

The syntax of the indefinite pronoun *nome*¹

ROBERTA D'ALESSANDRO AND ARTEMIS ALEXIADOU

Abstract

This paper examines the syntax of the indefinite pronoun nome in Eastern Abruzzese. Nome is syntactically intriguing as it appears in a subject position which is not available to other NPs. Moreover, it does not have any corresponding form in any other Italian dialect, except for Sardinian and some Marchigiano varieties. We first show that nome is a clitic subject, more precisely a weak pronoun subject in the sense of Cardinaletti and Starke (1999). Then, we draw a tentative sketch for the syntactic word patterns in EA. We argue that the properties and the behavior of nome support those views that recognize the need for specialized subject positions (Cardinaletti 1997, 2004).

1. Introduction

Dialects of Italian are well known for their wide syntactic variation. Dialectologists usually group Italian dialects into four main subgroups: the northern group, the central group, the upper southern group and the lower southern group (see Rohlfs 1972 and Ledgeway 2000 among others).

1. We are grateful to the audiences of the XXIX Generative Grammar Meeting in Urbino, the LSRL 33 at the University of Indiana, the International Conference on Comparative Romance Linguistics in Antwerp, and the Giornata di Dialettologia 2003 in Padova for the valuable feedback. We wish to thank Anna Cardinaletti and Adam Ledgeway for lengthy discussion on parts of the manuscript and for their insightful suggestions. Finally, we wish to thank two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments. The first author would like to acknowledge that this research was supported by the European Community's Sixth Framework Program/Marie Curie Intra-European Fellowship No 006833 'Abruzzese syntax'. For all Italian academic purposes, Roberta D'Alessandro is responsible for Sections 1-4 and 6 and Artemis Alexiadou for Section 5.



Figure 1. The Abruzzo region

In this paper, we are concerned with a dialect of the upper southern Italian group, namely Eastern Abruzzese (EA henceforth). The upper-southern group includes the dialects spoken in southern Lazio, Abruzzo, Molise, Campania, Basilicata, northern Apulia and northern Calabria (see Rohlf's 1972 and Ledge-way 2000). The Abruzzo region is located in the centre of Italy, and is divided into two main dialectal areas: the western area, which roughly coincides with the province of L'Aquila, where a central Italian dialect is spoken, and the south-eastern area, roughly corresponding to the provinces of Teramo, Pescara and Chieti, where a southern-Italian dialect is spoken. In this paper, we use the term 'Eastern Abruzzese' to refer only to the south-eastern group.

In this paper, we examine the indefinite pronoun *nome*, which is obligatorily expressed in sentences with a generic or arbitrary 3rd plural subject, as in (1):

- (1) *Nome magne*
 nome eat.3rd.pl
 'People eat'

Nome is a 3rd plural indefinite pronoun, which displays subject properties and is obligatorily expressed in sentences with an indefinite subject.² This obliga-

2. We use the term 'indefinite' in a broad sense, meaning generic or unspecified, arbitrary. In this paper, with 'indefinite' we refer to pronouns – and to constructions containing these pronouns.

toriness might be due to the necessity of distinguishing between the 3rd singular and the 3rd plural forms of the verb in the present tense, as we show in Section 2.2.

The paper is structured as follows: in the next section, we give a brief outline of EA syntax. In Section 2.3, we introduce indefinite constructions in EA. In Section 3, we list the properties of *nome* and show that *nome* is invariably used as a subject. We then present a short comparative overview in order to isolate the semantic properties of *nome*. In Section 4, we classify *nome* according to the classification of pronouns offered in Cardinaletti and Starke (1999). We show that *nome* presents all the characteristics of a weak pronoun. In Sections 5 and 6, we concentrate on the position of *nome* in the clause. Finally, Section 7 concludes our discussion.

2. Some notes on EA syntax

As mentioned, the description that follows mainly concerns the dialect of the provinces of Chieti, Pescara, and Teramo. It is worth underlining that we find considerable micro variation in Abruzzo: dialects of the same area can show morpho-phonological and syntactic characteristics which are very different from one another. We will not address such differences here, but we will limit ourselves to a case study, mentioning the variational differences only marginally.

2.1. Singular/plural morphology in EA

Almost all nouns in EA end in /ə/ (-e). Before all endings converged into -e, EA plural nouns underwent metaphony (cf. De Giovanni 1974, Rohlfs 1968). As a result, the stressed root vowel is now higher in plural nouns than in singular ones. This of course does not affect nouns that already have a high vowel in the singular to start with, e.g., 'file/file' (thread). An example is given in (2):

- (2) *lu* *bardasce* / *li* *bardisce*
 the.masc.sg kid.sg the.masc.pl kids.masc.pl

Metaphony affects also the verbal paradigm, as we will see in the next section.

2.2. Verb agreement in EA

The conjugation of verbs in EA follows the pattern illustrated in (3) (Finamore 1893, Giammarco 1965, 1985, Bigalke 1996):

(3)	Present tense			
	1st person singular	-e		<i>ji magne</i>
	2nd person singular	MET -e		<i>tu migne</i>
	3rd person singular	-e		<i>esse magne</i>
	1st person plural	-MET-eme		<i>nu magneme</i>
	2nd person plural	-MET-ete		<i>vu magnetete</i>
	3rd person plural	-e		<i>jisse magne</i>

It is usually the case that 1st and 3rd person singular and 3rd person plural coincide, therefore it is impossible to tell 1st and 3rd person singular and 3rd person plural apart. The singular/plural alternation is, however, visible in periphrastic tenses:

(4)	Past tense (passato prossimo)			
	1st person singular	so'	-ate	<i>je so' magnate</i>
	2nd person singular	si	-ate	<i>tu si magnate</i>
	3rd person singular	a	-ate	<i>esse a magnate</i>
	1st person plural	seme	-ite	<i>nu seme magnite</i>
	2nd person plural	sete	-ite	<i>vu sete magnite</i>
	3rd person plural	a	-ite	<i>jisse a magnite</i>

It is worth observing that the past participle in EA always agrees with the subject, as (4) shows.

