1-28-2013

# Cliticization Phenomena in Languages 'on the Border'

Jelena Runić
*University of Connecticut*, jelena.runic@uconn.edu

# Cliticization Phenomena in Languages 'on the Border'

**Abstract**

The paper investigates clitic doubling in two non-standard Serbian and Slovenian dialects, Prizren-Timok Serbian and Gorica Slovenian, respectively. These dialects have clitic doubling but lack overt articles, which, *prima facie*, seems problematic for Bošković's 2008 generalization that clitic doubling is found only in languages with articles. Nevertheless, a thorough analysis of the dialects at stake reveals that not only is doubling limited to pronouns exclusively but also that pronouns in these dialects enjoy both lexical/N and functional/D status. The major evidence for N status is based on the fact that the adjectival modification of personal pronouns is allowed, being banned, however, when the pronoun is doubled, which reveals its D status in the clitic doubling environment. In line with Kroch's 1994 account of syntactic change, I argue that the presence of the dual pronominal behavior in PTS/GS is the reflection of an ongoing language change, with the transitional stage containing two mutually exclusive systems. Further, several identical phenomena attested in these dialects, such as the impossibility of a verb to intervene between a clitic and its associate, the impossibility of a verb to precede the entire doubling construction, and doubling with full NPs, further demonstrate that the doubling constructions are undergoing a change. In line with Bošković's 2001 approach to cliticization in South Slavic, I argue that the order *verb-clitic* arises through a lower copy pronunciation, which I claim is blocked in the clitic doubling environment in the dialects in question. Finally, doubling with full NPs, attested with some speakers in the two dialects, yields no specificity/definiteness effects and licenses left branch extraction, which I show lends further credence to Bošković's 2008 claim that languages without overt articles do not project a DP layer on top of NP in the syntax.

# Cliticization Phenomena in Languages 'on the Border'

Jelena Runić*

## 1 Introduction

This paper explores the phenomenon of clitic doubling in Prizren-Timok Serbian (PTS) (1a) and Gorica Slovenian (GS) (1b), two non-standard dialects spoken in Southeastern Serbia and Western Slovenia:[1]

(1) a. Je l'   *gu*         *njuma*     vide       na    pijacu?                    (PTS)
       AUX Q   her.CL.ACC  her.ACC    saw.2SG   on    market
       'Did you see her in the (open) market?'
    b. Ma   to   *me*          *mene*     ne      briga. (GS, Marušič and Žaucer, 2010: 103)
       but   this  me.CL.GEN   me.GEN   not     cares
       'But I don't  care  about this.'

In both (1a) and (1b), the full/strong pronominal form is doubled with the clitic. In PTS, the pronoun *njuma* 'her' is doubled with the clitic *gu* 'her.' In parallel fashion, Marušič & Žaucer 2009, 2010 report that GS allows clitic doubling, as illustrated by the co-occurence of the pronoun *mene* 'me' with the clitic *me* 'me' in (1b). This state of affairs poses a problem for the recent Noun Phrase/Determiner Phrase (NP/DP) Parameter, as put forth by Bošković 2008. Specifically, Bošković 2008 draws a distinction between languages with articles (DP languages) and languages without articles (NP languages) in the sense that only the former project a DP in the syntax.[2] As far as clitic doubling is concerned, Bošković 2008 contends that only languages with overt articles may allow clitic doubling. Nevertheless, PTS and GS lack overt articles, but still allow clitic doubling, as demonstrated in (1a) and (1b) above. The aim of this paper is to explore the properties of clitic doubling and other related cliticization phenomena in these dialects, and to assess their theoretical implications.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 discusses general properties of clitic doubling in PTS and its relevance for the NP/DP Parameter. Section 3 analyzes other related cliticization phenomena; the adjacency requirement between clitic and its associate (Section 3.1), the ban on the order *verb-clitic* (Section 3.2), and clitic doubling with full NPs, attested with some speakers (Section 3.3). Finally, Section 4 concludes the paper.

## 2 Clitic Doubling in PTS and GS

### 2.1 The Problem: Doubling in Article-less Languages

Clitic doubling is a construction in which an argument clitic co-occurs (and co-refers) with another argument, as illustrated with an example from Romanian in (2) below, in which the clitic *l-* 'him' co-occurs and co-refers with the DP argument *Mircea*:

---

    [1]All relevant constituents throughout the examples are italicized in the interest of clarity.
    [2]See also Baker 2003, Cheng and Sybesma 1999, Chierchia 1998, among others, for no-DP analyses of at least some article-less languages.

