
SUBJECT DOUBLING IN FINNISH: THE ROLE OF DEFICIENT PRONOUNS

ANDERS HOLMBERG □ NEWCASTLE UNIVERSITY
URPO NIKANNE □ ÅBO AKADEMI

1 □ INTRODUCTION¹

In colloquial Finnish the subject can be doubled by a pronoun, as in (1a,b):

- (1)a. Se on Jari lopettanut tupakoinnin.
he has Jari quit smoking
'Jari has quit smoking.'
- b. Ne sai kaikki lapset samat oireet.
they got all children same symptoms
'All the children got the same symptoms.'

This doubling is typically used to express an all-new sentence about a familiar subject, often with a subtle 'believe-it-or-not' effect. That is to say, it typically has a form ofthetic reading (Sasse 1995). Often the doubled subject is focus-marked by the clitic *-kin* 'too/even'.

- (2) Nyt se on Tarjakin lopettanut tupakoinnin.
now she has Tarja-too quit smoking

The questions that will be addressed in this paper are, first, how is Finnish doubling derived, and second, what is it about Finnish that makes this form of doubling possible in this language as opposed to many other languages? More specifically, we will first discuss properties of the doubling pronoun, then properties of the doubled subject, then properties of the syntactic structure. It will be shown that the pronouns used for doubling are defective in a particular way, being marked for number but not person, a fact which is crucial for the doubling construction.

The paper includes some discussion of inter-speaker variation as regards doubling in Finnish. This is not, however, based on any systematic investigation, but instead based mainly on our own judgments and impressions of the linguistic situation in varieties that we are familiar with. A systematic investigation remains to be done.

2 □ PROPERTIES OF THE DOUBLING PRONOUN

Finnish has two series of 3rd person pronouns: *se* (SG)/ *ne* (PL), referring to things and in colloquial Finnish also to humans, and *hän* (SG)/ *he* (PL) referring to humans only.² Pronouns do not distinguish gender.

Of the two series *se/ne* are the unmarked doubling pronouns, while *hän/he* are at best marginal in that function.

¹ Special thanks to Satu Manninen, Valéria Molnár, and Hannu Reime.

² Use of *se/ne* to refer to humans is traditionally proscribed in Finnish normative grammar. The distinction between *se/ne* and *hän/he* when referring to humans is, however, grammatically significant and systematic in at least some varieties of spoken Finnish. In those varieties *hän/he* are used as same-subject pronouns in embedded clauses, while *se/ne* are used for any other function. The following sentences are thus unambiguous, in that variety of Finnish.

(i) Jari sanoo että hän/se tulee huomenna.
Jar says that he/he comes tomorrow
with *hän*: 'Jari says that he (Jari) is coming tomorrow.'
with *se*: 'Jari says that he (someone else) is coming tomorrow.'

- (3)a. ?Hän on Tarjakin lopettanut tupakoinnin.
she has Tarja-too quite smoking
 b. ?He sai kaikki lapset samat oireet.
they got all children same symptoms

The doubled subject can be 1st or 2nd person singular (with or without a focus clitic).

- (4)a. Se ole-n minä-kin lopettanut tupakoinnin.
SE have-1SG I-too quit smoking
 'I, too, have quite smoking.'
 b. Se ole-t sinä-kin ...
SE have-2SG you-too ...

It can also be a 3rd person singular pronoun, either *se* or *hän*.

- c. Se on se-kin lopettanut tupakoinnin.
 d. Se on hän-kin lopettanut tupakoinnin.
SE has-3SG he-too ... (or she or it)

With plural pronouns a problem appears, however. The 1PL pronoun cannot be doubled by singular *se*. Some speakers but not others accept doubling by plural *ne*, while all speakers³ accept doubling by the 1PL pronoun itself.⁴

- e. *Se ollaan me-kin lopettanut tupakoinnin.
SE are-1PL we-too quit smoking
 f. %Ne ollaan me-kin ...
they are-1PL we ...
 g. Me ollaan me-kin ...
we are-1PL we ...
 'We have quit smoking, too.'

The same pattern is seen with the 2PL pronoun *te*.

- h. *Se olette te-kin lopettanut tupakoinnin.
SE are-2PL you ...
 i. %Ne olette te-kin ...
NE are-2PL you...
 j. Te olette te-kin ...
you are-2PL you ...
 'You all have quit smoking, too.'

