Chapter 5

Agreement between nouns and attributive adjectives in TYA

5.1 Preliminary Remarks

Only in this chapter of this thesis we propose a descriptive analysis of gender-number agreement (henceforth GN agreement) as well as definiteness agreement between nouns and attributive adjectives in Tihami Yemeni Arabic (TYA). This is in accordance with the limitations and delimitations of the thesis realized in its title. According to Elsaadany Kamel A. (2007, p. 15): “The notion of agreement has long been a challenging topic for linguists.” This means that the linguistic phenomenon of agreement and its notion in any language involves not only the descriptive analysis of gender-number agreement as well as definiteness agreement between nouns and attributive adjectives, but also other relevant issues and investigations discussed and analyzed in the literature of many languages and dialects (other than the TYA dialect), some of which mentioned in the bibliography of this thesis. These other issues and investigations (see also the quotation below) need further research in case of TYA.

Recently, in the introduction of his paper entitled: “The linguistics and psycholinguistics of agreement: A tutorial overview.”, Acuña-Fariña, J.C. (2009) describes agreement as a challenge for both theories of grammar and theories of comprehension and production and provides, with references to many expert linguists, a number of reasons for the fact that there is no theoretical model of any standing can afford not to have a theory of agreement today.

Agreement is a challenge for both theories of grammar and theories of comprehension and production. In fact, no theoretical model of any standing can afford not to have a theory of agreement today. There are a number of reasons for this. In the first place, there is the sheer puzzle of it: that is, the fact that it is so pervasive in the world’s languages and yet seemingly redundant or even downright useless (Taylor, 2002:332 ff.; Corbett, 2006: XV). In the second place, “agreement is arguably the major interface problem between morphology and syntax, and hence appears particularly difficult when viewed from the heartland of either component” (Corbett, 2006:3; also Eberhard et al., 2005). In the third place, agreement lies at the heart of sentence structure in that it usually codifies the formal link between the subject and the predicate in many languages. In the fourth place, its nature, source, and functioning, display an unsettling mixture of formal and semantic motivations. There are models of grammar and processing that view it as an essentially encapsulated phenomenon whose range of operation is limited to the first cycles of the building of clause structure (Chomsky, 1995, 1999, 2001;
Bock and Eberhard, 1993; Eberhard, 1997; Levelt et al., 1999; Carminati, 2005; Franck et al., 2006). Then, there are others which maintain that agreement is either penetrated by semantic forces or, more radically, a semantic process in nature (Pollard and Sag, 1988; Barlow, 1999; Vigliocco et al., 1996a; Thornton and MacDonald, 2003; Vigliocco and Hartsuiker, 2002; Haskell and Macdonald, 2003). The different views usually belie the usual differences in where one puts the focus, and since agreement facts span a large portion of linguistic behavior, it is natural that that focus may rest in quite a large number of different places. Acuña-Fariña, J.C. (2009, pp. 389-390).

The goal of this chapter is also to describe patterns of grammatical agreement in TYA. Here we will take the notion of Arabic strict and deflected agreement and its application in TYA. The investigation focuses on both the variation and non-variation (in several cases) between strict (plural) and deflected (feminine singular) agreement with both human and non-human plural heads. In the literature it has been pointed out by many authors that agreement in Gender, Number, Definiteness, and Case is the largest number of agreement features that can be combined together. It is realized only in adjectives when they modify a noun of a human referent. In this case adjectives must agree with the nouns they modify in gender (masculine [m] or feminine [f]), number (singular [sg], dual [dl], or plural [Pl]), definiteness (definite or indefinite) and case (nominative [NOM], accusative [ACC], or genitive [GEN]). In terms of case inflection, adjectives fall into the same declensions as nouns, depending on their morphological form (their lexical root and pattern structure). However, if the head noun is a “broken plural of a non-human referent, the target is feminine” and singular. This means that the target, i.e. the adjective, will not agree in number with the controller, i.e. the head noun as demonstrated in the following noun phrase: al-kutubu-l-nuufiudat-u (def- books, pl-NOIV)-(def- useful, sg-NOM), “the useful books”. Alhawary (2009, p. 8) points out briefly that: “In Arabic, NPs consisting of a head noun and an attributive adjective involve agreement between these two elements in gender (masculine or feminine), number (singular, dual, or plural), definiteness, and case (nominative, accusative, or genitive).”

Actually, in TYA, there are no previous studies in the literature on this topic of agreement between nouns and attributive adjectives as well as definiteness agreement. The present work should rather be seen as an empirical attempt to apply to a particular problem results yielded by a research orientation the assumptions and inferences of which exceed morphology in the narrow sense of the study of word formation.
discussed and analyzed in the previous chapters. This is because such assumptions and inferences have consequences for the whole architecture of TYA grammar system.

5.2 Notion of agreement

There have been several attempts to define the notion of agreement in general. Quirk, et al. (1985, p. 755), points out that: “CONCORD (also termed ‘agreement’) can be defined as the relationship between two grammatical units such that one of them displays a particular feature (eg plurality) that accords with a displayed (or semantically implicit) feature in the other.” Katamba (1993:330) defines the notion of agreement as “a grammatical constraint requiring that if one word has a particular form, other words appearing in the same construction must take the appropriate corresponding form.” Katamba’s definition of agreement notion, according to Kihm, Alain (2003, pp. 4-5), means that is to say, agreement requires (a) a construction; (b) in that construction, a source element and one or several target elements; (c) the material copy of some features of the source onto the target(s). For example, in TYA noun phrase /ktab-u-O kabiir-u-O/ (or pausal /u/-INDEF red-OGNC /u/-INDEF / “a big book”, the adjective (the target) agrees in gender (M.) and number (sg), with the noun (the source). In addition to this OGNC /u/ (or pausal /u/) is found in both noun and adjective (i.e. in both the source and the target). Corbett, Greville G. (2001, p. 1/11), points out that “There have been several attempts to define agreement:” and that “The essential notion [of agreement] is the covariance or matching of feature specifications between two separate elements, such as subject noun phrase and verb.” Corbett’s definition of agreement fits this study but it basically targets subject-verb agreement, which is not the focus of this study. It turns out, according to Elsadany (2007, p. 15) that: “Though these agreement definitions suffice for agreement phenomena in some languages, morphological gender-number agreement between nouns and adjectives in Semitic languages such as Arabic is rendered complex by the occurrence of agreement mismatches in the marking of these elements.” Agreement, to follow Kihm (2003), as it is envisaged (in the following sections) is a morphosyntactic phenomenon, overtly signaled by some correspondence between the exponents of certain elements of a local syntactic structure, the noun phrase, as it enters Morphology.
Morphological gender-number (GN) agreement between nouns and adjectives in TYA will seem to be rendered more complex in TYA than it is in other varieties of Arabic (MSA/CA or other modern Arabic dialects), by the occurrence of agreement mismatches in the marking of these elements, under certain conditions, differing in TYA and other varieties of Arabic. The aim of this chapter is to explain some of the mismatches, and why they show up differently. In addition to GN agreement, TYA, like other varieties of Arabic, has what may be described as ‘Definiteness inheritance’ Kremers, (2003, pp.37-38), as well as ‘definiteness agreement’ (D/Def agreement) Kremers (2003) and many others mentioned in the bibliography of this thesis. TYA nouns and adjectives are marked for the feature DEFINITENESS. That is, a noun or an adjective in TYA will take either a definite determiner or an indefiniteness marker. The definite determiner is a prefix am- (not the Arabic al-), whereas the indefiniteness marker is a zero suffix -0 (not the Arabic suffix -n). By the addition of this am-, both the OGN /u/ (the pausal /u/) and the indefiniteness marker represented by the zero-suffix -0 will be deleted. A special section will be devoted to all of this, as they tell something important and noteworthy about Noun-adjective agreement in attributive structure and position in TYA. For example, the TYA am-beet am-kabiir (D-house D-big /the house the big/ “the big house”) vs. the CA/MSA al-bayt-(u) al-kubiir-(u) (D-house-(NOM) D-big- (NOM) /the house the big/ “the big house”) as well as the TYA beet-u-0 kabiir-u-0 (house-OGNC (or pausal /u/)-Indef big -OGN (or pausal /u/)-Indef /house big/ “a big house”) vs. the CA/MSA bayt-(u)-(n) kabiir-(u)-(n), (house-(Nom)-(Indef) big-(Nom)-(Indef) /house big/ “a big house”).

Finally, there is Case agreement (K agreement) in CA and MSA only and there is an over-generalized nominative case (OGNC) /u/ (or pausal /u/ in TYA only. (see Shaghi, Abdullah M. M. and Imtiaz Hasanain (to appear). see also section (2.5.6) in chapter 2). This will also be taken into consideration. In terms of the pausal /u/ or the OGN /u/ inflection, attributive adjectives fall into the same declensions as modified nouns, depending on their morphological form (their lexical root and pattern structure).

5.3 Strict and deflected agreement

As a starting point in this section, it is important to deal with a general notion of strict and deflected agreement. Belnap and Shabaneh (1992, p. 247), have pointed out that “Strict agreement here means plural form targets occurring with plural controllers,
However, grammatical gender of target and controller may or may not be the same."

Further, they report that:

In CA and MSA, adjectival agreement with plural, human head nouns is strict; there is no collapsing of categories in the plural parallel to the deflected agreement found with nonhuman heads. Gender and number agreement are marked in both singular and plural forms:

(5) a. al-mudarris l-jadiid
   the-teacher (MS) the-new (MS)
   "the new male teacher"
   b. al-mudarris-uun l-judud
   the-teacher (MP) the-new (MP)
   "the new male teachers"

(6) a. al-mudarris-a l-jadiid-a
   the-teacher (FS) the-new (FS)
   "the new female teacher"
   b. al-mudarris-aat l-jadiid-aat
   the-teacher (FP) the-new (FP)
   "the new female teachers"


This somehow holds true in case of TYA. though it is slightly different, the definite article being am- not al- and in (5.3.2b) there is collapsing of categories in the plural parallel to the deflected agreement found with human heads. Number but not gender agreement is marked in both singular and plural forms. This is evidently shown in the following TYA data:

(5.3.1) a. am-mdarris am-gdiid
   the-teacher (MS) the-new (MS)
   "the new male teacher"
   b. am-mdarris-iin am-gudud
   the-teacher (MP) the-new (MP)
   "the new male teachers"

(5.3.2) a. am-mdarris-eh am-gdiid-eh
   the-teacher (FS) the-new (FS)
   "the new female teacher"
   b. am-mdarris-aat am-gudud
   the-teacher (FP) the-new (MP)
   "the new female teachers"

Belnap and Shabaneh (1992, p. 248) go on to say that: "In some varieties of written and spoken Arabic, feminine singular agreement with plural nonhuman controllers is in variation with plural agreement, i.e. strict and deflected agreement alternate; in some modern dialects, plural agreement is categorical, or nearly so." In the literature, ‘deflected’ (means ‘syntactic’) and ‘strict’ (means ‘semantic’). In a
footnote. Corbett (2000, pp. 208) says that: “Arabists sometimes use the terms ‘deflected’ (our ‘syntactic’) and ‘strict’ (our ‘semantic’); see Ferguson (1989), Belnap (1993: 98n1).” The literature on agreement, in general, shows that the basic fact for Arabic is the existence of two types of noun-adjective agreement, known as ‘strict’ and ‘deflected’. Kihm (2003) in case of Semitic languages including Arabic, states that:

The basic fact for Arabic is the existence of two types of noun-adjective agreement, known as ‘strict’ and ‘deflected’. Agreement is strict when the GNDK features of the noun and the adjective are identical; otherwise, it is deflected. Features do not behave as a block in this respect. K agreement is always strict. D agreement nearly always (for exceptions, see Blachère & Gaudefroy-Demombynes 1975: 320; and Féghali 1928: 134 for the Lebanese dialect). Kihm (2003, pp. 5-6)

In the same direction, in case of Standard Arabic (SA), Elsadany (2007) under the section 2.1: ‘Strict agreement in Arabic NPs’, reports that:

Some languages show ‘strict’ agreement while others show ‘deflected’ agreement in noun-adjective agreement paradigms. Agreement is ‘strict’ when features of head nouns in NP constructions are identical to those of their adjectives or modifiers. In this sense, features of adjectives must agree in Gender (G), Number (N), Case (C) and Definiteness (D) (henceforth GNCD) with those of their head nouns; otherwise, they are ‘deflected’. SA NPs show both strict and deflected agreement. Elsadany (2007, p. 16).

The crucial fact for TYA is also the existence of these two types of noun-adjective agreement, known as ‘strict’ and ‘deflected’. Agreement is strict when the GND features (i.e. gender-number and definiteness/determiner features) of the noun and the adjective are identical; otherwise, it is deflected. In TYA, there is no ‘K/C agreement’ (i.e. Case-agreement) which is always strict in case of Arabic in general Kihm (2003) and in case of SA in particular Elsadany (2007); D agreement is always strict in TYA. In the following section, Strict Agreement will be discussed in details.

5.3.1 Strict Agreement

It has been noted above in (5.3) that agreement is ‘strict’ when features of head nouns in NP constructions are identical to those of their adjectives or modifiers. In this sense, features of adjectives must agree in Gender (G), Number (N), and Definiteness
(D) (henceforth GND) with those of their head nouns; otherwise, they are ‘deflected’. In TYA, there are two major kinds of strict agreement: strict singular agreement and strict plural agreement. There is no strict dual agreement in TYA. The first major kind of strict agreement is the strict singular agreement. GN agreement is strict when the noun is singular only as demonstrated in (5.3.1.1) below, whereas in case of Arabic noted by Kihm (2003): “GN agreement is strict when the noun is sg. or dual”. (p. 6). There is no strict dual agreement in TYA. In case of the dual in TYA (though restricted to few nouns as pointed out before) GN agreement is deflected; see section (5.3.2) below.

(5.3.1.1) (a) baladu kabiiru
    country.Msg big.Msg
    “a big country”
(b) madiin-eh kabiir-eh
    city-Fsg big-Fsg
    “a big city”

It is important to note that, whereas it is true that M nouns, apart from the pausal /u/, never bear a characterizing suffix (cf. baladu vs. madiin-eh), the opposite does not hold, since there are, also apart from the pausal /u/, suffixless F nouns, as GN agreement shows (e.g., waaldu ta’ban-eh “a tired woman who gives birth”).

