

LOREN F. BLIESE

CONSTRAINTS ON CLITICS IN AMHARIC

Constraint on Conjunctions

Amharic, the national language of Ethiopia, has various clitics which are restricted in their position in the sentence. For example, the clitic conjunction /(*I*) nna/ "and" is suffixed to the first element in a series of conjuncts.

DawitInna Ine mäṭṭan
"David and I came."

The clitic conjunction /*I m*/ has a different distribution in that it cannot stand between conjuncts but rather at the end of a series of three or more, or in the adverbial sense of "also" after noun phrases and verbs.

DawitInna Pawlos Innem mäṭṭan.
"David and Paul I and came."
DawitIm mäṭṭa. "David also came."
Dawit mäṭṭa. Hedäm.
"David came He also went."

The conjunction /*gIn*/ "but" is written as a free form in Amharic orthography but follows distributional characteristics of clitics. /Dawit *gIn* hedä./ "But David went."

All three of these conjunctions /Inna, Im, *gIn*/ are restricted from sentence initial position. For example, if an emphatic contrast is desired in initial position /*gIn*/ is bound to either of the particles /*daru*/ or /*nägär*/.

daru gIn Dawit hedä.
 nägär gIn Dawit hedä.
 "But David went."

This restriction against sentence initial position is supporting evidence for the clitic status of the three conjunctions in that they are bound to a preceding word. The mutually exclusive character of the three in that they cannot be bound to each other can be illustrated by the following ungrammatical sentences.

*Dawit gInIm hedä.	*DawitInna gIn Pawlos hedu.
*DawitIm gIn hedä.	*Dawit gIn Inna Pawlos hedu.
"But David also went."	"David and Paul but went."
*Dawit Innam Pawlos hedu.	*Dawit Inna Pawlos gIn hedu.
*DawitIm Inna Pawlos hedu.	"But David and Paul went."
"David and also Paul went."	

Since /Im/ as "also" operates rather freely, one might say that some of these combinations would be expected. However, in checking with informants and even adding pauses between the conjunctions none of the starred forms were acceptable. Expanding the coordinate conjunction /Inna/ "and" before the forms /Im/ "also", and /gIn/ "but" should make it possible to take care of the constraints against one following the other.

Constraint Against Object Clitics in Infinitives

Amharic possessives can either be a pronoun with a genitive /yä/ prefix-/yäne/ "my, mine", /yante/ "your, yours (masc.)", /yärsu/ "his", etc., or a clitic pronominal suffix on the noun such as /bete/ "my house", /bet + Ih/ "your (masc.) house", /bet-Iš/ "your (fem.) house", /bet-u/ "his house", /bet-wa/ "her house", /bet + aččIn/ "our house", /bet + aččihu/ "your (pl.) house", /bet + aččäw/ "their house", and /bet + wo/ "your (polite) house".

Some of the object suffix clitics of Amharic are of the same form as the possessives.

n	me	äw	or	t	him
Ih	you (masc.)			at	her
Iš	you (fem.)			n	us

wo	you (polite)	aččihu	you (pl.)
		aččäw	them

As a verbal noun the infinitive can derive from a deep structure with both a subject and an object.

Ine antän goddahu
 "I you hurt"
 "I hurt you"

The subject of a verb which reduces to an infinitive may take either the genitive free form or the clitic possessive suffix of the pronoun.

yäne	mägodat	or	mägodate
"of me (I)	to hurt"		"to hurt my"

In connection with the infinitive the object cannot also be a clitic but must remain a free form.

antän mägodate
 "you (acc.) to hurt my", "my hurting you."
 *mägodateh
 "to hurt my you", "my hurting you".
 *mägodatIhe
 "to hurt you (acc.) my", "my hurting you".

Verb forms (as illustrated in sections below) may take both subject and object clitics. The infinitive however, follows nouns in only taking subject clitics. The question can be asked why the infinitive which has a verbal origin has a constraint against object clitics. One reason is possibly because of the fact that the infinitive can stand without a subject clitic when the subject is a free form. This would have led to ambiguity if either subject or object clitics were allowed since second person subject and object clitics are identical. For example

mägodatIh "your hurting" if object clitics were allowed could also be "hurting you".

The same is true for /mägodatIš/ "your (fem.) hurting", /magodataččihu/ your (pl.) "hurting".

Verbs require the subject clitic even when the free form is present, so the object is always distinguished by its position following the subject.

godda + h + aččaw "hurt-you + them".

This indicates that the infinitive nominalization rule must precede object reduction (cliticization) in order to block reduction from taking place on infinitives.

