

**SUBJECT DOUBLING IN FINNISH**  
**ANDERS HOLMBERG**

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  
 'He's quit smoking, Jari has.'  
 b. **Ne** sai **kaikki lapset** samat oireet.  
 they got all children same symptoms  
 'All the children got the same symptoms.'

The pragmatic effect of the doubling is not very specific. It is typically an all-new sentence but about a familiar subject, often with a subtle 'believe-it-or-not' effect. Quite 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

In the talk I will discuss the properties of this construction, and consider its consequences for a theory of doubling more generally. The construction provides strong support for doubling (particularly NP-doubling) as derived by movement. This, in turn, makes certain predictions which need to be tested. To start with I will sketch (A) the features of the doubling pronoun, (B) the features of the doubled subject, and (C), the structural analysis of subject doubling.

**A** The doubling pronouns are *se* (singular) and *ne* (plural). *Se/ne* are the 'neutral' 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronouns, which can refer to humans ('he, she, they') as well as non-humans ('it, they'). *Se* can also double a 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular pronouns (*minä* or *sinä*).

- (3) **Se** olen **minäkin** lopettanut tupakoinnin.  
 it have-1sg I-too quit smoking

Thus *se* as a doubling pronoun has number but lacks person. *Se* also occurs as an expletive but the doubling pronoun *se* is not expletive, since it has number.

**B** The lexical subject cannot itself be an unstressed, unfocused pronoun.

- (4) **Se** on **sekin**/\**se* lopettanut tupakoinnin.

Furthermore, the doubling pronoun has the same case as the lexical subject. This is clearly shown by (5), where the lexical subject has the quirky case Aessive.

- (5) **Niillä**/ \**ne* on **koululaisilla** taas vapaapäivä.  
 they-ADE/ they-NOM is schoolkids-ADE again off-day  
 'The schoolkids are having a day off again.'

**C** Finnish word order in the middle field is quite free, so that for example the lexical subject's position in relation to auxiliaries, verb, and adverbs in the middle field is unrestricted, except that it cannot precede the finite verb or auxiliary (just as shown by Holmberg & Nikanne 2002 in the case of the Finnish TEC with the pure expletive *sitä*, structurally similar to subject doubling).

- (6) **Se** (\**Jari*) on (*Jari*) nyt (*Jari*) lopettanut (*Jari*) tupakoinnin.  
 he has now quit smoking

However, as first shown by Vilkuna 1989, the left periphery in the Finnish finite clause is very rigid: There are two positions. The innermost one, immediately preceding the finite auxiliary or verb, checks the EPP, and is typically (but not necessarily) the subject, and typically (but not necessarily) a topic. The outermost one is a wh-phrase or has contrastive interpretation, again typically, but as I will show, not necessarily.

The subject can be doubled twice.

- (7) **Se se on Tarjakin** lopettanut tupakoinnin.  
 she she has Tarja-too quit smoking

There is every reason to believe that the two pronouns occupy the two left-peripheral positions. For one thing, the subject can't be doubled more than twice; see (8a). Furthermore, it can be doubled twice only if no other category is fronted; see (8b), with *nyt* 'now' fronted. Third, the higher pronoun can carry a clitic modal particle otherwise sitting on a category in C or specCP (in (8c) the clitic *-hän*); the lower pronoun can't).

- (8) a. \**Se se se on Tarjakin lopettanut tupakoinnin* .  
 b. \**Nyt se se on Tarjakin lopettanut tupakoinnin*.  
 c. *Se (-hän) se (\*-hän) on Tarjakin lopettanut tupakoinnin*.

The higher pronoun in (7) is not contrastive, though. This implies, for one thing, that the left-peripheral positions are not actually defined by Rizzian information-structural features. Instead, it seems that Finnish sentential syntax provides a template with exactly two left-peripheral positions which doubling can make use of.

Doubling is only one case where the same syntactic information occurs in more than one place in a sentence. Two other well known and well studied cases are movement and agreement. A third one is clitic doubling.

- (9) **Which city** did you go to <**which city**> ?

- (10) **Minä** ole-**n** väsynyt. (Finnish)  
 I-NOM be-1SG tired

- (11) **Lo** vimos a **Juan**. (Spanish)  
 him saw-1PL P Juan  
 'We saw Juan.'

Considering just NPs, other cases where the same syntactic information occurs in two places are anaphoric binding, control, and pronominal coreference. Where does Finnish subject doubling fit in this scenario? (9,10,11) differ from binding, control, and coreference in that the two terms in (9,10,11) share a theta role (and at least in (9) also case). In subject doubling, too, the two terms share a theta-role (and case), so it belongs with movement, agreement, and clitic doubling rather than with binding, control, and coreference. Take agreement to be when a head (T, C, an adjective, an article, etc.) has an unvalued set of nominal phi-features which are assigned a value by an NP in a local relation to it. Subject doubling does not involve agreement in this sense. The Finnish doubling pronoun is not a clitic, and there is also no case-absorption of the sort seen with clitic-doubling (at least in some languages; see the extra P in (11)). This leaves movement as the closest relative to subject doubling. If, furthermore, we adopt the traditional Chomskian dictum that a category with referential content (including valued phi-features) has to be first-merged in a theta-position, then it follows that the pronoun doubling the subject cannot be first-merged in its final position, and so must be the result of movement, where, assuming the copy theory of movement, more than one copy is spelled out. In terms of its communicative function doubling patterns with cases of movement which have the effect of rearranging information structure.

This makes two predictions: (a) Doubling should not be possible where movement is impossible, for example out of islands. This can be shown to be right for Finnish subject doubling, but whether it is true of all doubling remains to be seen. (b) Where movement is possible, doubling should be in principle possible as well. This is harder to demonstrate, since there may also be constraints, universal or language-particular ones, on the spelling out of copies, interfering with doubling.

## REFERENCES

- Holmberg, A. & U. Nikanne. 2002. Expletives, subjects, and topics in Finnish. In P. Svenonius (ed.) *Subjects, expletives, and the EPP*. OUP.

Vilkuna, Maria. 1989. *Free word order in Finnish*. SKS.