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1. Introduction

MACEDONIAN (Indo-European > Slavic)

(1) \[ Jana_1 \text{ mu}_2 = go_3 = \text{dad-e}_4 \]
\[ \text{pismo-to}_5, \text{ na edno dete}_6. \]

\[ Jana \quad 3SG.M.DAT = 3SG.M.ACC = \text{give-AOR:2/3SG.SBJ} \quad \text{letter-DEF} \quad \text{to one child} \]

‘Jana gave the letter to a child (that I know)’ (Mišeska-Tomić 2006: 255)

In (1), there are found two kinds of cross-referencing relation between overt NPs (underlined) and pronominal elements found elsewhere in the clause (bold):

- **agreement:**
  1. morphosyntactically obligatory, i.e. presence of agreement morphemes is strictly determined by morphosyntactic context, and its absence makes the sentence ill-formed (in the strongest case, agreement morphemes are morphologically obligatory, i.e. are required by well-formedness principles of word-structure);
  2. morpho(phono)logically bound to the verb, i.e. forms integral and non-detachable part of the verbal word;
  3. cumulative, i.e. formal shape of the agreement morphemes is determined by such features as TAM and/or inflection class.

- **clitic-doubling:**
  1. morphosyntactically optional, i.e. presence of pronominal clitic is determined by such features as animacy, definiteness, topicity, word order, semantic role/grammatical function of the relevant NP, rather than by syntactic structure;
  2. morpho(phono)logically free, at least, not bound to the verb to the same degree as agreement morphemes; in particular, can show (limited) external mobility and non-selectivity of attachment;
  3. the shape of the clitic does not depend on any feature of the verbal domain, except for the phi-features (person, number, gender) of the doubled element.

In generative literature (see e.g. Chomsky 2001, Anagnostopoulou 2003, Preminger 2009), agreement and clitic-doubling are treated as entirely distinct phenomena, differing in their essential properties and in the mechanisms that give rise to them. In particular, agreement and clitic-doubling are subject to different locality restrictions, and show different sensitivity to the so-called defective intervention. These issues, however, will not be touched upon here, since they are not theory-independent and cannot be unequivocally determined for all languages discussed in this paper.

- By contrast, I assume that for the lack of cross-linguistic evidence to the contrary, the distinction between agreement of clitic-doubling is not that of essence, but rather that of degree: it essentially boils down to the well-known gradual nature of grammaticalization of pronominal cross-reference (Givón 1979; Creissels 2005).

---
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Moreover, there is strong cross-linguistic evidence that the degree of morphophonological boundedness of the pronominal element to its host (usually the verb) does not really correlate with the crucial parameter of morphosyntactic obligatoriness vs. optionality (cf. also Bresnan & Mchombo 1986).

Incidentally, Preminger (2009) argues that in Basque only absolutive pronominals on the auxiliary are genuine agreement morphemes whereas ergative and dative bound pronouns realize clitic-doubling; however, there is no evidence that the three series of bound pronouns in Basque differ in the degree of morphologization.

Northern Ostyak a.k.a. Khanty (Uralic > Finno-Ugric > Ob-Ugric; Siberia)

(2) a. \textit{ma năn xot-en wan-s-am.}  
   I you house-2SG see-TR-1SG:SBJ  
   ‘I saw your house.’  

b. \textit{ma năn xot-en wan-s-em.}  
   I you house-2SG see-TR-1SG:SBJ/SG.OBJ  
   ‘id.’ (Nikolaeva 1999 ex. 4)

\[
\text{Object agreement in Northern Ostyak is expressed by complex bound morphology, but is morphosyntactically clearly optional.}
\]

Spanish (Indo-European > Romance)

(3) a. \textit{La = invit-é a Mabel.}  
   3SG.F.ACC = invite-AOR.1SG.SBJ OBJ M.  
   ‘I invited Mabel.’  

b. \textit{Le = di un regalo a Mabel.}  
   3SG.DAT = give:AOR.1SG a gift OBJ M.  
   ‘I gave a gift to Mabel.’ (Belloro 2007: xiii)

Maithili (Indo-European > Indo-Iranian > Indo-Aryan > Eastern; India)