2.3. *Indefinites in EA*

EA makes use of several distinct indefinite constructions³ (Giammarco 1965, Hastings 1994), many of which have an Italian counterpart. Like Standard Italian, EA makes use of the indefinite construction with *se*, as illustrated in (5):

(5)	<i>A sta case se magne e se bbeve.</i>
	at this house SE eats and SE drinks
	'In this place one eats and drinks.'

(5) corresponds to Standard Italian (6):

(6)	<i>In questa casa si mangia e si beve.</i>
-----	--

Leaving aside the question concerning the degree of exact overlapping of Italian *si* and EA *se*, we can claim that this construction is the same in the two dialects. EA also has other indefinite constructions, such as the one in (7):

3. See Fn 4.

- (7) *Si vvu' esse bbelle t' a di'*
 SE want.2nd be beautiful you ?⁴ must.2nd.sg
 'mbegna'
 make-an-effort
 'If one wants to be beautiful one has to make an effort.'

In addition, we find in EA the construction with a 3rd person plural marker, *anne*, exemplified in (8):

- (8) *A la Germanije anne magne li patane.*
 at the Germany.pl pl eat-3rd.sg/pl the potatoes
 'In Germany they eat potatoes.'

Anne is derived from the Latin form *HABENT*. However, *anne* in EA is not used as an auxiliary, but rather as a marker of plurality. Notice that the verb *ave'* (to have) in EA is only used as an auxiliary. The verb which is used to express possession is *tene'* (to hold). The conjugation of the auxiliary in EA mirrors that of lexical verbs (cf. Section 2.2), and thus the 3rd person of the auxiliary *ave'* is *a* (they have). The form *anne* is only used together with a 3rd plural *pro*, in order to specify that the number feature is plural. This form is only attested recently, and there is a preference for the use of this form by the younger generation. The older generation does not use it at all, preferring *nome* instead.

Examples (7) and (8) have the Standard Italian counterparts in (9) and (10) respectively:

- (9) *Se vuoi essere bello ti devi impegnare.*
 (10) *In Germania mangiano le patate.*

Importantly, EA has yet another indefinite construction, which is absent in Standard Italian, namely the *nome* construction, exemplified in (11).

- (11) *Nome magne tutta lu juorne.*
 nome eat all the day
 'People eat all day long.'

The use of *nome* is mainly restricted to the province of Chieti and some towns of the Teramo and Pescara provinces. Variants of this form include *ome*, *dome*, *nume* (cf. Giammarco 1985), and *omme* (Manzini and Savoia 2005b). It is etymologically related to Latin *UNUS HOMO*. Despite the fact that *nome* has no corresponding form in modern Standard Italian (but cf. old Tuscan *uom dice*,

4. This *a* is used in several contexts in EA. It is not clear what guides its distribution.

'people say'), there are some Italian dialects, such as Sardinian, where a parallel form is attested. Moreover, *nome* has a corresponding French form ('*on*') and a Catalan one: *hom* (cf. Catalan *home* < *HOMINEM* 'man'). In the next section, we examine some of the common characteristics among these etymologically related pronouns.

3. *Nome* and its correlates

The form *nome* derives from Latin *UNUS HOMO* ('a man'). The uses of *nome* are, however, quite different from the uses of Latin *HOMO*, and so are also the syntactic properties of the two lexical items under examination. In this section, we provide an overview of the syntactic and semantic characteristics of *HOMO* and its derivatives: old Italian *omo* and *om*, modern Italian *uomo/l'uomo*, French *homme* and *on*, Sardinian *omine* and *omu*, and EA *ommene* and *nome*, in order to identify the underlying common semantic properties of these forms. We leave aside the Germanic *man* pronouns, which present a different semantic and syntactic behaviour. The reader is addressed to Kratzer (2000), Egerland (2003) and van Bergen (2003) for a detailed description of *man* pronouns in German, Swedish, and Old English respectively.

3.1. *HOMO*

The Latin word *HOMO* had several uses. It was mainly used to define 'a human being', as opposed to *vir*, which was the specialized form for 'man'. This use is exemplified in (12):

- (12) *Homo homini lupus.*
 homo.Nom homo.Dat wolf.Nom
 'The Man is an enemy for the man'

Moreover, *HOMO* could be used with a specific reference, to indicate a person who was already introduced in the discourse. This use is shown in (13):

- (13) *Collocari iussit hominem in aureo lecto.*
 put.inf ordered.past.pf.3rd.sg homo.Acc in golden bed
 'He made the man lay in a golden bed.' [Cicero in Castiglioni and Mariotti 1966]

'The man' in (13) is a specific man, which was already introduced in the discourse.

Latin *HOMO* could appear in any DP position. It could be used as a subject (14), as an object (15) and as an indirect object (16):

- (14) *Homo homini lupus.*
 homo.Nom homo.Dat wolf.Nom
 ‘The man is an enemy to the man.’/‘People are enemies of each other.’
- (15) *Tollere hominem ex homine.*
 take-away homo.Acc from homo.Abl
 ‘Take away the human nature from the man.’ [Cicero, in Castiglioni and Mariotti 1966]
- (16) *Minucius homini respondit.*
 Minucius homo.Dat replied
 ‘Minucius replied to the man.’

