

Clitic doubling in a determinerless language with second position clitics*

FRANC MARUŠIČ & ROK ŽAUCER

1 Introduction

It is typically the case that if a language exhibits clitic doubling, it has definite articles (see Bošković 2008a,b,c) and it has verb-adjacent clitics. In this paper, we discuss the case of certain western dialects of Slovenian around Nova Gorica/Gorica/Gorizia, which we subsume under the cover term ‘Gorica Slovenian’. These dialects are interesting in that they appear to defy these generalizations. Whereas they have clitic doubling, their clitics are not verb-adjacent but second-position/Wackernagel clitics. Moreover, these dialects do not have a definite article. In what follows, we discuss how both of these facts are relevant for the claims that have been made in the literature on the basis of the above-mentioned generalizations.

In section 2, we first introduce the phenomenon of clitic doubling, then quickly show (following Marušič & Žaucer 2009) that the phenomenon under investigation is indeed proper clitic doubling rather than some other sort of doubling (e.g. clitic left dislocation, right dislocation, etc.), and then we briefly mention some other characteristics of clitic doubling in Gorica Slovenian. In section 3, we review a major view about clitic doubling in Bulgarian and Macedonian, the only other Slavic languages that are known to have clitic doubling, and explain why it cannot be extended to Gorica Slovenian. In section 4, we discuss the implications of these data on Bošković’s (2008a,b,c) generalization about clitic doubling.

Unless marked otherwise, the Gorica Slovenian data come from spontaneous speech, examples marked as ‘J(udged)G(orica)’ were con-

* We thank an anonymous reviewer for many valuable comments. This research was partially supported by the ARRS grant J7-0382-0104-08 (Jure Zupan, PI).

structured and tested against several native speakers of Gorica Slovenian, whose help we gratefully acknowledge. We do not mark the ungrammatical examples as judged, even though they obviously are.¹

2. Clitic doubling in Gorica Slovenian

The doubling of a verb's argument by a clitic is known from many languages. Among the languages that are geographically close to our Slovenian dialects, these include certain Northern Italian dialects, Romanian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, South Serbian dialects, Greek and Albanian. A typical example of clitic doubling is shown in (1), and a comparable example from Gorica Slovenian is given in (2).

- (1) Na mene ne mi e studeno. Bulgarian
to me not I_{DAT} is cold
'I am not cold.' (Franks & Rudin 2004: (3a), p. 106)

- (2) Meni mi ni mraz.
I_{DAT} I_{DAT} neg-aux_{3SG} cold
'I am not cold.'

To some extent, this phenomenon appears to be exhibited by most or all western Slovenian dialects, but since there are some differences among the dialects, we limit ourselves to the dialects around Nova Gorica/Gorica/Gorizia.

2.1 Not CLLD, RD or Appositive D

Since clitic doubling can be easily mistaken for clitic left dislocation, right dislocation or appositive dislocation, we have to emphasize that the phenomenon under investigation is not one of these.

As shown in (3), the doubled DP (in (3) the full pronoun *mene*) does not have to be either first or last in the sentence; this shows that this is neither a case of clitic left dislocation nor right dislocation. The clitic doubled DP also does not have to be marked off with comma intonation, which shows that this is not a case of appositive doubling.

¹ As we are interested in the syntactic patterns, we do not use a phonetic transcription. Since there is no single standard way of writing the speech of our dialects, our transcription is partly random.

- (3) Ma to me mene ne briga.
 but this me.GEN me.GEN not cares
 ‘But I don’t care about this.’

This demonstrates, albeit in a very sketchy and somewhat simplifying manner, that the construction under investigation is indeed a case of clitic doubling rather than one of the other ‘doubling’ phenomena known in the literature. For a fuller demonstration and some more discussion, we refer the reader to Marušič and Žaucer (2009).²

2.2 The properties of clitic doubling in GoS

Perhaps the most prominent feature of clitic doubling in Gorica Slovenian is that it is limited in a specific sense. It can only happen when the doubled verbal argument is represented by a full pronoun; in other words, a clitic never doubles a non-pronominal argument (whether a common noun or a proper name), as shown in (4).