The 3PL pronoun, either *ne* or *he*, can only be doubled by 3PL *ne*.⁵

- k. *Se on ne-kin/he-kin ...
 l. Ne on ne-kin/he-kin ... (or Ne ovat ne-kin/he-kin ...)

³ More precisely, all speakers consulted so far (quite a random collection) accept it. As mentioned, a systematic survey remains to be done.

⁴ The example uses the colloquial 1PL form, which is homonymous with the impersonal form otherwise used in the passive (or impersonal) construction. It also has the colloquial invariant form of the participle. The doubling-facts are essentially the same if the standard 1SG form and the participle inflected for plural are used, apart from a certain stylistic incongruity.

(i) *Se/(*)ne ole-mme me-kin lopettaneet tupakoinnin.

SE NE have-1PL we-too quit-PL smoking

⁵ The example uses the colloquial 3 person finite verb form which is unmarked for number and the colloquial invariant form of the participle. The judgements are the same if the standard plural-marked forms are used.

(i) *Se ovat nekin lopettaneet tupakoinnin.

(ii) Ne ovat nekin lopettaneet tupakoinnin.

they be.3 they-too /they-too... they be.3PL they...

Consider first the variety which accepts doubling of 1PL *me* and 2PL *te* by *ne*. The facts under (4) then follow from (5a,b):

- (5)a. The features of the doubling pronoun must be a subset of the features of the doubled subject NP with matching values.
- b. The doubling pronouns *se* have and *ne* have number, SG and PL, respectively, but no person.

The subset in (5a) need not be a proper subset, so the doubling pronoun and the doubled subject may be identical, as when *se* doubles *se* (4c), or *me* doubles *me* (4g). Having singular number but being neutral for person, *se* can double 1st or 2nd singular pronouns (4a,b). It cannot, however, double any plural pronouns (4e,h,k), as the SG value of *se* does not match the PL value of the plural pronouns *me*, *te*, *he*, *ne*. The pronoun *ne*, having PL number but being neutral for person, can double any plural pronouns.

For the variety in which *ne* cannot double any other pronoun than *ne*, and more marginally *he*, we must assume that it is marked 3rd person in addition to PL. As such its feature values will not match those of 1PL *me* and 2PL *te*.

The difference between *hän/he* and *se/ne* is that the former are specified for 3rd person, and furthermore are specified [+human], while the latter are unmarked for person (with some variation regarding *ne*) as well as for humanness. We conjecture that this is the reason why *hän/he* are not good as doubling pronouns, not even if they double the same pronoun. They are too richly specified to be interpreted as non-referential, which is required if they are to double, i.e. share a theta role with an argument (see section 7 below).^{6 7}

- (6)a. ?Hän on hän-kin lopettanut tupakoinnin.
he has he-too quite smoking
- b. *He on he-kin kaikki saanut samat oireet.
they have they-too all got same symptoms

Assume that a category specified for person is a D, meaning that it is necessarily referential. Then it cannot bind another DP, without violating Principle C of the classical Binding Theory (Chomsky 1981). The only category it can bind is a referentially deficient category, i.e. an anaphor.⁸

- (7) Hän_i on itse_i lopettanut tupakoinnin.
he has self quit smoking
'He himself has quit smoking.'

Se occurs as a quasi-argumental pronoun as well, commonly in construction with extraposition, but also, marginally, as the subject of weather predicates. Alternatively (and preferably in the case of weather predicates) there is no overt subject in these constructions (see Holmberg & Nikanne 2002).

⁶ We are now ignoring the observation that *hän/he* are marginally acceptable as doubling pronouns (at least for some speakers).

⁷ [+human] alone does not make a pronoun referential: The generic pronoun *one* and its counterparts in other languages is [+human] but is not referential: *One can't stand up straight in this room* is a generic statement only about humans, not for example plants.

⁸ Another indication that *hän/he* patterns with the 1st and 2nd person pronouns, while *se/ne* do not, is that *hän/he* and the 1st and 2nd person pronouns have a special accusative form (marked by a suffix -t), while *se/ne* is like other nouns, having the same form for accusative and genitive (marked by a suffix -n). Furthermore, while *se/ne*, along with other DPs, have nominative case when occurring as objects of various impersonal verb forms, *hän/he* along with the 1st and 2nd person pronouns have accusative case; see Reime (1993).

- (8)a. (Se) oli hauskaa että sinä tulit käymään.
it was nice that you came visiting
 b. Nyt (se) taas sataa.
now it again rains
 'Now it's raining again.'

