

**CONSIDERATION ON THE PLACE AND  
ROLE OF SUBORDINATE CONJUNCTIONS  
IN «TUHFAT-UL-KHONI» BY MUHAMMAD  
VAFO KARMINAGI**

**Ashrapov Bahodurjon Pulotovich,**  
post-graduate student of Arabic Grammar  
Department KhSU named after acad.  
B.Gafurov (Tajikistan, Khujand)

**БАЪЗЕ МУЛОҲИЗАҶО ОИД БА МАКОН  
ВА НАҚШИ ПАЙВАНДАКҶОИ  
ТОБЕЪКУНАНДА ДАР «ТҶҲФАТ-УЛ-  
ХОНӢ»-И МУҶАММАД ВАҶОИ  
КАРМИНАГӢ**

**Ашрапов Баҳодурҷон Пулотович,**  
аспиранти кафедраи грамматикаи  
забони арабии ДДХ ба номи акад.  
Б.Гафуров (Тоҷикистон, Хуҷанд)

**НЕКОТОРЫЕ СООБРАЖЕНИЯ О МЕСТЕ И  
РОЛИ ПОДЧИНИТЕЛЬНЫХ СОЮЗОВ В  
«ТУХФАТ-УЛЬ-ХОНИ» МУХАММАДА  
ВАФО КАРМИНАГИ**

**Ашрапов Баҳодурҷон Пулотович,**  
аспирант кафедри грамматикаи  
арабского языка ХГУ им. акад. Б.  
Гафурова (Таджикистан, Худжанд)  
**E-MAIL:** bahodur.ashrapov@mail.ru

**Key words:** «*Tuhfat-ul-khoni*», historic source, copulative conjunctions, principal and subordinate clauses, disjunctive conjunctions, adversative conjunctions, subordinate conjunctions, temporal conjunctions, phrases and complex sentences

The article dwells on the place and role of conjunctions in the historic production belonging to Muhammadvafoi Karminagi called «*Tuhfat-ul-khoni*» which includes description of different historic events of the Manghtys` state. It is cleared out that the copulative conjunction **va** («and») is considered as one of the mostly frequent ones in both the corpus of the study and in MTL (Modern Tajik Literary Language). In addition, one of the specific features of the above-mentioned element is its sentence-initial position. The adversative conjunction «**bal**» by dint of the particle «**na**» organizes the parallel one only in one instance upon the whole. It is cleared that the Arabic conjunctions «**illo, av**» are adduced as disjunctive ones by the author of our text and this phenomenon is a less commonly used one. As a rule, temporal subordinate conjunctions are more productive than other ones in both MTL and in the historic source at issue. In terms of functions a large group of considerably subordinating conjunctions, such as «**to ba hadd-e ki, ba har vajh ki, ba on nahj-e ki, bo on nahj ki, to ba on ғoyat ki, ba nahj-e ki, ba nav`e ki, bo in tariqa ki**» serve to introduce the relations between the main clause and the adverbial clauses of manner and degree contrary to those ones of MTL. In a nutshell, the author comes to the conclusion that the author resorts to those conjunctions which pertain to frequent ones in both MTL and the corpus of our study.

**Калидвожаҳо:** «Тӯҳфат-ул-хонӣ», сарчашмаи таърихӣ, пайвандаки пайвасткунанда, сарҷумла ва аъзои пайрав, пайвандаки ҷудой, пайвандаки хилофӣ, пайвандаки тобекунанда, ибора ва ҷумлаи таркибӣ

Мақолаи мазкур ба таҳқиқи макон ва нақши пайвандакҳо дар асари таърихӣ «Тӯҳфат-ул-хонӣ»-и Муҳаммадвафои Карминагӣ бахшида шудааст, ки он фарогири

