

Н.А. Вохидова (Худжанд, Республика Таджикистан)

Морфологические особенности сложных слов, образованных с помощью -хона, и их английских эквивалентов (на материале «Гуломона» С. Айни)

Аннотация: В данной статье рассматриваются морфологические особенности сложных слов, образованных с помощью суффиксоида -хона («комната, дом, помещение»), в романе Садриддина Айни «Гуломон» («Рабы») и их функциональные эквиваленты в английском языке. На основе качественного описательно-сопоставительного анализа 20 примеров, извлеченных из романа, исследование выделяет пять морфолого-семантических категорий композитов с -хона: помещения для животных, социально-коммунальные пространства, складские и хозяйственные помещения, институциональные и абстрактные пространства, а также архитектурные метафоры. Результаты показывают, что таджикский язык использует систематическую и высокопродуктивную стратегию общего пространственного словообразования по единой модели X + хона, тогда как английский язык требует пяти различных переводческих стратегий, включая буквальную эквивалентность, функциональную эквивалентность, метонимический сдвиг, описательный перифраз и культурное заимствование. Английский суффиксоид «-room» оказывается значительно менее продуктивным и неспособен адекватно передать семантический диапазон таджикского -хона. Помимо чисто морфологического описания, использование этих композитов у Айни выполняет литературные функции аутентичности, социальной стратификации и эвфемистической иронии. Исследование вносит вклад в лексическую типологию, противопоставляя язык с общей стратегией пространственного словообразования (таджикский) языку, в котором такая стратегия отсутствует (английский).

Ключевые слова: сложные слова, суффиксоид, -хона, морфологические особенности, английские эквиваленты, стратегии перевода, Садриддин Айни, «Гуломон», таджикский язык, лексическая типология

N.A. Vohidova (Khujand, Tajikistan Republic)

Morphological Peculiarities of the Compound Words Formed by -хона / room and Their English Equivalents (on the material of “Ghulomon” by S. Aini)

Abstract: The given article dwells on the morphological peculiarities of compound words formed with the suffixoid -хона (“room, house, chamber”) in Sadriddin Aini’s novel Ghulomon (“Slaves”) and their functional equivalents in English. Based on a

qualitative descriptive-comparative analysis of 20 selected examples extracted from the novel, the study identifies five morphological-semantic categories of -хона compounds: animal shelters, social / communal spaces, storage / utility spaces, institutional / abstract spaces, and architectural metaphors. The findings reveal that while Tajik employs a systematic and highly productive general-purpose spatial compounding strategy using the single template X + хона, English requires five distinct translational strategies, including literal equivalence, functional equivalence, metonymic shift, descriptive paraphrase, and cultural borrowing. The English suffixoid “-room” proves far less productive and cannot adequately render the semantic range of Tajik -хона. Beyond purely morphological description, Aini’s use of these compounds serves literary functions of authenticity, social stratification, and euphemistic irony. The study contributes to lexical typology by contrasting a language with a general-purpose spatial compounding strategy (Tajik) with one that lacks it (English).

Key words: compound words, suffixoid, -хона, morphological peculiarities, English equivalents, translation strategies, Sadridin Aini, Ghulomon, Tajik language, lexical typology

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of compound words in any language reveals not only its morphological richness but also the cultural and cognitive frameworks of its speakers. The Tajik language, belonging to the Western Iranian group of the Indo-Iranian branch of the Indo-European family, has a long-standing tradition of nominal compounding. Among the most productive formants in Tajik is the suffixoid -хона (from Persian khāneh, meaning “house,” “room,” or “chamber”), which functions as the second element in countless compound nouns [5].

Sadridin Aini’s seminal work *Ghulomon* (“Slaves”) offers a unique linguistic corpus. Set against the backdrop of the Emirate of Bukhara in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the novel provides authentic descriptions of everyday life, architecture, social hierarchy, and material culture, all of which are lexically encoded through -хона compounds. However, the morphological peculiarities of these compounds and their equivalence in English – a language that rarely uses “room” as a productive suffix – remain underexplored [7; 8].

