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Abstract

Any discussion of Dari noun phrases pays special attention to Ezafat and the way it behaves. Ezafat is of great importance to understanding the underlying structure of a Dari noun phrase. Much of this thesis uses the methodologies and tools provided by generative syntax to determine the status of Ezafat and to answer a number of questions posed by Ezafat. I hypothesize that Ezafat belongs to a functional category which is base-generated under D and its function is to mark nouns for genitive case. In addition, the analysis of Ezafat entails the classification of most Dari prepositions as a subcategory of noun. My analysis of Ezafat takes place at a level that mediates between syntax and semantics, that is, a presentation of the function of Ezafat in the syntactic structure and the range of possible meanings that are generated by it in a modified-Ezafat-modifier configuration. Finally, the function and meanings of Ezafat are discussed in noun, adjective, prepositional, and adverb phrases.
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Chapter One: Introduction

The Ezafat suffix has been the center of focus in any discussion of Dari noun phrases and the exploration of it has uncovered important facts about the way a noun phrase is formed in Dari. Despite its superficial simplicity, the Ezafat suffix behaves in many interesting ways that pose important theoretical questions to the theory of syntax, many of which are discussed in the following sections. In this chapter, I will introduce the data that will be analyzed in the following chapters. In section one, I will present the data and discuss questions that pertain to the status of Ezafat in syntax. In section two, I will discuss the categorial status of Ezafat and provide examples to illustrate the use of Ezafat in adjective phrases. Similarly, in section three, I will examine the data that indicates a lack of the usage of Ezafat in adverbial phrases, and in section four, I will discuss the usage of Ezafat in prepositional phrases. In section five, I will introduce one treatment of Ezafat as a genitive case marker. In section six, I will shift my attention to X-bar theory focusing on DP-internal agreement. And finally, in section seven, I will discuss some aspects of the Ezafat suffix that connect syntax with semantics.

The Syntactic Standing of the Ezafat Suffix

Generally speaking, there are two treatments of Ezafat. First, it is a morphological element that has a grammatical function and is accessible to syntax. Secondly, it is solely a phonological element without any grammatical function or semantic content, and it is not accessible to syntax. Identifying the status of the Ezafat suffix in syntax can significantly help us in adopting a systematic approach for the treatment of the suffix. In the second chapter of this thesis, I will present my argument regarding the nature of the suffix and how it
should be treated. An example to clarify the direction of my discussion in Chapter Two is in order.¹

1. \([\text{NP} \text{fakåhi-ye} \text{xandådår-e} \text{yak siåsatmadår}]\)
   
   joke-EZ hilarious-EZ one politician
   “a politician’s hilarious joke”

   There are two instances where Ezafat is used in example 1 and they are attached to two words of different grammatical categories, that is, a noun and an adjective. Removing any of the suffixes in example 1 will result in the ungrammaticality of the noun phrase as shown in 2, 3, and 4.

2. \(*[\text{NP} \text{fakåhi} \text{xandådår-e} \text{yak siåsatmadår}]\)
   
   joke hilarious-EZ one politician
   “a politician’s hilarious joke”

3. \(*[\text{NP} \text{fakåhi-ye} \text{xandådår} \text{yak siåsatmadår}]\)
   
   joke-EZ hilarious one politician
   “a politician hilarious joke”

4. \(*[\text{NP} \text{fakåhi} \text{xandådår} \text{yak siåsatmadår}]\)
   
   joke hilarious one politician
   “a politician hilarious joke”

   The aim of the second chapter is to discuss why the noun phrase in 1 is grammatical and the ones in 2, 3, and 4 are ungrammatical. Chapter Two, for the most part, will focus on the behavior of Ezafat in a noun phrase. Additionally, Chapter One will provide a platform for further discussion of Ezafat in the chapters to follow.

**The Categorial Status of Ezafat**

The status of the Ezafat suffix in adjective phrases is somewhat debatable and causes confusion about the boundary of a noun phrase and an adjective phrase. There are two

¹ Ezafat –e has the phonologically conditioned allomorph –ye which attaches to words that end in a vowel.
treatments of Ezafat in adjectival phrases. First, it can be argued that in Farsi, adjectives do not project at the phrasal level and are adjoined to nouns and, then, get the Ezafat suffix (Ghomeshi, 1997). According to this analysis, the Ezafat suffix can never attach to an adjective alone. The following phrases in 5 and 6 clarify this point.

5. \([NP_{dastaward-e} [Adj_{bozorg}]]\)  
   achievement-EZ big  
   “a big achievement”

6. *[NP_{dastward bozorg]-e} [achievement big]-EZ  
   “a scholar’s big achievement”

The first treatment of adjectives in Dari as shown in 5 proposes that adjectives are adjoined to the nouns and are embedded in a noun phrase. So if a noun is modified by an adjective, the noun adjoins to the adjective and then takes Ezafat as one unit. The phrase in 5 illustrates that the adjective phrase projects at the phrase level and is an adjunct to the noun. However, the phrase in 6 is ungrammatical because Ezafat does not attach to a noun-adjoining-adjective combination.

An important question that Ezafat poses for the order of adjectives in relation to the nouns they modify comes from the use of comparative and superlative adjectives. The Ezafat suffix with comparative and superlative adjectives is interestingly a relatively new area of research and as far as I am aware, it has not been addressed yet in the literature. In Dari, simple adjectives and comparative adjectives follow the head noun while superlative adjectives precede the head as illustrated in 6, 7, and 8.

7. \([NP_{nama-ye tawil-tar}]\)  
   letter-EZ long-COM  
   “the longer letter”

---

2 Farsi, Persian, and Dari are basically the different names for the same language. The version of Persian which is spoken in Afghanistan is commonly referred to as Dari or Farsi-ye Dari. In this paper, I will use “Farsi” and “Dari” interchangeably.
8. \[Np\text{tawil-tarin nama}\] long-SUP letter “the longest letter”

9. \[Np\text{tawil-tarin-e nama-ha}\] vs. * \[Np\text{tawil-tarin-e nama}\] long-SUP-EZ letter-Pl “the longest of the letters” long-SUP-EZ letter “the longest of the letter”

In 7, a comparative adjective follows and modifies the noun head. In 8, a superlative precedes and modifies the noun head. One generalization that can be made so far is that an Ezafat suffix when attached to a superlative adjective is in complementary distribution with a singular noun, that is, when the Ezafat is attached to the superlative adjective, the noun has to be plural as shown in 9. This generalization does not hold true for simple and comparative adjectives.

In Chapter Three, I will discuss the presence of Ezafat in the nominal domain and the two treatments of adjectives introduced above as well as the results each analysis might generate. Subsequently, I will discuss the underlying order of adjectives in relation to the nouns they modify and make attempts to draw my conclusions on the basis of the generalizations that can be made based on the implications generated by the use of Ezafat with comparative and superlative adjectives.

Lack of Ezafat in Adverbial Phrases

Inasmuch as adverbs are used as modifiers of the verb within the verb phrase, an Ezafat suffix cannot be attached to an adverb. It can be generalized that Ezafat cannot occur with a verb and a verbal modifier. The reason for this will be discussed later in this thesis. An example is presented in 9 to demonstrate the ungrammaticality of Ezafat when attached to an adverb.

10. \[TP[DpSara] [Vp\text{hatman xahad amad}]\] vs. *\[TP[DpSara] [Vp\text{hatman-e xahad amad}]\] Sara definitely will came Sara definitely-EZ will came
“Sara will definitely come”  “Sara will definitely come”

The fact that Ezafat cannot be attached to an adverb raises three important questions whose answers may lead us to important generalizations about Ezafat. First, assuming that an adverb is an adjunct and cannot be attached to Ezafat, can it be generalized that Ezafat can only be attached to a nominal category? Secondly, if so, what is the status of adjectives in Dari and why can Ezafat be attached to adjectives? Do they belong to a nominal category? And, third, if the adjectives and nouns have distinguishing features and are treated as separate categories, then what is the true status of Ezafat in relation to adjuncts and complements?

Chapter Four will provide an in-depth discussion of these questions and similar other questions in an attempt to analyze the behavior of Ezafat in Dari syntax. The material which is going to be presented in the first three chapters should ease our analysis of the Ezafat suffix in prepositional phrases that will follow Chapter Four. After Chapter Five, I will present my solutions to the problems discussed so far using the X-bar theory.

**Ezafat in Prepositional Phrases**

Prepositions in Dari are divided into two subcategories, namely, real prepositions and nominal prepositions, and Ezafat can only occur with nominal prepositions. The semantic properties of a particular preposition determines its membership in the above-mentioned subcategories. In addition, any element that is categorized under the category noun has nominal features. Additional morpho-syntactic and semantic criteria need to be determined in order provide an accurate account of Ezafat in prepositional phrases. The phrases in 11 and 12 provide examples of the two types of prepositions.

11. \([\text{PPdar xana}]\) at home vs. \(*[\text{PPdar-e xana}]\) at-EZ home “at home” “at home”
In 11 a type A (real) preposition marks the phrase ungrammatical if it is attached to Ezafat. On the contrary, in 12, a type B (nominal) preposition without Ezafat appears to be ungrammatical. Does this mean Ezafat is in complementary distribution with (-N, -V) features? If so, then either Dari does not have the category adjective or the fact that Ezafat attaches to adjectives requires a syntactically cogent explanation. In Chapter Five, I will present a detailed analysis of Dari prepositions and their relation with Ezafat. Afterwards, I will discuss why Ezafat cannot attach to some prepositions while in other instances its occurrence in the prepositional phrase is necessary in order for the prepositional phrase to be grammatical.

**Ezafat as a Genitive Case Marker**

Ezafat has a range of meanings and functions but whether we can develop a unified theory for Ezafat is a question that this thesis explores. In addition, parts of the data that will be discussed in detail in the following chapters may suggest two treatments of Ezafat. First, it can be argued that Ezafat is solely a possessive suffix attached to a possessed noun, and the other functions, namely, indefiniteness and additive, are carried out by another element which accidently has the same phonological features as Ezafat. The second treatment of Ezafat proposes that Ezafat is a genitive case marker and it marks possessive case in addition to other functions that it carries. This way, Ezafat is its own head and, thus, projects as a functional category that expresses several grammatical meanings. The phrase in example 13 illustrates the range of meanings that are supposedly expressed by Ezafat.

“a worried man’s essay”  “the worried man’s essay”

In 13, there are three different grammatical functions that are carried by Ezafat. First, the Ezafat that is attached to the possessed noun essay expresses possession. Second, the Ezafat that is attached to the possessor man is used as an additive marker to predict the occurrence of a following element in the phrase. This occurrence of Ezafat is structurally motivated by a following element in the phrase and it automatically disappears if the following modifier worried is removed from the phrase. Third, Ezafat attached to the adjective worried is an indefinite marker which has the same status as a/an in English.

In Chapter Six, I will present my analysis of whether Ezafat has a homophonous phonological counterpart that has different functions in syntax or all the functions explained above are carried out by Ezafat. The aim of Chapter Six is to possibly lead us to the threshold of a unified theory of Ezafat.

**DP-internal Agreement and Case**

If Ezafat establishes a possessor-possessed relationship between a modifier and the noun head, it can be argued that Ezafat belongs to a functional category that assigns possessive case since case, per se, is a grammatical function. I am arguing that Ezafat belongs to a functional category on the assumption that since it is not a lexical category, it should be a functional category.

On a different analysis, an implicit assumption can be drawn that Ezafat is an instance of agreement within the determiner phrase. It can also be argued that Ezafat attaches to the noun possessed in order to satisfy the phi-features (person) of the noun possessor. The following example clarifies this assumption.

14. [NPbatʃ-e mama-yam]
son-EZ uncle-1st.P.Poss
“my uncle’s son”

In 14, Ezafat supposedly attaches to the noun son in order to agree with the first person possessive marker yam. Despite the fact that this assumption is very weak, it is worth considering this analysis in order to examine any chances of Ezafat insertion as a result of the requirements of Phi-features of agreement. In Chapter Seven, I will present my analysis of whether Ezafat is a genitive case marker or an instance of agreement, and if it is a genitive case marker, what makes it different from a possessive marker. Chapter Seven aims at leading us to the underlying structure of Dari noun phrases and the derivations resulted from Ezafat.

Ezafat and the Syntax-Semantics Interface

Assuming that Ezafat belongs to a functional category and carries out specific grammatical functions, its meanings, therefore, have to be predicted by the syntactic structure. In other words, the possible slots for Ezafat in the structure of Dari noun phrases predetermine the meaning of the suffix in the underlying form. Consider the following examples.

15. [IP [DP tohfa-ra] [VP xarid-am]]
gift-ACC bought-1st.P.Sg.
“I bought the gift”

16. [IP [DP tohfa-ye-ra [VP xaridam] [CP k dar mawardash feker mekard-i]]]
gift-EZ-ACC bought-1st.P.Sg. that in about-it think did-2nd.P.Sg
“I bought the gift that you were thinking about”

17. *[IP [DP tohfa-ye-ra [VP xaridam]]]
gift-EZ-ACC bought-1st.P.Sg
“I bought a gift that…”

As the Ezafat suffix attaches to the noun in 15 shown in 16, a CP is required to complete the meaning of the sentence. This requirement is brought about by the occurrence
of Ezafat in that particular slot and if the CP is removed from the sentence, the sentence becomes ungrammatical as shown in 17. Either both Ezafat and the CP have to be removed or none of them. If the Ezafat slot is filled, the occurrence of a CP is structurally predicted before it even gets pronounced. Semantically speaking, Ezafat in such instances also plays the role of a relative clause marker and further specifies the meaning of the noun head.