HOMO always triggered 3rd person singular agreement, even when used in the sense of ‘people’. Several Romance forms are derived from Latin *HOMO*. Some of them have kept the generic ‘human being’ reading, like Italian *l’uomo* and French *homme* (from the accusative *HOMINEM*). In other cases, the reduced forms derived from nominative *HOMO*, like Italian *omo* and French *on*, are not generic DPs but rather behave like arbitrary-impersonal pronouns, that is, they refer to an unspecified person, but not to the ‘human being’ (Cinque 1988, Egerland 2003, Welton-Lair, 1999). *Nome* is a further development of Latin *HOMO*. It has acquired a syntactic characterization that does not belong to any of the antecedent forms, together with a semantic specialization for exclusiveness, which also does not derive from the Latin (nor Old Italian) form. We shall return to *nome* in Section 3.9.

3.2. Old Italian *omo*

Omo is the direct outcome of Latin *HOMO*. Old Italian made large use of this item, which was used both as a DP meaning ‘the human being’ (17) and as an indefinite⁵ DP (18). *Omo* could appear in old Italian in both the diphthongal form *uomo* and in the non diphthongal form *omo*.

- (17) ... *che ciascheduna cosa la quale l’uomo fa* ...
 that each thing the which the-omo does
 ‘... that each thing that a man does’
 [Boccaccio, Decameron, Giornata prima, Novella prima, 2]

5. Generic-indefinites receive an existential reading under some conditions, as shown by Cinque (1988) and Cabredo-Hofherr (2002) among others. We do not draw a distinction between the generic (meaning universally quantified) and the arbitrary (meaning existentially quantified) readings of *HOMO* and its correlates, as the generic-arbitrary alternation is available for all pronouns of this sort (see Kratzer 1999, Cabredo-Hofherr 2002).

- (18) ... *com'om che ten lo foco*
 like omo that holds the fire
 'like a man who has fire in himself'
 [Jacopo da Lentini, *Meravigliosamente*, stanza VI, v. 29, ~1233–1240]

Omo could appear in subject position, as exemplified in both (17) and (18), in object position and in indirect object position, as shown in (19) and (20) respectively:

- (19) *El basilisco serpente uccide om col vedere.*
 the basilisk snake kills omo with-the sight
 'The basilisk kills people with its sight.'
 [Iacopone da Todi, in Battaglia (1981)]
- (20) ... *Ben sembra grave: non sono ad om contata.*
 well seems serious not am at omo told
 'It seems very serious: I am not told to anybody.'
 [Laude Cortonesi XXXV, in Battaglia (1981)]

The form *omo*, thus, kept the 'human being' reading that Latin *HOMO* used to have, and developed an additional indefinite meaning.

3.3. Italian l'uomo

L'uomo in Italian has exactly the same meanings that *HOMO* used to have in Latin. It can be used as a generic NP, meaning the human being, as shown in (21).

- (21) *L'uomo ha grandi capacità.*
 the-man has great abilities
 'The man has great abilities.'

It can also be used with a specific referent, to mean 'our man', 'the man we are talking about':

- (22) *L'uomo entrò e si sedette accanto a me.*
 the-man entered and sat next to me
 'The man came in and sat next to me.'

In (22), *l'uomo* is a specific man already mentioned in the discourse. It cannot mean 'some man', or 'somebody'. In that case, the form we would use is *un uomo*, or *una persona*. The form *un uomo*, with an indefinite article, would need to be discussed in more details. The discussion of definite and indefinite articles would however take us too far afield, and therefore we leave it aside.

As a full DP, *l'uomo* can appear in any DP position. It can appear as a subject, as shown in (22), as an object (23) and as an indirect object, as shown in (24):

- (23) *Il buco dell' ozono minaccia l'uomo.*
the hole of-the ozone threatens the-man
'The ozone hole threatens the man.'
- (24) *Questa scoperta suggerisce all' uomo dove cercare il proprio futuro.*
this discovery suggests to-the man where find the
own future
'This discovery indicates to the man where to look for his own future.'

L'uomo, in Italian, is thus the exact semantic counterpart of Latin *HOMO*.

3.4. French *homme*

Latin *HOMO* has developed into two different forms in modern French: The full NP *homme* and the clitic pronoun *on*, from different case forms, the former from the accusative and the latter from the nominative. The former means 'human being' or refers to a specific person. It can appear in any DP position and does not convey a generic-indefinite reading. The latter is an indefinite pronoun, which has developed into a first person plural pronoun in modern spoken French. It is worth noting that *on* can be also used with 1st and 2nd singular or plural reference.

The full form *l'homme* can convey a 'human being' meaning, (25), as well as identify a specific man, (26):

- (25) *L'homme est un animal social.*
the-man is an animal social
'Man is a sociable animal.'
- (26) *L'homme est entré et (il) s'est assis a côté de moi.*
the-man is entered and SE-is sat at side of me
'The man came in and sat next to me.'

Thus, *l'homme* also keeps the same meanings that Latin *HOMO* used to have. The interesting fact about French is that it has developed a parallel form, which conveys the generic-indefinite reading. This form is *on*, which we discuss in detail the next section.

3.5. French *on*

French *on* is an indefinite pronoun, etymologically derived from Latin *HOMO*. It bears a generic-indefinite meaning, as (27) shows, but it can also be used with a 1st person plural meaning, as in (28) (see Kayne 1972, 1975):⁶

- (27) *On ne me fera jamais croire cela.*
 on not me make.fut never believe that
 'Nobody will ever convince me of that.'
- (28) *On a bien mangé dans ce restaurant.*
 on has well eaten in that restaurant
 'We have eaten well in that restaurant.'

Interestingly, *on* is only used as a subject (Grevisse 1986, Le Petit Robert 1993), as this reflects its origin as a nominative form, which makes it different from Latin *HOMO/HOMINEM* and French *l'homme*.

