

Subject Doubling in the Slovenian Dialect of Resia

Florian Wandl*, **

Abstract: One of the most curious phenomena that makes the Resian dialect of Slovenian stand out among the Slavic languages is subject doubling. Subject phrases in Resian can be doubled by clitic variants of the personal pronouns. Within Slavic, this is unknown outside the Romance-Slavic contact zone in northern Italy, which is why it is generally explained as a borrowing, most probably from Friulian (Rhaeto-Romance). Despite being such a rarity, studies dealing with subject doubling are scarce, and the phenomenon remains poorly understood. This paper aims at a description of Resian subject doubling, focusing on (1) the types of subject phrases that occur with doubling and (2) the place the subject clitics occupy in clauses with doubling. To identify cases of subject doubling, a recent translation of *The Little Prince* is used. Comparing potential cases with the French original helps to distinguish instances of subject doubling from instances of left- and right-dislocation. The analysis shows that subject clitics always precede the predicate. Apart from cases with subject-verb inversion, they follow the subject phrase but can be separated from it by adverbials. Partly in line with earlier research, it is observed that, with the exception of interrogatives and indefinite pronouns, all types of subjects (including universal quantifiers) occur with doubling. Moreover, it is shown that the lack of animacy, definiteness, and specificity do not inhibit subject doubling. Finally, subject doubling in Resian is contrasted with the use of subject clitics in Friulian as the language that, most probably, provided the example for Resian subject doubling.

Keywords: subject clitics, clitic doubling, subject doubling, Resian, Romance-Slavic language contact

* I am thankful to Malinka Pila and Andreas Hölzl for their comments on earlier versions of this paper. Moreover, I would like to thank Malinka Pila and Han Steenwijk for their counsel on some of the Resian data, and Uwe Junghanns for his helpful suggestions for improving the paper. Proofreading has been provided by Dana Serditova and Alexander Robert Herren, which I gratefully acknowledge. Any remaining errors or omissions are my own.

** Barbara Sonnenhauser zum 50. Geburtstag gewidmet.

1. Introduction

Within Slavic languages, doubling of verbal arguments is a phenomenon well-known from Bulgarian and Macedonian.¹ In these languages, direct and indirect objects can be doubled by clitic pronouns under certain circumstances (cf., for example, Koneski 1976: 335; Usikova 2003: 140; Werkmann 2015, and the contributions on Slavic languages in Kallulli and Tasmowski 2008). What is less known is that in Slavic we also find varieties that show doubling of subject phrases. Western Slovenian dialects spoken in northern Italy have acquired subject doubling in contact with Romance varieties. Thus, in the two examples in (1) taken from Steenwijk's (1992: 201, 220) transcripts of spoken Resian, the tonic third-singular-masculine personal pronoun *wón* 'he' and third-singular-feminine personal pronoun *woné* 'she' are doubled by their respective subject clitics *an* and *na*.²

- (1) a. **Wón** **an** ma njagé mansione [...]

he.NOM he.SC have.PRS.3SG his job

'He has his job [...].'
- b. **Woné** **na** ma pašjón [...]

she.NOM she.SC have.PRS.3SG hobby.ACC.SG.M

'She has a hobby [...].'

The existence of a separate set of subject clitics and their use in a doubling construction is exceptional within Slavic. Studying the phenomenon of Resian subject doubling, therefore, promises new insights into the development and functioning of clitic systems. In this paper, I intend to give a description of Resian subject doubling based on the recent translation of de Saint-Exúpery's novella *The Little Prince* (French original, *Le petit prince*). The main focus of this paper will be on the place of the subject clitic in relation to its associate, i.e., the doubled phrase (Kallulli and Tasmowski 2008), and on the parts of speech which are doubled. The pragmatics of clitic doubling are difficult to determine from the available resources and require a separate study. Since the analyzed data come from a written source, they do not allow firm conclusions to be made about the use of subject doubling in actual speech. It has been proposed that subject doubling is optional in Resian, and data from fieldwork provided by Steenwijk (1992) suggest that in spoken language, it occurs much less frequently

¹ Object doubling, moreover, occurs in the Torlak dialects of Serbian, which share a number of features with the Bulgarian and Macedonian languages (cf. most recently Escher 2021).

² Throughout this article, boldface type is used to highlight relevant forms in examples. A list of abbreviations is given at the end of the article, before the References.

than in the primary source of the present paper. Furthermore, there seems to be inter-speaker variation in the use of subject clitics. While questions about the pragmatics of subject doubling and about its occurrence in actual speech must remain unanswered in this paper, the investigated resource allows us to determine cases in which doubling can potentially occur. As will be demonstrated in §5.2, this, for instance, allows us to exclude the absence of semantic properties such as definiteness, specificity, and animacy of a noun phrase as factors prohibiting subject doubling in Resian. These factors have been shown to influence subject doubling in other languages. Additional data considered in this paper come from the transcripts provided by Steenwijk (1992) and from the secondary literature (e.g., Benacchio 2002; Skubic 1997; Šekli 2010a).

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 briefly introduces the phenomenon of subject doubling. Section 3 gives some general background information about the Resian dialect. Section 4 provides a description of the Resian inventory of subject clitics, and Section 5 is dedicated to the phenomenon of subject doubling in this language. Section 6 presents the paper's conclusions.

2. The Phenomenon of Subject Doubling

In the previous section, we have already seen two examples with subject doubling from the Slovenian dialect of Resia (see examples 1a–b). To give some context for the more detailed discussion of subject doubling in Resian in §5, I provide a brief general introduction to this phenomenon here. In doing so, I will mainly focus on aspects that are relevant for the discussion of the Resian data.

Subject doubling can be defined as the reduplication of a subject phrase by a clitic pronoun. For instance, in example (2), a French clause is given in the standard variant (2a) and in a colloquial variant (2b). As can be seen, in the colloquial variant, the subject *le garçon* is repeated by the clitic *il*. However, according to Coveney (2005: 96), they have the same meaning and can be used in the same contexts.³ It is this type of doubling that is of interest for the present paper.

- (2) a. Le garçon mangeait une pomme.
DEF.M boy eat.IMPERF.3SG INDEF.F apple
- b. Le garçon il mangeait une pomme.
DEF.M boy he.SC eat.IMPERF.3SG INDEF.F apple
- 'The boy ate an apple.'

³ Note that Coveney (2005: 96) notates the example reproduced as (2b) with a comma after *le garçon*. However, he explicitly states that this is merely a convention and that, in actual speech, a break in the intonation pattern is not necessarily present.

Compared to the doubling of direct and indirect objects, subject doubling has received less attention in the scholarly literature.⁴ It is mainly known from Romance and Germanic varieties, e.g., colloquial and dialectal French (Coveney 2005), Rhaeto-Romance (Haiman and Benincà 1992), dialectal Dutch (de Vogelaer and Neuckermans 2002), and Övdalian (Rosenkvist 2015), but has also been reported, for instance, from colloquial Finnish (Holmberg and Nikanne 2008) and Arabic (Aoun 1999; Jlassi 2013). As mentioned in §1, within Slavic, subject doubling is attested solely in Slovenian varieties spoken in northern Italy, most prominently in Resian (Skubic 1997: 84; Benacchio 2002; Šekli 2010a).

Like object doubling, subject doubling must be distinguished from clitic left- and right-dislocation (Anagnostopoulou 2017: 4–6). In the latter phenomenon, subjects or objects occur outside the clause boundaries. Depending on whether they precede or follow the respective clause, the phenomenon is referred to as left- or right-dislocation. Unlike subject and object doubling, dislocation is known from a vast number of languages and is sometimes considered universal (e.g., Westbury 2016 on left-dislocation). Moreover, dislocation occurs as a separate phenomenon even in languages that exhibit clitic doubling (cf., for instance, Krapova and Cinque 2008 on clitic doubling and other clitic reduplication constructions in Bulgarian). The function of dislocation is related to information structure. Left-dislocated constituents usually introduce a new topic or mark a topic-shift, while right-dislocated constituents express what is often referred to as an antitopic (e.g., Lambrecht 1994: 176–84, 199–205). For this paper, information structure is of minor relevance since it does not aim at a contribution in this domain. An important issue, however, is how doubling constructions can be distinguished from instances of dislocation. The methodology applied to do so will be introduced in §5.1.

The scope of subject doubling has been related to certain semantic features of the doubled phrase. For example, subject doubling occurs almost exclusively with personal pronouns in dialectal Dutch. Only in some varieties can proper names be doubled as well. Moreover, most of the dialects with doubling do not duplicate the neuter third-person pronoun (see de Vogelaer and Neuckermans 2002: 238 on these restrictions). According to de Vogelaer and Neuckermans (2002), variation can be accounted for by referring to the animacy hierarchy: the closer a subject is to the animate pole of the scale, the more frequently it is doubled. Moreover, doubling in Dutch can be influenced by word order and clause type (main clause vs. subclause) (cf. further, Vogelaer and Devos 2008).

In colloquial French, subject doubling is more likely to occur with subjects that are [+specific] and [+definite]. If only one of these parameters has a positive value, doubling is possible but less likely; if both of them are negative, the

⁴ Cf., for example, the lengthy survey by Anagnostopoulou (2017) where subject doubling is not addressed.

subject will not be doubled.⁵ Subject doubling is also more likely if the subject is [+animate] (Nadasdi 1995).

The features relevant for subject doubling in these languages, therefore, seem to be identical to those which have been identified as having an influence on the realization of object doubling: specificity, definiteness, animacy, and pronominality (cf. Anagnostopoulou 2017; Kallulli and Tasmowski 2008). One of the objectives of the present paper is to investigate whether subject doubling is prohibited in Resian if the subject phrase lacks one or several of these features. Before the Resian data will be discussed in §5, it is, however, in order to briefly introduce this dialect to familiarize the reader with the context in which it is spoken.

3. The Resian Dialect of Slovenian

Resian is an autochthonous Slovenian dialect spoken in the Resia Valley, located in the autonomous region Friuli-Venezia Giulia in the northeast of Italy. Its speakers are mainly distributed across the villages San Giorgio (Italian) / Bila (Resian), Prato di Resia/Ravanca, Gniva/Njiva, Oseacco/Osojane, and Stolvizza/Solbica. Their number is estimated to be 1,000, which corresponds to the number of inhabitants in the municipality of Resia. Speakers of Resian are bilingual or even trilingual: They all speak the national language, Italian, and sometimes also Friulian (Steenwijk 1992: 2). It has been observed that children often do not learn Resian as their mother tongue at home, which makes it a “definitely endangered” language according to the UNESCO scale (Moseley 2010: 24–25).

Within Slovenian, Resian belongs to the Carinthian dialect group (cf. Ramovš 1928). However, as a result of Germanic and Romance colonization of the Canale and Belska valleys in the 14th and 15th centuries, ties with the Carinthian dialect group were cut. Subsequently, contact with the Littoral dialect group intensified, which is why Resian shares a number of features with this group as well. Overall, Resian developed largely independently from other Slovenian varieties due to its remote location. According to Ramovš (1935: 32), it should thus be considered a dialect of its own.

The Resian dialect itself is usually divided into four subdialects equal to the main varieties spoken in Bila, Njiva, Osojane, and Solbica (Steenwijk 1996). The differences between these dialects are mainly phonological, which is why they will not concern us in this paper (cf. Steenwijk 1996 for some non-phonological differences).

Resian has been in intense language contact with Romance at least since the 11th century (Breu 2022: 8). In the area surrounding Resia, Carnic dialects of Friulian are spoken. Contact with these varieties lasted for several centuries

⁵ Note that doubling seems to be more common in colloquial Swiss French (cf. Fonseca-Greber 2000).

and has left a profound impact on Resian.⁶ Moreover, Resian has been in contact with Italian dialects and, since 1866, also with the Italian standard language.

