

## CLITIC DOUBLING: TOWARDS A TYPOLOGY

Peter Arkadiev (Institute of Slavic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences & RSUH)  
[http://www.inslav.ru/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=279](http://www.inslav.ru/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=279)

1. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

MACEDONIAN (Indo-European > Slavic)

- (1) Jana<sub>1</sub> **mu**<sub>2</sub> = **go**<sub>3</sub> = **dad-e**<sub>1</sub> pismo-to<sub>3</sub> na edno dete<sub>2</sub>.  
 Jana 3SG.M.DAT = 3SG.M.ACC = give-AOR:2/3SG.SBJ letter-DEF 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:

- (i) 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);
- (ii) morpho(phono)logically bound to the verb, i.e. forms integral and non-detachable part of the verbal word;
- (iii) cumulative, i.e. formal shape of the agreement morphemes is determined by such features as TAM and/or inflection class.

➤ clitic-doubling:

- (i) morphosyntactically optional, i.e. presence of pronominal clitic is determined by such features as animacy, definiteness, topicality, word order, semantic role/grammatical function of the relevant NP, rather than by syntactic structure;
- (ii) 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;
- (iii) 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).

---

<sup>1</sup> This research is supported by the Russian Foundation for Humanities, grant No. 09-04-00297a. A large part of the research has been conducted during my stay at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology in Leipzig in January–February 2010.

➤ Moreover, there is strong cross-linguistic evidence that the degree of morphological 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 pronominals realize clitic-doubling; however, there is no evidence that the three series of bound pronominals in Basque differ in the degree of morphologization.

NORTHERN OSTYAK a.k.a. KHANTY (Uralic > Finno-Ugric > Ob-Ugric; Siberia)

- (2) a. *ma nǎŋ xot-en wan-s-əm.*  
 I you house-2SG see-TR-1SG:SBJ  
 'I saw your house.'
- b. *ma nǎŋ xot-en wan-s-əm.*  
 I you house-2SG see-TR-1SG:SBJ/SG.OBJ  
 'id.' (Nikolaeva 1999 ex. 4)

➤ Object agreement in Northern Ostyak is expressed by complex bound morphology, but is morphosyntactically clearly optional.

SPANISH (Indo-European > Romance)

- (3) a. *La = invit-é a Mabel.*  
 3SG.F.ACC = invite-AOR.1SG.SBJ OBJ M.  
 'I invited Mabel.'
- b. *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. *hām jibāch = kē dekh-əl-iāinh.*  
 I Jibach = OBJ see-PST-1SG.SBJ/3.SG.HON.OBJ  
 'I saw Jibach.' (Yadav 1996: 74)
- b. *hām rāmās = kē kitab pərh-ɔ-l-iāinh.*  
 I Ramesh = OBJ book read-CAUS-PST-1SG.SBJ/3SG.HON.OBJ  
 'I taught Ramesh the book' (ibid.: 82)

➤ 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-ni ŋaŋu 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<sub>1</sub> hi<sub>1</sub>-ga<sub>2</sub> xabim<sup>i</sup> sagameeriyat<sup>i</sup><sub>2</sub>.*

boy 3SBJ-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<sub>1</sub> kê-dê pwaɑ ngmê<sub>1</sub>.*

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)

(9)

	Nom	Acc	Dat	Loc
1Sg	-ŋa		-ŋa	-ŋala
3Sg		∅	-la	-ŋanda
1PlIncl	-liwa		-ŋaliba	-alipbagula
3Pl	-lu		-anu	-anungula

## 2. Parameters of typology

### ❶ 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.

② 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 (Mandang, PNG), Ulwa (Misumalpan, Nicaragua), Yawuru (Nyulnyulan, N.Australia) etc;
- subject and direct object agreement vs. indirect object clitic doubling

GAAGUDJU (Gunwingguan, N.Australia): .

- (10) *nganj-ngiirla = ngaayu<sub>1</sub> djaamu<sub>2</sub> ma<sub>2</sub>-rree-nj-djaba = yu<sub>1</sub>.*  
 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. *pusi-kin<sub>1</sub> seta-ko<sub>2</sub> = kin<sub>1</sub> hua-ke-d-ko<sub>2</sub>-a.*  
 cat-DU dog-PL = 3DU.SBJ bit-CPL-TR-3PL.OBJ-IND  
 ‘The two cats bit the dogs’  
 b. *seta-ko<sub>1</sub> pusi-kin<sub>2</sub> = ko<sub>1</sub> hua-ke-d-kin<sub>2</sub>-a.*  
 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.