ходисаҳои гуногуни таърихии сулолаи Мағитиён мебошад. Таъкид гардидааст, ки пайвандаки пайваस्तкунандаи «ва» ҳам дар забони асари мавриди таҳқиқ ва ҳам дар забони адабии ҳозираи тоҷик яке аз пайвандакҳои маъмулу серистеъмол мебошад. Бо ин пайвандак оғоз шудани ҷумла яке аз везагиҳои боризи услуби асари мазкур аст. Пайвандаки хилофии «бал» бо ёрии ҳиссаҳои «на» танҳо як маротиба барои ифодаи пайхамӣ корбаст гардидааст. Ба ҳайси пайвандакҳои ҷудой корбаст шудани пайвандакҳои арабии «илло, ав» дар «Тӯҳфат-ул-хонӣ» аҳён ба назар мерасад. Пайвандакҳои тобеъкунандаи замон ҳам дар забони асари мавриди таҳқиқ ва ҳам дар забони адабии ҳозираи тоҷик назар ба дигар пайвандакҳо каммаҳсул ба ҷаҳиш мерасанд. Як гурӯҳи калони пайвандакҳои тобеъкунанда, аз ҷумла «**то ба ҳадде ки, ба ҳар ваҷҳе ки, ба он наҳче ки, бо он наҳче ки, то ба он гоҳт ки, ба навъе ки, бо ин тариқа ки**» барои ифодаи намудани муносибатҳои тарзи амал ва дараҷа байни сарҷума ва ҷумлаи пайрав хизмат мекунад. Хуллас, муаллифи асар пайвандакҳои корбаст намудааст, ки онҳо ҳам дар забони асари мавриди таҳқиқ ва ҳам дар забони адабии ҳозираи тоҷик маъмуланд.

**Ключевые слова:** «Тухфат-уль-Хони», исторический источник, соединительные союзы, главные и придаточные предложения, разделительные союзы, противительные союзы, подчинительные союзы, фразы и сложные предложения

Рассмотрены место и роль союзов в сочинении Мухаммада Вафо Карминаги «Тухфат-уль-Хони», которое повествует о различных исторических событиях в государстве Мангытов. Выявлено, что соединительный союз «ва» («и») считается наиболее частотным и в этом сочинении, и в современном таджикском литературном языке (СТЛЯ). Особенностью данного союза является его первое место в предложении. Противительный союз «бал» при помощи частицы «на» организует параллельный союз только в одном примере. Определено, что арабские союзы «илло, ав» использованы в качестве разделительных, и это наименее употребительное явление. Как правило, темпоральные подчинительные союзы менее продуктивны, чем остальные, как в СТЛЯ, так и в рассматриваемом произведении. Большая группа подчинительных союзов: «то ба ҳадд-е ки, ба ҳар ваҷҳ ки, ба он наҳдҷ-е ки, бо он наҳдҷ ки, то ба он гоҳт ки, ба нав-е ки, бо ин тариқа ки» служит для демонстрации отношений между главным и придаточными предложениями образа действия и степени, противостоящими своим аналогам в СТЛЯ. Сделан вывод, что автор использует союзы, являющиеся частотными как в СТЛЯ, так и в «Тухфат-уль-Хони».

## INTRODUCTION

The study and consideration of new various periods of the development of the history of the Tajik literary language depend on surveying both authoritative prosaic and poetic works referring to the periods of the VIII-IX centuries up to now, in particular, as «In general, the history of literary language can be established on the basis of great men-of-letters' creations» [1, p.6]. It is worth stressing that determining different periods of the history of the language and its high points of development based on both scientific-historical traces and artistic ones we proceed from the assumption of the actual issues in the field of Tajik linguistics. In reference to it, it is impossible to create commonly accepted standard grammar without dwelling on comprehensive analysis of artistic and scientific-historical legacy. B. Sharifov emphasizes on the importance of canvassing beset with the history of the Tajik literary language in the introduction to his thesis

entitled «*Morphological Peculiarities of «Bado`-ul-vaqoe`» by Vosifi*» as: «The study of the above-mentioned traces enables us to disclose some issues related to MTLT and the ways of its prosperity and extension» [2, p.4]. The study is aimed at shedding light on the issue concerning morphological properties and usage of conjunctions. The analysis of our corpus is strengthened by the agreeable evidence from «*Tuhfat-ul-khoni*» by *Muhammadvafoi Karminagi* including description of different historic events of the *Manghtys`* state, which is supported by and focused on both coordinative and subordinate conjunctions targeted at the level of their semantic relatedness.

The research of prosaic works on the example of «*Tuhfat-ul-khoni*» by *Muhammadvafoi Karminagi* in regard to this theme pertains to the XVIII century. To begin with, it is important to bear in view that the relevant research work will be also useful for researchers who want to study the linguistic issues dealing with themes related to ours. A success of any research depends largely on precise comprehension of its objective [3,123]. The system of morphological forms and usage of conjunctions in the manuscript under consideration has significant peculiarities of its own as any subject under analysis. It is common knowledge that these conjunctions are closely connected with syntax, therefore, in this study we confine ourselves to syntax occurrences. That is to say, we only have made an effort to disclose some grammatical features and to determine the issues related to the usage of conjunctions. In this respect, it is worth mentioning that the survey of the issue in question has received a considerable attention in the field of linguistics. M. A. K. Halliday, Ruqaiya Hasan assert: «Conjunctive elements are cohesive not by themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meanings; they are not primarily devices for reaching out into the preceding (or following) text, but they express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse» [4, p.226]. What is more, conjunctions appear not only between two constituents but they provide their consecutiveness as well. Conjunctions have been studied under the following numerous labels, such as: discourse connectors, coordinators, pragmatic markers, linkers, discourse markers [5, p.98; 6, p.113; 7, p.302; 8, p.497].