(4) a. \textit{həm jibəch=kẽ dekh-əl-iśinh.}  
   I Jibach =OBJ see-PST-1SG.SBJ/3.SG.HON.OBJ  
   ‘I saw Jibach.’ (Yadav 1996: 74)  

b. \textit{həm rəməs=kẽ kitab pəṛh-əl-iśinh.}  
   I Ramesh =OBJ book read-CAUS-PST-1SG.SBJ/3SG.HON.OBJ  
   ‘I taught Ramesh the book’ (ibid.: 82)

\[
\text{Systems of case-marking and cross-referencing in Spanish in Maithili arguably differ only in expression, not in functional make-up.}
\]

Nevertheless, here I will assume that the gradual and by no means clear-cut distinction between clitics and affixes is relevant and will try to see whether clitic-doubling can be treated as a cross-linguistically meaningful notion.

In this paper I adhere to the following definition of clitic doubling:

A given language is said to exhibit clitic-doubling if it productively allows constructions where an overt NP co-occurs with a co-indexed overt pronominal in the same clause, and where this pronominal exhibits (language specific) features of morphosyntax and/or morphophonology sufficiently distinct from independently established (language specific) morphosyntactic and/or morphophonological features of both affixes and free words.
Problematic (borderline) issues:

- doubling by (arguably) free (non-clitic) pronominals

**SPOKEN RUSSIAN** (Indo-European > Slavic)

(4) Эта конструкция она встречается только в разговорной речи.

**JINGULU** (West-Barkly, N.Australia)

(5) wambaja-ŋa-nu ŋa nu bai-na.

speak-1SG.SBJ-PST him man-DAT

‘I spoke to the man.’ (Chadwick 1975: 21)

- clitic-doubling vs. dislocation + resumption by clitics

**FRENCH** (Indo-European > Romance)

(6) a. J’ai donné un livre à Marie.

‘I gave a book to Mary.’

b. Marie, je lui ai donné un livre.

‘Mary, I gave her a book.’

c. Je lui ai donné un livre, à Marie.

‘I gave her a book, to Mary.’

See also Berber (below) and Anatolian (Garrett 1990, Sideltsev 07.06.2010).

- clitic complexes vs. affix complexes forming independent words

**BURUNGE** (Cushitic > South, Tanzania); similar though even more complex situation is found in the closely related IRAQW (Mous 1993)

(7) qaraʔimo, hi-ga xa b1 mi 2 sagameerya1.

boy 3SG.F.OBJ marry:3SG.M.IPF girl

‘The boy is marrying this girl.’ (Kiessling 1994: 133)

**YELE** (Yele-West New Britain, Papua New-Guinea):

(8) W:uu kê-dê pwaa ngmê.

egg CERT-TAM:3.SBJ break TAM:3SG.OBJ

‘They broke the egg.’ (Henderson 1995: 16)

- problem of null clitics

**DJARU**, Wawarl dialect (Pama-Nyungan > South-West, N. Australia) (Tsunoda 1981: 68–71)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nom</th>
<th>Acc</th>
<th>Dat</th>
<th>Loc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Sg</td>
<td>-ŋa</td>
<td>-ŋa</td>
<td>-ŋala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Sg</td>
<td></td>
<td>-la</td>
<td>-ŋanda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PIIncl</td>
<td>-liwa</td>
<td>-ŋaliba</td>
<td>-alŋbagula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Pl</td>
<td>-lu</td>
<td>-anu</td>
<td>-anungula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Parameters of typology

★ Are clitics obligatory?

★ Impressionistically (for the current lack of a balanced sample), it appears that in the majority of languages with clitic-doubling at least some clitics are morphosyntactically obligatory (in contrast to the full NPs). Thus, the ‘Balkan prototype’ outlined in Section 1 is not a cross-linguistic ‘default’, but rather a feature of a particular linguistic area.
Does clitic-doubling co-exist with agreement, and if so, what is their distribution?
– subject agreement vs. object clitic-doubling: Macedonian, Bulgarian, Romanian, Albanian, Modern Greek, Spanish (esp. dialectal), Maltese (Semitic), Mauwake (Madang, PNG), Ulwa (Missonalpan, Nicaragua), Yawuru (Nyulnyulan, N.Australia) etc;
– subject and direct object agreement vs. indirect object clitic doubling

**GAAGUDJU** (Gunwingguan, N.Australia):

(10) nganj-ngiirla = ngaayu, djaa mu , ma rree-nj-djaba = yu .

