Clitic Doubling: Insights from Degema*

KARI, Ethelbert E.
Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa

Clitic doubling has been discussed extensively in the literature on clitics and has generated a lot of interest because of the many questions it raises. In this paper, I consider one of these questions with particular reference to Degema, i.e. when clitic doubling occurs, and show that in this language clitic doubling is not associated with the ‘presence of a preposition’, as in Romance languages, or with ‘specificity and topicality’, as in Slavic languages. Rather, what makes clitic doubling possible are syntactic (movement and anaphoricity) and discourse (emphasis and/or familiarity) factors.
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1. Introduction

Two types of clitics have been identified in Degema based on their position relative to the grammatical category that hosts them. They are proclitics (subject clitics) and enclitics (non-subject clitics). Proclitics occur before the grammatical categories (i.e. verbs, auxiliaries, and preverbal adverbs) that host them, and function principally
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as indicators of number and person. Enclitics occur after the grammatical categories (i.e. verbs, and (object) pronouns that begin with a consonant) that host them (For the most recent discussion on Degema clitics, see Kari 2003a). A surface endoclitic that results from a metathesis rule that applies after external clitic attachment has also been identified and discussed elaborately in Kari (2002c, 2003a). Enclitics and the surface endoclitic do not have any person and number features. Degema clitics are observed to be phonologically dependent upon the grammatical categories that host them. That is to say that the vowels of these clitics become expanded or non-expanded, depending on the set to which the vowels of the host belong. The following are some examples in Degema showing procliticization (1)–(3), encliticization (4) and (5), and endocliticization (6) and (7):

(1) \textit{mó}=kpén \textit{isama.}  
3SpPCL=wash shirts  
'(S)he washes shirts'

(2) \textit{mí}=kō \textit{ji} \textit{ə.}  
1SpPCL=EPAUX come CM  
'I did come'

(3) \textit{ɛ}=st \textit{a.}  
3PIPCL.NEG=still go  
'They still did not go'

(4) \textit{o}=mi=\textit{tín.}  
3SpPCL=become wet=FE  
'It became wet/It is wet'

(5) \textit{s}=kū \textit{mè}=\textit{tén.}  
3SpPCL=give me=FE  
'(S)he gave me'

(6) \textit{mi}=bó\textit{ọ́l.}  
1SpPCL=hold.FE  
'I held (sth.)'

---

1) It has been discovered recently that proclitics, in addition to person and number, also encode the semantic property of human/non-human that is associated with the subject (see Kari 2001, 2002a).

2) I wish to note that the surface endoclitic results from a process involving one of the clitics in the language—the factative enclitic.
(7) ə=nú  bá³áw.
3SgPCL-hit them.FE
'(S)he hit them'

In examples (1)–(3), the proclitic attaches to a verb, an auxiliary, and to a preverbal adverb respectively. In (4) and (5), the factative enclitic attaches to a verb and to the (object) pronoun respectively. The factative enclitic attaches endoclitically inside the verb in (6) and inside the pronoun in (7) (See Kari 2002c, 2003a for a detailed discussion on how the factative enclitic comes to be located in this position). In all cases, the clitics are affected by the vowel harmony that operates in the words to which they attach themselves.

Only proclitics will feature in my discussion on clitic doubling in Degema. The reason is that enclitics and the surface endoclitic do not have any coreferential properties.

The following table shows the forms of Degema clitics:

**Table 1. Forms of Degema clitics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proclitics (subject clitics)</th>
<th>Enclitics (non-subject clitics)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. Clitic Doubling**

'Clitic doubling' is a phenomenon whereby an NP in a sentence is duplicated by a clitic. The clitic that duplicates the NP agrees with the duplicated NP in such features as person, number, case and gender. Clitic doubling in this paper is not to be understood in terms of a clitic doubling a clitic but in terms of a clitic co-occurring with an NP and agreeing with it in some or all of its grammatical features. There is a large amount of literature on clitic doubling, especially with reference to Romance and Slavic languages (see Kayne (1975), Borer (1986), Spencer (1991), Rudin (1996, 1997), Franks (1998), Franks and King (2000) and Franco (2000)).