The fact that, in the doubling construction, *se* alternates with *ne* depending on the number of the doubled subject means that it is not expletive in the sense of lacking f-feature specification altogether. The fact that *se* occurs in the constructions (8a,b) indicates that there is a form *se* which is devoid of any f-features.

What case does the doubling pronoun have? In the examples shown so far, the case is nominative. This could be because the pronoun has the same case as the subject which it doubles, or it could be because it has no case, if nominative is the default form. This can be tested by picking a predicate which selects a non-nominative subject. For example, in the possessive construction in Finnish the possessor subject has adessive case (while the possessee has nominative, and no agreement is triggered on the finite verb). As shown in (9), there is variation regarding the pronoun: Some speakers do, other speakers do not, allow the nominative form *ne* to double an adessive subject.

- (9)a. Kaikilla lapsilla on samat oireet.
all-ADE children-ADE has same symptoms
 'All the children have the same symptoms.'
 b. Niillä on kaikilla lapsilla samat oireet.
they-ADE has all-ADE children-ADE same symptoms
 c. %Ne on kaikilla lapsilla samat oireet.
they-NOM has all-ADE children-ADE same symptoms

Necessive predicates are another class which require a non-nominative subject, namely genitive. Again, there is speaker variation: Some require the same case on the doubling pronoun, others allow the nominative form.

- (10) Se-n / se-0 pitäisi Marja-n lopettaa tupakointi.
she-GEN/she-NOM should Marja-GENquit smoking

Informally speaking, the doubling pronoun is more deficient in the varieties which allow nominative.⁹

⁹ Finnish has a class of predicates which take an experiencer argument with partitive case.

- (i) Meidän lapsia ei vielä väsytä.
our children-PART not yet tire
 'Our children are not getting tired yet.'

This argument cannot be doubled at all, neither with a partitive nor with a nominative pronoun.

- (ii) *Niitä/ *Ne ei meidän lapsia vielä väsytä.
they-PART/ they-NOM not our children yet tire

The reason for this is unclear. It may have to do with the fact that the verbs in question have a second argument, which may be implicit, referring to the causer of the state. In a singular doubling construction nominative *se* will be interpreted as referring to the causer, seemingly blocking the doubling analysis.

- (iii) Se ei Jaria vielä väsytä.
 'It doesn't make Jari tired.'

The partitive singular form of the pronoun, *sitä*, is analyzable as the expletive *sitä* (see Holmberg & Nikanne 2002).

- (iv) Sitä ei Jaria vielä väsytä.

This does not on its own explain why the plural forms in (ii) are not well formed, though.

(11) occurs as well (subject to inter-speaker variation):

- (11) Se on kaikilla lapsilla samat oireet.
SE has all-ADE children-ADE same symptoms
 'All the children have the same symptoms.'

Here the pronoun agrees neither in number nor in case with the lexical subject. In this case, then, it seems that *se* is used as a pure expletive (an alternative to the pure expletive *sitä*; see below).

3 □ PROPERTIES OF THE DOUBLED SUBJECT

The doubled subject cannot be an unstressed/unfocused pronoun (*mä* in (12b) is a colloquial unstressed form of the 1SG pronoun). With focus, either supported by a focus particle or by focus intonation, the subject can be a pronoun.

- (12) a.* Se on se lopettanut tupakoinnin
SE has he quit smoking
 b.* Se olen mä nyt menossasaunaan.
SE is I now going sauna-ILL
 'I'm on my way to the sauna.'
 c. Se on se-kin lopettanut tupakoinnin
SE has he-too quit smoking
 d. Se olen MINÄ menossanyt saunaan.
SE am I going now sauna-ILL
 'I'm on my way to the sauna now.'

This is arguably the only syntactically conditioned constraint on the doubled subject. Other properties follow from the semantic-pragmatic properties of the construction, that of it being athetic statement with, typically, a known subject. Doubling an indefinite subject is therefore often not felicitous.

- (13) * Se seisoo joku oven takana.
SE stands someone door behind
 'Someone is standing behind the door.'

This is not, however, a syntactic condition. In the right context the subject can be indefinite.

- (14) a. Se on taas joku jättänyt oven auki.
SE has again someone left door open
 'Someone has left the door open again.'
 b. Se voi semmonen auto tulla kalliiksi.
SE can such car become expensive
 'Such as car can become expensive.'

