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### Abbreviations and Symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj</td>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdvP</td>
<td>Adverb Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgrO</td>
<td>Agreement for Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgrP</td>
<td>Agreement Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgrS</td>
<td>Agreement for Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMCM</td>
<td>Affirmative Main Clause Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Adjective Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asp</td>
<td>Aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AspP</td>
<td>Aspect Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Complementiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card. Num</td>
<td>Cardinal Numeral/Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caus</td>
<td>Causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conj</td>
<td>Conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Const</td>
<td>Construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Complementizer Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CST</td>
<td>Construct State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat</td>
<td>Dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Dative Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>Definiteness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deg</td>
<td>Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem</td>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Determiner Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP</td>
<td>Extended Projection Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FocP</td>
<td>Focus Phrase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GC  Genitive Construction
GEN  Genitive
GMS  Gurage Mā sqan Soddo
Imperf  Imperfect
LF  Logical Form
M  Masculine
Mod  Modifier
Nom  Nominative
NP  Noun Phrase
Num  Number/Numeral
NumP  Number Phrase
Ord.  Ordinal
PF  Phonetic Form
PL  Plural
PPT  Principles and Parameters Theory
Prep  Preposition
Pro  Pronoun
Poss.  Possessive
Poss. Adj  Possessive Adjective
PS  Passive
Q  Quantifier
QP  Quantifier Phrase
Refl  Reflexive
SG  Singular
Spec  Specifier
T  Tense
ToP  Topic Phrase
TP  Tense Phrase
UG  Universal Grammar
VP  Verb Phrase
Abstract
This study is devoted to structures of determiner phrase in Ge’ez in the light of the Minimalist Program. It focuses on descriptions of words, phrases, sentences and their syntactic projections. DP in Ge’ez is formed by merging a determiner (as head) and a complement (NP). The function of each morpheme in the description is given. Construct state, dative and genitive constructions show possession relation between possesees and possessors. They use different possession markers. For example, -ā and lā- go with construct state and dative respectively, whereas zā-, ʔillā-, ʔintā- go with possesees and possessors in genitive constructions. Specifiers can be subjects, articles, pronouns and demonstratives.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1.1. Background

1.1.1. The Ge’ez Language

Ge’ez is one of the Northern Ethio-Semitic languages. It has a close relationship with modern Tigre spoken in the northern highlands and Red Sea coastal area. Ge’ez also stands in a more or less proximate ancestral relationship with Tigrinya, which is the current official language of the Regional State of Tigray in the northern part of Ethiopia (Gragg 1997:169). Historically, it is assumed that the Aksumite Empire in Northern Ethiopia, the present region of Tigre was the area where Ge’ez was originally spoken. It is brought to Ethiopia as a descendant of South Semitic language by south Arabian immigrants during the first Millennium B.C (Weninger 1993). Ge’ez was used as the only official written language of the church and the state for the Aksumite kingdom when the Northern Ethiopian province of Tigre and the large parts of the present day highland Eritrea became under its control during much of the first millennium A.D (Gragg 1997).

Later, Ge’ez gradually became the standard, religious medium when Amharic became the predominant spoken vernacular after its wider expansion into the boundaries of the province of Amhara in the 16th c (Herbert 1949).

Although Ge’ez ceased to be spoken sometimes between 10th to 12th centuries (Leslau 1958, Weninger 1993) or before (Gragg 1997), it is still used as a liturgical language in the realm of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church (Gragg 1997, Pankhurst 1976: 305-309).

1.1.2. Previous Studies on Ge’ez

In previous times, European researchers did research works on Ethiopic or Ge’ez, more particularly Germans. They studied the language with a traditional approach using philological approach or method other than linguistic approach. Weninger (1993) attempted to study the phonology (vowels, consonants), morphology (root, stem) and syntax (i.e. NP in genitive construction, clause structure, verbal and nominal clauses) of Ge’ez. Cases such as nominative, accusative and genitive and states like construct and free state, or absolute state
are also stated by Weninger (1993). In addition, Dillman (1907) stated the grammatical or structural concepts of Ethiopic (Ge’ez). Lambdin (1978) studied construct state, gender, number, pronoun, adjective and article.

1.1.3. Classification of Ethio-Semitic

North Ethio-Semitic (NES) and South Ethio-Semitic (SES) are the two groups of Ethio-Semitic languages (Hudson 2002). There are two sub-families of South Ethio-Semitic languages. These are Transversal South Ethiopic and Outer South Ethiopic. These two sub-families are divided into other mini-sub-groups. That means, Transversal is divided into Central and Southern. The Outer South Ethiopic has two mini-sub-families. These are n-group and tt-group\(^1\) (Hetzron 1972) or GMS- group and Western Gurage Girma (2001). The following family tree shows the modified and generalized classification of Ethio-Semitic languages by Girma (2009).

\(^1\) n- and tt- signify main clause markers of North and Western Gurage languages.
1.2. Statement of the Problem

Different linguistic research works are done by foreign and Ethiopian researchers on the phonological, morphological, syntactic and other aspects of North and South Ethio- Semitic languages. However, the syntactic procedures used in these research works are traditional. They have not been studied in the light of recent development in syntactic theory.

It is assumed that detailed phonological, morphological and syntactic studies have not yet been conducted on Ge’ez. However, there are more studies on its phonology as well as its morphology than on its syntax. Foreign researchers have done research on Ge’ez. Some of these For example, Dillmann (1907) on Ethiopic Grammar, Lambdin (1978) introduction to classical Ethiopic, Weninger (1993,2007) Classical Ethiopic and Sounds of Ge’ez for Sixteenth International Conference of Ethiopian Studies, Trondheim, Gragg (1997) Ge’ez (Classical Ethiopic) and Bulakh (2009) Nota-genitive zä-in Epigraphic Ge’ez.

However, there has been no work on the internal structures of DP. The present research is an attempt towards this in the light of recent developments in syntactic theory such as Minimalist Program of Chomsky (1995).

1.3. Objectives of the Study

1.3.1 General objective

The general objective of this study is to describe the structures of DP in Ge’ez. Its emphasis is on the projections of different nominal functional categories such as determiners, articles and possessive pronouns.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

The thesis has the following specific objectives:

1. Showing the minimal, intermediate and maximal projections of the determiner phrase

2. Identifying the categories serving as complements of D

3. Showing the syntactic operations such as movement within DP

4. Showing features of heads and non-heads in the DP projections

5. Showing feature checking operations
1.4. Significance of the Study
The study will have the following significances to contribute:
It can be used as a source material for future studies on the Ge’ez language.
It can be used in the preparation of teaching materials
It may contribute to Typological research as regards the syntax of determiners and other functional categories.

1.5. Delimitation/Scope of the Study
This study is limited to only structures of DP in Ge’ez in which syntactic and inflectional issues are considered.

1.6. Limitation of the Study
The problem that the researcher has constrained, or faced doing this thesis as follows:
Ge’ez has no native speakers: The data in this study come from the researcher’s knowledge of the language as a second language. And the data also come from others who have studied the language and teach it in Schools and Universities.

1.7. Methodology
The researcher used both introspective and informant methods. However, he focused more on the introspective method because of his familiarity with the language. He has also used the informant method to gather data about roots, affixes, morphemes, words, phrases, clauses and sentences by interviewing people who are very familiar with the language. Published Journals, articles on Ethiopic, Ethio-Semitic languages and books on minimalist syntax for example, Chomsky (1995), Adger (2003), Radford (2009) have been used as secondary sources.
CHAPTER TWO
Theoretical Considerations

This study uses the Minimalist Program of Government and Binding (GB) Theory of Chomsky (1982), the Linear Constraint Axiom (LCA) of Kayne (1994), Chomsky (1995), Radford (2009) and Adger (2003) as a general framework for the analysis of the structure of determiner phrases in Ge’ez. The basic assumptions of the theoretical principles are stated in this chapter.

2.1. The Minimalist Program

The Minimalist Program grew out of the efforts of researchers in the principles and parameters framework. The earlier theories in the principles and parameters framework, such as Government and Binding Theory presented by Chomsky (1981, 1982, 1986a and 1986b) include a rich set of principles from which it is possible to deduce the grammaticality of an utterance.

The Minimalist Program deals with the link between sound and meaning. In his earlier work, Chomsky proposes that the language faculty involves a computational system that feeds into the two components of the mind dealing with sound and meaning. In the Minimalist Program, there are two distinct interface levels; namely, Phonetic Form (PF) and Logical Form (LF) or articulatory-phonetic interface and conceptual-interpretative interface. The LF refers to the linguistic aspect of meaning, whereas the PF refers to the sound aspect. According to Radford (2009), the goal of Minimalism is to reduce theoretical apparatus to the minimum which is conceptually necessary.

2.2. Government and Binding Theory

Government and Binding Theory is a theory of syntax proposed by Chomsky (1981, 1982) and refers to a specific approach to linguistic theory. It is a following of the Extended Standard Theory (EST) in transformational grammar. Government and Binding Theory differs from previous approach because it focuses on a set of theories and principles rather than rules that govern levels of representation and derivation of linguistic facts such as clauses, for example.
2.3. Principles and Parameters Theory

Principles and Parameters Theory (PPT) is outlined and developed by Chomsky at the beginning of the 1980s. In the language acquisition process, a child faces to construct the grammar of the language. Universal grammatical principles and parameters are incorporated in the Innate Language Faculty. A child’s syntactic learning task is limited to determining an appropriate setting for each of the relevant grammatical parameters (i.e. parameter-setting). The proposition of Principles and Parameters Theory (PPT) plays a significant role in the nature of the language acquisition process. For example, it minimizes the complexity of the acquisition task which children face Radford (2009). The hypothesis PPT assumes that grammatical properties are universal and will not have to be learned by the child because they are wired into the language faculty and hence part of the child’s genetic endowment.

Universal Grammar (UG) can be defined as the set of principles that are common to all languages as well as the initial state of language knowledge for human beings, (Fokkens 2010 and Chomsky 1982). Principles may include parameters, which represent settings that may vary from language to language.

Generally, the basic ideas of Principles and Parameters are the following:

- Language consists of universal principles and language specific- parameters: a child would only need to learn the parameters of the language

2.4 Case Theory

Case Theory is first proposed by Chomsky (1981, 1982). In the defining works of GB, it attempts to solve the puzzling distribution of lexical (phonologically overt) NP’s such as subjects of infinitival clauses in English. The theory assumes that every phonetically realized NP phoned has case.