Chapter Seven explores further interactions of Ezafat with syntax and semantics and the ways in which its meanings are predictable by the syntactic structure. In addition, it is the goal of Chapter Eight to connect the missing links between the meanings of Ezafat and its underlying forms so that an overall conclusion can be drawn about the status of Ezafat in syntax.
Chapter Two: The Syntactic Standing of the Ezafat Suffix

There are two analyses of the Ezafat suffix. In fact, these two analyses inspired my treatment of Ezafat. The first analysis is that the Ezafat suffix is a phonological element that doesn’t have any semantic content and is not accessible to syntax. This analysis proposes that Ezafat attaches to some categories in a noun phrase purely for phonological reasons. The second analysis is that Ezafat is a morphological element that carries out specific functions and is accessible to syntax. The second approach requires a morphosyntactic investigation of Ezafat in the nominal domain. In this chapter, I am arguing that Ezafat is a morphological element that has specific grammatical functions and each of these functions can be explained by syntax. More importantly, the occurrence of Ezafat and its lack of occurrence have important implications for the structure of a noun phrase in terms of grammaticality judgments. Additionally, I will also present my argument for the occurrence of Ezafat in phrases other than the noun phrase.

In the first section of this chapter, I will consider Ezafat from a phonological standpoint in an attempt to investigate if Ezafat lies within the domain of phonology. In section two, I will investigate Ezafat in the morphological domain and will discuss how it communicates with syntax. In section three, I will present my analysis for how the lack of Ezafat in certain positions can result in the ungrammaticality of the phrase. The aim of this section is to examine the role of Ezafat in syntax and whether Ezafat is accessible to syntax or not. Finally, section four will open discussion for the occurrence of Ezafat in other phrases such as adjective phrases, adverb phrases, and prepositional phrases.
**Ezafat as a Phonological Element**

One reasonable idea about Ezafat is that it may be a phonological feature which gets pronounced for purely phonological reasons. Continuing the same line of thinking, I would further speculate that Ezafat’s somewhat unpredictable distribution, that is with all nouns, some adjectives, and some prepositions and no adverbs, is a symptom of the use of Ezafat as an element that is used to satisfy the needs of the melodic structure of a Dari noun phrase.

Consider the following examples.

18. [NP maqala-ye dʒəl-e ustad-ez karʃenas-e pohantun-e Kabul]
   essay-EZ interesting-EZ teacher-EZ university-EZ Kabul
   “the interesting essay of the expert teacher of Kabul university”

19. [NP tamir-e do manzela-ye kenar-e sarak]
   building-EZ two-floor-EZ corner-EZ road
   “The two-floor building on the corner of the road”

In both examples 18 and 19, we notice the occurrence of Ezafat with nouns, adjectives, and prepositions. The only element that doesn’t appear with Ezafat is the last element in the phrase regardless of its category. One implicit assumption that could be made based on the above observation is that Ezafat attaches to preceding elements in a noun phrase in order to facilitate the flow of speech, and when the noun phrase ends, the Ezafat is no longer inserted. A similar case is noticed in Galician by (Hall, 2011). She writes, “Metrical structure above the word level can also affect epenthesis.” In Galician, vowels are optionally added at the end of an intonational phrase (Matinez-Gil, 1997). The word *pan* can be pronounced with final [i] only if it directly precedes a prosodic break, not within an intonational phrase.” She provides an example from (Martinez-Gil, 1997) to illustrate vowel epenthesis at intonational phrase boundaries in Galician. Her examples are given in the following in a) and b).
(a) Ela vai trael-o pan (~ pan[i])
   ‘she is going to bring the bread’
(b) dille que traia pan (~ pan[i]), non vino
   ‘tell her to bring bread, not wine’

Hall notes that this kind of epenthesis only occurs with words whose final syllable is stressed. She cites (Martinez-Gil, 1997) who proposes that the function of this epenthesis is to create a well-formed bimoraic trochee at the edge of each intonational phrase. She also refers to (Fagyal, 2000) and argues that a similar pattern occurs with optional schwa insertion in Parisian French. However, Ezafat can be dealt with as a purely phonological element as long as it doesn’t carry any morphosyntactic or syntactic function. If Ezafat has morphosyntactic effects like third person singular marker in English verbal morphology, then it is not a pure phonological element and our method of treating Ezafat should shift its focus from phonology to morphology and syntax since it would be much easier to reach a unified theory of Ezafat using the right set of tools. In the next section, I will discuss the status of Ezafat in morphology and its implications for syntax.

**Ezafat as a Morphological Element**

Treating Ezafat as a morpheme requires a description of the (a) distribution of the morpheme, (b) function or functions it carries out, (c) range of meanings it expresses, and (d) whether or not it establishes any link with syntax. I am proposing these criteria to examine the status of Ezafat in morphology and whether it can stand as a morpheme.

Historically speaking, Ezafat is derived from the Old Dari *hya* which was a relativizer/demonstrative relative pronoun that inflected for case, number, and gender (Haig, 2011; Kent, 1944). According to (Kent, 1944), the relative pronoun *hya* reduces to Ezafat through the process of phonological reduction while maintaining its functional features. In
modern Dari, Ezafat attaches to nouns, adjectives, and some prepositions. In fact, it attaches to an element that precedes another right-branching element as illustrated in the following.

\[ \text{XP} \\
  \quad \text{x'} \\
  \quad \text{YP} \\
  \quad \text{EZ} \\
  \quad \text{x} \\
  \quad \text{EZP} \]

\[ \text{Figure 1. Distribution of Ezafat} \]

In the diagram above, Ezafat occurs before another element in the phrase to give a recursive property to the structure of the phrase. In addition, Ezafat can only attach to the last element of a conjoined set of elements, which implies that Ezafat is in complementary distribution with conjunctions. Consider the following example.

20. \[[NP \text{zemestan-e [sard wa daraz-e parsal]}] \text{ vs. } *[NP \text{zemestan-e sard-e wa daraz-e parsal}]

\begin{align*}
\text{winter-EZ [cold and long]-EZ last year} & \quad \text{winter-EZ cold-EZ wa daraz-e last year} \\
\text{“last year’s long and cold winter”} & \quad \text{“last year’s long and cold weather”}
\end{align*}

In 20, Ezafat attaches to the whole set of elements that are conjoined by a conjunction, and when Ezafat precedes the conjunction, the phrase becomes ungrammatical. This point has important consequences for the treatment of Ezafat, and I will come back to this point later in this thesis (Chapter Five). It is important to note that Ezafat has one phonologically conditioned allomorph –ye which only attaches to words that end in a vowel as shown in 21.

\[ \text{NP \text{zemestan-e sard} } \text{ hawa-ye garm} \]
\[ \text{winter-EZ cold} \text{ weather-EZ warm} \]
\[ \text{“cold winter”} \text{ “warm weather”} \]
Another important point for discussion is the range of functions that Ezafat has, that is, as genitive case marker, additive, and indefiniteness. In examples 22-25 I have illustrated the different functions that are carried out by Ezafat.

22. [NP motar-e alison]
car-EZ Alison
“Alison’s car”

23. [NP wajrani-ye] [ahr]
destruction-EZ city
“the destruction of the city”

24. [PP tawasot-e mardom-e begana]
by-EZ people-EZ foreign
“by foreign people”

25. [NP jagerd-emagh[o]] vs. [NP jagerd-emagh[o]-e]4
student-EZ confused student-EZ confused-EZ
“the confused student” “a confused student”

In 22, Ezafat is inserted to establish a possessee-possessor relationship between the noun head on the right and the nominal modifier on the left. The function of Ezafat in 22 is to mark possessive case the same as its English counterpart of. In 23, Ezafat is once again used as an equivalent of the English of-genitive in the sense that the possessee is the complement of the possessor. In example 24, Ezafat doesn’t add anything to the meaning of the phrase if the function of Ezafat is considered to be only possessive. However, in the later chapters of this thesis, I will discuss in detail what the meaning of each of those Ezafat suffixes is. It is actually inserted to predict the occurrence of a right branching element in the phrase. And that’s why we don’t see Ezafat on the last element of the phrase. This function of Ezafat is

---

3These functions seem completely different from each other, which leads us to the question of whether these three functions are expressed by the same element or different elements that accidentally have identical phonological features.

4The focus here is on the second Ezafat which is shown in boldface. The indefinite Ezafat can also attach to nouns as in [jagerd-e-ra didam] meaning “I saw a student” and [jagerd-ra didam] which means “I saw the student”. –ra is the accusative case marker.
known as the additive function. Likewise, Ezafat attaches to the adjective in 25 to show that the head noun, which is modified by the adjective, is indefinite. It attaches not only to the adjective but also to the head noun in which case the noun should not be modified by an adjective. Consider the following two examples.

26. \([\text{IP}[\text{NP} \text{taxt-e}] \ [\text{VP} \text{xarid-im}]\]
   \[\text{bed-EZ}_{\text{INDIF}} \text{ bought-we}\]
   \[\text{“we bought a bed”}\]

27. \([\text{IP}[\text{NP} \text{taxt-e zeba]-ye}] \ [\text{VP} \text{xarid-im}]\]
   \[\text{[bed-EZ}_{\text{ADD}} \text{ nice}-EZ_{\text{INDIF}} \text{ bought-we}\]
   \[\text{“we bought a nice bed”}\]

Ezafat attaches to the head noun in order to show that the noun \textit{bed} is indefinite, but when the same noun is modified by an adjective, the additive Ezafat replaces the indefinite Ezafat, and the indefinite Ezafat, instead, attaches to the whole phrase to describe that the whole phrase is indefinite. In addition, the additive Ezafat, unlike the indefinite Ezafat, always attaches to an element that precedes an additional right branching element in the phrase. This distribution points to an important difference between additive and indefinite Ezafat. Another piece of evidence that distinguishes the indefinite Ezafat comes from the use of demonstratives. The Indefinite Ezafat is in complementary distribution with demonstratives as shown in 28 and 29 where Ezafat does not occur with the demonstratives.

28. \([\text{IP}[\text{NP} \text{taxt-e-ra}] \ [\text{VP} \text{xarid-im}]\]
   \[\text{bed-EZ}_{\text{INDIF}}-\text{ACC} \text{ bought-we}\]
   \[\text{“we bought a bed”}\]

  \[\text{IP}[\text{an} \ [\text{NP} \text{taxt-e zeba]-ra}] \ [\text{VP} \text{xarid-im}]\]
  \[\text{that} \ [\text{bed-EZ}_{\text{ADD}} \text{ nice}-\text{ACC} \text{ bought-we}\]
  \[\text{“we bought that nice bed”}\]

29. \[\text{IP}[\text{an} \ [\text{NP} \text{taxt-e zeba]-ye-ra}] \ [\text{VP} \text{xarid-im}]\]
    \[\text{that} \ [\text{bed-EZ}_{\text{ADD}} \text{ nice}-\text{ACC} \text{ bought-we}\]
    \[\text{“we bought that a nice bed”}\]

\[\text{IP}[\text{an} \ [\text{NP} \text{taxt-e zeba]-ye-ra}] \ [\text{VP} \text{xarid-im}]\]
\[\text{that} \ [\text{bed-EZ}_{\text{ADD}} \text{ nice}-\text{ACC} \text{ bought-we}\]
\[\text{“we bought that a nice bed”}\]

\[\text{IP}[\text{an} \ [\text{NP} \text{taxt-e zeba]-ra}] \ [\text{VP} \text{xarid-im}]\]
\[\text{that} \ [\text{bed-EZ}_{\text{ADD}} \text{ nice}-\text{ACC} \text{ bought-we}\]
\[\text{“we bought that nice bed”}\]

---

5 The additive function of Ezafat also corresponds to the meaning of the Ezafat itself. Ezafat has been adopted from Arabic grammar \textit{idafat} which means \textit{addition} (Haig, 2011).
So far, we observed that Ezafat attaches to certain categories in order to carry out a number of functions such as genitive, additive, and indefiniteness. When it attaches to an element, it expresses that the head noun is either (a) possessed, (b) indefinite, or (c) modified by an additional following element. Bearing all of that in mind, we can now firmly state that Ezafat is a suffix which is inserted to carry out some specific functions. An important question that arises at this point is whether Ezafat is inserted to carry out morphological functions such as word formation or syntactic functions such as agreement and case. In the following section, I will examine the ways in which Ezafat interacts with morphology and syntax.

**Grammaticality Judgments**

So far, I have come to the conclusion that Ezafat is a suffix which carries out a certain number of grammatical functions (Samiiian, 1994; Ghomshi, 1997). In this section, I would like to explore whether the occurrence of Ezafat is motivated by morphology or the syntactic structure of the noun phrase. I begin my discussion with possessive Ezafat (EZ\_POSS).

In Dari, the only way to express possession through a marker is using Ezafat. The possessive Ezafat attaches to the possessee, that is, the head noun, and the possessor occurs on the right of the head and, therefore, Dari noun phrases are head-initial. Consider the example from 22 as repeated in 30.

30. \[NP\_motar-e alison\] vs. \[^NP\_motaralison\]
   
   car-EZ Alison car Alison
   
   “Alison’s car” “Alison car”

As it turns out from example in 30, Ezafat establishes a grammatical relation between the two syntactic heads, and removing the Ezafat suffix from the phrase results in ungrammaticality of the phrase. Accordingly, we can state that Ezafat is a morphological
element whose occurrence is motivated by the syntactic structure. It is important to note that
the possessive Ezafat carries out the functions of both English ‘s and of-genitive. So because
Ezafat has a possessive meaning, it must be a morpheme that should not be treated by ‘pure
phonology’. In addition, Ezafat is structurally inserted to satisfy the needs of a possessive
structure, that is, establish the relationship between possessor and possessee or else Ezafat
could be considered as a pure phonological element if the reason for which it appears in the
phrase is also phonological. The indefinite articles a/an in English, for instance, occur for a
purely phonological reason and their absence in an environment where one of them has to be
present can also result in ungrammaticality of the phrase.

Secondly, the indefinite Ezafat is in complementary distribution with a following DP
complement. This means that the occurrence of indefinite Ezafat is not structurally
motivated. The indefinite Ezafat rather is a morpheme that attaches to an adjective or the
head noun in order to modify the meaning of only the head noun. Consider the following
example.