It can be a wh-phrase, moved to specCP (see next section).

- (15) Kukase on *t* taas jättänyt oven auki?
who SE has again left door open
 'Who has left the door open again?'

The implication is that the answer will name a person from a contextually established set of persons. Compare this with, for example, (16):


- (16) * Mitkä sienet ne haisee *t* pahalta?
which fungi NE smell bad

4 ■ STRUCTURAL PROPERTIES

Holmberg & Nikanne (2002) investigated another ‘multiple subject construction’ in Finnish, featuring the expletive *sitä*, morphologically the partitive of *se*, but formally a pure expletive.

- (17) *Sitä ovat nämä lapset jo oppineet uimaan.*
EXP have these children already learnt swim
 ‘These children have already learnt to swim.’

They showed that the expletive is in the spec of F, a position which in the unmarked case is occupied by the subject. Vilkuna (1987, 1995) and Holmberg & Nikanne (2002) have shown that the structure of the Finnish finite sentence is (18), where F = Finite. The finite verb or auxiliary moves to F. At least one XP must precede F (a property encoded here as an EPP feature on F), and at most two XPs can precede F, the outermost one, by hypothesis, in specCP.



In the unmarked case specFP is the subject, but it may also be another argument or adverbial, which in that case is interpreted as topic, while the subject left in situ is focused.

- (19) a. [_{FP} Jari on+F maalannut olohuoneen].
Jari has painted living.room
 ‘Jari has painted the living room.’
 b. [_{FP} Olohuoneen on+F maalannut Jari].
living.room has painted Jari
 ‘The living room has been painted by Jari.’ /
 ‘The one who has painted the living room is Jari.’

SpecCP is either a whP or a category with contrastive interpretation (Vilkuna 1989,1995).

- (20) a. *Mitkä huoneet* C [_{FP} Jari on+F maalannut]?
which rooms Jari has painted
 ‘Which rooms has Jari painted?’
 b. *Tämän huoneen* C [_{FP} Jari on+F maalannut].
this room Jari has painted
 ‘Jari has painted THIS ROOM (but not that one).’

SpecFP is not a designated topic position, though, because:

- (a) The subject filling it need not be a topic; the indeterminate subject in (21) is not a possible topic, not being referential, yet can be specFP.

- (21) *Kukatahansa on voinut kirjoittaa tämän kirjan.*
who ever has could write this book
 ‘Anyone could have written this book.’

- (b) The expletive *sitä*, obviously also not a possible topic as it is not referential, can also be specFP. Holmberg & Nikanne (2002) argued that it occupies specFP, on the following grounds:

- It immediately precedes the finite verb/auxiliary, except when
- it is preceded by the finite verb moved to C (for example in yes/no questions);

- It can be preceded by one and only one XP, which in that case is a whP or has contrastive interpretation.

The same holds true of the doubling pronoun *se/ne*: in the examples cited so far, for instance in (1), it immediately precedes the finite verb or auxiliary. (22a,b,c) show that it must do so, except when the finite verb or auxiliary is moved to the CP-domain, as typically in yes/no questions

- (22) a. **Se sinäkin olet nyt lopettanut tupakoinnin.*
SE you-too have now quit smoking
 b. *Oletko se sinäkin nyt lopettanut tupakoinnin?*
have-Q SE you-too now quit smoking
 ‘Have you, too, quit smoking?’
 c. *Saiko ne kaikki lapset samat oireet?*
got-Q NE all children same symptoms
 ‘Did all the children get the same symptoms.’

(23a,b) show that the doubling pronoun can be preceded by one XP, which in that case has contrastive focus (in (23a)), or is a whP, (23b).

- (23) a. *Sinäkin se olet vihdoinkin lopettanut tupakoinnin.*
you-too SEhas finally quit smoking
 ‘So you, too, have finally quit smoking.’
 b. *Milloin se on Jari ehtinyt olohuoneen maalata?*
when SE has Jari had-time living.room paint
 ‘When has Jari found the time to paint the living room?’

(24a,b) show that it can be preceded by at most one XP.

- (24) a. **Nyt se sinäkin olet lopettanut tupakoinnin.*
now SE you-too have quit smoking
 b. **Nyt sinäkin se olet lopettanut tupakoinnin.*

The conclusion is, therefore, that the doubling pronoun is in specFP, satisfying the EPP.