This article aims to: (1) describe the morphological patterns of compound words ending in -хона in *Ghulomon*; (2) provide their contextual English translations; (3) conduct a comparative analysis of 20 selected examples; and (4) identify systematic equivalences and divergences between Tajik and English in rendering spatial and functional concepts.

2. METHODS

The research follows a qualitative, descriptive-comparative design. The material for the study consists of 20 compound nouns ending in -хона extracted from Aini’s *Ghulomon* (2019 edition, Dushanbe: Children’s Literature Publishing House). The selection was purposive: compounds were included if they (a) contained -хона as a bound root, (b) appeared in authentic narrative contexts, and (c) exhibited morphological or semantic diversity.

Each example was analyzed morphologically (stem + -хона) and semantically (literal vs. extended meaning). English equivalents were generated through functional

contextual translation, prioritizing idiomaticity over literal rendering. The comparative analysis was structured around five typological categories: (1) literal equivalence (EN “room / house”), (2) functional equivalence (EN specialized term), (3) metonymic shift, (4) descriptive paraphrase, and (5) cultural borrowing.

3. RESULTS

The analysis of Ghulomon yielded over 50 distinct -хона compounds. The 20 selected examples are presented below in Tajik (Cyrillic) with English translation and morphological breakdown.

Example 1: Дар шутурхонае, ки дар пахлуи ҳавлӣ буда, ба вай бо як дар мепайваст, дегҳои миси калонро, ки дар ҳар кадоми онҳо як ман (8 пуд) биринҷро дам кардан мумкин буд, қатор шинонда буданд [1: 84].

Translation: “In a *camel-shed (camel-room)* that was located next to the courtyard and connected to it by a single door, large copper cauldrons were lined up...”

Morphology: шутур (camel) + хона (room / shed)

Example 2: Ғуломони хонадор кардашуда ҳам бо канизони ба худашон додашуда дар коҳхонаҳо, саисхонаҳо, оғилхонаҳо ва шутурхонаҳо ҷой гирифтанд [1: 89].

Translation: “The married slaves, together with the maidservants given to them, settled in *chaff-houses, stable-rooms, cow-sheds, and camel-sheds*”.

Morphology: коҳ (chaff) + хона; саис (groom, stableman) + хона; оғил (cowshed) + хона; шутур (camel) + хона

Example 3: Ин гуна гарм омадани зимистон аломаги хубӣ нест, – гуфт Бобомурод такламачӣ, ки аз гурӯҳи мардум ҷудо шуда бар суфаҷаи дарвозахонааш қолинча паҳн карда ҷой нӯшида менишаст ва эзоҳ дод [1: 338].

Translation: “‘This kind of warm winter is not a good sign,’ said Bobomurod the taklamachi (beggar), who... sat on a small bench in his *gateway-room (porch)*, having spread a small carpet, drinking tea”.

Morphology: дарвоза (gate) + хона (room) → porch, entrance chamber

Example 4: – Сара ҷаноби олиатро аз нақорахонаи арки овоз хоҳӣ дид, – гуфт ба дили худ зане, ки барои халос кардани писари дастгиршудааш ба пеши қозӣ омада буд [1: 295].

Translation: “‘Soon you will hear His Excellency from the *naqqāra-khāneh (drum-chamber)* of the Ark,’ a woman said to herself...”

Morphology: нақора (drum / kettledrum) + хона (room / chamber)

Example 5: Гунбазҳои похсағӣ ва чевахонаҳои лой, ки дар ҳар ду-чор фарсахи он биёбон во меҳӯрданд, маданияти туркмани онрӯзаро нишон медоданд [1: 3].

Translation: “The mud domes and clay *pit-dwellings (pit-rooms)*, which appeared every two-four farsakhs in that desert, showed the Turkmen culture of that time”.

Morphology: чев (pit, trench) + хона (room)

Example 6: Милисионере, ки дар пеши дарвозаи милисахона дар посбонӣ истода буд, аз ин «уллос» дар ҳарос афтаида рафиқи худро... [1: 289].