31. (a)*IP[mard-e [negaran-e bat/[a]-sh]-ra did-am]⁶
   man-EZ [worried-EZ children-his]-ACC saw-1PrSg.
   “I saw the worried about his children man”

(b)   IP[mard-e negaran-e-ra did-am]
   man-EZ worried-EZ-ACC saw-1PrSg.
   “I saw a worried man”

(c)   IP[ʃaqer-ʃ-e [layeq-e Sara]-ra did-am]
   Student-EZ [intelligent-EZ Sara]-ACC saw-1PrSg.
   “I saw Sara’s intelligent student”

The sentence in 31a is ungrammatical because it contains an indefinite Ezafat that
precedes a complement, and as soon as the complement is removed, the sentence becomes

⁶ Example is taken from Ghomeshi (1997)
grammatical as shown in 31b. In 31c, the possessive Ezafat which can be seen at the exact same position as indefinite Ezafat takes the possessor as its complement. One generalization that can be made at this point is that the indefinite Ezafat does not precede a complement. I will come back to this generalization later in this thesis (Chapter Six).

As it turns out, the syntactic structure of the noun phrase motivates the occurrence of Ezafat and Ezafat is bound to the constraints imposed by the syntactic structure. An important point that I referred to earlier was the fact that when Ezafat attaches to an element in the phrase, it expresses that only the head noun is either (a) possessed, (b) indefinite, or (c) modified by an adjective. Interestingly, Ezafat somehow relates its function to the head noun even if it attaches to the other categories within the same phrase. Therefore, an examination of Ezafat in different phrases is in order. In the following section, I will examine the behavior of Ezafat in different types of phrases.

**Ezafat in NP, AdjP, AP, and PP**

The Ezafat suffix occurs in noun phrases and adjective phrases and in some prepositional phrases. However, it does not occur in adverb phrases. (Ghomeshi, 1997) argues that the trigger for the insertion of Ezafat is the feature [+N], and any category that contains this feature can occur with Ezafat. Additionally, Ghomeshi cites the feature geometry for the categories nouns, adjectives, verbs, and prepositions proposed by (Chomsky, 1970; Jackendoff, 1977) as [+N, -V], [+N, +V], [-N, +V], and [-N, -V] respectively. She maintains that nouns and adjectives already have the feature [+N] to host the Ezafat suffix, but in case of prepositions, most prepositions in Dari are nominal. She classifies prepositions into three subclasses, namely, P1s, P2s, and P3s. Her classification is based on whether the three types of prepositions take their complement through Ezafat or
not. According to her, P1s are true prepositions that obligatorily take a complement and can never occur with Ezafat. P2s are prepositions that may take a complement and must occur with Ezafat. And finally, P3s are prepositions that can optionally take Ezafat. Some examples for each of three types of prepositions are provided in the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dar</td>
<td>‘in’</td>
<td>‘without’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>az</td>
<td>‘of’</td>
<td>‘between’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Ghomeshi, P2s and P3s are nominal because they behave very much like a noun in that they take their arguments through Ezafat and can be modified by adjectives, the later point was supported by (Karimi; Brame, 1986). The consequences of this analysis generate the Ezafat insertion rule which is triggered by any category that has the feature [+N], that is, nouns, adjectives, P2s, and P3s. according to this rule, verbs and adverbs are ruled out.

One problem with such a view is that it does not explain whether prepositions of the second and third class, which according to Ghomeshi are nouns, head a PP or NP. According to this analysis, P2s and P3s must be able to head an NP, and if they do, can we replace them with other nouns and modify them with adjectives? The results show that such a proposition fails a replacement test as illustrated in the examples below.

32. [PPbedun-e sarpanah] [NPxana-ye ziba] *[PP/NPbedun-e ziba]  
   without-EZ shelter    house=EZ beautiful  without-EZ beautiful
   “without shelter”     “a beautiful house”    “a beautiful without”

16. [NPxana]-ra [VPrangkard-em]] replace NP with P3  
   house-ACC painted-1stPrPl.
   “we painted the house”
A P2 is used in 32 to examine if it can be modified by an adjective the same way a noun is modified, and the result turned out to be ungrammatical. Similarly, in 33, a noun that is marked for accusative case is replaced by a P3, but apparently the result again turns out to be ungrammatical.

To summarize, in this chapter I discussed that Ezafat is not solely a phonological element that is inserted for purely phonological reasons. It rather is a morphological element that has a specific number of grammatical functions, that is, genitive, additive, and indefiniteness. I also discussed the fact that the occurrence of Ezafat is motivated by the syntactic structure of the noun phrase. In addition, I illustrated through examples how the lack of Ezafat results in the ungrammaticality of a phrase, which further supports the fact that Ezafat is accessible to syntax. Finally, I presented Ghomeshi’s treatment of Ezafat in different phrases and the consequences that resulted from her analysis. In order to closely examine the behavior of Ezafat, I will present my analysis of Ezafat in every phrase individually. In the following chapter, I will discuss the presence of Ezafat in noun phrases.
Chapter Three: The Categorial Status of Ezafat

There is some controversy as to what the true nature of Ezafat is, and different analyses have been proposed in the literature. (Ghomeshi, 1997), for instance, analyzes Ezafat as a linker affixed to $X^0$'s at PF to identify elements forming a nominal constituent. She further argues that Ezafat causes $X^0$-adjunction of elements in the Ezafat domain. This analysis is illustrated in the following diagram.

![Diagram of NP construction with Ezafat](image)

In the diagram above, the noun *artist* and the adjective *famous* are adjoined creating a noun constituent within the Ezafat domain. In sum, Ghomeshi’s proposal states that the main function of Ezafat is to link two elements and create one constituent ($x$-$e$-$y = [XPXY]$).

The consequences of her analysis entail that nouns do not project in Dari, which means nouns do not occur in positions that have a complement and specifier. However, some empirical evidence appears to run contrary to her proposals and I will discuss this point in greater details later in this thesis. Another analysis of Ezafat is presented by (Samiian, 1994) and she maintains that Ezafat is the unstressed morpheme $–e$ which appears before some right branching phrasal complements and modifiers in the nonverbal phrasal categories; the noun phrase, adjective phrase, and a large number of prepositional phrases. She adds that Ezafat
occurs before all phrasal complements under the first bar level after passing a few filters. The following diagram illustrates the second proposal.

$$\text{XP} \quad \text{ZP}$$

$$\text{X}' \quad \text{EZ}$$

Figure 3. Ezafat after Filters

A third view is proposed by (Moyne; Carden, 1974) that the Ezafat construction, historically a reduced relative clause, is the standard modified-modifier construction in Dari. The overall claim of the third view is that Ezafat originally occurs between a modified noun and the modifier of the noun that appears on its right, that is, MODIFIED_{day} - EZ_{MODIFIER}nice meaning nice day. Having all of these views in mind, the status of Ezafat is still somewhat vague and requires further investigation. Therefore, I would like to present a stepwise study of Ezafat in every domain individually, that is, the nominal domain, adjectival, adverbial, and prepositional domains. In the following section, I will present my analysis of the Ezafat suffix in noun phrases and then begin analyzing Ezafat in adjective phrases. In section three, I will discuss the absence of Ezafat in adverbial phrases after which, in section four, I will propose a first version of my Ezafat insertion rule.

**Ezafat in the Nominal Domain**

Dari noun phrases are head-initial and all the modifiers and complements are right-branching. Ezafat occurs before any right-branching phrasal constituent to establish the modified-modifier relationship between the head noun and its adjuncts and complements. Consider the following examples.

---

7 It is worth mentioning that Ghomeshi does not agree with the filter-based approach of Samiiian. Instead, she argues that allowing base-generated $X^0$-adjunction in the syntax accounts for the constraints on elements that occur within the Ezafat domain far more elegantly than a filter-based approach.
34. \[\text{NP[sawal-e ADJP[mohem]]}\]
   question-EZ important
   “an important question”

35. \[\text{NP[sawal-e ADJP[mohem]-e PP[darbara-ye NP[ezafat]]]}\]^8
   question-EZ important-EZ about-EZ Ezafat
   “an important question about Ezafat”

36. \[\text{NP[sawal-e ADJP[mohem]-e PP[bedon-e NP[tawzihat]-e NP[sara]]]}\]^9
   question-EZ important-EZ without-EZ descriptions-EZ Sara
   “Sara’s important question without descriptions”

In 34, Ezafat attaches to the head noun which is modified by a right-branching modifier, that is, and adjective phrase. In 35, a prepositional modifier follows the adjective phrase to modify the head noun. The preposition \textit{about} takes an NP as its complement and, as a whole, the prepositional phrase obligatorily as a requirement of the order follows the adjective phrase. And in 36, a possessive NP follows the prepositional phrase to modify the noun head and act as its modifier. The order of the modifiers in the noun phrase is formulated in the following.

\[\text{DP} \rightarrow \ (D) \ \text{NP (AdjP)} \ (PP) \ (NP_{\text{POSS}})\]

It is important to mention that the final NP should always be a possessor or else the phrase becomes ungrammatical. An important question is, then, about the position of Ezafat. As mentioned earlier, Ezafat has three functions, namely, possessive, additive, and indefiniteness. I am going to analyze the position of Ezafat using an example of the possessive Ezafat which is given in the following.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{8} Notice that in this example, the occurrence of Ezafat right after the preposition that takes a noun as its complement confuses the modified-modifier configuration in the sense that the modified element is supposed to be a noun. This is an important point for the discussion of Ezafat in the prepositional phrases and I will discuss it more in Chapter Four.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{9} In example 3, Ezafat occurs after every element except for the last one, which questions whether it occurs before a modified constituent or any element. In fact, it occurs only before a modified constituent and I will explain why Ezafat appears after every element as the discussion of Ezafat builds up in the sections and chapters to follow. The reason these examples appear to be somewhat in controversy with the main claim is to mark a distinction between Ezafat and that which will later be claimed as a phantom of Ezafat.}\]
In the phrase in 4, Ezafat attaches to the noun possessed, and the possessor follows the head noun which is possessed. In this example, the function of Ezafat is identical to the function of ‘s in English. Therefore, for the purpose of my analysis, I am going to adopt the model proposed by (Abney, 1987). Abney’s model is present in the following.

![Abney’s Model](image)

*Figure 4. Abney’s Model*

This model works well for English since ‘s is in complementary distribution with any overt determiner, but adopting the same model for Dari possessive noun phrases has a number of disadvantages. First, in Dari, determiners are not in complementary distribution with Ezafat. Secondly, I am proposing that the order of adjectives in relation to the head noun is unlike their surface representation. On the surface, adjectives appear to occur on the right of the head noun, while underlingly the order is the opposite. The reason adjectives appear to be on the right of the head in the surface representation is the result of the movement of the noun which is motivated by Ezafat. Adopting the above model does not account for the underlying structure of the noun phrase. Third, Ezafat also occurs in prepositional phrases.
and the model illustrated above does not seem to account for the occurrence of Ezafat in prepositional phrases. Therefore, a different analysis for the Ezafat suffix is required in order to find a suitable position in the tree for Ezafat.

A different treatment of Ezafat is to say that Ezafat is base-generated under D and it causes the noun to move to D in order to get case, namely, possessive case. This analysis also accounts for the order of adjectives in relation to the head noun. Consider the following example from 34.

Example 34 (repeated)  
NP[sawal-e  ADJP[mohem]]

question-EZ important

“an important question”

Figure 5. Order of Noun and Adjectives

In the example above the head noun moves to D in order to take Ezafat, which results in noun-adjective order. And if we apply this model to possessive noun phrases, I am going to propose that the DP possessor is the complement of the head noun, and since the noun moves to D, the adjective seems to intervene between the head noun and its complement at the surface level. The following example contains a possessed head noun which is modified by an adjective. In the underlying form, we notice that the adjective precedes the noun head.
In the example above, the DP possessor is the complement of the head noun. An adjective is used to modify the head noun and the noun raises in order to get the possessive case. An important point which was proposed by (Ghomeshi, 1997) was the fact that only one possessor can occur in a Dari noun phrase and that is why there is no Dari equivalent to the English *the enemy’s destruction of the city*. In this English phrase, there seems to be only one possessor. The first DP which is *the enemy* is the possessory of the noun phrase *destruction of the city* and the noun *destruction* takes the prepositional modifier *of the city* as its complement. A similar case can also be noticed in Dari where two possessor’s occur within the same DP. Consider the following Example.

In the example above, son is the possessor of the head noun *picture*, and *king* is the possessor of the possessor DP *son* as illustrated in the following tree.
An important fact that supports the above model comes for the assignment of accusative case. If the assignment of the accusative case marker –ra does not comply with the tree given, the model above should crash, but as shown in the following example, the accusative case marker is assigned to the maximal DP and the result is grammatical.

40. [IP[DP] [DP] man [DP] aks-e bacha-ye patʃɑ-ra VP[did-am]]
   I [picture-EZ son-EZ king]-ACC saw-1stPrSg.
   “I saw a picture of the king’s son”

As shown in 40, the possessor follows the head noun and branches to the right, and the head noun takes its possessor as its complement. (Ghomeshi, 1997) also agrees with this claim as he argues that Dari is among many languages in which the possessor occurs to the right of the possessed noun. Hebrew is another. Ghomeshi cites the model proposed by (Ritter, 1991; 1992) for Hebrew and he adds that between Dari and Hebrew there are many
similarities one of which is the fact that the possessor follows the head noun and that the presence of a possessor gives a definite reading for the head noun. In the following, a model is given which was proposed by (Ritter, 1991; 1992) and cited by (Ghomeshi, 1997).

Figure 8. Ritter’s Model

So far, I have been discussing the presence of Ezafat in noun phrases, and at this point I would like to shift my attention to the presence of Ezafat in Adjective phrases. In the next section, I will present my analysis of Ezafat in Adjective phrases.

