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1 Introduction

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

(1) a. Se on Jari lopettanut tupakoinnin.
   \( \text{Se} \ \text{bäs} \ \text{Jari} \ \text{quit} \ \text{smoking} \)
   ‘Jari has quit smoking.’

b. Ne sai kaikki lapset samat oireet.
   \( \text{Ne} \ \text{sait} \ \text{kaikki} \ \text{lapset} \ \text{samat} \ \text{oireet} \)
   ‘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 of thetic reading (Sasse 1995). Often the doubled subject is focus-marked by the clitic –kin ‘too/even’.

(2) Nyt se on Tarjakin lopettanut tupakoinnin.
   \( \text{Nyt} \ \text{se} \ \text{bäs} \ \text{Tarjå-too} \ \text{quit} \ \text{smoking} \)

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

(4)a. Se ole-n minä-kin lopettanat tupakoiminn.
   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 lopettanat tupakoiminn.

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

d. Se on hän-kin lopettanat tupakoiminn.
   SE have-3SG be-too (or ohe 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 speakers accept doubling by the 1PL pronoun itself.¹

e.*Se ollaan me-kin lopettanat tupakoiminn.
   SE are-1PL we-too quit smoking

f.%Ne ollaan me-kin ...
   NE are-1PL we ...

g. Me ollaan me-kin ...
   we are-1PL we ...
   'We have quit smoking, too.'

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

k.*Se on ne-kin/fe-kin ...

l. Ne on ne-kin/fe-kin ... (or Ne ovat ne-kin/fe-kin ...)

---

¹ More precisely, all speakers consulted so far (quite a random collection) accept it. As mentioned, a systematic survey remains to be done.

² 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/fe ne ole-mme me-kin lopettaneet tupakoiminn.
   SE NE have-1PL we-too quit-PL smoking

² 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 tupakoiminn.

(ii) Ne ovat nekin lopettaneet tupakoiminn.
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, be, 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 be, 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/be 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/be 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).

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.

(6)a.?Hän on hän-kin lopettanut tupakoinnin.
be has be-too quite smoking

b.*He on he-kin kaikki saanut samat oireet.
they have they-too all got same symptoms

'She himself has quit smoking.'

Se occurs as a quasi-argumental pronoun as well, commonly in construction with extrapolation, 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/be 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/be patterns with the 1st and 2nd person pronouns, while se/ne do not, is that hän/be 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/be along with the 1st and 2nd person pronouns have accusative case; see Reime (1993).
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

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

Necessary 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.

In informally speaking, the doubling pronoun is more deficient in the varieties which allow nominative.

---

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

(i) Meidän lapsia ei vielä väästää.
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 väästää.
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 väästää.
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 väästää.
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.

‘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

b.* Se olen mä nyt menossasaunaan.

c. Se on se-kin lopettanut tupakoinnin

d. Se olen MINÄ menossanyt saunaan.

‘I’m on my way to the sauna.’

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 a thetic statement with, typically, a known subject. Doubling an indefinite subject is therefore often not felicitous.

(13) * Se seisoo joku oven takana.

‘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.

b. Se voi semmonen auto tulla kalliiksi.

‘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 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 nämälälapset jo oppineet uimaan.*

\[
\text{EXP have these children already learnt swim} \\
\text{‘These children have already learnt to swim.’}
\]

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.

(18)

\[\text{(CP)} \quad \text{FP} \quad \text{(C)} \quad \text{F} \quad \text{PredP} \]\n
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. \[\text{[FP Jari on+F maalannut olohuoneen].} \]

*Jari has painted the living room.*

b. \[\text{[FP Olohuoneen on+F maalannut Jari].} \]

*The living room has been painted by Jari.*

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

(20) a. \[\text{Mitkä huoneet C [FP Jari on+F maalannut]?} \]

*Which rooms has Jari painted?*

b. \[\text{Tämän huoneen C [FP Jari on+F maalannut].} \]

*This room has been painted by Jari.*

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.*

(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
   ‘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 SEbas finally quit smoking
   ‘So you too, have finally quit smoking.’

b. Milloin se on Jari ehtinyt olohuoneen maalata?
   *when SE has Jari have-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.