#### COORDINATIVE CONJUNCTIONS

In terms of syntactical functions conjunctions are divided into two groups (coordinative and subordinating bond) in both the corpus of the relevant topic and in Modern Tajik literary language (MTLL) [9, p.314]. In reference to it, *Muhammadvafoi Karminagi* adduces out a number of coordinative conjunctions as it follows:

a) copulative conjunctions: *va* (and) the variants of the enclitic (*-u*, *-yu*, *-vu*), *na...na* (neither...nor), *či... či* (both...and, whether...or);

b) adversative conjunctions: *ammo* (but), *lekin* (however), *balki*, *bal* (but), *vagarna* (however);

c) disjunctive conjunctions: *yo* (or), *juz* (except for), *yo...yo* (either...or), *va yo...va yo* (either...or), *illo* (apart for), *av= yo, yo ki* (or, or rather).

Thus, we assume that the grammatical peculiarities of conjunctions in contrary to MTLT and previously researched backgrounds are not of considerable distinctions upon the whole. However, from the findings on the subject under discussion, it is clear that in the course of time the majority of conjunctions have changed in terms of their usage functionally, semantically and grammatically.

#### SUBORDINATE CONJUNCTIONS

Supposedly, as a rule, subordinate conjunctions are divided into the following subgroups as: simple (*ki*, *to čun*, *agar*, *balki*, *bal*), derived (*vagarna*, *azbaski*) and compound (*zero ki*, *čandon*

*ki, ba`d az on ki, peš az on ki, qabl az on ki, aknun ki, alhol ki, jihat-i on ki, digar on ki, sabab on ki, dar makon-e ki* and etc.) in terms of morphological forms. In John Perry's opinion, the key to understanding subordinate clauses, and in particular their relation to the main clause is the subordinative conjunction (or phrase) [7, p.350]. It is important to mark that subordinative conjunctions are singled out into some sub-categories in our topic functionally and semantically, just as in MTL. For instance, we make an endeavor to show the following sub-categories in the table below, those ones combined with the types of relationships between the ideas they describe.

Semantic class	Subordinating Conjunctions and their English Equivalents
<b>Temporal</b>	<i>to</i> (until, up to, as far as, while), <i>qabl az on ki</i> (as, when), <i>dar vaqt-e ki</i> (at the time that, when), <i>ba`d az on ki</i> (after), <i>peš az on ki</i> (before), <i>qabl az on ki</i> (before), <i>aknun ki</i> (now), <i>alhol ki</i> (now that), <i>har goh ki</i> (any time that), <i>har goh</i> (if, ever), <i>hangom-e ki</i> (when), <i>dar hin-e ki</i> (during the time that, in the situation that), <i>dar har hangom-e ki</i> (at every time that), <i>har hangom-e ki</i> (every time that), <i>to ba in vaqt ki</i> (up to now), <i>to bilvaqt ki</i> (up to now), <i>ba`d az fursat-e ki</i> (after that), <i>dar in fursat ki</i> , <i>dar in ovon ki</i> (at this time, at the moment)
<b>Manner</b>	<i>ki</i> (that), <i>to ba hadd-e ki</i> (to the extent that), <i>ba har vajh ki</i> (in any way that), <i>ba on nahj-e ki</i> (in the way that), <i>bo on nahj ki</i> (by the way that), <i>to ba in vaqt ki</i> (to the extent that), <i>to ba on ġoyat ki</i> (to the end that), <i>ba nahj-e ki</i> (in the way that), <i>ba nav`-e ki</i> (in the way that), <i>bo in tariqa ki</i> (with the way that);
<b>Causal</b>	<i>to</i> , <i>čun</i> (since), <i>to ki</i> (until), <i>zero ki</i> (because), <i>azbaski</i> (since, as, for as much as), <i>ba vosita-i on ki</i> (because), <i>ba vosit-i on ki</i> (on account of), <i>bino bar on ki</i> (since, on account of, because), <i>jihat-i on ki</i> , <i>digar on ki</i> , <i>sabab on ki</i> (the reason of the fact that, since), <i>az in bois ki</i> , <i>bois-i in ki</i> (on account of), <i>az on jo ki</i> , <i>az in jost ki</i> , <i>to on ki</i> , <i>az in bois ki</i>
<b>Purpose</b>	<i>to</i> (so that), <i>to ki</i> (so as, so that, in order to), <i>ba xayf-i on ki</i> (in fear of that), <i>bo e`timod-i on ki</i> (with the confidence that)
<b>Concessive &amp; contrastive</b>	<i>holo ki</i> (whereas in fact, the state being that), <i>harčand</i> (although), <i>bo on ki</i> (for all that), <i>bo vujud-i on ki</i> (despite the fact that, although), <i>čandon ki</i>
<b>Locative</b>	<i>dar maqom-e ki</i> (in which place), <i>dar makon-e ki</i> (in which place), <i>jo-e ki</i> (where, the place which, wherever)
<b>Sequential</b>	<i>to</i> (until), <i>azbaski</i> (due to, owing to, because of), <i>čandon ki</i> (in such way), <i>čunon ki</i> (as)