Translation: “The militiaman who was standing guard in front of the *police-station (militia-room)* was frightened by this ‘hullo’ and his comrade...”

Morphology: милиса (militia / police) + хона (room) → police station

Example 7: Ду бандие, ки онҳоро аз обхона–аз ҳабсхонаи дар роҳрави арк буда бароварда оварда буданд, дар пеши дарвозаи арк ба сари тахтапул намудор гардиданд [1: 39].

Translation: “Two prisoners whom they had brought out from the *water-room (detention cell) – the prison-room* located in the Ark’s corridor – appeared on the wooden bridge in front of the Ark’s gate.”

Morphology: об (water) + хона (room) — euphemism for prison; ҳабс (imprisonment / arrest) + хона

Example 8: – «Дар мамлакат дузд ёфт нашавад, тарозудорро ба миршабхона кашола кун» гуфтаанд, – гуфта деҳқони дигаре хандаи ҳанӯз нахобидаро боз болотар бардоронид [1: 48].

Translation: “They say: “If no thief can be found in the country, drag the scale-keeper to the *watch-house (chief-of-night’s-room)*”, another peasant said”.

Morphology: миршаб (chief of the night watch; mir-i shab) + хона → night-watch station

Example 9: Маҳрамони Ўрмон-Полвон дастурхонро паҳн карда бар рӯи он лаълиҳои ширавор ва нонҳоро гузоштанд, чои кабудро аз даҳлез кашида даровардан гирифтанд, меҳмонон бо соҳибхона ба нонхӯрӣ ва чойнӯшӣ даромаданд [1: 152].

Translation: “Urmon-Polvon’s confidants spread the tablecloth... the guests and the *householder (owner of the room / house)* started eating bread and drinking tea”.

Morphology: соҳиб (owner, master) + хона (room / house) → host, householder

Example 10: Амир, ки дар задухӯрди аввалии ин ҷанг сараскараш ва тӯбхонааш талаф шуда буд, боз роҳи ҳиларо пеш гирифт... [1: 207].

Translation: “The Emir, who had lost his commander-in-chief and his *cannon-house (artillery battery)* in the first clash of this battle, again resorted to trickery...”

Morphology: тӯб (cannon / ball) + хона (room / house) → artillery unit, cannon emplacement

Example 11: Ҳасан Эргаш аз ёбон ба деҳа даромада ба чойхонаи сурх наздик расид, дар ин вақт як “сиёҳӣ”-е, ки ба девори чойхона пушт дода истода буд [1: 422].

Translation: “Hasan Erghash came from the steppe into the village and approached the red *teahouse (tea-room)*, when a ‘black figure’ standing leaning against the teahouse wall...”

Morphology: чой (tea) + хона (room) → teahouse

Example 12: – Ман чӣ медонам? – гуфт ва хареро, ки кашшааш аз нурӣ пур шуда буд, аз порухона бароварда, хари дигареро пеш кашид ва кашшаи бар болои вай бударо рост карда, ба вай пору андохтан гирифт [1: 77].

Translation: ““What do I know?” he said, and taking out the donkey whose pack-saddle was full of straw from the *dung-room (stable for dung / fodder)*, pulled forward another donkey”.

Morphology: пору (dung, manure) + хона (room) → manure shed, dung storage

Example 13: Ин пиразан, ки ба сари худ саллаи калонеро ба сохти лаклакхонаи манори Бухоро маҳрутишакл карда баста буд, ба яке аз ояндагон бе он ки расми салом ва пурсупоси туркманиро адо кунад [1: 5].

Translation: “This old woman, who had tied on her head a large turban shaped like a cone after the fashion of a *stork’s-nest-room (stork-house)* of the Bukhara minaret, [said something] to one of the arrivals...”

Morphology: лаклак (stork) + хона (room / nest) → stork’s nest (on a minaret)

Example 14: Акнун молхона бо гӯсфанд, сорбонхона бо шутур пур буд [1: 32].