In the Finnish transitive expletive construction (17), discussed in Holmberg & Nikanne 2002, the lexical subject occupies a place between F and VP, where the exact placement of the subject in relation to other constituents in that *Mittelfelt* domain is basically free. The same holds true of the doubled subject; consider (25):

- (25) *Nyt se on (Jarikin) ilmeisesti (Jarikin) lopulta (Jarikin) saanut*
now he has Jari-too evidently () finally () had
*(Jarikin) kuvansa (*Jarikin) lehteen (*Jarikin).*
() picture-his () paper-ILL ()
 ‘Now even Jari has evidently finally had his picture printed in the paper.’


Furthermore, as in the case of the transitive expletive construction, the lexical subject is part of the focus of the sentence. Again, following Holmberg & Nikanne (2002), let us say that the finite sentence consists of three domains: (i) The operator domain, that is specCP, (ii) the Presupposition domain, that is specFP, and the Information Focus domain, that is PredP. As mentioned above, the subject doubling sentence is typically an all-new sentence. This effect is achieved by having the doubling pronoun check the EPP in specFP, leaving the lexical content of the subject inside PredP, and thus part of the information focus (the new information) of the sentence.¹⁰

¹⁰ This is not the only way to express an all-new sentence with a known subject. The construction (i) can have that reading as well.

Now consider the structure of the left periphery of the Finnish sentence again, where the finite auxiliary has moved to F and the subject is doubled by *se* in specFP.




The existing well-formed alternants are now derivable by movement of F to C, deriving for example, the question (22b), with the structure (27), or movement of the subject to specCP, deriving (23a), with the structure (28).



-
- (i) Jari on lopettanut tupakoinnin.
'Jari has quit smoking.'

In this case the subject is moved to specFP, checking the EPP-feature. Nevertheless it can certainly, in the right context, be uttered out of the blue, conveying all-new information. However, this will take a certain amount of pragmatic, inferential processing on the part of the listener, not required in the case of the information-structurally more transparent subject doubling construction



5 ■ SUBJECT TREBLING

The subject can be doubled twice by the pronouns *se* and *ne*.

- (29) a. Se se on Tarjakin lopettanut tupakoinnin.
SESE has Tarja-too quit smoking
 b. Sehän se pärjäsi Olli kokeissa mainiosti.
SE-hAn SEmanaged Olli exams-INE brilliantly
 'He did brilliantly in the exam, Olli did.'
 c. Nehän ne sai kaikki lapset samat oireet.
NE-hAn NE got all children same symptoms
 'The children all got the same symptoms, didn't they!'
 d. Ne ne meni Jari ja pojat katsomaan uutta venettä.
NE NE went Jari and boys look new boat
 'They went to have a look at a new boat, Jari and the boys.'

The pragmatic effect of the trebling is not noticeably different from that of doubling. See below for the use and meaning of the clitic *-hAn*.

The proposed analysis is that the first pronoun is in specCP, the second in specFP.

- (30) [_{CP} *se* C [_{FP} *se on+F* [_{PredP} ... Tarjakin ...]]]

Trebling makes use of the two spec-positions allowed in the left periphery of the Finnish sentence. Just about all the properties of the construction are explained by this:

- More than two pronouns are impossible, as shown in (30):

- (31) * *Se se se on Tarjakin lopettanut tupakoinnin.*
SESESEhas Tarja-too quit smoking

- The two pronouns cannot be preceded by a fronted verb.

- (32) * *Oletko se se sinäkin lopettanut tupakoinnin?*
have-Q SESEyou-too quit smoking

- Nor can a verb intervene between the two pronouns. This is consistent with the 'anti-V2' condition which prohibits V-movement to C when specCP is filled, exemplified in (33a,b), while (33c) is a well formed wh-question.

- (33) a. **Se oletko se sinäkin lopettanut tupakoinnin?*
SEhave-Q SEyou-too quit smoking
 b. **Milloin olet sinä Lontoossa käynyt?*
when have you London-INEbeen

c. Milloin sinä olet Lontoossa käynyt?
when you have London.INE been
 ‘When did you go to London?’

- The two pronouns cannot be preceded by a fronted XP.

(34) * Nyt se se sinäkin olet lopettanut tupakoinnin.
now SESEyou-too have quit smoking

- The first pronoun, but not the second, can host the clitic particles *-hAn* and *-pA(s)*. The particle *-hAn* can be loosely characterized as evidential, while *-pA(s)* can be loosely characterized as ‘contradictive’ (see Holmberg 2001), but their use for a range of subtle pragmatic effects extends beyond these meanings.