D agreement is also strict between nouns and attributive adjectives as demonstrated in (5.3.1.2) below:

(5.3.1.2) (a) am- balad
    The- D country. Msg
    “The big country”
(b) am-madiin-eh
    The-D city-Fsg
    “The big city”

In case of the strict plural agreement in TYA, there are only two types of strict plural agreement. These are masculine sound plural agreement and broken plural agreement. These are slightly different from the three types of strict plural agreement traditionally known in Arabic in general. Belnap and Shabaneh. (1992, p. 248) states that: “There are three types of strict plural agreement in Arabic. They are traditionally known as feminine plural agreement, sound plural agreement and broken plural agreement.” There is no feminine plural agreement in TYA. The following TYA illustrative examples in (5.3.1.3) below show the strict plural agreement:

In case of the strict plural agreement in TYA, there are only two types of strict plural agreement. These are masculine sound plural agreement and broken plural agreement. These are slightly different from the three types of strict plural agreement traditionally known in Arabic in general. Belnap and Shabaneh. (1992, p. 248) states that: “There are three types of strict plural agreement in Arabic. They are traditionally known as feminine plural agreement, sound plural agreement and broken plural agreement.” There is no feminine plural agreement in TYA. The following TYA illustrative examples in (5.3.1.3) below show the strict plural agreement:
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(5.3.1.3) a. (1) riggaalah mahzuum-iin
men BP defeated MSP
“defeated men”
(2) banaatu mahzuum-iin
girls BP defeated MSP
“defeated girls”
(3) Hariimu mahzuum-iin
women BP defeated MSP
“defeated women”
(4) ṭyaabu malbuus-iin
clothes BP dressed MSP
“dressed clothes”

(5.3.1.3) b. (1) kutubuk kbaaru
books BP big BP
“big books”
(1) riggaalah kbaaru
men BP big BP
“big men”
(2) banaatu kbaaru
girls BP big BP
“big girls”
(3) Hariimu kbaaru
women BP big BP
“big women”

(5.3.1.3) c. (1) saffaaf-aatu kbaaru
Light-tubes BP big BP
“big light-tubes”
(4) sayyaar-aatu kbaaru
Cars FSP big BP
“big cars”

In (5.3.1.3a) a broken plural head noun occurs with a masculine sound plural form of the adjective. In (5.3.1.3b) a broken plural head noun occurs with a broken plural adjective. In (5.3.1.3c) a feminine sound plural head noun occurs with a broken plural adjective. With plural nouns the crucial factor is whether they refer to human [+H] or non-human [-H] entities. If the noun refers to a feminine or masculine human being, GN agreement is strict (this is as same as that of MSA whose “GN agreement is strict”, Kihm (2003, p. 6)), and it does not matter that the plural is MSP or FSP (produced by affixation) as in (5.3.1.4c) and (5.3.1.4b) or BP (produced by revowelling) as in (5.3.1.4a) and (5.3.1.4d):

(5.3.1.4) a. xwaalu (maternal) uncle-MBP
gaayb-iin [sg. : xaalu Gaaybu] absent-MSP
“absent (maternal) uncles”
If the noun refers to a non-human [-H] entity, GN agreement can be either idiosyncratically deflected, meaning the adjective is feminine singular in every case or idiosyncratically strict, meaning the adjective is BP which is unspecified for gender (it can stands for feminine or masculine), i.e. whatever plural type shows up on the noun as illustrated in (5.3.1.5) below:

(5.3.1.5)
(a.) msaamiiru
   nails-MBP
   "big nails"

(b.) baTTaany-aatu
   kabiir-eh [sg.: baTTaany-ah kabiir-eh]
   blanket-MBP
   "big blankets"

(c.) gmaalu
   kabiir-eh [sg.: gamalu kabiiru]
   camels-MBP
   "big camels"

(d.) Hayawaan-aatu mitwaHs-eh [sg. Hayawaanu mitwaHs-u]
   animal-MBP wild-Fsp
   "wild animals"

(e.) msaamiiru
   kbaaru [sg.: mismaaru kabiiru]
   nails-MBP
   "big nails"

(f.) baTTaany-aatu
   kbaaru [sg.: baTTaany-ah kabiir-eh]
   blanket-MBP
   "big blankets"

(g.) gmaalu
   kbaaru [sg.: gamalu kabiiru]
   camels-MBP
   "big camels"

(h.) Hayawaan-aatu mitwaHs-iin [sg. Hayawaanu mitwaHs-u]
   animal-MBP wild-Msp
   "wild animals"

Focusing on our example (c, d, g and h) for purpose of comparison and our discussion below, it can be said that TYA in this case shown above shows a discrepancy in case of Arabic reported by Kihm, who writes:
If the noun refers to a non-human entity, GN agreement is deflected, meaning the adjective is Fsg. in every case, i.e. whatever plural type shows up on the noun:

(5)(a) jimál 'aZim-a [sg. jimál 'aZim]
camel.Mpl enormous-Fsg
enormous camels

(b) Hayawan-át waHs-a [sg. Hayawan waHs]
animal-Fpl wild-Fsg
wild animals
Kihm (2003, p. 6).

Explaining his examples in the above quote with his reference to his example
(4c): xádim-at ?á'ib-at [sg. xádima ?á'iba] maidservant-Fpl absent-Fpl absent maidservants) and referring to the situation of CA and MSA in such cases, Kihm writes:

Notice that agreement as in (5b) is a possible alternative to agreement as in (4c), so we find xádimát jamila instead of xádimát jamilát ‘beautiful maidservants’. In Classical Arabic (prior to the 10th century), agreement as in (5a) was not generalized: internal plurals referring to non-human entities could induce strict agreement. If the adjective itself was provided with an internal plural, that form appeared (e.g., jimál 'a'biyá ‘stupid camels’, next to the also acceptable jimál 'abîya) ; otherwise, the adjective took on the Fpl. external form (e.g., jimál waHsát ‘wild camels’). That is to say, strict number agreement could be the rule. This collocation lives on in MSA in fixed expressions (e.g., ‘uSîr xawáli ‘times of yore’ instead of ‘uSîr xáliya), or in archaizing styles, as in layáli dámisát ‘dark nights’ for layáli dámisa (see Holes 1995: 165-166). Kihm (2003, p. 7).

Further in the footnote (20) he states that: “In MSA, internally pluralized adjectives usually modify only nouns referring to a plurality of male human beings. The unmarked paradigm is therefore: rijád kibár ‘aged men’ vs. xádimát kabirát ‘aged maidservants’ vs. mudán kahira ‘big cities’.” In TYA, if the collective noun belongs to the so-called ‘natural’ sort, deriving no overtly F singulative noun, the adjective is then Fsg., which may be considered strict agreement provided these nouns are assumed to be lexically F as demonstrated in (5.3.1.6) below:

(5.3.1.6)
(a) 'iblu Saabr-ah
Camel folck-Msg sober-Msg
"Sober camels"

This reminds us of what has been noted by Kihm in case of Arabic in the illustrative examples of number (7) that he presents. He writes:
If the collective belongs to the so-called ‘natural’ sort, deriving no overtly F singulative, the adjective is then Fsg., which may be considered strict agreement provided these nouns are assumed to be lexically F:

(7)
(a) 'ibil Sâbir-ah
Camel folek-Fsg sober-Fsg
‘Sober camels’ Kihm (2003, p. 7)

Or if the collective noun belongs to the so-called ‘natural’ sort, deriving no overtly M singulative noun, the adjective is then Msg., which may be considered strict agreement provided these nouns are assumed to be lexically M as illustrated in (5.3.1.7) below:

(5.3.1.7)
(a) maayu wisxu
water-Msg dirty-Msg
dirty water
(b) 'ilbu Hasanu
honey-Msg good-Msg
good honey

If there is a corresponding singulative, on the other hand, the adjective is Msg., which again may be viewed as strict agreement if these nouns are assumed to be lexically M as shown in (5.3.1.8) below:

(5.3.1.8)
(a) namlu Hmar
ants-Msg red-Msg
“red ants” [cf. naml-eh Hamraa “a red ant”]
(b) naxlu Tawiilu
ants-Msg red-Msg
“tall palm-trees” [cf. naxl-eh Tawiil-ah “a tall palm-tree”]
(c) Huutu Taryu
fish-Msg fresh-Msg
“fresh fish, pl” [cf. Huut-eh Tary-ah “a fresh fish”]

This reminds us of what has been noted by Kihm in case of Arabic in the illustrative examples of number (8) that he presents. He states that:

If there is a corresponding singulative, on the other hand, the adjective is Msg., which again may be viewed as strict agreement if these nouns are assumed to be lexically M:

(8)
(a) namlu kaʔir Ant troop-Msg numerous-Msg
5.3.2 Deflected Agreement

Unlike Arabic, in case of the dual in TYA (though restricted to few nouns as pointed out before) GN agreement is deflected as demonstrated in (5.3.2.1) below; cf. section (5.3.1) above:

(5.3.2.1) (a) balad-een kbaar\-u
    country-M-Dual big-BP
    two big countries

(b) madiini-teen kbaar\-u
    city-F-Dual big-BP
    “two big cities”

When the noun is a collective (i.e., semantically neither sg. nor pl., but morphologically sg.), agreement varies. If it is a so-called ‘accidental’ collective referring to a human group, the adjective shows up in the MSP with the MSP suffix -\(\text{-iin}\), the agreement will be of a deflected number agreement as demonstrated in (5.3.2.2) below:

(5.3.2.2) (a) naasu mahzuum-iin
    people-Msg defeated-MSP
    “a defeated people”

(b) naasu ka\(\text{biir}\)-iin
    people-Msg numerous-MSP
    “a numerous people”

This reminds us of what has been noted by Kihm in case of Arabic (though slightly different, the MSP suffix is -\(\text{-uun}\) not -\(\text{-iin}\)) in the illustrative examples of number (6) that he presents. He writes:

..., when the noun is a collective (i.e., semantically neither sg. nor pl., but morphologically sg.), agreement varies. If it is a so-called ‘accidental’ collective referring to a human group, the adjective shows up in the Mpl. form with the MSP suffix -\(\text{-un}\), the agreement will be of a (deflected number agreement):

(6)
(a) qawm ka\(\text{fr}\)-\(\text{-un}\)
    people-Msg numerous-Mpl
    “a numerous people”

5.4 Noun-adjective agreement in attributive structure and position

In section (5.3) we have pointed out that the crucial fact for TYA is the existence of two types of noun-adjective agreement, known as ‘strict’ and ‘deflected’ and that agreement is strict when the GND features (i.e. gender-number and
definiteness/determiner features) of the noun and the adjective are identical; otherwise, it is deflected and that there is no ‘K/C agreement’ (i.e. Case-agreement) and Definiteness agreement is always strict in TYA.

In this section (5.4) of this chapter in this thesis, we will only focus our discussion on the Noun-adjective agreement in attributive structure and position. That is to say we will only focus our discussion by looking at agreement in the phrasal level (attributive agreement) where (noun and adjective are adjacent). In other words, we will only focus our discussion by looking at agreement between an attributive adjective and the noun it modifies in their noun-adjective noun phrase structure. Within the Noun-adjective agreement in attributive structure and position (even the Noun-adjective agreement in predicative position which is not our scope here and needs future research), there are some peculiar agreement facts in TYA that suggest that the structure of the attributive adjective in the noun-adjective noun-phrase is more complex than sometimes assumed in case of CA, MSA or other varieties of Arabic. This discussion will give us an initial framework for the analysis with which we (or other linguists who are interested in linguistics in general and Semitic or Arabic linguistics in particular) can then look at other aspects that need further research.

Let us now in the following subsection examine the status of TYA adjectives versus nouns as modifying structures in an environment when the noun or adjective is used as an attributive modifier, adjoined directly to a noun phrase and where, the attributive adjectives too show gender and number agreement with the head nouns.

5.4.1 TYA Adjectives versus nouns as modifying structures
Before discussing the TYA adjectives versus nouns as modifying structures, we will go through a general notion of Arabic Adjectives versus nouns as modifying structures that has been pointed out by Baker (2008), under his section (2.1.2) ‘Adjectives versus nouns: modifying structures’, where he writes:

The same difference between nouns and adjectives can be seen in a different syntactic environment, when the noun or adjective is used as an attributive modifier, adjoined directly to a noun phrase. In this environment too, adjectives show gender and number agreement with the head noun, whereas nominal modifiers do not. (11) and (12) show this in Spanish; (13) and (14) show it in Swahili; (15) and (16) are from Arabic. Baker (2008, pp. 17-19).
For the convenience of our discussion below and for the purpose of comparison, we will consider Baker’s Arabic examples in (15) and (16) reproduced and quoted below:

(15) a. ?əbno ẓ-zuʾān (Arabic, agreeing adjectives)
son.his det-hungry.m.sg (Cowell 1964:500–1)
‘His hungry son’

b. wər-t-e zgūr-e
inheritance-f.sg small-f.sg
‘a small inheritance’

c. l-ʿ arab ʾs-sūrīyy-in
det-arabs.pl det-syrian-pl
‘the Syrian Arabs’

(16) s-sakak-iin al-fadd-a (Arabic, non-agreeing noun modifier)
det-knife-pl det-silver-f (Cowell 1964:507)

Similarly, in connection with the TYA adjectives versus nouns as modifying structures, we can also observe that the same difference between nouns and adjectives can be seen in a different syntactic environment, when the noun or adjective is used as an attributive modifier, adjoined directly to a noun phrase. In this environment too, adjectives show gender and number agreement with the head noun, whereas nominal modifiers do not. The relevant TYA examples in (5.4.1.1) and (5.4.1.2) below illustrate this:

(5.4.1.1)  
(a) bn-oh am-gaayi/Vag-gaayi (regressive assimilation) (TYA, agreeing adjectives)
son.his det-hungry.m.sg
‘His hungry son’

(b) wir0-eh SGiir-eh
inheritance-f.sg small-f.sg
‘a small inheritance’

c. am-ʿ arab as-sūrīyy-iin
det-arabs.pl det-syrian-pl
‘the Syrian Arabs’

(5.4.1.2)  
am-skak-iin am-fiDD-ah (TYA, non-agreeing noun modifier)
det-knife-pl det-silver-f
‘the silver knives’

The above data show attributive adjectives agreeing with the noun that they modify in definiteness in TYA. Predicate adjectives (that needs further research),
however, do not agree with their subjects in definiteness. This is not only observed in TYA but also in Arabic in general. In a footnote, Baker (2008) writes:

Attributive adjectives are also said to agree with the noun that they modify in definiteness in Arabic. Predicate adjectives, however, do not agree with their subjects in definiteness. This suggests to me that it is wrong to fully subsume the feature ± definite into the other φ-features in this language. A plausible alternative is to say that the modificational structure is really one of apposition between two DPs: [DP D NP] [DP D A 0N]. The second DP in apposition to the first naturally has the same definiteness value. (pp. 17-18).

It seems from the aforementioned discussion that attributive adjectives show important role in the Noun-adjective agreement in the attributive position. So, in the following sub-section, the discussion of attributive adjectives in the noun-phrase structure in TYA is given in details.

### 5.4.2 Attributive adjectives in the TYA noun-phrase structure

In the discussion of attributive adjectives, to follow Kremers. J. (2003, pp. 97-98), the main question is usually where adjectives are located in the noun-phrase structure. We will take a position on this in the following section, but before this, I believe there are other, more important questions to be answered. Probably the most important one is what the internal structure of the attributive adjective in the TYA noun-phrase is like and how much it is different from that one of Arabic. Data in TYA shows that this is indeed the case. Discussing the pattern of the adjectival agreement in Arabic, Kremers. J. (2003, pp. 97-98), points out that:

Adjectival agreement in Arabic shows the pattern familiar from Romance languages: there is agreement in gender (1a,b) and number (1c,d):

(1) a. rāgūl-un tall-un [with dot under t]
   man-NOM tall.M-NOM
   ‘a tall man’
   b. imra`at-un tawīl-at-un [with dot under t]
   woman-NOM tall-F-NOM
   ‘a tall woman’
   c. riḡāl-un tiwāl-un [with dot under t]
   men-NOM tall.M.PL-NOM
   ‘tall men’
   d. niṣā`-un tawīl-āt-un [with dot under t]
   women-NOM tall-F.PL-NOM
   ‘tall women’
Slightly different from what is quoted above, illustrative examples of adjectival agreement in TYA show evidently the following pattern: there is agreement in gender ((5.4.2.1) & (5.4.2.1)), number and gender (5.4.2.3) number but not gender ((5.4.2.4), (5.4.2.5) & (5.4.2.6)):

(5.4.2.1) riggaalu Tawiilu
   man (m) tall (m)
   “a tall man”

(5.4.2.2) mar-ah Tawiil-ah
   woman (f) tall (f)
   “a tall woman”

(5.4.2.3) riggaal-ah Twaalu
   men pl.(m) tall PB(m)
   “tall men”

(5.4.2.4) Hariimu Twaalu
   women pl (f) tall PB (m)
   “tall women”

(5.4.2.5) riggaal-ah m’adab-iin
   men pl.(m) polite pl (m)
   “polite men”

(5.4.2.6) Hariimu m’adab-iin
   women pl (f) polite pl (m)
   “polite women”

(See the illustrative examples (5.4.4.4.3), (5.4.4.4.4), (5.4.4.4.5), (5.4.4.4.6), (5.4.4.4.7) and (5.4.4.4.8) below where we deal with the definiteness agreement between attributive adjectives and modified nouns of the relevant aforementioned examples (5.4.2.1) (5.4.2.2) (5.4.2.3) (5.4.2.4) (5.4.2.5) and (5.4.2.6)).