Translation: “Now the *livestock-room (sheepfold)* was full of sheep, the *camel-driver’s-room (caravanserai section)* was full of camels”.

Morphology: мол (livestock, property) + хона; сорбон (camel driver) + хона

Example 15: Бой саночҳои пулро ба меҳмонхона дароварда ба сандуқи оҳанин андохт, дафтар ва асбоби ҳисобро дар тоқи меҳмонхона гузошт [1: 49].

Translation: “The wealthy man brought the sacks of money into the *guest-room* (*guesthouse / reception room*), threw them into an iron chest, and placed the ledger and counting tools in the niche of the *guest-room*”.

Morphology: меҳмон (guest) + хона (room)

Example 16: Дар ошхона барои ошпазӣ ва обгармкунӣ деғҳои ҷудогона шинонданд [1: 35].

Translation: “In the *kitchen* (*cooking-room*), separate cauldrons were installed for cooking and for heating water”.

Morphology: ош (cooked food, pilaf) + хона → kitchen

Example 17: Аз ягон мушхона ва ё сӯроҳии дигар об ба тарафи мо гузашта рошро бардоштааст...[1: 354].

Translation: “Water must have passed through some *mouse-hole* (*mouse-room*) or other hole and cut off our path...”

Morphology: муш (mouse) + хона (room) → mouse hole, small opening

Example 18: Дудҳое, ки аз оташхонаи трактор мебароманд, монанди моҳичаҳои хокистарранг, ки дар баҳри vaseи шаффоф сайр карда гарданд, дар ҳавои соф шино мекарданд [1: 425].

Translation: “The smoke rising from *the tractor’s fire-chamber* (*combustion chamber / engine*) – like small grayish fish swimming in a vast transparent sea – sailed through the clean air.”

Morphology: оташ (fire) + хона (room / chamber)

Example 19: Баъд аз даромадани аз дарвоза ба дасти чапатон ҷувозхона, ятимхона ва оғили моли сиёҳбандӣ буд [1: 114].

Translation: “After entering the gate, on your left were *the walnut-store* (*walnut-room*), *the orphanage* (*orphan-room*), and the fold for black cattle”.

Morphology: ҷувоз (walnut) + хона; ятим (orphan) + хона

Example 20: Бо шеҳа кашидани асп сарге ҳам, ки дар лаби чуқурии аспхона хобида буд, ғуррос зада ак-ак кард [1: 165].

Translation: “At the horse’s neighing, a dog that lay at the edge of *the pit of the stable* (*horse-room*) growled and barked”.

Morphology: асп (horse) + хона (room) → stable

4. DISCUSSION

4.1. MORPHOLOGICAL PRODUCTIVITY AND CONSTRAINTS

The suffixoid -хона in Tajik exhibits what linguists term semi-affixal behavior: it retains lexical meaning (“room”, “enclosure”, “chamber”) while functioning grammatically as a derivational suffix. Unlike a fully grammaticalized suffix (e.g., English “-ness”), -хона can still appear as an independent noun (хона – house, room) [2; 3]. However, in compounds, its meaning undergoes semantic bleaching to varying degrees, as shown in Figure 1 (conceptual).

Degree of semantic bleaching continuum:

Minimal bleaching: шутурхона = literal room for camels

Moderate bleaching: чойхона = not just a “tea room” but a social institution

Strong bleaching: тӯбхона = not a room at all, but a military unit

Complete metaphoric shift: обхона = euphemism for prison (no water involved)

A striking morphological constraint emerges from the corpus: no adjective + -хона compounds occur. Aini never writes калонхона (big-room) or сурххона (red-room) as nouns. This confirms that -хона attaches exclusively to nominal stems (including de-verbal nouns like ҳабс). This distinguishes Tajik from English, where “room” readily combines with adjectives (“darkroom”, “clean room”).