Ezafat in the Adjectival Domain

Adjectives are used to modify the head noun in a Dari noun phrase. On the surface representation, adjectives appear to be right-branching, but I am arguing that adjectives are underlyingly left-branching, that is, in the underlying representations, the order of the head noun in relation to adjectival modifiers is AdjP + Noun. The reason we get the opposite order in the surface representation is due to the movement of the head noun as illustrated in the examples earlier. Within the adjective phrase, adverbial modifiers are used to modify the head adjective. Consider the following example.

41. [NPensan-e [Adj[Adv|besyar] xob]]  
   person-EZ very good  
   “a very good person”
In the example above, a right-branching adjective phrase is used to modify the head noun on its right, and a left-branching adverb very is used within the adjective phrase to modify the head adjective. It should also be noted that on the surface representation, the head noun precedes the adjective phrase, while in the underlying representation before the head noun moves, it follows the adjective phrase. There are at least three pieces of evidence that support this claim. Each of these pieces are discussed in details in the following.

The first piece of evidence comes from superlative adjectives when compared with simple and comparative adjectives. The suffixes –tar and –tarin attach to the adjectives to form comparative and superlative adjectives respectively. Consider the following examples.

42. [\text{NP} \text{sawal-e [AdjPmo[kel]]}]
   \text{question-EZ difficult}
   “a difficult question”

43. [\text{NP} \text{sawal-e [AdjPmo[kel-tar]]}]
   \text{question-EZ difficult-COM}
   “a more difficult question”

44. [\text{NP} [\text{AdjPmo[kel-tarin} \text{ sawal]}]]
   \text{difficult-SUP question}
   “the most difficult question”

In 42, a simple adjective follows the noun head and Ezafat, in 43, again a comparative adjective follows the head noun and Ezafat attaches to the head. However, in 44 a superlative adjective precedes the head noun it modifies and Ezafat is also dropped. One conclusion that can be drawn at this moment is that the head noun does not require an Ezafat in order to be modified by a superlative adjective. The trees in the following illustrate the movement of the head noun to get case.
Figure 9. Head Raising to D

In Figure 9, the head noun raises to [Spec, DP] in order to get the Ezafat and the resulting order is Noun-AdjeP while in Figure 7 the noun does not move since it does not require the Ezafat suffix.

The second piece of evidence comes from prenominal adjectives where again the Ezafat is absent. In some cases when a linking verb is used, a prenominal adjective is used to modify the head noun which refers to the subject as shown in the example below.

45. [IP[DPjohn] [VP[DP[AdjXob] [NPadam] [vast]]]]
   John     good       man        is
   “John is a good man”

In the example above, the adjective good precedes the head noun man that it modifies. Notice that Ezafat is absent while in cases where Ezafat is present in an adjective-modifying-noun configuration, the head noun always precedes the adjective. This implies that Ezafat motivates the movement of the noun to [Spec, DP].

Finally, a third piece of evidence comes from the nominal features of the superlatives. I am arguing that the superlative marker –tarin not only turns an adjective into its superlative form but also converts it into a noun or at least makes it behave very much like a noun. If we are to
define a noun from a syntactic standpoint, then we would say that nouns can be marked for
nominative and accusative cases, are pluralized, are used with quantifiers, are possessivized,
and are modified by adjectives. If a superlative adjective truly behaves like a noun, then it
should be able to be used in the ways a noun is used. Interestingly, superlatives in Dari
demonstrate many of the structural properties of a noun. Consider the following examples.10

46. beh-tarin sawal]
good-SUP question
“the best question”

47. beht-tarin-ra xand-am
good-SUP-ACC read-1stPrSg.
“I read the best one”

48. beh-tarin-ha-ra entekhab kard-and
good-SUP-PI-ACC select did-3rdPrPl.
“they selected the best ones”

49. beh-tarin-ha-ye in tim
good-SUP-PI-EZ this team
“this team’s best ones”

50. pandʒ beh-tarin compared withpandʒ kola
five good-SUP five hat
“five best ones” “five hats”

51. beh-tarin-ha-ye amrikaʔi
good-SUP-PI-EZ American
“the best American ones”

In 46, the superlative adjective is used on the left of the head noun. In 47 the
superlative adjective is used as an object and is marked for accusative case. In 48, the
superlative adjective is pluralized and is marked for accusative case.11 Similarly, in 49, notice
the presence of Ezafat that attached to the superlative adjective which is followed by a
nominal possessor. In 50, a numeral is used in the same way it is used for a noun, and finally,

---

10 Also, it is important to mention that comparative and absolute adjectives, unlike superlative adjectives,
cannot be used in the same way a noun is used.
11 The accusative case marker is the the suffix –ra but there are no overt nominative case markers in Farsi.
in 51, the adjective *American* modifies the superlative adjective. These pieces of evidence suggest a nominal treatment of the superlatives. However, it should be noted that when the superlative precedes the noun it modifies, it loses all of its nominal structural properties as shown in 52 through 54.

52. *beh-tarin-ha  sawal  
good-SUP-Pl  question  
“the best question”

53. *beh-tarin-ra  sawal  
good-SUP-ACC  question  
“the best question”

54. *beh-tarin-ha-ye  sawal  
good-SUP-Pl-EZ  question  
“the best question”

Phrases 52, 53, and 54 are ungrammatical because a head noun is already present in the phrase and does not allow the superlative adjective to be nominal anymore.

However, there are cases where a superlative adjective precedes a possessed head noun. Now the question is how does the noun gets its case since the superlative is blocking its movement. If the noun moves to [Spec, DP], then we get the wrong word order, but if it does not move, how is it possible for Ezafat to attach to head noun. consider the following example.

55.[DP[Adjziba-tarin] [NPnaqfi]-ye [DPpikaso]]
beautiful-SUP  painting-EZ  Picasso
“Picasso’s most beautiful painting”

The head noun *painting* in 55 is a possessed noun which is followed by a possessor and modified by a preceding superlative adjective. The superlative adjective blocks the movement of the noun since if the head noun moves, we get the wrong word order. The solution that I am proposing is that in case of superlative adjectives when modifying a head
noun, the noun does not move to [Spec, DP], instead, the Ezafat suffix lowers so the noun gets its case. There are basically three reasons for the superlative adjective to block the movement of the head noun. First, superlative adjectives have nominal features and behave in almost the same ways as a noun does. Secondly, in a superlative-head noun configuration where the head noun is neither possessed nor modified by some other right-branching modifier, Ezafat is not required to establish a modified-modifier relationship. Third, the order of two elements whose relationship is built by Ezafat is only modified-modifier, while in case of superlative adjective modifying the noun head, it is the other way around and, therefore, the presence of Ezafat is not required. My solution involves the lowering of Ezafat as illustrated in the following tree.

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 11. Ezafat Lowers to Head Position*

In Figure 11 the Ezafat suffix lowers to head noun so the noun gets its case. This analysis solves the controversy between (Samiian, 1994) and (Ghomeshi, 1997). Samiian argues that Dari nouns project and take a specifier and complement. She writes, “In the noun phrase, Ezafe is found between the head noun and the right-branching adjective phrase
modifier, prepositional phrase modifier, or genitive noun phrase complement.” On the other hand, (Ghomeshi, 1997) claims that nouns do not project in Dari and they cannot occur in a position that has a specifier and complement, therefore, nouns do not take complements in Dari. In my analysis, I agree with Samiian and propose that nouns do take complements in Dari in the underlying representation, and sometimes if other elements intervene between a noun and its complement at the surface level is due to the movement of the head noun.

**Lack of Ezafat in Adverbial Phrases**

In Dari, adverb phrases are left-branching modifiers of verbs and adjectives. An important feature of adverb phrases is that they never occur with Ezafat. Using Ezafat with an adverb phrase results in the ungrammaticality of the phrase. Consider the following examples.

56. \[[\text{AdjP}[\text{AdvP besyar}] \ [\text{Adj} xob]]\]
   very good
   “very good”

57. \[[\text{IP}[\text{DP sara}] \ [\text{VP}[\text{AdvP fawran}] \ [\text{Vdʒawab dad}]]\]
   Sara quickly response gave
   “Sara responded quickly”

58. \* \[[\text{AdjP}[\text{AdvP besyar}] \ [\text{Adj} xob]]\]
   very-EZ good
   “very good”

59. \* \[[\text{IP}[\text{DP sara}] \ [\text{VP}[\text{AdvP fawran}] \ [\text{Vdʒawab dad}]]\]
   Sara quickly-EZ response gave
   “Sara responded quickly”

In 56, the adverb *very* precedes the head of the adjective phrase *good* and modifies it. Notice that the Ezafat suffix does not attach to the adverb and when it does, as shown in (58), the phrase becomes ungrammatical. Similarly, in 57, an adverb is followed by a verb that it modifies and, again, Ezafat is absent. The insertion of Ezafat in 57 generates the
ungrammatical result given in 59. In some cases an Ezafat attaches to an adjective which is modified by an adverb, but it does not mean Ezafat is related to the adverb. This point is illustrated in the following example.

50. [DP[NP‘hawa-ye [Adj[Adv‘besyar] [Adj‘sard]]]-e [DP‘Kabul]
   weather-EZ very cold-EZ Kabul
   “the very cold weather of Kabul”

In 50, Ezafat attaches to the whole adjective phrase regardless of the modifier(s) inside the adjective phrase. The occurrence of Ezafat in 50 is motivated by the possessor DP on the right of adjective phrase and the [+N] feature of the adjective supposedly allows the Ezafat to attach to it. In the verbal domain, too, adverbs are left-branching modifiers of the verb. The following example illustrates this point.

51. [IP[DP‘John] [VP[ADVP‘ahesta] [v‘daxel‘od]]]
   John slowly entered
   “John entered slowly”

In the example in 51, the adverb slowly modifies the verb entered but it does not occur with Ezafat. When an adverb modifies a verb, neither the verb nor the adverb takes Ezafat, which leads us to the generalization that adverbs do not occur with Ezafat in any environment. It is obvious that Ezafat does not occur with adverbs since there is no empirical evidence to show it does, but due to the complex and heterogeneous behavior of adverbs a discussion of which goes beyond the scope of this paper, I will leave the question of why Ezafat does not attach to adverbs as a topic for further research.

**Ezafat and the [+N] Feature**

It has been discussed by (Ghomeshi, 1997) that the trigger for Ezafat is the feature [+N]. This proposal allows Ezafat to attach to nouns and adjectives while ruling out
prepositions and verbs. According to the feature system devised by (Chomsky, 1970)$^{12}$ and cited by (Ghomeshi, 1997), prepositions are [-N, -V], which violate the Ezafat insertion rule proposed later in this section, while a larger number of prepositions do occur with Ezafat. In addition, the left-branching superlative adjectives when follow a head noun questions the assumption that [+N] is the trigger for insertion in the sense that Ezafat does not occur with superlatives.

An important and implicit assumption that can be made from the fact that adjectives do not take a complement is that Ezafat assumingly does not occur with categories that do not take a complement. While referring back to the proposals of (Moyne; Carden, 1974) that Ezafat is the standard modified-modifier construction in Dari, it can be hypothesized that the modified element is always the complement of modifier where the possessive Ezafat occurs between them. This assumption solves one question while raising another one. By adopting this hypothesis we can answer why prepositions can occur with Ezafat regardless of their [-N] feature, but, then, we need to explain how adjectives appear with Ezafat bearing in mind the fact that they do not take complement. I will come back to this last question in Chapter Six, but in order to illustrate my hypothesis, the following diagrams are in order.

---

$^{12}$ The feature system proposed by (Chomsky, 1970) consisted of the features [+N, -V] for the category noun, [-N, +V] for the category verb, [+N, +V] for the category adjective, and [-N, -V] for the category preposition.
The two diagrams in Figure 12 and 13 show that only heads that take a phrasal complement are licensed to occur with Ezafat. Given that, we can propose the first draft of Ezafat insertion rule given in the following.

\[ X \rightarrow X \text{EZ} Y \]

The rule reads that Ezafat attaches to a head if and only if that head is followed by a phrasal complement. There are at least three differences between this rule and the one proposed by (Ghomeshi, 1997). First, Ghomeshi’s rule shows that Ezafat attaches to any head that bears the feature \([+N]\) when it is followed by another phonetically realized, non-affixal material within the same extended projection. According to this rule, an adverb should also take Ezafat since it is followed by an adjective which is an independent constituent and is within the same extended projection as the adverb, but as it was illustrated by data earlier, adverbs never occur with Ezafat. Secondly, Ghomeshi’s rule fails to explain why superlative adjectives do not occur with Ezafat. Based on her rule, a superlative adjective (bearing the \([+N]\) feature) follows the noun head, and should take Ezafat by default. However, the occurrence of Ezafat with a superlative adjective is for the most part ungrammatical. Finally, in the following example, it should be possible for Ezafat to attach to the noun head based on Ghomeshi’s rule.

52. \[[\text{IP}[\text{DP}[\text{NP[N aftab]}][\text{VP medoroxʃad]]}}] \] vs. \[^*[[\text{IP}[\text{DP[NP[N aftab]-e [VP medoroxʃad]]}}]]\]

\begin{align*}
\text{sun} & \quad \text{shine} \\
\text{sun-EZ} & \quad \text{shine}
\end{align*}

“the sun is shining” vs. “the sun is shining”

Ezafat cannot attach to the head noun in 52 even though it is within the same extended projection \(IP\) as its following independent element, and when Ezafat attaches to the head noun, the sentence becomes ungrammatical. Therefore, I suggest a rule that utilizes a
tool that can address the cases discussed above, that is, the concept of *complement* as a locality constraint.

So far, the rule I suggested is too general to rule out the occurrence of Ezafat with verbs. Therefore, a constraint is necessary to make the rule more predictable, and I am going to adopt the [+N] feature hypothesis proposed by (Ghomeshi, 1997). She hypothesized that [+N] feature is the trigger for Ezafat insertion, and by using this feature, the constraint to the rule above is now ready.