(2)  *L*-am                           văzut   pe   *Mircea.*                    (Romanian)
     him.CL.ACC-have.AUX.1SG     see     *pe*   Mircea.ACC
     'I saw Mircea.'

Clitic doubling has been subject to thorough and painstaking linguistic research, both modern and traditional.[3] An apparent reason for examining this topic in such a thorough and systematic way is its intriguing cross-linguistic variation. While some languages exhibit clitic doubling, other languages completely lack it. Additionally, languages allowing clitic doubling differentiate further with respect to the exact requirements triggering clitic doubling.[4]

A new research flavor has been recently added to the investigation of clitic doubling by Bošković 2008, who considers this phenomenon under the umbrella of the NP/DP parameter. Specifically, while examining data from a number of heterogeneous languages, Bošković 2008 reaches the conclusion that the difference between languages with respect to the presence/absence of clitic doubling correlates with the dichotomy concerning the presence/absence of articles. Accordingly, Bošković 2008 puts forward a new generalization, as in (3):

(3)   Only languages with articles may allow clitic doubling.          (Bošković 2008:105)

Bošković 2008 provides a list of languages that allow clitic doubling. The list includes the following languages: Albanian, Macedonian, Bulgarian, Greek, Somali, Spanish, French (some dialects), Catalan, Romanian, Hebrew, Arabic, Dutch (some dialects), all of these being languages with articles. Additionally, Bošković 2008 observes that within the Slavic paradigm, only two languages, Bulgarian and Macedonian, allow clitic doubling. Crucially, these two languages are the only Slavic languages that have overt articles.[5] In this respect, consider the lack of clitic doubling in article-less languages, exemplified by Serbian/Croatian (SC) in (4a), as opposed to example (4b) from Macedonian, which is an article language, hence a DP language:

(4)  a.  Marija    *(\*ga)*    poznaje   *učenika/Vladu/njega.*                    (SC)
         Mary      him.ACC   knows     student/Vlado/him.ACC
     b.  Marija    *\*(go)*    poznava   *učenikot/Vlado/nego.*            (Macedonian)
         Mary      him.ACC   knows     student-the   Vlado him.ACC
         'Mary knows the student/Vlado/him.'

In (4a) clitic doubling is disallowed in SC with all types of arguments, full NPs (including proper names) and strong pronouns. On the other hand, Macedonian requires clitic doubling in the same context, hence omitting a doubled clitic with such arguments results in ungrammaticality (4b). In order to account for the above differences, Bošković 2008 tentatively suggests that clitic doubling requires D-feature checking, hence is only possible in DP languages, but does not fully develop this account.

Nonetheless, clitic doubling is allowed in two non-standard dialects that do not have articles, GS and PTS.[6] Crucially, however, as pointed out by Marušič and Žaucer 2009 for GS, this type of doubling is limited to the context with doubled (full/strong) pronouns exclusively (5a); doubling with full NPs is banned (5b):

---

[3]For an overview of generative approaches to clitic doubling, see Anagnostopoulou 2006.

[4]Although the specificity requirement holds cross-linguistically, some languages impose additional requirements on clitic doubling. To illustrate, Bulgarian requires arguments to be topical, whereas in Romanian, for instance, the category *animacy* is an obligatory component of clitic doubling.

[5]Bošković's 2008 definition of articles refers to the definite article exclusively. Slovenian has indefinite but not definite articles. Bošković 2008, however, notes that what is relevant for his generalizations, including the one above, is the presence/absence of the definite article.

[6]While the traditional literature reports on the presence of articles in PTS in some areas, none of my linguistic consultants (22 in total) in both PTS and GS have articles. See f.n. 7 for the claim that there exist articles in PTS.

(5)  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 Peter already from school.'                  (GS, Marušič & Žaucer 2009)

Thus, PTS and GS challenge the claim made by Bošković 2008 that only languages with articles may allow clitic doubling. Clitic doubling is allowed in both of these article-less dialects, as illustrated by pronominal doubling in (6a) and (6b). In (6a) and (6b), the full pronominal form *mene* 'me' is doubled with the clitic *me* 'me.' Additionally, the doubled argument *mene* is not positioned at the left or right periphery of the sentence, which casts doubt on the possibility of analyzing the construction as an instance of clitic right or clitic left dislocation. Therefore, both PTS and GS display genuine clitic doubling:

(6)  a.  Je      l'      *me*          *mene*      čekaš?                              (PTS)
         AUX    Q      me.CL.ACC    me.ACC   wait.2SG
     b.  A      ti      *me*          *mene*      čakaš?                              (GS)
         and    you    me.CL.ACC    me.ACC   wait.2SG
         'And you are waiting for me?'