4.2. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE 20 EXAMPLES BY CATEGORY

Category A: Animal Shelters (Examples 1, 2, 14, 20)

The four animal-shelter compounds – шутурхона (1,2), аспхона (20), оғилхона (2), молхона (14) – reveal an important typological difference. Tajik uses the same morphological template for all domesticated animals, regardless of the animal’s size or the structure’s complexity. English, by contrast, employs etymologically unrelated roots: stable (from Latin stabulum), cowshed (Germanic compound), camel-shed (descriptive compound), sheepfold (Germanic). No single English suffix corresponds to -хона in this domain.

Moreover, саиҳхона (2) and сорбонхона (14) introduce a human agent into the animal-space compound. These do not mean “room of the groom” in a possessive sense but rather “the area / quarters associated with the groom’s work.” English lacks this pattern: “groom-room” is unidiomatic; “stableman’s quarters” is a phrase, not a compound.

Category B: Social and Communal Spaces (Examples 3, 4, 6, 8, 11, 15, 16)

This is the largest and most diverse category. Дарвозахона (3) exemplifies a spatial concept central to Central Asian architecture: the entrance area, often a raised platform (суфа) inside the gateway. English “porch” or “vestibule” partially covers this, but “gateway-room” captures the enclosure better.

Нақорахона (4) is a cultural keyword. In the Ark of Bukhara, the naqqāra-khāneh was a gallery or tower where kettledrums were played to announce official events. Translating it as “drum-room” loses its ceremonial, institutional meaning. Retaining the borrowing naqqāra-khāneh (with italics) is preferable in scholarly translation.

Милицахона (6) and миршабхона (8) form a historical pair. Миршабхона derives from the pre-Soviet institution of the mirshab (night watch commander), whose station served as a local police post. Милицахона introduces the Soviet militsiya system. Both use -хона, but their English equivalents diverge (“watch-house” vs. “police station”), reflecting institutional history. This shows that -хона compounds are diachronically stable even as their referents change.

Чойхона (11) requires special attention. While literally “tea-room,” the Central Asian choykhona is a male-dominated social hub, often serving meals, allowing rest for travelers, and functioning as a de facto club. English “teahouse” (used in the translation) is acceptable but underrepresents the institution’s centrality. Меҳмонхона (15) similarly oscillates between “guest-room” (in a private house) and “guesthouse” (commercial). Context in Ghulomon suggests the former, but the morphological structure permits both.

Ошхона (16) is a rare case of almost perfect functional equivalence: Tajik oshkhona (pilaf-room) and English “kitchen” share the same core meaning – a space for cooking – though the Tajik term specifies a particular dish (osh), reflecting cultural dietary centrality.

Category C: Storage and Utility Spaces (Examples 2, 5, 12, 17, 19)

Коҳхона (2) – chaff-house – and порухона (12) – dung-room – refer to agricultural storage structures peripheral to the main house. English compounds with “-house” or “-shed” work well here.

Љевахона (5) is the most culturally specific term in the corpus. The Turkmen *jeva* is a semi-underground, dome-roofed dwelling made of clay, common in arid regions. Aini explicitly marks it as distinct from the *поҳсағӣ* (mud-brick) domes. English has no single-word equivalent; “pit-dwelling” or “semi-subterranean hut” must paraphrase. The morphological transparency of *љевахона* (pit + room) ironically aids the English reader despite the cultural gap.

Љувозхона (19) – walnut-store – reflects pre-refrigeration preservation practices: nuts were stored in dedicated cool rooms. English “walnut store” or “nut-house” is possible but rare; most English texts would simply say “the place where walnuts were kept”. The compound form in Tajik implies a permanent architectural feature.

Мушхона (17) is deceptive: it does not denote a structure built for mice but rather an unintended hole or gap that mice use. The *-хона* formant here is ironic or metaphorical – a “room” in miniature. English “mouse-hole” uses “hole,” not “room,” reflecting a different spatial metaphor (cavity vs. chamber).

Category D: Institutional and Abstract Spaces (Examples 7, 9, 10, 18, 19)

Обхона (7) as a euphemism for prison deserves detailed analysis. Aini adds an appositive clarification: аз обхона – аз ҳабсхона (“from the water-room – from the prison-room”). The euphemism likely derives from the practice of giving prisoners only water, or from prisons located near water cisterns. English has similar euphemisms (“cooler,” “slammer”) but none that preserve the *-хона* morphological pattern. The juxtaposition of *обхона* and *ҳабсхона* in the same sentence shows Aini exploiting both the euphemistic and the literal compound.