Among the questions raised by clitic doubling are (a) when does clitic doubling

---

3) Capital letters in the forms of clitics represent two phonological alternants, as follows: A=a/a, E=e/e, I=i/i, O=o/o, U=u/u.
occur? (b) how can both the clitic and the doubled argument be assigned a \( \theta \) role? (c) what is the role of the clitic in clitic doubling constructions with regard to the ECP, etc.? Although it will be interesting to tackle all these questions with regard to Degema, I will restrict myself, in this paper, to the first question regarding when clitic doubling occurs (see Kari (2002b, 2003a) for some discussion relating to questions (b) and (c)).

In discussions on clitic doubling, it has generally been assumed that the presence of a preposition or preposition-like element is necessary to assign case to a doubled NP—a phenomenon that is often referred to as Kayne-Jaeggi generalization. And the absence of a preposition is assumed to be the reason for the lack of clitic doubling in French (cf. Borer 1986). Consider the following example from Spanish taken from Spencer (1991, p.360):

(8) Lo vimos a Juan
    him I-saw to Juan
    'I saw Juan'

In example (8) the direct object \textit{Juan} is preceded by a preposition and doubled by the clitic \textit{Lo}.

Franks and King (2000), citing Rudin (1997), point out that \textit{topicality} and \textit{specificity} are the key factors that license the doubling of direct and indirect objects in Slavic languages, such as Bulgarian and Macedonian (see also Schick 2000 for some recent discussion). In Romance languages, clitic doubling is often associated with the presence of a preposition as seen in example (8). The Bulgarian data in (9), taken from Franks and King (2000, p.251), show that clitic doubling occurs in (9a) because the (direct) object is specific, whereas clitic doubling occurs in (9b) because the (indirect) object is topicalized:

(9a) Decata \textit{j}a običat neja.
    Children.DEF her.ACC love.3PL her.ACC
    'The children love her'

(9b) Na vas \textit{š}te \textit{vi} otmerja drugo po-xubavo.
    for you will you.DAT measure-off another nicer
    'For you I'll measure off another, better (piece)'

---

4) Abbreviations: 1SG=1st person singular, 1SgPCL=1st person singular proclitic, 3PL=3rd person plural, 3SgPCL=3rd person singular proclitic, 3P1PCL=3rd plural proclitic, ACC=accusative, Agr=agreement, AgrP=agreement of subject projection, aux.=auxiliary verb, C=complementizer/consonant, DAT=dative, Cl=clitic, CM=compensatory morpheme, DEF=definite, ECP=Empty Category Principle, EPAUX=emphatic past auxiliary, FE=factative enclitic, FOC=focus marker, Hum=human, NEG=negative, NP=noun phrase, NPM=non-past morpheme, p. adv.=preverbal adverb, pron.=pronoun, Spec=specifier, Spec-AgrP=specifier of agreement projection, T=tense, TP=tense projection, V=verb/vowel, VP=verb phrase.
Example (10) from Macedonian, also taken from Franks and King (2000, p.253), shows the doubling of a specific indefinite noun phrase (NP):

(10) Sakam da go pluknam eden čovek koj beše včera kaj tebe.  
      want.1sg C him spit-on.1sg one man who was yesterday by you.  
      'I want to spit on a man who was at your place yesterday'

3. Clitic Doubling in Degema

Degema has no clitic doubling whereby direct or indirect objects are doubled, as in Slavic languages like Bulgarian and Macedonian, or does it have clitic doubling that is associated with a preposition, as in Romance languages like Spanish.\(^5\) What occurs in Degema is clitic doubling whereby the subject NP is duplicated by a clitic\(^6\) that agrees with it in relevant grammatical features. Consider example (11) below:

(11)

```
  NP   AgrP
    |     |
   Agr'  TP
      |    |
  tatané,  T
     [+3Sg]  VP
    [Hum]  NP
      |    |
 mój,  V
    [+Cl]  t
     [+3Sg]  NP
    [Hum]  V'
      |  
     kótú w5
```

In (11), the subject NP tatané is doubled when it moves from its underlying position in the verb phrase (VP) to the specifier of agreement (Spec AgrP) position, a position that makes it possible for the subject clitic mój to copy all the grammatical features such as person, number, and human/non-human that are associated with the subject NP. This reasoning is consistent with the Principles and Parameters theory (See Chomsky (1981), Pollock (1989), Haegeman (1991), Cook and Newson (1996). For a detailed discussion on cliticization and movement in Degema, see Kari (2002b). But for a more recent discussion, see Kari (2003a)).