2.5. Linear Constraint Axiom (LCA)

Asymmetric c-command, the image under dominance of an ordered pair of non-terminal nodes and linear ordering are the different concepts of Linear Constraint Axiom proposed by Kayne (1994) Specifier-Head-Complement is considered as the basic word order in the theory
of LCA. Kayne’s definition of c-command is different from that of Chomsky’s which is shown in (1).

(1) **C-command**

C-Command is a particularly important syntactic relation. It is a conventional abbreviation of constituent-command. The determining relative position of two different constituents within the same tree is provided by C-Command.

   a. x c-commands Y if x does not dominate Y and every Z that dominate X dominates Y Chomsky (1986). That is, a constituent X c commands its sister constituent Y and any other constituent Z which is contained within Y Radford (2009). The structural relation of the constituents is visually represented by the following tree diagram.

```
(2)
A
  /\  
 B  E
 /\   /
C D  F
 /\   /
 H  G
 \
 J
```

A is the mother of B and E. If so, B and E are the two daughters of A. B is the mother of C and D; E is the mother of F and G; and G is the mother of H and J. C, D, F, H and J are terminal nodes since they take the position of lexical and functional constituents or elements, whereas A, B, E and G take the positions of either lexical phrase or functional phrase.

In the light of the definition of C-Command, A does not c-command any of the other nodes because it has no sister. However, B c-commands E, F, G, H and J since its sister is E. E contains F, G, H and J. C c-commands only D.

   b. X c-commands Y if X and Y are categories and X excludes Y and every category that dominates X dominates Y Kayne (1993).

(3) **Asymmetric C-Command**
X asymmetrically c-commands Y if X c-commands Y and Y does not c-command X (Kayne 1993:2).

The X- bar structure of LCA is diagrammatically shown in Kayne (1994) as follows:

\[ \text{(4)} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{XP} \\
\text{YP} \\
\text{Y} \\
\text{X} \\
\text{ZP} \\
\text{Z} \\
\end{array} \]

2.6. Full Interpretation

Every feature must be mappable to an interpretation at the interface levels. Phonetic Form (PF) and Lexical Form (LF) are the two levels of interface. The PF is associated with the articulatory and perceptual system whereas; LF is with the intentional conceptual system. Minimalists assume that derivation is the property of the Computational Human Language (CHL). Thus, the analysis considers interpretability as the property of mapping a syntactic feature onto PF or LF representation, Chomsky (1995). Mapping is determined by the information provided by the lexicon. Not all features are interpretable. However, categorical features of nouns and verbs are always interpretable at the PF and LF interface levels. Functional features are not necessarily PF interpretable. That means, there is no necessity to spell-out these features.

2.7. Economy Condition and Checking Operation

In the Minimalist Approach, Economy Condition assumes that syntactic structures should contain as few words as possible and syntactic operations should affect as few words as possible. In Economy Condition, derivations and representations…are required to be minimal, with no superfluous steps in derivations and no superfluous symbols in representations (Chomsky 1989:69). The idea of economy condition in Minimalism states that the distance between two or more agreeing components should be as short as possible Radford (1997).
Chomsky (2005) stated that in the lexical entries, inflectional features of the lexicon are inserted with their features such as, case, agreement, tense, etc. as an intrinsic property and must be checked at LF by the features of the inflectional heads.

Therefore, a derivation containing unchecked features will clash at LF (Ibid). Merge and Move are the most pivotal ways to achieve the Phonetic Form (PF) realization or representation of inflectional features. However, the lexicon prefers Merge to Move as an economical option. There is a proposed discussion by Chomsky (1995) about feature checking. Namely, feature checking is regarded as a property of the computational operation in which movement is a last resort operation. In the last resort condition, movement is licensed under the following conditions.

Any movement X can target K only if

a. a feature of X is checked by the operation
b. a feature of either X or K is checked by the operation
c. the operation is a necessary step toward some later operations in which a feature of x will be checked.

2.8. Merge and Move Operations

The main components of grammar include the structural-building operations of Merge and Move, feature checking through movement to functional categories, the interfaces and economies of derivation and representation in the Minimalist Program. Schematically, the structure-building operations Merge and Move are illustrated one after the other Chomsky (2003). Merge and Move are highly closed to each other in the Minimalist Program. Both are the simplest ways of forming a phrase, either a lexical or functional, or both of them. Merge is a technical term meaning ‘combining’ two words or phrases, whereas move is the raising of the combined constituents or elements Radford (2009).
P and Q may be lexical items or complex phrases, and Merge combines them to create a new structure R. The operation Move takes a substructure Q of P and creates a new phrase R which has P and a copy of Q as immediate substructures, again requiring the labels P,Q and R be consistent with X’-Theory, as seen below next.

The only difference between the Merge and Move operations is that the definition of Merge requires that P and Q be separate structures - which P does not contain Q and Q does not contain P - while the definition of Move requires either P contains Q or that Q contains P. From this, it is clearly understood that the definitions of Merge and Move are complementary. Both Merge and Move are the artificially-divided halves of a single structure-building operation. Both Adger (2003) and Radford (2009) stipulate that the output of Merge is a binary branching tree. Binarity is treated as a distinct principle by Radford in the Binarity Principle and as a working hypothesis by Adger. Merge is more economical than Move and it happens before Move to make Minimal, intermediate and maximal projections. Thus, Merge is preferred over Move.
2.9. Movement

Movement is the raising of the combined constituents (lexical or functional) from a position of the minimal structural projection to an intermediate and then to the maximal projection at the higher level. Movement is cyclic and it is from right-to-left. It can be head-to-head and spec-to-spec movement. In the Principle of Economy, movement begins from the lexical domains and goes to functional domains step by step. For example, VP-to-AspP-to-TP-to-CP-to VP-to-TP via merging. In structures of relative clause or complementizer phrase (CP), DP can move to CP. In passivization structures, DP can move to ʊP-to- CP - to -TP. This is stated in the analysis part of Chapter Four. Substitution and adjunction are the two options available in the movement of the shortest distance in any operations of (X ') and phrasal projections (XP) Chomsky (1995). He makes distinction between adjunction and substitution.

Adjunction forms two constitutions, whereas substitution forms a new category. Therefore, adjuncts are in ‘A’- position but substitution is in a specifier position is in the specifier of a position. In Greed Principle, Chomsky (1995) states that movement can only benefit the moved element but might not benefit a category outside the movement chain. At the interface level, case and agreement features such as person, number and gender should be checked to be spelled-out as expressions. Morphological features are required by case filter so as to be checked somewhere for convergence. Merge and move serve to check uninterpretation features. However, movement is either substitution or adjunction.

2.9.1. Head movement as General

A merger operation serves to derive a range of syntactic structures. Head movement is existed when the derivation of structures involves in merger and a specific type of movement Radford (2009). Movement can be from T-to-C and from V-to-T. Let us look at the movement in the following tree diagrams.
Both operations involve movement of a word from the head position in one phrase into the head position in a higher phrase. Therefore, in (7) the auxiliary moves from the head T position of TP to the head C position of CP; and in (8) the verb “care” moves from the head V position of VP to the head T position of TP as coping and deletion.
2.9.2. Head Movement in Nominals

Brief discussion is made at head-movement in nominals more particularly, at N-movement. This indicates that the movement of a noun out of the head N position of NP into a higher head position within the nominal expression containing it. Consider the syntax of the English nominal and its counterpart from (Cinque 1994, p.86).

(9)  
  a) The Italian invasion of Albania  
  b) I’ invasion italiana dell Albania  
  c) The invasion of the Albania

If the adjective Italian is the specifier of the noun invasion, (9a) will have the specified structure:

```
DP  
  |   |  
  D  |   | NP  
  The Adj N PP  
  Italian invasion of Albania
```

The N-bar (intermediate nominal projection) “invasion of Albania” is formed when the noun invasion merges with its PP complement of “Albania”, and this in turn merges with the adjectival specifier “Italian” to form the NP (maximal nominal projection) “Italian invasion of Albania.” The resulting NP is then merged with the determiner “the” to form the DP, “the Italian invasion of Albania.” The adjective “Italian” can be thought as being (in an informal sense) the ‘subject’ of “invasion,” since it identifies the people who are doing the invading—and if subjects are typically specifiers, it is appropriate to analyze the kind of adjective found in (9) as the specifier of the N “invasion,” of the N-bar “invasion of Albania” and of the NP “Italian invasion of Albania.”

2.9.3. Head Movement Constraint/ HMC

Travis’s Head Movement Constraint requires head-to-head movement to be strictly cyclical without any leaps over intermediate heads. This allows to read syntactic structures of
morphological structures. Head movement is only possible between a given head and the head of its complement Radford (2009).

Head Movement Constraint assumes that an X′ may only move to a Y′ which properly governs it Travis (1984). It is usually assumed that the Head Movement Constraint and the Mirror Principle of Baker (1985) follow from the Empty Category Principle, but Johnson (1992) and Rohrabacher (1993) show that this is not the case. A head can skip over another head and still governs its trace, provided that the intervening head has adjoined to the target of long head movement.

2.10. Features in Minimalist Program

There is no widely-adopted and even short formalization feature theory although it is not the central role in Minimalist Program. Very much explicit discussion is not given to what features are and how they work Adger (2003) and Radford (2004). Minimalists do not say very much about interpretable features except that ‘they play a role in semantic interpretation.’

2.11. Feature Checking /Valuation: Agreement and Case Assignment

Feature-Checking is the core operation of the Minimalist Program through movement to a checking domain, Adger (2003) and Radford (2009). Certain kinds of features must be Checked/that is, licensed by being in a certain structural configuration with a head which is lexically allowed to check that feature by virtue of its features. According to Adger (2003), uninterpretable features must be checked and once checked, they can be deleted. In the ‘Split-Infl’ system of Polloc (1989), case is checked by V or T whereas, agreement by Agr and wh by C. Agreement is matching with features. It is deeply interrelated with tense serving as a source. Agreement features, like person, gender, number, definiteness are inherent semantic features of nouns or pronouns. The agreement features are covert. They are not inherent features of verbs. However, the features come for verbs by agreement, not as inherent feature. These features are interpretable, valued, non-deleted and written in bold.

