

To be one or to be many: an analysis of subject doubling in Finnish

BACKGROUND– Doubling phenomena involve multiple pronunciation of the same constituent in different structural positions. Given the redundancy they apparently lead to, an interesting puzzle is how the doubling category relates to the doubled element (or *associate*). Much work has argued that the doubling element is an agreement marker (Anderson 2005; Borer 1984; Franks 2009; Sportiche 1996; Suñer 1988 a.o.). In this view, surface doubling is the result of feature agreement between the associate and the doubling category. Instead, multiple spell-out approaches to doubling (Anagnostopoulou 2003; Harizanov 2014; Kandybowicz 2007; Landau 2006; Nunes 1999, 2004 a.o.) rely on post-syntactic processes to determine which occurrence is pronounced and whether it is spelled out in full or in a reduced form.

DATA– This paper presents an analysis of subject doubling configurations in Colloquial Finnish (CF) ((1)-(2)), a language that allows doubling of both lexical and pronominal subjects¹.

- (1) *Se on se-kin lopettanut tupakoinnin.* (H&N08: 327 (4d))
 3SG.NOM has.3SG 3SG.NOM-too quit smoking
 ‘He/She, too, has quit smoking.’
- (2) *Ne sai kaikki lapset samat oireet.* (H&N08: 326 (1b))
 3PL.NOM got.3PL all children same symptoms
 ‘All the children got the same symptoms.’

I propose an account that combines a multiple spell-out approach with a mechanism for chain resolution. I argue that this novel analysis derives not only the doubling instances in CF, but also the cases where the subject is pronounced only once, either in a low or a high clausal position. Besides providing insights from a phenomenon that has been examined only scarcely, the broader aim of this work is to contribute to the understanding of how subject doubling can be derived structurally.

ANALYSIS– The main motivation for a multiple spell-out approach (over an agreement account, for example) stems from the results of two syntactic diagnostics: quantifier float and agreement with conjoined subjects. Based on a survey I conducted, a DP subject in Spec,CP, an A-bar position, does not license a stranded Q like *kaikki* ‘all’ that remains in the subject’s base position. In contrast, A-positions such as Spec,F(unctional)P are appropriate licensing slots from where a Q can be bound. Applying this test to doubling instances reveals that a Q can be stranded in the low clausal domain while the rest of the subject occupies Spec,CP as long as a pronoun doubling the subject appears in Spec,FP.

- (3) a. [CP **DP**_{SUBJ} [FP **ne** [TP [DP **kaikki** **DP**_{SUBJ}] . . .]]]
 b. * [CP **DP**_{SUBJ} [FP AdvP [TP [DP **kaikki** **DP**_{SUBJ}] . . .]]]

The second diagnostic involves agreement with conjoined subjects. In Finnish, the agreement patterns of the verb in F vary depending on whether the coordinated subject is pre- or postverbal: when a coordinated subject comprised of singular DPs appears preverbally, the verb or auxiliary in F always displays full agreement. But, if a coordinated subject occurs postverbally, F may realize full or singular agreement. Elicited data shows that in doubling contexts the verb in F must bear plural morphology; singular agreement is impossible (4). I conclude that the doubling pronoun in Spec,FP is a true copy of the subject, as it leads to the same patterns shown by preverbal subjects.

- (4) a. Doubling pronoun V_{PL} [_{SUBJECT} DP_{SG} and DP_{SG}]
 b. *Doubling pronoun V_{SG} [_{SUBJECT} DP_{SG} and DP_{SG}]

¹Pronominal subjects can be doubled only if they are focused, either via adjunction of the focus clitic *-kin* ‘too’ (as in (1)) or focus intonation.

The analysis proposed derives the three configurations for subjects in CF ((5)-(7))². In addition to adopting the copy theory of movement (Chomsky 1995; Landau 2006; Nunes 2004 a.o.), I assume that (a) F has an EPP feature, which leads it to probe either the closest XP or the closest [Top(ic)] constituent to its Spec; and (b) all arguments are specified as either focused (if a [Foc] feature is adjoined to them) or non-focused (if they lack a [Foc] feature).

(5) Focused low subject

a. [*Tämän kirjan*]_[Top] on **Graham Greene**_[Foc] kirjoittanut.
 this book has.3SG Graham Greene written
 ‘Graham Greene has written this book.’

b. [FP *tämän kirjan*]_[Top] [F on] [TP ~~on~~ [_{PtcP} **Graham Greene**]_[Foc] [_{Ptc} kirjoittanut] [_{VP} ~~Graham Greene~~]_[Foc] [_V kirjoittanut] *tämän kirjan*]_[Top]]]]

(6) Non-focused high subject

a. **Graham Greene** on kirjoittanut *tämän kirjan*. (H&N02: 78 (12a))
 Graham Greene has.3SG written this book
 ‘Graham Greene has written this book.’

b. [FP **Graham Greene** [F on] [TP ~~Graham Greene~~ [T ~~on~~] [_{PtcP} kirjoittanut] [_{VP} ~~Graham Greene~~ [_V kirjoittanut] *tämän kirjan*]]]

(7) Focused doubled subject

a. *Ne* ovat **ministerit**_[Foc] ostaneet *uusia autoja*. (H&N02: 72 (3b))
 3PL.NOM have.3PL ministers bought new cars
 ‘The ministers have bought new cars.’

b. [FP **ministerit** [F ovat] [TP **ministerit**]_[Foc] [T ovat] [_{PtcP} ostaneet] [_{VP} ~~ministerit~~]_[Foc] [_V ostaneet] *uusia autoja*]]]

I propose a post-syntactic Chain Resolution procedure that determines which chain links are pronounced and their exact phonological shape. The basic intuition behind it is that a pressure to pronounce the highest focused copy (usually, the one in Spec,TP) competes with a pressure to pronounce an XP in Spec,FP due to F’s EPP feature. These interact with a pressure to pronounce only the highest identical copy in a chain. When the former are incompatible with the latter, a repair mechanism takes place. (8) shows a schematic outline of the steps that comprise Chain Resolution.

(8) Chain Resolution

- a. Chain Reduction mechanism: blindly marks each chain link for either pronunciation or non-pronunciation, according to a specific algorithm.
- b. Lexical requirements: based on the copies’ lexical requirements, each copy is marked for either pronunciation or non-pronunciation.
- c. Repair strategy: applies as a last resort under certain conditions.

I argue that Chain Resolution yields the right results for the three scenarios: in (5)-(6) it determines that only the highest subject copy is spelled out. In the doubling cases (7) it derives the pronunciation of multiple copies and also the fact that the highest occurrence is spelled out as a reduced form.

SELECTED REFERENCES– Holmberg, A. & U. Nikanne. 2002. Expletives, subjects, and topics in Finnish. In *Subjects, expletives, and the EPP* • Holmberg, A. & U. Nikanne. 2008. Subject doubling in Finnish: the role of deficient pronouns. In *Microvariation in syntactic doubling* • Holmberg, A. et al. 1993. The Structure of INFL and the finite clause in Finnish. In *Case and other functional categories in Finnish syntax* • Nunes, J. 2004. *Linearization of chains and sideward movement*

²For ease of exposition, some intermediate clausal projections are omitted in the representations (5b), (6b), and (7b).