③ 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 = mtsà dâdâ.*  
 3SG.SBJ = die father  
 ‘The father died.’  
 b. *yó màmà á = vâ-n-tá kà sàwàrì šágrà gè gdzrè.*  
 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 = bukɔʔ la = knlək hn = pintuʔ.*  
 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 absolutes (S + O) (16)

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

- (15) a. *pikee-ka-di = ina taʔnipizi-a niʔi.*  
see-PRF-NML = 3SG man-ACC I  
'I saw the man.'
- b. *taʔnipizi nigaya pikee-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)

- (16) a. *aipač-uŋ yaxa-yi = aŋ.*  
boy-DEF cry-PRS = 3SG  
'The boy is crying.' (Bunte 1979: 13)
- b. *ni' aipac-i-uŋ tona-va = ŋa.*  
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. *kurrkatī 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-nda = 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. *ngalijarra-rla = pa-Ø-rli-ngu-rla* *pirriyani.*  
 we:two-OBJ = AUX-3SG.SBJ-1INC.OBJ-DU.OBJ-OBJ came  
 ‘He came up to us two.’
- b. *ngalijarra-rla = pa-Ø-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. *ngaju = ma-rna-rla* *linya yawiyi-wu.*  
 I(NOM) = AUX-1SG.SBJ-3SG.DAT cried sorrow-DAT  
 ‘I cried because of my sorrow.’ (ibid.: 26)
- d. *ngaju = ma-rna-Ø-nyanta<sub>1</sub>* *kirrarnana manga-nga<sub>1</sub> ngalu-nga<sub>1</sub>.*  
 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. *ŋaju = ŋa-ŋa-ŋanda* *ŋinanŋ-an 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. *gaŋdi = ŋa-lananda* *wandij-a linga-gawu.*  
 tree = AUX-3SG.LOC fall-PST snake-ALL  
 ‘A tree fell on top of the snake.’ (ibid.: 114)
- c. *ŋaju-ŋu = ŋa-ŋa-ŋanda* *magaqa man-i jambagina-ŋu.*  
 I-ERG = AUX-1SG.SBJ-3SG.LOC hat take-PST child-ABL  
 ‘I took a hat from a child.’ (ibid.: 115)

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

- (23) *malaku = latju-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)

#### ④ 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) *nhila pama-ng ngathu ku’a = thu waa.*  
 he man-ERG I:DAT dog = 1SG.DAT give  
 ‘The man gave me a dog.’ (Smith & Johnson 1985: 103)

– 2<sup>nd</sup> 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) *Meni<sub>1</sub> = mi<sub>1</sub> = ga<sub>2</sub>* *njega<sub>2</sub> 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 = ten = id*                                  *te-fk*                                  *teqcict.*  
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. *teqcict* | *te-fka = yas = ten = 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) *watjirra-ngka<sub>1</sub> = na-lu<sub>1</sub>*                  *tjalira*                  *tjunu*                  *katja-ku<sub>2</sub> = na-ra<sub>2</sub>.*  
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)

⑤ Interaction with marking on NPs (see Arkadiev 2009, 2010 for more details)

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

- (28) a. *Tu = e-grap-s-a*                                  *tu*                                  *Jorgh-u.*  
3SG.DAT.SG.M = PST-write-PFV-1SG.SBJ    DEF:DAT.SG.M    J.-DAT.SG  
‘I wrote to Jorgho.’
- b. *(\*Tu = )e-grap-s-a*                                  *s-to*                                  *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. *L-am*                                  *văzut*                  *pe profesor-ul*                  *tău.*  
3SG.ACC-AUX.1SG.SBJ    seen    OBJ    professor-DEF    your  
‘I saw your professor.’
- b. *(\*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)

⑥ Factors affecting clitic-doubling: see e.g. Friedman 2008 for Balkan.