Agreement involves two feature-valuations when a probe (like T) agrees with one or active goals in its local domain.
(a) The unvalued (person, number) \( \Phi \) features on the probe will be valued or assigned a value which is a copy of that on the goal/s.

(b) The unvalued case features on the goal/s will be valued or assigned a value depending on the nature of the probe. For example, nominative case is checked if the probe is a finite T, null case if the probe is a null T with nonfinite tense, accusative if the probe is transitive.

Case is one parameter to check features. It is systematically related to agreement. Both case and agreement work in a sentence. Case features do not have semantic interpretation. Such case features as nominative, accusative and genitive are uninterpretable and unvalued features of noun expressions or pronouns. They are written in italics rather than in bold and checked as well as deleted.

Chomsky (1998) argues that the difference between valued and unvalued grammatical features correlate with a related distinction between those grammatical features which are interpretable and uninterpretable. A feature is semantically interpretable if it has semantic content or plays a role in semantic interpretation, whereas uninterpretable feature has no role in semantic interpretation. A T-constituent has interpretable features (like tense, aspect and mood) and uninterpretable features like person and number. Person, number and gender are interpretable features of noun expression or pronoun, whereas case is uninterpretable feature. Look at the interpretable (valued) features shown in bold and uninterpretable or unvalued features in italics in the following diagram below.
From this diagram, THEY enters the derivation carrying the features [3-pers, pl-Num, u-case], where, pers = person, pl = plural, Num = number, and u = unvalued. The pronoun THEY is the thematic component of the passive verb arrested and so it merges with it to form the VP arrested THEY. This VP is in turn merged with the tense auxiliary BE to form the higher structure. The finite T-constituents like the auxiliary BE enter the derivation with their tense feature already valued. However, their person and number φ-features as yet unvalued because they will be valued via agreement with the appropriate goal. That means, BE enters the derivation with the features [past-Tns, u-pers, u-Num].

The following structure shows the underlined features which have been valued via agreement.
Since all of the features carried by BE are now valued, BE can ultimately be spelled out in the phonology as the third person plural past tense form “were.” Likewise, since all of the features carried by THEY are also valued at this point, THEY can ultimately be spelled out as the third person plural nominative form “they.”

2.12. Feature Deletion
In the Completeness Condition of Radford(2009), an interpretable case or agreement feature on a constituent A is deleted when A agrees (in respect of one or more Ф features) with a Ф complete constituent B which carries a complete set of person and number Ф features.

An uninterpretable EPP feature on a probe is deleted by movement of the closest active goal of the relevant type to become the specifier of the probe (EPP Condition). Once deleted, a feature becomes invisible in the syntactic and semantic components (and hence inactive in the syntax) while remaining visible in the PF component (Invisibility Condition). Let’s look at feature deletion in the following tree diagram.

(12)

```
TP
  /
PRN they
  /
T [3-pers] were
   /
[Pl-Num] [Past-Tns]

VP
  /
V [3-pers] they
   /
[Pl-Num]
    /
[EPP]
```

2.13. Determiners as Head of NP in Structure of DP
Determiner phrase is one of the functional or non-lexical phrases, among CP, TP, AgrP, FocP, Top, QP, etc. A determiner phrase uses articles and demonstratives as head together with a nominal complement. Baye (2004) stated that a determiner phrase or DP includes
articles, pronouns, demonstratives, interrogatives, quantifiers for the expressions of the extended projection of the noun in Ethiopian Semitic. In addition to these, DP constitutes possessive determiners or adjectives as well as nouns with the possession markers.

In works before the mid-1980s, a structure like ‘the king of Utopia’ would have been analyzed as a noun phrase (NP), comprising the head noun “king,” and its complement “of Utopia.” However, Abney (1987) showed that such kind of phrasal expressions have the status of a determiner phrase (DP).

He stated that DP has a determiner as head and uses NP as its complement. Others like Danon (1996) and Esayas (2003) support Abney’s claim. In recent developments in generative syntax, since D is the head of the noun phrase, the analysis showed “DP-analysis not NP.” In the agreement of nominal features, DP can be a subject or an object. For example, in “the man killed the lion,” there are two determiner phrases. The first DP, “the man” is a subject, whereas the second DP “the lion” is an object.

Abney (1987) and Danon (1996) put the projection of DP in English and in the head-initial Semitic languages, for example, Hebrew, Ge’ez as follows.

(13)

```
  DP
 /  \
/    \Spec
/      
\       D*
 \      /  \  
  \    D   NP
   \  Head  Complement
```

Here, DP stands for a phrase headed by an element of category D. However, the position of the head and the complement of head-final languages in the DP structure are changed due to movement.

In this projection, there is a Specifier-Head-Complement relation from left-to-right. So, DP consists of a head D and a complement NP respectively. The spec of DP is e or empty. D and
NP first merge and move up to form D’ (D-bar), which is a minimal projection. Then, D’ moves alone and forms the maximal projection, DP.

Esayas (2003) stated that the DP hypothesis has been adopted by Ritter (1987, 1988); Ouhalla (1988); Fassi-Fehri (1989); Siloni (1990) and others since they have already accepted the claim.

In addition, Siloni (1997) mentioned other supporters, like Mohammed (1988); Hazout (1990); Fuki and Speas (1986); Longobardi (1994) who has shown the overt movement of the complement, NP to the head, D. The present researcher believes that this is by merging and movement rules in EPP(Extended Projection Principle).

### 2.13.1 Determiner

Abney (1987) and Radford (2009) stated that a determiner is a functional category and it lacks descriptive content of its own. Traditionally, determiner included the definite article ‘the’ and the demonstratives ‘this’, ‘that’ ‘these’ and ‘those’ Radford (2009). According to Danon (1996) Baye (2004) determiners include articles, pronouns, demonstratives, interrogatives and quantifiers.

In Ge’ez, demonstratives or determiners precede nouns but not follow them. Demonstratives can appear with the accusative lä- in the absence of nouns since they imply number and gender.

The English functional elements, such as the definite article (the) and the indefinite articles (a and an), possessive and demonstrative adjectives or pronouns, nouns with the possession markers, s’, ‘s, the preposition of and quantifiers are grouped under the category of determiner (Lyons1968) and (Radford1997).

Siloni (1997) considered numerals as functional elements, determiners (D). Although nouns constitute the semantic core of noun phrases, and syntactically determiners play a significant role in DP analysis in providing important morpho-syntactic features that are relevant to both the internal and the external agreement relations of noun phrase Abney (1987).
2.14. Quantifiers as Heads of Nominal Structure

QP hypothesis in Valois and Shlonsky (1991) selects D and DP as head and complement respectively. The projection of this syntactic phenomenon is shown in (13).

\[(14)\]
\[
\text{QP} \quad \text{Spec} \quad Q' \quad Q \quad DP \quad D \quad D' \quad NP
\]

\[(15)\] Consider the following example of QP.

\[\text{ḫįdat'} \quad ḥalib-ā' \quad laḥm\]

\[Q \quad \text{milk-GEN} \quad \text{cow}\]

Lit. ‘Little milk of cow’ This QP is structured from the quantifier ḥįdat ‘little’ as a head and the DP, ḥalib-ā' laḥm as a complement.

2.15. Positions of Agreement Features inside DP

In Semitic, Romance and Germanic languages, Ritter (1991) and Siloni (1997) stated that structure of DP includes extra inflectional structures like AgrNumP, AgrGenP\(^2\) between DPs and NPs. Both Ritter and Siloni have shown the projection of this DP structure in the following.

\[(16)\] Ritter (1991)  \hspace{2cm} Siloni (1997)

\[\text{DP} \quad \text{Spec} \quad D' \quad D \quad AgrNumP \quad AgrNum' \quad NP\]

\[\text{DP} \quad \text{Spec} \quad D' \quad D \quad AgrGenP \quad AgrGen' \quad NP\]

\(^2\) AgrNumP and AgrGenP mean agreement number phrase and agreement gender phrase.
(17) Observe the following examples of DP structures which have the same syntactic projection shown above.

a. ʔaḥad-u bet
   Num-DEF house
   ‘The one house’

b. zū- ḥenok zāwg
   GEN- Henok relative
   ‘(The) relative of Henok’
CHAPTER THREE
Specifier, Head and Complement

This chapter concerns specifier, head and complement relations.

3.1.Specifier

A specifier refers to a grammatical function. The constituent that comes before the head of a lexical, functional phrase or even a sentence is considered as a specifier (Radford 2009).

Consider the following sentences and phrases of Ge’ez in (18) and (19).

(18) ḥorā ṭiyāsus ṭǐm gālīla ḥābä yohannis
went Jesus from Gelila to John
Lit. ‘Jesus went from Gelila to John.’

Here, ṭiyāsus, the subject of the sentence is a specifier because it is taken as a category of a specifier.

(19) dāmmāna mālįltā sāmay
Cloud on sky
Lit. ‘Cloud on (the) sky’

Here, in this phrase, dāmmāna is the specifier of the prepositional phrase headed by the preposition mālįltā.

According to their grammatical functions, specifies found in noun phrase (NP) are articles, deictics, possessives/genitives as well as quantifiers. The definite quantifier includes numerals, measure and classifier phrases.

Generally, in Minimalist Approach, specifiers include subjects, articles (definite and indefinite), quantifiers, pronouns, degree words, genitive or possessive nouns, demonstrative pronouns.

3.1.1. Articles

Lambdin (1978:15) stated that there are no definite and indefinite articles in Ge’ez. However, in contrast to this, Dessie (2002:88) stated that Ge’ez has both definite and indefinite articles which show definiteness and indefiniteness. The present researcher supports Dessie’s claim.
3.1.1.1. Definite Article

In Ge’ez, there are two definite articles which show familiarity or definiteness. Phonemically, these are ʔahad-u and ʔahad-ti. -u and -ti are definite masculine and feminine markers. In the absence of these suffixes (-u and -ti), the two words show unfamiliarity because they become ʔahad and ʔahad-ti. However, the other suffixes attached to the independent nouns that show familiarity are dependent. For example, in Ge’ez, ʔa- shows definiteness apart from indicating possession. Moreover, it serves as a complementizer in relative clause.