Quantitatively, temporal subordinative conjunctions are more productive than other ones in both MTL and in the manuscript «*Tuhfat-ul-khoni*». The latter introduces adverbial clauses of time, punctual actions and habitual or iterative ones in the temporal clause, in particular. However, they are not equivalent from the view-point of illustration. Hence, it is important to adhere in mind that the majority of temporal conjunctions are compound ones and the adduced examples in the table above will absolutely prove this statement. In association with the relevant conjunctions like «*vaqt-e ki*», N. Bazidov asserts such a thesis: «Conjunction *vaqt-e ki* with the existence of some of its synonymic variants occupies a significant place among temporal ones categorically as: *vaqt-e ki, vaqt-e, dar vaqt-e ki, to vaqt-e ki, ba vaqt-e ki, az vaqt-e ki, har vaq-te ki, har vaqt, kadam vaqt-e ki*» [12, p.50]. For that matter, not only the conjunction «*vaqt-e ki*», but its other synonymic variants are not resorted to in «*Tuhfat-ul-khoni*» at all, apart from «*dar*

**vaqt-e ki»** while the conjunction **«vaqt-e ki»** is considered to be one of the most frequently used in Modern Tajik literary language. Apparently, a number of certain conjunctions are of distinction to each other in terms of their functions referring to the period of the history of MTL development. For instance, notwithstanding, in the course of comprehensive findings aimed at the temporal conjunction in view **«vaqt-e ki»** did not leap into our eyes at all. But, the author of our historic data adduces the primitive conjunction **«čun»** instead of that one of **«vaqt-e ki»** in certain cases. Of course, *Muhammadvafoi Karminagi* managed to be lucky in this respect.

The conjunction **«dar vaqt-e ki»** reminds temporal meanings and subordinates a dependent clause to an independent one functionally. Due to the available examples it can be known that the element under study is considered as a non-productive conjunction while it is the mostly productive one in MTL: *Dar in hangom raoyo-i Sitob, ki az ta'addi-vu bedod-i ū ba sutūh omada budand, dar vaqt-e ki Jum'abek az qal'a baromada, darvoza-ro ba rūyu-i ū basta naguzošand...* (13,218/434, 276/549).

The conjunctions **«to ba in vaqt ki, to bilvaqt ki»** insert the end of action time into a subordinate clause referring to the principal one. It must be borne in mind that the above-mentioned conjunctions appear to be non-productive ones being encountered once by the author upon the whole. One of the specific peculiarities of **«ba in vaqt»** lies in the fact that *Muhammadvafoi Karminagi* adduces the Arabic constituent variant being **«bilvaqt»** which will enlarge the compound conjunction up to the variant **«to bilvaqt ki»** as a result. Besides, the grammatical occurrence under consideration is not characteristic for MTL because the relevant phenomenon of morphological compound conjunction is considered as one of the principal approaches and creative nature of the author himself: *...az qatl-u ehlok va qat'-i omol-u axz-i amvol daqiqa furūguzoš nakardand, to ba in vaqt ki podšoh-i ala-l-itloq ...hašamat-i mo-ro dar nazar-i ahl-i inod va dida-i arbob-i fasod mismor-u avtod soxt* (13,211/420); *Ba'd az in ba čandin bor miyon-i amir-i komiyob va Taqoymurod-i Barqut, ki sokin-i viloyat-i Nur bud, muhorobot voqe' šud, to bilvaqt ki amir-ul-umaro – Muhammad Hakimbiy atoliq az in dor-i bee'tabor raxt ba olam-i digar kašid* (13,276/549, 275/547).

