-depth examination of the linguistic value of these monuments at two fundamental levels: lexico-semantic and grammatical (morphological and syntactic).

The lexical stock of these works is evaluated by contemporary Tajik linguists as a complex syncretic system in which three primary lexical strata are intricately interwoven.

3.1.1. Interpretation of the Role and Status of Turkic-Uzbek Borrowings: From "Impurity" to "Historical Reality"

The relevant issue has been a central axis of linguistic debate, and the perspective of contemporary Tajik linguistics in this area has evolved significantly. Whereas in the early stages of study this phenomenon was sometimes evaluated as a sign of language "decay," contemporary linguists view it as an objective and historically inevitable process reflecting the political and social realities of the era.

Professor S. Nazarzoda holds a clear view on this matter. He emphasizes that these words were not foreign elements but an inseparable part of the linguistic reality of the period. He writes: "The Turkic-Uzbek administrative and systemic terminology abundantly present in 18th-century historical works, especially chronicles related to the Bukharan Khanate, should not be evaluated as language 'impurity,' but rather accepted as living testimony to cultural and political contact... These terms expressed the reality of the state system of that time, without which an accurate depiction of socio-political life would have been impossible" [9, P. 88].

Comparative analysis of the works fully confirms this view and clearly reveals geographical-political differences in the usage of these words:

A. Differences in Thematic Groups: Bukharan vs. Iranian Context

In works related to the Bukharan Khanate («'Ubaydullāhnāma», «Tārīkh-i Abulfayzkhān», «Tuhfat al-khānī»), these words primarily pertain to administrative structure, court ranks, and tribal titles, indicating the key role of Uzbek tribal nobility in state administration.

Example 1: *Va otaliqii kulli mamlakat va ikhtiyori khallu fasli umuri sipoh va raiyat-ro ba Ibrāhimbīy dodkhoh, ki az akobiri qabilai kenges bud, mufavvaz doshtand* [6, P. 47] — And they delegated the supreme ataliq (prime minister, guardian of the Khan) and the authority to adjudicate military and civilian affairs to Ibrāhimbīy, who was among the elders of the Keneges tribe (translated by the author).

Here, two key ranks — "ataliq" and "dodkhoh" (responsible for justice) — appear with the Turkic tribal title "bīy," reflecting the real administrative system of the Manghits.

Example 2: *Farmon shud, ki Abdullokh-ro ba mansabi qushbegī sarafroz gardonand va zimomi ikhtiyori shahri Bukhororo ba dasti ū dihand* [3, P. 98] — An order was issued to elevate Abdullāhkhwāja to the rank of qūshbegī and to place the governance of the city of Bukhara in his hands (translated by the author).

"Qūshbegī" (literally "chief of huntsmen," but effectively a high governor or vizier) was a specific rank of Central Asian Khans, and the author could not use a Persian equivalent.

In works related to the Afsharid state («Jahāngushā-yi Nādirī», «Ālamārā-yi Nādirī»), Turkic words more often have a military character, reflecting the structure of Nader Shah's army, composed mainly of Turkic tribes like the Qizilbash and Afshar.

Example 3: *Shohi olamsiton dah hazor nafar az ghoziyoni dilovar va yasovuloni bahodurro ba sardorii Tahmospkhoni Jaloyir ba jonibi qal'ai Qandahor firistod* [1, P. 248] — The World-Conquering Shah sent ten thousand daring ghazis and brave yasāwuls under the command of Tahmāspkhān Jalāyir towards the fortress of Kandahar (translated by the author).

"Yasāwul" was a specific military rank in Nader Shah's court, responsible for guard duties and executing special orders, reflecting the reality of his army's structure.

Example 4: *Dar in yurishi buzurg ba Hinduston, qurchiboshī amr dod, ki tamomi qurol va jabhakhona-ro omoda sozand* [7, P. 415] — In this great yurish (campaign) to Hindustan, the qurchibāshī (commander of the royal guard) ordered all qūrāl (weapons) and jabhākhāna (armory) to be prepared (translated by the author).