_Ezafat Insertion Rule:_ Ezafat attaches to any head that bears the feature [+N] if and only if that head is followed by its complement. Hence, $\text{XP} \rightarrow X^{[+N]} \text{EZ YP}$

According to this rule, two categories, namely, verbs and prepositions are already ruled out since they do not pass the feature test. Even though adjectives appear with Ezafat, they are also ruled out because they do not pass the constraint. I will get back to the case of Ezafat with adjectives later in this thesis (Chapter Five). The only elements that remain are the categories noun and prepositions of type 2. A detailed analysis of prepositions in relation to the rule above will be postponed for the next chapter. But speaking of adjective phrases, there are cases in that Ezafat attaches to adjectives as shown in the following example.

53. [NP[Nbradar]-e xord-e ti sam] 
   borther-EZ little-EZ Sam 
   “Sam’s little brother”

In the example above, the head noun underlyingly takes the DP possessor as its complement but in order to get case, moves to a position that precedes the adjective. The occurrence of Ezafat on the noun is perfectly predictable by the rule, however, the rule has no explanation for the occurrence of Ezafat on the adjective. There are cases that make us
reconsider the fact that Ezafat truly occurs with an adjective. In the example below when Ezafat attaches to the adjective, the phrase becomes ungrammatical.

54. \[IP[DPSam] [VP[xob] [\text{\textit{v}}\text{bod}]] \] vs. \[^{*}\[IP[DPSam] [VP[xob-e] [\text{\textit{v}}\text{bod}]] \]

Sam good was
“Sam was good”

Sam good-EZ was
“Sam was good”

In the example above, a linking verb is used to link the adjective with the DP subject and when Ezafat attaches to the adjective, the sentence becomes ungrammatical. On a different occasion where two adjective phrases are conjoined by a the conjunction but and none of them take Ezafat, and if Ezafat appears with any of them, the phrase becomes ungrammatical as shown in the following example.

55. \[IP[DPzemestan-e waqean sard ama besyar kotah] [VP[NP\text{\textit{man}}-ra bayad-e barfkotf] [\text{\textit{v}}\text{andaxt}]] \]

winter-EZ really cold but very short I-ACC memory-EZ avalanche dropped
“the very short but really cold winter reminded me of the avalanche”

There are two assumptions that will answer the question of why Ezafat does not occur with any of the adjectives or adjective phrases even though they are followed by another item as shown in 55. The first assumption supports the rule which was proposed earlier and that is the fact that only a [+N] bearing head that is followed by its complement takes Ezafat. In 55, the adjective (phrase) is followed by other items but not its complement. Secondly, according to what the rule predicts, Ezafat never occurs with adjectives which means that the cases where Ezafat appears on an adjective is simply a pronunciation rather than a function. I will get back to this point in further details in Chapter Six, but before that, an analysis of Ezafat in prepositional phrases is required for further revisions of our rule, which will take place in the next chapter.

To conclude, I discussed the occurrence of Ezafat in noun phrases in section one, and in section two discussed Ezafat in the adjectival domain. I proposed that in cases of simple
adjectives and comparative adjectives, the head noun moves to [Spec, DP] in order to get case, while in case of superlative adjectives, the Ezafat suffix lowers inasmuch as the superlative blocks the movement of the noun due to peculiar properties of the superlatives. In section three, I discussed the lack of Ezafat in adverb phrases and concluded that Ezafat never attaches to adverbs. Finally, in section four, I adopted Ghomeshi’s approach of [+N] feature as the trigger for Ezafat insertion and generated the first draft of my rule for inserting Ezafat. The discussion of Ezafat will still continue in the following chapters and more details will be analyzed as required. In the next chapter, I will discuss the occurrence of Ezafat in prepositional phrases with a detailed discussion of the type Dari prepositions. The solution that I proposed above is by no means complete yet and still requires further discussion to which I will get back.
Chapter Four: Ezafat in the Prepositional Domain

Prepositional phrases in Farsi are right-branching modifiers in the nominal domain yet left-branching modifiers in the verbal domain. All Farsi prepositions require a complement and, thus, project to a phrasal level. Ezafat frequently occurs with a large number of prepositions while it is in complementary distribution with another specific group of prepositions. The occurrence of Ezafat with a specific number of prepositions has brought about many controversies in determining the category of those prepositions that occur with Ezafat. Consider the following examples.

56. PPba sara] vs. *PPba-ye sara]  
with Sara with-EZ Sara  
“with Sara” “with Sara”

57. Pppoft-e blak] vs. *Pppoft blak]  
behind-EZ block behind-EZ block  
“behind the block” “behind the block”

58. PP ba pul]14 vs. *PPba-ye pul]  
With money with-EZ money  
“with/by money” “with money”

In 56, the occurrence of Ezafat with the preposition with results in the ungrammaticality of the phrase, while in 57 removing Ezafat generates an ungrammatical result. Some researchers have proposed that behind as shown in 57 is not a true preposition but rather is a noun. For instance, (Ghomeshi, 1997; Samiian, 1994) who also cites (Palmer, 1970; Brame and Karimi, 1986) argue that there are mainly two types of prepositions in

---

13 The direction of branching in a phrase is measured by the position of the head. When a head that precedes its modifiers occurs initially in the phrase, the modifiers are considered to be right-branching, and when a head that is followed by its modifiers occurs finally in the phrase, the modifiers of that head are considered to be left branching.

14 The difference between the two prepositions in 56 and 58 meaning with is that the former shows accompaniment and the later is an instrumental prepositions. Therefore, phrase 56 means together with Sara and phrase 57 means by using money.
Farsi, namely, prepositions of type 1 (P1s) and prepositions of type 2 (P2s). P1s is the set of prepositions that never occur with Ezafat as shown in 56 above and P2s are prepositions that obligatorily appear with Ezafat. It has, therefore, been proposed that P2s are nominal and P1s are true prepositions. In the first section of this chapter, I will discuss the classification proposed by (Samiian, 1994) and cited by (Ghomeshi, 1997). In section two, I will discuss the debate between Samiian and Ghomeshi on determining the category of the prepositions of the second type. Finally, in section three, I will present my own analysis of the classification of prepositions and the occurrence of Ezafat with them.

**Classification of Prepositions: True vs. Nominal Prepositions**

(Samiian, 1994) proposes two types of prepositions the first of which, according to her, do not require Ezafat. She adds that, in fact, the occurrence of Ezafat with type 1 results in an ungrammatical sequence. Stating that type 1 prepositions do not require Ezafat may imply the possibility of the occurrence of Ezafat with P1s while the truth is that they can never occur with Ezafat. Therefore, I would propose that P1s are in complementary distribution with Ezafat; where one occurs the other doesn’t. Three examples of P1s are given in 59a, 59b, and 59c. The following examples are taken from (Samiian, 1994).

59(a). \([PPba\) Hassan] vs. \(*[PPba-ye\) Hassan]

\(\text{to Hassan}\) vs. \(\text{to-EZ Hassan}\)

\(\text{“to Hassan”}\) vs. \(\text{“to Hassan”}\)

(b). \([PPaz\) N.Y.] vs. \(*[PPaz-e\) N.Y.]

\(\text{from N.Y.}\) vs. \(\text{from-EZ N.Y.}\)

\(\text{“from N.Y.”}\) vs. \(\text{“from N.Y.”}\)

(c). \([PPdaer\) manzel] vs. \(*[PPdaer-e\) manzel]

\(\text{in house}\) vs. \(\text{in-EZ house}\)

\(\text{“in the house”}\) vs. \(\text{“in the house”}\)

\(^{15}\) Even though Samiian and Ghomeshi talk about a third class of prepositions that optionally occur with Ezafat, but none of them provide any empirical evidence to support their claim. In my opinion, prepositions in Farsi either occur or do not occur with Ezafat and there is no middle line.
In examples 59a through 59c, the prepositions are immediately followed by a complement without any Ezafat intervening between them. Samiian lists nine prepositions of type 1 that never occur with Ezafat and two of this set are subject to Ghomeshi’s disagreement and will be discussed in the following section.

In Samiian’s classification, P2s contain a larger number of prepositions, that is, there are more P2 prepositions than there are P1 prepositions. P2s either obligatorily or optionally take Ezafat before the object noun phrase. Consider the following examples of both subtypes of P2.

60. [PPzer-e mez] vs. *[PPzer mez]
   under-EZ table “under the table”
   under table “under the table”

61. [PPwasat-e otaq] vs. *[PPwasat otaq]
   middle-EZ room “in the middle of the room”
   middle room “in the middle of the room”

The preposition in 60 is a subtype of P2s that optionally takes Ezafat and the preposition in 61 is another P2 subtype that obligatorily occurs with Ezafat. However, Samiian does not provide evidence for the occurrence of the preposition under without Ezafat. In my analysis, if Ezafat does not occur with under, the result is ungrammatical. In addition, she does not explain why middle yields an ungrammatical result if it occurs with Ezafat although she claims that Ezafat can be optionally used with middle.\(^{17}\) Samiian’s analysis makes an important point in that she makes a distinction between true and nominal prepositions, but the fact that some of the nominal prepositions optionally occur with Ezafat


\(^{17}\) It could also be hypothesized that if the occurrence of Ezafat with the preposition middle as in 61 is considered to be grammatical/acceptable, then this is a dialectal difference between Iranian Farsi and Afghan Farsi in the sense that the former takes Ezafat optionally while the later does not occur with Ezafat at all.
requires empirical evidence. Ghomeshi’s classification is very similar to that of Samiian’s. She classifies prepositions into three types, that is, P1s, P2s, and P3s. She maintains that P1s are prepositions that do not take their complement via Ezafat, P2s are prepositions that must take Ezafat, and P3s are prepositions that optionally take Ezafat. The P3 in example (5) is taken from (Ghomeshi, 1997).

62. pahlu-(ye) “next to”

It is suggested by Ghomeshi that the preposition in 62 optionally takes Ezafat. When it occurs with Ezafat, the result is perfectly grammatical, however; she does not provide an example of an instance in which pahlu does not occur with Ezafat in a context. The same comment holds for other prepositions that she lists as P3s. Locating parentheses around Ezafat conventionally means that the parenthesized element is optional yet Ghomeshi’s example still cannot be deemed as evidence because the nature of the preposition pahlu in 62 requires a context in which the preposition precedes its complement. This way we will be able to make grammaticality judgments otherwise it would be vague to say, for instance in English, that using to with next is optional merely by putting parentheses around to. In other words, to generally may or may not occur with next but if we want to use next as a two-word preposition of place to mean “near”, it must occur with to. Consider the following example.

63. next (to): next week (*next to week) vs. next to the store (*next the store)

In 63, only if next to is used in a context can we then make the judgment that if to does not occur with next, the result is an ungrammatical usage of the preposition. Similar is the case in Farsi P3s. Ghomeshi only provides a list of prepositions with parenthesized Ezafats. The Farsi Pahlu meaning next to requires a context based on which we could make a judgment. In short, I disagree with Ghomshi’s claim about the presence of a third group of
prepositions, that is, P3s. In my opinion, all the prepositions in Farsi could be from either nominal or true categories.

The lack of empirical evidence for P3s occurring without Ezafat questions the status of P3s and may imply that such a subtype does not exist and all the prepositions of type 3 are basically P2s.

Samiian’s analysis of the types of prepositions concludes that considering the semantic content of these two groups, P1s correspond to true function words and their meaning is dependent on their complement, and P2s have some nominal semantic content, that is, their meaning and the way they behave are more nominal. There is some debate between Samiian and Ghomeshi as to what the true nature of P2s is. In the following section, a brief overview of their arguments is provided.

**On Nomaniality of P2s**

In Ghomeshi’s classification, the prepositions *bedone* ‘without’ and *baraye* ‘for’ are, unlike Samiian’s classification, listed as P2s, while Samiian treats them as P1s. (Samiian, 1994) argues that the two above-mentioned prepositions have a final –*e* and have historically originated in group 2 and the final –*e* was actually Ezafat. On the other hand, for (Ghomeshi, 1997) these two prepositions still belong to group 2 and Ezafat can be isolated from the prepositions. This controversy is illustrated in the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>P2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bedone</em> “without”</td>
<td><em>bedon-e</em> “without”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>baraye</em> “for”</td>
<td><em>bara-ye</em> “for”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though it does not seem easy to classify the above prepositions, for the purposes of my analysis, I will treat them as P1s and propose that they never occur with Ezafat. The fact that they end with a phoneme which is homophonous with Ezafat is a coincidence.
Another controversy between Samiian and Ghomeshi involves the treatment of P2s. Despite the fact that Samiian thinks that P2s seem nominal, she still does not treat them as nouns. As mentioned by (Ghomeshi, 1994), she argues that P2s cannot take the full range of NP specifiers, and they cannot co-occur with relative clauses. According to these two restrictions, the P2s cannot be true nouns. However, Ghomeshi argues that it is not clear yet if the two properties mentioned by Samiian can necessarily be conditions for membership in the category noun. She further argues that there are generally accepted nouns that are not in compliance with Samiian’s restrictions of nounhood. She, for instance, gives the example of *bozorgi* which means ‘greatness’ and argues that it does not occur in any of the contexts Samiian mentions. For Ghomeshi, P2s are a subcategory of nouns with a clearly definable characterization.

A third controversy between Ghomeshi and Samiian pertains to the types of prepositions. According to Samiian’s analysis, P3s are a subcategory of P2s. On the other hand, for Ghomeshi the distinction between P2s and P3s is important in the sense that P3s are mixed prepositions and optionally take Ezafat; however, she does not provide examples for the use of P3s when they occur without Ezafat. For the purposes of my analysis, I have adopted a mixture of the two views which is presented in the following section.

**Ezafat in the Prepositional Domain**

In order to decide on a proper treatment of Ezafat in prepositional phrases, it is necessary to determine the nature of P2s as opposed to P1s. In my view, there is only one class of prepositions, that is, true prepositions or P1s and there is no other class that can be categorized under prepositions. The true prepositions are the only prepositions that form a functional category and they carry out a number of specific functions such as marking...
locative, ablative, and the like. Before I begin my argument for what, then, the true nature of
P2s is, I would like to discuss a number of relevant cases that I noticed in papers by
(Ghomeshi, 1997; Samiian, 1994). First I will begin with Ghomeshi’s notion of intransitivity
of P2s.