Using Arabic examples ([with dot under P’ t] in tawil-at-an and al-tawilat-i and [with dot under h] in hawla) from: Syntax der Arabischen Schriftsprache der Gegenwart (El-Ayoubi, Fischer & Langer 2001), which he abbreviated as ‘SASG’. Kremers (2003) points out that:

Adjectives also agree with the noun in case:

(2) a. ra’aytu imra’at-an tawil-at-an
   I.saw woman-ACC tall-F-ACC
   ‘I saw a tall woman’

b. naglisu hawla al-tawilat-i al-mustadTrat-i
   we.sit around the-table-GEN the-round-GEN
   ‘we sit down around the round table’

This is different from what is quoted above; illustrative examples of adjectival agreement in TYA do not show agreement in case. This is evidently shown in (5.4.2.7) below:

(5.4.2.7)
a. ūfīt mar-ah Tawīl-ah
I saw woman tall-F
“I saw a tall woman”
b. naglis Hoola am-Taawil-ah am-mustadiir-eh
we sit around the-table-F the-round-F
“We sit down around the round table.”

There is, however, another phenomenon, which slightly distinguishes the TYA concord pattern from that of Arabic: there is also agreement in definiteness. To see how slightly different it is, let us first see what Kremers. (2003, p. 98), points out in this:

There is, however, another phenomenon, which distinguishes the Arabic concord pattern from that of Romance languages: there is also agreement in definiteness. The adjective takes the same definiteness marker as the noun it modifies:

(3) a. raġul-un tawTl-un [with dot under t]
man-NOM tall.M-NOM
‘a tall man’
b. al-raġul-u al-tawTl-un [with dot under t]
the-man-NOM the-tall-NOM

Explaining the examples (3a) and (3b), he states “(3a) and (3b) show the contrast between an indefinite noun and a definite one: an adjective has the same definiteness marker as the noun, either -n or al-.’’ This is slightly different from what is quoted above; illustrative examples of adjectival agreement in TYA show evidently the following pattern: there is also agreement in definiteness. The definite marker is am- not al- and the indefinite marker is the pausal /u/ or the zero morpheme Ø not -n. The adjective takes the same definiteness marker as the noun it modifies as demonstrated in (5.4.2.8) below (see section (5.4.4) below for more details):

(5.4.2.8) a. riggaal-u - Ø Tawīl-u - Ø
man-OGNC/pausal tall.M- OGNC/pausal
‘a tall man’
b. am-riggaal am-Tawiil
the-man the-tall
‘the tall man’
((5.4.2.8) a) and ((5.4.2.8) b) show the contrast between an indefinite noun and a definite one: an adjective has the same definiteness marker as the noun, either – 0 (including OGNC/pausal /u/) or *am- (excluding OGNC/pausal /u/ which is deleted when am- is prefixed).

5.4.3 Gender and Number Agreement between attributive adjectives and modified nouns

The attributive adjective, in its non-complex construction, (complex construction needs future research) shows obligatory gender and number agreement with its head noun. Consider the following example in (5.4.3.1) below where the adjective has to agree in gender with its head noun:

(5.4.3.1) am-mar-ah am-Hasan-eh
Def.-woman-F def.-beautiful-F

The attributive adjective am-Hasan-eh shows the formal gender agreement markers of its head noun am-mara-ah: both constituents reflect the feminine marker/suffix -ah/-eh. If gender agreement is not established between the two concerned elements here, then ill-formedness or ungrammaticality will occur as demonstrated in (5.4.3.2) below:

(5.4.3.2) *am-mar-ah am-Hasan
Def.-woman-F def.-beautiful-M

The attributive adjective in (5.4.3.2) does not agree with its head noun in gender. Therefore, the output is ruled out. As regards number agreement, the following construction in (5.4.3.3) below shows that the attributive adjective has to agree with its head noun in the plural number:

(5.4.3.3) am-Tullaab am-mugtahd-iin
Def.-student-MSP Def.-hardworking-MSP
“The hardworking students”

The attributive adjective am-mugtahd-iin in (5.4.3.3) reflects the formal marker -iin of plural number agreement here MSP number agreement. The head noun is internally plural, a feature that is peculiar to broken plurals of TYA. If number
agreement is not established in (5.4.3.3) between the head noun and its attributive adjective, then ill-formed construction will be produced. The following TYA construction in (5.4.3.4) shows evidence of that:

(5.4.3.4) *am-Tullaab am-mugtahid
Def.-student-MSP Def.-hardworking-Sing
“The hardworking students”

The attributive adjective in (5.4.3.4) does not reflect the formal plural marking in agreement with its head noun. Hence, the resultant construction is not well-formed. It is ungrammatical.

5.4.3.1 TYA (agreement with singular noun phrases)
We have pointed out in section (5.3.1) that the type of the GN agreement is strict when the noun is singular. Also there and in (5.3) we have pointed that agreement is ‘strict’ when features of head nouns in NP constructions are identical to those of their adjectives or modifiers and that features of adjectives must agree in Gender (G), Number (N), and Definiteness (D) with those of their head nouns; otherwise, they are ‘deflected’. In this section, we are going to discuss in details the identical/matching agreements with both Masculine Singular adjective-noun noun phrases where the adjective-noun noun phrase is masculine singular in agreement features as well as feminine singular adjective-noun noun phrases where the adjective-noun noun phrase is feminine singular in agreement features. For the sake of illustration consider the TYA examples (5.4.3.1.1) and (5.4.3.1.2) shown below:

(5.4.3.1.1) GND Agreement: Masculine Singular (Human and Non-Human)

| a.       | rigged-u | Hasanu                 |
|          | man-M.SG-pausal/OGNC-IND | handsome-M.SG-pausal/OGNC-IND |
|          | “a handsome man”          | “a handsome man”          |
| b.       | am-riggaal | am-Hasan                |
|          | the-man-M.SG-DEF          | the-handsome-M.SG-DEF     |
| c.       | ktaab-u     | gdiid-u                 |
|          | “a new book”             | “a new book”             |
| d.       | am-ktaab    | am-gdiid                |
|          | the-book-M.SG-DEF        | the-new-M.SG-DEF          |
|          | “the new book”           | “the new book”           |
5.4.3.1.2 GND Agreement: Feminine Singular (Human and Non-Human):

a. marah-Ø
woman-F.SG-IND
“a beautiful woman”

b. am- marah
the-woman-F.SG-DEF
“the beautiful woman”

c. mgall-eh-Ø
magazine-F.SG-IND
“a new magazine”

d. am-mgall-eh
the-magazine-F.SG-DEF
“the new magazine”

5.4.3.2 TYA (agreement with dual noun phrases)

It has been pointed out in chapter 2 that the formation of the TYA dual forms, like English, seems to be commonly equivalent to a numeral 0néeen (m) or 0intéen (f) “two”, that are commonly used. So, the same examples in (5.4.3.1.1) and (5.4.3.1.2) are not rendered DUAL (neither the masculine dual (MD), nor the feminine dual (FD)) in (5.4.3.2.1) and (5.4.3.2.2). However, they are rendered plural in (5.4.3.2.1) and (5.4.3.2.2) with 0néeen expressing MD numeral two or with 0intéen expressing FD numeral two.

5.4.3.2.1 GND Agreement: Masculine Plural (Human and Non-Human) with 0néeen expressing MD numeral two:

a. 0néeen riggaalah-Ø
two-men-M.BP-IND
“two handsome men”

b. amma-0néeen am-riggaalah
the-two-the-men-M.BP-DEF
“the two handsome men”

c. 0néeen kutub-u
two-book-M.BP-pausal/OGNC-IND
“two new books”

d. amma-0néeen am-kutub
the-two the-book-M.BP-DEF
“the two new books”
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(5.4.3.2.2) GND Agreement: Feminine Plural (Human and Non-Human) with ḥinteen expressing FD numeral two:

a. ḥinteen Hariim-u
   two-women-F.BP-IND
   "two beautiful women"

b. am-ḥinteen am Hariim
   the-two the-women-F.BP-DEF
   "the two beautiful women"

c. ḥinteen mgall-aatu
   two-magazine-F.FSP-IND
   "two new magazines"

d. am-ḥinteen am-mgall-aat
   the-two the-magazine-F.FSP-DEF
   "the two new magazines"

Hsaan-u
beautiful-F.BP-pausal/OGNC-IND

am-Hsaan
the-beautiful-F.BP-DEF

gududu
new-F.BP-IND

If dual agreement is established between the two concerned elements here, then ill-formedness or ungrammaticality will occur as demonstrated in (5.4.3.2.3) and (5.4.3.2.4) below:

(5.4.3.2.3) GND Agreement: Masculine Dual (Human and Non-Human):

a. *riggaal-een-Ø
   men-M.MD-IND
   "two handsome men"

b. *am- riggaal-een
   the-man-M.MD-DEF
   "the two handsome men"

c. *ktaab-een-Ø
   book-M.MD-IND
   "two new books"

d. *am-ktaab-een
   the-book-M.MD-DEF
   "the two new books"

Hasan-een-Ø
handsome-M.MD-IND

am- Hasan-een
the- handsome-M.MD-DEF

gdiid-een-Ø
new-M.MD-IND

am-gdiid-een
the-new-M.MD-DEF

(5.4.3.2.4) GND Agreement: Feminine Dual (Human and Non-Human):

a. *mara-teen-Ø
   women-F.FD-IND
   "two beautiful women"

b. *am-mara-teen
   the-women-F.FD-DEF
   "the two beautiful women"

c. *mgalli-teen-Ø
   magazine-F.FD-IND
   "two new magazines"

Hasana-teen-Ø
beautiful-F.FD-IND

am-Hasana-teen
the-beautiful-F.FD-DEF

gdiidi-teen-Ø
new-F.FD-IND
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Only few nouns are marked as dual (for marginal exceptions, see below) and attributive adjectives are marked as plural as evidently shown in the ill-formed or ungrammatical structures in (a) and (b) of both (5.4.3.2.5) and (5.4.3.2.6) and in the well-formed or grammatical structures in (a) and (b) of both (5.4.3.2.5) and (5.4.3.2.6):

(5.4.3.2.5) GND Agreement: Masculine Dual/plural (Human and Non-Human):

a. *riggaal-een-O
   men-M.MD-IND
   “two handsome men”

b. *am-riggaal-een
   the-men-M.MD-DEF
   “the two handsome men”

c. ktaab-een-O
   book-M.MD-IND
   “two new books”

d. am-ktaab-een
   the-book-M.MD-DEF
   “the two new books”

(5.4.3.2.6) GND Agreement: Feminine Dual/plural (Human and Non-Human):

a. *mara-teen-O
   women-F.FD-IND
   “two beautiful women”

b. *am- mara-teen
   the-women-F.FD-DEF
   “the two beautiful women”

c. mgalli-teen-O
   magazine-F.FD-IND
   “two new magazines”

d. am-mgalli-teen
   the-magazine-F.FD-DEF
   “the two new magazines”

In point of fact, unlike the classical dual which is considered to be ‘a grammatical concord category’, see Blanc, (1970, p.43), the TYA dual is not a grammatical concord category. Generally, the dialectal dual is not a grammatical concord category. This generalization has been stated by Blanc, (1970), who writes:
The dialectal dual is not a grammatical concord category. Only nouns are marked as dual (for marginal exceptions, see below), and these are in virtually all respects functionally equivalent to nouns preceded by a numeral or other quantifier. The dual suffix has thus become little more than an equivalent of the numeral 'two'; overt reference to two-ness is no more obligatory, even in nouns, than is overt reference to three-ness, four-ness or n-ness. In all dialects, there are nouns that do not admit the dual at all, and for these two-ness is marked by a free numeral (itnēn and the like); but whether or not a noun has a dual form, its plural refers to any unspecified number from two on up: itnēn 'asākīr 'two policemen', 'asākīr (two or more) policemen', kalbēn 'two dogs', kilāb 'two or more) dogs'.

Ferguson (1959b) identifies the absence of dual agreement as one case of grammatical consistency among the dialects which is not found in Classical Arabic. Referring to Ferguson (620-1) and Cohen (1962:133, fn. 1), Blanc, (1970), writes:

"We owe to Ferguson (620-1) the observation that, though dual concord as such no longer exists, dual nouns nevertheless differ from plural nouns with respect to concord. In his succinct and necessarily simplified statement, he pointed out that dual nouns take plural concord (bitēn kūbār 'two big houses'), whereas plural nouns take feminine singular concord (biyūt kībīra 'big houses'). Ferguson thought this applied to a large, though limited, group of dialects (all sedentary dialects outside Arabia); but Cohen (1962:133, fn. 1) points out that the phenomenon is not restricted to these dialects. Blanc, (1970. p.49)

Based on this, the dual agreement forms are lost in TYA. only few duals take plural agreement (beet-en kbaaru “two big houses” or usually with the numeral “two” ūneen followed by the plural form of the modified noun and the plural form of the postnominal attributive adjective as in ūneen byuutu kbaaru “two big houses”), while plurals take optionally the feminine singular or the plural byuutu kabiir-eh/byuutu kbaaru “big houses”; see the following section (5.4.3.3) that deals with TYA (agreement with plural noun phrases) and the quotation there from Corbett (2000, pp. 207-208) with his reference to (Ferguson 1959: 620–1).

In what follows, we will try to show that, although plural concord (PC) is the norm for only few dual nouns, it is also the norm for plural nouns in TYA, and is not always a frequent alternative to feminine singular concord (FSC) in this dialect, because the FSC is also optionally used: what we really have is not only beet-en kbaaru vs. byuutu kabiir-eh, but also ūneen byuutu kbaaru vs. byuutu kbaaru/byuutu kabiir-eh. Moreover, it can be shown that in the TYA dialect, the alternation PC or
FSC does not occur (unlike what is observed in other Arabic dialects, cf. the quote below); the PC applies to other ‘enumerative’ expressions that go together with the dual as well as to ‘non-numerative’ plurals, which include the dual (not the pseudo-dual, due to its non-existence in this dialect, see the following paragraph): beetu w-maxzanu kbaaru ‘a big house and store’, as well as yadd-een Twaalu ‘two long hands, arms’ (θint-een yaaduun Twaalu/θint-een yaaduun Tawiil-ah ‘two big hands, arms’ is commonly used). In yaaduun Tawiil-ah, the application of the FSC can be observed, but in *θint-een yaaduun Tawiil-ah it is not, this latter should be θint-een yaaduun Twaalu showing the norm of the application of the PC. For the purpose of remembering the case of the nonexistence of the pseudo-dual in the dialect, in chapter 2 in the last two paragraphs of section (2.2.2.2.1), we have pointed out that the pseudo-dual does not occur in TYA. And that we have only one example riglu/rigl-eenu “foot/feet” that have the suffix -eenu that seems to be different from the pseudo-dual -een as well as the true dual -een, by having the pausal /u/ or (OGNC) /u/. There, in our discussion under section and table (2.2.2.3.1.1.4), as regard to the suffix -eenu as represented only in the illustrative example rigl-eenu, we proposed to be a masculine sound plural (MSP) allomorph. In the following discussion, NOUN is to be understood as excluding nouns of personal reference, and CONCORD/AGREEMENT refers, unless otherwise specified, to only the concord of attributive adjectives in simple noun phrases (i.e. in non-sentential construction): (the concord of adjectives, verbs, and pro-nouns, whether attributive or predicative needs further investigation and research in case of TYA.) Before this let us compare the above discussion with what has been noted by Blanc, (1970), in case of some Arabic dialects:

.... although plural concord (PC) is indeed the norm for dual nouns, it is also the norm for plural nouns in some dialects, and is a frequent alternative to feminine singular concord (FSC) in other dialects: what we really have is not bitēn kubār vs. biyūt kibīra, but bitēn kubār (and rarer variants, q.v. below) vs. biyut kubār’ biyut kibīra. Furthermore, it can be shown that in at least several of the dialects where the alternation PC ' FSC does occur, PC applies to other 'enumerative' expressions that go together with the dual, while FSC applies to 'non-numerative' plurals, which include the pseudo-dual: bēt wigara j kubār ‘a big house and garage’, but idēn tawila ‘long hands, arms’. In the following discussion, NOUN is to be understood as excluding nouns of personal reference, and CONCORD refers, unless otherwise specified, to the concord of adjectives, verbs, and pro-nouns, whether attributive or predicative. Blanc (1970, p.49).
To conclude and sum up this sub-section, there is no agreement in dual between the noun and the adjective; agreement is in plural. It means that no element other than the noun distinguishes dual from plural. The PC for the few TYA dual nouns is viewed as very much similar to PC in enumerative constructions. The dual is a constant combination of the numeral 'two' plus a plural noun, and as such it is similar to English expressions meaning "two" and sequences connected by "and". It is also very much similar to numeral + noun constructions. In the latter, PC is not as constant as in the dual, due to the optional use of the FSC in the plural nouns, a fact which may be connected with the portmanteau nature of the dual in opposition to the looser combinations of free numerals plus plural nouns. Compare this with the somehow reminiscent (though slightly different) summary of Blanc, (1970) in case of some Arabic dialects, where he writes:

To sum up, PC for dual nouns is, at least in some dialects, to be viewed as closely akin to PC in enumerative constructions. The dual is a stable combination of the numeral 'two' plus a noun, and as such it is akin to expressions meaning 'a few', 'several', 'one or two', and sequences connected by 'and'; it is also closely akin to numeral + noun constructions. In the latter, PC is not as stable as in the dual, a fact which may be connected with the portmanteau nature of the dual as against the looser combinations of free numerals plus nouns. Blanc, (1970, p.53)

5.4.3.3 TYA (agreement with plural noun phrases)

What is new for us and other linguists in TYA is that there is a choice of forms for agreement with plural noun phrases (feminine or plural agreement), and TYA data on their distribution. Like many Arabic dialects, TYA plural nouns admit either PC or FSC. It may be difficult to say anything general about this optional alternation, except that it seems partly free and partly conditioned-and that, to the extent that it is free, speakers or styles within this dialect may prefer the one or the other. Blanc, (1970), writes:

In many-perhaps most-dialects, plural nouns admit either PC or FSC. It is difficult to say anything general about this alternation, except that it seems partly free and partly conditioned-and that, to the extent that it is free, speakers or styles within a given dialect may prefer the one or the other. Some dialects seem to have generalized PC to such an extent that FSC is either lacking or restricted to a few special cases. In dialects where FSC and PC both occur for plural nouns, PC is, as has been stated, the norm for dual nouns; the exceptions noted below do not seem to invalidate the generality of the rule. Blanc, (1970, p.50)
FSC and PC are normal for plural nouns. PC is only normal for only few dual nouns. We have noted this in greater or lesser detail for a number of illustrative examples, but shall give details here for the PC and FSC for the plural nouns in TYA only. Hours of digitally recorded TYA data as well as digital and taped songs, video-clips, radio/TV play-lists and playlets (= short plays) and discussions with informants, and hundreds of pages of proverbs, folklore poems and other texts, establish the norm as PC for only few dual nouns (beet-en kbaar u or usually th-en byuutu kbaar u), PC and FSC for plural (daaan Tuwiil-ah or Twaalu "long ears"). This is apart from the non-existence of pseudo-duals as noted before, which seems to be existent in some Arabic dialects, where the PC or FSC is observed. Blanc. (1970), writes:

In dialects where both FSC and PC are normal for plural nouns, both are also normal for the pseudo-dual, whereas only PC is normal for dual nouns. I have noted this in greater or lesser detail for a number of dialects, but shall give details here for Cairo only. Hours of taped radio playlets and of discussions with informants, and hundreds of pages of texts, establish the norm as PC for dual (biit-en khabar), PC and FSC for plural (wid-an Tawiil or tuwal 'long ears'), and PC or FSC for pseudo-duals (riglen simila or suman 'fat legs'). Blanc. (1970, p.51)

All instances of concord/agreement in the TYA data with human and nonhuman [± H] controllers (plural) are identified and include attributive adjectives. The agreement token is coded for factors such as the morphological type of the controller and of the target (sound (MSP/FSP) or Broken Plural (BP)) and the syntactic/morphosyntactic position of the target in addition to the type of the agreement which is to be obtained. Belnap and Shabaneh. (1992, pp. 246-7) report that: A distinctive syntactic feature of many varieties of Arabic is the phenomenon of feminine singular agreement of targets with nonhuman plural controllers". (On the use of controllers and targets, see Corbett 2000.) See also the following quotation from Corbett (2001, p. 1/11), where he generally and briefly states that:

In order to be able to generalize about different types of agreement, we need a set of terms. We call the element which determines the agreement (say the subject noun phrase) the ‘controller’. The element whose form is determined by agreement is the ‘target’. The syntactic environment in which agreement occurs is the ‘domain’ of agreement. And when we indicate in what respect there is agreement (agreement in number. e.g.), we are referring to ‘agreement features’. As these terms suggest, there is a clear intuition that agreement is directional. Corbett (2001, p. 1/11)
Further, in his endnote (2) shown in the above quotation, he (Corbett, 2001), points out that “We shall treat, say, number as a ‘feature’ and singular, dual, plural as ‘values’ of that feature. The features and their values carried by a controller or target are its ‘feature specification’.” (p. 10/11)

They (Belnap and Shabaneh) go on to say that:

In Modern Standard Arabic, adjectives show masculine and feminine gender distinction when agreeing with singular, nonhuman head nouns as shown in the (a) versions of (1)-(2)”. However, adjective agreement with plural, nonhuman head nouns shows no corresponding differentiation; the same type of adjective agreement occurs with all nonhuman plurals, regardless of the gender of the corresponding singular of the head noun, as in (1b) and (2b).

(1) a. al-kitaab al-jadiid
     the-book (MS) the-new (MS)
     “the new book”

b. al-kutub al-jadiid-a
     the-book (P) the-new (FS)
     “the new books”

(2) a. al-sana al-jadiid-a
     the-year (FS) the-new (FS)
     “the new year”

b. al-sanaw-aat al-jadiid-a
     the-years (FP) the-new (FS)
     “the new years” Belnap and Shabaneh (1992, pp. 245-246).

What is mentioned in the aforementioned quote with its illustrative examples seems to hold true in case of TYA, though it is slightly different, the definite article being am- not al-. This is evidently shown in the following TYA data demonstrated in (5.4.3.3.1) and (5.4.3.3.2) respectively:

(5.4.3.3.1) a. am-ktaab am-gdiid
     the-book (MS) the-new (MS)
     “the new book”

b. am-kutub am-gidiid-eh
     the-books (P) the-new (FS)
     “the new books”

(5.4.3.3.2) a. am-san-eh am-gdiid-eh
     the-year (FS) the-new (FS)
     “the new year”

b. am-sn-iin am-gidiid-eh
     the-years (FP) the-new (FS)
     “the new years”
This type of phenomenon, as pointed out by Belnap and Shabaneh, (1992, p. 247) in case of Arabic in general, has traditionally been referred to as feminine singular agreement with nonhuman plurals and that Ferguson refers to this type as 'deflected' as opposed to 'strict', agreement (Ferguson et al. 1961; Ferguson 1989), the topic of our discussion that has been dealt with in section (5.3) above. Moreover, TYA (agreement with plural noun phrases) will be considered as surprising. Before discussing the TYA (agreement with plural noun phrases) that will be considered as surprising, we will have a general notion about Arabic (agreement with plural noun phrases) as pointed out by Corbett (2000), who states that “The agreements found with plural noun phrases in Arabic are initially surprising.” (p. 207) Within this notion and talking about Cairene Arabic (like many other dialects), Corbett reports that:

Although the dual agreement forms are lost, in the relevant dialects noun phrases headed by nouns in the dual still differ from plural noun phrases with respect to agreement. There is variation, but duals take plural agreement (the form used with plural pronouns), while plurals take the feminine singular or the plural (Ferguson 1959: 620–1). The situation in such varieties (Cairene Arabic for example, Belnap 1993: 111) is as in table 6.15: as before, the rows and columns are labelled according to the controller. Cairene Arabic, like many other dialects, has lost gender distinctions in the plural, and so there are only three agreeing forms. Once again we have a mismatch between the controller system (which distinguishes three numbers, and two genders, as shown by the labels on the rows and the columns in table 6.15) and the target system (which has three forms, given in the cells). Corbett (2000, pp. 207-208).

Similarly, TYA (like Cairene Arabic, and like many other dialects observed in the above quote) has lost gender distinctions in the plural, and so there are only three agreeing forms.

Also within this notion of Corbett that “The agreements found with plural noun phrases in Arabic are initially surprising.” (p. 207), and talking about Cairene Arabic, MSA and other vernacular varieties of Arabic, Corbett suggests that:
What is new for us in Cairene Arabic is that there is a choice of forms for agreement with plural noun phrases (feminine or plural agreement), and data on their distribution. As we investigate the distribution of the feminine singular (syntactic agreement) and the plural (semantic agreement), we shall find ourselves on partly familiar ground. While Modern Standard Arabic has standardized rules of agreement, other modern varieties (as well as the earliest texts) show more variability. We will concentrate on Cairene Arabic. Here, as in many other vernacular varieties, when we have a plural noun denoting humans, plural agreement is expected, but feminine singular agreement is possible too (examples from Belnap 1999: 171):

(54) riggaala kuwayyis-iin/(kuwayyis-a)
men.PL nice-PL/nice-SG.FEM

‘nice men’

Further, in a footnote following the above quote, Corbett points out that: “Interestingly the feminine is not the default form, but the masculine, used for instance where there is a clausal subject (see Cowell 1964: 421 on Syrian Arabic).” Also in another footnote he points out that: “Arabists sometimes use the terms ‘deflected’ (our ‘syntactic’) and ‘strict’ (our ‘semantic’); see Ferguson (1989), Belnap (1993: 98n1).” This notion holds somewhat true in case of TYA dialect. When we have a plural noun denoting humans, plural agreement is only expected. This is demonstrated in the following TYA example shown in (5.4.3.3.3) below:

(5.4.3.3.3) riggaal-ah kwayyis-iin
men.PL nice-PL

‘nice men’

However, feminine singular agreement is not possible in TYA, when we have a plural noun denoting humans. This is evidently demonstrated in the oddity of the construction given in (5.4.3.3.4) below:

(5.4.3.3.4) *riggaal-ah (kwayyis-eh)
men.PL nice-SG.FEM

‘nice men’

Further in case of Cairene Arabic, Corbett points out that “Conversely, if the plural head noun does not denote a human then feminine singular agreement is usual, but plural agreement is also found: (55) biyuut kabiir-a/(kubaar) houses.PL large-SG.FEM/large.PL ‘large houses’.” This notion holds true in case of TYA dialect. In
TYA, if the plural head noun does not denote a human then feminine singular agreement is usual, but plural agreement is also found as evidently shown in the following TYA data demonstrated in (5.4.3.3.5) below:

(5.4.3.3.5) byuutu kabiir-ch/kaaru
houses.BP large-SG.FEM/large.BP
“large houses”

This variation as generally considered by Corbett “is a variation on a familiar theme: controllers with higher animacy are more likely to take semantic agreement (plural here) than those with lower animacy.” This leads us to a possible explanation for the Arabic agreement system in general, which has been stated by Belnap and Shabaneh, (1992, p. 259), where they say: “A possible explanation is that the Arabic agreement system was based on gender and number but underwent reanalysis, triggered by the inclusion of the [± HUMAN] distinction.”

5.4.3.4 Morphological type of broken plural agreement
Most (if not all) instances of broken plural agreement in TYA consist of adjectives of one morphological type, the CiC2aaC3U (faalu) pattern, e.g.’ qsaaru “short”, twaalu “long”, gsaaamu “huge”, 0qaalu “heavy”. A similar notion (although with a slightly different morphological type) in case of Arabic in general has been pointed out by Belnap and Shabaneh, (1992), where they say that: “All instances of broken plural agreement in modern prose consist of adjectives of one morphological type, the fi’aal pattern, e.g.’ qisaaar “short”, ti visaal [with a dot under t] “long”, jisam “huge”. 0iqaal “heavy.” They go on to say that: “This type of agreement appears to be relic which has been taken on the status of a marker indicating literary style.” (p. 259)

5.4.4 Definiteness marking, inheritance and agreement
5.4.4.1 TYA definite article am-, the Himyaritic am- vs. Arabic al-
From a morphosyntactic point of view, the discussion of TYA definite article am-, the Himyaritic am- vs. Arabic al- as a uniquely definiteness marking should be firstly and for all intents and purposes shown and discussed in details before discussing the Definiteness inheritance and agreement.

As a starting point for a general notion of the existence of definite article in Arabic as a Semitic language and other varieties of Semitic languages, we will quote
below the statement of Bauer, Brigitte L.M. (2007) with his reference to (Greenberg 1978: 59), where it reads that:

The definite article is found in Semitic languages such as Arabic, Hebrew, and Aramaic, but the place of occurrence varies: in Modern Arabic and Hebrew it precedes the noun; in the earliest Aramaic texts it follows the noun, but in Modern Eastern Aramaic dialects a newly developed “prefixed article” may be found (Greenberg 1978: 59). Bauer, Brigitte L.M. (2007, p. 104).

In Tihami Yemeni Arabic (TYA) a newly developed “prefixed article” is found. This prefixed article is the definite article am- not the Arabic definite article ‘al-.

Generally speaking, the notion of definite article in Arabic has been discussed by many authors, here we will show a brief interpretation of this notion in accordance with what has been pointed out by Al-Shamrani. Abdulrahman Hadi (1994, pp.176-177). Under the section (3.4.5) entitled: ‘(in)definiteness’ and within his discussion and explanation of his representative Arabic example: (126a), where it reads:

(126a) raja‘a r-rajul-u l-mariiD-u
came back def. man-nom. Def. sick-nom.
“A sick man came”.

Al-Shamrani points out that the attributive adjective l-mariiD-u in (126a) shows the formative l- prefixing its stem and that this affix is interpreted in Arabic grammatical literature as a definite article and hence that indefinite nouns and adjectives when prefixed by this l- affix are said to be definitized and that the English glosses of (126a) show that the NP r-rajul-u is definite, yet it does not reflect the definite article l-. With his reference to Ullendorff (1965) he points out that Ullendorff (1965, p. 361) remarks that the definite article in Arabic may appear in four different forms:

(1) ‘al- at the beginning of an utterance (‘al-baytu)
(2) l- in any position except as at (1) (fi-l-bayti)
(3) ‘a- plus first consonant of the following noun, that is, at the beginning of an utterance (‘ar-rajulu)
(4) a sound identical with the first consonant of the following noun, that is in any position, except as at (3) (dahaba r-rajulu) (with dot under d)
And, based on these, Al-Shamrani points out that if we apply Ullendorff’s classification literally, we can say that the definite article appearing on the attributive adjective l-mariiD-u in (126a) belongs to (2) and the definite NP r-rajulu in (126a) will reflect, according to Ullendorff, form (4) of the definite article and that it is rather doubtful that the form of the definite article in Arabic is conditioned by its graphic appearance and by the type of consonant that follows it. He also points out that without denying the validity of Ullendorff’s classification, we still can reduce the forms of the definite article to two: namely, the one appearing in (2) of Ullendorff’s classification and the one appearing in his (4). By then, he points out that we shall take the sound l- to be the essential formal marker of the definite article and definiteness in Arabic and that this sound, however, assimilates completely, according to Haddad and Kenstowicz (1980, p. 141), to ‘a following coronal consonant’. He finally points out that the definite article l-, then, will always keep this sound and form if followed by the following consonants: , b, j, h, x, , y, f, q, k, m, h, w, and y, and that it always fully assimilate to the following consonants: t, ð, d, ð, r, z, s, š, S, D, T, DH, l, and n. As will be evidently shown in our discussion of TYA definite article am- and its allomorphic variations below, the definite article with /m/ assimilates to some initial consonant of the following noun or adjective. This is different from the definite article with /m/ that is used in a few areas in both western and central Yemen, and nowhere does it assimilate to any initial consonant of the following noun. Vanhove, Martine (à paraître/forthcoming) points out that:

The definite article with /m/ is used in a few areas in both western and central Yemen, and nowhere does it assimilate to any initial consonant of the following noun: /am-sanînî/ [with dot under s] ‘the little finger’ (Abyan). It is now receding. Landberg (1909:286) for Upper ‘Awlaqi and Marxah in Abyan, and Behnstedt (1987) for the area of Sa’dah, also mention an article /en-/ or /an-/, which corresponds to the old Himyaritic article. Vanhove, Martine (à paraître/forthcoming).