In brief, although PTS and GS are article-less languages, they have clitic doubling, which seems problematic for Bošković's generalization in light of the NP/DP Parameter. In the remainder of the paper, I investigate the properties of clitic doubling in PTS and GS and explore their theoretical implications.

## 2.2  Clitic Doubling in PTS and GS: A Change in Progress

Prizren-Timok Serbian (*aka* Torlag Serbian) (PTS) is a non-standard Serbian dialect spoken in Southeastern Serbia. Linguistically and geographically, PTS is situated between the Kosovo-Resava dialects, another group of non-standard Serbian dialects to the west and north, Albanian to the southwest, and the Bulgarian and Macedonian languages to the east and south respectively. Pronominal clitic doubling is one of the major morphosyntactic phenomena found in PTS, a characteristic shared with its neighboring languages - Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Albanian.[7] Linguistic properties of the PTS dialect are thus, to a certain extent, a reflection of linguistic characteristics found in the neighboring languages/dialects, given that, on the one hand, PTS concomitantly contains features of Serbian (both the Kosovo-Resava non-standard Serbian dialects and Standard Serbian), as well as, on the other hand, those features present in Bulgarian and Macedonian.[8] Transferring these facts to the realm of modern research trends under the NP/DP Parameter (Bošković 2008) means that PTS is situated at the crossroads between article/DP languages, (Bulgarian and Macedonian), and article-less/NP languages (the Kosovo-Resava Serbian and Standard Serbian).

Gorica Slovenian (GS) is a cover term for non-standard dialects of spoken Slovenian around the town of Nova Gorica/Gorica/Gorizia, situated on the border of Italy.[9] Languages and dialects

---

[7]Another two features worth mentioning, since they are thoroughly discussed in the traditional literature, are the loss of the full declension paradigm with nouns and the use of the post-positive article (see, for example, Bogdanović 1987). While the loss of full declension, or, more precisely, the use of only two cases (the nominative and the accusative) with nouns has been confirmed by all of my informants, the presence of the post-positive article has not been found with any of my consultants. Mišeska Tomić 2006:120 reports that the definite article in PTS appears only in the eastern and southern periphery of the dialectal area, near the borders with Macedonia and Bulgaria. Further, like the Macedonian articles, the definite article found in the peripheral area of PTS exhibits triple spatial differentiation. For discussion, see Mišeska Tomić 2006.

[8]Needless to say, PTS is in constant 'touch' with Standard Serbian through media and education.

[9]Spoken Slovenian has approximately 50 main dialects and subdialects. The term *Gorica Slovenian* has been coined by Marušič and Žaucer 2009, 2010, who limit their observations to clitic doubling found in the

spoken in the vicinity of Gorica Slovenian are: Italian, Friulan, non-standard Slovenian dialects (e.g., the Resian dialect), and, above all, Standard Slovenian.[10] Again, the general picture is fairly similar to the one encountered with PTS; GS is situated at the crossroads between DP languages (Italian, Friulan) and NP languages (such as Standard Slovenian), speaking in Bošković's 2008 NP/DP parlance. Additionally, properties found in GS bear remarkable resemblance to the properties presented in PTS, as shown below.

Before exploring the categorical status of pronouns in PTS and GS, let us first focus on the categorical status of pronouns more generally. Pronouns have not had a unique syntactic treatement crosslinguistically. Thus, Fukui 1986, 1988 notes that Japansese pronouns behave differently from English pronouns, subsequently arguing that Japanese pronouns are not D elements.[11] One of the major criteria for establishing the status of pronouns is *modifiability*.[12] Functional categories represent a closed class that does not allow modification. Conversely, lexical categories are an open class, which can be productively modified. Thus, Fukui 1988 uses a test involving pronoun modification to determine the N/D status of pronouns. He observes that Japanese pronouns are modifiable (7a, b), whereas English pronouns are not (8a, b, c), hence arriving at the conclusion that Japanese pronouns are lexical/N elements, whereas English pronouns are functional/D elements:[13]

(7)  a.  kinoo            Taroo-ni       att  ka-i?                    (Japanese, Fukui 1988:265)
         Yesterday        Taro-with      met  Q
         'Did you see Taro yesterday?'
     b.  un,  demo *kinoo-no*        *kare-wa*  sukosi      yoosu-ga    hendat-ta
         yes  but  yesterday.GEN     he.TOP     somewhat    state.NOM   be.strange.PAST
         Lit. 'Yes, but yesterday's he was somewhat strange.'