3.6. Sardinian *omine*

Sardinian (*s'*) *omine* has the same use as Latin *HOMO*, Italian *l'uomo* and French *l'homme*. It can be used with the meaning of 'the human being', as in (29), and to identify a specific referent (30):

- (29) *S'omine est omine si fachet su chi devet fachere.*
 the-omine is omine if does what that must do
 'The man is a man if he does what he has to do.' [Ditzionariu.org]
- (30) *S'omine est intrau e s'è sezziru accanto.*
 the-omine is entered and SE-is sat aside
 'The man entered and sat next to me.'

The generic-indefinite meaning is instead conveyed by the form *omo*.

3.7. Sardinian *omu*

Sardinian has a form which is directly linked to Latin *HOMO* and which conveys the generic-indefinite reading. Such form, *omu*, is always used as a subject (Francesca Biggio, p.c.) and is 3rd person plural:

6. The inclusive reading of indefinite pronouns is another well-known fact that interests French *on* as well as Swedish *man* and Italian *si*. The reader is referred to Egerland (2003) and D'Alessandro (2004) for this issue.

- (31) *Omu nanta ki proiri.*
 omu say.3rd.pl that rain.fut
 'They say that it will rain.'

Omu is 3rd person plural, and as such it is in competition with 3rd plural arbitrary *pro*. This is leading to the disappearing of *omu* as an arbitrary pronoun. The sentence in (31) is more often uttered as (32):

- (32) *Naki (=nanta ki) proiri.*
 say.3rd.pl-that rain.fut
 'They say that it will rain.'

Omu is very likely to be disappearing because of the presence of an arbitrary *pro* in the grammar that conveys the same meaning. According to Jaeggli (1986), in fact, if a language has a full pronoun and a corresponding empty one, it will always select the empty form to convey the generic-indefinite meaning.

3.8. EA l'ommene

EA also has a full NP form descending from *HOMO*. This form, (*l'*) *ommene*, is parallel to Latin *HOMO* in its accusative form (*hominem*). In (33), *l'ommene* has the 'human being' meaning:

- (33) *L'ommene jè 'na cosa triste.*
 the-ommene is a thing sad
 'Mankind is a difficult issue.'

In (34), on the other hand, *l'ommene* refers to a specific man, already introduced in the discourse. However, the demonstrative adjective *chille* is necessary to license this interpretation:

- (34) *(chil)L'ommene a ndrate e s'a 'ssittate.*
 that-the-ommene has entered and SE-has sat
 'The man entered and sat down.'

In EA, *l'ommene* can appear in subject position (33)–(34), as well as in object (35) and indirect object position (36):

- (35) *So viste l'ommene dell' atra sere.*
 am seen the-man of-the other evening
 'I saw the man whom I met the other evening.'

- (36) *Le so ditte a chill'ommene.*
 it.Acc am said to that-man
 'I said it to that man'

L'ommene is hence a full DP, which has a full DP distribution. In what follows, we shall address the syntax-semantics of the pronoun *nome*, which presents an exceptional distributional pattern when compared to the other EA DPs.

In this section, we have seen that *nome* has several corresponding forms in other languages. Some of these forms, like French (*l'*)*homme*, Latin *HOMO* and Italian (*l'*)*uomo*, may appear as subjects, objects, or indirect objects in the clause. These forms have a 'human being' or a definite NP reading. Some other forms, such as Sardinian *omu* and French *on*, have a more restricted distribution and a generic/indefinite reading. While Sardinian *omu*, just like EA *nome*, identifies a plural reference group that excludes the speaker and requires plural inflection on the verb, French *on* may have an inclusive ('we') reading, and requires singular inflection on the verb. It should be noticed that both singular (like *on*) and plural (like *omu*) pronouns may identify groups of people, i.e., may be semantically plural. Obviously, semantic plurality does not entail syntactic plurality.

4. Abruzzese *nome*

Like Sardinian, Abruzzese has an indefinite pronoun: *nome*. We shall list its phonological, syntactic, and semantic properties in the remainder of the paper.

4.1. Prosodic properties of *nome*

Nome is a disyllabic item. It can form a single prosodic unit with adjacent elements, as in (37):

- (37) *L'a* *nome ditte*.⁷
 it-have.3rd.sg/pl nome said
 'They said that.'

This is not possible with full pronouns, like *esse* (he/she), as shown in (38):

- (38) #*Esse l'a* *ditte*
 he it-has.3rd.sg/pl said
 'He said that'

For (38) to be grammatical, *esse* needs to be stressed, as in (39):

- (39) *Esse l'a ditte*.
 he it-has said
 'He said that.'

7. We indicate the syllable that bears the main stress in bold.

(39) shows that *esse* does not form a single prosodic unit with adjacent elements, while *nome* does. *Nome* is therefore a weak phonological element.

4.2. Semantic properties of *nome*

Nome is an exclusive pronoun, inasmuch as it can never refer to the speaker. To be more precise, the speaker can never be among the referents of *nome*. By way of example, let us consider the following sentence:

- (40) *A sta case nome magne bbone.*
 at this house nome eat well
 ‘They eat well in this place.’

Despite the adverbial ‘in this place, which would force an inclusive reading of the pronoun, *nome* in (40) may never include the speaker. In other words, (40) may only mean ‘They/One eat/s well in this place’, while it can never mean ‘We eat well in this place’.

This exclusive reading is particularly relevant because of the *nome-anne* complementary distribution issue, exemplified in (43). When a 3rd person plural arbitrary *pro*, which is by definition an exclusive pronoun, is present in the clause, the form *anne* is used as a plural marker on the verb. The verb in EA, as we saw in (3), does not differentiate between a 3rd singular and a 3rd plural form, and detecting the presence of an arbitrary plural *pro* would be impossible without a plural marker that tells us that the verb is plural. For example, if we compare the sentences in (41) and (42), we see that they have exactly the same meaning:

- (41) *A la Germanie nome magne’ li patane.*
 at the Germany nome ate the potatoes
 ‘In Germany people used to eat potatoes.’
- (42) *A la Germanie pro anne magne’ li patane.*
 at the Germany pro anne ate the potatoes
 ‘In Germany people used to eat potatoes.’