---

5) See Franco (2000) on clitic doubling in Spanish where he shows that clitic doubling with a preposition-less NP direct object is possible in Southern Cone Spanish.

Other factors that combine with the movement and copying operations are emphasis and/or familiarity between speaker and hearer of the subject of discourse which incidentally is also the subject of the sentence, as in (12b) and (13b):

(12a) \( \text{mètè me=ménè úmene.} \) (emphatic)
I 1SgPCL=do work
'I am working'

(12b) \( \text{me=ménè úmene.} \) (unemphatic)
1SgPCL=do work
'I am working'

(13a) \( \text{baw mé=kpén ísama.} \) (emphatic/unfamiliar)
they 3PlPCL=wash shirts
'They wash shirts'

(13b) \( \text{mé=kpén ísama.} \) (unemphatic/familiar)
3PlPCL=wash shirts
'They wash shirts'

In (12a) where the subject NP is emphasized, the clitic exists alongside the subject. This contrasts with (12b) where the subject is not emphasized. In this case, the clitic exists without the subject NP. In (13a) where the clitic doubles the subject NP, the doubled NP is emphatic. In addition, it is assumed that the subject is unfamiliar to the discourse participants. For these reasons its presence in the sentence is obligatory. In (13b) where the doubled NP in (13a) is emphatic and familiar, the clitic exists without the subject NP. It should be borne in mind that the clitic doubles the subject NP, prior to the deletion of the subject NP, when it has copied all the relevant grammatical features of the doubled subject.

Movement and emphasis and/or familiarity seem to account for why the subject and its associated clitic, very often, co-occur in the same clause, as in (12a) and (13a) (For a related discussion, see Kari 2003a). Unlike Bulgarian, where clitic doubling is associated with topicalization and specificity (i.e. doubling occurs when the doubled NP is topicalized and/or specific), clitic doubling in Degema occurs when the doubled NP is moved and emphasized and/or unfamiliar to one of the participants in discourse. Once emphasis and/or familiarity are absent when the NP is moved to Spec AgrP position, and its grammatical features have been copied, the doubled subject NP deletes.

I have said that subject NP’s are doubled by subject clitics that are anaphoric\(^7\) to

\(^7\) See Anagnostopoulou and Giannakidou (1995), cited by Franks and King (2000), for a
them. Sentences in Degema without a clitic doubling the subject NP prior to its deletion, except positive imperatives, are ungrammatical, as there is no element to carry the grammatical features of the subject on the one hand, and tone that combines with other non-prosodic elements of the sentence to express tense, aspect, polarity, etc. on the other. Consider example (14):

(14a) iβiβo so má=fjá ú’táŋ.
Ivioso 3SgPCL=cut tree
'Ivioso will cut a tree'

(14b) *iβiβo so fjá ú’táŋ.
Ivioso cut tree

(14c) *fjá ú’táŋ.
cut tree

description on the referential scale within which cross-linguistic clitic doubling can be situated. One such referential notion has to do with anaphoricity.

Example (14a) is grammatical because there is a clitic doubling the subject iβiβo, and bearing tone to show that the tense of the sentence is non-past. (14b) and (14c) are ungrammatical. The reason why (14b) is ungrammatical is because there is no clitic doubling the subject NP, and bearing tone to show the tense of the sentence. (14c) is also ungrammatical because the subject NP and the clitic doubling it are missing. Again, (14c) is ungrammatical because it has no tense.