(8)  a.  *big it                                                       (Fukui 1988: 264)
     b.  *short he
     c.  *yesterday's himself

In light of the NP/DP Parameter, Bošković 2008 revives Fukui's 1988 observation about modifiability of pronouns and shows that SC pronouns are modifiable, thus patterning with Japanese, as illustrated in (9) below:

(9)  Jesi li    ga             vidio    juče?
     are  Q     him.CL.ACC     seen     yesterday
     Jesam,     ali  je *jučerašnji*  *on*  baš      nekako     bio    čudan.
     Am         but  is  yesterday's   he   really   somehow    been   strange
     'Did you see him yesterday? *I did, but yesterday's he was really somehow strange.'
                                                                       (SC, Bošković 2008a: f.n. 9)

The possibility of pronoun modification in SC reveals the lexical status of SC pronouns, since they are Ns in SC.  In other words, SC pronouns have the structure in (10):

(10)  [NP N]

---

town of Nova Gorica/Gorica/Gorizia, still acknowledging that "the phenomenon can be found in other western Slovenian dialects as well." (Marušič and Žaucer 2009: 281-282)

[10]Note that the Resian dialect, colloquial Italian, as well as the Friulan language, all have clitic doubling. See Erat 2006.

[11]More generally, Fukui 1986, 1988 argues that Japanese lacks functional categories.  Note that there are a few cases where a pronoun can be modified even in English (e.g., *a healthy you*). These authors show that English is still very different from SC/Japanese, where such modification is productively available

[12]There are other tests for determining the status of pronouns cross-linguistically. Baggley 1998 claims that Functional  pronouns can operate as a bound variable, whereas Lexical pronouns cannot.

[13]Note that there are a few cases where a pronoun can be modified even in English (e.g., *a healthy you*). Fukui 1988 shows that English is still very different from Japanese, where such modification is productively available.

The remaining issue is to test DP clitic doubling languages by entertaining Fukui's 1988 D test for pronoun modification. The prediction is that DP languages will disallow pronoun modification. This seems to be accurate, as productive pronoun modification is not possible in Bulgarian and Macedonian, illustrated by Macedonian in (11), which patterns with English (cf. (8)) in the relevant respect:

(11) *Toj e      interesen    sekoj  den,  no  *včerašniot  toj*  beše   mnogo
     he  is     interesting  every  day   but  yesterday's  he    was    much
     po        interesen    od     *zavčerašniot*        *nego.*
     more      interesting  than   the.day.before.yesterday's  he
     '*He is interesting every day but yesterday's he was much more interesting than the
       day before yesterday's he.'                                    (Macedonian)

This means that pronouns should be treated like DP elements in languages with articles, having the following structure:[14]

(12) [$_{DP}$ D [NP N]]

In sum, pronouns in article-less/NP languages seem to pattern with full NPs regarding their categorial status, as shown by the possibility of modification. The syntactic structure of pronouns lacks a DP layer on top of NP in such languages. Pronouns in DP languages, on the other hand, do not allow pronoun modification, which means they are DPs. Below I discuss a third type of language: PTS and GS, which have pronouns that are both Ns and Ds, or at least may be moving in one of these directions.[15]

A thorough examination of the dialects in question has revealed some hitherto unnoticed properties regarding the categorial status of pronouns. The data in (13) show the behavior of pronouns with respect to modification, both non-doubled (13a-b) and doubled pronouns, as in (13c-d):

(13) a. On  je    svaki   dan   zanimljiv, ali  je    *jučerašnji   on*  bio       (PTS)
        he  is    every   day   interesting but  AUX   yesterday's  he   was
        zanimljiviji    od    *prekjučerašnjeg*        *njega.*
        more.interesting  than  the.day.before.yesterday's  he
        '?He is interesting every day but yesterday's him was more interesting than the day
          before yesterday's him.'
     b. Jesi           *jučerašnjeg  njega* pitaja za   što  je   to   tako?
        AUX.2SG         yesterday's  him   asked  why  is   that like that
        '*Did you ask yesterday's him why this is the case?'
     c. *Jesi    *ga*           *jučerašnjeg njega* pitaja    za    što je  to   tako?
        AUX.2SG  him.CL.ACC    yesterday's him    asked    why is  that like that
        '*Did you ask yesterday's him why this is the case?'
     d. Jesi    *ga*            *njega*  pitaja za   što je   to   tako?
        AUX.2SG  him.CL.ACC     him.ACC asked  why is   that like that
        'Did you ask him why this is the case?'