1SG-aunt = 3F.DAT tucker 3EDIBLE.OBJ-1SG.SBJ-FUT-send = 3F.IO

‘I will send tucker to my aunt.’ (Harvey 2002: 264)

– subject clitic-doubling vs. object agreement

**MUNDARI** (Munda, India), also **WANDALA** (Afroasiatic > Chadic, Cameroon)

(11) a. pus i -kin 1

seta - ko 2 = kin 1  

cat-DU dog-PL =3DU.SBJ  bit-CPL-TR-3PL.OBJ-IND

‘The two cats bit the dogs’

b. seta - ko 1  

pusi -kin2 = ko 1  

dog-PL cat-DU = 3PL.SBJ  bit-CPL-TR-3DU.OBJ-IND

‘The dogs bit the two cats’ (Osada 2008: 108)

– only clitic doubling: Djaru, Warlpiri, Wik-Ngathana, Pintupi, Walmatjari (all Pama-Nyungan, Australia), Kawaiisu, Southern Paiute (both Uto-Aztecan > Numic), etc.

☆ Which types of NPs can be clitic-doubled?

– only subjects (S + A)

**SOUTH EFATE** (Austronesian > Malayo-Polynesian < Oceanic, Vanuatu)

(12) Mama neu  

i = to  

maet-ki  

kineu.

mother my 3SG.REAL = STAT angry-TR me

‘My mother would be angry with me.’ (Thieberger 2004: 272)

**WANDALA** (Afroasiatic > Chadic, Cameroon)

(13) a. à = mtsè  

dàdà.

3SG.SBJ = die father

‘The father died.’

b. yö m m à  

d = và-n-tô  

kà sàwàrì  

šàgrà  

gò gdsrè.

well mother 3SG.SBJ = give-3SG.OBJ-T NEG advice good to child

‘The mother does not give good advice to her child.’ (Frajzyngier 2008: 63)

– (rarely) just agents

**SEMELAI** (Mon-Khmer > Aislian, Peninsular Malaysia)

(14) a. ki = buko?  

la = knl: k  

hn = pintu?.

3.AGT = open ERG = husband OBJ = door

‘The husband opened the door.’ (Kruspe 2004: 255)

b. dehn  

paloh.

they fled

‘They fled.’ (ibid.: 248)
– (rarely) just direct objects (O) (15) or absolutives (S+O) (16)

Kawaiisu (Uto-Aztecan > Northern > Numic, USA)


see-PRF-NML=3SG man-ACC I

‘I saw the man.’

b. *taʔnipiζi nɪgaya* pɨkee-ka-di=ni.

man me see-PRF-NML=1SG

‘The man saw me.’ (Zigmond et al. 1990: 15)

Southern Paiute (Uto-Aztecan > Northern > Numic, USA)


boy-DEF cry-PRS=3SG

‘The boy is crying.’ (Bunte 1979: 13)

b. *ni’ aɪpa-ci-ʊŋ* tonɑ-va=ŋḁ.

1SG:NOM boy-ACC-DEF hit-FUT=3SG

‘I’m going to hit the boy.’ (ibid.: 17)

– ‘primary objects’ (transitive patients + ditransitive recipients)

Pintupi (Pama-Nyungan > South-West, N.Australia)

(17) a. *mutukayi-tjanu=na-pulanya nyangu, wati kutjarra.*

car-origin=1SG.SBJ-3DU.OBJ saw men two

‘I saw the two men who were in the car’ (Hansen & Hansen 1975: 72)

b. *kurrkāti kutju=na-pulanya yungu yaparranytji kutjarra-ku.*

goanna one=1SG.SBJ-3DU.OBJ gave children two-DAT

‘I gave one goanna to those two children’ (ibid.: 56)

– indirect objects, beneficiaries and ‘raised’ possessors

Macedonian

(18) a. *Naizlego-a gluvc-i i mu=pojdo-a*

come.out-AOR:3PL.SBJ rat-PL and 3SG.M.DAT=go-AOR.3PL.SBJ

kaj adži mačor-ot...

to haji cat-DEF

‘The rats came out in crowds and went to Haji Cat...’ (Lunt 1952: 108)

b. *i starec-ot ... ja=pokosi-l treva-ta i*

and old.man-DEF 3SG.F.ACC=mow-PART grass-DEF and

*mu=ja=frli-l pred magare-to...* (ibid.: 110)

3SG.M.DAT=3SG.F.ACC=throw-PART before donkey-DEF

‘... and the old man mowed the grass and threw it before the donkey.’