Nome and *anne* cannot occur together, as (43) shows.

- (43) a. **A la Germanie nome anne magne’ li patane.*
 b. **A la Germanie anne nome magne’ li patane.*
 at the Germany nome/anne ate the potatoes
 ‘In Germany people used to eat potatoes.’

This indirectly suggests that *nome* and *anne*, or *nome* and arbitrary *pro*, are in competition. If *anne* is an inflection marker, there is no reason why, in fact, it

should not be able to co-occur with a 3rd person pronoun. EA, like all other Romance languages, allows the double specification of *phi*-features on the verb and on the pronoun, as (44) shows:

- (44) *Tu si bbelle.*
 you.2nd.sg are.2nd.sg beautiful
 'You are beautiful.'

Hence, the fact that *nome* and *anne* cannot co-occur suggests that they are in competition for the same function, or for the same position. Both possibilities are equally likely, as *nome* and *anne* seem to occupy the same position, as (45) and (46) show:

- (45) *Ji si l'a nome magnite.*
 to-him one it-have.3rd.sg/pl nome eaten.pl
 'Somebody has eaten it from him'
- (46) *Ji si l'anne magnite.*⁸
 to-him one it-anne eaten.pl
 'Somebody has eaten it from him'

According to Jaeggli's generalization and to the Avoid Pronoun Principle, *nome* should never appear when a non-phonetically realized version of it is available in the lexicon. The fact that either *nome* or *anne* is obligatorily expressed in indefinite sentences suggests that *nome* is losing its pronoun status and is transforming into a plural marker. This tentative explanation is supported by the following data of the Montenerodomo (CH) dialect, collected by Leonardo Savoia (p.c.):

- (47) *Chisse omme/anne jè cuntiente.*
 they nome anne are happy
 'They are happy.'

Two grammaticalisation possibilities are at hand if we think about *nome* and *anne*: either *nome* will disappear from the lexicon, as is happening to Sardinian *omu*, or it will acquire another function, that of plural marker. For a discussion of the grammaticalization pattern, the reader is referred to D'Alessandro and Alexiadou (2002: 6).

In sum, *nome* is semantically plural. It is in complementary distribution with the plural marker *anne*, which shows that it is slowly turning into a plural

8. Observe that in (46) *anne* does not act as a solely plural marker, but also as an auxiliary. The sentence **Ji si l'a anne magnite* is in fact ungrammatical. This indicates that *anne* is both an auxiliary and a plural marker here.

marker itself. In what follows, we present a list of syntactic features that characterize *nome*. We show that *nome* occupies a position in the clause which is not available to other DPs. This offers support to those theories that recognize the need for specialized subject positions (Cardinaletti 1997, 2004).

4.3. Syntactic properties of *nome*

Nome refers to a group of people excluding the speaker, and its distribution overlaps with the distribution of *anne*, as we have seen in the previous section. *Nome* displays subject properties. In (48), we see that *nome* can alternate with a full DP subject:

- (48) a. *Marije e Jide face' li pinne a la fonde.*
 Mary and Ida did the clothes at the fountain
 'Mary and Ida used to wash the clothes at the fountain.'
- b. *Nome face' li pinne a la fonde.*
 nome did the clothes at the fountain
 'People used to wash the clothes at the fountain.'

Nome cannot appear in any position in the clause other than in the subject position. In (49) we see that *nome* cannot be the object of the verb, (49a), nor of a preposition, (49b):

- (49) a. **So' viste nome.*
 am seen nome
 'I have seen somebody.'
- b. **So' date nu cunzije a nome.*
 am given an advice to nome
 'I have given a piece of advice to someone.'

We can conclude that *nome* is a syntactic subject.

4.3.1. *Nome as a plural subject.* The verbal agreement patterns in EA provide evidence that *nome* is syntactically plural. As shown in Section 2.2, the verb in EA does not make any distinction between 3rd person singular or plural. The past participle, however, always agrees with the subject and is inflected for number. Therefore, we can detect the number feature on *nome* by looking at the past participle in a periphrastic tense:

- (50) A *nome magnite tutta lu journe*
 have.3rd.sg/pl nome eaten.pp.pl all the day
 'Some people have eaten all the day'

In (50), the past participle is marked for plural, and agrees with *nome*. We can thus conclude that *nome* is syntactically plural. The question now arises what kind of element *nome* is. In the next section we show that its position is peculiar both with respect to full lexical NPs and to clitics. It will emerge that *nome* is in fact a weak pronoun, in accordance with Cardinaletti and Starke's (1999) classification.

5. *Nome*: A weak pronoun

Cardinaletti and Starke (1999) propose a tripartite classification of pronouns according to which pronouns are strong, weak, or clitic. Weak and clitic pronouns are grouped together under the label "deficient pronouns". The adjective deficient refers to the lack of functional structure that Cardinaletti and Starke take to be responsible for the different morphological, syntactic and semantic behavior of pronouns. According to this proposal, strong pronouns are "richer" than deficient ones. Deficiency may be mild (in the case of weak pronouns) or severe (in the case of clitics). In particular, weak pronouns lack what they call γ' , a set of syntactic heads, and clitics lack both γ' and γ'' , an additional set of syntactic heads.⁹

The lack of γ' :

- forces the pronoun to occur in a functional projection at s-structure, and thus to move away from its base-generation site;
- renders coordination and c-modification (i.e., modification with sentential adverbs) impossible;
- correlates with the absence of a range specification (thus allowing indefinite reading);
- legitimates prosodic restructuring and phonological reduction.

The absence of both γ' and γ'' causes:

- lack of word accent;
- need of displacement in order to recover missing prosodic features.