Starting from the 1980s, efforts have been made to create a literary standard for Resian. An orthographic norm has been developed by Steenwijk (1994), who has also published several works on the grammar and lexicon of Resian (Steenwijk 2005, 1999a, 1999b). However, it should be noted that despite the small number of Resian speakers, the proposed orthography has not been generally accepted. For more information about the textual attestation of Resian, which goes back to the 18th century, and the history of research on this dialect, the reader is referred to Benacchio (2002: 71–75), Steenwijk (1992: 3–7), Dapit (2003), Malakov (2017), and Šekli (2018: 82–83). An overview of the history and sociolinguistics of Slovenian varieties in northern Italy can be found in Čermelj (1938) and Skubic (1997: 9–50).

4. Resian Subject Clitics

Resian as well as a few other Slovenian dialects spoken in northern Italy have developed a system of personal pronouns that is unique within Slavic. Apart from the clitic variants of the genitive, dative, and accusative forms characteristic of West and South Slavic languages (Franks and King 2000), they have developed clitic variants of the nominative forms of the personal pronoun. These nominative clitics, which are referred to as “subject clitics” in this paper,⁷ appear in all three persons in the singular and the plural. Solely in the dual, we do not find clitic variants of the tonic pronouns. Instead, in the third person, the plural clitic or, according to Šekli (2010a), the neuter singular clitic is used. Tables 1 through 3 on the next page show the system of Resian subject clitics according to Steenwijk’s (1992: 118) grammar of the dialect of San Giorgio. For the sake of convenience, the examples have been transcribed into the Resian standard orthography (cf. Steenwijk 1994), which is also used in the translation of *The Little Prince* (de Saint-Exupéry 2021), the primary resource of the present study.

As can be seen in tables 1 through 3, subject clitics differ from their tonic counterparts not only by their prosodic features but also segmentally. These differences are least significant in the first- and second-person personal pronouns, where, apart from the tonic first-singular form *jäs*, tonic and clitic variants are distinguished from each other solely by the quality of the vowel. In the third person, on the other hand, tonic and clitic variants differ from each other also by the lack of certain segments in the latter. The origin of these differences must largely be sought in regular sound changes, which affected either the accented or the unaccented variant of the personal pronouns (cf. Šekli 2015 for a brief

⁶ Note that, of the above-mentioned Resian dialects, the dialect of San Giorgio shows the most influence from Romance (Steenwijk 1996).

⁷ This term is used in parallel to the nomenclature applied in Romance linguistics.

Table 1. Nominative forms of the first-person personal pronouns in Resian

1st person	Tonic	Clitic
SG	<i>jäs/jä</i>	<i>ja</i>
DU	<i>midwa</i> (M), <i>midvi</i> (F)	not attested
PL	<i>mī</i>	<i>mi</i>

Table 2. Nominative forms of the second-person personal pronouns in Resian

2nd person	Tonic	Clitic
SG	<i>tī</i>	<i>ti</i>
DU	<i>vidwa</i> (M), <i>vidvi</i> (F)	not attested
PL	<i>vī</i>	<i>vi</i>

Table 3. Nominative forms of the third-person personal pronouns in Resian

3rd person	M		F	
	Tonic	Clitic	Tonic	Clitic
SG	<i>wun</i>	<i>an</i>	<i>wonä</i>	<i>na</i>
DU	<i>wonedva</i>	not attested	<i>wonedvi</i>	not attested
PL	<i>wunŷ</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>wone</i>	<i>ni</i>

overview of Resian sound changes). Finally, in the third-person plural form, gender differences have been eliminated in the clitic variant (Šekli 2010a: 145–46).

In the singular, Resian also has a neuter personal pronoun. However, according to Šekli (2010a: 146), the tonic third-singular-neuter pronoun *onö* ‘it’ is only rarely used. Instead, speakers employ the clitic *to* based on the demonstrative stem *t-*. The investigated text does not contain the pronoun *onö*.

There are currently no detailed studies on the use and placement of pronominal clitics in Resian. The matter is merely addressed as part of works with a more general scope (e.g., Skubic 1997; Benacchio 2002). The most informative study on the use of personal pronouns in Resian is Šekli (2010a). However, the author is not concerned with the place that subject clitics occupy in the clause. Therefore, the information on the position of subject clitics in the clause reported

in the following stems from a separate study on pronominal clitics in Resian that is currently in preparation (Wandl, forthcoming).

While standard Slovenian is a pro-drop language, in Resian pronominal subjects are usually expressed by subject clitics (Šekli 2010a: 150–51). At least in some cases, the expression of pronominal subjects, however, is not obligatory. Example (3) contains two largely identical clauses taken from Šekli (2010a: 150 and cf. also Šekli 2010b: 161) (accent marks have been adapted for the sake of convenience). These clauses differ from each other in the presence or absence of a subject clitic. When, exactly, pro-drop occurs in Resian has yet to be properly studied. Šekli (2010a: 150) suggests that it is related to information structure. For the present paper, this question is not of immediate relevance since it is concerned mainly with the types of subjects that are doubled and with the place of the subject clitics in constructions with doubling.

It is interesting to note that subject clitics are placed according to different rules than object clitics. They always precede the highest-ranking verb in the clause (Wandl, forthcoming, and less specifically, Skubic 1997 and Benacchio 2002). Usually, this is the finite verb, including clitic and tonic auxiliaries. However, in past tense and modal constructions, the auxiliary can also be omitted, in which case the subject clitics precede the past participle (i.e., the so-called *l*-participle). Since Resian subject clitics are proclitic to the verb, they can appear in clause-initial position.

- (3) a. [...] kə to oré w Rêzijə
 because this.ACC.SG.F hour.ACC.SG.F in Resia.LOC.SG.F
 ja si jin dál wžę
 I.SC AUX.1SG they.DAT.PL give.PST.PTCP.SG.M already
 den lípə azək [...]
 INDEF.ACC.SG.M beautiful.ACC.SG.M language.ACC.SG.M
 ‘[...] because in Resia I already gave them a beautiful language [...]’
- b. [...] kə Ø si jin dál
 because Ø AUX.1SG they.DAT.PL give.PST.PTCP.SG.M
 den lípə azək [...]
 INDEF.ACC.SG.M beautiful.ACC.SG.M language.ACC.SG.M
 ‘[...] I already gave them a beautiful language [...]’

Although subject clitics have to precede the verb, they do not have to do so immediately. We find examples with both tonic and clitic elements occurring between subject clitics and verbs (more on this in §5.3 below). Moreover, subject clitics do not form a clitic cluster with other pronominal clitics. While the former must precede the highest-ranking verb in the clause, the latter usually precede their immediate lexical head verb. Therefore, whenever the lexical verb

is preceded by auxiliaries, adverbs, or particles, subject and object clitics do not occur subsequent to each other.

In sum, the investigated data justify the qualification of Resian subject clitics as clitics if they are understood as "elements with some of the properties characteristic of independent words and some characteristic of affixes" (Zwicky 1994: xii). Compared to their tonic counterparts, they not only lack accent but also differ in their phonological structure. Especially in the third person, segmental differences are so significant that they cannot simply be explained by means of synchronic rules. Furthermore, subject clitics are more restricted with regard to their placement than their tonic counterparts. While the latter can occur both before and after the verb depending on information structural requirements, the former must precede the verb.⁸

From what has been said above, it is also clear that in the broader Slavic context, Resian belongs to the group of languages with verb-oriented clitics. In this regard, it is more similar to the eastern South Slavic languages Bulgarian and Macedonian than to standard Slovenian, which belongs to the group of languages with second-position (Wackernagel position) clitics (Franks and King 2000).

5. Subject Doubling in Resian

Having provided some general information about subject doubling (§2) and introducing the Resian language (§3), in this section, I discuss the phenomenon of subject doubling in Resian. To do so, I first describe the resource and the methodology that has been applied to identify constructions with doubling (§5.1). In line with the objectives of this paper, I then provide a survey of collected data with a focus on the types of associates found with doubling (§5.2) and on the place of subject clitics in clauses with subject doubling (§5.3).

5.1. Resource and Methodology

As mentioned in §2, a major issue in analyzing doubling constructions is distinguishing them from instances of dislocation, i.e., instances in which subjects or objects are detached from the clause that contains the co-referential pronoun. This problem is especially salient when working with low-resource languages,

⁸ An anonymous reviewer asks whether Resian subject clitics could be classified as weak pronouns in the sense of Cardinaletti and Starke (1999). However, Cardinaletti and Starke (1999: 169) conclude that "[d]oubling is always clitic-doubling, in the sense that doubling must always involve (at least) one clitic, no combination of weak and strong pronoun is possible", which seems to exclude the very analysis the reviewer asks about. See Testelefs (2003) for a further analysis that casts doubt on the general applicability of the concept of weak pronouns.

which often lack detailed descriptions of the phenomena involved. However, I propose that identifying relevant cases can still be possible based on the existence of parallel texts in doubling and non-doubling languages.

The parallel text I use as the main resource for this investigation is the recent translation of *The Little Prince* by Antoine de Saint-Exupéry (de Saint-Exupéry 2021) into Resian. It has been prepared by a native speaker of Resian, Silvana Paletti, and a linguist, Malinka Pila, based on the French original. The native dialect spoken by Silvana Paletti is that of Varcota, which is largely identical to the dialect of San Giorgio.

The way that doubling constructions are identified in the Resian version of *The Little Prince* is similar to Coveney's (2005) approach to subject doubling in colloquial French. This author argues that structures can be counted as an example of subject doubling if non-doubled structures can replace them without resulting in a change in the semantics or pragmatics of the expression (Coveney 2005: 100). Although the application of these diagnostics leads Coveney (2005: 99–102) to also include instances of dislocation in his study, we can apply them more strictly to identify cases of subject doubling in Resian (see below).

Since examples such as those from standard and colloquial French in (2) are semantically and pragmatically equal, they can be regarded as translations of each other. *Mutatis mutandis*, it can be argued that whenever Resian doubling constructions are used to translate non-doubling constructions in the French original of *The Little Prince*, they are semantically and pragmatically equal because they occur in exactly the same context. Needless to say, this argument is only plausible if the number of examples in which non-doubling structures are conveyed by doubling structures is large enough. With regard to the investigated resource, this is clearly the case since about one-third of the 1,500 sentences (in total) of the Resian translation of *The Little Prince* exhibit subject doubling.

As mentioned above, Coveney (2005), in his investigation of spoken French, also includes instances of dislocation, although he does not use a specific term to distinguish them from other doubling constructions. Since the present study is not interested in instances of dislocation, several examples had to be excluded from the analysis. On one hand, this concerns instances where the French original contains structures consisting of a subject and a coreferential subject pronoun. In these cases, it cannot be excluded that the use of the doubling construction in Resian is influenced by the original text. On the other hand, I have excluded examples which contain some indication of an intonation break in the Resian translation. This concerns instances where subjects are separated from doubling clitics by commas or ellipses. To verify whether structures such as those investigated in this paper indeed do not require intonation breaks, I additionally checked the pronunciation of several example recordings which were generously provided to me by Malinka Pila (including examples with and without subject-verb inversion, cf. §5.3). Therefore, I believe that the diagnostics applied in this paper are sufficiently reliable for identifying instances of subject

doubling in Resian, even though the limitations of working with written text must be acknowledged.

5.2. Types of Associates

In §1, we have already encountered two examples for the doubling of tonic personal pronouns. However, the phenomenon is not limited to this part of speech. The purpose of this section is to determine the different associates attested with doubling in the investigated text. In doing so, I not only give examples for the different parts of speech that are doubled but also consider different genders and try to provide examples for animate and inanimate subjects if attested. Most of the existing studies provide only a limited number of examples (see Benacchio 2002; Skubic 1997; Steenwijk 1992; but cf. Šekli 2010a), which is why I believe that a larger set of examples will be beneficial for future research. For instance, it has been noted by Poletto (2008) that across northern Italian dialects, some tonic pronouns are more readily doubled than others. Therefore, providing examples for doubling with different tonic pronouns is relevant for identifying the source language of the doubling in Resian. Moreover, I provide examples for noun phrases that are modified by definite or indefinite articles. It is important to include these features because clitic doubling has been reported to be influenced by specificity, definiteness, and animacy in other languages (see §2).