   *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 SE has Jari too evidently ( ) finally ( ) bad
   (Jarikin) kuvansa (*Jarikin) lehteen (*Jarikin).
   ( ) picture-bis ( ) 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.

\[(26)\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
CP \\
\qquad \begin{array}{c}
C \\
\quad \begin{array}{c}
FP \\
\quad \begin{array}{c}
se \\
\quad \begin{array}{c}
olet + F \\
\quad \begin{array}{c}
PredP \\
\qquad \text{sinäkin ...}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

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).

\[(27)\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
CP \\
\qquad \begin{array}{c}
olet + C \\
\quad \begin{array}{c}[Q] \\
\quad \begin{array}{c}
se \\
\quad \begin{array}{c}
F' \\
\quad \begin{array}{c}
t \\
\quad \begin{array}{c}
PredP \\
\qquad \text{sinäkin ...}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

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

(29) a. **Se se on** Tarjakin lopettanut tupakoinnin.

b. **Se hän se pärjäsi** Olli kokeissa mainiosti.

c. **Ne hän ne sai** kaikki lapset samat oireet.

d. **Ne ne meni** Jari ja pojat katsomaan uutta venettä.

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.

(32) * **Oletko se se sinäkin lopettanut tupakoinnin?**

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

(33) a. ***Se oletko se sinäkin lopettanut tupakoinnin?**

b. ***Milloin olet sinä Lontoossa käynyt?**
c. Milloin sinä olet Lontoossa käynyt?

\textit{When you have London.}\textit{INE have 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.

\textit{now SESE you-too have quit smoking}

- The first pronoun, but not the second, can host the clitic particles –\textit{hAn} and –\textit{pA(s)}. The particle –\textit{hAn} can be loosely characterized as evidential, while –\textit{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-pA\textit{SE} Tarja-\textit{too now} \textit{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 \textit{get 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 –\textit{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!

\textit{has-pA\textit{SE} Tarja-\textit{found nice} dress}

‘What a nice dress Tarja has found!’

b. Samat oireethan ne on kaikki lapset saanut.

\textit{same symptoms-hAn NE have all children got}

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

c. Missähän Jari on ollut?

\textit{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 \textit{se} and \textit{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.

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

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.

\[(38)\]
\[a.*\text{Han har också Jari slutatröka.} \]
\[\text{be has also Jari quit smoking} \]
\[\text{‘He has also Jari quit smoking.’} \]
\[b.*\text{Dom kunde inte pojkarna heller öppna dörren.} \]
\[\text{they could not the-boys either open the-door} \]
\[\text{‘They could not the-boys open the door, either.’} \]

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.

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

Much more plausibly the higher member of the pair is in a position corresponding to the Finnish specFP (see Holmberg & Plat Zack 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 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).

\[(40)\]
\[a.*\text{Hän on Jari lopettanut tupakoinnin.} \]
\[\text{be has Jari quit smoking} \]
\[\text{‘He has quit smoking.’} \]
\[b.*\text{He sai kaikki lapset samat oireet.} \]
\[\text{they got all children same symptoms} \]

Finnish allows Swedish doubling, as well. In this case hän/he are just as good as se/ne.
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.\(^\text{11}\)

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.

\[
\text{(42) } \text{Missä se Olli nyt on?} \\
\text{where } SE\text{Olli now is} \\
\text{‘Where is Olli gone?’}
\]

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.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Selebas again somebody left door open} \\
\text{‘Somebody has left the door open again.’}
\end{array}
\]

b. Kuka se on taas jättänyt oven auki?

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{who Selebas again left door open} \\
\text{‘Who has left the door open again?’}
\end{array}
\]

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.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Sele-1SG I too quit smoking} \\
\text{‘I, too, have quite smoking.’}
\end{array}
\]

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 …

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NE are-1PL we} \\
\text{‘We …’}
\end{array}
\]

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 featureless, thus can double a plural argument.

(46)  Se on kaikilla lapsilla samat oireet.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Selebas all-ADE children-ADE same symptoms} \\
\text{‘All the children have the same symptoms.’}
\end{array}
\]

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
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