"Yurish," "qurchibāshī," and "qūrāl" are key Turkic military terms widely used in the military language of this period.

B. Degree of Linguistic Assimilation

Linguists also note that many of these borrowings were not used as foreign elements but were accepted as part of the Tajik Persian language system, even used with Tajik grammatical patterns.

Example 5: *Az har gūshavu kanor qorovuloni chobukdast khabarhoi toza meovardand* [12, P. 154] — Swift-footed qarāwuls (sentries) brought fresh news from every corner (translated by the author).

Here, the Turkic word "qarāwul" appears with the Tajik plural suffix "-on" (qarāwulon), demonstrating clear morphological assimilation into Tajik.

3.1.2. Evaluation of the Classical Heritage and Archaisms: Means of Cultural Connection and Elevating Style

Linguists believe that alongside the influx of new elements, the authors of these works were strongly influenced by the classical prose tradition. The use of archaisms was a conscious effort to elevate the style of expression and connect with the great historians of the past.

Professor M. Imomov describes this phenomenon as a "conscious effort to preserve connection with the past heritage" and "conscious archaization": "The historians of this period, by using words characteristic of the elevated style and classical phrases, showed that they considered themselves continuers of the path of Bayhaqi and Juwayni... This was a kind of cultural resistance in the face of rapid linguistic and political changes" [5, P. 95].

Example 6: Shoh ba on farzona-mardi khiradmand guft: Zihī tadbīru royi tu, ki moro az in vartai halokat berun ovarad [7, P. 388] — The Shah said to that farzāna-mard (wise, prudent man): Zihī (Bravo!) your counsel and judgment, which brought us out from this brink of destruction (translated by the author).

"Farzāna" and the exclamation "Zihī" are words characteristic of classical literature, especially the "Shāhnāma," used by the author to impart grandeur and majesty to his narrative.

Example 7: On safdar-i maydonshikan, ki az kase haros nadosht, shamsher az ghilof berun ovarad va ba qalbi sipohi dushman dar maydoni korzor zad [12, P. 178] — That safdar (breaker of ranks), undaunted by anyone, drew his sword from the scabbard and struck the heart of the enemy army on the battlefield (kārzār) (translated by the author).

"Safdar" and "kārzār" are terms specific to epic literature, lending an epic color to the narrative.

3.1.3. Arabic Words: Indicators of High Literacy, Munshi Style, and Religious-Scientific Necessity

Linguists, including Academician H. Majidov, argue that Arabic words in this period served three primary functions:

1. Religious and Sharia Terminology: Essential in an Islamic state.

Example 8: Ulamoi Bukhoro jam' omada, fatvo dodand, ki islohoti pulii khon mukholifi shari'at nest [3, P. 165] — The ulamā (scholars) of Bukhara gathered and issued a fatwā (legal opinion) that the Khan's monetary reforms were not contrary to the shari'at (translated by the author).

2. Abstract, Scientific, and Philosophical Concepts: Tajik Persian utilized the rich lexical resources of Arabic to express these concepts.

Example 9: Iqtidori davlati nav ba hadde rasida bud, ki kase jur'ati mukholifat namekard va inqirozi sulolai peshin ba hama ayon gashta bud [6, P. 210] — The iqtidār (power) of the new dynasty had reached such a level that no one dared oppose it, and the inqirāz (collapse) of the former dynasty had become evident to all.

3. Munshi Style and Artificial Prose: A prominent feature of the official prose of the period, serving to demonstrate the author's high literacy and impart formal weight to the text.

Example 10: Ba'd az istimdod az arvohi muqaddasa va istishfo' az jaddi a'lo, ba taskhiri qal'ai dushman himmat gumoshtand [1, P. 199] — After istimdād (seeking help) from the sacred spirits and istishfā' (seeking intercession) from the exalted ancestor, they resolved upon the taskhīr (subjugation) of the enemy fortress (translated by the author).