Before I discuss doubling with different parts of speech in separate sections below (sections 5.2.1–5.2.3), a few general notes on agreement in Resian subject doubling are in order. Resian subject clitics agree with their associates in number, and in the third-person singular also in gender (cf. the examples cited throughout this paper).⁹ In the dual, where no separate subject clitics are available, the plural form of the third-person clitic is used (see §5.2.3, and see also §5.4). The same form is also used with coordinated phrases. Thus, in example (4), *ni* ‘they’ doubles the coordinated noun phrases *dizenj nümër 1 anü nümër 2* ‘drawing number 1 and number 2’.¹⁰

⁹ Gender differences have been lost in the plural form of the third-person subject clitic (see Table 3 on p. 303).

¹⁰ Page numbers given in parentheses after the English translations of glossed examples refer to the Resian translation of *The Little Prince*.

- (4) [...] ko si vidël da möj
 when AUX.1SG see.PST.PTCP.SG.M COMP my.NOM.SG.M
 dizenj nümër 1
 drawing.NOM.SG.M number.NOM.SG.M one
 anö nümër 2 ni ni grejo.
 and number.NOM.SG.M two they.SC NEG GO.PRS.3PL
 '[...] when I saw that my drawings number 1 and number 2 did not
 work out.' (p. 10)

Apart from grammatical gender and number agreement, we also find one instance of plural agreement *ad sensum*. In example (23), the quantifier phrase *malö njuh* 'few of them' is doubled by the nominative plural subject clitic *ni* 'they'. Moreover, there are several instances of the neuter third-person subject clitic *to* occurring with masculine and feminine noun phrases. In these cases, the subject clitic most probably functions as an expletive (cf. Runić 2014: 11, and further, Schuster-Šewc 1974: 349–50).

5.2.1. Nouns

In the investigated text, subject doubling is attested with masculine and feminine nouns, regardless of whether they refer to animate or inanimate subjects. Representative examples for doubling with unmodified nouns can be found in examples (5a–f). Example (5b) further shows that doubling occurs with foreign nouns.

- (5) a. **Krej** z no roko an
 king.NOM.SG.M with INDEF.ACC.SG.F hand.ACC.SG.F he.SC
 mu löpö pokazal swöj
 he.OC.DAT meaningfully show.PST.PTCP.SG.M his.ACC.SG.M
 planët [...]

planet.ACC.SG.M

'And with a meaningful gesture, the king showed him his planet [...]' (p. 38)

- b. **Aštronomo** an spet naredil
 astronomer.NOM.SG.M he.SC again hold.PST.PTCP.SG.M
 swo dimunstracijun tu-w lëtö 1920 [...]
 his.ACC.SG.F lecture.ACC.SG.F in year.LOC.SG.N 1920

'The astronomer held his lecture again in the year 1920 [...]' (p. 19)

- (5) c. **Pisak** **an** **jë** **to** **barbo**
 sand.NOM.SG.M he.SC be.PRS.3SG DEF.NOM.SG.N color.NOM.SG.N
 od stârde.
 of honey.GEN.SG.F
 'The sand has the color of honey.' (p. 81)
- d. Ma **lisica** **na** paršlâ spet na
 but fox.NOM.SG.F she.SC come.PST.PTCP.SG.F again on
 nji idëjo.
 her idea.ACC.SG.F
 'But the fox came back to its idea.' (p. 68)
- e. Dan **din** **roža** **na**
 day.ACC.SG.M INDEF.ACC.SG.M flower.NOM.SG.F she.SC
 bila vîdala prijtyt no
 AUX.PST.PTCP.SG.F see.PST.PTCP.SG.F pass.INF INDEF.ACC.SG.F
 rižo wözöw.
 row.ACC.SG.F wagon.GEN.PL.M
 'One day the flower had seen a caravan passing by.' (p. 62)
- f. **Utrucy** **ni** mäjö mët
 child.NOM.PL.M they.SC have.PRS.3SG have.INF
 pacincjo ziz timi vlikimi
 patience.ACC.SG.F with DEF.INS.PL grown.up.INS.PL
 judin.
 people.INS.PL.M
 'Children must have patience with grown-ups.' (p. 20)

Instances of doubled neuter noun phrases are more difficult to identify because Resian uses the neuter subject clitic *to* also as an expletive (Schuster-Šewc 1974: 349–50). Thus, in example (6), *to* is ambiguous. The only conclusion that can be drawn is that the use of the subject clitic is not the result of a loan translation. It does not have a counterpart in the French original.

- (6) Anö **hawfanjë** za-me **to** **jë** na
 and yawning.NOM.SG.N for-me it.SC be.PRS.3SG INDEF.NOM.SG.F
 rič kurjöws.
 thing.NOM.SG.F curious
 'And yawning, for me it is something interesting.' (p. 37)

- (7) e. **Dan** **din** izdë **an** dura
 day.NOM.SG.M INDEF.NOM.SG.M here he.SC last.PRS.3SG
 dan minüt.
 INDEF.ACC.SG.M minute.ACC.SG.M
 'A day lasts one minute here.' (p. 52)

There are also numerous examples in which the head nouns of the doubled subject noun phrases are modified by a definiteness marker and an adjective.¹¹ Although this may not be surprising given the occurrence of doubling with other parts of speech, it is still noteworthy. Runič's (2014: 138–78) formal analysis suggests that Resian definiteness markers, referred to as weak pronouns, possess all the functions typically associated with definite articles only when occurring with modified nouns. The investigated data show that these differences are not significant enough to influence the general possibility of the doubling. Examples (8a–c) contain instances of doubling with modified noun phrases marked as definite, and in examples (8d–f), the doubled noun phrases contain indefinite articles.

- (8) a. **Te** **mali** **prīncip** **an**
 DEF.SG.M little.NOM.SG.M prince.NOM.SG.M he.SC
 nī rišpundäl nikar.
 NEG.AUX.3SG answer.PST.PTCP.SG.M nothing.ACC
 'The little prince did not answer anything.' (p. 60)
- b. **Te** **petnji** **planēt** **an** bil
 DEF.SG.M fifth.NOM.SG.M planet.NOM.SG.M he.SC be.PST.PTCP.SG.M
 fys kurjöws.
 really curious
 'The fifth planet was very curious.' (p. 50)
- c. **Ti** **vliki** **jüdi** **ni** ni
 DEF.NOM.PL big.NOM.PL people.NOM.PL they.SC NEG
 kapījo mej nikar sami [...]
 understand.PRS.3PL never nothing.ACC self.NOM.PL
 'The big people never understand anything by themselves [...]'
 (p. 10)

¹¹ However, note that in most cases, this concerns the noun phrase *te mali prīncip* 'the little prince'.

- (8) d. [...] anö ka **na** **mala** **wöwca**
 and that INDEF.NOM.SG.F small.NOM.SG.F sheep.NOM.SG.F
na mörë dan sami nur
 she.SC can.PRS.3SG one.ACC.SG.M self.ACC.SG.M time.OCC.ACC
 jo pužrët [...] [
 she devour.INF
 ‘[...] and that a small sheep can devour her at once [...]’ (p. 29)

- e. [...] ka **dan** **türski** **ditatör**
 when INDEF.NOM.SG.M Turkish.NOM.SG.M dictator.NOM.SG.M
an wkazal svën judin, da
 he.SC order.PST.PTCP.SG.M his.DAT.PL people.DAT.PL COMP
 wsi mäjo se ublic tej ti
 all.NOM.PL have.PRS.3PL REFL dress.INF AS DEF.NOM.PL
 jüdi tu-w Ewropi [...] [
 people.NOM.PL in Europe.LOC.SG.F
 ‘[...] when a Turkish dictator ordered his people to dress like the
 people in Europe [...]’ (p. 19)

- f. **Na** **taka** **möcnöst** **na**
 INDEF.NOM.SG.F such.NOM.SG.F power.NOM.SG.F she.SC
 čüdila toga malaga prïncipa.
 surprise.PST.PTCP.SG.F DEF.ACC.SG.M little.ACC.SG.M prince.ACC.SG.M
 ‘Such power surprised the little prince.’ (p. 38)

Subject doubling also occurs with substantivized adjectives. The only two instances of this kind that I came across in *The Little Prince* are examples (9a–b). In both cases, the adjective is modified by a definite article. However, it is not clear to me whether substantivization of adjectives modified by indefinite articles is possible outside predicative constructions. Steenwijk (1992: 114) only provides examples where the adjective is part of the predicate.

- (9) a. **Ti** **vliki** **ni** so mi
 DEF.NOM.PL big.NOM.PL they.SC AUX.3PL LOC.DAT
 konsajali [...] [
 advise.PST.PTCP.PL
 ‘The grown-ups advised me [...]’ (p. 10)

Noun phrases modified by possessive pronouns are also doubled; cf. (11a–g). This includes phrases modified by the non-agreeing third-person possessive pronouns; cf. (11d and 11g).

- (11) a. **Möj** **amig** **an** se nasmëjnöl [...]
 my.NOM.SG.M friend.NOM.SG.M he.SC REFL smile.PST.PTCP.SG.M
 ‘My friend smiled [...]’ (p. 14)
- b. **Ma** **hışa** **na** skrïwala
 my.NOM.SG.F house.NOM.SG.F she.SC hide.PST.PTCP.SG.F
 no bogatïjo tu-w svin sãrcö...
 INDEF.ACC.SG.F riches.ACC.SG.F in its.LOC.SG.N heart.LOC.SG.N
 ‘My house hid riches in its heart...’ (p. 77)
- c. **Wař** **řpinjulët** **an** jë
 your.NOM.SG.M cigarette.NOM.SG.M he.SC be.PRS.3SG
 wgasnën.
 go.out.NOM.SG.M
 ‘Your cigarette has gone out.’ (p. 46)
- d. **Ma njagã** **planët** **an** jë fys mãsa
 but his planet.NOM.SG.M he.SC be.PRS.3SG really too
 dan mali.
 INDEF.NOM.SG.M small.NOM.SG.M
 ‘But his planet was too small.’ (p. 53)
- e. **Swa** **rořica** **na** bila mu
 his.NOM.SG.F flower.NOM.SG.F she.SC AUX.PST.PTCP.SG.F LOC.DAT
 raklä, da [...]
 say.PST.PTCP.SG.F COMP
 ‘His flower had told him [...]’ (p. 64)
- f. **Anö twujy** **amigavi** **ni** ćejo se
 and your.NOM.PL friend.NOM.PL they.SC AUX.FUT.3PL REFL
 fys ćüdit za te vïdët [...]
 really be.surprised.INF for you.OC.ACC.SG see.INF
 ‘Your friends will be really surprised to see you [...]’ (p. 87)

- (11) g. Itakü **nji** **žiwjöst** **na** bo
 thus their life.NOM.SG.F she.SC be.FUT.3SG
 wezana na two jušticijo.
 bind.PST.PTCP.PASS.SG.F to your.ACC.SG.F jurisdiction.ACC.SG.F
 ‘Thus their life will be bound to your justice.’ (p. 41)

Subject doubling does not only occur with subjects specified by adjectival attributes. In *The Little Prince*, we find the following two instances of subject doubling with noun phrases modified by attributes expressed by prepositional phrases (12a–b). A doubled subject noun phrase containing an apposition, i.e., *müj dizenj nümër 2* ‘my drawing number 2’, is given in example (12c).

- (12) a. **Zëmja** **od planëta** **na** bila
 earth.NOM.SG.F of planet.GEN.SG.M she.SC be.PST.PTCP.SG.F
 basana.
 full.NOM.SG.F
 ‘The ground of the planet was full.’ (p. 23)
- b. **Idëja** **od tröp** **lafantöw** **na** se
 idea.NOM.SG.F of herd elephant.GEN.PL.M she.SC REFL
 zdëlala smëjat timu malimö
 make.PST.PTCP.SG.F laugh.INF DEF.DAT.SG.M little.DAT.SG.M
 principö.
 prince.DAT.SG.M
 ‘The idea of a herd of elephants made the little prince laugh.’
 (p. 22)
- c. **Möj** **dizenj** **nümër** **2 an**
 my.NOM.SG.M drawing.NOM.SG.M number.NOM.SG.M 2 he.SC
 jë bil itakö:
 AUX.3SG be.PST.PTCP.SG.M like.that
 ‘My drawing number 2 was like that.’ (p. 10)

5.2.2. Personal Pronouns

In §1, two examples containing doubling of masculine and feminine forms of the tonic third-person personal pronoun were given in (1). However, doubling is not limited to the third person. We find reliable instances also in the second-person singular and plural. Examples containing the third- and second-person personal pronouns are given in (13a–e). I have not come across an instance of doubling with the feminine plural pronoun *wune* ‘they’, which

occurs only once in the investigated text. The neuter singular pronoun *onö* 'it' is absent from the text.