Like Ge’ez, other Semitic languages including Hebrew, Arabic, Amharic, etc. have definite articles which show definiteness or familiarity. According to Danon (1996), definiteness in Hebrew is marked by a bound morpheme ( ha-). Borer (1989 and 1994), Siloni (1994), and others have suggested that definiteness in Hebrew as well as in other Semitic languages is a syntactic feature of the noun, similar to phi-features such as gender and number. Therefore, the definite article ha- in Hebrew is not an independent lexical item.

Mohammad (1988), Fassi-fehri (1993) and Benmamoun (2000) said that the definite article in Arabic has been analyzed as the head of a determiner phrase (DP) to which the nominal head raises and incorporates.

In Semitic languages, for example, Hebrew, nothing can intervene between the definite article ha- and the nouns as opposed to in English (Danon1996). However, in Ge’ez, there are exceptions but not for the definite articles ʔahad-u and ʔahad-ti respectively. There is an intervention between the suffixes, -u, -hu, -ʔa, -ha and the independent nouns while showing definiteness. This is shown in the following examples:

(20)  
a. bi-tu  lä- Dawit  
    house-DEF GEN-Dawit  
    Lit. ‘Dawit’s known house’
b. gäbo-hu  lä- ḫenok  
    waist -DEF GEN- Henok  
    Lit. ‘Henok’s known waist’
c. źămād-ʔa  lä- rut
relative-DEF GEN- Rut
Lit. ‘Rut’s known relative’

d. ḡab u - ha lä- ḡaster
father -DEF-SGFGEN DEF GEN- Aster
Lit. ‘Aster’s much known father’

In a dative construction of Ge’ez, two definite markers sometimes may come one after the other as shown in (20d) above.
Therefore, the researcher argues that -u,-hu,-ʔa and -ha show definiteness in dative construction of Ge’ez due to the presence of the genitive lä-.
However, in the absence of the possessors, the researcher assumes that -u,-hu,-ʔa and -ha show both definiteness and possession. Consider the following:

(21) a. gor-u
neighbor-3SGMGEN DEF
Lit. ‘his known neighbor’

b. wis’bo-hu
ring -3SGM GEN DEF
Lit. ‘His known ring’

c. mälbäs-ʔa
cloth -3SGF GEN DEF
Lit. ‘Her known cloth’

d. ḡab-u-ha
father-DEF-3SGF GEN DEF
Lit. ‘Her known father’

In dative constructions of Ge’ez, the preposition lä- can intervene between the possessee and possessor in showing possession.

The following DP structures show definiteness in the Semitic languages mentioned above.
(22) a. šlošet ha-sfarim  (Hebrew)
    three DEF - books
    ‘The three books’

b. *ha-šlošet sfarim

(23) 'al-kitab-u  (Arabic)
    DEF-book-NOM
    ‘The book’

(24) a. lij-u-n  (Amharic)
    Boy-DEF-ACC
    ‘The boy’

b. ljj-it -u-ʔa-n
    girl-3SF-3SGM DEF-3SGF DEF-ACC
    ‘The girl’

(25) a. ḥahad-u wäld-u  (Ge’ez)
    one-3SGM DEF son-3SGM GEN
    ‘His one known boy’ ḥahad is a root.

b. ḥahäd-ʔi wälät
    one-3SGF DEF girl
    ‘The one girl (the known)’ ḥahad is the root word for ḥahäd-ʔi underlying. However; it becomes ḥahatt-ʔi on the surface. When d is preceded before t underlyingly, it changes to t on the the surface.

In Ge’ez, the DP may contain two dependent definite markers. The first dependent definite marker is zä- attached to a modifier preceding the noun and the other independent noun follows the suffix -u as in the following example.

(26). a. zä-ʔäbiyy wäld-u
    DEF-big son-3SGMGEN DEF
Lit. ‘The big son of his’ This shows definiteness and possession.

Sometimes, the suffix -u may not be present following the noun.

(27) żä-żebiyy wäld
DEF-big boy
‘The big boy’

In the above examples (26) and (27), respectively, there is no intervening element between the modifier and the head noun. The dependent definite and possessive marker żä as well as the suffix -u appeared at the initial and final positions only. In dative constructions, the genitive marker lä- always intervenes between the suffices attached to the possessed noun and the possessor comes at the end.

(28) bet-u læ-dawit
house-DEF GEN- Dawit
‘Dawit’s house’ (the known house belonging to him.)

However, bet-u żä-dawit is ungrammatical because -u never follows żä- in genitive constructions of Ge’ez.

However, the preposition lä- as a genitive marker cannot intervene between the possessed noun and the possessor in the following other form of dative construction.

(29) læ-dawit bet-u
GEN-Dawit house -DEF
‘Dawit’s house’ (the known particular house) in this example, the genitive marker læ- comes at the beginning.

3.1.1.2. Indefinite Article

Ge’ez has two indefinite articles. These are ḥaḥad (masculine indefinite) and ḥaḥad-t (feminine indefinite) respectively.

(30) a. ḥaḥad bet
Indef house
‘A /One house’ (one house which is not known)
Sometimes, the indefinite articles and the dependent genitive marker may appear together as in the following.

(31) a. ḥad ʷäld-u
    Indef son-3SGM GEN
    ‘His one son’

b. ḥad ʷāld-ʔa
    one son-3SGF GEN
    ‘Her one son’

3.1.2. Quantifiers

Quantifiers are functional categories which denote quantity. This is, how much or how many of something (Radford 2009). In English, some, all, no, each, every, much, most, several, few/a few, little/a little, etc. denote the quantity or the amount of something.

In Ge’ez, quantifiers can be specific (definite) and non-specific (indefinite). Specific or definite quantifiers relate to objects of reference that are of countable and/or measurable size. So, they can be classified, measured or counted.

On the contrary, the non-specific (indefinite) quantifiers relate to objects of mass or abstract reference that cannot be classified, measured or counted.

3.1.2.1. Specific/Definite Quantifiers

Specific quantifiers express the exact number, quantity or amount by direct counting or by units of measurement. Numerals are included in this.

(32) a. ʔe-ʈʈ-u ʷɪlud
    two-AGR -DEF boys
Lit. ‘(The) two boys’ The singular noun wäld a root for the broken plural wilud. Therefore, the plural of wäld is wilud due to the insertion of the vowels -i- and -u- among the consonant sounds.

b. säläs-t-u ʔa-t’ali
Three-AGR -DEF PL- goat
Lit. ‘(The) three goats’

In example 32(a) and (b) above, the exact number of the nouns wilud and ʔa-t’ali is specified or known by the cardinal numbers.

In addition to numerals, specific or definite quantifiers include both measure and classifier phrases.

3.1.2.1.1. Numerals
In Ge’ez, there are two types of numerals, cardinals and ordinals. These are described below respectively.

3.1.2.1.1.1. Cardinal Numerals
Cardinal numerals such as ʔahad-u, kilʔe-tt-u or kilʔe, säläs-t-u, etc.on the surface can occur with countable (+count) nouns to specify them by making a definite reference to their quantity.

The basic cardinal numerals of Ge’ez are the following.

(33) ʔahad-u ‘one’
Kîliʔe-tt-u/kîlʔe ‘two’
säläs-t-u ‘three’
ʔarîbaʕi- tt-u ‘four’
ḥāmmisî-t-u ‘five’
sîddis-t-u ‘six’
sâbîʕa-tt-u ‘seven’
s/sâmmân-tt-u ‘eight’
tâsîʕa-tt-u ‘nine’
ʔasśâr-t-u ‘ten’
The cardinal numbers from 11-19 are primary derivatives of the basic ones as in ʕassär-t-u wä-ʔahad-u. These numerals derived from ʔassärj-t-u preceding and the linker/wä-/ (and) are attached to the other aforementioned basic cardinal numerals above.

In Ge’ez, there are secondary derivatives of cardinal numerals. Except the number mįšįt and sāman-ya, all have suffices -ša and -ʔa attached to them.

(34) ʕɨśr-ʔa ‘twenty’
     šēlas-ʔa ‘thirty’
     ʔaribšįʔa ‘fourty’
     ʰams-ʔa ‘fifty’
     siss-ʔa/sids-ʔa ‘sixty’
     sābšįʔa ‘seventy’
     s/sāman-ya ‘eighty’
     tāsšįʔa ‘ninty’
     mįšįt ‘hundred’

Ge’ez has also other cardinal numerals which express vast, great multitude/number, or aggregates that can be difficult to finish counting in a short period of time. These numerals can be pluralized with some repetition or duplication. But, this is not true for all numerals.

(35) ʕassär-t-u mįšįt ‘one thousand’
     ᵃ́lf ‘ten thousand’
     ᵡa-ʔilaf (plural) ‘hundred thousand’
     ᵡa-ʔilaf-at (plural of plural) ‘million (myriad or miliyard)’
     ᵃ́lf-ίt ‘ten million’
     mį-ʔilf-ίt ‘hundred million’
     ʕassär-t-u mį-ʔilf-ίt ‘one billion’

The basic cardinal numerals have both nominative and accusative forms for masculine and feminine genders (Amsalu 2003). Consider the following examples given below.
The cardinal numerals can occur with demonstratives, nouns, possessive adjectives and pronouns.

Observe these examples here below.

(37) a.  wį-ʔį-to-n  kįliʔe-ťt-u  ʔa-walįd-  ā-  zi-ʔa-yā
STEM-STEM-this-PLF  two -AGR-DEF  PL- daughter- GEN-STEM-GEN-1SG
Lit. ‘Those two my daughters’ or ‘those two daughters of mine’

In Ge’ez, words such as zi-ʔa-yā, ?į-ntti-ʔa-yā and ?į-lli-ʔa-yā can be both possessive adjectives and pronouns with the same form. All have the same meaning, my/mine.

b.  za-tti (za)  wälät-ä  zi-ʔa-hu
that -F  girl -GEN  STEM-GEN-3SGM
Lit. ‘That his girl’

c.  ?į-ll-u  kįliʔe-ťt-u  kahin-ʔat
STEM-this-PLM  two-AGR-DEF  clergyman-PL
Lit. ‘These two clergymen’

3.1.2.1.1.2. Ordinal Numerals

Ordinal numerals are specific or definite quantifiers. They are derived from the basic cardinal numerals with the addition or attachment of some vowel changes. When markers like ‘-ay’, ‘-awi’ are added to ordinal numbers in final positions, they show masculine, whereas ‘-it’ and ‘-awit’ show feminine.