(35) a. Sepäs se on Tarjakin nyt lopettanut tupakoinnin.
SE-pAs SEhas Tarja-too now quit smoking

‘Even Tarja has quit smoking now, would you believe it!’

b. *Se sepäs on Tarjakin vihdoinkin lopettanut tupakoinnin.

c. Nehän ne saikaikki lapset samat oireet.

NE-hAn NE got all children same symptoms

‘You know, all the children got the same symptoms.’

d. *Ne nehän sai kaikki lapset samat oireet.

Like the question particle *-ko*, these particles are always cliticized to a category moved to C or specCP: a verb in (36a), an object in (36b) and a whP in (36c).

(36) a. Onpas Tarja löytänyt hienon puvun!

has-pAs Tarja found nice dress

‘What a nice dress Tarja has found!’

b. Samat oireethan ne on kaikki lapset saanut.

same symptoms-hAn NE have all children got

‘But they have all got the same symptoms, haven’t they?’

c. Missähän Jari on ollut?

where-hAn Jari has been

‘Where has Jari been, I wonder?’

The one property of the trebling construction which is not directly explained by the analysis (30) is that the initial pronoun does not have contrastive interpretation, otherwise taken to be a property of non-wh categories fronted to specCP (Vilkuna 1989, 1995). What this shows is that specCP is not a designated contrast-position – as indeed is also shown by the fact that it is the landing site of wh-movement. Instead, Finnish grammar makes available two positions in the left periphery of the finite sentence. The lower is an EPP-position, as discussed earlier. If it is filled by a referring expression, a rule of information-structural interpretation will assign ‘topic interpretation’ to it. The higher position is optionally filled. If it is filled with a referring expression (not a whP, for example), a rule of information-structural interpretation will assign ‘contrast interpretation’ to it. The doubling pronouns *se* and *ne* are not referring expressions (being deficient pronouns), and therefore are not assigned a topic interpretation in specFP, or a contrast interpretation in specCP.

6 □ WHAT IS SPECIAL ABOUT FINNISH?

Why is subject doubling of the Finnish kind not found in all languages? Presumably either because the other languages lack the requisite categories, i.e. deficient pronouns, or because they lack the requisite ‘structural positions’, however this is formally expressed. We will take Swedish as a comparator language, as Swedish has a form of subject doubling, recently

discussed by Engdahl (2003), but which is crucially different from the Finnish doubling construction.

- (37) a. Jari har också han slutat röka.
Jari has also he quit smoking
 ‘Jari, too, has quit smoking.’
 b. Pojkarna kunde inte dom heller öppna dörren.
the-boys could not they either open the-door
 ‘The boys couldn’t open the door, either.’
 c. Hon har nog hon också tänkt söka in till en konstskola.
she has PRT she too intended apply to an art school
 ‘She probably means to apply to an art school, too.’

Let us call this ‘Swedish doubling’ (although it is also found in the other Scandinavian languages). In Swedish, the lexical subject (the contentful part of the doubled subject) is in the higher position, while the lower position contains a pronominal double in construction with a focus particle, typically *också* ‘also, too’ or its negative counterpart *heller* ‘either’. The reverse order is not possible.

- (38) a. *Han har också Jari slutat röka.
he has also Jari quit smoking
 b. *Dom kunde inte pojkar heller öppna dörren.
they could not the-boys either open the-door

This means that Swedish has the requisite syntactic structure for subject doubling: There are two subject positions which can be simultaneously pronounced. According to Engdahl (2003) the positions are specIP and specCP. This cannot be right, though, as the higher member of the pair can be preceded by a whP, and, in a direct question, by a verb moved to C.

- (39) a. Varför kunde pojkar inte heller dom öppna dörren?
why could the-boys not either they open the-door
 ‘Why couldn’t the boys open the door, either?’
 b. Jag undrar varför pojkar inte heller dom kunde
I wonder why the-boys not either they could
 öppna dörren.
open the-door
 ‘I wonder why the boys couldn’t open the door, either.’

Much more plausibly the higher member of the pair is in a position corresponding to the Finnish specFP (see Holmberg & Platzack 2005, postulating such a position), while the lower member is in PredP, the information focus domain (see Svenonius 2002 on subject positions in Mainland Scandinavian).