Соҳибхона (9) is morphologically exceptional because the first element *соҳиб* (owner, master) is itself a loanword from Arabic. The compound means “host” or “master of the house” – a person, not a room. This is a case of metonymic shift whereby a locative compound comes to denote the occupant. Similar shifts occur in English (“the White House said today...”), but English lacks a dedicated compound for “room-owner.” The translation “householder” is approximate.

Љубхона (10) undergoes military metonymy: from “cannon-room” (an actual storage or firing chamber) to “artillery unit” (an abstract military formation). In the context, the Emir has lost his *tūbkhona* in battle – clearly not a physical room but a tactical asset. English “artillery battery” is a parallel metonymy (from French *batterie* – the act of beating / bombarding). Both languages thus extend spatial terms to military units, but Tajik uses the *-хона* template while English borrows from French.

Оташхона (18) in the context of a tractor refers to the internal combustion chamber. This is a rare case of *-хона* extending into modern technology. Aini, writing in the 1930s, already applies the traditional pattern to a Soviet-era machine. This demonstrates the formant’s adaptability. English “fire-chamber” or “combustion chamber” is a direct parallel, though modern technical English prefers “cylinder” or “combustion chamber” as fixed terms.

Ятимхона (19) – orphanage – shows institutional abstraction. Unlike *меҳмонхона* (guest-room), which retains a spatial sense, *ятимхона* denotes not just a room but an entire institution, often a large building. English “orphanage” is a single word (from Latin *orphanus* + *-age*), while Tajik preserves the transparent compound. This reflects

different lexicalization strategies: Tajik favors analytic transparency, English favors synthetic opacity.

Category E: Architectural Metaphors (Example 13)

Лаклакхона (13) is the most poetic compound in the selection. The stork's nest on top of a Bukhara minaret is described as a "stork-room." The old woman's turban is then compared to the conical shape of that nest. This triple layering – concrete nest → architectural feature → headwear shape – is only possible because -хона can denote both human and animal dwellings. English "stork's nest" lacks the "room" resonance, weakening the metaphorical chain.

4.3. CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS: TAJIK -ХОНА VS. ENGLISH "-ROOM"

The English suffixoid "-room" exists but is far less productive. Examples like "chat-room," "showroom," "restroom" are limited to modern, often commercial, contexts. English does not form "camel-room," "chaff-room," or "prison-room" idiomatically. Instead, English uses:

English strategy / Example Corresponding / Tajik pattern

Zero-derived specific noun / kitchen / ОШХОНА

Agentive possessive / cow-shed / ОҒИЛХОНА

"-house" compound / storehouse / анборхона (not in corpus but regular)

"-hole" compound / mouse-hole / МУШХОНА

Descriptive phrase / pit-dwelling / чевахона

This contrast suggests a fundamental difference in construal: Tajik conceptualizes almost any bounded functional space as a "room" (хона), while English differentiates spaces by material, size, animal, or purpose using diverse roots.

4.4. PRAGMATIC FUNCTIONS IN GHULOMON

Aini's use of -хона compounds serves three literary-pragmatic functions:

1. Authenticity and local color. By consistently using дарвозахона, чойхона, нақорахона, Aini constructs a linguistically authentic Bukharan world. These are not neologisms but real terms from the spoken language of his childhood (Aini was born in 1878 in the village of Sektare near Bukhara).

2. Social stratification. The contrast between соҳибхона (householder, master) and ғулумони хонадор (housed slaves) in Example 2 is telling. The slave has a хона only as a dependent compound (хонадор – literally "room-holding"), not as autonomous possession. -Хона thus participates in the novel's critique of feudal hierarchy.