(38) **Ordinal numbers**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordinal numbers</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q’ā dam</td>
<td>‘first’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dagim</td>
<td>‘second’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ordinal numerals can occur with the definite marker żä- and before adjectives and nouns to show definiteness or specificity.

(39)  
   a.  żä- dagim-it sämay  
       DEF- second-3SGF sky  
       ‘The second sky’

   b.  żä- dagim tiguh mämihjr  
       DEF- second diligent teacher  
       Lit. ‘The second diligent teacher’

3.1.2.1.1.2. Measure Phrases

Measure phrases are noun phrases which denote the amount of non-countable or mass entity with nominal heads.

Measure phrases always use containers/scales, units of measurement or other measuring devices. Cardinal numerals appear preceding nominal heads in measure phrases. However, the mass or the non-countable entities follow the cardinal numerals and the nominal heads.

Here are examples.

(40)  
   a.  ḥaḥād-u mäste may  
       one -DEF can/glass water  
       ‘A single or one (can/glass) of water’

   b.  kiliże-tt-u mazag bt-ä mänahi  
       two-AGR-DEF stores -GEN teff (white)
‘Two individual stores of teff’

c. šälä-s-t-u  mäste  -at  -ä  may  
    three-AGR-DEF  cans/glass  -PL  -GEN  water  
    ‘Three individual containers of water’

d. ḥaḥad  -u  sizr  -ä  ḡäs’s’  
    one-DEF  span  -GEN  wire/coil  
    ‘A single span of wire/coil’

e. kilī-e-tt-u  mätän  -at  -ä  zäyt  
    two-AGR-DEF  liter  -PL  -GEN  oil  
    ‘Two individual liters of oil’

In number 40 above, examples (a- e) contain two specific or definite quantifiers for the quantity or amount of the entities denoted by the noun. The first are the cardinal numerals, and the second are the nominal heads which refer to the containers or measuring units. The measure phrases given in (a, b and c) are noun phrases with mäste and mäziğäb as their nominal heads. However, in the remaining examples (d and e), the head nouns of the measure phrases are measuring units/devices and not containers. Containers, measuring units or devices serving as nominal heads in measure phrases are plural when the numeral specifiers denote more than one entity.

In structures of definite or specific measure phrases of Ge’ez, the dependent definite marker zä- occurs with the numerals not with the nominal heads of the noun phrases. The cardinal numerals show definiteness or specificity in the absence of the definite marker zä-. 

The following examples demonstrate these.

(41)  a. ḥaḥad-u  mäziğäb  -ä  ḡabl  
    one-DEF  arm/arm strip  -GEN  rope  
    ‘The one arm/arm strip of rope’
b. ẓä-qahad-u mäzraḥt -ä ḥabl
   DEF-one-DEF arm/arm strip -GEN rope
   ‘The one arm/arm strip of rope’

3.1.2.1.1.3. Classifier Phrase
Classifier phrases are definite or specific quantifiers. Like measure phrases, they are noun
phrases. However, there are differences between them. For example, measure phrases use
units of measurement/devices and containers like enclosures, vessels, pots, sacks, etc. as
nominal heads. But classifier phrases never employ these; rather they use body parts such as
head, leg, horn, arm, span, etc. as metaphors of individual elements of the mass.
Consider the following classifier phrases.

(42)   a. qahad-u rīs bis’ältuma/sigurād
       One - DEF head garlic( white onion)/ red onion
       ‘A single (head of) garlic/onion’

In Ge’ez, body parts serve as nominal heads with specific cardinal numerals like qahad-u
cannot be pluralized as in the above example. But body parts like nominal head of a classifier
phrase with other specific or definite cardinal numerals can be pluralized.

(43)   a. ẓalās-t-u qā-ẓīgar -ā p’erka/ziful
       three-AGR-DEF PL- leg - GEN chickpea
       ‘Three individual legs of chickpea’

b. * ẓalās-t-u qā-ẓīgar-ā p’erka-at/ziful-at
    Three-AGR-DEF PL- leg-GEN chickpea-pl
    ‘Three individual legs of chickpeas’

c. ẓalās-t-u qā-ẓīgar -ā q’abela/q’abila
    Three-AGR-DEF PL- leg - GEN maize/dura
    ‘Three individual legs of maize/dura’

33
d.  *kiliʔe-tti-\dot{u}  ?jniʔis-\dot{at}-\dot{a}  q'\dot{a}rn*

   Two-AGR-DEF cattle-PL-GEN horn

   ‘Two cattles of horn’

In (43 a, b, c and d), the classifier phrases are structured in the form of construct state. The nouns of the classifier phrases in (a, b and c) cannot be pluralized but the nominal heads cannot since they refer to mass (-count) nouns. The noun of the classifier phrase in (d) is plural because it is a unit or countable noun. The nominal head *q'ārn* can be plural since it is countable.

### 3.1.2.2. Non-specific/Definite Quantifiers

Non-specific quantifiers which are grouped under specifier, do not show the exact quantity, amount, number or size of the mass (non-count) and unit (count) nouns. Non-specific quantifiers show instances of non-specific quantificational references. Adjectives of quantification are employed to serve as specifiers of nominal heads of both count and mass references.

The singular and plural adjectives of quantification are given in the following examples.

(44) a.  *bizuʔ-\dot{an}*

   many-PLM

   ‘Many or several males’

b.  *bizuʔ-\dot{at}*

   many-PLF

   ‘Many or several females’

In example 44 (a and b) above, the quantifiers are plural. They use the plural markers *-an* and *-at* for masculine and feminine respectively.

Baye (2004) has shown that the forms of adjectives of quantification of small or large in size and with both mass (-count) and unit (+count) nouns may have collective reference that can be made specific and non-specific.
(45)  

a. *bįzu*ḫ ‘many/much’
b. *nįst-it* ‘little, some, small amount’
c. *įdat’* ‘few, little’

In 44 and 45(a), the masses or the collections are non-specific or indefinite for classification and quantification because they are too large or huge to count or measure.

In Ge’ez, the singular adjectives of quantification *bįzu*ḫ goes with mass or non-countable nouns but not with unit (+count) singular and plural nouns. However, the plural adjectives of quantification *bįzu-an* and *bizu-št* can go with unit or countable plural nouns. This is shown in the following examples.

(46)  

a. *bįzu*ḫ may (mass (-count) nouns)  
   much water  
   ‘much or more water’

b. *bizu*ḫ-a *mānih*  
   much-Acc water-Acc  
   ‘much or more water’

c. *bįzu-an* *mānih*  
   many-PLM teacher-PLM  
   many male teachers’

d. *bįzu-št* *mānih*  
   many-PLF teacher-PLM  
   ‘many female teachers’

Examples 46 (a) and (b) show the occurrence of an adjective preceding the mass or non-countable nouns respectively whereas, (c) and (d) show the plural adjectives of quantification preceding the plural unit(+count) nouns masculine and feminine genders.
The non-specific adjectives of quantification go with both mass and plural unit nouns as in the following examples.

(47) a. *njst-it may*
little/small-count water
‘Little or small amount of water’

b. *ḥidat’ wāyn*
little wine
‘little wine’

c. *ḥidat’-an bīšīray-at*
few -PL ox -PL
‘Few oxen’

3.1.3. Floating Quantifiers

Floating quantifiers agree in case with an antecedent subject in a sentence Radford (2009).

Ge’ez has floating quantifiers. For example, the basic word *kull-u* and its derived forms *kull-jk-imu, kull-jk-ìn, kull-o-mu, kull-on*

(48) a. *kahin-at kull-jk-imu*
clergy-PL all -2-PLM
‘(You) all clergymen’

b. *kull-jk-imu kahin-at*
all -2-PLM clergy-PL
‘(You) all clergymen’

c. *mānhir-at kull-jk-ìn ḥor - k-ìn mängālā kānisa*
teacher-PLF all-2-PLF went-2-PLF to church
‘(You) all female teachers went to market’
Floating quantifiers are found not only in Ge’ez but also in other Semitic languages. In Hebrew, floating quantifiers occur with a much wider range of determiners than in English Danon (1996). There was an argument on floating quantifier raised by Shlonky (1991) following Sportiche (1988). The argument was Q-float is the result of leftward movement of the nominal projection which is quantified over to a position that comes before the quantifier. Thus, Hebrew sentences like (49b) and (49c) are derived from (49a) by leftward movement of the quantified phrase ha-yeladim:

(49) a. ne?elmu kol ha-yeladim
    disappeared all the-children
b. ne?elmu ha-yeladim kul-am
c. ha-yeladim ne?elmu kul-am

According to Shlonsky’s analysis, ha-yeladim first raises to the pre-quantifier specifier position, which is its position in (49b); and from that position, the noun phrase moves again to its position in (49c).

Example 49 (a) shows the word kol is a floating quantifier in Hebrew. This language uses kul-am, the derived form of kol as a floating quantifier.
Floating quantifiers are found in different sentential aspects or forms in Semitic such as in Hebrew, Amharic, Ge’ez, etc. Amharic uses hullu and derivatives like hullaćč-įhu/-aćč-ław as floating quantifier. These floating quantifiers appear preceding or following the subject in a sentence with or without a topic marker-m. For better understanding and clarity, it is possible to show this in the following examples of Amharic.

(50)  
a. säw -očč hullu ?and įhu-ay-däll-um  
  human -PL all same not-are-3PL  
  ‘All humans are not the same.

b. hullu-m säw -očč ?and ąy-däll-um  
  all-Top human -PL same not-are -3PL  
  ‘All humans are not the same.’

c. hullaćč-įhu-m tamari - wočč ?all-ačč-įhu?  
  all -3PL-DEF-Top student-PL present-are-3PL  
  ‘Are you all students present?’

d. tamari - wočč hullaćč-ţhu-m ?all-ačč-įhu?  
  student-PL all -3PL-DEF-Top present-are-3PL  
  ‘Are you all students present?’

Therefore, the researcher concludes that Ge’ez, Hebrew and Amharic have different basic floating quantifiers and derivatives. They can appear before a subject of a sentence or after.