It is common knowledge that temporal conjunctions **«aknun ki, alhol ki»** express the beginning of the subordinate clause action developing into the principal one in both our topic and MTL and on account of their usage they are not equal in a sentence. In general, the conjunction **«aknun ki»** is more frequently used than **«alhol ki»** in **«Tuhfat-ul-khoni»**. In reference to **«aknun ki, holo ki»** N. Bazidov asserts: «The two conjunctions begin always by being placed in the subordinating sentence-initial position which is embedded before the principal clause» [12, p.56]. Conversely, the conjunctions in view can be embedded both by being placed in the subordinating sentence-initial position and after the principal clause in the corpus of the study. All in all, the element **«alhol ki»** (built of the Arabic article **al** + noun + conjunction **«ki»**) is resorted to twice by *Muhammadvafoi Karminagi* and, in addition, it is considered as a synonymic variant of **«aknun ki, holo ki»** whose relevant grammatical occurrence is one of the specific peculiarities in **«Tuhfat-ul-khoni»**: *...har favj-e va gurūh-e-ro munosib-i ahvol-i ešon va sardoru pešrav mutaayyin karda ba asp-u asliha binavoxt va alhol ki ibtido'-i tulū' axtar-i davlat va oğoz-i zuhur-i kavkab-i hašamat bud va hanūz tir-i iqbol-i manzalat bi nisf-un-nahor-i kamol royat-i irtifo' nayafrošt* (13,110/217); *Hazrat-i fayyoz-i mutlaq... ba mavotin-i ma'lufaš solim-u muraffah-ul-hol rasonid, pas guft: aknun ki to jonest dar tan va raqamest dar badan sarfi adovat-u kina-i derina namuda, otaš-i harb-u paykor boyad afrūxt* (13,111/220).

Out of the number of the following, such temporal conjunctions as **pas az on ki**, **ba`d az on ki**, **peš az on ki**, **qabl az on ki**, **ba`d-i in ki**, **barobar-i in ki**, **ba`d-e ki** are used by different ways of language [9, p.319] and necessarily mark an action unrealized patently from the principal clause. Adducing the examples on the object under discussion one can maintain the fact that among the above-mentioned temporal conjunctions just «**peš az on ki**, **qabl az on ki**, **ba`d az on ki**» have led to the fulfillment of the relevant function in our topic. In addition, it is worth stating that the conjunction «**ba`d az on ki**» is the most frequent and productive one. However, the conjunctions «**peš az on ki** (one instance), **qabl az on ki** (two instances)» occur on the whole and this occurrence testifies that the appropriate elements join the rarely used ones by groups: ...*dast-i mardum-i on diyor az kor va poy-i ešon az raftor bozmond, či ba`d az on ki sel-i havodis devor-i sad(d)-i suğur-ro az jo kand...* (13,23/42); **Peš az on ki** *muqaddima-i laškar-i mansur ba on jo ubur namoyad, sardor-i xud-ro ba vodi-i firor taxsis namuda roh-i gurez-ro kušoda yofstand* (13,240/477); ...*az zilzila-i in axbor poy-i subot-u viqor-i sarkašon az jo rafta, qabl az on ki sipoh-i zafarpanoh ba on diyor rasad, jamo`a-i Barqut va firqa-i qazoq ba jonib-i viloyat-i Nur xosir-u xoif murur-u ubur namudand* (13,112/222, 187/372).

A considerable number of temporal conjunctions like «**hangom-e ki**, **dar hangom-e ki**, **dar har hangom-e ki**, **har hangom-e ki**, **dar hin-e ki**» are frequently resorted to in the corpus of the study, but the use of «**hangom-e ki**» is more restricted than its other synonymic variants and occurs once by the author upon the whole. One dominant question related to the temporal conjunction «**dar hangom-e ki**» is that *Muhammadvafoi Karminagi* adduces the constituent of «**dar hin-e ki**» which served functionally and semantically as a euphemism of the element at issue. A major difference within this analysis is in the adverbial word «**hangom**» being the Tajik one and «**hin**» being the Arabic one. It is important to lay an emphasis on the fact that the variant of «**dar hin-e ki**» is not characteristic for either MTLL or for previously explored traces in the field of philology: **Dar hangom-e ki** *bozor-i muhoraba garm gardid, jamo`a-i kuffor bunduqahoi otaššor va jazoirho-i ra`d bor-ro dar amal ovarda, ba har taraf sufufi sipoh rohi kardand* (13,25/46); *Ba amr-i jahonmuto` sado-i nofir-u naqora gūši zamona-ro mamlu' soxt va dar hangom-e ki kūča-vu bozor az ahl-i tamošo pur bud...* (13,268/534); ...*bo favj-e az mardum-i jangjū mutavajjeh-i Šhtrak šud va dar hin-e ki sipoh-i zafarogoh ba muhosara-i on qal`a muqayid gašta, az jonib-i šarqi sarkūb bardošta budand* (13,129/256).