As stated above, deficient elements are forced to move from their base-generation position, which arguably coincides with that of NPs. In other words,

9. More specifically, γ' correlates with a forced [+human] interpretation, and with the referentiality of the pronoun. Weak pronouns are usually not referential and do not forcedly identify humans. Moreover, the absence of γ' legitimates prosodic restructuring and phonological reduction of the pronoun. γ'' is instead the overt realization of the morpheme missing on clitics but realized on both weak and strong pronouns. The lack of γ'' correlates with X^o -chains and entails the lack of word-stress. For a more detailed explanation, the reader is referred to Cardinaletti and Starke (1999).

they cannot stay in their base-position, as illustrated in (51) for Italian (a_D on the items stands for deficient; an_S stands for strong):

- (51) a. {*Essa*_D; *Lei*_S; *Maria*} *forse l'ha*
 it_D she_S Maria maybe it-has
fatto {**essa*_D; *lei*_S; *Maria*} *da sola.*
 done alone
 'Maybe she has done it alone.'
- b. *Non dirò mai* {*loro*_D; **a loro*_S; **a Gianni*} *tutto* {**loro*_D; *a loro*_S; *a Gianni*}
 not (I)-will say never to-them_D; to them_S; to
 Gianni everything to-them_D; to them_S to Gianni
 'I will never tell them everything.'
- c. *Gianni* {*li*_D; **loro*_S; **questi studenti*_S} *stima*
 Gianni them_D; them_S; these students estimates
 {**li*_D; *loro*_S; *questi studenti*_D}
 them_D; them_S; these students
 'Gianni estimates these students.' (Cardinaletti and Starke 1999: 150–151)

As (51) shows, deficient elements cannot appear where full NPs and strong elements can appear. In particular, deficient elements have to move away from their base-generation site, where they are assigned a Θ -role. Moreover, deficient elements cannot appear in a series of peripheral positions, that is they cannot be focused or appear in isolation, as illustrated in (52):

- (52) a. *È *essa_D che è bella* (cleft)
 it-is it-3rd.sg.fem that is beautiful
- b. **Essa, lei è bella* (left dislocation)
 it-3rd.sg.fem she-3rd.sg.fem is beautiful
- c. *pro arriverà presto, *essa* (right dislocation)
 she-it will-arrive soon it-3rd.sg.fem
- d. *Chi è bella? *Essa* (isolation)
 who is beautiful it-3rd.sg.fem
 (Cardinaletti and Starke 1999: 151)

In addition, deficient elements cannot be coordinated (53 for Italian) or modified with adverbs which modify the whole DP (c-modified) (54 for French):

- (53) *Lei e(d) *essa sono belle.*
 she and it-3rd.sg.fem are beautiful
 'She and it are beautiful.'

- (54) *{*vraiment; seulement*} *il*
 truly only he-3rd.sg.masc
 'Truly, only him' (Cardinaletti and Starke 1999: 151)

In the next section, we shall first show that *nome* belongs to the class of deficient elements, and we shall then try to formulate a first hypothesis concerning its exact position in the clause.

5.1. Preverbal subject position

As shown in Section 4.3, *nome* displays subject properties. Its distribution, however, differs from that of full lexical NP subjects. According to Cardinaletti and Starke, only strong pronouns have the same distribution as full DPs. (56) shows that this is not the case for *nome*, which is strictly preverbal and cannot occur in its thematic position. The verb in (55) and (56) is unaccusative. Unaccusatives license post-verbal subjects. More precisely, their argument NP – i.e., their subject – is merged in complement position. (55) and (56) show that *nome* cannot occur in the position where the full DP appears:

- (55) a. *Giuwanne e Marije arrive dumane.*
 John and Mary arrive tomorrow
 b. *Dumane arrive Giuwanne e Marije.*
 tomorrow arrive John and Mary
 'John and Mary will arrive¹⁰ tomorrow.'
- (56) a. *Nome arrive dumane.*
 nome arrive tomorrow
 b. **Dumane arrive nome.*
 tomorrow arrive nome
 'Some people will arrive tomorrow.'

(56) also shows that the position of *nome* is strictly preverbal in simple tenses. In periphrastic tenses, *nome* always appears between the auxiliary and the past participle, as (57) shows:

- (57) a. *A nome arrivite.*
 have-3rd.sg/pl nome arrived.pp.pl
 b. **A 'rrivite nome.*
 have-3rd.sg/pl arrived.pp.pl nome

10. EA lacks the future tense.

- c. **Nome a* *'rrivite.*
 nome have-3rd.sg/pl arrived.pp.pl
 'Some people have arrived.'

The difference between *nome* and full DPs is very clear. No full DP can have the distribution that *nome* has in periphrastic tenses. (58) shows that a full DP is grammatical in the equivalent of (57b) and (57c), but ungrammatical in the equivalent of (57a):

- (58) a. **A* *Marije e Giuwanne arrivite.*
 have.3rd.sg/pl Mary and John arrived.pp.pl
 b. *A* *'rrivite Marije e Giuwanne*
 have.3rd.sg/pl arrived.pp.pl Mary and John
 c. *Marije e Giuwanne a* *'rrivite.*
 Mary and John have.3rd.sg/pl arrived.pp.pl
 'Mary and John have arrived.'

The data in (57)–(58) illustrate how the pre-participial position is available only for *nome*. *Nome* cannot occur in its base position and can occur where full DPs cannot occur. As we have seen, the fact that a pronoun cannot occur in its base position tells us that it is not strong. In fact, *nome* does not seem to behave like a strong pronoun. The hypothesis that *nome* is a deficient pronoun finds further support in the dislocation and focalization structures, as we show in the next section.