3.1.4. Pronouns

Pronouns are functional categories used in the form of substitution. According to Longobardi (1994) and Radford (1997, 2009), pronouns are parts of the category of determiners. Like other languages, Ge’ez has different types of pronouns, such as personal, reflexive, interrogative and possessive pronouns.
3.1.4.1. Personal pronouns

Personal pronouns have different forms in different cases.

(51) | Nominative | gloss | Accusative | gloss |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>ʔan-ʕ</td>
<td>‘ I’</td>
<td>ki-ya-ʕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second M</td>
<td>ʔan-ttä</td>
<td>‘ you’</td>
<td>ki-ya-kä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ʔan-tti</td>
<td>‘ you’</td>
<td>ki-ya-ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third M</td>
<td>wįʔt-u</td>
<td>‘ he’</td>
<td>ki-ya-hu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>yįʔt-i</td>
<td>‘ she’</td>
<td>ki-ya-ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>ɲįʔ-n-ʕ</td>
<td>‘ we’</td>
<td>ki-ya-nā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second M</td>
<td>ʔant-mu</td>
<td>‘ you’</td>
<td>ki-ya-kim-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ʔant-n</td>
<td>‘ you’</td>
<td>ki-ya-kį-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third M</td>
<td>wįʔt-on-ʔįmm-ant-u</td>
<td>‘ they’</td>
<td>ki-ya-hom-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>wįʔt-on-ʔįmm-ant-u</td>
<td>‘ they’</td>
<td>ki-ya-kį-n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observe the following sentences in the example given here.

(52) a. wįʔt-u yi-ʔakibjir ki-ya-ki
    he-3SGMNOM 3SG M imperf- respect STEM-ACC-2SGF
    ‘Let he/him respect her.’

    b. ʔamlak-ʕ ʔisраʔel ʔakābā ki-ya-nā bā- kull-u mākan-ʔat
    God-GEN. Israel keeps STEM- ACC-1PL in- all-DEF place-PL
    ‘God of Israel keeps us in all places.’

3.1.4.2. Interrogative Pronoun

The interrogative pronouns of Ge’ez are the following.

(53) | Nominative/Genitive | Gloss | Accusative | Gloss |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>mānn-u</td>
<td>‘ who’</td>
<td>mānn-ʕ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observe interrogative pronouns in the following examples.

(54)  
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>mānn-ū yā- ḥāssīs mānn-ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who-NOM</td>
<td>Imperf- wants who-ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit. ‘Who wants whom?’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.1.4.3. Reflexive Pronoun

Ge’ez has both singular and plural reflexive pronouns.

(55)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflexive Pronoun</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>lä-lij-yā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plural</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>lä-li-nā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reflexive pronouns sometimes come preceding the subject of a sentence, or preceding the verb.

Consider the following examples.

(56)  
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>lä-li-hu yā- ḥānābih mās’ḥāf-ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM- he-3M refl</td>
<td>Imperf - reads book-ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit. ‘He himself reads book.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.4.4. Possessive Pronouns

Possessive pronouns show possession with possessive markers. These markers are suffices attached to the end of the independent nouns. In Ge’ez, the possessive suffices are -yä, -kä, -ki,-hu,-ha,-nä,-kim-u,-kñ-n,-hom-u and -ho-n. There are three different possessive pronouns which have the same function.

(57)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronouns</th>
<th>Possessive</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>ziʔa-yä /ʔiʔa-yä /ʔiʔnttiʔa-yä</td>
<td>‘my/mine’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second M</td>
<td>ziʔa-kä /ʔiʔa-kä /ʔiʔnttiʔa-kä</td>
<td>‘your/yours’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second F</td>
<td>ziʔa-ki /ʔiʔa-ki /ʔiʔnttiʔa-ki</td>
<td>‘your/yours’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third M</td>
<td>ziʔa-hu /ʔiʔa-hu /ʔiʔnttiʔa-hu</td>
<td>‘his’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third F</td>
<td>ziʔa-ha /ʔiʔa-ha /ʔiʔnttiʔa-ha</td>
<td>‘her/hers’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>ziʔa-nä /ʔiʔa-nä /ʔiʔnttiʔa-nä</td>
<td>‘our/ours’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second M</td>
<td>ziʔa-kim-u /ʔiʔa-kim-u /ʔiʔnttiʔa-kim-u</td>
<td>‘your/yours’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second F</td>
<td>ziʔa-kj-n /ʔiʔa-kj-n /ʔiʔnttiʔa-kj-n</td>
<td>‘your/yours’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third M</td>
<td>ziʔa-hom-u /ʔiʔa-hom-u /ʔiʔnttiʔa-hom-u</td>
<td>‘their/their’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third F</td>
<td>ziʔa-ho-n /ʔiʔa-ho-n /ʔiʔnttiʔa-ho-n</td>
<td>‘their/their’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Ge’ez, there are other dependent possessive markers such as -ʔu,-ʔa,-ʔo-mu and -ʔo-n which are equivalent to the aforementioned markers -hu,-ha,-ho-mu and -ho-n respectively.

(58) a. mänbärʔu

chair-3SGM GEN
‘His chair’

b. *mänbär-*ʔa
   chair -3SGF GEN
   ‘Her chair’

c. *mänbär-*ʔo-mu
   chair- GEN -3PLM GEN
   ‘Their chairs’

d. *mänbär-*ʔo-n
   chair-GEN -3 PL F GEN
   ‘Their chair’

3.1.5. Demonstrative
Demonstrative is a term which refers to words like this, that, these so as to indicate a location relatively nearer to or further from the speaker (Radford 2009).

3.1.5.1. Demonstrative pronouns
In Ge’ez, demonstrative pronouns indicate relative distance from a speaker to a hearer. They can be proximal and distal.

3.1.5.1.1. Proximal demonstrative pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proximal</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third M</td>
<td><em>zi-ntt-u/z</em></td>
<td>‘this’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td><em>za-tti/za</em></td>
<td>‘this’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proximal</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td><em>ʔi-ll-u/ʔi-ll-on-tu</em></td>
<td>‘these’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These singular and plural proximal demonstratives occur in phrase and sentence.

(60)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & zį \quad mämḥjr \quad \text{(DP)} \\
& 3SGM \quad \text{teacher} \\
& \quad \text{‘This teacher’}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & za-tti \quad wälätt \quad sänay-įt \quad yįʔįt-i \quad \text{(sentence)} \\
& \text{this-3SGF \ boy \ beautiful-3F \ is-3F} \\
& \quad \text{‘This girl is beautiful.’}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{c. } & ?į-ll \quad -u \quad kahin-at \quad ságād-u \quad q’įdm \quad -ā \quad ?įgziʔabiḥer \\
& \text{this-PL-3PL \ DEF \ clergy-PL \ bowed-3PL \ in front of \ -GEN \ God} \\
& \quad \text{Lit. ‘These clergymen bowed in front of God.’}
\end{align*}

3.1.5.1.2. Distal Demonstrative Pronouns

Distal demonstrative pronouns refer to distant objects relative to speaker and hearer or listener. These pronouns have singular and plural forms.

(61)  
\begin{align*}
\text{Distal} & \\
\text{Demonstrative} & \\
\text{Gloss} & \\
\text{Singular} & \\
\text{Third} & M \quad \text{zį-}kku/žį-ktu/zį-sku/wįʔt-u \quad \text{‘that’} \\
& \quad F \quad yįʔt-iʔ-nt-a-ktu/ʔį-ŋįtįt-ku \quad \text{‘that’} \\
\text{Plural} & \\
\text{Third} & M \quad ?į-llį-ku/ʔį-llį-kt-u/ʔįmm-unt-u/wįʔt-om-u \quad \text{‘those’} \\
& \quad F \quad ?į-llį-kko-n/?į-llį-kto-n/ʔįmm-anțt-u/wįʔt-on \quad \text{‘those’}
\end{align*}

Both proximal and distal demonstrative pronouns always appear preceding nouns in a phrase or a sentence. When a noun in a phrase or a nominal subject of a sentence has other
constituents like numerals and adjectives, demonstrative pronouns come first as in the following example.

(62)  zi̱-ku ʔahd-u  njus wäld
That-3SGM one-3M DEF small boy
Lit. ‘That one small boy’

3.2. Head

Head is a lexical or phrasal element which forms a phrase. It is the key word which determines the type of phrase. It is universal and complementary with the other obligatory constituents like specifier and complement. The type of phrase is identified or determined by the head it contains. For example, NP, VP, AP, ADVP and PP have heads like N, V, Adj, Adv and P respectively.

Head is an obligatory word for a phrase. Therefore, all phrases have heads. For example, NP, VP, AP, ADVP and PP are lexical phrase which take N, V, A, ADV and P as their heads. Phrases like CP, TopP, FocP, NegP, AspP, DP, QP, etc are functional phrases.

A language can be either head initial or head final. For example, in English all heads precede their complements. Thus, English is a head-initial language. However, in languages like Korean heads follow their complements (Radford 2009).

Ge’ez is usually head-initial but not all the time. The heads of the phrases precede immediately their complements. Consider the following examples here below.

(63)  a. ʔakbir ʔabba-kä
respect father –2SGMACC/GEN
Lit. ‘respect your father’

In this imperative sentence or VP, the head ʔakbir precedes the complement ʔabba-kä.

b. mämḥr-an-ä ʔingilt’ar (DP/NP)
teacher-PL-GEN language
Lit. ‘Teachers of language/language teachers’

In this DP, māmīhr-an-ā is head, whereas ʔiŋjilt’ar is complement.

c. mįslā       marta      (Prepositional phrase)
   With       Marta
   Lit. ‘With Marta’

In this PP, the preposition mįslā and the proper name marta are head and complement respectively.

d. t’iq’q’ā   nįʔus      (Adjectival phrase)
   Very      small
   Deg       Adj
   Lit. ‘Very small’

The head of a phrase, whether lexical or functional determines the grammatical properties of its complement (Radford 2009).

(64)   a. lä-sîte may      (TP)
   To-drink water
   Lit. ‘To drink water’

This infinitival projection/phrase lä- which serve as a head. The verb phrase sîte may is the complement of the head. Let us look at this in the following diagram.
3.3. Complement

A complement is a constituent which is selected by a head. It occurs with a specifier and a head. A complement may come before or after a head. When it merges with a head, it forms a minimal projection of a phrase. There are words which need complement obligatorily. For example, auxiliary verbs, prepositions, transitive verbs need complement. Consider the following examples.