Thus, (13a-b) shows that in both PTS and GS pronouns can be modified (only PTS is used for illustration), which provides evidence that PTS/GS pronouns are actually Ns. However, given Bošković's 2008 claim that clitic doubling is possible with D elements only, the generalization in (3) above should be taking as providing evidence that PTS/GS pronouns are Ds. We thus have a conflicting situation here. Crucially, clitic doubling in PTS and GS is banned with modified pronouns (13c); only non-modified pronouns can be doubled, as in (13d). This enables us to resolve the conflicting situation noted above. This means that PTS/GS have both N and D

---

[14]I leave it open whether NP is present, in addition to DP.

[15]Due to space limitations, only PTS is used for illustration although GS behaves in exactly the same way.

pronouns, which explains why they allow both pronoun modification (13a-b) and clitic doubling (13d). However, (13c) is unacceptable because pronoun modification and clitic doubling cannot be concomitant operations since they are mutually exclusive.

Based on the above discussion, in which it is claimed that N pronouns can be modified, whereas D pronouns cannot, I argue that PTS and GS display both types of pronouns in their pronominal systems. Each pronoun then has a dual lexical entry: one as an N pronoun and the other one as a D pronoun. Regarding modifiability, an N pronoun must be chosen from the lexicon; (13a-b) then involves an N pronoun. As expected, doubling with modified pronouns leads to ungrammaticality, as in (13c). Only a D pronoun can be doubled, as illustrated in (13d) by an acceptable sentence involving a non-modified doubled pronoun.

In line with Kroch's 1994 account of syntactic change, I argue that the presence of the dual pronominal behavior in PTS/GS is the reflection of an ongoing language change. Specifically, two mutually incompatible systems co-exist for some time before completely changing to one or another. This explains why D pronouns and N pronouns co-exist in the pronominal systems of these languages. The change, according to Kroch 1994, among others, is gradual and manifests variations in certain areas of grammars, unlike in stable systems in which such an option is excluded. This explicates why the pronoun modification that is a feature of an NP language cannot be present in stable systems containing a DP (cf. (11)) or, vice versa, why clitic doubling (which involves a D feature, as put forth by Bošković 2008) cannot be present with NP languages (cf. (4a)). At any rate, clitic doubling remains limited to D pronouns,  as illustrated both by DP languages, as well as NP languages containing D pronouns.

Another possibility in analyzing the dual status of PTS/GS pronouns is that, possibly as a result of an ongoing change, PTS and GS have a D feature [DF],  but [DF] is not yet lexicalized in these languages but rather added during the derivation to particular elements, namely pronouns.[16] Under this view, PTS and GS have only N pronouns in the lexicon. However, [DF], necessarily involved in clitic doubling under Bošković's 2008 analysis, is then added to PTS/GS pronouns during the derivation. Such an option is available in these dialects as a result of an ongoing language change with the next step likely involving lexicalization of the [DF] (at least with pronouns or with pronouns initially). The dual (and identical) behavior of pronouns in PTS and GS is justified by the fact that both dialects are situated between NP (article-less) languages (Standard Serbian and Slovenian) and DP (article) languages (Bulgarian, Macedonian, Italian). Thus, this may be a consequence of language contact.

# 3  Other Related Cliticization Phenomena

## 3.1  The Adjacency Requirement

Another hitherto unnoticed property is exhibited in clitic doubling contexts in both dialects, as illustrated by PTS in (14). More precisely, in both PTS and GS, a doubled pronoun and a clitic cannot be separated by a verb:[17]

(14) a. *Je l'  *me*      čekaš        *mene*?                               (PTS)
         AUX Q   me.CL.ACC    wait.2SG  me.ACC
     b. Je l'  *me*      *mene*       čekaš?
         AUX Q   me.CL.ACC    me.ACC    wait.2SG
     'Are you waiting for me?'

This property of clitic doubling found in PTS and GS is very different from clitic doubling in DP languages, where the clitic and the doubling element can be separated by a verb, as illustrated by Macedonian (15), in which the clitic and its associate are separated by the verb *zamoli*:[18]

---

[16]This is similar to Chomsky's 2005 Edge Feature, which drives movement to specifiers and which is added during the derivation. Note that under this view, D is a lexical feature in PTS/GS, but has not yet been added to particular lexical items.