Ghomeshi distinguishes between prepositions of group 1 and group 2 by stating that
group 2, unlike group 1, can occur intransitively. She gives the preposition birun meaning
‘outside’ and uses it in two different contexts in one of which it takes a complement while in
the other it occurs intransitively. Her examples are given below in 64 and 65.

64. birun-e manzel-ra tamiz kard-em
   outside-EZ house-ACC clean did-1stPrPl.
   “we cleaned the outside of the house”

65. birun raft-em
   outside went-1stPrPl.
   “we went out”

The preposition in 64 occurs with Ezafat and takes the noun house as its complement.
The element birun in 65 is considered to be a preposition that occurs intransitively. However,
in my opinion, it is not a preposition since it behaves more like an adverb that denotes place.
Thus, the noun birun in 64 functions as an adverb of time just like the noun book which
functions both as a noun and a verb in English. Semantically speaking, the noun house
basically is the possessor of the preposition outside, which means the outer space that
belongs to the house or “the house’s outside”. Since a preposition is a functional category
that may have some or no semantic content and cannot stand alone, it cannot be modified by
a possessive noun phrase complement. What I mean by the fact that a preposition does not

---

18 The dialect of Farsi which Ghomeshi analyzes is the one spoken in Iran. However, I am analyzing Farsi-ye
Dari which is a different dialect of Farsi spoken in Afghanistan. Therefore, there are a few phonological
differences between the two dialects which are reflected in the examples. Ghomeshi’s way of transcribing the
sentence in 64 is: birun-e manzel-o tamiz kard-im
have independent semantic content is that a preposition’s meaning, unlike lexical categories, is dependent on its noun phrase complement. This does not mean that prepositions do not have any semantic content at all but the claim is that their meaning is dependent on the meaning of another lexical categories. Thus, a possessor should only be able to modify an element that is semantically independent. It is self-explanatory that the word birun meaning ‘outside’ is not a preposition by the virtue of being semantically independent. If we define preposition as a functional element that introduces a relation between two entities, then the element birun is by no means a preposition. The following examples further clarifies this suggestion by using an adjective that modifies birun.

66. birun-e xana garm ast
   outside-EZ house warm is
   “outside of the house is warm”

67. birun garm ast
   outside warm is
   “outside is warm”

68. birun-e garm-e xana
   outside-EZ warm-EZ house
   “the warm outside of the house”

69. hawa-ye birun
   weather-EZ outside
   “the weather of outside”

   In 66, the element birun is modified by the possessor house and an adjective via a linking verb. The adjective warm in 66 only modifies birun, which indicates that house is also a modifier rather than a complement. In 67, the possessor house is elided and the subject again is birun which is modified by the adjective warm. In 68, an adjective intervenes between birun and its possessor, which, in Farsi, is only possible in a noun-modifier configuration. Finally, in 69, birun is the possessor of the noun head. In short, there are two
types of prepositions in Farsi, that is, true prepositions and nominal prepositions. I am claiming that nominal prepositions are, in fact, a group of nouns that in some contexts behave similar to prepositions but are actually not prepositions. To support this claim, the following examples are provided to illustrate the functional and semantic differences between the so-called nominal prepositions and true prepositions.

70. az senf vs. *az-e senf
from class from-EZ class
“from class” “from class”

71. birun-e senf vs. *birun senf
outside-EZ class outside class
“outside the classroom” “outside the classroom”

72. birun-e roshan daxel-e tarik
outside-EZ bright inside-EZ dark

73. az birun-e senf
from outside-EZ class
“from outside of the class”

In 70, the true preposition “az” does not occur with Ezafat. In 71 the nominal preposition occurs with Ezafat and then it is modified by an adjective in 72. In 73, a nominal preposition becomes the complement of a true preposition. The examples above show that a nominal preposition is basically a type of noun which in some contexts has a behavior similar to that of a preposition. Also, it is important to note that all nominal prepositions behave in this way, that is, they can be pluralized, used as the complement of a true preposition, used as the subject or object of a verb, modified by an adjective or a possessor, and joined with a conjunction.

Secondly, (Samiian, 1994) argues that P1s correspond to function words since they do not have any semantic content, while P2s have some semantic content, that is, locative, temoral, or purposive. However, (Abney, 1987) provides a list of properties that characterize
functional elements, and among the properties are two important ones that seem to disagree with Samiian’s proposal. First, Abney argues that functional elements are usually inseparable from their complement. This means if P2s are capable of appearing intransitively, they no longer belong to a functional category, instead, they should be deemed as thematic elements. While according to Samiian, P2s are still prepositions, that is, functional. Secondly, Abney further argues that functional elements lack “descriptive content”. Their semantic contribution is second order, regulating or contributing to the interpretation of their complement. He adds that functional elements mark grammatical or relational features, rather than picking out a class of objects. Referring back to Samiian’s classification, it is important to note two notions about P1s and P2s. First, P1s are always dependent on their complement and never occur without a complement. Secondly, P1s, unlike under Samiian’s analysis, carry out specific grammatical functions such as marking ablative, temporal, allative, locative, instrumental and the like. On the other hand, P2s do not express any grammatical function or relation. They rather contain some “descriptive content” which can be defined by means of other words as well. These two notions sort of nullify the status of P2s as prepositions.

In addition, Samiian argues that P1s, but not P2s, are strictly subcategorized for an obligatory noun phrase complement. If P2s can occur without a complement, this means they are independent of their complement and have their own semantic content in order to be able to stand alone, while functional elements seem more dependent on their complement. Another proposal by Samiian that renders further support to the notion that P2s cannot be categorized as prepositions is the fact that P2s occur with specifiers, which happen only for the sake of the nominal features of P2s. In the following, examples are given in 74a through
74d to show P1s marking specific cases, and in 75, a demonstrative is used to show the use of specifiers with P2s.

74. Group 1 prepositions

(a). [PP][dar xana]
   at home
   “at home”

(b). [IP][Dp][sara][PP][ba dafatar-esh][VP][raft]]
   Sara to office-POSS went
   “Sara went to her office”

(c). [IP][Dp][sara][PP][az Kabul][VP][amad]]
   Sara from Kabul came
   “Sara came from Kabul”

(d). [IP][Dp][sara][PP][ta da roz][VP][name-aayad]]
   Sara until ten day NEG-come
   “Sara won’t come for the next ten days”

75. [PP][in zer-e mez]
   this under-EZ table
   “this underneath of the table”

In 74a through 74d, the preposition carries out a specific grammatical function, that is, marking case. In 75, according to Samiian, the preposition under is preceded by a specifier. However, the element under appears to belong to some thematic category, and semantically, it has a descriptive content which is the ‘surface beneath the table’. It is a possessed noun which relates to an outside physical object.

Moreover, the fact that P2s can be used intransitively is an instance of word formation. According to my analysis, the P2 birun given in 65 above is basically a noun that through process of conversion or zero derivation changes its nominal function to that of adverbial.
In general, the only prepositions in Farsi are the ones classified as P1s by Samiian and Ghomeshi. There are no other classes of prepositions. The P2s and P3s are simply a subcategory of noun. For my analysis, I am going to adopt Ghomeshi’s approach of treating P2s, which are proposed to be nouns. Therefore, the tree for the sentence in 64 is given in the following.

\[
\text{NP} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{NP}
\]

\[
[biron-e \quad \text{manzel}]
\]

outside-EZ house

“outside of the house”

*Figure 14. P2’s as Nouns*

In the tree above, the noun *biron* previously treated as a preposition is a possessed noun which is modified by the DP possessor that it takes as its complement. The noun raises to D to get Ezafat and establishes the possessed-possessor relationship with its complement. Therefore, the meaning of the phrase is ‘the outer space that belongs to the house’. Had the noun *biron* been a preposition, its meaning wouldn’t have been possible to be described, while *biron* even without depending on its complement has full semantic content.

Now that we have determined a proper treatment for P2s and P3s, let us consider the rule that I proposed for the insertion of Ezafat in the previous chapter. The rule was:

*Ezafat Insertion Rule:* Ezafat attaches to any head that bears the feature [+N] if and only if that head is followed by its complement. Hence, \( \text{XP} \rightarrow X^{+[N]} \text{EZ YP} \)
According to the rule above, prepositions, adjectives, adverbs, and verbs are ruled out for Ezafat insertion. The only possible category that is licensed to appear with Ezafat is the category noun. However, I have given plenty of examples where Ezafat attaches to the adjectives and haven’t discussed how adjectives appear with Ezafat. The aim of the next chapter is to address how it is possible for Ezafat to occur with adjectives and to generalize my hypothesis for the status of Ezafat in syntax.

To summarize, in this chapter I discussed three classes of prepositions, that is, P1s, P2s, and P3s which were proposed by (Samiiian, 1994; Ghomeshi, 1997). Then I discussed the controversies between them and presented my own hypothesis for the treatment of prepositions in Farsi. I concluded that the only prepositions in Farsi are the ones listed as P1s, and the rest are simply a subcategory of the general category of noun whose characteristics are subject to further investigation. Finally, I recalled my Ezafat insertion rule and generalized that, according to my analysis, the only possible category that is licensed to occur with Ezafat is the category noun, the rest of categories are ruled out.
Chapter Five: Ezafat as a Genitive Case Marker

The function of genitive case is to establish a grammatical relationship between the modifying and the modified noun. Among the relationships that genitive case builds is possession. However, in a lot of literature, the terms “genitive” and “possessive” are used interchangeably. A possessive case might only imply the idea of ownership of one thing over another, while genitive case, as categorized by (Wheelock, 1956) for Latin, can be extended to broader concepts of origin, participation in action (subjective genitive), composition (genitive of material), reference, description and genitive of possession. In addition, (Lyons, 1986) notices the difference between genitive and possessive and cites (Partee, 1983) and (Hawkins, 1981) both of whom also make a distinction between genitive and possessive. He writes. “Both make the important point that the genitive does not simply express 'possession'. For example, John's team can mean the team that John owns, plays in, supports, etc. As Partee says, the only generalization possible about the meaning of the genitive is that it always expresses one argument of a relation.” In Farsi too, Ezafat seems to carry out the functions of a genitive case marker as listed above. Consider the following examples.

76. kola-ye sara
    hat-EZ Sara
   “Sara’s hat”

77. ustad-e faransawi
       teacher-EZ French
    “a French teacher”

78. markaz-e faliat-ha

---

19 This classification of genitives first appeared in Wheelock’s Latin by Frederic M. Wheelock in 1956 and the book was later edited and revised as sixth edition by Richard A. LaFleur in 2005.
20 This information has been taken from Swarthmore College Computer Society’s (SCCS) website at: http://www.sccs.swarthmore.edu/users/08/ajb/tmve/wiki100k/docs/Genitive_case.html
21 (Partee, 1983), as cited by (Lyons, 1986), distinguishes two types of genitive reading: free R (relation), where the relevant relation will be determined by contextual factors, and inherent R, where the head N lexically determines the nature of the relation
In 76, Ezafat establishes a possessed-possessor relationship between the noun head and its modifier. In 77, the Ezafat expresses origin of the head noun showing the head noun originated from a place denoted by the modifier. In 78, a reference, which is encoded in the modifier of the head, is given to the head noun. In 79, the modified noun is an action and the modifier is the participant in the action, that is, the agent, and the relation between the action and its participant is that of possessive, that is, the act of eating that relates/belongs to Sara. In 80, Ezafat shows that the head noun is composed of the material which is denoted by the modifier. Therefore, the meaning of the phrase in 80 is a ring which is made out of gold. Finally, in 81, the profession of the head noun is described by its modifier. The meaning of the phrase in 81 is; Farhad who possesses the profession of carpentry.

In my opinion, the only phrase that implies a direct relation of ownership is the one in 76, while the other phrases contain a modified-modifier relationship that carry an indirect meaning of possession of various sorts. Therefore, I am going to propose that Ezafat belongs to a functional category that marks genitive case on the head noun. However, there are cases

22 The phrase in 2 is ambiguous as it is in the English phrase the French teacher and has two interpretations that are, then, determined by the context. The first interpretation is ‘a teacher who is from France’ and the second interpretation is ‘a teacher who teaches French’.
where Ezafat seems to express indefiniteness. It is important to differentiate between the

- genitive Ezafat ($\text{Ezafat}_{\text{GEN}}$) and the Indefinite Ezafat. An explanation of the differences
- between these two concepts is given in the following section highlighting the fact that the $-e$
suffix that expresses indefiniteness is not Ezafat.

**Ezafat and the Indefinite Marker**

The indefinite marker $-e$ in Farsi attaches to nouns and adjectives and happens to have

- the same phonological features as Ezafat yet they are syntactically very different. The enclitic
- $-e$ which expresses indefiniteness is a morphological element that is not accessible to syntax,
that is, it does not carry a relational function. On the other hand, Ezafat is a morphological
- element that marks genitive case on nouns. Ezafat, according to our rule, occurs with only
- nouns while the indefinite marker occurs with both nouns and adjectives. An important
- difference between the two is that the meaning of the indefinite marker is dependent on a VP
while the meaning of Ezafat is dependent on a phrase. This means that Ezafat occurs at the

- phrase level due to structural requirements of the phrase and it does not carry independent
- semantic content. It rather has a grammatical function. However, the indefinite marker has
- semantic content (a/an) and its grammatical function is to mark indefiniteness. The following
- examples illustrate the difference between Ezafat and the indefinite marker $-e$.