5.4.4.1.1 Historical review
According to what has been mentioned by authors interested in Yemeni dialect in general and Tihami dialect of Yemen in particular such as Sharafa al-Diin, A.H (1970, pp. 20 and 64); Greenman, (1979); Al-Omariy, (2000); Al - Shaiby, Fahd (2001); Al-Ahdal Khalid, (2004); Watson, (2002); Al-Samrres’i, (2005, p. 107), etc., (Many of them mention it in Arabic scripts and in accordance with the topic of their discussions
for instance dialects, proverbs, folklore poetry, folklore music or folklore dances), the definite article used in Tihamah region of Yemen and other Yemeni regions is the Himyaritic am- and not al- as used in CA or MSA or many other modern Arabic dialects. To quote what Al-Samraa`i, (2005) mentions:

```
"ibdaal al-laam fi al-at-ta`riif bi-l-miim. ya-quuluun: am-beet, am-biqarah, am-shigarah, am-raHaa, am-qalb, badal: al-beet, al-biqarah, al-shajarah, al-raHaa, al-qalb, wa haathihii 'adh-dhaahirah 'ashaara `ilayhah 'al-qudaamah` min qabl wa nasabuuhaa `ila lughat Himyar" (204) wa qad gaa'a fi-l-Hadiith qawluluh Sallal-llaah `alayhi wa sallam (laysa min am-bir am-Syaam fi am-safar) (205); 'ibdaal al-at-ta`riif bi am musta'mal fi kathiir min manaaTiq al-yaman wa 'alaa waghi-l-khuSuuS fi Haashid wa 'arHab wa ba'D khawlaan wa Hamdaan wa Radaa` wa-l-Hadaa`, wa kathhaalik fi saHaari min Sa`dah wa bi-l-`akhaS fi qaryat aT-TalH wa fi mu'UDHam manaaTiq Tihaamah wa hiyah Himyariyyah wa kadhaalik lahghah saba`iyyah. (206) Al-Saamraa`i, (2005, p. 107).
```

Our own translation of the above Arabic transcribed and transliterated quotation with its own numbers of end-notes from 204-206 are shown below:

Replacement of the /l/ in the definite article 'al- by the /m/: they say am-beet, am-biqarah, am-shigarah, am-raHaa, am-qalb, instead of al-beet, al-biqarah, al-shajarah, al-raHaa, al-qalb. This phenomenon has been referred to by the old scholars and the traced it back to the dialect of Himyar and it has come in the tradition his saying, the prophet peace be upon him (laysa min am-bir am-Syaam fi am-safar (= fasting in journeying is not (an act) of piety)) (204); the replacement of the definite article 'al- with am- is used in many of Yemen regions, particularly or specially in Haashid, 'arHab, and some of Khawlaan, Hamdaan, Radaa` and al-Hadaa`; it is also in some deserts of Sa`dah, specially in the village of aT-TalH and in most regions of Tihamah.. And it is Himyaritic as well as sabaean dialect.

This is reminiscent of Wrights’ remark (1955, p. 270), where he points out that in South Arabia ‘am- was (and even still is) used for ‘al-, but without assimilation; as laysa min am-bir am-Syaam fi am-safar. fasting in journeying is not (an act) of piety; yarmi waraa’iy b-am-sahm wa-m-salimah. he casts (standing) behind me with arrow and stone: for al-birr, aS-Siyaamu, as-safari, bis-sahmi, and wa-s-salimati. Rephrasing the aforementioned Wrights’ remark will be as follows: the definite article 'am- was and is still used for the definite article 'al-; unlike 'al-, there is no assimilation in case of 'am- [this is, of course, wrong, as will be shown in the evident TYA data below]; exemplifying his remark, he, first,
transliterated the tradition of the prophet (peace be upon him), where am- occurs as laysa min am-birr am-Syaam fi am-safar, fasting in journeying is not (an act) of piety, which is clarified as follows:

\[
\text{laysa min } \text{am-birr am-Syaam fi am-safar}
\]

Not of the-(an act) of piety the-fasting in the-journeying

Lit.: fasting in journeying is not (an act) of piety.

That is to say in case of ‘al-:

\[
\text{laysa min al-birr aS-Syaam fi as-safar}
\]

Not of the-(an act) of piety the-fasting in the-journeying

Lit.: fasting in journeying is not (an act) of piety.

Second he transliterated an example of a part of a verse-line from traditional poetry, where am- occurs as yarmi waraa’iy b-am-sahm wa-m-salimah, he casts (standing) behind me with arrow and stone, which is clarified as follows:

\[
yar\-mi \text{ waraa’-iy b- am-sahm wa -m-salimah,}
\]

he casts behind me with the arrow and the stone

Lit.: he casts (standing) behind me with arrow and stone.

That is to say in case of ‘al-:

\[
yar\-mi \text{ waraa’-iy b- as-sahm wa -s-salimah.}
\]

he casts behind me with the arrow and the stone

Lit.: he casts (standing) behind me with arrow and stone.

Similarly, in his article entitled: “A sketch of the Arabic dialect of the Central Yamani Tihāmah”, Greenman, (1979) reports that:

Recognition of this dialect, or at least of one of its features, since early in the Islamic period is indicated by the recording of the hadīt [with dot under h and the t is underlined] laysa min m-birri m-siyāmu [with dot under s] fī m-safar ‘fasting (during the holy month of Ramadān) while traveling is not (considered) piety.’ Greenman, (1979, p. 47).

Under the section 4, “Morphology” in his article entitled: “A sketch of the Arabic dialect of the Central Yamani Tihāmah”, where he uses CT, LA. U, and R as abbreviations of Central Tihāmah, Literary Arabic, Urban, and Rural,
respectively, Greenman. (1979). refers to the m-article and that it is commonly attributed to Himyaritic [with dot under H] and still heard regularly in CT though, as might be expected, it is the very first feature to change to the “standard form”, i.e., the article based upon the LA l-. when the social situation requires such a change. He states that:

... the definite article m-, is quite well documented. Among Yamanis it is commonly attributed to Himyaritic, the extinct language that was widely spoken in the area even after the advent of Islam, but its true history remains uncertain. In any case, this phenomenon is still heard regularly in CT though, as might be expected, it is the very first feature to change to the “standard form”, i.e., the article based upon l-, when the social situation requires such a change. Greenman, (1979, p. 57).

We will focus our discussion on the occurrence of the am-article only. Though, in fact, the am-article in TYA is not used exclusively. During the entire course of the research we did not encounter a single conversation in which the am-article was used exclusively, and this seems to be the practice among TYA speakers in all domains of usage. The typical case is that the m-article would be interchanged, apparently randomly, with the appropriate šamsî or qamarî of the MSA al-article. This reminds us of what Greenman, under the section (4.0.1) states with examples:

During the entire course of the research I did not encounter a single conversation in which the m-article was used exclusively, and this seems to be the practice among CT speakers in all domains of usage. As might be expected, R speakers use it more regularly than U speakers. The typical case is that the m-article would be interchanged, apparently randomly, with the appropriate šamsî or qamarî of the l-article, e.g.

[tlyan ruhtlyôm ruhtEmxabt] ‘Where did you go today, did you go to the desert?’ (U)
[mšantah dahi bënEmruk] ‘The suitcase, that’s it is in the corner.’ (U)
[whi ?atan lammambāb yā?ani lbāb haqqEmbayt] ‘... and she came as far as the door, that is, the door of the house.’ (R). Greenman, (1979, p. 58)

Further, under the section (4.0.2) he states:

In CT, in the cases where the l-article occurs, the sounds that are subject to the šamsî gemination are the same as in LA. Unlike LA, however, in which the šamsî process requires that all consonants homorganic with [l], i.e., the alveolars, are geminated, the CT m-article does not undergo this progressive assimilation with homorganic consonants, see the last of the examples in 4.0.1. and also the hadît [with dot under h and t is underlined] quoted in 1.1. above. Greenman, (1979, p. 58).
As will be evidently shown in our discussion of TYA definite article am- and its allomorphic variations below that it assimilates to some initial consonant of the following noun or adjective, we do not agree with Greenman’s general statement that: “the CT m-article does not undergo this progressive assimilation with homorganic consonants”.

In his discussion of the languages of Pre-Islamic Arabia in general and the position of the Himyaritic in relation to Arabic in particular and retention of a few of its archaic features such as the present-day restriction of the am- article to a few isolated pockets in Yemen, Beeston, A. F. L. (Jun. – Sep., 1981), writes:

..., it may be illuminating to consider the position of Himyaritic (as known to the Muslims scholars) in relation to Arabic. The philologists have recorded for us several features of the Himyaritic, two being conspicuously deviant from Arabic: the use of a definite article am-, and a verbal inflexion fa’ilka, fa’ilki, fa’ilku.... At the present day, the abovementioned two features of ancient Himyaritic are still to be found in some speech-forms of the southern end of the west-Arabian mountain spine, though in other respects it would not be possible to classify these as other than Arabic dialects [Diem 1973]. What has happened is a gradual convergence between ancient Himyaritic and ancient Arabic, leading ultimately to the disappearance of the individual status of Himyaritic but with retention of a few of its archaic features. Beeston, A. F. L. (Jun. – Sep., 1981, pp. 185-186).

Further,

The philologist have also recorded the am- article in a few west-central areas, such as Murrah in the vicinity of the Medina, and this led Rabin [1951.35] to infer that its, 'common-west-Arabian'; this, however, seems a slight over-simplification, in that it does not take account of the heavy dominance of the h(n) article in exactly those areas. Beeston, A. F. L. (Jun. – Sep., 1981, pp. 185-186).

Finally, in another paragraph, he writes:

.....; and the remaining speech-forms have converged so as to produce the amalgam of dialects which can properly be called Arabic. One of the effects of this convergence has been total elimination of the h(n) article in favor of the (‘)l form, and the present-day restriction of the am- article to a few isolated pockets in Yemen.
Making report on the Arabic dialects spoken within the Republic of Yemen and that they exhibit a huge array of archaic features and the Tihama dialects share the Himyaritic definite article am- or im-, Watson (2006), in her article entitled “Yemen: Language Situation”, in the Encyclopedia of language and linguistics (2006), points out that:

The Arabic dialects spoken within the Republic of Yemen are extremely varied, due, at least partially, to the rugged mountainous terrain that separates groups of people and to the dependence of the isolated groups on traditional means of communication. Dialects in the north can be divided broadly into five dialect areas: the coastal plain (the Tihama), the western mountain range, the central plateau, Hugari:yah to the south of Ta’izz, and the desert east. Behnstedt (1985) divided these dialects more specifically into 11 areas. Taken together, the dialects exhibit a huge array of archaic features, particularly in the morphology and vocabulary, with remnants of Old Arabic or of one or more of the Ancient South Arabian languages. The Tihama dialects share the Himyaritic definite article am- or im-, and, as in many dialects in Saudi Arabia to the north, traces of nunation – usually realized as –in and suffixed to non-final indefinite nouns and adjectives. Watson (2006, p. 729).

Further, Watson points out that: “Geographical isolation leads not only to maintenance of archaic features, but also to grammaticalizations and isolated innovations based on analogy.” (729).

In general, the maintenance of archaic features is attested in modern spoken Arabic dialects. Kaye Alan S. (2007) in his essay “Classical and Colloquial Arabic Archaisms” in the book entitled: “Approaches to Arabic Linguistics” states that:

This essay argues that modern spoken Arabic dialects sometimes retain very archaic Semitic features. In fact, they may even preserve Proto-Semitic forms that have been lost in Classical Arabic—another indication that Classical Arabic is not to be regarded as their ancestral proto-language (see Kaye 1976 for fuller explication of this idea). Rather, there were other Arabic dialects spoken alongside Classical Arabic all throughout history that served as the ancestral inputting ones to the contemporary picture of Arabic dialects. Kaye Alan S. (2007, p. 595).

Further in his conclusion, Kaye Alan S. (2007) states that: “Additional comparisons along the lines of the present investigation of Classical Arabic and colloquial Arabic dialects with other Semitic languages will undoubtedly further demonstrate that spoken Arabic dialects occasionally preserve more original forms than does Classical Arabic.” (pp. 504-605).
5.4.4.1.2 TYA definite article am- and its allomorphic variations

Unlike CA or MSA or any other varieties of Arabic, TYA has the definite article am- not the CA/MSA 'al-. The TYA definite article am- when attached to a word (i.e. noun or adjective) used in isolation or pause, the initial glottal stop of this article will not be represented, and the remaining am- will be separated from the word it defines by a dash “-” e.g., am- šams “the sun”. The post final vowel /u/, which has been considered as an over-generalized nominative case (OGNC) in the introductory chapter, is deleted when the definite article am- is prefixed to the word.

When this definite article am- prefixed to a word beginning with one of the following consonants / b, m, f, w /, the m- of the definite article is assimilated to the sound it is annexed to and its vowel a is nasalized (i.e. it becomes a nasalized vowel /a/), e.g.,

- am- + baabu → āb-baab “the door”
- am- + miqhaayah → ām-miqhaayah “the café”
- am- + waqtu → āw-waqt “the time/free time”
- am- + faaru → āf-faar “the mouse/the rat”

However, when prefixed to a word beginning with one of the following three radicals/consonants / k, g, q /, it undergoes two processes: (i) the m- of the definite article is first changed to n (n alternates with m), and then this n is assimilated to the sound it is annexed to and its vowel /a/ is nasalized (i.e. it becomes a nasalized vowel /a/), e.g.,

- am- + kaasu - an- kaas → āk-kaas “the cup”
- am- + gamalu ~ an- gamal → āg-gamal “the camel”
- am- + qamaru ~ an- qamar → āq-qamar “the moon”

All sounds other than those shown above do not cause assimilation or changing to the m- of the definite article am- when it is attached to any one of them. This is illustrated bellow:

- am- + xeemeh → am- xeemeh “the tent”
- am- + zoou → am- zoog “the husband”
- am- + daftaru → am- daflar “the copy book”
- am- + naamsu → am- naamis “the mosquitoes”
- am- + subbaaku → am- subbaak “the window”
- am- + Gadee → am- Gadee “the lunch”
- am- + Hamaameh → am- Hamaameh “the dove/the pigeon”
Another allomorphic variation for the definite article am- is presented in the insertion of ma- between am- and adjective form/pattern C1C2aC3; we believe that the ma- insertion is being considered as a COMPENSATORY SYLLABLE. This is demonstrated in the following instances or environments of ma- insertion in TYA only.