The use of complex Arabic verbal nouns (istimdād, istishfā', taskhīr) made the prose weighty but, from the perspective of the courtiers and scholars of the time, "dignified" and "scholarly."

3.2. Linguists' Views on the Grammatical Structure of 18th-Century Historical Works

3.2.1. Interpretation of Morphological Features

Linguists characterize this period as a stage of struggle and coexistence of old and new norms. A researcher — B. Safarova while dwelling on the structural and semantic features of verb composites with preverbs bar- and dar- in "Ubaydullah-name" underscores that "the language of the relevant period is considered to be one of the priceless ones in the study of language scape historically" [11, P. 67].

Coexistence of "me-" and "hame-":

Example 11: Abulfayzkhon dar Arki Bukhoro ba ayshu nūsh mashghul bud va dushman az har sū hamerasid [12, P. 201] — Abulfayz Khan was engaged in revelry ('aysh-u nūsh) in the Ark of Bukhara, and the enemy hame-rasīd (was approaching) from all sides (translated by the author).

Example 12: Az har gūshai mamlakat khabarhoi toza merasid [7, P. 115] — Fresh news me-rasīd (was arriving) from every corner of the realm (translated by the author).

These examples show that both forms (me- and hame-) were used contemporaneously, with hame- carrying a more elevated, bookish stylistic coloring.

The Use of the Evidential Copula "-dur": This interesting phenomenon of linguistic interference is a clear marker of geographical linguistic differentiation.

Example 13: Harchand amiron ūro nasihat kardand, ki in iqdom khatarnokdur va boisi fitna khohad shud, Ubaydullokhon qabul nakard [3, P. 188] — Although the amirs advised him that this undertaking khatarnok-dur (is dangerous) and will cause sedition (fitna), 'Ubaydullākh Khan did not accept (translated by the author).

Linguists hold that this Uzbek language element was so prevalent in the bilingual environment of Bukhara that it even entered formal written language. Crucially, this phenomenon is not observed at all in works related to Iran («Jahāngushā» and «Ālamārā»), providing strong evidence for the geographical distribution of linguistic features.

3.2.2. Evaluation of Syntactic Structure: Stylistic Diglossia and Tendency towards Complexity

Professor Sh. Rustamov, a specialist in historical syntax, writes about the syntax of this period: "The syntax of historical prose in this period was in a state of duality. On the one hand, there was a strong tendency to use long, complex subordinate clauses, a legacy of the munshi style of earlier periods. On the other hand, the influence of the living spoken language led to the occasional use of simpler structures" [10, P. 155].

Example of Complex Subordinate Sentence:

Example 14: Chun Muhammad Rahimkhon, ki bo tadbiru khiradi voloi khud tavonista bud tamomi dushmanoni dokhilro sarkūb namoyad va poyahoi davlati navi Manghitiyaro mustahkam sozad, khabari shūrishī amironi Hisorro shunid, beta'khir farmon dod, to lashkari garone jam' orand va ba on sū ravona shavand, zero ba khūbī medonist, ki agar in fitna dar ibtido khomūsh karda nashavad, metavonad ba otashi buzurge mubaddal gardad, ki khomūsh kardani on digar imkonpazir khohad bud [6, P. 155] — When Muḥammad Raḥīmkhān, who with his great counsel and wisdom had been able to suppress all internal enemies and firmly establish the foundations of the new Manghit dynasty, heard the news of the rebellion of the amirs of Hisar, he immediately ordered a mighty army to be assembled and dispatched there, for he knew well that if this sedition (fitna) were not quelled at the outset, it could turn into a great fire, the extinguishing of which would no longer be possible (translated by the author).

This single complex sentence, encompassing a paragraph, consists of temporal ("When..."), relative ("who..."), causal ("for..."), and conditional ("if...") clauses. This structure is common to all five works.