- (13) a. Ma **tī** **tī** boš ji
 but you.NOM.SG you.SC AUX.FUT.2SG she.OC.DAT
 naredil wsaki vijáč no
 make.PST.PTCP.SG.M every.ACC.SG.M time.ACC.SG.M INDEF.ACC.SG.F
 gračijo za jo sparnjät.
 grace.ACC.SG.F for she.OC.ACC save.INF
 'But you will reprieve her every time to save her.' (p. 41)
- b. Anö **wun** **an** di.
 and he.NOM he.SC say.PRS.3SG
 'And he says.' (p. 90)
- c. Anö **wonä** **na** jä tulikö žboh.
 and she.NOM she.SC be.PRS.3SG so weak.NOM.SG.M
 'And she is so weak.' (p. 90)
- d. Ma **vī** **vi** se ni samajata fys
 but you.NOM.PL you.SC REFL NEG resemble.PRS.2PL really
 nika mimu gorofulö [...]
 nothing.ACC my.DAT.SG.M rose.DAT.SG.M
 'But you do not resemble my rose at all [...]' (p. 72)
- e. **Wuny** **ni** ni durijavawajo si mislit
 they.NOM they.SC NEG be.capable.PRS.3PL REFL imagine.INF
 po itěj hiši.
 about this.LOC.SG.F house.LOC.SG.F
 'They are not capable of picturing this house.' (p. 20)

Instances of doubling with first-person personal pronouns are uncertain. In *The Little Prince*, examples in the singular are limited to cases where the tonic variant *jäs* is separated from the rest of the clause by intonation breaks marked with commas. Moreover, *jäs* in these instances translates French *moi*, which is also detached from the clause (e.g., example 14).

- (14) **Ja** dilan, **jäs**, poštene rëči!
 I.SC do.PRS.1SG I.NOM important.ACC.PL thing.ACC.PL
 'I do important things!' (p. 28)

The analysis of these structures as non-doubling additionally seems to be confirmed by example (15). Here, we find the tonic personal pronoun repeated while no subject clitic is present in the clause.¹²

- (15) Ma **jäs** si poštën, **jäs**.
 but I.NOM be.PRS.1SG serious.NOM.SG.M I.NOM
 'But I am serious.' (p. 47)

However, it should be noted that similar instances of doubling with the first-person personal pronoun are also attested in Steenwijk's (1992: 201, 203) transcripts. Therefore, further research is needed to determine whether doubling of this form might not be possible after all.

The sole instance of the nominative plural *mī* 'we' does not provide a clear example of doubling. In example (16), *mī* is repeated by the subject clitic *mi*, but this is true not only for the Resian text but also the French original (cf. *nous... nous*). Therefore, following the methodology laid out in §5.1, example (16) cannot be classified as an instance of doubling.

- (16) Ma, sigür, **mī** ki kapimo žiwjöst, **mi**
 but of.course we.NOM REL understand.PRS.1PL life.ACC.SG.F we.SC
 nīsīmō interešani na nūmarje!
 NEG.be.PRS.1PL interested.NOM.PL on numbers.ACC.PL
 'But, of course, we who do understand life are not interested in numbers!' (p. 20)

5.2.3. Other Parts of Speech

Other parts of speech that occur with doubling in *The Little Prince* are demonstrative and relative pronouns, quantifiers, and numerals. Instances of doubling with demonstratives are given in (17).

- (17) a. [...] **isi** **an** ražona nu
 this.NOM.SG.M he.SC be.similar.PRS.3SG INDEF.ACC.SG.N
 malō tej möj pijancar.
 little.ACC.SG.N like my.NOM.SG.M drunkard.NOM.SG.M
 '[...] this one thinks like my drunkard a little bit.' (p. 48)

¹² An anonymous reviewer suggested that *jä(s)* in the above examples could be compared to emphatic pronouns in Italian, cf. *Giovanni intervieni lui* 'Giovanni himself intervenes' (see Burzio 1986: 109–15 and Cardinaletti 1999 for two different interpretations of this phenomenon).

- (17) b. **Isa** **na** **jë** **wžë** **karjë** **bulna**.
 this.NOM.SG.F she.SC be.PRS.3SG already very ill.NOM.SG.F
 ‘This one is already very ill.’ (p. 14)
- c. **Isö** **to** **jë** **sćatula**.
 this.NOM.SG.N it.SC be.PRS.3SG box.NOM.SG.F
 ‘This is a box.’ (p. 14)

Subject clitics further occur with the two uninflected relative markers *ki* and *ka*; cf. (18a–g).¹³ In this case, subject clitics agree with the antecedents of the relative clauses in number and gender. It is interesting to note that this use of subject clitics with uninflected relative markers resembles the standard Slovenian model of employing resumptive pronouns for marking oblique cases with the relative marker *ki* (see Herrity 2016: 146, and cf. also §5.5 below).

- (18) a. **Anö** **pa** **ešploradür**, **ka an** **pijë**
 and also explorer.NOM.SG.M REL he.SC drink.PRS.3SG
mäsa **muć**.
 too much
 ‘And also an explorer who drinks too much.’ (p. 55)
- b. **Itö** **jë** **stal** **dan** **stari**
 there AUX.PRS.3SG live.PST.PTCP.SG.M INDEF.NOM.SG.M old.NOM.SG.M
muž, **ka an** **pisal** **ne**
 man.NOM.SG.M REL he.SC write.PST.PTCP.SG.M INDEF.ACC.PL
privlike **librine**.
 very.big.ACC.PL book.ACC.PL
 ‘There lived an old man who wrote voluminous books.’ (p. 53)
- c. **Si** **vidël** **no** **hišo**, **ki**
 AUX.PRS.1SG see.PST.PTCP.SG.M INDEF.ACC.SG.F house.ACC.SG.F REL
na **vala** **stu** **mijarjüw**
 she.SC be.worth.PRS.3SG hundred.NOM.SG.N thousand.GEN.PL
franköw.
 francs.GEN.PL
 ‘I saw a house that is worth one hundred thousand francs.’ (p. 20)

¹³ Note that the latter element also introduces other subordinate clauses (Steenwijk 2005: 56).

- (18) d. Na rožica, ka na ni
 INDEF.NOM.SG.F flower.NOM.SG.F REL she.SC NEG.AUX.3SG
 valala nikar...
 be.worth.PST.PTCP.SG.F nothing.ACC
 'A flower that was not worth anything...' (p. 62)
- e. Anü ja mürën dovantät tej ti vliki
 and I.NOM can.PRS.1SG become.INF like DEF.NOM.PL big.NOM.PL
 jüdi, ki ni se interašajo köj
 people.NOM.PL REL they.SC REFL be.interested.PRS.3PL only
 na nūmarje.
 in number.ACC.PL
 'And I can become like the grown-up people which are interested
 only in numbers.' (p. 20)
- f. Mujy amigavi, ki ni so spet
 my.NOM.PL.M friend.NOM.PL.M REL they.SC AUX.3PL again
 me vīdali [...]
 LOC.ACC see.PST.PTCP.PL
 'My friends which saw me again [...]' (p. 91)
- g. An löpö spücinäl te vulkane,
 he.SC properly sweep.PST.PTCP.SG.M DEF.ACC.PL volcano.ACC.PL
 ki ni gurījo ta-znutrë.
 REL they.SC burn.PRS.3PL inside
 'He properly swepted the volcanos which burn inside.' (p. 34)

As these examples show, doubling does not depend on the type of relative clause introduced by the relative marker. We find doubling in both restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses.

In one instance, the components of the correlative construction 'one... the other' are doubled; cf. (19). However, the correlatives *dan* 'one' and *driügi* 'other' are used attributively in this example since they modify the noun *dizenj* 'drawing'. It could not be verified based on the investigated resource whether doubling is possible with bare correlatives.

- (19) **Dan** **dizenj** **an** gre prow,
 one.NOM.SG.M drawing.NOM.SG.M he.SC go.PRS.3SG right.NOM.SG.M
ma te **drügi** **an** se ni samaja
 but DEF.NOM.SG.M other.NOM.SG.M he.SC REFL NEG resemble.PRS.3SG
 vić.
 more
 ‘One drawing goes along alright, but the other does already not resemble the subject.’ (p. 21)

There are several instances of doubling with quantifier phrases in *The Little Prince*. Example (20) contains cases with the quantifiers *väs* ‘all; whole’ and *wsaki* ‘every(one)’, together with a noun, cf. (20a–b, 20d), or a demonstrative (20c).

- (20) a. **Väs** **svit** **an** ga
 whole.NOM.SG.M world.NOM.SG.M he.SC he.OC.GEN
 nīmël.
 NEG.have.PST.PTCP.SG.M
 ‘The whole world does not have him.’ (p. 20)
- b. **Wse** **zwizde** **ni** céjo byt ne
 all.NOM.PL star.NOM.PL they.SC AUX.FUT.3PL be.INF INDEF.NOM.PL
 päče ziz no rījawo karikulo.
 wells.NOM.PL with INDEF.INS.SG.F rusty.INS.SG.F winch.INS.SG.F
 ‘All the stars will be wells with rusty winches.’ (p. 89)
- c. Alore **wsë** **isö** **to** nareja
 so all.NOM.SG.N this.NOM.SG.N it.SC make.PRS.3SG
 petstu [...]
 five.hundred.ACC.SG.N
 ‘So all this makes five hundred [...]’ (p. 47)
- d. [...] da **wsaki** **šlovëk** dan
 COMP every.NOM.SG.M human.NOM.SG.M day.ACC.SG.M
 din **an** mörë nalëst swo.
 one.ACC.SG.M he.SC can.PRS.3SG find.INF his.ACC.SG.F
 ‘[...] so that one day every man can find his.’ (p. 60)

There is also one possible instance of doubling of a bare universal quantifier. However, it should be noted that the quantifier in example (21) is referring to *mak* ‘pile’ and thus could be interpreted as elliptic. Note further that the object clitic genitive-plural *jih* ‘they’ is not an attribute of the quantifier but a genitive

argument of the verb *mä* 'has'. The attribute use of the tonic genitive-plural *njyh* can be found in (23).

- (21) Ja divīdinān jūdi w make, anō
 I.NOM sort.PRS.1SG people.ACC.PL in pile.ACC.PL and
wsaki an jih mā dān
 every.NOM.SG.M he.SC they.OG.GEN have.PRS.3SG one.ACC.SG.M
 mijar.
 thousand.ACC.SG.M
 'I sort the people in piles, and every pile has one thousand people.'
 (p. 74)

A clear example of doubling of a universal quantifier is cited by Runić (2018: 8) from the Resian local newspaper *Nāš glas* (cf. also the example given by Šekli 2010a: 149). It is reproduced in (22). Here, the quantifier *wsak* 'everyone' is further specified by the prepositional phrase *ta-mi nami* 'among us'.

- (22) [W]sak ta-mi nami an ma wojo
 everyone.NOM.SG.M among we.INS he.SC have.PRS.3SG wish.ACC.SG.F
 si wdāržat itō ka an si čūjē
 REFL conserve.INF that.ACC.SG.N REL he.SC REFL feel.PRS.3SG
 '[E]veryone of us has the wish to conserve what he is feeling'¹⁴

The only instance with a quantifier other than *vās* and *wsaki* that I came across is example (23). Here, the quantifier *malō* 'few', which is further specified by genitive plural *njyh* 'they', is doubled by the subject clitic *ni* 'they'. The subject clitic agrees with the quantifier *ad sensum* since the latter has a neuter singular ending.