- (4) a. Js se ga njega spomnem še iz šole.
 I refl him_{ACC} him_{ACC} remember already from school
 ‘I remember him already from school.’
 b.*Js se ga Petra spomnem še iz šole.
 I refl him_{ACC} Peter_{ACC} remember already from school
 ‘I remember him already from school.’

But whereas clitic doubling is restricted to pronominal arguments, it is available in any person, number and case where the pronouns have a clitic and a non-clitic variant (i.e. genitive, dative, accusative). Here we give examples for all persons and numbers. Examples in (5) are for singular (all taken from spontaneous speech) and examples in (6) for plural persons ((5) and (6a,c) from Marušič and Žaucer 2009).

- (5) a. Mi lahko daste kar meni?
 Me_{DAT} possible give_{2.PL} ptcl me_{DAT}
 ‘Can you give it to me?’

² It is hard to establish whether the clitic doubling in Gorica Slovenian could be said to be obligatory, since all speakers are under the influence of non-doubling dialects as well as of non-doubling standard Slovenian (either due to education or everyday usage, and most often both).

b. Ma kaj tebe te ne zanima, kako bo šlo končat?
 but Q you_{GEN} you_{GEN} not interest how will go end
 ‘Don't you want to know how it will end?’

c. Js bi ga njega peljala domov prej.
 I_{NOM} would him_{ACC} him_{ACC} drive home first
 ‘I would first take him home.’

(6) a. Peter nam nám ni tou prnest neč za pit. JG
 Peter us_{DAT} us_{DAT} not-is want bring nothnig for drink
 ‘Peter didn't want to bring us anything to drink.’

b. Tko da vam ni treba vám skrbet.
 so comp you_{DAT} not-is need you_{DAT} care
 ‘So that you don't have to care about this.’

c. Lahko jih pa njih vpraša.
 possible them_{ACC} ptcl them_{ACC} ask
 ‘He can ask them.’

It might be just impossible to find spontaneous examples of a double object construction with two full pronouns. But a sentence like (7) was judged possible by our informants

(7) Meni mi ga njega niso teli predstaviti. JG
 Me_{DAT} me_{DAT} him_{ACC} him_{ACC} not want introduce
 ‘They didn't want to introduce him to me.’

To summarize, clitic doubling in Gorica Slovenian is restricted to pronouns. It is not possible to double a regular NP argument, but it is at the same time completely general, since all strong pronouns with a clitic counterpart, regardless of person/number/case, can be doubled, including the reflexive pronoun.

3. A possible analysis

Franks & King (2000) analyze clitic doubling in Bulgarian and Macedonian as verb agreement (we limit ourselves to testing only the mainstream analysis of clitic doubling in Slavic). Bulgarian and Macedonian clitics are verb-adjacent, so that this analysis makes perfect sense. But this kind of analysis makes sense only if clitics under discussion are verb adjacent. It cannot be used on Gorica Slovenian clitics since clitics in western Slovenian dialects are Wackernagel clitics, as shown in examples (8) (partially repeated from above).

- (8) a. Js **se ga** njega spomnim še iz šole.
 I_{NOM} refl him_{ACC} him_{ACC} remember still from school
 ‘I remember him already from school.’
- b. Js **se ga** njega dobro spomnim še iz šole.JG
 I_{NOM} refl him_{ACC} him_{ACC} well remember still from school
 ‘I remember him well already from School.’
- c. Lahko **jih** pa njih vpraša.
 possible them_{ACC} ptcl them_{ACC} ask
 ‘He can ask them.’
- d. Zato **me** mene to moti.
 because me_{ACC} me_{ACC} this bothers
 ‘That is why this bothers me.’
- e. Zato **me** mene to zelo moti. JG
 because me_{ACC} me_{ACC} this very bothers
 ‘That is why this bothers me a lot.’
- f. Kdo **me je** mene udaru?
 who me_{ACC} aux me_{ACC} hit
 ‘Who hit me?’