Inversion (Unconventional Word Order):

Example 15: Biraft ba jonibi Samarqand bo lashkare garon va niyati on dosht, ki on shahrro az dasti isyongaron pok sozad [1, P. 189] — Biraft (Went) he towards Samarqand with a mighty army, intending to cleanse that city of rebels (translated by the author).

Here, the verb (biraft) appears at the beginning of the sentence, a syntactic device used to emphasize the action and impart dynamism to the narrative.

Discussion

A comprehensive analysis of Tajik linguists' views, based on the actual linguistic material of five major 18th-century historical works, allows us to move beyond a simple description of linguistic phenomena towards profound theoretical, historiographical, and historical-cultural conclusions. The discussion of results can be synthesized along four main axes:

4.1. Evolution of the Scientific Paradigm: From Prescriptive to Descriptive-Functional Viewpoints

One of the most significant results of this historiographical analysis is the observation of a paradigm shift in Tajik linguistics.

The Old View (Prescriptive/Normative): In the early stages of study (20th century), the language of this period was often judged from the perspective of an "ideal" classical language of the Samanid or Timurid eras. From this viewpoint, the influx of Turkic words was seen as "impurity," complex syntactic structures as "haughtiness" of the munshi style, and deviation from the "simplicity" of Rudaki's language. This was a prescriptive approach, judging the language as "correct" or "incorrect" according to predetermined norms.

The New View (Descriptive/Functional): Contemporary Tajik linguistics, as seen in the ideas of scholars like S. Nazarzoda, M. Imomov, and A. Mirzoev, views these phenomena from a descriptive and historical-functional perspective. This approach asks different questions: "What function did this linguistic element serve at that time?", "Why did the author use this word or structure?", "What does this linguistic feature say about the political, social, and cultural situation of the period?". From this perspective, Turkic borrowings are not "impurity" but linguistic "indicators" of political reality; archaisms are not "archaism" but a means of preserving cultural connection; and complex sentences are not "haughtiness" but adherence to the formal stylistic norm of the period. This evolution signifies the maturation of Tajik linguistics and its alignment with advanced global linguistic trends (such as sociolinguistics, pragmatics, and discourse analysis).

4.2. Linguistic Syncretism as a Key Characteristic of the Period: Not Decline, but Adaptation

Synthesizing the views of linguists and analyzing the examples leads to the definitive conclusion that the language of 18th-century works is a syncretic (hybrid) phenomenon in a state of transition. This syncretism manifested at three levels:

Lexical Syncretism: Intermingling of the deep layer of core Tajik Persian vocabulary with layers of Arabic, Turkic-Uzbek, and even Mongol borrowings.

Morphological Syncretism: Coexistence of old (hame-) and new (me-) grammatical forms, as well as elements from neighboring languages (the evidential copula -dur).

Syntactic-Stylistic Syncretism: Blending of the elevated, bookish munshi style with simpler structures and elements of the living spoken language.

Contemporary Tajik linguistics evaluates this syncretism not as a sign of the "collapse" or "decline" of the classical language, but as a natural process of language adaptation to new political, social, and ethnic realities. Language is a living organism, and in the 18th century, this organism utilized all its internal and external resources to express new administrative (e.g., ataliq, qushbegi), military (e.g., yasovul, yurish), and social concepts that did not exist in the classical period.

4.3. Language as a Mirror of Civilization and Indicator of Geo-Political Differences

Comparative analysis of works related to the two political centers — Bukhara and Iran — clearly shows that language is not only a means of communication but also a mirror of civilization and a political map.

In Transoxiana (Mawarannahr), where the nobility of Turkic Uzbek tribes (Manghit, Keneges, Yuz) held political power, the language of historiography was "colored" by Turkic administrative, tribal, and social terminology. The use of the evidential copula -dur indicates a deeply bilingual environment.

In Iran, where Nader Shah built a huge military empire based on Qizilbash and Afshar tribes, the language of historiography was more mixed with Turkic military and organizational terminology, but elements specific to the Uzbek language of Transoxiana are not seen.