- (23) Ma **malō njyh ni** se spomānjajo.
 but few they.GEN.PL they.SC REFL remember.PRS.3PL
 'But few of them remember.' (p. 5)

Two instances of doubled bare numerals have been encountered in *The Little Prince*. In example (24a), the numeral 'one' translates French *on* 'one' and thus acts as the subject of an impersonal clause. Therefore, this example does not present a case of doubling with a true numeral. In the second instance, the masculine form of the numeral *dwa* 'two' is doubled; cf. (24b). Due to the

¹⁴ Cf. Runić's (2018: 8) Croatian translation: "Svi među nama imaju želju da sačuvaju ono što osećaju".

lack of a dual subject clitic, the plural form *ni* is employed in this construction. Likewise, the finite verb of the clause occurs in the third-person plural.

- (24) a. To karjě pomaga, ċi dān an
 that.NOM.SG.N a.lot help.PRS.3SG when one.NOM.SG.M he.SC
 se zgubi tu-w nićy.
 REFL be.lost.PRS.3SG in night.LOC.SG.F
 ‘That helps a lot when you are lost in the night.’ (p. 10)
- b. Dwa ni fys gurjjo, anō
 two.NOM.DU.M they.SC.PL proper burn.PRS.3PL and
 dān jě wgasněn.
 one.NOM.SG.M be.PRS.3SG expire.PST.PTCP.PASS
 ‘Two which are properly burning and one which is expired.’
 (p. 56)

5.3. The Place of the Doubling Clitic

Having discussed the types of phrases that occur with doubling in the previous section, I now turn to the place that the subject clitic occupies in clauses with subject doubling. The reference points for determining the position of the clitics will be (i) the finite verb and (ii) the associate of the doubling clitic. As for the latter position, it is not expected that there will be any deviations from the placement of subject clitics in clauses without doubling if they are indeed oriented towards the verb, and this is exactly what we find in the investigated text. Subject clitics precede the highest-ranking verb even in clauses with subject-verb inversion. Examples for this placement are given in the discussion of the relative position of subject clitics and their associates; cf. (32a–c, 33a–e, 34, 35, and 36). They clearly show that subject clitics are more restricted in their placement compared to their tonic counterparts as well as compared to lexical subjects which follow the verb in clauses with inversion. Although I did not encounter differences in the relative placement of subject clitics and the finite verb in clauses with and without doubling, in the following, I provide several examples attesting various positions of the clitics in clauses with doubling. Since there are at present no studies dealing with clitic placement in Resian specifically (cf. §4), the provided examples have a documentary value. Moreover, it is not excluded that other resources might reveal differences between the placement of subject clitics in clauses with and without doubling.

As mentioned in §4, Resian subject clitics do not have to precede the finite verb immediately. In clauses with and without doubling alike, they can be separated from it by particles (PTCL), reflexive markers (REFL), object clitics (OC),

and negation markers (NEG). Examples with these elements occurring between the subject clitic and the finite verb are given in (25a–c). Note that the particle *ba* is glossed with the label ATT since, according to Steenwijk (1992: 186), it has attenuative meaning.

- (25) a. [...] anö pa cí **wun** an ba
 and EMPH if he.NOM.SG he.SC ATT
 vignäl dan cëli
 drive.OUT.PST.PTCP.SG.M INDEF.ACC.SG.M entire.ACC.SG.M
 tröp lafantöw [...]
 flock.ACC.SG.M elephant.GEN.PL.M
 '[...] and even if he would drive out an entire flock of elephants
 [...]]' (p. 22)
- b. [...] da **wonä** na se rädi härći [...]
 COMP she.NOM she.SC REFL gladly praise.PRS.3SG
 '[...] that she gladly praises herself [...]]' (p. 31)
- c. **Wćinica** na mi ni sarvija.
 wheat.NOM.SG.F she.SC I.LOC.DAT NEG serve.PRS.3SG
 'Wheat is useless for me.' (p. 69)

Starting with subject clitics and ending with the finite verb or the *l*-participle in past-tense constructions lacking auxiliaries, the tentative sequence in (26) can be proposed. However, it must be noted that this sequence should not be considered a clitic cluster since it can be split at various places by tonic elements. I intend to address these issues in more detail elsewhere (Wandl, forthcoming). For now, it is sufficient to state that subject clitics always precede the highest-ranking verb, regardless of whether the subject is doubled or not.

- (26) SC + PTCL + OC + REFL + NEG + finV/*l*-PTCP

The relative position of subject clitics and their associates depends on the order of the subject and the verb. In unmarked declarative sentences, subject clitics follow their associates. To be precise, they follow the entire subject phrase, including postponed genitive or prepositional attributes (e.g., example (27) with a prepositional attribute further modified by a genitive attribute).

- (27) **Gnüwanjě** **od ise** **tropade** **judi**
 movement.NOM.SG.N of this.GEN.SG.F army.GEN.SG.F people.GEN.PL
to bilö **däržanö** [...] **[...]**
 it.SC be.PST.PTCP.SG.N hold.PST.PTCP.PASS.NOM.SG.N
 ‘the movement of this army of people was organized [...]’ (p. 58)

However, we also find instances where subject clitics and their associates are separated from each other by constituents that are not part of the subject phrase. More specifically, it is adverbials that occur between the associates and the subject clitics. Examples (28a–d) contain adverbials with clausal scope in the discussed position. In example (28e), on the other hand, the associate and the subject clitic are separated from each other by the prepositional phrase *z no roko* ‘with one hand’, which serves as an adjunct of the verb *pokazati* ‘show’.

- (28) a. **Te** **mali** **princip** **injän an**
 DEF.NOM.SG.M little.NOM.SG.M prince.NOM.SG.M now he.SC
bil **fys smlid** **za wümon.**
 be.PST.PTCP.SG.M really pale.NOM.SG.M from anger.INS.SG.M
 ‘Now, the little prince was really pale from anger.’ (p. 29)
- b. **Rožice** **prid ni** **ti** **rumunijo**
 flower.NOM.PL at.first they.SC.PL you.OC.DAT.SG tell.PRS.3PL
dnö, **döpö ni** **ti** **ričėjo**
 one.ACC.SG.N then they.SC.PL you.OC.DAT.SG say.PRS.3PL
nö **drügě.**
 INDEF.ACC.SG.N other.ACC.SG.N
 ‘First, the flowers tell you one thing and then, they say something else.’ (p. 33)
- c. **Te** **mali** **princip** **wsako**
 DEF.NOM.SG.M little.NOM.SG.M prince.NOM.SG.M every.ACC.SG.F
nuć **an diwa** **to** **rožo**
 night.ACC.SG.F he.SC put.PRS.3SG DEF.ACC.SG.F flower.ACC.SG.F
ta-pod dan **verinavi** **zwun!**
 under INDEF.ACC.SG.M of.glass.ACC.SG.M bell.ACC.SG.M
 ‘Every night the little prince puts the flower under a bell made from glass!’ (p. 93)

- (28) d. ka **te** **mali** **prīncip** s
 because DEF.NOM.SG.M little.NOM.SG.M prince.NOM.SG.M with
 potjo **an** me baral, tej ba an
 way.INS.SG.F he.SC I.OC.ACC ask.PST.PTCP.SG.M as if he.SC
 ni bēšē sigūr.
 NEG be.IMPERF.3SG sure.NOM.SG.M
 'that the little prince, in passing, asked me as if he wasn't sure.'
 (p. 21)

- e. **Krej** z no roko **an**
 king.NOM.SG.M with INDEF.INS.SG.F hand.INS.SG.F he.SC
 mu löpö pokazal swöj
 he.OC.DAT meaningfully show.PST.PTCP.SG.M his.ACC.SG.M
 planēt [...]
 planet.ACC.SG.M
 'And with a meaningful gesture, the king showed him his planet
 [...]' (p. 38)

Yet another constituent occurring between associates and doubling subject clitics are prepositional phrases acting as verbal arguments. In example (29), *na te poštēne rēči* 'on these important things' is an argument of the verbal noun *vidanjē* 'seeing'. Verbal nouns are not recognized as forming a distinct verb form in Resian by Steenwijk (1992: 127) due to their potentially unpredictable meaning. However, *vidanjē* clearly demonstrates that some nouns which at least originally presented verbal nouns have retained their ability to govern prepositional phrases. Whether more prototypical arguments such as direct and indirect objects can be placed between associates and subject clitics could not be determined based on the investigated resource or the available secondary literature.

- (29) **Te** **mali** **prīncip** na te
 DEF.NOM.SG.M little.NOM.SG.M prince.NOM.SG.M ON DEF.ACC.PL
 poštēne rēči **an** mēl fys
 important.ACC.PL thing.ACC.PL he.SC have.PST.PTCP.SG.M entirely
 nö drügē vīdanjē [...]
 INDEF.ACC.SG.N different.ACC.SG.N view.ACC.SG.N
 'The little prince had an entirely different view on important things
 [...]' (p. 49)

The lexical subject is also split from the subject clitic in example (30a). Here, the combination of the preposition *za* 'for' and the bound morpheme accusative

me ‘me’ is part of the predicative construction ‘to be an interesting thing for somebody’. Thus, we are dealing with a different function compared to the prepositional phrases in examples (28d–e). The placement of the combination of preposition and bound pronominal form between the subject phrase and the subject clitic is, however, not obligatory. In example (30b), it follows the copula verb. A possible explanation for the placement of *za-me* between the subject phrase and the subject clitic in example (30a) is that *za-me* is highlighted to emphasize the contrast between the opinion of the speaker, the king, and others.

- (30) a. Anö **hawfanjë** za-me to jë na
 and yawning.NOM.SG.N for-me it.SC be.PRS.3SG INDEF.NOM.SG.F
 rič kurjöws.
 thing.NOM.SG.F curious

‘And yawning, for me it is something interesting.’ (p. 37)

- b. **Ma** **zvįzda** **na** bo za-te
 my.NOM.SG.F star.NOM.SG.F she.SC be.FUT.3SG for-you
 dnä od zvįzdi.
 one.NOM.SG.F of star.GEN.PL

‘My star will be one among many stars.’ (p. 87)

Splitting of subject clitics and their associates seems to be less common with personal pronouns. The only instance I found in the investigated text is example (31). Here, the third-person personal pronoun *wun* ‘he’ is separated from the subject clitic *an* by the adverb *kadä* ‘once’. Whether the scarcity of examples with pronouns is incidental or whether tonic subject pronouns and subject clitics are more prone to being grouped together could not be determined based on the investigated data.

- (31) [...] anö ka **wun** kadä **an** hudył jįskat [...]
 and REL he.NOM once he.SC turn.PST.PTCP.SG.M search.INF

‘[...] and which he once had gone to seek [...]’ (p. 52)

The subject phrase and the subject clitic are also separated from each other in cases of subject-verb inversion. This follows from the different degrees of freedom in the placement of subject clitics compared to their tonic counterparts and other subject phrases: While the latter can be placed before or after the verb, the former must precede it. Inversion is mostly attested in subordinate clauses and with direct speech complements. However, I can also report a few instances of inversion in main clauses. These comprise example (32a) and examples (32b–c), which show inversion in the second of two coordinated

clauses. As can be seen in example (32b), combinations of prepositional phrase and bound personal pronoun, e.g., *za-me* 'for me', can precede the subject clitic also in inversion.