Romanian (Indo-European > Romance)

(19) *I-am vazut Mari-ei carte-a.*

3SG.F.DAT-AUX.1SG seen Mary-OBL.SG book-DEF

‘I have seen Mary’s book’ (Pancheva 2004: 204)

Yawuru (Nyulnyulan; N.Australia)

(20) *nyamba mi-na-ka-nدا=dyina dyuyu-ni kamba=yi mirdanya.*

this 2SG.SBJ-TR-carry-PFV=3SG.DAT 2SG.ERG that=DAT old.man

‘You brought this for the old man’ (Hosokawa 1991: 242)
– other participants

WALMATJARI (Pama-Nyungan > South-West; N.Australia) (note the complex make-up of the objective clitics)

(21) a. \( \text{ngalijarra-rla} = \text{pa-} \text{rli-ngu-rla} \) pirriyani.
we:two-OBJ = AUX-3SG.SBJ-1INC.OBJ-DU.OBJ-OBJ came
‘He came up to us two.’

b. \( \text{ngalijarra-rla} = \text{pa-} \text{jarra-ngu-rla} \) laparni rayin.
we:two-OBJ = AUX-3SG.SBJ-1EXC.OBJ-DU.OBJ-OBJ ran fear
‘He ran away from us two in fear.’ (Hudson 1978: 23)

c. \( \text{ngaju} = \text{ma-ma-rla} \) linya yawiyi-wu.
I(NOM) = AUX-1SG.SBJ-3SG.DAT cried sorrow-DAT
‘I cried because of my sorrow.’ (ibid.: 26)

d. \( \text{ngaju} = \text{ma-ma-} \text{Nyanta} \) kirrarnana mango-nga, ngalu-nga-ŋ.
I(NOM) = AUX-1SG.SBJ-3SG.OBJ-OBJ sitting girl-OBJ/COM shade-OBJ/LOC
‘I am sitting in the shade with the girl.’ (ibid.: 29)

DJARU (Pama-Nyungan > South-West, N.Australia)

(22) a. \( \text{ŋaɟu} = \text{ŋa-} \text{ɲanda} \) jambagina-la.
I(NOM) = AUX-1SG.SBJ-3SG.LOC sit-PRS child-LOC
‘I am sitting near/by/with a child.’ (Tsunoda 1981: 113)

b. \( \text{ɡaɳɖi} = \text{ŋa-} \text{ɲanda} \) wandiɲ-a liŋga-gawu.
tree = AUX-3SG.LOC fall-PST snake-ALL
‘A tree fell on top of the snake.’ (ibid.: 114)

c. \( \text{ŋaɟu-ŋu} = \text{ŋa-} \text{ɲanda} \) mgaɖa man-i jambagina-ŋu.
I-ERG = AUX-1SG.SBJ-3SG.OBJ-OBJ take-PST child-ABL
‘I took a hat from a child.’ (ibid.: 115)

PINTUPI (Pama-Nyungan > South-West, N.Australia)

(23) \( \text{maḻaku} = \text{latju-} \text{tjanampalura} \) pitjangu malpu-ngkamarra patjal-tjakumarra.
return = 1PL.EXC.SBJ-3PL.AVOID went spirit-AVOID biting-AVOID
‘We turned back to avoid the spirits biting us.’ (Hansen & Hansen 1975: 61)

\( \text{Type of clitics} \)

– verb-adjacent: Balkan, Romance, some Non-Pama-Nyungan Australian, Paman (< Pama-Nyungan), North Munda (subject clitics phonologically attach to the immediately preverbal constituent, Cysouw 2005)

KUGU NGANHCARA a.k.a. KUGU-UWANH (Pama-Nyungan > Paman)