In this connection, one can assert that compound conjunctions including «**ki har goh**, **har goh ki**» are observed in «*Tuhfat-ul-khoni*» as well. They are considered as productive ones in MTLL categorically. The above-mentioned conjunctions introduce the multi-actions of the principal clause. However, designing on the premise of statistical approach towards the theme explored by *B. Sharifov*, a researcher of the prosaic literary productions referring to the XVI-th century (on the example of «*Badoe`-ul-vaqoe`*» by *Vosifi*) one can suppose that relevant conjunctions are less common ones [2, p.212]: ...*ya`ne foxira-i Buxoro rondand, či maqsad-i on fia`-i boğiya on bud, ki har goh muqobil-i xud-ro az nazar-i e`tabor andoxta, vujud-i ešon-ro vazn-e nanihem* (13,12/21); ...*badon-u sarkašon vazifa-i tanbiya va martaba-i gūšmol binand va har goh ki az mavqif-i farmon hukm-i nofizuliz`on ba taqovi-vu istimdod-i junud-i noma`dud az on mamlakat-i sohivujud zuhur-u sudur yobad... doxil-i laškar-i anjumgurūh šavand* (13,82/162).

Seemingly, there are a number of subordinative conjunctions referring to manner and degree such as «**ba tarz-e ki**, **ba tavr-e ki**, **dar holat-e ki**, **ba holat-e ki**, **be on ki**, **be in ki**» in TMLL [9, p.319] which introduce the relation between the principal clause and the clause referring to

manner or degree, in particular. Meanwhile, when trying to survey the above-stated elements we have not met them at all. Likewise, one of the distinctive features of the conjunctions under discussion is that *Muhammadvafoi Karminagi* adduces those out of the number of subordinative conjunctions including «*to ba hadd-e ki, ba har vajh ki, ba on nahj-e ki, bo on nahj ki, to ba on ġoyat ki, ba nahj-e ki, ba nav`-e ki, bo in tariqa ki*» instead of the above-mentioned conjunctions. However, they rarely encounter in the corpus of the study: ...*atvor-i Bani Odam dar tasodum omad, ba on nahj-e ki har yak az tumtaroq-i in navoib-i advor selob-i inqilob-e bud (13,3/4); ...onan faonan ro'yat-i davlat-i ū rutba-i balandi meyoft, to ba on ġoyat ki asos-i salotin-i jūjinažod zamima-i dastgoh-i boadl-u dod-i ū šud (13,18/31).*

In accordance with the Tajik grammatical rule, the subordinative conjunction «*azbaski*» leads to link the subordinate clause of purpose with the principal one according to the historic data in question. To cap it all, the element in view serves to subordinate the clause of the result to the principal one; relevant occurrence is considered as one of the distinctive peculiarities of our topic. Nevertheless, taking into consideration the object in view we have faced up with it four times comprehensively. Owing to our statistical approach we are informed that «*azbaski*» refers to the group of non-productive conjunctions: **a) the clause of purpose:** ...*az mahall-i sukun-u qaror peš natavonand nihod va azbaski dar on sarzamin ba ġayr-i tūda-i reg-u xok qatra-i ob-e az dida-i namnok mutavaqqe` va mutasavvar-i ahl-i basorat-u idrok nabud... (13,124/245, 115/228, 206/409); b) the clause of result:* ...*ba osoni peromun-i qal`a gardand va azbaski atrof-i on qal`a dašt-i musattah došt va dar heč makon devor-e nabud, ki dar panoh-i on jo girifta daleron-i safšikan ba on mufsidon-i purmaktar-u fan mudofaat-u kūšiš namoyand... (13,199/395).*