This implies that the crucial difference between Finnish and Swedish is that Swedish does not have the requisite deficient pronouns. (38a,b) are ruled out because the pronoun in the high position is specified for person as well as number. It is therefore referential, and therefore not a possible doubling pronoun. We predict that the same would pertain to the Finnish pronouns *hän* and *he*. This prediction is only half right, as their use as doubling pronouns is marginal, yet not completely ruled out, as in the case of (38).

- (40) a. ?Hän on Jari lopettanut tupakoinnin.
he has Jari quit smoking
 b. ?He sai kaikki lapset samat oireet.
they got all children same symptoms

Finnish allows Swedish doubling, as well. In this case *hän/he* are just as good as *se/ne*.

- (41) a. Jari on hänkin/sekin lopettanut tupakoinnin.
Jari has he-too/he-too quit smoking
 ‘Jari has quit smoking, too.’
- b. Pojat ei hekään/nekään pystynyt avamaan ovea.
boys notthey-either/they-either managed open-INF door
 ‘The boys couldn’t open the door, either.’

The next section will present some thoughts on doubling as a syntactic operation, in light of these facts.

7 ■ THE SYNTAX OF DOUBLING

The question is what the relation is between the two members of the pair (or three members in the case of trebling) in the Finnish and the Swedish doubling constructions. Consider the following theory of doubling, specifically DP-doubling (doubling of an argument).

- A category *a* doubles a DP *b* iff they share a theta-role.
- Doubling is possible iff
 - *a* and *b* are copies (the case of A and A'-movement);
 - *a* is deficient
- Deficient pronouns include
 - pronominal clitics (the case of clitic doubling);
 - personless pronouns.¹¹

If *a* and *b* are copies, *b* (the lower copy) is usually deleted/not pronounced. But in some cases it is pronounced; this is the case of resumptive pronouns. One instance of this is Swedish doubling. In this case the lower copy is pronounced because it is in the (narrow) scope of a focus particle; a focused category cannot be deleted. It is spelled out as a pronoun since this is the minimal morphological representation of the argument, sufficient to satisfy the requirement of a pronounceable/focuseable form in the lower argument position.

This theory construes movement as a special case of doubling, the case when only the highest copy is pronounced. But movement can be viewed in several different ways. One is movement as copying: a copy of a category, e.g. a DP, is merged in a higher position (Chomsky 1993, 2000). Another hypothesis is that movement is, or at least can be, detaching a part of an already merged argument, and merging it in a higher position. This has been proposed as analysis of quantifier float by Sportiche (1988), and clitic doubling by Uriagereka (1995) and Kayne (2002).

The latter hypothesis seems attractive as an analysis of doubling by a deficient pronoun: The deficient pronoun and the doubled argument would initially form a complex category, which is taken apart, the deficient pronoun merging in a higher position, the lexical part staying within the PredP. In the case of Finnish it is suggestive that *se/ne* are also colloquially used as determiners (*se poika* ‘that boy/the boy’, *ne pojat* ‘those boys/the boys’); see Laury (1997). *Se* is also commonly used as a determiner with proper names. In (42), for example, *se* unequivocally forms a constituent with the name *Olli*.

- (42) Missä *se* Olli nyt on?
where SEOlli now is
 ‘Where is Olli gone?’

This suggests that Finnish doubling is derived by detaching *se* or *ne* from the determiner position of a subject in the PredP, merging them in specFP.

¹¹ See Cardinaletti & Starke (1999) for a theory of deficient pronouns, which, however, does not include personless pronouns as a special category.

There are some reasons for rejecting this analysis, though. First, not all of the categories which can be doubled by *se/ne* can take *se/ne* as determiners. A very clear case is the quantifier *joku* ‘somebody’ and the wh-word *kuka* ‘who’. As shown in (43a) (= (14a)) and (43b) (= (15)) *joku* and *kuka* can be doubled. As shown in (43c,d), neither can take *se* as a determiner.