82. dastan-e-ra xand-am k… vs. dastan-ra xand-am
  story-IND-ACC read-1\textsuperscript{st}PrSg. that… story-ACC read-1\textsuperscript{st}PrSg.
  “I read a story that…” “I read the story”

83(a). dastan-e dʒaleb-e-ra xand-am vs dastan-e dʒaleb-ra xand-am
  story-EZ interesting-IND-ACC read-1\textsuperscript{st}PrSg. story-E interesting-ACC read-1\textsuperscript{st}PrSg,
  “I read an interesting story” “I read the interesting story”

(b). *dastan dʒaleb-e-ra xand-am
  story interesting-IND-ACC read-1\textsuperscript{st}PrSg

---

23 Later in this chapter, I will discuss how Ezafat does not occur with adjectives and prepositions even though
there were instances where Ezafat was noticed with both categories.
“I read an interesting story”

84. mard-e waredʃod vs mard waredʃod vs *mard-e waredʃod
man-IND entered man entered man-IND
“a man entered” “the man entered” “a man”

In 82, the indefinite marker precedes the accusative case marker –ra and attaches to the noun object. In 83a, the indefinite marker attaches to an adjective that modifies the head noun, and in 84, it attaches to the head noun which is in nominative case. It is important to mention that when the indefinite marker is removed, the phrase or sentence does not become ungrammatical, it rather changes its meanings while if Ezafat is removed from the phrase as shown in 83b, the phrase becomes ungrammatical. Given this, I am proposing that Ezafat and the indefinite marker are different elements having accidently identical phonological features yet different functions. Therefore, the Ezafat insertion rule does not account for the use of the indefinite marker because it occurs purely for semantic purposes.

It was argued earlier that Ezafat can only attach to the category noun; a question that can be raised now is how we can account for the cases where Ezafat is also pronounced on adjectives. In the following section, I will present my analysis for the occurrence of Ezafat with adjectives and the head nouns that are modified by an adjective.

**Ezafat in Adjective Phrases (Continued)**

For the purpose of my analysis of the occurrence of Ezafat in adjective phrases, I am going to adopt the hypothesis, which was proposed by (Palmer, 1971) and cited by (Samiian, 1994) that all occurrences of Ezafat derive from an underlying relative clause with the verbs daftan meaning ‘to have’ and bodan meaning ‘to be’. Although neither Palmer nor Samiian

24 The reason I am adopting this hypothesis is because I am suggesting that, loosely speaking, Ezafat is basically an element that indicates a relationship of ‘belonging/ownership’ at an abstract semantic level. Therefore, I would like to further suggest that the relative clause that underlies Ezafat contains the verb to have when the modifier is an NP and to be when the modifier is an adjective.
provide evidence to show how Ezafat derived from the underlying relative clause, I consider
the following examples to be indicative of such derivation as far as my analysis is concerned.

85(a). qanon-e law-EZ dominant
        “a dominant law”

(b). qanon-k hakemiat darad bayad ehtram fawad law-EZ that dominance has must respect become
        “a law that has dominance must be respected”

(c). qanon-e hakem bayad ehtram fawad law-EZ dominant must respect become
        “a dominant law must be respected”

86(a). *qanon hakem law dominant
        “a dominant law”

(b). *qanon k hakemiat darad bayad ehtram fawad law that dominance has must respect become
        “a law that has dominance must be respected”

(c). *qanon-e bayad ehtram fawad law-EZ must respect become
        “a law must be respected”

Examples 85b and 85c show that an adjective and a relative clause can occur with
Ezafat and if they do not occur with Ezafat as shown in 86a and 86b, the result is
ungrammatical. Similarly, there seems to be a relationship of possession between the noun
and its relative clause as shown in 85b. Though this relationship is very abstract, it still draws
a conspicuous sense of possession especially by the occurrence of the verb “to have” in the
relative clause. Also, it worth mentioning that 85b and 85c have exactly the same underlying
meanings. 85b means that the noun law has the quality of dominance. An amalgam of
dominance and to have is expressed by the adjective dominant. Therefore, based on 85b and
85c, dominant is something or somebody that has dominance. According to such an analysis,
it should, therefore, be possible to use 87 and 88 interchangeably.
The sentence in 88b seems outdated and has the same meaning as the phrase in 87. In fact, it could be argued that 87 is the reduced version of 88b. Therefore, it could be argued that the type of relationship between the adjective and the head noun is a modified-modifier relation in a predication configuration which entails the idea of possession. The only difference between nominal modifiers and adjectival modifiers is the fact that nominal modifiers happen to be the possessor of the head noun while in case of adjectives; the head noun is the possessor of the quality (at an abstract semantic level) which is expressed by the adjective, but this does not imply that adjectives in Farsi are derived from nouns inasmuch as it was argued that Ezafat is a genitive case marker and it establishes a range of relations in addition to possession. This point is clarified in the examples below.

In 89, the nominal modifier occurring to the right of the head noun is the possessor of the head noun while in 90, the head noun is the possessor of the quality redness which is expressed by the adjective. However, there are cases where Ezafat attaches to the adjective if it is followed by another element in the phrase. This following element could be a nominal possessor or another adjectival modifier. Consider the following example.
In 91, the adjective *red* is followed by a possessor as a result of which Ezafat attaches to the adjective. Similarly, Ezafat attaches to the adjective *red* in 92 because it is followed by another adjectival modifier. According to the Ezafat insertion rule proposed in Chapter Five and repeated in the following, adjectives do not take Ezafat. However, examples 92 and 91 shows that Ezafat occurs with Ezafat.

*Ezafat Insertion Rule: Repeated*

a) Ezafat attaches to any head that bears the feature [+N] if and only if that head is followed by its complement. Hence, $XP \rightarrow X^{+[N]}EZYP$

b) Ezafat spreads its features to any phrasal modifier whose head bears the feature [+N] if and only if that phrasal modifier is followed by another element. Hence, $XP \rightarrow X^{+[N]}EZ(Y^{+[N]}P)-EZZP$

According to the rule above, adjectives in Dari do not take Ezafat since they do not occur with a complement. However, there are instances where Ezafat appears on the adjective (examples 91 and 92 above), which raises the question of how the rule can address this asymmetry. The evidence which was found in Middle Persian indicates that Ezafat did not occur between a noun and an adjective as shown in the following example from (Moinzadeh, 2003).

93. kara mada AND mard hamraz
    army median man intimate
“the median army”   “the intimate man”

94. kara hya man AND handarz i man
    army EZ  I   advice EZ  I
    “the army of mine”   “my advice”

In the two example above we notice that adjectives do not occur with Ezafat and Ezafat, in 94 is mainly used to mark possessive case. However, I am hypothesizing that as the use of an adjective between a possessor and a possessee increases and becomes common, the pronunciation of Ezafat also spreads on to the adjective as shown in 95.

95. [kara mada] hya/kara hya mada man
    [army median] EZ/ army EZ  median  I
    “my median army”

In 95, the adjective intervenes between the possessor and the possessee and this intervention results in Ezafat spreading its feature on the adjective for concord. By the passage of the time, this rule is reanalyzed and applied to all phrases in which a noun occurred with an adjective. In fact, it could be hypothesized that the Ezafat on the adjective is a reflection of the Ezafat that is attached to the head noun. This means that the Ezafat on the adjective is merely a phonological feature which is spread by the Ezafat on head noun. Ezafat attaches to the head noun and spreads its feature to any other following element in the phrase to indicate that all the right-branching modifiers are modifiers of the head noun.

Consider the following example.25

96. motar-e sorx-e amrikaʔi-ye sara
    car-EZ  red-EZ American-EZ Sara
    “Sara’s red American car”

---

25 A further revision of the Ezafat insertion rule will show how the phonological features of Ezafat are not spread on to a ‘prepositional phrase’. 

---
The example in 96 as illustrated in the diagram above shows that there is basically only one Ezafat that spreads its features throughout the phrase. Informally speaking, the phonological features of Ezafat that are spread on to modifiers of the head noun indicate that modifiers of the head noun still continue and that the noun phrase along with its modifiers should be perceived as one constituent which are dominated by the maximal projection of the head noun. It is also worth mentioning that there is no additional Ezafat that should attach to the final element of the phrase (here Sara). Three pieces of evidence for feature spreading of Ezafat come from pronominal adjectives, phrase boundaries, and the use of conjunctions. Consider the following examples.

97. ḍan [xoʃ tab wa porneʃat] ast
   John happy mood and lively is
   “John is in/has a happy and lively mood”

9818. tab-e xoʃ-e ḍan dar in rozha
       mood-EZ happy-EZ John on these days
       “John’s happy mood on these days”

99. tab-e [xoʃ wa porneʃat]-e ḍan
    mood-EZ [happy and lively]-EZ John
    “John’s happy and lively mood”

In 97, a predicative adjective precedes the head noun that does not take Ezafat, so there is no sign of Ezafat or its spread features throughout the noun phrase. The reason Ezafat does not occur in 97 is because the adjective phrase does not occur in the nominal domain and the head noun has no following element within its own local domain on which it can spread its features. In 98, an adjectival and a prepositional phrase is used to modify the noun head. Ezafat attaches to the head noun mood and spreads its features to the adjective phrase and stops spreading when the prepositional phrase starts. Ezafat does not spread its features to the prepositional phrase since the relationship between the head noun and the prepositional
phrase is not that of possession. In 99, a conjunction is used to conjoin two adjectives that modify the head noun. The phonological features of Ezafat are also pronounced on the adjective phrase as a whole rather than on individual adjectives of the adjective phrase. This explains that the Ezafat suffix in 98 does not occur with the adjective, but with the adjective phrase as a modifier of the noun. It can further be argued that Ezafat does not occur in prepositional phrases since in Farsi a genitive relationship cannot be established between a head noun and a prepositional phrase and the only possible categories to qualify for such a relationship are nouns and adjectives. Having said all of that, a further revision of the Ezafat insertion rule that also covers the feature spreading property of Ezafat is now ready.

Ezafat Insertion Rule:

c) Ezafat attaches to any head that bears the feature [+N] if and only if that head is followed by its complement. Hence, XP → X^{[+N]}EZYP

d) Ezafat spreads its features to any phrasal modifier whose head bears the feature [+N] if and only if that phrasal modifier is followed by another element within its maximal projection.

Hence, XP → X^{[+N]}EZ (Y^{[+N]}P)-EZZP

In the following the tree for the example given in 96 is drawn to illustrate the application of the rule above.
In the tree Figure 16, the head noun *motar* raises to D and gets genitive case and the genitive case marker, that is, Ezafat spreads its features throughout the phrase.

To summarize, in this chapter I discussed that Ezafat and the indefinite marker are two different elements with identical phonological features. I also discussed that Ezafat is a genitive case marker that establishes a relation of different possessive types (genitive) between the head noun and its modifiers. In addition, I proposed that there is only one Ezafat as a genitive case marker in a noun phrase and it spreads its features throughout the phrase. Finally, our rule for the insertion of Ezafat and its feature spreading property was further revised to cover the new data. It is necessary to mention that the first part of the Ezafat insertion rule rules out adjectives as an attachment site for Ezafat in the sense that adjectives in Farsi do not occur with a complement. However, the second part of the rule qualifies adjectives for receiving the phonological feature of Ezafat because they bear the feature [+N]. In the next chapter, I will discuss the underlying structure of the Farsi noun phrase and its resulting surface representations.
Chapter Six: DP-Internal Agreement and Case

Based on the discussions in the previous chapters, I am hypothesizing that Ezafat belongs to a functional category and is a genitive case marker that attaches to only nouns. According to the insertion rule that I proposed, all other phrases, namely, adjective, adverb, prepositional, and verb phrases are ruled out as attachment sites for Ezafat.

In this chapter, I will present my final analysis for the status of Ezafat along with the rules and derivations associated with it. In the first section, I will recall my rule from previous chapters and present my final remarks on the Ezafat insertion rule. In section two, I will present my analysis for the underlying structure of Farsi noun phrases along with the derivations that generate the surface forms. And finally, in section three, I will present some examples detailing technical aspects of the analysis the chapter develops.

Ezafat Insertion Rule

Ezafat is a genitive case marker that is base-generated under D and prompts the movement of the head noun. The head noun raises to D in order to be marked for genitive case, which results in noun-adjective word order since adjectives are left-branching adjuncts and when the noun raises to D, the adjective appears on the right of the noun. In addition, Ezafat is a bound morpheme which requires a noun host. In cases where Ezafat does not attach to the head noun, the adjective precedes the head noun while in most cases, the order is the other way around as a result of the occurrence of Ezafat. The only possible category

26 For instance, the noun does not attach to Ezafat if it is modified by a superlative adjective that appears on the left of the head noun. Also, some predicative adjectives modify nouns and occur to the left of the head noun. In the later case, too, Ezafat does not have presence. The examples for both of these cases were provided in the previous chapters and are repeated here.

a) ziba-tarin manzera
b) [dpJohn] [vp xob adam] [v ast]]
that can host Ezafat is the category noun, that is, Ezafat attaches to nouns only. Other
categories do not occur with Ezafat. The rule which was presented in the previous chapters is
repeated below. Note that the following rule has two parts. The first part inserts Ezafat and
the second part spreads its features throughout the noun phrase based on a number of
constraints which are specified in the rule.

_Ezafat Insertion Rule (Repeated)_

e) Ezafat attaches to any head that bears the feature [+N] if and only if that head is
followed by its complement. Hence, \( XP \rightarrow X^{+[N]}EZYP \)
f) Ezafat spreads its features to any phrasal modifier whose head bears the feature [+N]
if and only if that phrasal modifier is followed by another element.
Hence, \( XP \rightarrow X^{+[N]}EZ(Y^{+[N]}P)\)-EZ ZP

The Rule above triggers the [+N] feature as a constraint on hosting Ezafat. According
to this constraint, verb phrases, adverb phrases, and prepositional phrases are ruled out in the
first place since the head of none of these phrases bear the feature [+N]. Secondly, the rule
requires the Ezafat-hosting head to be immediately followed by its complement, which rules
out adjective phrases as well.\(^{27}\) Note that a constraint of the rule is that [+N] bearing head
must be followed by its complement, and not its adjunct or any other phrase. So the only
possible category that remains is the noun phrase. The head noun takes a DP possessor as its
complement and in order to get marked for genitive case, raises to D. The resulting word
order would be the head noun first, adjectival modifiers second, and possessors third (as
illustrated later in example 100). Due to the fact that the complement of the head noun gets
separated from it as a result of movement, Ezafat spreads its feature onto the following

\(^{27}\) The phrase ‘proud of his son’ in Farsi is ungrammatical. Instead, Farsi speakers say ‘I have pride for my son’.
modifiers that precede the complement. One reason for why Ezafat spreads its features onto the following modifiers is concord. In many languages, determiners and adjectives agree with the head noun in person, number, gender, and case. The second part of the rule above poses two constraints on the feature spreading of Ezafat. The first constraint is that the feature of Ezafat can be spread to any category that has the [+]N feature, and secondly, that category must be followed by another element within that maximal projection only.