4. Irrelevance of Specificity and Topicality to Clitic Doubling in Degema

Although I stated earlier in my discussion that clitic doubling in Degema is not associated with a preposition as it is the case in Spanish, I have not pursued this point further for the reason that in Degema the preposition does not feature in clitic doubling constructions in particular and in cliticization in general. Again, I stated that clitic doubling in Degema does not depend on specificity and topicality as in Bulgarian and Macedonian. In the preceding section, I have shown the factors that underlie clitic doubling in Degema. These factors have nothing to do with specificity and/or topicality. That specificity is not a crucial factor in the licensing of clitic doubling in Degema can be seen from the fact that even sentences where the subject NP’s are non-specific or indefinite, as in (15a) and (16a), are doubled by clitics just as those that have specific or definite subjects, as in (15b) and (16b):
(15a) ènam, o=sirè=tèn.
   animal 3SgPCL=ran=FE
   ‘An animal ran’
(non-specific)

(15b) ènám jo, o=sirè=tèn.
   animal the 3SgPCL=ran=FE
   ‘The animal ran’
(specific)

(16a) owéj òbù, mó=jí ù
   person one 3SgPCL=come NPM
   ‘Somebody is coming’
(non-specific)

(16b) owéej jò, o=dèri=n ti=nùm.
   person that 3SgPCL=know=FE something
   ‘That person is intelligent’
(specific)

What is crucial in the examples above, without going into details, is not specificity but anaphoricity, as both specific and non-specific subjects can be doubled. That anaphoricity is crucial to clitic doubling is evident as examples (15)–(16), repeated as (17)–(18) without anaphoric clitics, are ungrammatical:

(17a) *ènám sirè=tèn
   animal ran=FE

(17b) *ènám jo sirè=tèn
   animal DEF ran=FE

(18a) *owéj òbù jí ù
   person one come NPM

(18b) *owéej jò dèrì=n ti=nùm
   person that know=FE something

I have shown that specificity has no place in clitic doubling constructions in Degema, as both specific and non-specific subject NP’s can be doubled. Since there are no object clitics in Degema, a topicalized or focused object will not have any clitic doubling it. Doubling is only possible with subject NP’s, given that there are subject clitics. Consider the following examples that have to do with focus:

(19a) i'mànè'të, a=klàjè=n ùji esen.
   Imanete 3SgPCL=give=FE him fish
   ‘Imanete gave him a fish’
Example (19b) shows that a focused object NP is not doubled by a clitic. Example (20) shows that clitic doubling is possible regardless of whether the subject NP is focused, as in (20b) or non-focused, as in (20a). Thus it is clear that clitic doubling in Degema has nothing to do with topicalization or focalization.

5. Second-position and Verb-adjacency

Other criteria that are thought of as accounting for the presence of clitic doubling are verb-adjacency and second-position (see Franks and King 2000). These criteria basically have to do with whether clitics originate as heads of Agr(eement) or as heads of arguments. Languages where clitics originate as Agr heads (verb-adjacent) are thought of as having clitic doubling whereas those in which clitics originate as heads of arguments (second-position) are considered as not having clitic doubling.

A characteristic difference between verb-adjacent and second-position clitics in terms of their syntagmatic position is that verb-adjacent clitics occur next to the verb and thus follow the constituent or constituents before the verb. These clitics are not separated from the verb, as in Romance languages like Spanish, French, Italian, and in Slavic languages like Macedonian and Bulgarian. Second-position clitics occur after the first word or first constituent of the clause, as in Slavic languages like Slovenian, Serbian/Croatian, Czech, and Slovak. Where do Degema subject clitics fall? Are they second-position or verb-adjacent? It appears that in some sentences Degema subject clitics are verb-adjacent, whereas in some they are second-position.\(^8\)

Consider the following examples:

(21) tatané mó=kpór íťší.
Tatane 3SgPCL=sing song
‘Tatane is singing (a song)’

\(^8\) Tomić (2000) shows that both second position and verb-adjacent clitics can occur in a single language. She notes that clausal clitics in Macedonian ‘... whose heads are past or passive participles behave sometimes as verbal, sometimes as Wackernagel clitics’ (p.299).
In (21), the subject clitic is adjacent to the verb, whereas in (22) and (23) it is not, since an auxiliary or a preverbal adverb separates it from the verb. In all three cases, however, the subject clitics occur in second position relative to the subject of the sentence (see Kari 2002b: 20ff., 2003a for a detailed discussion on second position in Degema). How does one determine to which type Degema subject clitics belong, since they occur ambiguously as second-position and verb-adjacent? It appears that the test to determine whether a language has second-position or verb-adjacent clitics is ‘separability’. Franks and King (2000, p.261) note that ‘in [Slavic] languages with verb-adjacent clitics, the clitic cluster remains adjacent to the verb ...’. Halpern (2001, p.104) notes that verb-adjacent clitics, which he refers to as verbal clitics, ‘... always appear adjacent to a verb and attach morphologically or phonologically to it’. Second-position clitics, however, can be separated from the verb. If one goes by what I would like to call ‘separability test’, then Degema clitics are not verb-adjacent but second-position clitics, since the clitic-verb sequence can be interrupted as in (22) and (23).