None of the clitic clusters in (8) appear next to the verb. In (8a) and (8f) the clitic and the verb are separated by the pronominal argument – the object of the clause, in (8b) by the pronominal argument and an adverb, in (8c) by the pronoun and an additional topic particle, in (8d) by the pronominal argument and the object of the clause and in (8e) by an additional adverb.

Clitics were in the second position also in all other examples we have encountered. Sentences where clitics are not in the second position, like those in (9), are judged ungrammatical by speakers of Gorica Slovenian.

- (9) a.*Js njega dobro **se ga** spomnim še iz šole.
 I_{NOM} him_{ACC} well refl him_{ACC} remember still from school
 (intended: ‘I remember him well already from School.’)
- b.*Js dobro **se ga** njega spomnim še iz šole.
 I_{NOM} well refl him_{ACC} him_{ACC} remember still from school
 (intended: ‘I remember him well already from School.’)
- c.*Zato mene to zelo **me** moti.
 because me_{ACC} this very me_{ACC} bothers
 (intended: ‘That is why this bothers me a lot.’)

Therefore with respect to their position clitics in Gorica Slovenian appear to be regular Wackernagel clitics, comparable to clitics in Standard Slovenian, for which see Golden and Sheppard (2000), Golden (2003) and Marušič (2008). For this reason any analysis of clitic doubling as verbal agreement cannot be applied.³

4. Bošković's (2008a, 2008b, 2008c) generalization

On the basis of a number of typologically distinct languages, Bošković (2008a,b,c) proposes 10 generalizations, all linking the presence/absence of a definite article and another characteristic. One of these relates definite articles with clitic doubling saying that only languages with definite articles can have clitic doubling. In other words, there should be no language with clitic doubling and no definite article.⁴

Gorica Slovenian seems to be just such a language. It has clitic doubling, but just like other varieties of Slovenian, it does not have a definite article (cf. Toporišič 2000). Just like central Slovenian dialects, Gorica Slovenian has the so-called "adjectival definite article *ta*", but this is not a definite determiner, as can be most clearly seen in examples like (10) where *ta* occurs in an indefinite noun phrase with an overt indefinite determiner (see Marušič & Žaucer 2006, 2007 for discussion).

³ A reviewer points out that there is no need for agreement to be verb adjacent so that the fact that Gorica Slovenian clitics are second position clitics cannot be used as an argument against Franks and King's (2000) analysis. We are not sure how to respond here. If one takes agreement so loosely that it can be found anywhere in the clause, then there's really no difference between agreement and pronouns, which means it would not be possible to distinguish between the two. Nevertheless we still think that a clitics-as-object-agreement analysis cannot be applied to Slovenian also because it is only pronouns that get doubled with a clitic, while there seems to be no difference between pronouns and regular (definite or indefinite) nominal phrases which could be relevant for a situation where one but not the other would trigger verb agreement.

⁴ A reviewer claims that the incorrectness of Bošković's generalization is obvious and as such should not be taken as a starting point. He/she points out several languages that supposedly violate this generalization, among which are Udi, modern Iranian, and Warlpiri. We have not been able to confirm these facts from the literature available to us at the moment, but found out that at least Warlpiri (cf. Lyons 1999 for the lack of def. article, cf. Woolford 2003 for clitic doubling) should be considered a counterexample parallel to Gorica Slovenian. The reviewer's point is clearly valid, however, since Bošković's generalizations were published in and presented at high profile conferences and publications, the »obvious« incorrectness apparently isn't that widely obvious. We do not comment on Bošković's methods (including the set of languages used to establish the generalizations), but simply cite him as the source of the claim/generalization our data speaks against.

- (10) ene ta velike plošče Central Slovenian/JG
 one_{PL} TA big records
 ‘some LPs’ (cf. English ‘some (*the) LPs’)

Gorica Slovenian also matches central dialects in having the indefiniteness element *en* (literally ‘one’), given also in (10) above, but the presence of such indefiniteness elements (which may also turn out to be adjectives) is not relevant for the generalization anyway (Bošković 2008b, but cf. also an alternative speculation in Bošković 2008b: fn. 23)

In short, Gorica Slovenian, which has clitic doubling and no definite determiner, seems to be problematic for Bošković’s otherwise robust generalization.