[17](14a) is possible if the doubled argument forms a distinct prosodic phrase, in which case this is not an instance of clitic doubling but of a clitic right dislocation phenomenon.

(15) Mila  *go*                zamoli  *nego*    včera.                    (Macedonian)
     Mila  him.CL.ACC          asked.  him.ACC  yesterday
     'Mila asked him yesterday.'

Regarding the adjacency effects in PTS and GS (14), and the lack thereof in Macedonian (15), it should be mentioned that a number of authors have argued that a clitic and a doubled argument are located in the same phrase at some point during the derivation (Kayne 2002, *i.a.*).[19] Under this view, clitics are D heads and they constitute a DP together with their associate. By applying such an analysis to Macedonian in (15),  the clitic *go* and the doubled argument *nego* form a constituent in their base position prior to clitic movement. I suggest that PTS and GS preserve the constituency of the *clitic+double* complex. As a result, if there is movement in front of the verb, the whole complex (*clitic+double*) moves in front of it, as in (14b). It should be noted, however, that some speakers do allow elements other than verbs to intervene between a clitic and its double. Such examples are best when the intervening elements are phonologically light, for example, a clitic or a short adverb, as exemplified in (16):

(16) a.  Je    l'    *me*        sad    *mene*    čekaš?                    (PTS)
         AUX   Q    me.CL.ACC  now   me.ACC   wait.2SG
         'Are you waiting for me now?'
     b.  Ali   si         *ga*          včeraj   *njega*   videl  na tržnici?   (GS)
         but   AUX.2SG  him.CL.ACC  yesterday  him.ACC  saw   on market
         'Did you see him yesterday in the (open) market?'

The speakers in question then allow movement of the clitic from the *clitic+double* constituent, but they (or at least some of them) may have a further restriction that the clitic and its associate must form a prosodic constituent, which disallows intervening prosodic words. PTS and GS may then still be in the process of initiating the stage where the clitic movement from the doubling phrase takes place, with some speaker variation.

### 3.2  The \**Verb-Clitic* Order

     Another previously unnoticed property of doubled clitics is that a doubled clitic cannot follow a verb in both PTS and GS, as demonstrated by PTS in (17):

(17) a.  \*Čekaš     *me*         *mene.*                                   (PTS)
         wait.2SG    me.CL.ACC  me.ACC
     b.  Ti   *me*         *mene*    čekaš?
         you  me.CL.ACC  me.ACC   wait.2SG
         'Are you waiting for me?'

In order to account for the ban on the *verb-clitic* order, I adopt Bošković's 2001 analysis of cliticization based on the Copy Theory of Movement (Chomsky 1993) and  propose that lower copy pronunciation of clitics is ruled out in clitic doubling contexts.  Bošković 2001 assumes that a copy of pronominal clitics is present both above and below the verb, thus forming a non-trivial chain, as in (18):

(18) a.  X clitic V ~~clitic~~                                    (Bošković 2001: 184)
     b.  ~~clitic~~ V clitic

---

[18]In (15), the clitic in fact has to be separated from its associate because in Macedonian verbal clitics are proclitics, i.e., they are prefixes to the verb (see Bošković  2001, among others).
     [19]Pronominal doubling in Romance is treated in terms of a 'big-XP' analysis by a large number of authors. See, among others, Uriagereka 1995, Cecchetto 2000, Kayne 2002. Note that Bošković (2008) also assumes that D feature checking between a clitic and its associate occurs within the same phrase in languages with clitic doubling.

There is a strong preference for pronouncing the head of the chain in PF. Thus, the *clitic- verb* order is obtained through the pronunciation of the head of the chain. Only if this pronunciation would lead to a PF violation, the tail of the chain is pronounced, leading to the sequence *verb-clitic*. If clitics are not specified as prefixes or suffixes, Bošković 2001 argues that there is nothing wrong in PF and the head should be pronounced. The no-specification-of-attachment analysis correctly predicts that the tail of the chain should not be pronounced. Following Bošković 2001, suppose there is a copy of the doubled clitic above and below the verb in PTS and GS, as illustrated in (19) by PTS:

(19) *me mene* čekaš *me  mene*                                         (PTS)

If the doubled clitic is lexically unspecified as a prefix or a suffix, there would be no PF violation if the head of the chain is pronounced, hence the tail of the chain would have to be deleted, as in (20):

(20) *me mene* čekaš ~~*me  mene*~~                                         (PTS)