5.1. Second-position vs. Verb-adjacency: A Correlation with Clitic Doubling

Franks and King (2000) note that there is the possibility for a language to change from second-position to verb-adjacent. Bulgarian is a language where this transition is reported to have taken place.9) The change from second-position to verb-adjacent is noted as giving rise to clitic doubling in Bulgarian, a phenomenon that was absent when the language had second-position clitics (Franks and King 2000, p.319).

Furthermore, it is thought that the difference in the syntactic behaviour of clitics in second-position and verb-adjacent languages also gives rise to clitic doubling. Franks and King (2000) note that ‘in ...languages with verb-adjacent clitics ..., the clitics originate as Agr heads and the verb moves up to them through its extended projection. Because the clitics do not originate in argument positions, these positions can be filled by overt argument, resulting in clitic doubling ...’ (p.371f.). With regard to the behaviour of clitics in second-position languages, they note that in such languages ‘... the pronominal clitics originate as heads of arguments which then move to Agr head positions.... Because the pronominal clitics originate in argument position, no clitic

9) See also Tomić (2000) for a discussion on the change from second-position to verbal clitics. She notes that in Macedonian, the change from second-position to verbal clitics is still underway.
doubling is possible’ (p.372). The interested reader is referred to Franks and King (2000) for details.

6. Clitic Doubling in a Second-position Language

In this section, I am going to discuss why clitic doubling is possible in a second-position language such as Degema. Consider example (24):

(24) AgrP
    Spec
    NP
    Agr
    mọi
    kótn
    T
    VP
    t
    V
    NP
    wọ

As example (24) shows (many processes in the phrase marker are assumed), the syntactic behaviour of Degema subject clitics is consistent with the assumptions about verb-adjacent clitics than with those about second-position clitics in the sense that (a) the subject clitic is seen as originating under Agr as a purely agreement marker, and not as originating within VP in argument position (b) the verb moves to (right adjoin to) the clitic, and not the clitic undergoing head movement (see Ndimele and Kari 2000, Kari 2003a for some discussion). Since Degema subject clitics are base-generated under Agr and do not involve movement to any head position, it allows the Spec position of AgrP to be filled by the moved subject NP that originates from within the VP, as shown in (11) and (24), thereby resulting in the clitic doubling the subject NP in Spec position of AgrP.

In Kari (2002b), it is argued that clitic doubling may not be tied to second-position or verb-adjacency. The argument is based on the observation that Degema subject clitics occur in second position yet they do not prohibit clitic doubling. In this paper, I give up the ‘no correlation’ view expressed in Kari (2002b) in favour of Franks and King’s (2000) view that sees clitic doubling as being determined by whether the clitics are second-position or verb-adjacent. I also give up the view expressed in Kari (2002b), which assumes that Degema clitics were originally verb-adjacent clitics that
have become second-position clitics over time. Degema subject clitics were not verb-
adjacent clitics.\(^{10}\)