- (43) a. *Se on taas joku jättänyt oven auki.*
SEhas again somebody left door open
 ‘Somebody has left the door open again.’
 b. *Kukase on taas jättänyt oven auki?*
who SEhas again left door open
 ‘Who has left the door open again?’
 c. **Se joku on taas jättänyt oven auki.*
 d. **Se kuka on taas jättänyt oven auki?*

Second, trebling by *se/ne* cannot be derived by detaching and re-merging parts of a complex DP, as no DP has two determiners *se/ne*. Instead, it would seem that trebling must involve copying, for example detaching the pronoun from a complex DP, merging it in specFP, and then merging a copy of it in specCP. Or, if the detachment analysis is rejected on the basis of (43), trebling could be derived by copying the subject, or just the f-features of the subject, twice. Alternatively, a deficient pronoun is part of the Numeration, and is merged either once or twice, subsequent to which the relation between the pronoun(s) and the lexical subject is established by an additional operation of Chain formation, possibly falling under the operation Agree of Chomsky 2000.

8. Degrees of deficiency

What we see in Finnish is a cline of pronominal deficiency: many varieties of Finnish have a personless, singular pronoun *se*. This *se* can double any singular argument, including 1st and 2nd person singular pronouns. (44) = (4a).

- (44) *Se ole-n minä-kin lopettanut tupakoinnin.*
SE have-1SG I-too quit smoking
 ‘I, too, have quite smoking.’

For some speakers the plural pronoun *ne* is also personless, hence can double any plural argument, including 1st and 2nd person plural pronouns. (45) = (4f).

- (45) % *Ne ollaan me-kin ...*
NE are-1PL we ...

For other speakers *ne* cannot double a 1st or 2nd person pronoun, and thus seems to retain a 3rd person feature. Yet it is capable of doubling other plural arguments, meaning that it is still deficient, not fully referential. Furthermore, some speakers have a *se* which is entirely f-featureless, thus can double a plural argument.

- (46) *Se on kaikilla lapsilla samat oireet.*
SEhas all-ADE children-ADE same symptoms
 ‘All the children have the same symptoms.’

However, the question is whether this should be called doubling at all, rather than simply the merging of an expletive in specFP. An observation that may have a bearing on this question is that there are other languages, for example Swedish, which have an expletive pronoun used in various impersonal constructions, but which cannot be used in a construction seemingly analogous to (46).

- (47) * Det har alla barn samma symptom.
EXPL has all children same symptoms

REFERENCES

- Cardinaletti, Anna & Michal Starke (1999). The typology of structural deficiency. In: *Clitics and other functional categories in European languages*, ed. Riemsdijk, H. van, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chomsky, Noam (1981). *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- — (1993). A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory. In: K. Hale and S.J. Keyser, eds., *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger* (MIT).
- — (2000). Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In: R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka (eds.), *Step by Step. Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 83-155..
- Engdahl, Elisabeth (2003). Med fokus på subjektet. In: *Grammar in Focus, vol. II. Festschrift for Christer Platzack 18 November 2003*, ed. by L-O. Delsing, C. Falk, G. Josefsson and H.A. Sigurdsson, Department of Scandinavian languages, Lund University.
- Holmberg, Anders (2001). The syntax of yes and no in Finnish. *Studia Linguistica* 55: 141-174.
- Holmberg, Anders and Urpo Nikanne (2002). Expletives, subjects, and topics in Finnish. In: *Subjects, expletives and the EPP*, ed. by Peter Svenonius, 71-105. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holmberg, Anders and Christer Platzack (2005). The Scandinavian languages. In: *The Oxford handbook of comparative syntax*, ed. by G. Cinque and R.S. Kayne, 420-458. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kayne, Richard S. (2002). Pronouns and their antecedents. In: *Derivation and explanation in the minimalist program*, ed. by S.D. Epstein and T.D. Seely, 133-166. Malden: Blackwell.
- Laury, Ritva (1997). *Demonstratives in interaction. The emergence of a definite article in Finnish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Reime, Hannu (1993). "Accusative marking in Finnish". In: *Case and other functional categories in Finnish syntax*, Anders Holmberg and Urpo Nikanne (eds.) 175-206. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sasse, Hans-Jürgen (1995). "Theticity" and VS order: a case study. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 48: 3-31.
- Sportiche, Dominique. 1988. A theory of floating quantifiers and its corollaries for constituent structure. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 425-449.
- Svenonius, Peter (2002). Subject positions and the placement of adverbials. In: *Subjects, expletives and the EPP*, ed. by Peter Svenonius, 201-242. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Uriagereka, Juan (1995). Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in Westren Romance. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26: 79-123.
- Vilkuna, Maria (1989). *Free word order in Finnish*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. Helsinki
- — (1995). Discourse configurationality in Finnish. In: K.É. Kiss (ed.) *Discourse-configurational languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 244-268.