4.1 Reconciling Gorica Slovenian with Bošković (2008a,b,c)?

In this section we discuss some options that could explain the problematic data. But first let’s go back to Bošković (2008a,b,c). The generalizations he proposes make a clear distinction between languages with and languages without a definite article. He proposes that the difference is not just lexical but rather structural. For him, only languages with a definite article have the DP projection as shown in (11). Difference between NP and DP languages extends also to the way adjectives are merged into the structure since in NP languages adjectives are in Spec.NP, while in DP languages they take NP as their complement.

- (11) a. [_{DP} D [_{AP} A [_{NP} N]]] → DP languages (e.g. English)
 b. [_{NP} AP N] → NP languages (e.g. Serbo-Croatian)

The availability of clitic doubling is linked to the presence of the DP phrase also because clitic doubling is typically assumed to bring in specificity. Even though we did not discuss semantics of clitic doubling in Gorica Slovenian, the specificity requirement is trivially satisfied since clitic doubling is limited to personal pronoun, which are always specific (cf. Marušič & Žaucer 2009). Given all these, Gorica Slovenian should have the structure in (11a), but as we said, this dialect lacks a definite article.

One option is to say that Gorica Slovenian has the definite determiner, but that it is null. That would mean that Slovenian would have the structure in (11a) with the DP topping the nominal phrase rather than the one given in (11b), where the topmost projection in a nominal phrase is NP (Bošković presents this as the weaker version of his claim regarding

the structural differences between languages with definite articles and languages without definite articles).

This option is problematic for the following reason. If there is a structural difference between Gorica Slovenian and Serbo-Croatian, this structural difference should be observable in all relevant constructions. This would mean that Gorica Slovenian should behave as a DP-language according to all applicable characteristics from Bošković (2008a,b,c). Since not all generalizations are two way generalizations, only a subset of them makes predictions following the presented hypothesis about Gorica Slovenian. We will now go through the relevant generalizations proposed in Bošković (2008a,b,c) and test whether this is indeed the case (this is partly done in Bošković (2008b) for standard Slovenian).

Bošković (2008a,b,c) proposes that languages without articles disallow neg-raising and those with articles allow it. Following this generalization, if Gorica Slovenian has a null article, it should allow neg-raising. But as shown in (12), matrix negation has no effect on the negation sensitive elements in the embedded clause. In (12) genitive of negation is impossible, even though it is generally obligatory in clauses with negation. Matrix negation affects direct objects in an embedded non-finite clause, (12b). As (13) shows, negative concord elements are also impossible even though they are also available inside infinitives under matrix negation. (14) shows that matrix negation does not license an embedded NPI (see Bošković 2008b for the standard Slovenian counterpart). And even semantically, matrix negation cannot be understood inside the embedded clause in any of these sentences.

- (12) a. Vid ne misli, da Peter je fige/ *fig. JG
 Vid neg think that Peter eats figs_{ACC} figs_{GEN}
 ‘Vid doesn’t think that Peter eats figs.’
- b. Vid ni tel jest fig. JG
 Vid neg want eat figs_{GEN}
 ‘Vid didn’t want to eat figs.’
- (13) a. *Vid ne misli, da je Peter nikoli nič/ničesar jedu.
 Vid neg think that aux Peter never nothing eat
 (intended: ‘Vid doesn’t think that Peter ate nothing’)
- b. Vid ni tel nikoli nič jest. JG
 Vid neg want never nothing eat
 ‘Vid didn’t want to eat anything at any time.’

- (14) *Ne misli, [da jo je vidla že narmajn dve leti]
 neg think that her aux saw already at least two years
 ‘He doesn't think that she has seen her in at least two years.’

Secondly, Bošković (2008a,b,c) claims that only languages without articles may allow adjunct extraction out of traditional noun phrases. Again, as shown in (15), Gorica Slovenian does allow adjunct extraction (at least to some degree) and thus patterns with other NP-languages.⁵ Following Bošković (2008a,b,c) this should mean that it does not have a definite article.