3. Euphemism and irony. Обхона (water-room) for prison is darkly ironic – the "water" is minimal sustenance, not comfort. The reader familiar with prison conditions understands the grim joke. Aini reinforces this by immediately glossing it with хабсхона, ensuring comprehension while preserving the euphemistic texture.

4.5. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study is limited in three respects. First, it analyzes a single literary work; spoken and dialectal Tajik may exhibit different patterns. Second, diachronic change is not tracked; Soviet-era coinages like компютерхона (computer room) are absent from Aini. Third, only 20 of 52 compounds are analyzed in depth; a full corpus analysis would be necessary for statistical generalization.

4.6. IMPLICATIONS FOR LEXICAL TYPOLOGY

The Tajik -хона pattern exemplifies a general-purpose spatial compounding strategy (GPSCS) – a morphological tool that can generate a name for almost any bounded location, regardless of size, function, or formality. Languages with GPSCS (e. g., Japanese -ya ‘shop / house’, Turkish -hane from Persian, German -haus) contrast with languages like English that lack such a strategy and instead rely on diverse, etymologically unrelated nouns. This typological difference has cognitive implications: speakers of GPSCS languages may perceive a stronger family resemblance between a camel-shed, a kitchen, and a prison than English speakers, for whom these concepts belong to different lexical categories [4; 6; 9 10].

The morphological peculiarity of -хона compounds in Ghulomon lies not in their formation (which is regular and predictable) but in their semantic range and cultural specificity. English equivalents require five distinct strategies, revealing a major typological divergence. Aini exploits this morphological resource for literary realism, social commentary, and euphemistic irony. Future research should investigate contemporary Tajik media to determine whether -хона is gaining or losing productivity in the digital age (e. g., интернетхона, харидхона – online shop).

5. CONCLUSION

The analysis of compound words formed with the suffixoid -хона in S. Aini’s Ghulomon reveals that their morphological peculiarity lies not in unpredictable formation patterns – which are regular and transparent – but in their remarkable semantic range and deep cultural embeddedness. The 20 examined examples demonstrate that Tajik employs a general-purpose spatial compounding strategy, whereby the element -хона (etymologically “room / house”) attaches productively to nominal stems to designate any bounded functional space, regardless of size (from a mouse-hole to a prison), purpose (storage, shelter, cooking, ceremony), or degree of abstraction (military unit, social institution).

The comparative analysis with English equivalents uncovers a major typological divergence. While Tajik systematically deploys the single template X + хона across diverse semantic domains, English resorts to five distinct translational strategies: (1) literal equivalence (“room / house”), (2) functional equivalence (specialized terms like kitchen), (3) metonymic shift (artillery battery), (4) descriptive paraphrase (pit-dwelling), and (5) cultural borrowing (naqqāra-khāneh). No single English suffix corresponds to the productivity of Tajik -хона; the English suffixoid “-room” remains lexically restricted and pragmatically limited to modern, often commercial contexts.

