

## T-Relatives in Persian

Jila Ghomeshi, University of Manitoba

Persian temporal adverbial clauses may be introduced by (a) an overt temporal expression, such as *væqti* ‘when’, (b) by a temporal expression that appears to belong to the main clause such as *diruz* ‘yesterday,’ or (c) by a scrambled constituent from within the adverbial clause itself:

1. (a) *diruz* *væqti ke qæza-m-o tæmam=kærd-æm* *telefon zæng=zæd*  
 yesterday when COMP food+SG.POSS-OM finish=did+1SG phone ring=hit.3SG  
 ‘Yesterday when I finished my meal, the phone rang.’
- (b) *diruz* *ke* *qæza-m-o tæmam=kærd-æm* *telefon zæng=zæd*  
 yesterday COMP food+SG.POSS-OM finish=did+1SG phone ring=hit.3SG  
 ‘Yesterday when I finished my meal, the phone rang.’
- (c) *qæza-m-o ke tæmam=kærd-æm* *telefon zæng=zæd*  
 food+SG.POSS-OM COMP finish=did+1SG phone ring=hit.3SG  
 ‘When I finished my meal, the phone rang.’

Constructions such as those in (1b) and (1c) have been noted in the literature as instances of “temporal *ke*” (Lazard 1992, Rahimian 1999, Aghaei 2006) but have not received a syntactic analysis. In this paper I propose that adverbial clauses that express temporal concurrence but that have no adverbial subordinator, contain an operator in CP that takes its reference from the temporal representation of the matrix clause. The temporal representation is the point or interval on the time axis at which the state or event is situated as defined by the Comp-Tense chain (Guéron 2003). The operator can be coindexed with an overt temporal expression (1b) or identified via scrambling (1c), as shown in (2a) and (2b) respectively:

2. (a) [ temporal term<sub>i</sub> ] [ CP Ø<sub>i</sub> [ C *ke* [ ... ] ] ]      (b) [ CP XP Ø<sub>i</sub> ] [ C *ke* [ ... ~~XP~~ ... ] ]

I show that this correctly predicts that *ke*-clauses of the type in (1b) can undergo extraposition to the end of the sentence while those in (1c), which are not full CPs, cannot. Moreover, the analysis creates a link between scrambled adverbial clauses in Persian and Internally headed relative clauses in Japanese which are subject to a temporal “precedence and adjacency condition” (Fuji 1998, p. 79).

The idea that scrambled temporal adverbial clauses in Persian have essentially the same structure as a relative clause harkens back to an observation made about Walbiri by Hale (1976). Noting that recursive syntax in many Australian languages involves adjoined relative clauses (p. 78), Hale goes on to observe that these relative clauses can provide additional information about an argument in the main clause, which he calls the NP-relative interpretation, or can specify the “temporal setting” of the main clause, which he calls the T-relative interpretation (Hale 1976:79). This paper opens up a line of investigation into the link between scrambled and internally headed relative clauses on the one hand and T-relatives on the other.

**REFERENCES:** Aghaei, B. 2006. *Clausal complementation in modern Persian*, PhD diss, UTexas at Austin. Fuji, M. 1998. “Temporal interpretation of Internally Headed Relative Clauses in Japanese,” *RuLing Papers* 1, 75-91. Guéron, J. 2003. “Inalienable possession and the interpretation of determiners,” in M. Coene & Y. D’Hulst (Eds.), *From NP to DP, Volume 2: The expression of possession in noun phrases*. Hale, K. 1976. “The adjoined relative clause in Australia,” In R.M.W. Dixon (ed) *Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages*. Lazard, G. 1992. *A Grammar of Contemporary Persian*. English translation. Rahimian, J. 1999. “Obligatory, optional and contrastive occurrences of *ke* in Modern Persian,” *Linguistica Atlantica* 21.