This difference confirms that, despite the commonalities of the literary language, the process of forming regional variants of Tajik Persian intensified in the 18th century. Linguists rightly emphasize that it was precisely in this period that the foundations for the later separation of the Tajik language from the Persian of Iran were strengthened.

4.4. Foundational Significance for Language History and Lexicography

The views of all contemporary linguists converge on one point: 18th-century historical works constitute an invaluable treasure trove for historical linguistics and lexicography.

For Language History: These works provide a precise "snapshot" of the language at an important transitional stage. They allow us to systematically study the process of evolution of grammatical norms, semantic shifts in words, and the emergence of features of the modern language.

For Lexicography: As Academician H. Majidov emphasizes, these texts are replete with words, phrases, and meanings not recorded in existing dictionaries. Compiling a "Historical Dictionary of the 18th Century" based on this material could be a major step in Tajik lexicography and aid in a deeper understanding of texts from this and subsequent periods. For example, words like chopqun (brigandage), charoghon (a type of tax), qalmoq (meaning a people), and dozens of others require precise lexicographical explanation [4], [14], [15].

Conclusion

Contemporary Tajik linguistics in the independence period has achieved a new conceptual and scientifically profound evaluation of the language of 18th-century historical works. The main conclusions of the analysis of linguists' views and linguistic material can be summarized as follows:

1. The language of 18th-century historical works is not a language of "collapse" or "decay," but a complex, living, and functional linguistic system that fully met the demands of its time.
 2. The key characteristic of this language is syncretism (hybridity), in which the classical heritage, new Turkic political realities, and elements of the living language organically merged.
 3. Lexical and grammatical differences between works related to Iran and Transoxiana are clear indicators of the formation of regional variants of the literary language and the profound influence of the socio-political environment on language.
 4. These works represent an invaluable scientific source for future research in Tajik language history, historical lexicology, lexicography, sociolinguistics, and historical stylistics.
- In summary, the views of Tajik linguists in this area represent a prominent example of new scientific thinking, viewing language history not as a collection of frozen phenomena, but as a living, dynamic process intertwined with the life of society.

Конфликт интересов

Не указан.

Рецензия

Гурская О.А., Университет Сан Диего для Интегративных Исследований, Сан Диего Соединенные Штаты Америки
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.60797/RULB.2025.69.16.1>

Conflict of Interest

None declared.

Review

Hurskaya V., San Diego University for Integrative Studies, San Diego USA
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.60797/RULB.2025.69.16.1>