This would then correctly predict that the *verb-clitic* order would be ruled out, as attested by PTS and GS above. Nevertheless, in order to completely understand this phenomenon, it is important to set these facts in the context of neighboring languages. Doubled clitics in PTS and GS behave exactly as clitics in Macedonian and Italian. Clitic doubling in PTS and GS is in fact probably the result of borrowing from Macedonian and Italian due to the contact situation. Crucially, in both Macedonian and Italian verbal clitics are proclitics, hence the pronunciation of a lower copy is excluded. The suggestion is that since clitic doubling in PTS and GS seems to be the result of borrowing from Macedonian and Italian, at least some of its properties are influenced by Macedonian and Italian, in particular, the ban on the *verb-clitic* order, i.e., the ban on the pronunciation of lower copies of clitics in this context. Another possibility (at least for some speakers) is that in a context like (19), if lower copy pronunciation were to take place, only the clitic would be pronounced in a lower position, not its doubled associate (there is no need to pronounce a lower copy of the associate). This would yield the *doubled pronoun-verb-clitic* order, which could be ruled out if we assume that the clitic and its doubled associate cannot be split by a prosodic word in PF. Additionally, this order would result in a violation of the second position requirement.

## 3.3  Clitic Doubling with Full NPs

Some speakers allow clitic doubling with full NPs.  This is illustrated in (21) by PTS:[20]

(21) %Izvin'te.          Imate         *gu*          *salvetu?*                    (PTS)
     sorry   have.2SG   it.CL.ACC  napkin
     'Excuse me. Do you have a napkin?'

The data in (21) display two features. First, not all speakers allow doubling with full NPs (thus, (21) is not grammatical for most speakers of PTS and GS). Second, and more important, is the fact that full NP doubling for the speakers who allow it does not reveal standard definiteness/specificity effects. In this regard, it is well-known that clitic doubling typically involves specificity/definiteness. Conversely, in such languages clitic doubling must be absent if there is no specificity involved. Thus, as (21) illustrates, doubling is allowed in the non-specific indefinite context, which contrasts sharply with this phenomenon in article languages. Therefore, I suggest that we are dealing here with a different phenomenon from standard clitic doubling, which crucially involves definiteness/specificity. I consider two possibilities that may be the culprit for triggering clitic doubling with full NPs. One possibility here is that doubling with full NPs is undergoing a change, moving towards the stage in which clitic doubling will show specificity

---

[20]My consultants from GS allow doubling with proper nouns only, whereas some speakers of PTS allow doubling with both common and proper nouns.

effects. This in turn would require the development of a full blown DP system.[21] Another possibility is that clitic doubling with full NPs is not an instance of standard clitic doubling at all but rather some other phenomenon, i.e., a fundamentally different kind of doubling phenomenon. There are in fact doubling phenomena that are quite different from clitic doubling. In this regard, it is worth mentioning noun doubling in Iroquoian languages, reported in Baker 1988, where an incorporated noun is doubled by an external Noun Phrase.  This is illustrated in (22) from Baker 1988:144:

(22)  Wa-k-*nvhs*-v:ti:                    [he:ni:kv:    o:-*nvhs*-eh].
      AOR-1sS/3N-*house*-make/PERF         that         PRE-*house*-SUF
      'I have made that house.'                         (Tuscarora, Williams 1976: 63)

In (22), there is an incorporated noun root in the verb which is doubled by the same root. The purpose of the external root is to provide more information about the object discussed. The major point here is that there are other doubling constructions in which NPs are involved; in fact, the one under consideration (cf. (22)) seems to be a property of NP languages. Turning to PTS, however, it remains unclear what function the clitic performs with a full NP given that doubling is possible in all contexts, specific and non-specific, as discussed above, hence doubling with a full NP is not specificity-driven. My suggestion is that we may be dealing here with a fundamentally different kind of doubling phenomenon, not a standard one, specificity driven one. As such, this phenomenon is not limited to DPs and can involve NPs. A piece of evidence that this may be the case is provided by Left-Branch Extraction (LBE). Specifically, Bošković 2008 shows that LBE is allowed in NP languages. Importantly, LBE is possible with doubled full NPs, as illustrated below:

(23)  *Debelu*$_i$    si      *gu*         je      taj   [$_{NP}$ t$_i$ *vezu*]   imao.          (PTS)
      thick    REFL    it.CL.ACC    AUX.3SG  he    connection    had
      'He had good connections.'