- (32) a. Měj lipi mali
 my.NOM.SG.M beautiful.NOM.SG.M little.NOM.SG.M
 mužyč, izdē na ni čentra vić
 little.man.NOM.SG.M here she.SC NEG be.in.FOCUS.PRS.3SG more
lisica!
 fox.NOM.SG.F
 'My beautiful little man, the fox is not in the focus here anymore!'
 (p. 76)
- b. Anö si jo pagnäl amig anö
 and be.PRS.1SG she.O.C.ACC bend.PST.PTCP.SG.M friend and
 injän za-me na jě köj wonä na
 now for-me she.SC be.PRS.3SG only she.NOM in
 světö.
 world.LOC.SG.M
 'And I have made her my friend and now she is the only one in
 the world for me.' (p. 72)
- c. Itö, kë si stal, si
 there where be.PRS.1SG live.PST.PTCP.SG.M be.PRS.1SG
 mël no rožo: na
 have.PST.PTCP.SG.M INDEF.ACC.SG.F flower.ACC.SG.F she.SC
 römunila rüdi wonä ta pärwa...
 speak.PST.PTCP.SG.F always she.NOM DEF.NOM.SG.F first.NOM.SG.F
 'Where I lived, I had a flower: she always spoke first...' (p. 64)

Examples of inversion in subordinated clauses can be found in (33a–e). They include the relative conjunction *skod* 'where', the temporal conjunction *ko* 'when', the comparative conjunction *tej*, the complementizer *da* 'that', and the conditional conjunction *či* 'if'.

- (33) a. [...] da planët, skod an parhaja
 that planet.NOM.SG.M from.where he.SC come.PRS.3SG
 te mali princíp [...]
 DEF.NOM.SG.M little.NOM.SG.M prince.NOM.SG.M
 '[...] that the planet from which the little prince came [...]' (p. 19)

An unusual case of inversion in a relative clause can be found in example (34). Here, the uninflected relative marker *ka* is followed by a resumptive subject clitic, which should be sufficient for expressing the syntactic relationship of the relative marker (cf. §5.2.3 for more examples of doubled relative markers). However, in this specific case, the relative clause also contains the tonic pronoun *wonä* 'she', following the predicative construction *jë maköj* 'be the only one'. Example (36) shows that the use of subject clitics is not obligatory in this type of construction. If it is further correct that, in example (36), *za-me* 'for me' and *za-te* 'for you' are moved to the beginning of the sentences to contrast them with each other, then the appearance of both a subject clitic and its tonic counterpart in example (34) may serve the purpose of highlighting the subject.

- (34) Anö cí ja znan no rožo, ka
 and if I.SC know.PRS.1SG INDEF.ACC.SG.F flower.ACC.SG.F REL
na jë maköj **wonä** na svëtö [...]
 she.SC be.PRS.3SG only she.NOM on earth.LOC.SG.M
 'And if I know a flower which is the only one in the world [...]' (p. 29)

Examples for quotative inversion can be found in examples (35a–c).

- (35) a. "Hum! Hum", **an** mu rišpundal
 hm hm he.SC he.OC.DAT answer.PST.PTCP.SG.M
krej.
 king.NOM.SG.M
 'Hm, hm, the king replied to him.' (p. 37)
- b. "Ti si dan čüdni
 you.SC be.PRS.2SG INDEF.NOM.SG.M peculiar.NOM.SG.M
 braw", **an** ji
 animal.NOM.SG.M he.SC she.OC.DAT
 rëkal **wun** nejzad [...]
 say.PST.PTCP.SG.M he.NOM finally
 "You are a peculiar animal," he finally said to her [...]' (p. 60)
- c. "Bongórno", **an** mu rëkal **isi.**
 good-day he.SC he.OC.DAT say.PST.PTCP.SG.M this.NOM.SG.M
 "Good day," he said to him.' (p. 46)

Moreover, inversion seems to occur in contrastive constructions. In example (36), *za-me* 'for me' is contrasted with *za-te* 'for you' in the next sentence. In both sentences, the combination of *za* plus bound personal pronoun (i.e., *-me*

and *-te*) is placed in initial position, only preceded by a conjunction in the second sentence.

- (36) Za-me **ti** *ći* byt maköj **tĩ** na
 for-me you.SC.SG AUX.FUT.2SG be.INF only you.NOM.SG in
 světö. Anö za-te *ćon* byt maköj jä
 world.LOC.SG.M and for-you AUX.FUT.1SG be.INF only I.NOM
 na světö...
 in world.LOC.SG.M

'You will be the only one in the world for me. And I will be the only one in the world for you...'
 (p. 68)

It is interesting to note that in example (36), doubling of the tonic personal pronoun occurs only in the first of the two clauses. One possible explanation for this discrepancy is that the second-person subject clitic is more likely to occur with the future auxiliary than the first-person personal pronoun. This is because the form of the auxiliary is ambiguous in the case of the former, cf. second/third auxiliary *ći* but first auxiliary *ćon* (cf. Steenwijk 1992: 133 for the auxiliary paradigm).

In sentences with inversion, the following parts of speech have been found to occur between the subject clitic and the lexical verb: NEG, REFL, OC, AUX, and adverbials. Adverbials can occur both between subject clitics and verbs and between verbs and the associates of the subject clitics. Additionally, we find prepositional phrases acting as verbal arguments in the latter position. For further examples of the different word orders, the reader is referred to the examples given in §5.2.

5.4. Intermediate Summary

Before discussing Resian subject doubling as a case of language contact in §5.5, it is in order to give a summary of the findings so far. This is the purpose of the present section.

First of all, it is worth noting that although subject doubling has been described as optional in Resian (Sekli 2010a), at least in written language, it is far from a marginal phenomenon. We find repetition of subjects by the corresponding clitics in about one-third of the 1,500 sentences of *The Little Prince*. As for the phrases that function as associates of the doubling clitics, we find them to contain nouns (including substantivized adjectives), pronouns, and quantifiers as their heads (cf. also Sekli 2010a). Doubling of subjects containing nouns occurs regardless of whether they are modified by definite or indefinite articles, possessives, or demonstratives. Secure instances of doubling with personal pronouns are limited to the second- and third-person singular and

plural. Examples of co-occurring tonic and clitic nominative *jäs/jä* and subject clitic *ja* 'I', cf. (14), are rather to be explained as cases of dislocation. First, in these examples, the tonic pronoun is separated from the rest of the clause by commas indicating intonation breaks, and second, they translate French constructions with *moi*, which, according to Coveney (2005), are not equal to doubling constructions.

As regards the first-person plural pronoun, neither *The Little Prince* nor the secondary literature provides us with secure examples for doubling (Benacchio 2002; Skubic 1997; Steenwijk 1992). The repetition of the pronoun in example (16) mirrors the French original, which is why it is not a secure instance of doubling. However, it should be noted that this is the only occurrence of the tonic pronoun *mi* 'we' in the text. Doubling with second-person personal pronouns, on the other hand, is reliably attested in *The Little Prince*.

Doubling of demonstrative pronouns occurs in numerous examples, e.g., (17), regardless of their deixis (*isi* 'this', *iti* 'that'), gender, and number (apart from the dual). The same is true for the uninflected relatives *ki* and *ka*. Subject clitics occurring with these markers are co-referential with their antecedents. They resemble standard Slovenian resumptives used in relative clauses introduced by uninflected *ki*, except that in Standard Slovenian, resumptives are naturally limited to the oblique cases due to the lack of subject clitics in this language.

For determining the status of Resian subject doubling, examples with relatives are of special interest. As stated by Haiman and Benincà (1992: 172–73), relative pronouns cannot be dislocated. Thus, examples such as those cited in (18) provide evidence for the assumption that Resian does present a doubling language.

The other part of speech that is of special interest for the analysis of subject doubling in Resian are quantifiers. Runić (2018 with reference to Rizzi 1986; cf. also Brandi and Cordin 1989) argues that the doubling of quantifiers, cf. (22), proves that subject doubling in Resian is a genuine doubling phenomenon because quantifiers cannot be dislocated.¹⁵ In *The Little Prince*, we find instances of doubling with both universal and existential quantifiers; cf. (20, 21, 23). In the latter case, the neuter singular quantifier *malö* 'few' modified by the genitive plural *njyh* 'they' is doubled by the plural subject clitic *ni* 'they'. Therefore, this example shows that subject clitics in doubling constructions do not necessarily have to agree with their associate in number. Agreement can also be *ad sensum*.

¹⁵ However, note that this does not seem to be generally accepted since Poletto (2008: 45) states that universal quantifiers are more easily left dislocated than existential and negative quantifiers.

Doubling of quantifiers also includes numerals. In *The Little Prince*, it is attested with the numeral ‘two’.¹⁶ “This is of special interest because Resian (as standard Slovenian) has preserved the dual throughout all parts of speech apart from pronominal clitics. Accordingly, no specific dual clitic is available for doubling in this number. Šekli (2010a: 146) argues that the subject clitic used instead is the neuter singular form *to*. However, in example (24b), *dwa* ‘two’ is doubled by the plural clitic *ni* ‘they’. Considering that *to* also acts as an expletive in Resian (cf. Schuster-Šewc 1974), the question arises whether it does not rather have this function in the examples analyzed by Šekli (2010a: 146). Thus, Runić (2014: 11) interprets the clitic *to* in the example repeated in (37) (glossing and translation adapted) as an expletive. Due to a lack of studies dealing with Resian expletives, this question has to remain unanswered here. At any rate, what example (24b) shows is that subjects in the dual can be doubled by the plural clitic *ni* ‘they’.

- (37) [...] *dwa* *mlada,* *muž* *anu*
 two.NOM.DU young.NOM.DU.M husband.NOM.SG.M and
 žana, *to* *bilu* *šlo* *kopat* [...]
 wife.NOM.SG.F it.SC AUX.PST.PTCP.SG.N go.PST.PTCP.SG.N dig.INF
 ‘[...] two young people, husband and wife, had gone to dig [...]’

The large variety of different subject phrases that occur with doubling gives the impression that any type of phrase can be doubled in Resian. However, there are also parts of speech that do not seem to allow for doubling. In accordance with Šekli’s (2010a) findings, no instances of doubling with interrogative and negative pronouns can be reported from *The Little Prince*. Examples (38a–b) show the lack of doubling with these parts of speech.

- (38) a. *Du* *stā?*
 who be.PRS.2PL
 ‘Who are you?’ (p. 64)
- b. *Ma* *nišči* *nī* *bil* *se*
 but nobody.NOM.SG.M NEG.AUX.3SG be.PST.PTCP.SG.M REFL
 mu *vērwal* [...]
 he.OC.DAT believe.PST.PTCP.SG.M
 ‘But nobody did believe him [...]’ (p. 19)

¹⁶ In the sole instance of doubling with the bare numeral ‘one’ (24a), the numeral acts as a generalizing pronoun (see §5.2.3).

Thus, unlike, for example, in dialectal Dutch (cf. §2), subject doubling is much less restricted in Resian with regard to the parts of speech that occur with doubling. Among the semantic properties shown to influence the realization of doubling in some languages (cf. §2), none appear to inhibit the phenomenon in Resian. The lack of animacy, definiteness, or specificity of subjects does not prevent the doubling, nor did I find a restriction of the doubling to main or subordinate clauses. The same can be said about different word order patterns. At the least, subject-verb inversion does not inhibit doubling. However, it should be stressed that the present study was not designed to make any claims about the frequency of subject doubling in Resian. In a further step, it should be investigated whether there is a correlation between the frequency of doubling and the above-mentioned semantic and clausal properties.

As for the placement of subject clitics in doubling constructions, I have not found any differences compared to constructions without doubling. Subject clitics always precede the highest-ranking verb in the clause, including auxiliaries. The presence of subject phrases in the clause does not have an influence on this placement. Regarding this, clauses with subject-verb inversion are especially telling. In these clauses, subject phrases follow the entire verbal complex, while subject clitics remain in a position before the highest-ranking verb. Therefore, we can conclude that the placement of subject clitics is independent of the subject phrase (cf. also (2)).

5.5. Resian Subject Doubling as a Case of Language Contact

It has already been noted that from a broader Slavic perspective, subject doubling is an exceptional phenomenon. Apart from Resian, it only occurs in several other Slovenian dialects spoken in northern Italy (cf. Skubic 1997: 84). However, it is no accident that doubling is attested exactly here in Slavic. While standard Italian is a pro-drop-language (e.g., Dryer 2013), several Romance varieties of the area exhibit subject clitics, which they can in many cases use together with overt subjects. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the Slovenian dialects of the area have developed subject doubling as a result of language contact (cf. Skubic 1997: 84; Benacchio 2002; Šekli 2010a). As for Resian, the most likely source for the doubling is the Rhaeto-Romance language Friulian. Before the introduction of the Italian standard language, it had been the largest language of the area, which is, for instance, also reflected in the numerous lexical loans found in Resian (e.g., Steenwijk 1990). Concerning the phenomenon of Resian subject doubling specifically, Friulian is the most likely source because of the similarity between the two languages. For instance, in the Venetian dialects discussed by Benincà (2014: 43), the scope of doubling is much more limited. Therefore, the purpose of the present section is to compare the observed Resian patterns with the example of Friulian.