Список литературы / References

1. Астарободӣ М.М. Ҷаҳонкушои Нодирӣ / М.М. Астарободӣ; бо тасҳеҳ ва эҳтимоми А. Абдуллоҳи. — Техрон: Анҷумани осор ва мафохирӣ фарҳангӣ, 1377. — 980 с.
2. Ашрапов Б.П. Употребление производных арабских наречий в таджикском литературном языке XVIII-го века / Б.П. Ашрапов // Заметки ученого. — 2022. — № 2. — С. 42–45.
3. Бухорой М.А. Убайдуллоҳнома / М.А. Бухорой; таҳия ва нашри А.А. Семёнов. — Тошканд: Изд-во АН Ўзбекистон, 1957. — 420 с.
4. Граматикаи забони адабии ҳозираи тоҷик. — Душанбе: Дониш, 1985. — 356 с.
5. Имомов М.С. Языковые особенности постклассического периода в прозе «Таърих-и Абулфайз-хан» / М.С. Имомов // Вестник Таджикского национального университета. Серия филология. — 2022. — № 4. — С. 112–121.
6. Карминағӣ М. Тухфат-ул-хонӣ / М. Карминағӣ; муқаддима, таҳияи матн, нусхабадал, таълиқот ва феҳрастҳои Ҷ. Ҷӯразода, Н. Ғиёсов, И.У. Раҳимов, Б.П. Ашрапов. — Хучанд: Ношир, 2018. — 976 с.
7. Марвӣ М.К. Оламорои Нодирӣ / М.К. Марвӣ; нашри интиқодӣ бо муқаддима ва тавзеҳоти Н.Д. Миклухо-Маклай. — Москва: Наука, 1960–1966.
8. Мирзоев А. Роль исторической прозы XVIII века в формировании норм современного таджикского литературного языка / А. Мирзоев // Забон – рукни ҳастии миллат: Маҷмӯаи мақолаҳои конференсияи байналмилалӣ. — Душанбе: Дониш, 2022. — С. 211–219.
9. Назарзода С. Лексика государственного управления в таджикской историографии XVIII века (на материале «Джаханкушой-и Нодирӣ» и «Аламорои-и Нодирӣ») / С. Назарзода // Паёми Донишгоҳи миллии Тоҷикистон. — 2023. — № 2. — С. 88–97.
10. Рустамов Ш. Синтаксический архаизм и новаторство в языке таджикских исторических произведений XVIII века / Ш. Рустамов; отв. ред. Д. Саймиддинов // Историческая грамматика таджикского языка: Новые подходы. — Душанбе: Дониш, 2022. — С. 154–178.
11. Сафаров Б. Структурно-семантические особенности глагольных композитов с превербами бар- и дар- в «Убайдулла-наме» / Б. Сафаров // Ахбори Академияи илмҳои Ҷумҳурии Тоҷикистон. Силсилаи филология ва шарқшиносӣ. — 2023. — № 1. — С. 67–75.
12. Толеъ А. Таърихи Абулфайзхон / А. Толеъ; таҳия ва нашри А.А. Семёнов. — Тошканд: Нашриёти давлатии Ўзбекистон, 1959. — 380 с.
13. Beeman W.O. Language, Power, and Identity in 18th-Century Bukhara: A Linguistic Analysis of Courtly Prose / W.O. Beeman // Central Asiatic Journal. — 2023. — Vol. 66. — № 1-2. — P. 95–115.
14. Rakhmonov S. About the history of the study of the Chandyr dialects and the names of some of their groups / S. Rakhmonov // International Journal of Artificial Intelligence. — 2025. — Vol. 1. — № 5. — P. 1102–1105.
15. Schmidt A. The Evolution of Compound Verbs in 18th-Century Central Asian Persian: A Case Study of “Olamoroy-i Nodiri” / A. Schmidt // Iran and the Caucasus. — 2024. — Vol. 28. — № 1. — P. 45–62.

Список литературы на английском языке / References in English

1. Astarobodi M.M. Jahonkushoy Nodiri [The World-Conqueror Nadir] / M.M. Astarobodi; ed. by A. Abdullohi. — Tehron: Anjumani osor va mafokhiri farhangi, 1377. — 980 p. [in Tajik]