Furthermore, Aini’s literary use of -хона compounds serves three pragmatic functions within Ghulomon: constructing linguistic authenticity for the Bukharan setting, encoding social stratification (contrasting sohibkhona ‘householder’ with enslaved dependents), and enabling euphemistic irony (as in obkhona ‘water-room’ for prison). These findings confirm that the study of compound words transcends purely morphological description, offering insights into the cognitive categorization of space, cultural practices, and the artistic resources of literary language. Future research should extend this analysis to contemporary Tajik media to assess whether -хона retains its productivity in the digital age.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. *Айнӣ С. Ғулумон. Роман. Душанбе: Адабиёти бачагона, 2019. 488 с.*
2. *Мамадназаров А. Фарҳанги англисӣ-тоҷикӣ. Душанбе: Эр-граф, 2021. 1016 с.*
3. *Расторгуева В.С. Среднеперсидский язык / В.С. Расторгуева, Е.К. Молчанова // Основы иранского языкознания. Среднеиранские языки. М.: Наука, 1981. С. 6–146.*
4. *Розӣ Шамси Қайс. Ал-Муъҷам / Муаллифи сарсухану тавзеҳот ва ҳозиркунандаи чоп У.Тоиров. Душанбе: Адиб, 1991. 463 с.*
5. *Ashrapov B.P. Comparative Analysis of the Morphological Peculiarities of the Suffix -mand and Its English Equivalents (on the material of Ghulomon by S. Aini) // Herald of Daghestan Scientific Center. 2024. №94. P. 141–145. DOI 10.31029/vestdnc94/20; EDN PDCGHN.*
6. *Ashrapov B.P. Morphological Peculiarities of the Tajik Prexoid ‘khush-’ in Tajik Literary Language Referring to the 18th Century // Stephanos. 2026. №2(76). P. 45–53. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2026-76-2-45-53; EDN HSEJSP.*
7. *Ashrapov B.P. Some Considerations Beset with English Word-building Rules // Образование от «А» до «Я». 2021. №4. P. 5–6. EDN EQYIVI.*
8. *Ashrapov B.P. Morphological Peculiarities of the Tajik Prexoid ‘khush-’ in Tajik Literary Language Referring to the 18th Century // Stephanos. 2026. №2(76). P. 45–53. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2026-76-2-45-53; EDN HSEJSP.*
9. *Ashrapov B.P. On the Issue of the Usage of Certain Tajik Interjections and Their English and Chinese Equivalents: A Comparative Pragmatic and Semantic Analysis // Stephanos. 2026. №1(75). P. 20–27. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2026-75-1-20-27; EDN MFWABE.*
10. *John R. Perry. A Tajik Persian Reference Grammar. Leiden; Boston: Brill 2005. 528 p.*

REFERENCES

1. Aini S. Ghulomon. (2019) Novel. Dushanbe. Children’s Literature Publ. 488 p.
2. Mamadnazarov A. (2021) English-Tajik Dictionary. Dushanbe. Er-graf Publ. 1016 p.
3. Rastorgueva V.S. Middle Persian Language / V.S. Rastorgueva, E.K. Molchanova. Fundamentals of Iranian Linguistics. Middle Iranian languages. Mocsow. Nauka Publ. 1981, pp. 6–146.
4. Razi Shamsi Qais. Al-Mu’jam / Author of the introduction and comments and editor U. Toirov. Dushanbe. Adib Publ. 463 p.
5. Ashrapov B.P. Comparative Analysis of the Morphological Peculiarities of the Suffix -mand and Its English Equivalents (on the material of Ghulomon by S. Aini). *Herald of Daghestan Scientific Center*. 2024. No 94, pp. 141–145. DOI 10.31029/vestdnc94/20. EDN PDCGHN.
6. Ashrapov B.P. Morphological Peculiarities of the Tajik Prexoid ‘khush-’ in Tajik Literary Language Referring to the 18th Century. *Stephanos*. 2026. No 2(76), pp. 45–53. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2026-76-2-45-53; EDN HSEJSP.
7. Ashrapov B.P. Some Considerations Beset with English Word-building Rules. *Obrazovanie from “A” to “Ya”*. 2021. No4, pp. 5–6. EDN EQYIVI.
8. Ashrapov B.P. Morphological Peculiarities of the Tajik Prexoid ‘khush-’ in Tajik Literary Language Referring to the 18th Century. *Stephanos*. 2026. No 2(76), pp. 45–53. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2026-76-2-45-53; EDN HSEJSP.
9. Ashrapov B.P. On the Issue of the Usage of Certain Tajik Interjections and Their English and Chinese Equivalents: A Comparative Pragmatic and Semantic Analysis. *Stephanos*. 2026. No 1(75), pp. 20–27. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2026-75-1-20-27; EDN MFWABE.

10. John R. Perry. (2005) A Tajik Persian Reference Grammar. Leiden; Boston. Brill. 528 p.

Сведения об авторе:

Нодира Абдусатторовна Вохидова,

канд. филол. наук

доцент

факультета иностранных языков

Худжандский государственный университет
имени академика Б. Гафурова

Nodira A. Vohidova,

PhD

Associate Professor

Faculty of Foreign Languages

Khujand State University named
after academician B. Gafurov