(65) a. *misl*- *məm̩j̩r*-u (PP)
    with- teacher -3M DEF
    Lit. ‘With the/his teacher’

In this prepositional phrase, the head *misl*- cannot stand alone in the absence of the nominal complement *məm̩j̩r*-u.

    b. *məh̩r*- dawit wāngel-ä lā - wäld-u (TP)
    taught Dawit gospel-ACC DAT- son-GEN
    Lit ‘Dawit taught gospel the/his son.’

In this TP, the transitive verb *məh̩r*- has two nominal complements. The first wāngel-ä is a direct object and the second lā-wäld-u as genitive complement which is an indirect object. *məh̩r*- is a head, whereas *dawit* is a specifier.

For word categories like adjective, adverb, noun, intransitive verbs, complement is optional.

3.3.1. Simple Nominal Complements

Nominal complements occur with head nouns.

3.3.1.1. Genitive NPs

The term genitive includes sources, locatives, purposive, temporal understood as complements of a simple nominal head.
3.3.1.1.1. Source Genitives

Source Genitives show the head noun in relation to the items that designate from which it /the head noun/ derived or prepared. In Ge’ez, it serves as a complement of a nominal head in noun phrase. Examples are like the following.

(66) a. ḥalib-ā laḥm
    milk-GEN cow
    ‘milk of cow’

b. ḥibist-ā šīrnay
    bread-GEN wheat
    ‘bread of wheat’

In the structures of 66 (a and b), laḥm and šīrnay are genitive sources and occur as complement and modify head nouns, ḥalib as well as ḥibist in the nominal phrase. Adjectives occur preceding source genitives as in the following.

c. t’iʕum ḥibist-ā šīrnay
    delicious/sweet bread-GEN bread
    ‘delicious/sweet bread of wheat’

3.3.1.1.2. Locative Genitives

Locative Genitives modify head nouns with regard to their location or place of origin.

(67) a. ʕasa ḏim- wist-ā bahr / zā- bahr
    fish LOC- inside-GEN sea/ GEN- sea
    ‘fish from inside the sea/ fish of sea’

b. niguṣ zā- šēwa
    king LOC- Shewa
    ‘king of Shewa’

c. mānahi zā- gojjam
white teff LOC- Gojjam
‘white teff of Gojjam’

*bahr*, -šäwa and gojjam are locative genitives.

### 3.3.1.1.3. Purposive Genitives

Purposive Genitives indicate the function or purpose of nominal heads and serve as complements.

(68) a. *laḥm lā-ḥalib*
    cow Purps-milk
    ‘cow for milk’

b. *wärk’ lā-hlk’āt*
    gold Purps-ring
    ‘gold for ring’

### 3.3.1.1.4. Temporal Genitives

Temporal genitives refer to genitives of time which modify a noun by giving a specific reference to time. Consider the following examples.

(69) a. *zinam-ā yom*
    rain-TEMP GEN today
    ‘today’s rain’

b. *nāfas-ā timalim*
    wind-TEMP GEN yesterday
    ‘yesterday’s wind’
CHAPTER FOUR

Description and Projection of DP in Ge’ez

In this chapter, the research focuses on the description and projection of DPs. Structures of DP can be simple and complex. Structures of construct state, dative as well as genitive constructions will be described.

4.1. Simple DP

In Ge’ez, simple DP may have one or more constituents. Examples are like the following:

(70) a.  

\[ \text{zä- hiyyul wäld} \]

DEF-clever boy

‘The clever boy’

In Ge’ez, \( zä- \) serves as possessive prefix in genitive constructions, definite and as a complementizer in relative clauses. However, in 70(a), \( zä- \) shows definiteness. This simple DP has one dependent and two independent constituents. The noun \( wäld \) alone can be simple DP in the absence of \( zä- \) and \( hiyyul \). The above simple DP can be shown in the following diagram below.
Diagrammatically, such kind of simple DP structure has the following projection.

Numerals or quantifiers come before the construct state and genitive construction. One simple DP may consist of one or more modifiers and other constituents like noun or nominal phrase.

Consider the following examples.

(71) a. zi-ku ʔabiyy ᵗsa’dada bāggīṭī
that-3M big white sheep
‘That big white sheep’
Diagrammatically, the projection seems as follows:

b. za-tti k’iddis-it hagär
   that-3F blessed-3F country
   ‘That blessed country’

c. * k’iddis-it za-tti hagär
   blessed-3F that-3F country
   ‘Blessed that country’

d. * hagär kiddis-it za-tti
   country blessed-3F that-3F
   ‘Country blessed that’
The projection of DP in 71 a looks as in the following way.

According to specifier-modifier (optional)-head-complement order, demonstratives come first since they are specifiers, and then modifiers follow. As a result, 71 (c) and (d) are ungrammatical because they violate the order. The above simple DP in 70 (a) contains three constituents namely, specifier, modifier and head but no complement. This is grammatically acceptable.

(72)  

a. ẓä-yared  timhirt-ä  q’ine

    GEN-Yared  education-GEN  poetry

    ‘Yared’s poetry education/education of poetry’

This DP in Ge’ez contains two possessive constructions. That is, timhirt-ä q’ine is a construct state, whereas the second q’ine ẓä- yared is a genitive construction. Functionally, in the above simple DP, the nominal word q’ine serves in two different ways:

One, in the construct state, q’ine is employed as possessor. Two, in the genitive construction, it serves as possessee.
b. lä- yared timhirt-ä q’ine-hu

GEN - Yared  education-GEN  poetry-3M GEN
‘Yared’s education of poetry’

Look at the projections of DPs in 72 (a) and (b) mentioned above as examples respectively.

72 a.

There is a difference between lä- and zä-. lä- serves as a possessive marker in dative, whereas zä- serves as a genetival marker in genitive construction.
(73) a. zi-ku zā-ʔanā wahid bäggi-ā fasika
that-3M GEN-I one sheep-GEN. Easter

‘That my one sheep of Easter’ This is also a simple DP. Here, bäggi-ā serves as head and possessee, whereas fasika is employed as complement and possessor in the construct state.
Diagrammatically, the above structure of DP has the following projection.

4.1.1. Possessors and possessees in simple DP

Analysis is developed for nominal phrase which treats them as DPs, rather than as NPs. Since D is a head, we might expect it to have a specifier as well as a complement. Certain possessor phrases in English and other languages are taken as specifiers of DP Adger (2003). In a construct state of Ge’ez, DP has a possessor as well as a possessee. This is a common phenomenon (KideaneWeld 1948). Consider the following examples.

(74)    a. ṣamlak-ā  sāmay
        God-GEN  Heavens
        ‘God of Heavens’

ṣamlak is a possessee, whereas sāmay a possessor.-ā is construct which is a possession or genitiva marker in a construct state.
Its diagrammatic projection is as follows:

Consider the following example.

(75)  a. zinam-ä kirämt
     rain-GEN summer
     Lit. ‘Summer rain, or rain of summer’

KidaneWold (1948) stated that the occurrence of two possesees linked by wä- is not common in Ge’ez grammar like gime wä- zinam-ä kirämt ‘summer rain and summer fog’ In this structure, there are two DPs.
The projection of the DP in 75 (a) is as in the following.

### 4.1.2. Grammatical Possession of DP in Ge’ez

Like in many Semitic languages, including Ge’ez, possession relation is shown by a possessor and possessed noun or possessee. Possession by noun phrases or NPs in Ge’ez is shown through a construct state, dative and genitive constructions. In addition, it is shown by possessive pronouns.

#### 4.1.2.1. Construct State (CST)

Hoyt (2002) states that in Semitic, the construct state consists of two nominal expressions grouped as single constituents. The first nominal expression is possessor. The second expression is possessee.

Semitic nominal construct states which express a genitival relation between a head noun and a noun phrase (NP) without the mediation of a (dummy) preposition, have received much attention in the recent generative literature Fassi-Fehri (1989), Mohammad (1988), Ritter (1988), Siloni (1991, 1994, 1997).
The absolute state is the unmarked form (NOM and GEN). The construct state is the marked state form for (ACC) Weninger (1993). Consider this in the following example.

(76) Unmarked form (NOM and GEN of the absolute state) Marked form (ACC; CST) Meaning

| wilud | wilud-ā | sons |
| k'idus-an | k'idus-an-ā | saints (M.PL) |
| k'idus-at | k'idus-at-ā | saints (F.PL) |

In Ge’ez, construct state is formed by inserting the suffix -ā between the possessee and the possessor. -ā is attached to the end of the first noun in the sequence Noun1- + Noun2. Noun one is said to be in a construct with Noun two in the construct state Lambdin (1978). Look at the following examples.

(77) Construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Possessed</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Possessor</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wäld-ā nägus</td>
<td>wäld</td>
<td>-ā</td>
<td>nägus</td>
<td>The son of the king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lik'-ā kahn-at</td>
<td>lik'</td>
<td>-ā</td>
<td>kahn-at</td>
<td>The chief of the priests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two important points in a construct state. One, most nouns ending in the vowel /-i/ have their construct in /-el/. This happens when possessed nouns and possessors are put together in a
construct state. Two, nouns ending in the long vowels /aː/, /eː/ and /oː/ remain unchanged in the construct state. These are shown as in the following examples.

(78) a. s’āhaf-ı ‘scribe’ s’āhaf- e ḥizb ‘the scribe of the people’

b. s ’ā w a r -i ‘carrier’ s’āwar- e mānībār ‘carrier of the chair’

s’āhaf- e ḥizb and s’āwar- e mānībār have the same kind of diagrammatic projection. Observe the one.

c. ʔanbās-a: ‘lion’ ʔanbās-a: gādam ‘the lion of the monastery’

d. widdas-e: ‘praise’ widdas-e: mariam ‘the praise of Mary’

e. ġāb-o: ‘waist’ ġāb-o: ʔamlak ‘waist of God’

Most such combinations in a construct state may be translated, at least roughly, by the use of the preposition ‘of’.

4.1.2.2. Dative Construction

Dative Construction (DC) is formed by inserting genitival or possessive preposition ʼ-lāl between possessed nouns and possessors. ʼ-lāl has equivalent translation as a preposition of and possessive markers/s’, or l’s/.