5.2. Dislocation and focalization

Recall that deficient pronouns cannot be left-dislocated (cf. 52b). The examples below show that *nome* cannot be dislocated either:

- (59) *Jisse, a Giuwanne, l'* *a*
 they.3rd.pl to John him.3rd.sg.Acc have.3rd.sg/pl
 viste.
 seen.pp.sg/pl
 'It was them who saw John.'
- (60) **Nome, a Giuwanne, l'* *a*
 nome to John him.3rd.sg.Acc have.3rd.sg/pl.Acc
 viste.
 seen.pp.sg/pl
 'It was some people who saw John.'

(61) and (62) show that *nome* cannot be focalized:

- (61) A *Giuwanne l'* a viste
 to John him-3rd.sg.Acc have.3rd.sg/pl seen.pp
JISSE.
 they.3rd.pl
 'It was them who saw John.'
- (62) *A *Giuwanne l'* a viste *NOME.*
 to John him.3rd.sg.Acc have.3rd.sg/pl seen.pp nome
 'It was some people who saw John'

Thus *nome* shares the characteristics of deficient elements with respect to topicalization and focalization.

5.3. Occurrence in isolation, modification and coordination

Nome cannot occur in isolation, as (63) shows:

- (63) *Chi l'* a *fatte?* *Marije.* / **Nome.*
 who it.3rd.sg.Acc have.3rd.sg/pl done.pp.sg Mary / nome
 'Who has done that? Mary/ Somebody.'

It is worth observing that the fact that *nome* cannot occur in isolation is not due to semantic constraints¹¹. The strong semantic counterpart of *nome*, namely *cacchedune* (somebody), can occur in isolation, as example (64) shows:

- (64) *Chi l'* a *fatte?* *Cacchedune!*
 who it.3rd.sg.Acc have.3rd.sg/pl done.pp.sg somebody
 'Who has done it? Somebody!'

The contrast between (63) and (64) suggests that the position constraints that operate on *nome* are syntactically in nature.

According to Cardinaletti and Starke (1999), deficient elements cannot be modified by sentence adverbs or modifiers. This is in fact the case with *nome*, which cannot be modified by a XP-modifier such as *sole* ("only"), as (65) shows, while its strong counterpart *cacchedune* can, as (66) shows:

- (65) *A *sole nome ditte quelle.*
 have.3rd.sg/pl only nome said that
 'Only somebody said that.'
- (66) *Sole cacchedune a ditte quelle.*
 only somebody have.3rd.sg/pl said that
 'Only somebody said that.'

11. Like other indefinite pronouns, *nome* receives an existential interpretation under boundedness (see D'Alessandro 2004, Cabredo-Hofherr 2002)

Finally, *nome* cannot be coordinated with a full NP, as (67) and (68) show:

- (67) **Marije e nome (atre) a litte lu libbre.*
 Mary and nome (else) have.3rd.sg/pl read.pp.pl the book
 ‘Mary and somebody else have read the book.’
- (68) *Marije e cacchedune (atre) a litte lu libbre.*
 Mary and somebody else have.3rd.sg/pl read.pp.pl the
 book
 ‘Mary and somebody else have read the book.’

To sum up, in this section we have shown that *nome* behaves like a deficient element. The question now is whether *nome* is a clitic or a weak pronoun. We discuss this issue in the next section.

5.4. Weak pronoun or clitic?

So far, we have shown that *nome* is a deficient element. According to Cardinaletti and Starke’s (1999) classification, deficient elements are subdivided into two subgroups: weak elements and clitics. The question now arises whether *nome* is a weak pronoun or a clitic. We have seen in Section 4.1 that *nome* may form a single prosodic unit with other lexical items. It is a disyllabic element, and therefore it may in principle be still classified as a clitic (Zec 2002). Let us consider the morpho-syntactic distribution of clitics in EA. *Nome* always follows other clitics. (69a) shows a clitic cluster in EA. In (69b) *nome* follows the clitic cluster.

- (69) a. *Me le dice’.*
 to-me.cl.Dat it.cl.Acc said.3rd.sg/pl.impf
 ‘They used to tell me.’
- b. *Me le nome dice’.*
 to-me.cl.Dat it.cl.Acc nome said.3rd.sg/pl.impf
 ‘Some people used to tell me.’

(69b) shows that *nome* follows the other clitics. This is still not sufficient in order to determine the exact nature of *nome*. The status of *nome* becomes more transparent, if we consider once again periphrastic tenses. In (70) we can see that *nome* follows the auxiliary, while other clitics precede it:

- (70) a. *Jisse ji si l’*
 they.3rd.pl to-him.cl.Dat cl.applicative it.cl.Acc
a magnite.
 have.3rd.sg/pl eaten.pp.pl
 ‘They have eaten it (from him).’

- b. *Ji si l' a nome*
 to-him.cl.Dat cl.applicative it.cl.Acc have.3rd.sg/pl nome
magnite.
 eaten.pp.pl
 'Some people have eaten it (from him).'

Nome does therefore not pattern with other clitics. This leads us to conclude that it is not a clitic, but rather a weak pronoun. We now wish to identify the exact position of *nome* inside the clause. We are concerned with this issue in the next section.

6. The position of *nome*

We have shown that *nome* has a special position when compared to the position clitics and full DPs occupy in the EA: no other element, in particular, can appear between the auxiliary and the main verb. The exact position which *nome* occupies in the clause is not immediately evident. In principle, if the auxiliary is in T, *nome* might occupy a position lower than that. However, it is not immediately transparent what this position can be, especially because the position in which the auxiliary occurs has not been fully defined yet.

In order to determine the position of *nome* we will examine its distribution with respect to negation and other low adverbs.

6.1. Negation

Negation in EA precedes the main verb and follows the subject:

- (71) *Ji ne mmagne.*
 I.1st.sg NEG eat.1st.sg
 'I do not eat.'
- (72) *Jisse ne mmagne.*
 they.3rd.pl NEG eat.3rd.pl
 'They do not eat.'