*Constraint on Subject and Object Clitics
of the Perfect Tense Verb.*

The perfect tense verb in Amharic is formed by suffixing the personal pronoun subject markers preceded by a connecting vowel. The subject markers are /hu/ "I", /h/ "you" (m.), /š/ "you" (f.), null "he", /č/ "she", /n/ "we", /aččihu/ "you" (pl.), /u/ "they" "you" (polite).

The second person singular and plural and first person plural subject markers are the same as the object suffixes listed above. The similarity suggests considering pronominal subject affixes as clitics also. One major similarity is that when either subjects or objects are reduced from free to bound form the free forms may optionally be deleted.

(antä)hed + Ih — "(you) went-you"

(Ine) (antän) godda + hu + h "(I) (you) hurt + I + you".

The verb plus its clitics carries both the subject /hu/ "I" and object /h/ "you" so that the free forms may be deleted with no loss in meaning. One difference between subject and object clitics is that the verb must have the pronominal affix whether the free form is present or not, while the object clitic may be omitted if the free form is present.

Ine antän godda + hu + h "I you hurt + I + you"

or Ine antän godda + hu "I you (acc.) hurt + I"

but *Ine antän godda (+ h) "I you (acc.) hurt (+ you)"

Figure I shows grammatical and ungrammatical combinations of these two suffixes. Amharic also has clitic prepositional phrases

with /(ä)llä/ "for", "to" and /(ä)bbä/ "against", "on" followed by the bound object pronouns. A few examples are added to show that the distribution of subject and prepositional object clitics is the same as with direct objects.

Fig. 1 Subject and Object Pronominal Clitics of the Perfect Tense

		Singular					Plural		
		1	2m	2f	3m	3f	1	2	3
1S	godd ahu	{(n),	h,	š,	t,	at,	*n,	aččihu,	aččaw}
2SM	„ ah(a)	{ n,	*h,	*š,	w,	at,	n,	*aččihu,	aččaw}
2SF	„ aš(I)	{ n,	*h,	*š,	w,	at,	n,	*aččihu,	aččaw}
3SM	„ a	{ n,	h,	š,	w,	at,	n,	aččihu,	aččaw}
3SF	„ ač(I)	{ n,	h,	š,	w,	at,	n,	aččihu,	aččaw}
1PL	„ an(I)	{*n,	h,	š,	w,	at,	*n,	aččihu,	aččaw}
2PL	„ aččihu	{ n,	*h,	*š,	t,	at,	n,	*aččihu,	aččaw}
3PL	„ u	{ n,	h,	š,	t,	at,	n,	aččihu,	aččaw}
2P	„ u	{ n,	*h,	*š,	t,	at,	n,	*aččihu,	aččaw}

With prepositional infix:

2SM godd ahällä { n, *h, *š, t, at, n, *aččihu, aččaw}

2SF „ ašällä { n, *h, *š, t, at, n, *aččihu, aččaw}

2PL „ aččihullä { n, *h, *š, t, at, n, *aččihu, aččaw}

It can be noted that all forms are possible except combinations of different genders or numbers in the first and second persons. The reflexive forms using /ras/ with pronominal suffixes are obligatory when the subject and object are identical. /Ine rasen goddah/ "I hurt myself" /antä rasihi goddah/ "you hurt yourself". A semantic explanation for the lack between other combinations is the impossibility in the same phrase to refer to others both inclusively and exclusively in Amharic. To say, "you (masc.) hurt you (fem.), */antä ančin goddah/ or "I hurt us" */Ine Inän goddah/ was rejected by my informants. To put both suffixes on the verb and delete the free forms is also impossible */goddä + h + Iš/ "hurt + you (masc.) + you (fem. acc.)".

It may be just an accident, but it is the case that the set of subject pronominal affixes is the same as the corresponding object clitics in almost the same places where they are mutually exclusive

(2ms/h/, 2fs/š/, 2pl /aččihu/, and 1pl /n/). The exceptions are the polite form which uses the third person plural verb and has its own object suffix /wo/ and the first person singular /ń/. Since the polite form is a more artificial and dialectally varying form, an exception for it could probably be justified in a grammar which wants to capture the above observation.

The generalization is that combinations of clitics with identical subject and object forms have a constraint which non-identical forms do not have, namely, that first and second person subject-object combinations of the same person in any gender or number may not both be affixed to the same verb. "Any" gender or number excludes also those which are different in form such as second person feminine and masculine.

A dialect variant of the first person singular subject affix can be cited as independent evidence in favor of this constraint. The dialect includes the object suffix /ń/ "me" as part of the subject suffix, giving /huń/, for example, /bəllahuń/ "I ate" (not "I ate myself"). In this dialect the subject clitic includes the object clitic making an identity which eliminates the exception noted for first person singular above. Mutual exclusion of all first and second persons except polite can therefore be described by tagmemic lists of clitics as well as semantic restrictions against inclusive and exclusive pronouns in the same sentence. It should be noted, however that the same restriction exists in free forms. So the constraint does not involve only clitics.