– pronoun vs. full NP

SLOVENIAN (Indo-European < Slavic), Gorica dialect

- (30) a. *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. *\*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; Лопашов 1978; Mišeska-Tomić 2006: Ch. 4; Kal-luli & 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-mettut.*  
 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-mettut.*  
 DIR-reed 3SG.SBJ-give = 3SG.M.ACC OBL-man to OBL-woman  
 ‘id.’ (‘the reed’ is topicalized)
- c. *ta-mettut, ye-fka = yas 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

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

- (32) a. *taʔnipizi pikee-ka-di = ina momoʔo-na.*  
 man see-PRF-NML = 3SG woman-ACC  
 ‘The man saw the woman.’
- b. *yuwaati [taʔnipizi-a<sub>2</sub> pikee-kee-na = ina<sub>1</sub> = ana<sub>2</sub> momoʔo-na<sub>1</sub>].*  
 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)

### ⑦ 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. 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 KAWAIIISU (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.

#### Abbreviations

ABL – ablative, ACC – accusative, AGT – agent, ALL – allative, AOR – aorist, AUX – auxiliary, AVOID – avoidance case, CAUS – causative, CERT – certainty, COM – comitative, CPL – completive, DAT – dative, DEF – definite, DIR – direct case, DU – dual, EDIBLE – edible noun class, ERG – ergative, EXC – exclusive, F – feminine, FUT – future, GEN – genitive, HON – honorific, INC – inclusive, IND – indicative, INF – infinitive, IO – indirect object, IPF – imperfective, IRR – irrealis, LOC – locative, M – masculine, NEG – negation, NML – nominalization, NOM – nominative, OBJ – object, OBL – oblique, PART – participle, PFV – perfective, PL – plural, PRF – perfect, PROX – proximate, PRS – present, PST – past, REAL – realis, RFL – reflexive, SBD – subordinator, SBJ – subject, SG – singular, STAT – stative, T – target, TAM – tense/aspect/mood, TR – transitivity

#### References

- Аркадьев П.М. (2009). Согласование с именной группой в периферийном падеже: опыт типологии. Доклад на VI конференции по типологии и грамматике для молодых исследователей, ИЛИ РАН, Санкт-Петербург, 26–28 ноября 2009.
- Лопашов Ю.А. (1978). *Местоименные повторы дополнения в балканских языках*. Л.: Наука.
- Цыхун Г.А. (1968). *Синтаксис местоименных клитик в южнославянских языках (балкано-славянская модель)*. Минск: Наука и техника.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. (2003). *The Syntax of Ditransitives: Evidence from Clitics*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Arkadiev P.M. (2010). Towards a typology of case in head-marking languages. Talk at MPI for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig, 4 February 2010.
- Baker M. (1996). *The Polysynthesis Parameter*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Béjar S. (1999). Agreement alternations and functional licensing in Selayarese. In: C. Smallwood & C. Kitto (eds.), *Proceedings of the 6<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Austronesian*