(24) \( \text{nhila pama-ng ngathu ku’} \text{a} = \text{thu} \) waa.
he man-ERG I:DAT dog = 1SG.DAT give
‘The man gave me a dog.’ (Smith & Johnson 1985: 103)

– 2\( ^{\text{nd}} \) position: North-West Pama-Nyungan, Slovenian dialects, Northern Uto-Aztecan (to different degrees; see e.g. Cupeño, Hill 2006)

SLOVENIAN (Indo-European < Slavic), Gorica dialect

(25) \( \text{Meni,} = \text{mi} = \text{ga}_{2} \) njega\_2 niso te-l-i predstavi-t.
I:DAT = 1SG.DAT = 3SG.M.ACC he:ACC not want-PST-3PL introduce-INF
‘They did not want to introduce him to me.’ (Marušič, Žaucer to appear: 4)
in V-initial languages, V-adjacent enclitics ≈ 2-nd position clitics

KABYLE (Afroasiatic > Berber, Alger)

(26) a. \( ad = as = \text{ten} = \text{id} \)  \( \text{te-fk} \)  \( \text{teqict} \).
irr = 3SG.DAT = 3PL.M.ACC = PROX 3SG.F.SBJ-give girl(OBL)
‘The girl will give them to him/her.’ (Mettouchi 2008: 12)

b. \( \text{taqict} | \text{te-fka} = \text{yas} = \text{ten} = \text{id} \).
girl(DIR) 3SG.F.SBJ-give = 3SG.DAT = 3PL.M.ACC = PROX
‘The girl gave them to him/her.’ (ibid.: 10) → | = morphosyntactic barrier

– other: PINTUPI multiple clitic-doubling

(27) \( \text{watiirra-ngka} = \text{na-lu}, \text{tjalira} \text{tjunu} \text{katja-ku} = \text{na-ra} \).
cousin-OBL = 1SG.SBJ-3SG.OBL have.carried put son-DAT = 1SG.SBJ-3SG.DAT
‘I put (the kangaroo) on my cousin’s (head) for my son’ (Hansen & Hansen 1975: 114)

Interaction with marking on NPs (see Arkadiev 2009, 2010 for more details)

MODERN GREEK (Indo-European): prepositional vs. bare indirect objects

(28) a. \( \text{Tu} = \text{e-grap-s-a} \)  \( \text{tu} \)  \( \text{Jorgh-u} \).
3SG.DAT.SG.M = PST-write-PFV-1SG.SBJ DEF:DAT.SG.M J.-DAT.SG
‘I wrote to Jorgho.’

b. \( (*\text{Tu} = \text{e-grap-s-a} \)  \( \text{s-to} \)  \( \text{Jorgh-o} \).
(*3SG.DAT.SG.M =)PST-write-PFV-1SG.SBJ to-DEF:ACC.SG.M J.-ACC.SG
‘id.’ (Mišeska-Tomić 2006: 324)

ROMANIAN (Indo-European > Romance)

(29) a. \( \text{L-am văzut pe profesor-ul tău} \).
3SG.ACC-AUX.1SG.SBJ seen OBJ professor-DEF your
‘I saw your professor.’

b. \( (*\text{L-am văzut (*pe) autobuzu-ul tău} \).
(*3SG.ACC-AUX.1SG.SBJ seen OBJ bus-DEF your
‘I saw your bus.’ (von Heusinger & Onea 2008: 69)

Factors affecting clitic-doubling: see e.g. Friedman 2008 for Balkan.

– pronoun vs. full NP

SLOVENIAN (Indo-European < Slavic), Gorica dialect

(30) a. \( \text{Js = se = ga njega spomn-e-m še iž šol-e} \).
I(NOM) = RFL = 3SG.M.ACC he:ACC remember-PRS-1SG already from school-GEN
‘I remember him already from school.’

b. \( *\text{Js = se = ga Petr-a spomn-e-m še iž šol-e} \).
I(NOM) = RFL = 3SG.M.ACC P.-ACC remember-PRS-1SG already from school-GEN
‘I remember Peter already from school.’ (Marušič & Zaučer to appear: 3)

– animacy: Romanian

– definiteness and topicality: principal factors for Balkan languages with interesting (micro)variation, see Цыхун 1968; Лопатов 1978; Mišeska-Tomić 2006: Ch. 4; Kalluli & Tasmovski (eds.) 2008.
– word order: e.g. Berber (Galand 1979, Mettouchi 2008) ~ left/right dislocation