A Surface Structure Constraint in The Present Perfect

The present perfect tense in Amharic is a compound with a gerund plus the helping verb /allä/ suffixed to it. The pronominal subject markers for the gerund are /e/ "I", /h/ "you (masc.)" /š/ "you (fem.)" /o/ "he", /a/ "she", /n/ "we", /aččihu/ "you (pl.)", /äw/ "they", "you (pol.)". The pronominal subjects of /allä/ are the same as those listed for the perfect tense above. The distribution of pronominal subjects is mutually exclusive in that the only places the /allä/ subjects occur are the first person singular and third person feminine singular where the initial /a/ of /allä/ causes assimilatory deletion of the /e/ and /s/ pronominal subject markers of the gerund.

hej(e) + allähu	"I have gone".
hedIh + al-	"you (masc.) have gone".
hedIš + al-	"you (fem.) have gone".
hedo + al-	"he has gone"
hed(a) + alleč	"she has gone"
hedän + al-	"we have gone"
hedaččihu + al-	"you (pl.) have gone"
hedäw + al-	"they have gone".

We can term this the "no double subject constraint". The mutually exclusive character of the subject clitics is confirmed by comparison with the past perfect made of the gerund plus the helping verb /näbbärä/. Since /näbbärä/ begins with a consonant, no gerund pronominal subject suffixes are lost by assimilation and the entire conjugation of /näbbärä/ has the form /näbbär/ without pronominal markers, for example, /heje + näbbär/ "I had gone", /heda + näbbär/ "she had gone".

Since the assimilation rule is part of the phonology, no transformation of the syntactic component can give the right combination without purely ad hoc marking of first and third feminine singular present perfect forms for minus the person deletion rule. The clitic rule therefore will have to be a deletion rule which follows the phonological component. When two subject pronouns come together in the same word of the present perfect, the second is deleted.

More Information on First and Second Person Clitic Constraints

It can be noted that subject-object suffixes in the present perfect and past perfect follow the same pattern of mutual exclusion noted with the perfect aspect above. Although the subject forms for the perfect, present perfect, and past perfect are different in the third person where no constraint exists, /ä/ (perfect) — /o/ (present/past perfect) "he", /äč/ — /a/ "she", /u/ — /äw/ "they", except for the first person singular and second person polite form they are identical to each other and to the object suffix where the hypothesized constraint holds against first and second person subject object combinations of the same person in any gender or number. /h/ — /h/ (present/past perfect) — /h/ (object) "you

(masc.), /š/ — /š/ — /š/ “you (fem.)”, /n/ — /n/ /n/ “we”, “us”, /aččihu/ — /aččihu/ — /aččihu/ “you (pl.)” for the perfect and present and past perfect subjects and object clitic respectively. The exception of the first person singular has /hu(ń)/ — /e/ — /ń/. Is it only an accident that all other person markers are different between perfect aspect and gerund, but that most of those which are mutually exclusive from the object clitic are identical to it (and to each other)?

Problems in the Imperfect.

The imperfect stem in Amharic is formed by prefixing (instead of suffixing) the subject pronouns. The second person feminine also suffixes an /i/, and the second and third pluralis suffix an /u/ which assimilates with the /a/ of the helping verb. The stem may take the same helping verbs /allä/ and /näbbärä/ as the gerund.

The previously discussed constraint of having only one subject pronoun per verb applies with the helping verb /näbbärä/ since the pronominal subject markers are never lost from the stem and the helping verb is always /näbbär/ without any personal markers.

Ihed + näbbär	“I was going”
tIhed + näbbär	“you (masc.) were, she was going”
tIheji + näbbär	“you (fem.) were going”

However, with the helping verb /allä/ only the third person singular follows the “no double subject constraint”.

yIhedal- “he goes”, not */yIhedallä/. All other forms have a subject pronoun on both the stem and helping verb.

tIhedalläč	“she goes”
Inahedallän	“we go”
tIhedallaččihu	“you (pl.) go”
yIhedallu	“they go”

It can be noted concerning the double pronoun for “you (mas.)” and “she” that a loss of the suffix from the helping verb would throw the two together as */tIhedal/ (as happened with /-Ihed-näbbär/ above). Since the perfect suffixes keep the second masculine and third feminine distinct, clarity is gained by keeping the perfect suffixes on /allä/.