When the TYA definite article/prefix am- occurs at a plural morpheme boundary provided that it is on the plural patterns: C1C2aaC3eh, C1aC2aaC3, and C1C2iC3-eh. (which alternate with the MSA 'aC1C2aaC3, 'aaC1aaC3, and 'aC1C2iC3-ah), it is inserted between the prefix and the word. This is illustrated below:

Taking into consideration the MSA plural form as an underlying representation form which begins with the syllable /'a-1/ (i.e. the syllable that begins with the glottal stop /'/followed by the vowel /a/, which is lost in the TYA form as a process of alternation), the ma- inserted between the definite article/prefix am- and the TYA plural form can be considered what we assume as a COMPENSATORY SYLLABLE.
Another TYA data, this time from adjectives, on the adjective pattern (3.1.3.16) $C_1C_2aC_3$, which alternates with the MSA adjective pattern ‘af’al (i.e. ‘a$C_1C_2aC_3$), reveals the fact of ma- insertion between the definite article/prefix am- and the TYA adjective form/pattern $C_1C_2aC_3$ This is illustrated below:

| am + Hmar     | am   | Hmar | “the red” |
| am + zraq     | am   | zraq | “the blue” |
| am + Sfar     | am   | Sfar | “the yellow” |
| am + xDHHar   | am   | xDHHar | “the green” |
| am + sqar     | am   | sqar | “the blond” |
| am + qlab     | am   | qlab | “the cross-eyed” |
| am + Sla’     | am   | Sla’ | “the bald” |
| am + bkam     | am   | bkam | “the mute, dumb” |
| am + Snag     | am   | Snag | “the deaf” |
| am + qzal     | am   | qzal | the cripple |
| am + Hmaq     | am   | Hmaq | “the foolish” |
| am + swad     | am   | swad | “the black” |
| am + Hwal     | am   | Hwal | “the cross-eyed” |
| am + swal     | am   | swal | “the left-handed” |
| am + byaD     | am   | byaD | “the white” |

The above TYA data showing the ma- inserted between am- and $C_1C_2aC_3$ adjective form/pattern, provide another evidence for the validity of our assumption about the ma- insertion being considered as a COMPENSATORY SYLLABLE.

One more allomorphic variation for the definite article m- is evidently presented in its changing to a nasalized consonant when it occurs in a more complex context: this is after getting assimilated to the following consonant discussed in the aforementioned illustrative examples. Before this, see what is evidently quoted below:

It has been pointed out in two web sites (http://www.answers.com/topic/nasalization and http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nasalization) (accessed on 05/02/2010)) that “Some of the South Arabic languages have phonemic nasalized fricatives, such as [z], which sounds something like a simultaneous [n] and [z].”

Similarly, some of the TYA have phonemic nasalized consonants, such as [q], which sounds something like a simultaneous [n] and [q]. Or, generally, some of the TYA have phonemic nasalized consonants (N.C.), such as [c], which sounds something like a simultaneous [n] and [c]. This is usually when the TYA definite article am- or m without the preceding vowel /a/ occurs in a context especially when preceded by a word the last phoneme of which is /i/ as in fi “in” or /u/ as in the
common second plural pronoun 'you' (2 CPL) in the imperative verb Hiiduu “see”; see appendix I. Illustrative examples are shown below:

\[ k = n + k \quad \text{as in} \quad \text{fi-k-kaas} \quad \text{“in the cup”} \]
\[ g = n + g \quad \text{as in} \quad \text{fi-g-gamal} \quad \text{“in the camel”} \]
\[ q = n + q \quad \text{as in} \quad \text{fi-q-qamar} \quad \text{“in the moon”} \]

**OR**

\[ k = n + k \quad \text{as in} \quad \text{Hiiduu-k-kaas} \quad \text{“see the cup”} \]
\[ g = n + g \quad \text{as in} \quad \text{Hiiduu-g-gamal} \quad \text{“see the camel”} \]
\[ q = n + q \quad \text{as in} \quad \text{Hiiduu-q-qamar} \quad \text{“see the moon”} \]

Also TYA have phonemic nasalized consonants, such as \([\hat{b}]\), which sounds something like a simultaneous \([n]\) and \([\hat{q}]\). Or, generally, TYA have phonemic nasalized consonants (N.C.), such as \([\hat{c}]\), which sounds something like a simultaneous \([m]\) and \([\hat{c}]\). This is usually when the TYA definite article am- or m without the preceding vowel /a/ occurs in a context especially when preceded by a word the last phoneme of which is /i/ or /u/. Illustrative examples are shown below:

\[ b = m + b \quad \text{as in} \quad \text{fi-b-baab} \quad \text{“in the door”} \]
\[ m = m + m \quad \text{as in} \quad \text{fi-m-miqhaayah} \quad \text{“in the café”} \]
\[ w = m + w \quad \text{as in} \quad \text{fi-w-waqt} \quad \text{“in the time/free time”} \]
\[ f = m + f \quad \text{as in} \quad \text{fi-f-faar} \quad \text{“in the mouse/the rat”} \]

**OR**

\[ b = m + b \quad \text{as in} \quad \text{Hiiduu-b-baab} \quad \text{“in the door”} \]
\[ m = m + m \quad \text{as in} \quad \text{Hiiduu-m-miqhaayah} \quad \text{“in the café”} \]
\[ w = m + w \quad \text{as in} \quad \text{Hiiduu-w-waqt} \quad \text{“in the time/free time”} \]
\[ f = m + f \quad \text{as in} \quad \text{Hiiduu-f-faar} \quad \text{“in the mouse/the rat”} \]

All sounds other than those shown above do not have nasalization. am-becomes m without the preceding vowel a, for example fi-m-xeemeh “in the tent”, Hiiduu-m-xeemeh “see the tent”, etc.

### 5.4.4.2 Definiteness or indefiniteness of noun-adjective noun phrases

Generally speaking, “in many languages”, according to Lyons, Christopher (1999, 2003), “a noun phrase may contain an element which seems to have as its sole or principal role to indicate the definiteness or indefiniteness of the noun phrase. This element may be a lexical item like the definite and indefinite articles of English *(the).*
a), or an affix of some kind like the Arabic definite prefix ُال- and indefinite suffix -ن. (p.1). (See also Lyons (1999, 2003, pp. 91-94) for more details).

Indefiniteness, which corresponds to the use of “a” or “an” in English, is not marked with a separate word in Arabic. Instead, it is marked with a suffix, an /n/ sound that comes at the end of a word, for example a house (nominative) bayt-u-n; a house (accusative bayt-a-n; a house (genitive) bayt-i-n. This is in accordance with what has been pointed out by Ryding (2005, pp. 42-43) under the section 8.2 entitled: ‘indefinite marker: nunation (تاموين)’. Further, Ryding points out that “Nunation as a marker of indefiniteness may appear on nouns, adjectives, and adverbs.” (p. 43).

Shlonsky, U. (2004, p. 1472) reports that: “It is clear that Standard Arabic nunation marks indefiniteness but it is not obvious that the tanwiin is the indefinite article. For some recent discussion see Ayoub (1991).” The TYA counterexample of Ryding’s one is a house (nominative) beetu; a house (accusative beet-u; a house (genitive) beet-u. This post-final vowel /u/ which has been considered as the pausal /u/ or the over-generalized nominative case (OGNC) /u/ (see Shaghi, Abdullah and Imtiaz Hasnain (to appear), see also section (2.5.6) in chapter 2) seems to be the only prominent case standing for all syntactic cases for majority of indefinite nouns and adjectives or simply their pausal forms. However, many nouns and adjectives do not end in this /u/, especially those ending in the feminine marker -ه/-ة as in a school (nominative) madras-ah-0; a school (accusative madras-ah-0; a school (genitive) madras-ah-0. This zero suffix or /u/ or both represent the indefiniteness marker in TYA. If this is the case, we suggest that /u/ functions as a ‘portmanteau morpheme’, a matter that needs more investigation.

It can be argued that in TYA it is definiteness which arguably has two exponents one negative and the other positive. Many singular and most plural inflections of nouns signal indefiniteness by the pausal /u/ or the zero suffix –0, whose absence is therefore a fairly reliable indicator of definiteness; and when definite, a noun requires the definite prefix ُام- as demonstrated above as well as in (5.4.4.2.1) below:

(5.4.4.2.1) a. kalb-u-0
dog- pausal /u/-INDEF
b. am-kalb (āk-kalb (regressive assimilation))
DEF-dog
This is slightly different from that of Arabic in general about which Plank, Frans (2003, p. 381) points out that:

In Arabic it is definiteness which arguably has two exponents even in unamplified NPs, one negative and the other positive. Many singular and most plural inflections of nouns signal indefiniteness by nunation, whose absence is therefore a fairly reliable indicator of definiteness; and when definite, an unnunated noun requires the definite prefix (or proclitic):

(152) a. kalbu-n
dog-INDEF
b. al-kalbu-Ø

TYA has both definite and indefinite markers. The definite marker is a word (am-) which is not independent but is prefixed to nouns and adjectives; the indefiniteness marker is the presence of OGNC /u/ (or the pausal /u/) or a zero suffix -Ø (not the Arabic suffix -n), normally suffixed to the indefinite forms of nouns and adjectives (definite forms do not have them); thus, am-beet (‘the house’, definite), but beet-u-Ø (‘a house’ – pausal /u/, indefinite; am-madras-ah “the school” but madras-ah-Ø “school - indefinite”) (See section (5.4.4.3) below for more details and illustrative examples). Similar kind of observation can be found in Arabic: however a discrepancy can be seen. To see such discrepancy, let us return to Ryding, where she adds that:

Arabic has both definite and indefinite markers. The definite marker is a word (al-) which is not independent but is prefixed to nouns and adjectives; the indefiniteness marker is an affix (-n), normally suffixed to the case-marking vowel on nouns and adjectives; thus, al-bayt-u (‘the house’ – nominative, definite), but bayt-u-Ø (‘a house’ – nominative, indefinite). Ryding (2005, pp. 42-43).

It is plausible for regular marking of a feature definiteness to be completely general, affecting inherently all nouns (and adjectives) under all circumstances. This is indeed what we appear to find in TYA in the following section, where all nouns (and adjectives) are marked for the feature DEFINITENESS.

5.4.4.3 Definiteness inheritance
TYA nouns are marked for the feature DEFINITENESS. That is, a noun in TYA will take either a definite determiner or an indefiniteness marker. The definite determiner
is a prefix *am-* (not the Arabic *al-*), whereas the indefiniteness marker is the OGNC
/u/ (or the pausal /u/) or a zero suffix –Ø in the absence of /u/ or both (but not the
Arabic suffix -n). By the addition of this am-, both the OGNC /u/ (the pausal /u/) or
the zero suffix –Ø or both will be deleted. These three elements are in complementary
distribution, as shown in ((5.4.4.3.1) c):

(5.4.4.3.1)  a.  riggaal-u- Ø
               man- pausal /u/-INDEF
               “a man”
b.  am- riggaal
   the-man
   “the man”
c.  *am- riggaal-u- Ø
   the-man- pausal /u/-INDEF

On the basis of the above analysis and exemplification, there will be a
discrepancy between the analysis and exemplification of the phenomenon of TYA
‘Definiteness inheritance’ and their Arabic counterparts. To see such discrepancy, let
us look at what Kremers, (2003) reports:

Arabic nouns are marked for the feature DEFINITENESS. That is, a noun
in Arabic will take either a definite determiner or an indefiniteness marker. The
definite determiner is a prefix *al-*, whereas the indefiniteness marker
is a suffix -n. These two elements are in complementary distribution, as
shown in (5c):

(5)  a.  rağul-u-n
    man-NOM-INDEF
    ‘a man’
b.  al-rağul-u
    the-man-NOM
    ‘the man’
c.  *al-rağul-u-n

Adjectives that modify a noun agree with that noun in definiteness (Kremers
(2003)). The following analysis and exemplification of this phenomenon of Arabic
and their TYA counterparts show a discrepancy; let us first look at what Kremers
reports:
Adjectives that modify a noun agree with that noun in definiteness. That is, the adjective receives either a definite article or an indefiniteness marker, just like the noun:

(6) a. bayt-u-n kabīr-u-n
    house-NOM-INDEF large-NOM-INDEF
    ‘a large house’
b. al-bayt-u -l-kabīr-u
    the-house-NOM the-large-NOM
    ‘the large house’

In both examples of (6), the adjective kabīr ‘large’ has the same definiteness marking as the noun bayt ‘house’. This is what is known as definiteness agreement in Arabic. Kremers, (2003, p. 38).

TYA adjectives that modify a noun agree with that noun in definiteness too. But, the adjective receives the definite article am- (but not the Arabic al-) or the indefiniteness marker represented by the OGNC /u/ (or the pausal /u/) or the zero morpheme Ø or both (but not the Arabic indefiniteness marker -n), just like the noun. Here also, by the addition of am-, such indefiniteness marker(s) will be deleted as demonstrated in (5.4.4.3.2) below:

(5.4.4.3.2)
a. beet-u-Ø kabiir-u-Ø
    house-OGNC/pausal-INDEF large-OGNC/pausal-INDEF
    “a large house”
b. am-beet am-kabiir(ak-kabiir regressive assimilation)
    the-house the-large
    “the large house”

In both examples of (5.4.4.3.2), the adjective kabiir ‘large’ (apart from the regressive assimilation) has the same definiteness marking as the noun beet ‘house’. This can be called as definiteness agreement between attributive adjectives and modified nouns in TYA, the topic we are going to discuss in the following section.

5.4.4.4 Definiteness agreement between attributive adjectives and modified nouns

TYA definite prefix am- is an article of uncertain morphological status like that of the Standard Arabic definite prefix al-. This is clitic-like in that there are no idiosyncrasies displayed by any combination of it with a host noun; any morphological variation shown by am- is determined by general rules. But there is one respect in which definiteness behaves in a way normally associated with inflectional categories. Attributive adjectives agree with their head noun in
definiteness, as well as in number, gender but not in case, unlike that of MSA; and definiteness agreement takes the form of the article prefix appearing on the adjective as well as on the noun: am-bustaan a-ĸkabiir (DEF-garden- DEF-big) ‘the big garden’. Confer this with the MSA definite prefix al- about which Lyons, Christopher (1999, 2003, p.71), writes in a footnote that:

Another article of uncertain morphological status is the Standard Arabic definite prefix al-. This is clitic-like in that there are no idiosyncrasies displayed by any combination of it with a host noun; any morphological variation shown by al- is determined by general rules. But there is one respect in which definiteness behaves in a way normally associated with inflectional categories. Attributive adjectives agree with their noun in definiteness, as well as in number, gender and case: and definiteness agreement takes the form of the article prefix appearing on the adjective as well as on the noun: al-bustan-u l-kabir-u (DEF-garden-NOM DEF-big-NOM) ‘the big garden’. Lyons, Christopher (1999, 2003, p.71)

As will be shown below in accordance with the scope of this thesis in this chapter, the article prefix will appear attached to a modified noun as well as its modifier represented in a postnominal adjective; other modifiers such as pronominal/postnominal numerals are also more systematically marked for definiteness in agreement with the modified noun. Pointing out to Arabic and some other languages, Lyons (1999, 2003) states generally that:

A phrasal clitic article may appear attached to an adjective if this is in the appropriate position, and adjectives (and other modifiers) may be more systematically marked for definiteness in agreement with the modified noun (or noun phrase) as in Arabic, Albanian, and, to a limited degree, Romanian. Lyons (1999, 2003, p.82)

This shows us a fact, in case of Arabic in general, that there are many issues related to the phenomenon of ‘Def agreement’ or ‘agreement in definiteness’ or ‘Definiteness agreement’ Fassi Fehri. (1999). Lyons (1999, 2003) and Kremers, (2003, pp.111-113). This needs future research and investigation in case of TYA. In this section, we will discuss only the phenomenon of definiteness agreement between TYA nouns and their attributive adjectives and see how we can account for it. First, let us look at some relevant examples again like the above mentioned example (5.4.4.3.2) repeated below as (5.4.4.4.1):
As can be seen, the definiteness feature of the TYA adjective manifests itself in the same way as it does on the noun phrase: indefiniteness is marked with the OGNC /u/ (or the pausal /u/) or a suffix -Ø in the nonexistence of /u/, whereas definiteness is marked with the determiner am- after the deletion of both the suffix -Ø and the OGNC /u/ (or the pausal /u/). Cf. Kremers, (2003. p.111), who points out that: “... the definiteness feature of the adjective manifests itself in the same way as it does on the noun phrase: indefiniteness is marked with a suffix -n, whereas definiteness is marked with the determiner al-.” One more observation of definiteness agreement in TYA is that both the modified noun and the attributive adjective are preceded by the definite article am- as demonstrated in (5.4.4.2) below:

(5.4.4.2) TYA from informants of present researcher:

am-beet
DEF-house
“the house”
am-beet am-kabiir (ak-kabiir regressive assimilation)
DEF-house DEF-big
“the big house”

Similar notion of such kind of observation in case of MSA definite article al-, about which, in the section (2.1): “Double (triple) definite marking” of his paper “Definite articles in Scandinavian”: Competing grammaticalization processes in standard and non-standard varieties. Dahl, Östen (2004, p. 149) points out that:

A relatively straightforward pattern is when the definite article is simply repeated, that is, both the noun and the adjective are preceded (or followed) by an identical morpheme. Modern Standard Arabic exemplifies this:

(1) Standard Arabic
a. al-bayt
DEF-house
‘the house’
b. al-bayt al-kabîr
DEF-house DEF-big
‘the big house’ Dahl, Östen (2004, p. 149)
In another way in case of agreement feature in Arabic, Corbett, (2001, p. 4/11), points out that: “... some consider definiteness to be an agreement feature, since there are languages like Arabic in which definiteness is marked more than once within the noun phrase.” This holds true in case of TYA. In TYA, definiteness is also marked more than once within the noun phrase. The adjective takes the same definiteness marker as the noun it modifies. This is evidently shown in the relevant TYA data shown below:

(5.4.4.4.3) am-riggaal       am-Tawiil
       def-man (m)       def- tall (m)
     “the tall man”
(5.4.4.4.4) am- mar-ah       m- Tawiil-ah
       def- woman (f)    def- tall (f)
     “the tall woman”
(5.4.4.4.5) am-riggaal-ah     m-Twaal
       def-men pl.(m)    def- tall PB(m)
     “the tall men”
(5.4.4.4.6) am-Harim         am- Twaal
       def- women pl (f) def-tall PB (m)
     “the tall women”
(5.4.4.4.7) am-riggaal-ah     m- m’adab-iin
       def- men pl.(m)   def- polite pl (m)
     “the polite men”
(5.4.4.4.8) am-Harim         am- m’adab-iin
       def- women pl (f) def-policite pl (m)
     “the polite women”

(See the illustrative examples (5.4.2.1) (5.4.2.2) (5.4.2.3) (5.4.2.4) (5.4.2.5) and (5.4.2.6) above where we have dealt with their indefiniteness forms and the gender-number agreement between attributive adjectives and modified nouns of the relevant aforementioned examples (5.4.4.4.3), (5.4.4.4.4), (5.4.4.4.5), (5.4.4.4.6), (5.4.4.4.7) and (5.4.4.4.8) in their definiteness forms).

Like Classical Arabic and most varieties of Colloquial Arabic, TYA puts the attributive adjective after the noun and the definite article before the noun as well as before the attributive adjective as a prefix, the addition of which involves the deletion of the pausal /u/, and it lacks a free indefinite article, with indefiniteness being signaled in most singular and many plural inflections of nouns and adjectives by the pausal /u/ as demonstrated in (5.4.4.4.9) below. Its pattern (TYA) of definite re-articulation is, however, essentially the same:
Moreover, there is a possibility for each TYA adjective in a sequence to take its own definite article am- as demonstrated in (5.4.4.4.10) below:

(5.4.4.4.10) am-kalb am-kabiir am-qabiiH
DEF-dog DEF-big DEF-vicious

A similar notion in case of Classical Arabic and most varieties of Colloquial Arabic has been reported by Plank (2003), with his reference to (Lecomte 1976. pp. 99–105), where he points out that:

Differing from Swedish, Classical Arabic (like most varieties of Colloquial Arabic too) puts the attributive adjective after the noun and the definite article before the noun as a prefix (or perhaps a proclitic), and it lacks a free indefinite article, with indefiniteness being signaled in most singular and many plural inflections of nouns and adjectives by nunation. Its pattern of definite re-articulation is, however, essentially the same (Lecomte 1976:99–105):

(68) a. kalbu-n
dog-INDEF
b. al-kalbu
DEF-dog
c. kalbu-n qabiHu-n
dog-INDEF victorious-INDEF
d. al-kalbu l-qabiHu
DEF-dog DEF-vicious

Unlike in Swedish, each adjective in a sequence takes its own article:

(69) al-kalbu l-kabiru l-qabiHu
DEF-dog DEF-big DEF-vicious

Plank (2003, p. 356), referring to the examples (68d) and (68c) in the above quote points out that: “Doubly articulated NPs as exemplified by (68d) appear to be as basic and simple as simply articulated ones such as (68c), and their attributives are not vastly more nominal either.” And that: “One way of making sense of double
definiteness marking in basic attributive constructions is in terms of agreement, especially if the markers on both nouns and adjectives are bound, as they are in Arabic.” This holds true in case of the TYA doubly articulated NPs as exemplified by ((5.4.4.4.9) d) and ((5.4.4.4.9) e). What is doubly marked is, essentially (ignoring TYA pausal /u/ or OGNc /u/ or the –O suffix), definiteness rather than indefiniteness. This reminds us to some extent in case of Arabic in general with what has been noted by Plank (2003) that: “And it is perhaps also worth noticing that what is doubly marked is, essentially (ignoring Arabic nunation and the strong adjective declension of Swedish), definiteness rather than indefiniteness.” (pp. 356-357)

The above observation is not only within the noun-adjective noun phrases but also within the non-complex construction, like Standard Arabic (cf Al-Shamrani, 1994, pp. 273)) though this is not our scope here, the attributive adjective in TYA must agree with its head noun in the feature of definiteness. That is to say, if the head noun is definite, then the attributive adjective must be definite and if the head noun is indefinite, the attributive adjective must be indefinite. Compare the TYA example in (5.4.4.4.11) below:

(5.4.4.4.11)

a. suf-t am-riggaal am-wasiim/aw-wasiim (regressive assimilation)
   Saw-I def. man def.-handsome
   “I saw the handsome man.”

b. suf-t riggaal-u-0 wasiim-u-0
   “I saw a handsome man.”

For convenience for our discussion below and for the purpose of comparison, let us reproduce below the ungrammatical structure of Al-Shamrani’s (1994) Standard Arabic counter-example (129) (reproduced below as (5.4.4.4.12)) of our TYA (5.4.4.4.11) shown above:

(5.4.4.4.12)

a. ra’ay-tu r-rajul-a l-wasiim-a
   Saw-I def. man def.-handsome
   “I saw the handsome man.”

b. ra’ay-tu rajul-a(n) wasiim-a(n)
   Saw-I Man-indef. handsome-indef.
   “I saw a handsome man.”

(Standard Arabic Al-Shamrani (1994, p. 274)
Following Al-Shamrani (1994), the attributive adjective in ((5.4.4.4.11) a) agrees with its head in the feature [+ def.]. Both elements reflect the TYA definite article am- as the English glosses reveal. Likewise, the attributive adjective in ((5.4.4.4.11) b) agrees with its noun in the feature [- def.]. The prediction, on the basis of the TYA preceding data, is that when the attributive adjective does agree with its head noun in the definiteness feature, ungrammaticality will result. This prediction turns out to be true of ((5.4.4.4.11) b) only but not of ((5.4.4.4.11) a) as is evident from the following ungrammatical structure:

(5.4.4.4.13)
* suf-t riggaal-u-0 am-wasiim/aw-wsiim (regressive assimilation)
Saw-I Man-OGNC/ pauseal-indef. Def.-handsome
“I saw a handsome man.”

Also, for convenience for our discussion below and for the purpose of comparison, let us reproduce below the ungrammatical structure of Al-Shamrani’s (1994) Standard Arabic counter-example (130) (reproduced below as (5.4.4.4.14)) of our TYA (5.4.4.4.13) shown above:

(5.4.4.4.14) * ra’ay-tu rajul-a(n) l-wasiim-a
Saw-I Man-indef. Def.-handsome
(Standard Arabic, Al-Shamrani (1994, p. 274))

Explaining his example (130) reproduced and quoted above as (5.4.4.4.14), Al-Shamrani (pp. 274-275) suggests that:

The ill-formedness of (130) is largely because the attributive adjective marks the formal features of definite while its head is marked indefinite. The case of the example in (129a) is somewhat different. The attributive adjective may be marked indefinite while its head remains definite. The resulting construction is perfectly grammatical as (131) below illustrates:

(131) ra’a-tu al-rajul-a wasiim-a (n)
Saw-I def.-Man handsome-acc- indef.

Similarly, (though slightly different), the ill-formedness of the TYA (3) is largely because the attributive adjective marks the formal features of definiteness (i.e. marked definite) while its head is marked indefinite. The case of the example in (2a) is somewhat different and even different from Al-Shamrani’s Standard Arabic
counter-example (129a) as will be realized below. The attributive adjective (within its
sentential occurrence, though this is not our scope here, hence an invitation for future
research) may be marked indefinite while its head remains definite. The resulting
construction is perfectly grammatical as it is demonstrated in (5.4.4.4.15) below:

(5.4.4.4.15)
Suf-t am-riggaal wasiim-u-Ø
Saw-1 def.-Man handsome-OGNC/pausal- indef.
“I saw the man as handsome.”

However, the grammaticality of (5.4.4.4.15) is contingent on checking the
existence of the OGNC/pausal /u/ in the indefinite forms. Like Arabic dialects, TYA
does not show case, but the TYA pausal /u/ that makes it different from all varieties of
Arabic dialects can be considered OGNC /u/ provided that the two forms of noun and
(attributive) adjective must be indefinite; if such forms are marked definite, and then
this pausal /u/ or OGNC /u/ is deleted. Therefore, unlike Standard Arabic, the
grammaticality of (5.4.4.4.15) is contingent on checking the existence of the
OGNC/pausal /u/ in the indefinite forms but it is not contingent on checking the right
Case which must be accusative as in case of Standard Arabic discussed by Al-
Shamrani whose example in (131) is shown in the above quotation.

Explaining his example (131) shown in the above quotation and referring to
his Standard Arabic example (130), Al-Shamrani (pp. 274-275) suggests that:

However, the grammaticality of (131) is contingent on checking the right
Case. That is, the adjective in (131), in addition to being indefinite, must
be accusative. In other words, if the adjective in (131) reveals any Case
from other than accusative, the construction will be ungrammatical
irrespective of the adjective’s marking of definiteness features. The reason
for the grammaticality of (131) but not (130) is due, for the most part, to
whether we think of the adjective in (131) as predicational or

Unlike Standard Arabic, the TYA adjective in (5.4.4.4.15), in addition to
being indefinite, must show OGNC/pausal /u/. If the adjective in (5.4.4.4.15) does not
show OGNC/pausal /u/ in its indefinite form in the above construction, it loses its
function as an adjective and becomes a noun referring to a personal/proper name (here
a man called Wasiim), hence the construction in (5.4.4.4.16) can also be grammatical
in TYA, but this is not our scope here; this needs further research:
In case of Semitic languages in general including Arabic, it has been pointed out by Kihm (2003, p. 19) that “… the syntactic structure of noun–adjective noun phrases is actually very close to their surface form.” And that “… the determiner modifying the adjective is basically there, and the fact that its value must be the same as that of the determiner on the noun is a necessary consequence of the type of constructions the two constituents are in.”

5.5 Analysis of noun-adjective agreement in an empirically descriptive sense

We are going to take ‘agreement’ here in an empirically descriptive sense, to refer to the well-known fact of TYA grammar (like Arabic/Semitic grammar in general, cf. Kihm (2003)) that attributive adjectives are overtly definite when they modify definite nouns (cf. TYA am-ktaab am-gdiid).

Following Kihm (2003), what we are suggesting is an analysis such that the initial structure of, e.g., am-ktaab am-gdiid would be as in (5.5.1):

(5.5.1) [DP [D°] [XP [X°] [YP gdiid [Y°] [NP [N° ktaab]]]]]

Because adjectives fully agree with nouns in Arabic and sometimes in TYA, N° raises to the head of the modifier projection YP, thus giving rise to an agreement configuration with the adjective in Spec YP, and from there to the head of an intermediate projection XP between DP and YP. N° is inherently specified for the definiteness feature, so that ktaab in (5.5.1) ought to be written down as ktaab [+def]. As it passes through the head of YP, ktaab [+def] triggers definiteness (as well as Gender-Number agreement of the adjective, i.e. it sets gdiid’s D-feature value at <+>). Then ktaab [+def] adjoins to D°, setting its unspecified value to <+>. [+def] spells out as /am-/ on both the adjective and the noun. This definite article am-, the Himyaritic am-, is another unique linguistic feature in TYA as it is different from the definite article al- observed in CA, MSA and all other modern Arabic dialects.

Let see what Kihm states in case of Arabic and Hebrew in particular and Semitic languages in general:
What I am suggesting is an analysis such that the initial structure of, e.g., *al-kitāb al-jadīd* would be as in (30):

\[(30) \{\text{DP} [\text{D}^0] \{\text{XP} [\text{X}^0] \{\text{YP} [\text{Y}^0] \{\text{NP} [\text{N}^0 \text{kitāb}]\}\}\}\}\]

Because adjectives fully agree with nouns in Arabic and Hebrew, to the difference of Amharic, N° raises to the head of the modifier projection YP, thus giving rise to an agreement configuration with the adjective in Spec YP, and from there to the head of an intermediate projection XP between DP and YP. Kihm (2003, p. 17).

Further, he points out that:

According to Borer, then, D in (30) is “unspecified for its ±definite value” (p. 53), and that would be a parameter of Semitic languages – at least Arabic and Hebrew. N°, in contrast, is inherently specified for the definiteness feature, so that *kitāb* in (30) ought to be written down as *kitāb[+def]*. As it passes through the head of YP, *kitāb[+def]* triggers definiteness (as well as GN) agreement of the adjective, i.e. it sets *jadīd’s* D-feature value at <+>. Then *kitāb[+def]* adjoins to D°, setting its unspecified value to <+>. [+def] spells out as *al-* (*ha-* in Hebrew) on both the adjective and the noun. Kihm (2003, pp. 17-18).

### 5.6 Agreement with definite or indefinite quantified expressions

Whereas attributive adjective phrases must appear to the right of the noun in TYA as shown and discussed in the above sections, other functional material such as numerals is either exclusively pre-nominal or post nominal. This will be discussed in details below. Other functional material such as demonstratives, quantifiers, etc., and how to determine and in what terms to characterize the choice between pronominal and post-nominal modification needs further research in case of TYA. It has been pointed out by Shlonsky (2004) in case of Hebrew and practically all varieties of Arabic that:

Whereas attributive adjective phrases must appear to the right of the noun in Hebrew and in practically all varieties of Arabic, other functional material such as numerals, demonstratives, quantifiers, etc., is either exclusively pre-nominal (like the definite determiner) or is subject to dialectal variation as to its position relative to the head noun. This fact, well illustrated by the pattern of numeral configuration in Hebrew, discussed in Section 4, poses the question of how to determine and in what terms to characterize the choice between pronominal and post-nominal modification. Shlonsky (2004, p. 1487).