- (15) a. Od kirga avtorja je Peter prebral vse knjige? JG
 from which author aux Peter read all books
 ‘For which author is it true that Peter read all of his books?’
 b. Iz kirga kluba praviš, da je Peter srečal vse tipe? JG
 from which club say_{2,PL} that aux Peter met all guys
 ‘For which club do you claim that Peter met all guys.’

Thirdly, Bošković (2008a,b,c) claims that only languages with articles allow transitive nominals with two genitives, as in German example (16), whereas languages without definite articles do not allow transitive nominals with two (non-lexical) genitives. Gorica Slovenian, just like standard Slovenian (and Serbo-Croatian) does not allow such constructions, (17).

- (16) Hannibals Eroberung Roms German
 Hannibal's conquest of Roma (from Bošković 2008b)
 (17) a. *zavzetje Rima Hanibala / *zavzetje Hanibala Rima
 conquest Roma_{GEN} Hannibal_{GEN}
 (intended: ‘Hannibal's conquest of Rome’)

⁵ As already mentioned in Bošković (2008b), data of this type are tricky. So for example, whereas (15a) and (15b) are fine, minimally different (i) and (ii) are not (neither in Gorica Slovenian nor in Standard Slovenian).

- (i) *Od kirga avtorja je Peter včeraj bral najboljšo knjigo?
 from which author aux Peter yesterday read best book
 (intended: ‘For which author is it the case that Peter read his best book?’)
 (ii)??Iz kirga kluba je Peter pretepel vse tipe?
 from which club aux Peter beat all guys
 ‘For which club is it the case that Peter beat all guys?’

b. *petje Zdravljice Toneta
 singing Zdravljica_{GEN} Toneta
 (intended: ‘Tone’s singing of Zdravljica’)

Fourthly, independently of Bošković (2008a,b,c), Živanović (2008) explicitly links the presence/absence of a definite article to the presence/absence of the majority reading of the superlative determiner (based on a substantial sample of languages). The English superlative determiner in (19) can only have the reading that more than half of the (relevant group of) people drink beer. If Gorica Slovenian patterned with languages with a definite article, it should behave the same way as English. However, Gorica Slovenian patterns with standard Slovenian allowing only the interpretation that is given in the English translation in (18).

- (18) a. Narveč tipov pije vino. JG
 most guys drink wine
 ‘More guys drink wine than any other drink.’
 b. Največ ljudi pije pivo. Standard Slovenian
 most people drink beer
 ‘More people drink beer than any other drink.’

(19) Most people drink beer. = More than half of people drink beer.

If this correlation indeed holds both ways, the absence of the majority reading in Gorica Slovenian means that Gorica Slovenian cannot have a definite article, not even a null one.

Fifthly, Bošković (2008a,b,c) proposes that only languages without articles may allow scrambling.⁶ Here again, Gorica Slovenian seems just as flexible as Standard Slovenia, as should be obvious also from many of the examples given above and also from (20) below, where the direct object of the non-finite complement is scrambled to the front of the sentence.

- (20) a. Mene me ne morte zjebat.
 I_{ACC} I_{ACC} neg can up-fuck
 ‘You cannot fuck me up.’ (a line by the local rapper Valterap)

⁶ A reviewer points out that this generalization may be problematic on the basis of languages such as Ancient Greek, Hungarian, Turkish and Papago. As far as we were able to check, Turkish does not have definite articles, while Hungarian (like German, another potential counterexample) does not have scrambling out of finite clauses, which may be what Bošković (p.c.) takes as the relevant kind of scrambling.

b. Mene sme ni upu udart.
 I_{ACC} refl-I_{ACC} neg dare hit
 ‘He didn’t dare to hit me.’

Bošković also gives a generalization linking the availability of left branch extraction to the presence/absence of the definite determiner, but here the data both in Gorica Slovenian and standard Slovenian are really not clear, as pointed out also by Bošković (2008b), so we will not discuss this any further.