When contrasting subject doubling in Resian with the same phenomenon in Friulian, it should first of all be remembered that in the former language, the use of subject clitics is not obligatory. As mentioned in §4, we find many instances of pro-drop in Resian. In Friulian, on the other hand, subject clitics are almost always obligatory (e.g., Marchetti 1977: 224; Benincà and Vanelli 2016: 150). Moreover, subject clitics in Friulian “are well on the way to becoming further reduced to the status of bound affixes on the verb” (Haiman and Benincà 1992: 170 on subject clitics in Rhaeto-Romance and northern Italian dialects). Aside from the placement before the negative marker in the third-person plural reported by Gaglia (2010), they are always adjacent to the verb and, therefore, largely non-selective with regard to their host. In Resian, on the other hand, subject clitics exhibit a greater degree of positional freedom, as shown by the fact that they can be separated from the verb by tonic elements.

Another difference between the placement of subject clitics in Resian and Friulian doubling constructions concerns questions. While in Resian the subject clitics always precede the verb regardless of the clause type, in Friulian they do so only in declarative sentences (cf. examples 39a–b). In questions, on the other hand, subject clitics follow the verb while their associates can precede or follow the verb as is shown in examples (39c–d) (Haiman and Benincà 1992: 170).¹⁷

- (39) a. Jo o feveli.
 I.NOM I.SC speak.PRS.3SG
- b. O feveli jo.
 I.SC speak.PRS.3SG I.NOM
 ‘I speak.’ (assertive)
- c. Jo feveli-o?
 I.NOM speak.PRS.3SG-I.SC
 ‘Do I speak?’
- d. Feveli-o jo?
 speak.PRS.3SG-I.SC I.NOM
 ‘Maybe I speak?’

However, it should be acknowledged that while the restriction of Resian subject clitics to the preverbal position is generally very well attested in the investigated source, I have come across only examples (40a–b) as potential instances of doubling in binary questions.

¹⁷ Note that in the Gorizia dialect of Friulian, subject clitics are confined to the preverbal position (see Roseano 2015: 179). However, this is not true for the central and Carnic dialects adjacent to the Resian speech area (cf. the map in Frau 1984).

- (41) a. *Rive / Al rive (*Arrives / He arrives)
 b. Toni al rive / *Toni rive (Toni he arrives / *Toni arrives)
 c. Nissun al rive / *Nissun rive (Nobody he arrives
 / *Nobody arrives)
 d. Cui rivi-al? / *Cui rive? / Rivi-al? (Who arrives-he? / *Who arrives?
 / Arrives-he?)
 e. Il fantat k-al rive... / *Il fantat ke rive... (The boy that-he arrives...
 / *The boy that arrives...)
 f. Al rive Toni / *Rive Toni (He arrives Toni / *Arrives Toni)
 g. Al è masse tart / *È masse tart (It is too late / *Is too late)

As can be seen, there are no restrictions with regard to the elements that can be doubled in Friulian. Notably, subject clitics occur with interrogative and indefinite pronouns, cf. (41c–d), where no doubling is attested in Resian; cf. (38a–b). In the northern Italian context, a similarly extended use of subject clitics can be found in most Piedmontese dialects and in some Ligurian and Lombard varieties (Poletto 2008: 142). Elsewhere, the realization of subject clitics is more restricted. Based on an analysis of these restrictions, Poletto (2000: 140) proposed that subject doubling proceeds according to an implicational scale. According to her, DPs are doubled in a language only if tonic pronouns are doubled, and QPs are doubled only if DPs and tonic pronouns are doubled. Finally, if relative, interrogative, and cleft structures are doubled, doubling is obligatory with all the other types of subjects. The resulting scale is given in (42) (Poletto 2008: 40–41).

- (42) Pronouns
 Pronouns, DPs
 Pronouns, DPs, QPs
 Pronouns, DPs, QPs, Variables

Although Poletto (2000) developed this scale based on Romance data, there are no indications that she perceives it as restricted to them. Therefore, it is interesting to note that Resian does not fit into the hierarchy. On one hand, Resian shows doubling of relative markers (18) but not of interrogative pronouns (38a), and on the other hand, it exhibits doubling of universal quantifiers, cf. (22), but not with negative pronouns (38b). Poletto (2008: 40–54) acknowledges that there are differences in the proneness to doubling also between subjects belonging to the same rank on the scale. For instance, certain case forms of pronouns may be more readily doubled than others. Similarly, universal quantifiers appear with doubling more often than existential or negative quantifiers. Therefore, Poletto (2008: 44) suggests that doubling is more frequently realized with elements that

have more functional information. She then reformulates the implicational scale above as a probability scale: “the more an element has features, the more it will be prone to [...] double” (Poletto 2008: 44).

Applying Poletto’s (2008: 46) adapted scale to Resian does not, however, resolve the above-stated contradiction. The functional feature that differentiates QPs and Variables from each other in Poletto’s (2008: 46) scale is number. The Resian negative pronoun *niščí* ‘nobody’ has the feature number since it occurs only with verbs in the singular.¹⁹ The uninflected relative markers *ki* and *ka*, on the other hand, do not. Following Poletto’s argumentation, we would thus rather expect doubling with negative pronouns than with the relative markers. Therefore, Resian contradicts the proposed doubling scale. An explanation of this deviation, however, can be provided if the origin of subject doubling in the Romance languages and in Resian are considered.

Doubling in the Romance languages spoken in northern Italy is assumed to have originated as the result of language-internal developments (Poletto 1991). On the other hand, Resian adopted subject doubling from Romance varieties (most notably from Friulian) due to language contact. Accordingly, there may have been certain structural conditions in Resian that, for some reason, facilitated the adaptation of doubling with certain elements regardless of their place in the doubling scale. One such structure could have been exactly relative clauses. To express case with uninflected relative markers, Slovenian has developed resumptive pronouns identical to the clitic variants of personal pronouns. As can be seen from the standard Slovenian and Resian examples in (43), the uninflected relative marker *ki* is accompanied by the resumptives Slovenian *jim* and Resian *jin*, which both express the dative plural (for the standard Slovenian example, see Herrity 2016: 148).

- (43) a. Učenci, ki ste (Standard Slovenian)
 pupils.NOM.PL.M REL AUX.2PL
jin dali knjige, so
 they.OC.DAT give.PST.PTCP.PL book.ACC.PL.F AUX.3PL
 naredili izpit.
 pass.PST.PTCP.PL exam.ACC.SG.M
 ‘The pupils to whom you gave the books have passed the exam.’

¹⁹ Poletto (2008: 45) argues that the fact that universal quantifiers in northern Italian dialects are doubled by subject clitics in the plural while negative pronouns are doubled by subject clitics in the default singular shows that the former have the feature number while the latter do not.

- (43) b. Män tri vulkane, ka (Resian)
 have.PRS.1SG three volcanoes.ACC.PL REL
jin pücinan čamyn
 they.OC.DAT.PL sweep.PRS.1SG chimney.ACC.SG.M
 wsaki tēdan.
 every.ACC.SG.M week.ACC.SG.M
 ‘I have three volcanoes which I sweep every week.’ (p. 49)

Structurally, this pattern is identical to the instances of subject doubling with relative markers (cf. §5.2.3). Therefore, the reason why Resian adopted the doubling of relative markers but not of negative pronouns could be found in the fact that a corresponding structure already existed in the language. Hence, the borrowing consisted in the extension of the pattern to a further cell of the paradigm. If this explanation is correct, it shows that when formulating implicational scales or universals, it is important to consider the origin of the patterns at hand. If it is the result of language contact, other factors, such as the similarity of certain structures in the involved languages, might have played a role in the borrowing process.

In sum, we may conclude that it can hardly be doubted that subject doubling was introduced into Resian as a result of the prolonged language contact with Romance, most notably with Friulian. The fact that we do not find this phenomenon in Slavic languages outside the northern Italian contact zone, as well as the significant similarities between the two languages, clearly speaks for this assumption.

6. Conclusions

In this paper, I aimed at a comprehensive description of subject doubling in the Slovenian dialect of Resia with a focus on (1) the types of associates that occur with doubling (cf. §5.2) and (2) the place of the subject clitic relative to its associate and the verb (cf. §5.3). Based on the translation of *The Little Prince*, we can conclude that subject doubling in Resian is far from a sporadic phenomenon. Numerous examples of doubling in a variety of different contexts and positions have been found in the text.

The assumption that Resian has developed subject doubling as a result of language contact with Romance can hardly be contested. However, we also find interesting differences between the Resian and Romance languages spoken in the area. Notably, Resian does not fit into the doubling scale proposed by Poletto (2000, 2008). It has been argued that this can be explained by considering language-internal factors in Resian, which facilitated the adoption of doubling with certain elements. This highlights the importance of considering the origins of phenomena under scrutiny when establishing or contesting implicational scales.

Another conclusion that can be drawn from both Resian and, to a lesser extent, also from Friulian concerns the relationship between clitic doubling and the complexity of inflectional systems. It has often been assumed that clitic doubling is linked to the loss of nominal declension. The idea behind this is that clitic doubling develops as a consequence of the necessity to distinguish subject and object. However, as pointed out by Guentchéva (2008: 207–08 with references) with regard to object doubling in Bulgarian, syntactic relations can remain entirely clear without clitic doubling. According to her, the fact that indirect objects which are marked by the preposition *na* can be doubled in Bulgarian suggests that clitic doubling is not related to the grammatical function of the constituents. With its complex six-case declensional system, Resian seems to confirm the assumption that the rise of clitic doubling is not necessarily linked to the loss of declension (Šekli 2010a: 152). Based on Šekli's (2010a) suggestion that the realization of subject doubling in Resian is related to information structure, it could, therefore, be proposed that factors from this domain can play a role in the introduction as well. However, it must be acknowledged that, at present, we do not know the exact circumstances that induce the doubling in Resian. In this paper, it could be shown that the lack of animacy, specificity, and definiteness in subjects is not an inhibiting factor. However, we do not know whether doubling is more likely to occur when one of these features is present. Therefore, the next step in the research on Resian subject doubling should be to test whether semantic and pragmatic factors indeed play a role in the realization of the doubling. The most promising way to do so seems to be by conducting a large-scale quantitative study, which, however, at the current stage, is not possible because there exist no annotated electronic corpora of Resian.

Abbreviations

ADV	adverb	M	masculine
ACC	accusative	N	neuter
ATT	attenuative	NEG	negation marker
COMP	complementizer	NOM	nominative
DAT	dative	OC	object clitic
DEF	definite	PASS	passive
DU	dual	PL	plural
EMPH	emphasizer	PRS	present
F	feminine	PST	past
GEN	genitive	PTCL	particle
IMPERF	imperfect	PTCP	participle
INDEF	indefinite	REFL	reflexive
INF	infinitive	REL	relative
INS	instrumental	SC	subject clitic
LOC	locative	SG	singular

References

- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. (2017) "Clitic doubling". Martin Everaert and Henk C. van Riemsdijk, eds. *The Wiley Blackwell companion to syntax*. 2nd ed. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., 1–56.
- Aoun, Joseph. (1999) "Clitic doubled arguments". Kyle Johnson and Ian Roberts, eds. *Beyond principles and parameters: Essays in memory of Osvaldo Jaeggli*. Dordrecht: Springer, 13–42.
- Benacchio, Rosanna. (2002) *Contatti slavo-romanzi nei dialetti sloveni del Friuli*. Udine, Italy: Società Filologica Friulana, 63–103.
- Benincà, Paola. (2014) "Friulian linguistics". Rose Mucignat, ed. *The Friulian language: Identity, migration, culture*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 30–52.
- Benincà, Paola, and Laura Vanelli. (2016) "Friulian". Adam Ledgeway and Martin Maiden, eds. *The Oxford guide to the romance languages*. 1st ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 139–53. [Oxford Guides to the World's Languages.]
- Brandi, Luciana, and Patrizia Cordin. (1989) "Two Italian dialects and the null subject parameter". Osvaldo Jaeggli and Kenneth J. Safir, eds. *The null subject parameter*. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publisher, 111–42. [Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 15.]