In the following section, a chart is provided to illustrate how a surface structure is derived from its underlying representation after the above-mentioned rule is applied.

**Underlying vs. Surface Representations**

The underlying rule for noun phrases in Farsi suggests that adjective phrases and adverb phrases are left-branching while prepositional phrases occur on the right of the noun head as shown in the following.

\[
\text{NP} \rightarrow (\text{AdjP}) \ N \ (\text{DP}\text{POSS}) \ (\text{PP})
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underlying Representation</th>
<th>(AdjP) N (DPPOSS) (PP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Movement (Ezafat Insertion)</td>
<td>( XP \rightarrow X^{[+N]}EZ YP )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Feature-spreading</td>
<td>( XP \rightarrow X^{[+N]}EZ(Y^{[+N]}P)-EZ ZP )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart above illustrates how Ezafat is inserted and how its features get spread throughout the noun phrase. First, the head noun moves to D to take Ezafat and after it takes Ezafat, Ezafat spreads its features on the other intervening modifiers. Accordingly to the rule above, the only possible category that can intervene between a head noun and its complement is the adjective phrase. In the following examples, trees are provided to illustrate the movement of the noun.
Examples and Trees

100. $[\text{DP}_{\text{NP} \text{maqala-ye}} \ [\text{AdjP} \text{dʒəleb-e}] \ [\text{DP}_{\text{Arash}}]]$
   essay-EZ interesting-EZ Arash
   “Arash’s interesting essay”

![Figure 17. Head to D](image)

101. $[\text{DP}_{\text{NP} \text{maqala-ye}} \ [\text{AdjP} \text{dʒəleb-e}] \ [\text{DP}_{\text{NP} \text{ʃaɡerd-e}} \ [\text{DP}_{\text{Arash}}]])$
   essay-EZ interesting-EZ student-EZ Arash
   “the interesting essay of Arash’s student”

![Figure 18. Head to D – Multiple Possessors](image)

In 100, the possessor DP *Arash* becomes the complement of the head noun *maqala*
which is modified by a right-branching adjective. The noun moves to D in order to be
marked for possessive case. Similarly, in 101, there are two possessors occurring within the larger DP, and each DP has its own internal movement. In 102 given in the following, one aspect of the head noun turns out to be contradicting with our Ezafat insertion rule. However, this contradiction can be explained by a slight adjustment of the rule. Consider the following example.

102. \[
\text{NP} \quad \text{mood-EZ} \quad \text{happy}
\]

“happy mood”

\[
\text{figure 19. rule adjustment}
\]

In the example above, our rule’s constraint that a head must be immediately followed by its complement blocks the movement of the noun since the noun, according to the rule, does not qualify for taking Ezafat. However, I am arguing that the relationship between the head noun and its adjectival modifier is possessive. When Ezafat precedes an adjective, it establishes a relationship that the head noun is the possessor of the quality which is expressed by the adjective. This point is further supported by a piece of evidence within the same example where the adjective occurs on the left of the head noun if the head noun does not take Ezafat. Both examples 103 and 104 are perfectly grammatical in Farsi.

104. \[
\text{NP} \quad \text{xoj} \quad \text{tab}
\]

“a happy mood”
In 104, the adjective *happy* occurs on the left of the head noun which does not occur with Ezafat. Ezafat does attach to adjective since it cannot be the possessor of the noun and since it does not qualify for taking Ezafat according to the rule. Therefore, a further revision of the Ezafat insertion rule is required so it can account for the cases explained in 103. The following is the final revision of our rule.

**Ezafat Insertion Rule (Complete)**

a) Ezafat attaches to a head noun or any head that bears the feature [+N] if and only if that head is either preceded by its adjunct or followed by its complement.

Hence, \( XP \rightarrow (\text{AdjP}) \ X^{[+N]} \text{EZ} \ (YP) \)

b) Ezafat spreads its features to any phrasal modifier whose head bears the feature [+N] if and only if that phrasal modifier is followed by another element.

Hence, \( XP \rightarrow X^{[+N]} \text{EZ} \ (Y^{[+N]} P) - \text{EZ} \ ZP \)

The revision of the rule above subsumes the category noun as the only category that occurs with Ezafat by ruling out the other categories through its constraints. In addition, it predicts that the only possible adjunct that precedes the head noun is the adjective phrase.

To summarize, I presented a consolidated account of my hypothesis in which I argued that Ezafat belongs to a functional category that marks genitive case on nouns. In addition, I discussed the underlying and surface representation of the structure of noun phrases in Farsi and finally suggested a final revision to the Ezafat insertion rule. Theoretically speaking, the Ezafat insertion rule provides a unified theory for the status of Ezafat, however, some important aspects of Ezafat that are supported by empirical evidence will be discussed at a level that mediates between syntax and semantics in the following chapter.
Chapter Seven: The Syntax-Semantics Interface

It has been proposed that Ezafat has historically evolved from an underlying relative clause, (Palmer, 1971) cited by (Samiian, 1994). The relative clause which underlies the Ezafat suffix always appears to occur with either of the verbs to have or to be. By and large, the head nouns that are modified by a DP possessor are usually associated with the verb to have in the underlying relative clause and the heads that are modified by an adjective are associated with the verb to be. Consider the following examples.

105. kolah-e Sulaiman hat-EZ Sulaiman “Sulaiman’s hat” = kolah-e k Sulaiman darad hat-EZ that Sulaiman has “The hat that Sulaiman has”

106. kolah-e garm hat-EZ warm “a warm hat” = kolah-e k garm ast hat-EZ that warm is “a hat which is warm”

Notice that in both of the examples above, the modifier of the head noun is replaced by a CP relative clause. The first CP is associated with the verb to have and the second CP which replaces an adjective is associated with the verb to be. In old Farsi, the Ezafat suffix, having derived from the relative pronoun hya, was used at the beginning of each of these clauses as a clause marker. However, I am hypothesizing that Ezafat is only associated with the verb to have since every context in which Ezafat occurs is an instance of possession. And because Ezafat expresses a wide range of possessive types, I decided to treat it as a genitive case marker. It is important to note that the order of the possessor and the possessed noun is different depending on whether the head noun is the possessor or the possessed entity. When the head noun is modified by a noun phrase complement, it is the possessed entity, and when the head noun is modified by an adjectival adjunct, it is the possessor of the quality which is described by the adjective. So, in the Example 106 above, a warm hat is a hat that has
warmth. The relationship between hat and warmth is possessive. This relationship is rather clearer in the following example.

107(a). [IP[DPsardi-ye zemestan] [VPtaqatfarsa bod]]
   coldness-EZ winter intolerable was
   “the coldness of the winter was intolerable”

(b). [IP[DPzemestan-e sard] [VPtaqatfarsa bod]]
   winter-EZ cold intolerable was
   “the cold winter was intolerable”

The two NPs in 107a and 107b have potentially the same meanings. In the first noun phrase in 107a, the DP winter is the possessor of the head noun coldness while the same DP is the possessor of the quality coldness which is expressed by an adjective as shown in 107b.

Now, if we argue that coldness is a quality which is possessed by the head noun winter, then the meaning of 107b would be the winter that had coldness. Here we have three concepts, that is, winter, coldness, and cold. If we assign a variable for each of these concepts, we would have an equation that would show that 107a and 107b both have the same relation of possession. Consider the following equation.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Winter} &= X = \text{possessor} & Y - \text{EZ} + X &= X - \text{EZ} + Z \\
\text{Coldness} &= Y = \text{possessed} & Y^{[+Q]} &= Z^{[+Q]} \\
\text{Cold} &= Z = \text{possessed quality} & X & \text{has } Y/Z \\
\text{Quality of being cold} &= Q & X & \text{has } Q
\end{align*}
\]

According to the equation above, X possesses the same concept which is expressed by a noun and an adjective. It can, therefore, be concluded that Ezafat mainly establishes a possessive relationship between two entities, that is, the head noun and an adjunct or complement. In addition, it can be generalized that a complement is the possessor and the adjunct is the “possessee” of the head noun. This generalization is further clarified in the following example.
The semantic logic of the DP in 108 is that a happy man is a man who has happiness, and happiness is the only potential quality that a happy man has. The adjective happy is a possessed quality as an adjunct and the noun happiness is a possessed quality as a complement.

Another important aspect of Ezafat is the fact that it expresses different types of possessive. When compared to English, Ezafat carries out the functions of both 's and the of-genitive. There are a number of possessive relationships that are expressed through Ezafat.

The following examples describe each type of possession.

109. dastha-ye behzad
   hands-EZ Behzad
   “Behzad’s hands”

110. tfawki-ye behzad
    chair-EZ Behzad
    “Behzad’s chair”

111. dana-ye berendʒ
    grain-EZ rice
    “a grain of rice”

In 110, the type of possession established by Ezafat is an inalienable possession while in 6, it is an alienable possession. Similarly, in 111 Ezafat expresses a type of possession that when translated into English, it turns out to be an of-genitive.

Another issue worth of discussion is the behavior of prepositions of type 2. Earlier in this paper, I argued that P2s are, in fact, nouns, that is they are lexical items rather than functional elements. Semantically speaking, the meaning of P2s is similar to the meaning of a preposition, especially when they get translated into English, but the features of P2s are all
nominal. Most importantly, P2s have semantic content when compared to functional
categories that do not contain any semantic content. In addition, the meaning of a P2 is not
dependent on the meaning of its complement and it can be described by means of other
words. Consider the following examples.

112. ro-ye mez
    on-EZ table
    “on the table”

113. atraf-e park
    around-EZ park
    “around the park”

114. nazdik-e frošgah
    near-EZ store
    “near the store”

All the prepositions in 112-114 are, in fact, nouns. The P2 on in 112 means the top
surface of anything which is flat. The P2 around in 113 means the periphery, and the P2 near
in 114 means proximity. Notice that all these P2s can be described by means of other
synonyms while true prepositions do not have the same possibility. Therefore, for the
purpose of my analysis, I will treat P2s as nouns, and it is only the category noun that can
take Ezafat by rule and based on the logic of the meaning of Ezafat itself. Ezafat is simply a
genitive marker and its occurrence can be determined by the syntactic structure.

In conclusion, the meaning of Ezafat is dependent on a modifier or complement that
modifies the head noun. And the relationship which is established by Ezafat between a head
noun and its complement of modifier is genitive. When a noun is followed by its
complement, Ezafat indicates that the head noun is possessed, and when the head noun is
modified by an adjectival adjunct, Ezafat indicates that the head noun is the possessor of the
quality or state which is expressed by the adjective.
Summary

In the first chapter of this thesis, I introduced the data and the areas in which Ezafat is explored, and a number of questions were asked that were later covered throughout the paper. In Chapter Two, I discussed the status of Ezafat in syntax and proposed that Ezafat is a morphological element that is available to syntax. In addition, I hypothesized that Ezafat is not a phonological element that occurs for merely phonological reasons. In Chapter Three, I discussed the categorial status of Ezafat and concluded that Ezafat belongs to a functional category that is base-generated under D and that causes the head noun to move to D. In Chapter Four, I presented my analysis for why Ezafat does not occur in adverb phrases and adopted Ghomeshi’s proposal that the trigger for the insertion of Ezafat is the feature [+N] which rules out verb phrases, adverb phrases, and prepositional phrases. In Chapter Five, I discussed two classes of prepositions developed by (Samiian, 1994) and a third class which was added by (Ghomeshi, 1997). I concluded that prepositions of type 2 and 3 are basically nouns and their meanings are similar to prepositions.

The essence of my analysis of Ezafat was presented in Chapters Six and Seven in which I suggested three important proposals. First, Ezafat is a genitive case marker that attaches to nouns. Secondly, Ezafat does not occur with categories of adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, and verbs. Third, Ezafat spreads its features to the categories that bear the feature [+N] throughout the noun phrase. In addition, I proposed a rule for the insertion of Ezafat that had two parts the first of which inserted Ezafat and the second one spread the features of Ezafat. The rule has two important constraints. First, Ezafat attaches to any head that bears the feature [+N], and secondly, that head must be either preceded by an adjunct or
followed by its complement. Many revisions were made to the rule and its final version is presented in the following.

_Ezafat Insertion Rule (Complete)_

a) Ezafat attaches to a head noun or any head that bears the feature [+N] if and only if that head is either preceded by its adjunct or followed by its complement.

Hence, \( XP \rightarrow (\text{AdjP}) \ X^{[+N]}E_{Z} \ (YP) \)

b) Ezafat spreads its features to any phrasal modifier whose head bears the feature [+N] if and only if that phrasal modifier is followed by another element.

Hence, \( XP \rightarrow X^{[+N]}E_{Z} \ (Y^{[+N]}P)-E_{Z} \ ZP \)

Finally, in Chapter Seven, I discussed the relationship of a noun with adjectives and concluded that head nouns in Farsi are the possessor of the state or quality which is expressed by the adjective and this relationship is establish by the occurrence of Ezafat on nouns. Additionally, I discussed the meaning of prepositions of type 2 and proposed that P2s are lexical items that have independent semantic content.
References


Pantcheva, Marina. 2007. *Everything I don’t know about Ezafe*. University of Troms


