Introduction: Clitic doubling, a phenomenon where an argument of the verb is doubled by a corresponding clitic, as in (1), is known from many languages, which all seem to share (at least) two things: they all have verb adjacent clitics and they all have determiners. Such languages include Bulgarian, Greek, Spanish, etc. Given a typical analysis of clitic doubling (e.g. Franks & King 2000, where the doubled clitics are treated as object agreement on the verb), one would not expect to find clitic doubling in languages with second position clitics.

(1) *Mene me e jad.* (Bulgarian)
   me.ACC me.ACC be.3SG angry
   ‘I am angry.’ (Franks & King 2000: 251)

Contrary to such expectations, clitic doubling exists in Gorica Slovenian, a western Slovenian dialect, which places its clitics in the Wackernagel position. An example is given in (2).

(2) *Mene me zebe.* (Gorica Slovenian [GoS])
   me.ACC me.ACC cold.3SG
   ‘I am cold.’

Clitic doubling or something else?: Anagnostopoulou (2006) points out that not every cooccurrence of a clitic and a DP argument within the same sentence is an instance of clitic doubling since various types of dislocation also create two instances of an argument.

The clitic/DP argument cooccurrence of Gorica Slovenian is not an instance of Clitic Left Dislocation, since there is no need for the doubled DP argument to come first in the sentence, and it may very well follow the clitic, as in (3). (3) also shows that this is not a case of Right Dislocation, as the doubled DP need not appear at the right edge of the clause/sentence.

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

The phenomenon is also not a case of an appositive ‘doubling’, which requires heavy comma intonation, and which is not restricted to Gorica Slovenian but is possible in Slovenian quite generally, (4).

(4) *Torej so ga, lisjaka zvitega, le ujeli.* (Standard Slovenian)
   so are him.ACC dog-fox cunning at-last caught
   ‘So they managed to catch that cunning fox after all.’

This exhausts the options for what else the clitic/DP argument cooccurrence in Gorica Slovenian could be, so we can only conclude that it is indeed a case of clitic doubling in the standard sense of the term. Furthermore, Arnaudova & Krapova (2007) claim that clitic-doubled full DPs (unlike dislocated DPs) cooccurring with a clitic in Bulgarian can be contrastively focused, wh-moved, and can serve as new information. And with respect to all of these, Gorica Slovenian doubling more or less behaves the same, (5), thereby confirming that the phenomenon is clitic doubling ((5c) as an answer to the question in (5b)).

(5) a. *Sebe se slišim, drugih ne.* (GoS)
   self.ACC self.ACC hear others not
   ‘I hear myself but not others.’

b. *Komu mu paše skočit u vodo?* (judged GoS)
   whom him.DAT feels-like jump in water
   ‘Who feels like jumping in the water.’

c. *Meni mi paše.* (judged GoS)
   I.DAT I.DAT feels-like
   ‘I feel like it (=I do).’
**Generality of clitic doubling in GoS:** Clitic doubling in Gorica Slovenian is limited to pronouns, i.e., only pronouns are doubled by a corresponding clitic. For example, in contrast to (5a), recorded in spontaneous speech, (5b) is judged as ungrammatical.

(6)  

a. **Bi mu mogu njemu pustit.** (GoS)  
would him.DAT must him.DAT leave  
‘I should have left that to him.’

b. *Bi mu mogu Petru / tatu pustit.** (GoS)  
would him.DAT must Petru.DAT dad.DAT leave

Within pronouns, however, clitic doubling is general: it is not limited with respect to person, number or case, and it applies to any pronoun with a clitic version (though not all pronouns have a clitic counterpart), as shown in (7)-(8) below ((7a)-(7c) and (8c) were recorded in spontaneous speech, (8a)-(8b) were judged).

(7)  

a. **Mi lahko daste kar meni?** (GoS)  
me.DAT possible give.2PL PTCL me.DAT  
‘Can you give it to me?’

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

c. **Js se ga njega spomnim še iz srednje šole.** (GoS)  
I.NOM REFL him.ACC him.ACC remember still from high school  
‘I remember him already from High School.’

(8)  

a. **Peter nam nám ni tou prnest neč za pit.** (GoS)  
Peter us.DAT us.DAT not want bring notnig for drink  
‘Peter didn't want to bring us anything to drink.’

b. **Vás si vas ne upam neč prašat.** (GoS)  
you.GEN REFL you.GEN not dare nothing ask  
‘I dare not ask you anything.’

c. **Lahko jih pa njih vpraša.** (GoS)  
possible them.ACC PTCL them.ACC ask  
‘He can ask them.’

Both the comparison with various dislocation structures and the generality of GoS clitic doubling show that the phenomenon is indeed clitic doubling. At this point we do not have a strong working proposal for the analysis of clitic doubling in Gorica Slovenian, but we offer the following two theoretically significant points for consideration.

**A typical analysis:** As note above, a typical proposal à la Franks & King (2000) thus cannot be applied to it, since for them, Buglarian clitic doubling is a case of object agreement on the verb, but such an analysis is only available in languages with verb adjacent clitics, which Gorica Slovenian is not.

**Bošković’s generalization:** On the basis of a number of typologically distinct languages, Bošković (2008) proposes that only languages with definite articles can have clitic doubling, so we should not find a language that has clitic doubling but no definite article. Contrary to this prediction, Gorica Slovenian has clitic doubling, but just like standard Slovenian and other Slovenian dialects does not have a definite article (cf. Toporišič 2000).