**KABYLE** (Afroasiatic > Berber, Alger)

(31) a. *ye-fka we-rgaz a-γanim i t-meṭṭut.*

   3SG.SBJ-give OBL-man DIR-reed to OBL-woman

   ‘The man gave the reed to the woman.’

b. *a-γanim, ye-fka=t we-rgaz i t-meṭṭut.*

   DIR-reed 3SG.SBJ-give=3SG.M.ACC OBL-man to OBL-woman

   ‘id.’ (‘the reed’ is topicalized)

c. *ta-meṭṭut, ye-fka=γas we-rgaz a-γanim.*

   DIR-woman 3SG.SBJ-give=3SG.IO OBL-man DIR-reed

   ‘id.’ (‘the woman’ is topicalized) (based on Naït-Zerrad 2001: 61, 163)

– finiteness

**Kawaiisu** (Uto-Aztecan > Northern > Numic, USA): subject clitic-doubling occurs only in subordinate (nominalized) clauses


   man see-PRF-NML=3SG woman-ACC

   ‘The man saw the woman.’

b. *yuwaati [taʔnipızi-a₂ pikee-kee-na =ina, =ana₂ momoʔo-na₁].*

   NEG man-ACC see-PRF-SBD=3SG=3SG woman-ACC

   ‘The man didn’t see the woman.’ [lit. there was no man’s seeing-her-his the woman] (Zigmond et al. 1990: 111)

Featural make-up of clitics

– person, number, gender/class etc.;
– case/role;
– TAM, cf. realis vs. irrealis subject clitics in Oceanic

3. Other fascinating issues not discussed here

– argument status of clitics and full NPs (Jelinek 1984, Baker 1996, Mettouchi 2008 on Berber etc.)

– clitic-doubling and the NP/DP distinction (Bošković 2008)

  ➢ According to Bošković, only languages with articles have clitic-doubling.

  ➢ Counterexamples (NB under the current definition of clitic-doubling): Spoken Slovenian (IE), Warlpiri, Djaru, Pintupi, Walmatjari, Wik-Ngathana (PN), Gaagudju (Gunw), Mundari (Munda), Kawaiisu, Southern Paiute (UA).

– ‘default’ clitic-doubling?

According to Preminger 2009, when the structural conditions for agreement are not satisfied, ‘default’ agreement morphology (e.g. 3rd pers.) appears, whereas failure of clitic-doubling leads to clitics’ not surfacing at all.

➢ Object clitics cross-referencing complement clauses in Northern Paiute (Bunte 1979: 101–102) and Kawaiisu (Zigmond et al. 1990: 106) might perhaps be analysed this way. Also in Selayarese (Austronesian > Malayo-Polynesian, Sulawesi), according to Béjar (1999: 52–53), clausal complements trigger object clitics, whereas indefinite NP objects do not.
4. Discussion

- Clitic-doubling, at least with the current data-sample, seems to be a characteristic of genetic (North-West Pama-Nyungan, Numic, North Munda, numerous Austronesian) or areal (Balkans and Mediterranean) groupings, rather than to correlate with some independent structural features of languages.
- Clitic-doubling is ‘cross-reference by means of clitics’, not a deeper phenomenon essentially different from affixal agreement according to any cross-linguistically recurrent properties. Most of the parameters outlined in section 2 (i.e. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7) apply to cross-reference in general, rather than just to clitic-doubling.
- Features of ‘prototypical agreement’ and ‘prototypical clitic-doubling’ determined on the basis of Balkan languages in section 1 do not correlate with one another cross-linguistically.
- Clitic-doubling is an interesting phenomenon from the perspective of clitics (provided they are defined in a cross-linguistically meaningful way), but probably not from the perspective of argument-marking.
- Since functional and morphosyntactic properties of cross-referencing are independent of the morpho(phono)logical expression, and since distinction between clitics and affixes are language-specific and fuzzy, it is advisable, for the current lack of sufficient and unequivocal evidence to the contrary, to abandon the distinction between ‘agreement’ and ‘clitic-doubling’ in typological studies and cross-linguistic theorizing.
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