(23) provides evidence that the double in nominal doubling is an NP. Future research is required in order to shed more light on this phenomenon. What is important for our purposes is that this type of doubling does not involve a DP, i.e., the nominal double is not a DP, evidence for which comes from the absence of specificity effects and the possibility of LBE.

## 4  Conclusion

In this paper, I have discussed several cliticization phenomena in PTS and GS, non-standard Serbian and Slovenian dialects. These languages do not have articles but allow clitic doubling, which seems to be problematic for the recently proposed NP/DP Parameter (Bošković 2008), according to which article-less languages do not exhibit clitic doubling. Based on the test involving pronoun modification, the data show that these dialects exhibit two types of pronouns in their systems,  D pronouns and N pronouns. I argue that PTS and GS are subject to language change, which allows two mutually incompatible systems to co-exist for some time, in the spirit of Kroch 1994.

Several identical cliticization phenomena have been attested in the two dialects. Specifically, a doubling pronoun cannot be separated from the clitic by the verb, which I have interpreted as providing evidence for the body of research that claims that a clitic and its double associate are generated together. Additionally, a doubled clitic cannot follow a verb in both GS and PTS. I have followed Bošković's 2001 analysis of clitic placement in South Slavic, in which the *verb-clitic* order arises as a result of lower copy pronunciation in a non-trivial chain created by clitic movement. Finally, doubling with full NPs, found among some speakers, does not show standard definiteness/specificity effects, since doubling in non-specific contexts and LBE are allowed.

---

[21]The opposite direction of language change would also be considered plausible. Under this view, doubling with full NPs would be moving toward the stage in which doubling would disappear. In fact, Bogdanović 1987 acknowledges that pronominal doubling used to be much more frequent at the beginning of the 20th century.

## References

Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2006. Clitic Doubling. In *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, Vol.1, ed. M. Everaert, 519-581. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.

Baggaley, Valerie. 1998. *The Syntactic Category of Pronouns*. MA Thesis, University of Calgary.

Baker, Mark C. 1988. *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Baker, Mark. 2003. *Lexical categories: Verbs, nouns, and adjectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bogdanović, Nedeljko. 1987. Govor Aleksinačkog Pomoravlja. *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* 33:7-302.

Bošković, Željko. 2001. *On the Nature of the Syntax-Phonology Interface*: *Cliticization and Related Phenomena*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Bošković, Željko. 2008. What will you have, DP or NP? *Proceedings of NELS* 37.

Cecchetto, Carlo. 2000. Doubling structures and reconstruction. *Probus* 12: 1-34.

Cheng, Lisa L.-S.and Rint Sybesma. 1999. Bare and not-so-bare nouns and the structure of NP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30:509-542.

Chierchia, Gennaro. 1998. Reference to Kinds across Languages. *Natural Language Semantics* 6: 339-405.

Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, ed. K. Hale and S.J. Keyser, 1–57. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2005. *On Phases*. Ms.

Erat, Janez. 2006. *Furlanska slovnica*. Ms. URL
http://sabotin.png.si/~jezik/furlanscina/Erat_2006_furlanska_slovnica.pdf

Fukui, Naoki. 1986. *A theory of category projection and its application*. Doctoral Dissertation. MIT.

Fukui, Naoki. 1988. *Deriving the differences between English and Japanese*. English Linguistics 5:249-270.

Kayne, Richard S. 2002. Pronouns and their antecedents. In *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program* , ed. S. D. Epstein and T.D. Seeley, 136-166. Blackwell Publishers.

Kroch, Anthony. 1994. *Morphosyntactic variation*. Proceedings of CLS 30.

Marušič, Franz and Rok Žaucer. 2009. On Clitic Doubling in Gorica Slovenian. In *A Linguist's Linguist: Studies in South Slavic Linguistics in Honor of E. Wayles Browne*, ed. S. Franks, S., V. Chidambaram, and B. Joseph, 281-295. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.

Marušič, Franz and Rok Žaucer. 2010. *Clitic doubling in a determinerless language with second position clitics*. Proceedings of FDSL 7.5

Mišeska Tomić, Olga. 2006. *Balkan Sprachbund Morpho-syntactic Features*. Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, Volume 67. Dordrecht: Springer.

Uriagereka, Juan. 1995. *Aspects of the Syntax of Clitic Placement in Western Romance*. Linguistic Inquiry 26:79-123.

Williams, Marianne. 1976. *A Grammar of Tuscarora*. New York: Garland.

Jelena Runić
Department of Linguistics
University of Connecticut
Storrs, CT 06269-1145
*jelena.runic@uconn.edu*