Out of a number of purpose (final) conjunctions there are those like «*to, to ki, ba xavf-i on ki, bo e`timod-i on ki*» which subordinate the clause of purpose (in other word it is called as a final clause as well) to the principal one in «*Tuhfat-ul-khoni*» language. Another important statement being worth mentioning is the fact that among the above-mentioned conjunctions «*to, to ki*» are more illustrative ones in the scope of this respect comparatively. In reference to it, the conjunctions «*ba xavf-i on ki, bo e`timod-i on ki*» are resorted to only once upon the whole: ...*dar on čahordevor xazida bud, ba xavf-i on ki mabodo ġalaba-vu hujum-i qūšunot-i zafarluzum bar maforiq-i mardum-i boġot va mahallot-i xorij-i qal`a yobad (13,123/243); ...bo du-se hazor piyoda-vu savor sar-i roh bar muqaddima-i sipoh girifta az boġot guzaštand va bo e`timod-i on ki muddat-i yak qarn qat`-i tariq-u berohi ba aqtor-u anho-i viloyat namuda, kas-e panja-i jalodat-i ešon-ro natofta bud (13,186/369).*

Our canvassing proves that all the types of concessive conjunctions, such as *harčand, bo on ki, agarči, bo vujud-i on ki, čandon ki*, are the most frequently occurred ones in «*Tuhfat-ul-khoni*». They subordinate the adversative clause to the principal one in terms of grammatical functions inclusive. To accomplish this, the evidence beset with the theme explored testifies that the concessive conjunctions «*harčand, bo on ki, agarči*» are precisely reinforced by beginning the principal clause with adversative ones such as: *ammo* and *lekin* in one complex sentence. It is very interesting to note here that, if, on the one hand, the above stated elements establish a contrastive attitude between principal and subordinating clauses, on the other hand, they provide the exact meanings to CCSs within the frameworks of grammatical behavior: *Bo on ki, a`do az kasrat-i juyuš-i islom sarosema šudand, ammo tav`an av karhan az markaz-i tuġyon, ...čun lujja-i sahob dar mavj omadand (13,25/45); Oqoz-i muhoraba bo amir-i komyob namudand, agarči dar ruz-i paykor zafar ba sipoh-i amir-i komgor bud, lekin ba`z-e az umaro-i manqitiya dar*

---

*miyon omada, čunon surat-i musolaha-ro qaror dodand (13,276/549); Ba fazl-i Ezid-i bemuntaho mavoši va amvol-i ū mutakosir va dar maro-vu bavodi xayl-u gala-i ū mutavotir, harčand sobiqa-i amorat nadošt, ammo lohiqa-i amorat az ū ibroz meyoft (13,6/10).*

It should be noted that from the conditional conjunctions only «**agar** and **gar**» appear in our corpus. It stands to reason that the conjunction «**agar**» is the mostly productive one being widely used in the written monuments of the XVII-th – XVIII-th centuries. On the ground of the adduced examples dealing with the above-mentioned elements, one can lay an emphasis upon the idea that other types of the conditional conjunctions did not occur at all: ...*čunin payğom rasonid, ki sipoh-i xasm dar lujja-i iztirob-u ma`raz-i xatar ast, agar ro`yot-i nusratsamot nazdik ronda, soya-i vusul bar bolo-i tal-e, ki muhozi-i dara voqe` ast (13,207/412).*

### CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis of the place and role of conjunctions in «*Tuhfat-ul-khoni*» by *Muhammadvafoi Karminagi* and other manuscripts referring to the XVII-th – XVIII-th centuries we conclude that the author of the manuscript resorts to those conjunctions which pertain to frequent ones in both MTL and the corpus of our study. As it is stated above, one of the specific features of copulative conjunction *va* («and») is its being placed in the sentence-initial position and this grammatical phenomenon occurs as the widely-used one. From findings we have elicited that parallel conjunctions «*na...na*» (neither...nor), *či ... či* (both...and, whether...or) are used only once by M. Karminagi. In addition, it is also noticeable that the adversative conjunction «*vale*» has not leapt to our eye although it is considered as the mostly productive one in both MTL and other previously studied works. In the corpus of the study the Arabic conjunction «*av*» is adduced as a synonymic variant of the Tajik disjunctive conjunction «*yo*» functionally. As a rule, temporal conjunctions are the mostly productive ones among subordinative conjunctions in our topic and it is worth noting that the author of our topic managed to illustrate the primitive conjunction «*čun*» instead of the conjunction «*vaqt-e ki*» semantically.