To summarize, Gorica Slovenian patterns with Standard Slovenian with all relevant generalizations, except that it has clitic doubling, and both Standard Slovenian and Gorica Slovenian mostly pattern with Serbo-Croatian. This should mean that both Gorica and Standard Slovenian are NP-languages. In turn this should mean that the possibility of analyzing Gorica Slovenian as having a null definite article is not feasible. Therefore the fact that Gorica Slovenian has clitic doubling remains problematic for Bošković’s generalization.

4.2 A Change in Progress?

In a footnote Bošković (2008b, fn. 23) also mentions the option that the situation in Slovenian, where some of the characteristics diagnose the language as an NP language less clearly than is the case in Serbo-Croatian, could reflect a change in progress, i.e. a change from a typical NP language to a DP language. For example, it might be possible that the structure of Slovenian and Gorica Slovenian nominal phrases has begun to grow, with the lowest parts of the extended projection of the noun (but not all of it) having already been added on top of the NP.

Potential support for this could be seen in the fact that Slovenian (as mentioned under 4. above) has an indefinite article, which is also true for Gorica Slovenian, as shown in (21) (repeated from (10) above).

(21) ene ta velike plošče Central Slovenian/JG
 one_{PL} TA big records
 ‘some LPs’ (cf. English ‘some (*the) LPs’)

If we assume that the indefinite article sits in some projection lower than the DefP/DP (in the spirit of Julien 2005), one could claim that the fact that Gorica and standard Slovenian have an indefinite article but not a definite article suggests that the structure of the nominal phrase in these systems indeed does contain a part of the extended projection of the noun, but only its lower part. That is, the structure of the Gorica and standard

Slovenian noun phrase would not be like that of Serbo-Croatian (i.e. as in (11b) above). Rather, its NP would be dominated by the functional projection which the indefinite article is associated with, but that would be where the functional structure of Slovenian nominal phrases stops, so it is not topped off by a DefP/DP.

Furthermore the presence of this additional functional structure in Gorica and standard Slovenian nominal phrases could mean that adjectives are merged into the nominal phrase as in DP languages rather than as in NP languages. This could also explain the relative unavailability of Left Branch extraction in Slovenian. Though at the same time, if the position of the adjective in Slovenian and Gorica Slovenian is comparable to English, then left branch extraction should be just as bad in Slovenian as it is in English, but this is actually not the case (as discussed at some length in Bošković 2008b).

However, if the existing but deficient functional structure above NPs in Gorica and standard Slovenian is supposed to explain the non-perfectly-clear situation with respect to the NP/DP characteristics, it simply cannot explain the presence of clitic doubling in Gorica Slovenian, assuming, with Bošković, that clitic doubling can only occur in the presence of DP.

Clitic doubling in Gorica Slovenian is limited to personal pronouns, which are standardly analyzed as Ds. So at least for pronouns, doubling could still be analyzed as linked to the presence of the DP projection.⁷ But if we accept that personal pronouns are DPs in Slovenian, they should probably be DPs universally, also in Serbian, but that only means that the existence of clitic doubling limited to personal pronouns might not affect the generalization, which should probably be restated as (22).

- (22) Only languages with articles may allow clitic doubling of non-pronominal arguments.

5. Conclusion

Given the fact that Gorica Slovenian has clitic doubling of strong pronouns in Accusative, Genitive and Dative case in all numbers and persons, we can conclude that clitic doubling is not restricted to languages

⁷ If we accept that personal pronouns are DPs, we should also analyze as DPs demonstratives when used as pronominal elements, e.g. when used to refer to persons as in (i). But such demonstrative pronouns cannot be doubled in Gorica Slovenian.

(i) Včera sm (*ga) tega to vidu. JG
yesterday aux him this here see
'I have seen this guy yesterday.'

with verb-adjacent clitics and overt definite articles. Gorica Slovenian thus presents a problem for the generalization made in Bošković (2008a,b,c), which says that clitic doubling only exists in languages with overt definite determiners. In light of the presented data and ignoring all counterexamples mentioned in fn. 4, this generalization can only be saved if we modify it to exclude clitic doubling of personal pronouns, which significantly weakens the generalization.