The question that needs to be answered is why is clitic doubling possible in De-
chema, which I claim is a second-position language, given the view that clitic doubling
is possible in verb-adjacent languages but not in second-position languages? I would
like to make some assumptions in this regard. Let me take (24), for example. I noted
that the syntactic behaviour of Degema subject clitics is consistent with that of verb-
adjacent clitics than with second-position clitics in the sense that the subject clitic is
seen as originating under Agr as a purely agreement marker, and that the verb moves
to the clitic. My assumption in respect of this syntactic behaviour is that it may be a
carry-over from the stage when these clitics existed as true (agreement) affixes (For the
source of Degema clitics, see Kari 2002a or Kari 2003a for a more recent discussion).
The verb-adjacency of Degema subject clitics, in an example like (21), may be a carry-
over of the (agreement) affix-verb relation that, I assume, once existed. The location
of subject clitics under Agr may also be a carry-over of the location of the (agreement)
affix, assuming that the affix was located under Agr. Finally, movement of the verb to
unite with the clitic, as shown in (24), may also be a carry-over of the behaviour of the
verb when it moved to the (agreement) affix located under Agr to form a morphologi-
cal unit with the affix. In all these assumptions, there is close-knit relationship between
the verb and the (agreement) affix. These assumptions account for the possibility of
cletic doubling in a second-position language like Degema. Again, these assumptions
point to the fact that clitic doubling may be synchronically or diachronically related
to verb-adjacency. Thus one can say that the relationship between clitic doubling and
verb-adjacency in Bulgarian is synchronic, whereas that in Degema is diachronic.

\(^{10}\) The historical development of subject clitics could probably be as given below (cf. Kari 2002a,
2003a. See Kari 2003b for further discussion.):

```
affix-verb-affix (first stage)
↓
affix X verb X affix (second stage)
↓
clitic (X) verb (X) clitic (third stage)
```

The development of Degema clitics may have been in three stages. The first is the stage
when clitics existed as affixes attached to the verb—a stage when no element interrupted
the affix-verb sequence. The second shows the beginning of cliticization—a stage when it became
possible for the affix-verb sequence to be interrupted. The third shows a stage when the affix
lost its morphological unity with the verb, and thus became a clitic, being sometimes separated
from the verb by an auxiliary, sometimes by a preverbal adverb (as in the case of subject clitics),
and sometimes by an object pronoun beginning with a consonant (as in the case of non-subject
clitics).

The precise period when Degema affixes became clitics or when an auxiliary or preverbal
adverb broke the affix-verb sequence is unknown. This is probably because Degema does not
have a long tradition of writing. The orthography of Degema was first published in 1975, and
the first primer in 1977.
I mentioned the observation by Franks and King (2000) of the possibility of a language to change from second-position to verbal clitics as in the case of Bulgarian that changed from second-position to verb-adjacent, and so became associated with clitic doubling. I also mentioned Tomić’s (2000) observation that Macedonian is changing from second-position to verbal clitics. The case of Bulgarian seems to suggest that language change might result in the acquisition of features that were not originally associated with the language that changed or is changing. Again, it also seems to suggest that language change might result in the relinquishing of features that were originally associated with the language that changed or is changing. If this is true, then we assume that the change of some affixes in Degema to clitics may not have done away completely with some of the features that, we assume, were associated with affixes, such as the movement of the verb to form a unit with affixes, the location of agreement affixes in Agr, and the verb-adjacency of affixes to the verb.

7. Conclusion

I have shown that, unlike Bulgarian and Macedonian, what licenses clitic doubling in Degema is not topicality or specificity, as specific and non-specific subject NP’s, and focused and non-focused NP’s could be doubled by a clitic. Also noted is the fact that clitic doubling in Degema is not associated with a preposition, as in a language like Spanish. This conclusion is based on the fact that in Degema the preposition does not participate in clitic doubling constructions in particular and in cliticization in general.

The assumptions that the Degema subject clitic is the head of Agr; that the underlying subject NP in VP moves to occupy the vacant Spec position of AgrP thereby providing the condition for anaphoricity, and that discourse factors of emphasis and/or familiarity also play a role in clitic doubling constructions are perhaps the strongest reasons for clitic doubling in Degema. I should, however, add that syntactic factors are stronger than discourse factors in the licensing of clitic doubling in Degema. Discourse factors only ensure the expression or suppression of the doubled NP after syntactic operations have taken place. My investigation also confirms Franks and King’s (2000) observation that there is a correlation between clitic doubling and verb-adjacency or second-position, as the syntactic behaviour of Degema subject clitics, which I argue are second-position clitics, is consistent with that of verb-adjacent clitics that allow clitic doubling. That Degema, a second-position language, permits clitic doubling shows that languages transiting from one type to another carry some of their unique old features.
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