### Reference Literature:

1. Vinogradov V.V. *Russian Language*. – M.: Russian language, 2001. – 242 pp.
2. Sharifov, B. *Morphological Peculiarities in «Badoye -ul-vaqoye »* by Vosifi / B. Sharifov. - Dushanbe: Knowledge, 1985. – 232 pp.
3. Ashrapov B.P. *The Place of Poly-Affixes in the Tajik Literary Language of the XVIII-th Century*. // *Bulletin of TSU LBP «Series of Humanitarian Sciences»*, 2015 - Khujand: Noshir, – pp. 122 – 131.
4. M. A. K. Halliday, *Ruqaiya Hasan Cohesion in English* / 5. M. A. K. Halliday, *Ruqaiya Hasan*. Longman Group Limited London: Printed in Hong Kong by Sheck Wah Tong Printing Press, - 1976. – 375 pp.
5. Jones, William. *A Grammar of the Persian language* / William Jones. The ninth edition. – London, 1828. -283pp.
6. Ibraheem, Meerza Mohammad. *A Grammar of the Persian language* / Meerza Mohammad Ibraheem. – London, 1841. – 269 pp.
7. John R. Perry. *A Tajik Persian Reference Grammar* / Perry J.R. Brill Leiden, - Boston, 2005. -528 pp.
8. Phillott D.C. *Higher Persian Grammar for the Use of the Calcutta University* / D.C. Phillott. – Calcutta: printed at the Baptist Mission Press, Calcutta, and Published by the University, 1919. – 975 pp.



9. *A Grammar of Modern Tajik Language. Part 1. Phonetics and Morphology.* - Dushanbe: Knowledge, 1985, - 356 pp.
10. Nazarzoda Sayfiddin. «Ajoib-ul-makhlugot» and Lexicology in the History of Persian-Tajik Language / Sayfiddin Nazarzoda. - Dushanbe: Knowledge, 1999. - 210 pp.
11. Sulaymonov, O. Morphological Peculiarities of «Ta`rikhi Bayhaqi»: candidate dissertation in philology: 10.02.22. / O. Sulaymonov. - Khujand, 2008. - 150 pp.
12. Bazidov N. Conjunctions in Modern Tajik Literary Language / N. Bazidov. - Dushanbe: Enlightenment, 1985. - 102 pp.
13. Karminagi, M. Donation of Khoni. / M. Karminagi. Manuscript (№1426) of the Institute of Language, Literature, Oriental Studies and Written Heritage under Tajikistan Republic Academy of Sciences.

**Список использованной литературы:**

1. Виноградов В.В. Русский язык. – М.: Русский язык, 2001. -242 с.
2. Шарифов Б. Хусусиятҳои морфологии «Бадоеъ-ул-вақоъеъ» - и Восифӣ. – Душанбе: Дониш, 1985. 232 с.
3. Ashrapov B.P. The Place of Poly-Affixes in the Tajik Literary Language of the XVIII-th Century. // Bulletin of TSU LBP «Series of Humanitarian Sciences», 2015 - Khujand: Noshir, - pp. 122 – 131.
4. M. A. K. Halliday, *Ruqaiya Hasan Cohesion in English* / 5. M. A. K. Halliday, *Ruqaiya Hasan. Longman Group Limited London: Printed in Hong Kong by Sheck Wah Tong Printing Press, - 1976. – 375 pp.*
5. Jones, William. *A Grammar of the Persian language* / William Jones. The ninth edition. – London, 1828. -283 p.
6. Ibraheem, Meerza Mohammad. *A Grammar of the Persian language* / Meerza Mohammad Ibraheem. – London, 1841. – 269 pp.
7. John R. Perry. *A Tajik Persian Reference Grammar* / Perry J.R. Brill Leiden, - Boston, 2005. -528 pp.
8. Phillott D.C. *Higher Persian Grammar for the Use of the Calcutta University* / D.C. Phillott. – Calcutta: printed at the Baptist Mission Press, Calcutta, and Published by the University, 1919. – 975 pp.
9. Грамматикаи забони адабии ҳозираи тоҷик - Душанбе: Дониш, 1985. -356с.
10. Назарзода Сайфиддин. «Аҷоиб-ул-маҳлуқот» ва вояшиносии таърихи форсӣ-тоҷикӣ / Сайфиддин Назарзода. –Душанбе: Дониш, 1999. – 210 с.
11. Сулаймонов О. Хусусиятҳои морфологии «Таърихи Байҳақӣ»-и Рисолаи номзадӣ барои дарёфти дараҷаи н. и. филологӣ. - Хуҷанд, 2008.
12. Бозидов Н. Пайвандакҳо дар забони адабии ҳозираи тоҷик / Н. Бозидов. –Душанбе: Маориф, 1985. – 102 с.
13. Карминагӣ, М. Тӯҳфаи хонӣ. Дастнависи №1426 Институту забон ва адабиёт, шарҳиносӣ ва мероси хаттии Академияи илмҳои Ҷумҳурии Тоҷикистон / Карминагӣ, М.