TYA cardinal numerals ‘three’ to ‘ten’ exhibit an inquiring ‘disagreement’ phenomenon in that the ‘masculine’ form is associated with feminine-gender referents, whereas the ‘feminine’ form (marked either with the feminine suffix –eh/-ah or with feminine grammatical gender form without such feminine suffix) is
associated with masculine referents (cf. TYA tis'-eh riggaalah “nine men” vs. tsi' Hariimu ‘nine women’; xams-eh maraaSdu “five pencils” vs. xams massaaH-aatu “five erasers”). This is not only observed in TYA but also in all Semitic languages in general. In a footnote, Testen, David (1998) throughout his discussion of reconstruction of the Common Semitic cardinal numeral ‘nine’, points out that:

The forms are listed here in terms of gender as it is expressed through the morphosyntax rather than he morphology. ‘Nine’ displays the curious ‘disagreement’ phenomenon characteristic of the Semitic cardinal numerals ‘three’ to ‘ten’ – i.e., the endingless ‘masculine’ form is associated with feminine-gender referents, whereas the ‘feminine’ form (marked with the suffix *-(a)t-) is associated with masculine referents (cf. Arabic tis ‘atu rija‘in ‘nine men’ vs. tis’u nisā‘in ‘nine women’). Testen, David (1998, p. 314).

TYA definite quantified expressions such as ‘the five books’ appear under the following two forms in ((5.6.1) & (5.6.2)):

(5.6.1) am-kutub am-xams-eh
   the-book.M.BP the-five-Fsg
   “The five books”
(5.6.2) am-xams-eh am-kutub
   the-five-Fsg the-book.M.BP
   “The five books”

The examples in (5.6.1) and (5.6.2) look like an ordinary noun–adjective construction, with the post-nominal or pre-nominal numeral showing deflected agreement for gender and being overtly definite. This is different (especially in ((5.6.2)) from the definite quantified expressions such as ‘the five books’ observed in other varieties of Arabic (see Kihm (2003) and Shlonsky (2004)). Kihm (2003, p. 18) points out that:

.... it is not true that Semitic D is unspecified until some N° adjoins to it. Standard Arabic definite quantified expressions such as ‘the five books’ appear under two forms:
(31) al-kutub-u l-xams-at-u
   D-book.pl-Nom D-five-F-Nom
   the five books
(32) al-xams-at-u kutub-in
   D-five-F-Nom book.pl-Gen.Indef
   the five books
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The first one looks like an ordinary noun–adjective construction, with the post nominal numeral showing deflected agreement for gender, direct agreement for case, and being overtly definite. In (32), in contrast, we see a peculiar kind of genitive construction where a definite numeral precedes and apparently governs an indefinite genitive noun (on this, see Shlonsky 2000). It is this form which generalized in the dialects, as in the following Egyptian example:

(33) el-xamas kotob
D-five book.pl
the five books

This Egyptian example: (33) el-xamas kotob (which lacks the determiner or the definite article el- in noun kotob) observed by Kihm in the above quote as the form generalized in the dialects (i.e., Arabic dialects) is different from our TYA example (5.6.2) am-xams-eh am-kutub (which does not lack the determiner or the definite article am- in the noun kutub).

Explaining the Egyptian example: (33) el-xamas kotob that has been considered as the form generalized in the dialects (i.e., Arabic dialects) in the above quote, Kihm states that:

In (33) all morphological clues to the inner constituency of the expression disappeared, so it looks overtly nondistinct from the English equivalent with the numeral possibly heading some quantifying projection between DP and NP (see Shlonsky 2000). Note that as a structure (33) is marginally acceptable in Modern Hebrew as well, as in ha-xames kisim ‘the five pockets’ next to the ‘correct’ Construct State expression xamešet ha-kisim (Shlonsky 2000). Kihm (2003, p. 18).

However, in our TYA example (5.6.2) am-xams-eh am-kutub all morphological clues to the inner constituency of the expression appeared, so it looks overtly distinct from the English equivalent with the numeral possibly heading some quantifying projection between DP and NP.

Further, referring to the examples (32), (33), and their Hebrew substandard equivalent in the above quotes, Kihm points out that:

What is crucial for us in (32), (33), and their Hebrew substandard equivalent is that the noun does not adjoin to D, but D makes all the difference with the corresponding indefinite noun phrases (cf. xamsatu kisim ‘five books’, xameš kisim ‘five pockets’). It cannot be true, therefore, that D is unspecified for definiteness, which seriously weakens the case for [def] being an inherent lexical feature in Semitic. Kihm (2003, p. 18).
However, the crucial for us in (5.6.1), (5.6.2) and as exemplified thoroughly above and below is that the noun adjoins to D, and D makes all the difference with the corresponding indefinite noun phrases (cf. xams-eh kutubu “five books”). Therefore, it can be true, that D is specified for definiteness, which remarkably strengthens the case for [def] being an inherent lexical feature in TYA. (cf. our discussion about definiteness inheritance in section (5.4.4.3) given above).

In TYA, cardinal numerals occur between the definite determiner and the noun which is also definite. Some examples are given in (5.6.3) below:

(5.6.3) a. am xamas am-banaat
   The five the-girls
   b. am- xams-eh am-riggaalah
   the-five the-men
   c. am-ma-Had'śar am-ryaal
   the eleven the-Reals
   d. am-ma-Had'śar am-gaahil
   the eleven the children

This is different from numerous Arabic dialects where cardinal numerals occur between the definite determiner and the noun but the noun is not definite. Shlonsky (2004) reports that:

In numerous Arabic dialects—see, for example, the list in Mörtl (1998: 171–172)—as well as in colloquial Hebrew (see Glinert, 1989: 84), substandard for some speakers, cardinal numerals occur between the definite determiner and the noun. Some examples are given in (21).

(21) a. el xamas banaat Cairo, Tomiche (1964)
    The five girls
   b. I xams rjaal
    the five men Damascus, Cowell (1964: 471 ff.)
   c. le had'as ryal
    the eleven Reals Morocco, Harrel (1962: 207)
   d. al hid'aas jaahil
    the eleven children San 'aa (Yemen), Watson (1993)
   e. #ha xamisim sekel /skalim
    the fifty Shekel/Shekels Hebrew

TYA numerals are configured differently. Cardinal numerals can, by and large, precede the noun or follow it. The alternation between a post-nominal and pre-nominal position holds strongly in TYA, in both definite and indefinite noun phrases. Consider the pairs in (5.6.4), (5.6.5), (5.6.6) and (5.6.7), respectively:
am-θαλαθ-εθ am-kutub
the three the-books
b. am-kutub am-θαλαθ-εθ
the-books the-three
(5.6.5) a. am-θαμαα am-digaagaat
the-eight the-chickens
b. am-digaagaat am-θαμαα
the-chickens the-eight
(5.6.6) a. θαλαθ-εθ kutubu
three books
b. kutubu θαλαθ-εθ
books three
(5.6.7) a. θαμαα digaagaatu
eight chickens
b. digaagaatu θαμαα
chickens eight

Here also TYA show a discrepancy, though the numerals are also configured differently in the Arabic dialects as noted by Shlonsky (2004) where the alternation between a post- nominal and pre-nominal position holds robustly across many dialects, at least in definite noun phrases. Shlonsky (2004) points out that:

Numerals are configured differently in the Arabic dialects. Cardinal numerals can, by and large, precede the noun, as in Hebrew, or follow it. The alternation between a post- nominal and pre-nominal position holds robustly across many dialects, at least in definite noun phrases. Consider the pairs in (33) and (34).

(33) a. ttleet kitub Beirut
   The-three books
b. kitub t ttleet
   the-books the-three

(34) a. θ θαμαα diyaayat Gulf Qafisheh (1977: 126)
   The-eight chickens
b. d diyaayat θ θαμαα
   the-chickens the-eight

The difference between Hebrew and Arabic can, it seems, be expressed in terms of different degrees of N-raising. Hebrew nouns cannot raise above Card#P while Arabic ones can. Shlonsky (2004, p. 1479).

Based on the above analysis, TYA vary as to whether and to what degree pre-nominal or post nominal cardinal numerals agree with the noun they determine. However, Arabic dialects only vary as to whether and to what degree pre-nominal (but not post nominal) cardinal numerals agree with the noun they determine. In case of Arabic dialects. Shlonsky (2004) reports that:
Arabic dialects vary as to whether and to what degree pre-nominal cardinal numerals agree with the noun they determine. Some systems only have a single form for most or all the cardinal numerals (e.g. Cypriot Arabic, Tsiapera, 1969: 56; Borg, 1985: 127–128) so that the question of agreement or non-agreement cannot be stated. In those systems that exhibit both a 'long' and a 'short' form, and where the choice cannot be stated in purely phonotactic terms (as it is in, e.g. Sudanese; Kaye. 1976), it seems to be overwhelmingly the case that the short form cannot follow the noun it modifies. Shlonsky (2004, p. 1494).

In addition to the above discussion, it is also important to point out that in TYA, in numeral + noun combinations (i.e., numeral + combinations of nouns with postnominal attributive adjectives), there are cases, in which ‘Plural Concord’ (PC) is optional. e.g. in TYA with plurals of unit noun as in sitt beeD-aatu mlaaHu “six good eggs”, cf., Dam. satt bêDât mnâH “six good eggs”, Cowell, (1964, p. 503) where the PC seems to be only mandatory/compulsory, but in most cases TYA informants and texts give both possibilities, viz. sitt beeD-aatu mlaaHu or sitt beeD-aatu maliiH-eh “six good eggs”; ðâlaað-eh byuutu kbaarû or ðâlaað-eh byuutu kabiir-eh “three big houses”, etc., Compare this with what has been reported by Blanc, (1970), who writes in case of other Arabic dialects that:

In numeral + noun combinations, there are cases in which PC is mandatory, e.g. in Damascus with plurals of unit nouns (cf. the example 'six good eggs' above, and the reference to Cowell); but in most cases informants and texts give both possibilities, viz. talat biyût kbaar or kibûra ‘three big houses’. Blanc, (1970, p.52).

5.7 Empirical tree structures of Attributive agreement in TYA
As a starting point, it has been stated by Baker (2008, p. 50) that “... attributive modifiers are simply adjoined to the phrase that they modify, giving the structures in (77), enriched by the presence of an agreement-bearing F head that dominates the attributive modifier.” Given below is Baker’s (2008) structures in (77) reproduced as structures in (5.7.1):

(5.7.1) a. wart-e zgîr-e
inheritance-f.sg small-f.sg ‘small inheritance’

b.s-sakakîn al-fâdd-a (Arabic)
the-knife-pl the-silver-f.sg ‘the silver knives’
According to Baker (2008, p. 45), “the functional head $F_A$” is “associated with the adjective” and “the functional head $F_N$ is, by definition, a functional head that shares the same essential categorical properties as its NP complement – an idea borrowed from Grimshaw’s (1991) notion of an extended projection.” (p. 50) Making comments on such structures and explaining them, Baker (2008) writes:

```
According to Baker (2008, p. 45), “the functional head $F_A$” is “associated with the adjective” and “the functional head $F_N$ is, by definition, a functional head that shares the same essential categorical properties as its NP complement – an idea borrowed from Grimshaw’s (1991) notion of an extended projection.” (p. 50) Making comments on such structures and explaining them, Baker (2008) writes:

..., the presence of φ-features on the complement of $F_N$ makes the complement a closer goal for agreement than the NP that $F_N$ is adjoined to. Therefore, if an attributive N bears inflectional morphology at all, it manifests its own features, not those of the noun that it modifies. In contrast, there are no φ-features on the complement of $F_A$, so there is no intervener to prevent $F_A$ from agreeing with the NP that it adjoins to, which c-commands it. Baker (2008, p. 51)

This overall situation evidently and empirically holds true in case of TYA similar examples illustrated in (5.7.2) below:

(5.7.2) (a) wirθ-eh SGiir-eh
Inheritance-f.sg small-f.sg
“a small inheritance”

(b) am-skaak-iin am-fiDD-ah (TYA, non-agreeing noun modifier)
det-knife-pl det-silver-f
“the silver knives”
In the TYA phrase θνεν σαραγο μιτράφκιν “two inseparable thieves” illustrated in (5.7.3) and its tree structure below, the ‘adjectival quantifier’ (c.f. Higgenbotham 1987 cited in Hoyt, (2000, p. 76)) θνεν “two” occurs as a specifier of Number Phrase (following Ritter 1991 cited in (ibid.)), and the attributive modifier mitraafqiin “inseparable” is an adjunct to NP. The noun head raises and adjoins to the head of NumP, checking a categorical feature there (cf. Hoyt (2000, pp. 76-77), in case of Rural Palestinian Arabic (RPA) phrase θνεν हरामियी मित्राफ्किन “two inseparable thieves”):

(5.7.3) θνεν σαραγο mitraafqiin
two thieves MPB companied MSP
“two inseparable thieves”
Following Hoyt's analysis of the structure of definite noun phrases which departs considerably from what has come to be the 'standard' analysis (see the quote below), according to which the head noun raises to the head of D, incorporating with the definite article, (or with a null head in the case of construct state nominals, which is not our scope here and needs future research in case of TYA).

(5.7.4) am-beet ak-kabiir
the-house the-big
"the big house"

This, to follow Hoyt, (2000, p. 77), derives the relative ordering of the head nouns and modifiers, which are assumed to be left-adjuncts in the NP projection.
For pointing out to the ‘standard’ analysis, in a footnote, Hoyt, (2000, p. 77) guides us to “see Benmamoun (1993), Borer (1996), Fassi Fehri (1989, 1993), Hazout (1990, 1992, 1995), Mohammad (1988, 1997b), Ritter (1987, 1988, 1991, 1995), Shlonsky (1988, 1991), and Siloni (Siloni 1990a, 1990b, 1991, 1994, 1995, 1997, 2002).” And he points out that “Of these authors, Fassi Fehri, Mohammad, and Siloni expressly argue that noun raising to the head of D occurs generally.” He adds that “Ritter (1988, 1991), on the other hand, argues that nouns which host the definite article do not raise to the head of D. Borer (1996) argues that indefinite (as opposed to construct state) noun phrases that lack a determiner also lack a DP layer in their structure.” Accordingly, Hoyt, (2000, p. 79) points out that: “Since, according to this analysis, noun heads always raise to D (cf. Fassi Fehri 1993: 217; Siloni 1991: 255; Siloni 1997: 31-34) this entails a further assumption that indefinite noun phrases include a “null” determiner, to which the noun adjoins.” This assumption holds true in case of TYA and hence it is necessary to derive the correct word order facts with regard to modifiers and with indefinite nouns, such as the following (also with regard to possessors in the construct state, but this needs further research (cf. Hoyt, (2000, p. 79)):

(5.7.5) beetu kabiiru
house big
“a big house”

The problem with this analysis, to follow Hoyt, (2000, p. 79), is that it fails to capture a fact that, to our knowledge (as well as the knowledge of Hoyt in case of RPA), has been generally overlooked in the literature on Semitic nominal structure, concerning the position of cardinal numbers relative to the head noun (however, see
Shlonsky 2000, p. 6). Within a similar kind of observation in case of many varieties of Arabic, Hoyt, (2000, p. 79) reports that: “In many varieties of Arabic, when a definite noun phrase includes a cardinal numeral, the numeral usually behaves as an adjective, following the noun and “agreeing” with it in definiteness.” And this, of course, holds true in case of TYA as it is evidently discussed here. All these facts (illustrated above and in examples 32-34 of Hoyt (2000, p. 79)) are predicted by the standard analysis. In the TYA phrase am-marba’a am-HiSnah am-mlaaH “the four good horses”, the noun phrase am-marba’a am-HiSnah “the four horses” is modified by the adjective mlaaHu “good”, which agrees with it in both definiteness and number. I follow Ritter (1991: 43) cited in Hoyt (2000, pp. 84-85) in claiming that the noun head does not raise to D in the Arabic DP, but rather raises to the head of NumP, thereby deriving its order relative to the adjective mlaaHu “good”:

(5.7.6) am-marba’-ah am-HiSnah am-mlaaH
the-four the-horses the-good pl
“the four good horses”

```
(5.7.6) am-marba’-ah am-HiSnah am-mlaaH
            NumP
               /
              /  
             /    
           Num’
              /
             /  
            /    
           Num  NP
              /
             /  
            /    
           Num  am-HiSnah, AP
             /
            /  
           am-mlaaH
```

530