2. Ashrapov, B. P. Upotreblenie proizvodnykh arabskikh narechii v tadzhikskom literaturnom yazyke XVIII-go veka [The Use of Derived Arabic Adverbs in the 18th-Century Tajik Literary Language] / B.P. Ashrapiv // *Zametki uchenogo* [Scholar's Notes]. — 2022. — № 2. — P. 42–45. [in Russian]
3. Bukhoroi M.A. Ubaydullohnoma [The Book of Ubaydullah] / M.A. Bukhoroi; ed. by A.A. Semyonov. — Toshkand: Publishing House AS UzbSSR, 1957. — 420 p. [in Tajik]
4. Gramatikai zaboni adabii hozirai tojik [Grammar of the Modern Tajik Literary Language]. — Dushanbe: Donish, 1985. — 356 p. [in Tajik]
5. Imomov M.S. Yazykovye osobennosti postklassicheskogo perioda v proze «Ta'rikh-i Abulfayz-khan» [Linguistic Features of the Post-Classical Period in the Prose of "Ta'rikh-i Abulfayz-khan"] / M.S. Imomov // *Vestnik Tadjzhikskogo natsional'nogo universiteta. Seriya filologiya* [Bulletin of the Tajik National University. Philology Series]. — 2022. — № 4. — P. 112–121. [in Russian]
6. Karminagi M. Tuhfat-ul-khoni [The Khan's Gift] / M. Karminagi; prep. by J. Jurazoda, N. Ghiyosov, I.U. Rahimov, B.P. Ashrapov. — Khujand: Noshir, 2018. — 976 p. [in Tajik]
7. Marvi M.K. Olamoroy Nodiri [Nadir, the Adorner of the World] / M.K. Muhammad; critical ed. with introduction and notes by N.D. Miklukho-Maklay. — Moscow: Nauka, 1960–1966. [in Tajik]
8. Mirzoev A. Rol' istoricheskoi prozy XVIII veka v formirovani norm sovremennogo tadzhikskogo literaturnogo yazyka [The Role of 18th-Century Historical Prose in the Formation of Modern Tajik Literary Language Norms] / A. Mirzoev // *Zabon – rukni hastii millat: Majmuai maqolaho konferensiyai baynalmilali* [Language – a Pillar of the Nation's Existence: Proceedings of the International Conference]. — Dushanbe: Donish, 2022. — P. 211–219. [in Russian]
9. Nazarzoda S. Leksika gosudarstvennogo upravleniya v tadzhikskoi istoriografii XVIII veka (na materiale «Dzhakhankushoi-i Nodiri» i «Alamoroi-i Nodiri») [The Lexicon of State Administration in 18th-Century Tajik Historiography (Based on "Jahonkushoy-i Nodiri" and "Olamoroy-i Nodiri")] / S. Nazarzoda // *Payomi Donishgohi millii Tojikiston* [Bulletin of the National University of Tajikistan]. — 2023. — № 2. — P. 88–97. [in Russian]
10. Rustamov Sh. Sintaksicheskii arkhazm i novatorstvo v yazyke tadzhikskikh istoricheskikh proizvedenii XVIII veka [Syntactic Archaism and Innovation in the Language of 18th-Century Tajik Historical Works] / Sh. Rustamov; ed. by D. Saymiddinov // *Istoricheskaya grammatika tadzhikskogo yazyka: Nove podkhody* [Historical Grammar of the Tajik Language: New Approaches] — Dushanbe: Donish, 2022. — P. 154–178. [in Russian]
11. Safarov, B. Strukturno-semanticheskie osobennosti glagol'nykh kompozitov s preverbami bar- i dar- v «Ubaydullakh-name» [Structural and Semantic Features of Verbal Composites with the Preverbs Bar- and Dar- in "Ubaydullahnoma"] / B. Safarov // *Akhbori Akademiyai ilmhoi Jumhuri Tojikiston. Sililai filologiya va sharqshinosi* [Reports of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tajikistan. Philology and Oriental Studies Series]. — 2023. — № 1. — P. 67–75. [in Russian]
12. Tole' A. Ta'rikhi Abulfayzkhon [The History of Abulfayz Khan] / A. Tole'; ed. by A.A. Semyonov. — Toshkand: Nashriyoti davlatii Uzbekiston, 1959. — 380 p. [in Tajik]
13. Beeman W.O. Language, Power, and Identity in 18th-Century Bukhara: A Linguistic Analysis of Courtly Prose / W.O. Beeman // *Central Asiatic Journal*. — 2023. — Vol. 66. — № 1-2. — P. 95–115.
14. Rakhmonov S. About the history of the study of the Chandyr dialects and the names of some of their groups / S. Rakhmonov // *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence*. — 2025. — Vol. 1. — № 5. — P. 1102–1105.
15. Schmidt A. The Evolution of Compound Verbs in 18th-Century Central Asian Persian: A Case Study of “Olamoroy-i Nodiri” / A. Schmidt // *Iran and the Caucasus*. — 2024. — Vol. 28. — № 1. — P. 45–62.