We leave for future research the detailed investigation of the other clitic-doubling western Slovenian dialects, including the well documented dialect of Režija, and the variation between these dialects that is briefly described in Marušič and Žaucer (2009). Also interesting is the question how this syntactic phenomena is related to clitic doubling in the neighboring Romance languages: e.g. Friulian (see Erat 2006) and Triestino (Pinguentini 1984).

References

- Bošković, Željko. 2008a. 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.
- Bošković, Željko. 2008b. The NP/DP analysis and Slovenian. To appear in *Proceeding of the University of Novi Sad Workshop on Generative Syntax*.
- Bošković, Željko. 2008c. More on the no-DP analysis of article-less languages. To appear in *Studia Linguistica*.
- Erat, Janez. 2006. *Furlanska slovnica*. Ms. Available: <http://www.p-ng.si/~jezik/furlanscina/>
- Franks, Steven and Tracy Holloway King. 2000. *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Franks, Steven and Catherine Rudin. 2005. Bulgarian Clitics as K^0 heads. In S. Franks, F. Gladney, and M. Tasseva-Kurktchieva (eds.) *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 13, The South Carolina Meeting 2004*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications. pp. 104-116.
- Golden, Marija and Milena Sheppard. 2000. Slovene Pronominal Clitics. In F. Beukema and M. den Dikken (eds.) *The Clitic Phenomena in European Languages*. Amstrdam: John Benjamins. pp. 191-207.
- Golden, Marija. 2003. Clitic placement and clitic climbing in Slovenian. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 56.3: 208-233. *Focus on: Slovenian from a typological perspective*, ed. by Janez Orešnik & Donald D. Reindl.
- Julien, Marit. 2005. *Nominal phrases from a Scandinavian perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lyons, Christopher. 1999. *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Marušič, Franc. 2008. On Slovenian Clitics In A. Antonenko, J. Bailyn, and C. Bethin (eds.) *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 16: The Stony Brook Meeting 2007*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications. pp. 266-281.
- Marušič, Franc and Rok Žaucer. 2006. The 'Definite Article' TA in Colloquial Slovenian. In J. Lavine et al. (eds.) *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 14, The Princeton Meeting 2005*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications. pp. 189-204.
- Marušič, Franc and Rok Žaucer. 2007. On the Adjectival Definite Article in Slovenian". *Pismo* 5(1): 102-124.
- Marušič, Franc, and Rok Žaucer. 2009. On Clitic doubling in Gorica Slovenian. In Steven Franks, Vrinda Chidambaram, and Brian Joseph (eds.), *A linguist's linguist: studies in South Slavic linguistics in honor of E. Wayles Browne*. Bloomington: Slavica, pp. 281-295.
- Pinguentini, Gianni. 1984. *Nuovo dizionario del Dialetto Triestino*. Trieste: Del Bianco Ed.
- Šekli, Matej. 2008. Subject and object clitic doubling in the Rezija/Resia dialect of Slovenian. Talk given at the Ljubljana Linguistic Circle, University of Ljubljana, May 26, 2008.
- Werkmann, Valja. 2008. Clitic Doubling, Specificity, and Focus in Bulgarian. In G. Zybatow et al. (eds.) *Formal Description of Slavic Languages, The fifth conference, Leipzig 2003*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. pp. 571-586.
- Ramovš, Fran. 1957. *Karta slovenskih narečij v priročni izdaji*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba
- Toporišič, Jože. 2000. *Slovenska slovnica*. Maribor: Založba Obzorja.
- Woolford, Ellen. 2003. Clitics and Agreement in Competition: Ergative cross-referencing patterns. In A. Carpenter et al. (eds) *Papers in Optimality Theory II*. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Živanović, Sašo. 2008. Varieties of *Most*, on Different Readings of Superlative Determiners. In F. Marušič and R. Žaucer *Studies in Formal Slavic Linguistics, Contributions from Formal Descriptions of Slavic Languages 6.5*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. pp. 337-354.