- Formal Linguistics Association*. (Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics Vol. 16/2), 51–62.
- Belloro, Valeria A. (2007). *Spanish Clitic Doubling: A Study of the Syntax-Pragmatics Interface*. Doctoral Dissertation, SUNY Buffalo.
- Bošković, Željko (2008). What will you have, DP or NP?. In E. Elfner & M. Walkow (eds.), *NELS 37: Proceedings of the 37th Annual Meeting of the North East LS*. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Bresnan J. & S. Mchombo (1986). Grammatical and anaphoric agreement. In: *Chicago Linguistic Society 22, Parasession on Pragmatics and Grammatical Theory*, 278–297.
- Bunte, Pamela A. (1979). *Problems in Southern Paiute Syntax and Semantics*. Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University.
- Chadwick N. (1975). *A descriptive study of the Djingili language*. Canberra: Australian Institute for Aboriginal Studies.
- Chomsky N. (2001). Derivation by phase. In: M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: Life in Language*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1–73.
- Creissels D. (2005). A typology of subject and object markers in African languages. In: F.K.E. Voeltz (ed.), *Studies in African Linguistics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 43–70.
- Cysouw M. (2005). Morphology in the wrong place. A survey of preposed enclitics. In: W. Dressler et al. (eds.) *Morphology and Its Demarcations. Selected Papers from the 11<sup>th</sup> Morphology Meeting*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 17–37.
- Frajzyngier Z. (2008). One way of becoming a dative subject. In: Frajzyngier & Shay (eds.): 61–84.
- Frajzyngier Z. & E. Shay (eds) (2008), *Interaction of Syntax and Morphology: Case Studies in Afroasiatic*. (Typological Studies in Language 75) Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Friedman V. (2008). Balkan object reduplication in areal and dialectological perspective. In: Kalluli & Tasmowski (eds.), 35–63.
- Galand L. (1979). Relations du verbe et du nom dans l'énoncé berbère. In: C. Paris (éd.), *Relations prédicat-actant(s) dans les langues de types divers*. Paris: CNRS, 131–146.
- Garrett A. (1990). *The Syntax of Anatolian Pronominal Clitics*. PhD Thesis, Harvard University.
- Givón T. (1979). *On Understanding Grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
- Hansen, Kenneth C., L.E. Hansen (1975). *The core of Pintupi grammar*. Alice Springs: Institute of Aboriginal Development.
- Harvey, Mark (2002). *A Grammar of Gaagudju*. (Mouton Grammar Library 24) Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hill, J.H. (2006). *A Grammar of Cupeño*. Berkeley: University of California Publications in Linguistics, Vol. 136.
- Hosokawa, Komei (1991). *The Yawuru language of West Kimberley: a meaning-based description*. Doctoral dissertation, Australian Nat. Univ., Canberra.
- Hudson, Joyce (1978). *The core of Walmatjari grammar*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Jelinek E. (1984). Empty categories, case, and configurationality. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2/1, 39–76.

- Kalluli D. & L. Tasmowski (eds.) (2008). *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kiessling, Roland (1994). *Eine Grammatik des Burunge*. (Afrikanistische Forschungen Bd. 13) Hamburg: Research and Progress Verlag.
- Kruspe N. (2004). *A Grammar of Semelai*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Lunt, H. G. (1952). *Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language*. Skopje.
- Marušič Fr. & R. Žaucer (to appear). Clitic doubling in a determinerless language with second position clitics. To appear in *Proceedings of FDSL 7,5*. (ling-Buzz/000924)
- Mettouchi A. (2008). Case-marking, syntactic domains and information structure in Kabyle (Berber). In: Frajzyngier & Shay (eds.): 7–40.
- Mišeska-Tomić, O. (2006). *Balkan Sprachbund Morphosyntactic Features*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Mous, Maarten (1993). *A Grammar of Iraqw*. (Cushitic Language Studies 9) Hamburg: Buske.
- Naït-Zerrad K. (2001). *Grammaire moderne du kabyle*. Paris: Karthala.
- Nikolaeva I. (1999). Object agreement, grammatical relations and information structure. *Studies in Language* 23, 331–376.
- Osada T. (2008). Mundari. In: Gregory D. S. Anderson (ed.), *The Munda Languages*. London, New York: Routledge, 2008, 99–164.
- Pancheva R. (2004). Balkan possessive clitics: The problem of case and category. In: O. Mišeska-Tomić (ed.), *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins: 175–219.
- Preminger O. (2009). Breaking agreements: Distinguishing agreement and clitic-doubling by their failures. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40/4, 619–666.
- Smith I. & S. Johnson (1985). The syntax of clitic cross-referencing pronouns in Kugu Nganhcara. *Anthropological Linguistics* 27/1, 102–111.
- Thieberger N.A. (2004). *Topics in the Grammar and Documentation of South Efate, an Oceanic Language of Central Vanuatu*. PhD Thesis, University of Melbourne.
- Tsunoda T. (1981). *The Djaru Language of Kimberley, Western Australia*. Canberra: Australian National University.
- von Heusinger K. & E. Onea (2008). Triggering and blocking effects in the diachronic development of DOM in Romanian. *Probus* 20/1, 71–118.
- Yadav, Ramawatar (1996). *A Reference Grammar of Maithili*. (Trends in Linguistics: Documentation Vol. 11) Berlin, New York: Mouton.
- Zigmond, Maurice L., Curtis G. Booth, Pamela Munro (1990). *Kawaiisu: A Grammar and Dictionary with Texts*. (UCPL 119) Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.