(79) a. tāʔamir-i-ha -lā mariam ‘miracle of Mary’

b. lā-noon ḳamār-u ‘ship of Noh’ or ‘Noh’s ship’
c. *hamār-u lā-noḥ* ‘ship of Noh’ or ‘Noh’s ship’

In the above 79 (b and c), it is possible to use the positions of both possessed nouns and possessors interchangeably. Observe the projection of *hamār-u lā-noḥ*.

4.1.2.3. Genitive Construction

Genitive Construction (GC) uses three genitive-markers. These are */zā-/, */ʔintā-/* and */ʔillā-/* which are equivalent with a preposition */of/* and apostrophe */’s/* or */’/’. These genitive-markers have the same meaning. This makes them become related to one another. However, there are differences among them Dessie (2002). */zā-/* is used with both singular and plural nouns, whereas */ʔintā-/* and */ʔillā-/* are used with singular and plural nouns respectively. All of them can occur either in initial or medial positions but not final.

The following are examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genitive Constructions</th>
<th>Genitive Markers</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wāld  zā-yosef</td>
<td>zā-</td>
<td>‘the son of Yosef’ or ‘Yosef’s son’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥa-wālid ʔillā- rahel</td>
<td>ʔillā-</td>
<td>‘daughters of Rahel’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observe the projection of ئَا-ۋاۋ ئىلى-ۋەھ. 

There are similarities and differences between construct state, dative and genitive constructions. One similarity is that all show possessive relation. The other is that all of them have their own possessive markers. Their difference is that their possessive markers are different. The possessive marker of a construct state cannot occur at initial position but medial, whereas the possessive markers of both dative and genitive constructions appear at the beginning and medial positions but not final.

If we use the possessive markers of these possessive constructions interchangeably, the structures become ungrammatical. Consider the following examples.

wälätt ئىنتا- مۋس ئىنتا- ‘daughter of Muse’ or ‘Muse’s daughter’
(81) a. giyorgis zä- gasiča  (grammatical GC)

   Giorgis GEN - Gascha

   Lit. ‘Giorgis person/father/resident/founder, etc of Gascha’

In such kind of genitive constructions, the possessee can be existed on the genitive marker zä- like person, founder, father, etc. via the possessor gasiča. The reason behind this is that proper names of persons cannot be possessees. They are rather possessors.

Therefore, such kind of genitive construction mentioned above is grammatically accepted in Ge’ez.

b. *giyorgis-ä gasiča

   Giorgis-GEN Gascha

   Lit. ‘*Giorgis of Gascha’

The reason that this structure being ungrammatical is proper names of persons in a construct state of Ge’ez cannot be possessed or possessee.

Ge’ez does not allow such kind of possessive construction in the construct state because proper names like giyorgis are employed as possessee.

As a result, it is ungrammatical phenomenon. The same is true for dative constructions like the following.

c. *giyorgis-u lä-gasiča

   Giorgis-DEF GEN- Gascha

   Lit. ‘*Giorgis the of Gascha’

In dative construction, this structure is not allowed because definite markers are never attached to the proper name of person. In addition, the proper noun giyorgis cannot be a possessee because of the addition of -u. This kind of affix is never attached to proper names of persons.

Therefore, the researcher concludes that the use of proper names of persons as possessees in both construct state and dative construction does not have grammatical acceptance. KidaneWold (1948) stated that the possible and impossible grammatical phenomena of Ge’ez construct state, dative and genitive constructions.
4.1.3. DP in Causative Structure
In causative structures of Ge’ez, there is a causative DP which uses a causative verb with the dependent, causative prefix ʔa-. Consider the following example.

(82) ʔa-k’itil-o wäld zä- yosef
Caus-killed-ACC son GEN- Yosef
Lit. ‘Yosef’s making son kill’

Diagrammatically, the projection of this causative DP as in the following.

4.2. Complex DP with Relative Clause
In both defining and non-defining relative clause, relative pronouns such as who, which, that, whom and whose are employed for the existence of complex DP in English.

The Semitic language, for example Ge’ez has its relativization marker or complementizer. That is zä- which always precedes the verb. Amharic also has one relativization marker, which is yä- which is attached to the verb. The reason why the researcher raises relative clause is because of
having complex DP through it. Consider the following example.

(83) a. wäld-u zä-k’ätäl-o ?anis’e/iwa
    boy-DEF complementizer- killed-Acc rat
    Lit. ‘A rat that the boy killed ’

The projection of the complex DP of the above relative clause is as follows:

In the aforementioned relative clause of Ge’ez, wäld-u zä-k’ätäl-o ?anis’e/iwa is a complex DP. This DP has CP and C. The complementiser phrase consisted of the dependent morpheme zä- and the transitive verb k’ätäl-ä. Both wäld-u and ?anis’e/iwa are independently simple DPs found inside the complex DP.
CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSION

This study concerns the structure of DP in Ge’ez. The study tried to address three important issues. First, DP projection in Construct State, Dative and Genitive Constructions with their grammatical possibility and impossibility. Second, identifying the internal constituents serve as complements of DP. Third, showing the movement of DP in relative clause.

The analysis is done, viz. Minimalist Program. Simple and Complex DPs are separately stated in the form of phonemic transcription with their projection. Ge’ez has both definite and indefinite articles. The independent definite articles are ?ahad-u and ?ahad-ti, whereas the indefinite articles are ?ahad and ?ahad-t. The suffixes as -u,-hu,-?a and -ha show definiteness as well as possession according to their context.

The syntactic order, specifier-head-complement is universal for all languages. A specifier refers to a grammatical function. It includes for example, articles, quantifiers, numerals, subjects, pronouns. A head is the key word which determines the type of phrase. A complement is a constituent selected by the head of a phrase. It may appear before or after a head depending on head-final and head-initial languages. Complements function to modify or specify a head noun. Genitive NPs include sources, locatives, purposive and temporal are understood as complements of a simple nominal head.

In Ge’ez, Construct State, Dative and Genitive Constructions show the existence of possession. All these possessive constructions are the same in function. However, there are noticeable differences among them. For example, Construct State and Dative construction use the possession markers -ӓ and là- respectively, whereas Genitive Construction employs zä-, ?intä- and ?illä- to imply possession.

In Dative construction, the definite possession markers always attach to the possessees. Proper names of persons can be only possessors other than possessees in Construct State, Dative and Genitive Constructions. If they are employed as possessees, they will be grammatically wrong.
Features are interpretable and uninterpretable. Interpretable features play a role in semantic interpretation, whereas uninterpretable features do not have semantic concept. Interpretable features of probe (T) and noun expression or pronoun are checked and written in bold. Their uninterpretable features are written in italics and deleted.
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# Appendix-I: Consonants - /h/, /h', /ŋ/, /s/, /ʃ/, /ʒ/ and /d'/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ge’ez</th>
<th>ከመቁንጭ</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/h/</td>
<td>ከ ከላል እርፋፋ</td>
<td>ከ ከላል እርፋፋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
<td>ከ ከላል እርፋፋ ከላል እርፋፋ</td>
<td>ከ ከላል እርፋፋ ከላል እርፋፋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ʃ/</td>
<td>ከ ከላል እርፋፋ ከላል እርፋፋ</td>
<td>ከ ከላል እርፋፋ ከላል እርፋፋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ʒ/</td>
<td>ከ ከላል እርፋፋ ከላል እርፋፋ</td>
<td>ከ ከላል እርፋፋ ከላል እርፋፋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/d'/</td>
<td>ከ ከላል እርፋፋ ከላል እርፋፋ</td>
<td>ከ ከላል እርፋፋ ከላል እርፋፋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ʃ/</td>
<td>ከ ከላል እርፋፋ ከላል እርፋፋ</td>
<td>ከ ከላል እርፋፋ ከላል እርፋፋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
<td>ከ ከላል እርፋፋ ከላል እርፋፋ</td>
<td>ከ ከላል እርፋፋ ከላል እርፋፋ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And the word made flesh and dwell among us (and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only Begotten of the father full of Grace and truth).

...But unto you that fear my name shall the sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings

Appendix II-Labio-velar and vowel sounds of Ge’ez

Labio-velars

/gʷ/ - ዓ
/lʲʷ/ - ዓ
/kʷ/ - አ
/qʷ/ - ኲ
Vowels

Ge’ez has seven vowels.

/ä/-\  mid central vowel

/u/-\  high back vowel

/i/-\  high front vowel

/a/-\  low central vowel

/e/-\  mid front vowel

/ɨ/-\  high central vowel

/o/-\  mid back vowel

Appendix-III  Number inflection in Ge’ez

Ge’ez has singular and plural numbers. Adjectives, feminine nouns and some masculine nouns have plural endings, “outer, inflectional or sound plural.” The ending of the masculine plural is “-an” whereas, the ending of the feminine plural is “-at.” The feminine plural ending sometimes replaces the feminine singular endings “-t” and “-at”, in many cases the plural ending is attached to the singular. The feminine ending is often used for masculine nouns. Most masculine nouns, however, have lexicalized nominal patterns for the plural, “inner, derivational, or broken plural.”

Outer Plural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>māmhir</td>
<td>māmhir-an</td>
<td>‘teacher’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kibur</td>
<td>kibur-an</td>
<td>‘honoured’ (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q’iddus</td>
<td>q’iddus-an</td>
<td>‘blessed’ (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>māmhir-t</td>
<td>māmhir-at</td>
<td>‘teacher’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q’iddis-t</td>
<td>q’iddis-at</td>
<td>‘blessed’ (F)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Masculine plural nouns of Ge’ez sometimes may end with feminine plural ending. For example, p’ap’as (SG). Its plural is p’ap’as-at (popes).

### Inner or broken plural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qʷos’l</td>
<td>?aqʷs’il</td>
<td>‘leave’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kinf</td>
<td>?akinaf</td>
<td>‘wing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hagār</td>
<td>?ahgur</td>
<td>‘country’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riʔs</td>
<td>?arʔist</td>
<td>‘head’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t’äli</td>
<td>?at’ali</td>
<td>‘goat’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A plural ending is sometimes affixed to an inner plural. For example, nāgāś-t-at “kings.”