The imperfect also presents a problem of inconsistency in regard to infixed pronominal objects. Most forms simply infix the object between the stem and helping verb. Second and third plural forms have an assimilation of the plural stem suffix /u/ with the initial /a/ of the helping verb so that /u/ is deleted. Compare

yIhedu-näbbär	“They were going”
yIhedallu	“They go”, not */yiheduallu/.

However, the object infix intervenes between the two vowels so no assimilation takes place and /u/ remains when the word includes an infixed object or prepositional phrase.

tIhedullätallaččihu	“you (pl.) go for him”
yIhedullätal-	“they go for him”

The latter form is significant in that the subject suffix is deleted from the helping verb. This was not the case without the object-/yIhedallu/ “they go”. In searching for an explanation of the deletion, the reason seems to be the fact that the /u/ is not assimilated before the object thereby keeping the plural form distinct from the singular. This is not true in the case of the objectless forms which if apocopated would fall together because of the assimilation of /u/.

yIhedal from */yIhedallä/
*yIhedal from */yIheduallu/

We can then go one step further to show that opacity resulting from assimilation of /u/ to /a/ has also blocked the “no double subject constraint” for the second person.

*tIhedal from tIhedalläh
*tIhedal from tIheduallaččihu

If the apocopated forms were allowed as the rules would predict, the distinction between singular and plural in second person would be lost. The second person plural differs from the first in that even when the assimilation rule is blocked the “no double subject constraint” does not apply.

This reference to opacity offers an explanation of why five of

the imperfect verb forms have not followed the „no double subject constraint” on clitics. With this much blocking, apparently only the third person was able to maintain the rule when opacity didn't interfere. The first person forms remain with the exceptions probably by analogy.

SUMMARY

These examples of clitics in Amharic have shown three and possibly four constraints.

The first example of a constraint in conjunctions appears to have a natural solution by ordered expansions which would keep any of the three from coming together.

The second set of data shows that the constraint against object clitics on the infinitive can also be described by ordered rules. An explanation for the constraint is the fact that ambiguity would result from second person clitics which are identical in subject and object forms.

The third set of data shows that a possible subject-object constraint in first and second person is not only semantic but is at least partially statable in terms of mutually exclusive sets of clitics. Further data shows that most of these mutually exclusive forms are the same in both perfect and gerund in spite of the fact that all other persons have different markers in the two tenses. Problems come up in the formal address form and the imperfect stem where the subjects and objects are not identical and yet the same mutually exclusive constraint holds. The mutual exclusiveness therefore seems best described with selectional restrictions.

The present and past perfect data gives a strong case for what has been called the „no double subject constraint” since either the stem or the auxiliary may have the subject clitic, but not both. Since the determining factor depends on a phonological assimilation, the constraint will have to be described with a post phonology deletion rule (unless look-ahead global rules are allowed).

The last set of data discusses exceptions to this rule in the imperfect stem, and shows how vowel assimilations would make person and number distinctions opaque in several cases. The exceptions to the „no double subject constraint” can be largely explained as being blocked by this opacity.

ZDZISŁAW J. KAPERA

CYPRIOT ANTIQUITIES IN THE POLISH COLLECTIONS
AT THE END OF THE XIX C.*

At the end of the XIXth century there were two large collections of Cypriot antiquities in Poland. One has been preserved in Kraków (in the Archaeological Department of the Jagiellonian University and in the then created Czartoryski Museum) and the other in the Gołuchów castle in Great Poland, near Poznań. Both originated from the collecting passions of two members of the eminent Czartoryski family: prince Władysław and his sister Izabela married to count Jan Kanty Działyński.

As you probably know, the Czartoryski family was one of the richest and most powerful in the Polish Kingdom at the end of the XVIIIth c., during the reign of the last king Stanisław August Poniatowski (1764—1795). Collecting Roman antiquities was popular at the time and as we know, during the enlightenment it was closely connected with the revival of Classical traditions and the first archaeological excavations in Italy¹. But the “Pantheon

* This is a full text of my lecture held at the Warburg Institute (University of London) on May 11, 1977. It was a great pleasure for me to speak at the Institute and to present the results of my studies on the Cypriot antiquities in Poland. I should like to express my deepest gratitude to Professor J. B. Trapp, Director of the Warburg Institute, for his invitation to London and to C. R. Ligota, Associate Librarian, who presided the meeting, for his very constant help during my work in the Library.

¹ M. L. Bernhard, *Stanisław Kostka Potocki, kolekcjoner waz greckich*, Meander 6, 1951, pp. 431—449 (cf. *Fasti Archaeologici* 8, 1953, § 773); K. Michałowski, *Zbiór antyków w Nieborowie jako wyraz kolekcjonerstwa polskiego w dobie Oświecenia*, *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki* 13, 1951, no 4, pp. 124—137.