- Breu, Walter. (2022) "Romance in contact with Slavic in southern and south-eastern Europe". *Oxford research encyclopedias of linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burzio, Luigi. (1986) *Italian syntax: A government-binding approach*. Dordrecht/Boston/Lancaster/Tokyo: D. Reidel.
- Cardinaletti, Anna. (1999) "Italian emphatic pronouns are postverbal subjects". *University of Venice working papers in linguistics* 9(1–2): 59–92.
- Cardinaletti, Anna, and Michal Starke. (1999) "The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of the three classes of pronouns". Henk van Riemsdijk, ed. *Clitics in the languages of Europe, Part 1*. Vol. 5 of *Eurotyp*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 145–234.
- Coveney, Aidan. (2005) "Subject doubling in spoken French: A sociolinguistic approach". *The French review* 79(1): 96–111.
- Čermelj, Lavo. (1938) *La minorité slave en Italie (les slovènes et croates de la marche Julienne)*. Ljubljana: Delniška tiskarna d. d.
- Dapit, Roberto. (2003) "Nastajanje krajevnih knjižnih jezikov pri slovincih v furlaniji". Ada Vidovič-Muha, ed. *Slovenski knjižni jezik—aktualna vprašanja in zgodovinske izkušnje: ob 450-letnici izida prve slovenske knjige*. Ljubljana: Center za slovenščino kot drugi/tuji jezik pri Oddelku za slovenistiko Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani, 301–12.
- de Saint-Exupéry, Antoine. (2021) *Te mali princip. Ziz dizinje od itogä, ki ga napisal. Vobračën po rozajanskin od Silvane Paletti anö Malinke Pila*. Neckarsteinach, Germany: Tintenfass.
- de Vogelaer, Gunther, and Annemie Neuckermans. (2002) "Subject doubling in Dutch: A dialect phenomenon in cross-linguistic perspective". *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 55(3): 234–58.
- Dryer, Mathew S. (2013) "Expression of pronominal subjects (v2020.3)". Matthew S. Dryer and Martin Haspelmath, eds. *The world atlas of language structures online*. Zenodo.
- Escher, Anastasia. (2021) "Double argument marking in Timok dialect texts (in Balkan Slavic context)". *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 66(1): 61–90.
- Fonseca-Greber, Bonnibeth Beale. (2000) *The change from pronoun to clitic and the rise of null subjects in spoken Swiss French*. PhD thesis, University of Arizona.
- Franks, Steven, and Tracy H. King. (2000) *A handbook of Slavic clitics*. New York: Oxford University Press. [Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax.]
- Frau, Giovanni. (1984) *I dialetti del friuli*. Udine, Italy: Societa' filologica friulana.
- Gaglia, Sascha. (2010) "The omission of preverbal subject clitics in Friulian: Methodology and constraint-based analysis". *Corpus* 9: 191–220.
- Guentchéva, Zlatka. (2008) "Object clitic doubling constructions and topicality in Bulgarian". Dalina Kallulli and Liliane Tasmowski, eds. *Clitic doubling in the Balkan languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 203–23. [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, 130.]

- Haiman, John, and Paola Benincà. (1992) *The Rhaeto-Romance languages*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Herrity, Peter. (2016) *Slovene: A comprehensive grammar*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge. [Routledge Comprehensive Grammars.]
- Holmberg, Anders, and Urpo Nikanne. (2008) "Subject doubling in Finnish: The role of deficient pronouns". Sjeff Barbiers, Olaf Koenenman, Marika Lekakou, and Margaret van der Ham, eds. *Microvariation in syntactic doubling*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 147–89.
- Jlassi, Mohamed. (2013) *The multiple subject construction in Arabic: Evidence from subject doubling in Tunisian Arabic*. PhD thesis, School of English Literature, Language and Linguistics, Newcastle University.
- Kallulli, Dalina, and Liliane Tasmowski, eds. (2008) *Clitic doubling in the Balkan languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, 130.]
- Koneski, Blaže. (1976) *Gramatika na makedonskiot literaturni jazik*. Vols. 1 and 2. Skopje, North Macedonia: Kultura.
- Krapova, Iliyana, and Guglielmo Cinque. (2008) "Clitic reduplication constructions in Bulgarian". Dalina Kallulli and Liliane Tasmowski, eds. *Clitic doubling in the Balkan languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 257–86. [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, 130.]
- Lambrecht, Knud. (1994) *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus, and the mental representation of discourse referents*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Madriz, Anna, and Paolo Roseano. (2003) *Scrivere in friulano*. Udine, Italy: Società filologica friulana.
- Malakov, Milen. (2017) "Rezijanski knjižoven ezik". *Balkanistic Forum* 3: 95–103.
- Marchetti, Giuseppe. (1977) *Lineamenti di grammatica friulana*. Udine, Italy: Società filologica friulana.
- Moseley, Christopher, ed. (2010) *Atlas of the world's languages in danger*. Paris: Unesco. [Memory of Peoples Series, 3rd ed.]
- Nadasdi, Terry. (1995) "Subject NP doubling, matching, and minority French". *Language variation and change* 7(1): 1–14.
- Poletto, Cecilia. (1991) "The diachronic development of subject clitics in North Eastern Italian dialects". *Working papers in linguistics*. Vol. 1. Venice: Centro Linguistico Interfacoltà, Università degli studi di Venezia.
- . (2000) *The higher functional field: Evidence from northern Italian dialects*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press
- . (2008) "Doubling as splitting". Sjeff Barbiers, Olaf Koenenman, Marika Lekakou, and Margaret van der Ham, eds. *Microvariation in syntactic doubling*. Bingley, West Yorkshire, UK: Emerald, 37–68. [Syntax and Semantics, 36.]
- Ramovš, Franc. (1928) "Karakteristika slovenskega narečja v Reziji". *Časopis za slovenski jezik, književnost in zgodovino* 7(1–4): 107–21.

- Ramovš, Franc. (1935) *Historična gramatika slovenskega jezika*. Vol. 7, *Dialekti*. Ljubljana, Slovenia: Učiteljska tiskarna.
- Rizzi, Luigi. (1986) "On the status of subject clitics in Romance". Osvaldo Jaeggli and Carmen Silva-Corvalán, eds. *Studies in romance linguistics*. Dordrecht: Foris, 391–419.
- Roseano, Paolo. (2015) "Suddivisione dialettale del friulano". Sabine Heinemann and Luca Melchior, eds. *Manuale di linguistica friulana*. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter, 155–86.
- Rosenkvist, Henrik. (2015) "The syntax and meaning of subject doubling in Övdalian". Kristine Bentzen, Henrik Rosenkvist, and Janne Bondi Johannessen, eds. *Studies in Övdalian morphology and syntax: New research on a lesser-known Scandinavian language*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 107–35. [Linguistik Aktuell Linguistics Today, 221.]
- Runić, Marija. (2014) *Issues in the syntax of nominals*. PhD thesis, Dipartimento di Studi Linguistici e Letterari, Università degli Studi di Padova, Padua, Italy.
- . (2018) "Slovensko-romanski jezički kontakt na primeru dve pojave iz rezijskog". *Slavia meridionalis* 18: 1–16.
- Schuster-Šewc, Heinz. (1974) "Sätze mit fiktivem Subjekt vom Typ os. *wono so deščuje* / ns. *to se pada 'es regnet'* und ihre Stellung in der slawischen Syntax". *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 19(3): 340–52.
- Skubic, Mitja. (1997) *Romanske jezikovne provine na zahodni slovenski jezikovni meji*. Ljubljana, Slovenia: Znanstveni inštitut Filozofske fakultete.
- Steenwijk, Han. (1990) "The nominal declension of Friulian loans in the Slovene dialect of Val Resia". *Slovene studies* 12(1): 23–31.
- . (1992) *The Slovene dialect of Resia: San Giorgio*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. [Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, 18.]
- . (1994) *Ortografia resiana*. Padua, Italy: CLEUP.
- . (1996) "Der romanisch-slavisches Sprachkontakt und die interne Differenzierung des Resianischen". Jože Toporišič, ed. *Kopitarjev sbornik: Mednarodni simpozij v Ljubljani, 29. junij do 1. julij 1994*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, Oddelek za slovanske jezike in književnosti, Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture, Znanstveni inštitut, 553–66.
- . (2005) *Piccolo dizionario ortografico resiano*. Padua, Italy: CLEUP.
- , ed. (1999a) *Fondamenti per una grammatica pratica resiana*. Padua, Italy: CLEUP.
- , ed. (1999b), *Grammatica pratica resiana: il sostantivo*. Padua, Italy: CLEUP.
- Stolz, Thomas. (2007) "Harry Potter meets *Le petite prince*—on the usefulness of parallel corpora in crosslinguistic investigation". *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 60(2): 100–17.

- Šekli, Matej. (2010a) "Zaimkovno podvajanje predmeta in osebka v rezijanskem narečju slovenščine : (s stališča jezikovnega stika s furlanščino)". *Treta makedonsko-sloveneška naučna konferencija: makedonsko-slovenečki jazični, književnini i kulturni vrski = makedonsko-slovenske jezikoslovne, književne in kulturne zveze (Ohrid, 12–15 septembra 2007)*. Skopje: Filološki fakultet "Blaže Koneski". Univerzitet "Sv. Kiril i Metodij", 133–55.
- . (2010b) "Furlanščina in rezijansko narečje slovenščine v besedilih". *Treta makedonsko-sloveneška naučna konferencija: makedonsko-slovenečki jazični, književnini i kulturni vrski = makedonsko-slovenske jezikoslovne, književne in kulturne zveze (Ohrid, 12–15 septembra 2007)*. Skopje: Filološki fakultet "Blaže Koneski". Univerzitet "Sv. Kiril i Metodij", 157–79.
- . (2015) "Rezijanščina: geneolingvistična in sociolingvistična opredelitev". *Poznańskie studia slawistyczne* 8: 199–213.
- . (2018) "Slovenski jezik v Reziji". Andreja Žele and Matej Šekli, eds. *Slovenistika in slavistika v zamejstvu—Videm*. Ljubljana, Slovenia: Zveza društev Slavistično društvo Slovenije, 82–94.
- Testelets, Yakov. (2003) "Are there strong and weak pronouns in Russian?". Wayles Browne, Ji-Yung Kim, Barbara H. Partee, and Robert A. Rothstein, eds. *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Languages: The Amherst Meeting 2002*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, 515–38.
- Usikova, Rina Pavlovna. (2003) *Grammatika makedonskogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Moscow: Muravej.
- Vogelaer, Gunther D., and Magda Devos. (2008) "On geographical adequacy, or: How many types of subject doubling in Dutch". Sjef Barbiers, Olaf Koenenman, Marika Lekakou, and Margaret van der Ham, eds. *Microvariation in syntactic doubling*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 251–76. [Syntax and Semantics 36.]
- Wandl, Florian. (forthcoming) "Pronominal clitics in the Slovenian dialect of Resia".
- Werkmann, Valja. (2015) *Objektklitika im Bulgarischen*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. [Studia Grammatica, 57; reprint 2015 ed.]
- Westbury, Josh. (2016) "Left dislocation: A typological overview". *Stellenbosch papers in linguistics plus* 50: 21–45.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. (1994) "What is a clitic?". Joel A. Nevis, Brian D. Joseph, Dieter Wanner, and Arnold M. Zwicky, eds. *Clitics: A comprehensive bibliography (1892–1991)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, xii–xx. [Library and Information Sources in Linguistics 22.]

Florian Wandl

University of Zurich

Department of Slavonic Languages and Literatures

Zurich, Switzerland

florian.wandl@uzh.ch