With respect to *nome*, negation has a different distribution. In fact, it precedes *nome*:

- (73) *Ne nome magne.*
 NEG nome eat.3rd.pl
 'Some people do not eat.'

Consider the distribution of *nome* with respect to both negation and the auxiliary in periphrastic tenses. (74) contains a full DP subject, while (75) contains *nome*.

(74) *Esse n' a magnate.*
 he.3rd.sg NEG have.3rd.sg/pl eaten.pp.sg
 'He has not eaten.'

(75) *N' a nome magnate.*
 NEG have.3rd.sg/pl nome eaten.pp.pl
 'Some people did not eat.'

We can summarize the distribution of DPs and *nome* as in (76):

(76) a. DP Neg Aux
 b. Neg Aux Nome
 c. DP neg Aux Nome

(76) seems to suggest that there are two subject positions in a clause: one which is higher than Negation and one which is lower than Negation, in support of the cartographic approach proposed in (Cardinaletti 1997, 2004).

Consider now the position of negation with respect to clitics. As (77) shows, negation precedes all clitics:

(77) *Ne ji l' a ditte.*
 NEG to-him.cl.Dat it.cl.Acc have.3rd.sg/pl said.pp
 'They/he haven't said it to him'

We can now draw an approximate scheme for word order in EA: in (70a) we have seen that a full DP subject precedes clitic pronouns. (70b) shows that clitic pronouns precede the auxiliary *a*, while *nome* follows it. With respect to negation, we have seen in (71)–(74) that a full NP subject precedes Negation, while *nome* follows it, together with clitics, which follow negation, as shown in (77). A first approximation to the word order pattern in EA is provided in (78):

(78) Full subj – Neg – CL – Aux – nome – PP

Nome appears to be very low in the structure, right above the Past Participle. In order to see whether *nome* is inside or outside the VP, it is necessary to test the position of *nome* with respect to low adverbs.

6.2. *Low adverbs*

We assume, following Alexiadou (1997) and Cinque (1999), that adverbs are not sentential adjuncts but rather occupy specifier positions of dedicated functional heads. Adverbs appear cross-linguistically in a fixed order, which is universal, invariant across languages. For our purposes it is important to look at those adverbs that both Alexiadou and Cinque classify as “low” in the clause.

Let us first consider the low adverb *bbone* (“well”). This adverb follows the past participle in EA, as (79) shows. This means that the participle in EA, much like its Standard Italian and Greek counterparts, moves higher than the VoiceP, the position assigned to adverbs like “well”. But, we cannot place *nome* with respect to this adverb, as it appears too low in the clause:

- (79) L' *a* *nome* *fitte* *bbone*.
 it.cl.Acc have.3rd.sg/pl *nome* made.pp.pl well
 ‘People have made it well.’

Crucially, both the past participle and *nome* are outside the VP. For this reason it is necessary to consider “higher” adverbs, which occur in the mid-field of the clause, such as *sembre* (“always”).

6.3. *Higher adverbs*

“Always”-type adverbs are known to occupy a position which is higher than Aspect. Therefore, if *nome* precedes one of these adverbs, it must be located somewhere in the T field. (80) shows that *sembre* is in fact lower than *nome*:

- (80) L' *a* *nome* *sembre* *fitte*.
 it.cl.Acc have.3rd.sg/pl *nome* always done.pp.pl
 ‘People have always done that.’

The example in (80) turns to be ungrammatical if *sembre* appears before *nome*, as (81) shows:

- (81) * L' *a* *sembre* *nome* *fitte*.
 it.cl.Acc have.3rd.sg/pl always *nome* done.pp.pl
 ‘People have always done that.’

In order to delimit the field in which *nome* can appear, we check its position with respect to those adverbs which are usually referred to as T-adverbs. An adverb of this group is *allore*, “then”. *Allore* appears before *nome*, as shown in example (82). The position of *nome* is thus restricted to the T field.

- (82) *Si allore nome magne' la carne, mo' nni*
 if then nome ate.3rd.sg/pl.impf the meat now NEG
li nome magne cchiù.
 it.cl.Acc nome eat.3rd.sg/pl more
 'If, at that time, people used to eat meat, now they do not do anymore'

The fact that *nome* lands in the T field is not surprising. *Nome* is a subject, as we have shown in Section 4.2.1, and Spec, TP is considered to be a subject position (Bobaljik and Jonas 1996, McCloskey 1996).

Cardinaletti (1997, 2003, 2004) proposes that there are at least two preverbal subject positions in the clause: the AgrSP and the SubjP. She defines the AgrSP projection as the projection where *phi*-features are checked on Nominative NPs, and the SubjP projection as the one where the “subject-of-predication” feature is checked. According to Cardinaletti, AgrSP usually hosts weak subjects, while SubjP hosts full NP subjects. In Section 6.4, we show that *nome* occupies exactly the AgrSP projection, conforming to Cardinaletti’s cartography of subject positions.

6.4. *Nome in Spec, AgrSP*

In Section 5.4 we have shown that *nome* is a weak pronoun. As already mentioned, in Cardinaletti’s view the structure of the “subject” field is as follows:¹²

- (83) [SubjP [AgrSP* [TP ... [... [VP ...]]]]]

The AgrSP is the lower subject projection, while SubjP is the higher one, which is dedicated to fully referential NP subjects. Weak pronouns are in the specifier of AgrSP. We propose that *nome* is a weak element and occupies the specifier of AgrSP.

According to Cardinaletti, parentheticals cannot occur between AgrSP and the verb, while they can occur between a full NP subject and the verb. As (84) and (85) show, applying this test to *nome* and full NPs in EA, suggests that *nome* is indeed lower than SubjP:

- (84) *Giuwanne e Marie, penze ji, je' bbuna*
 John and Mary think I are.3rd.sg/pl good.pl
ggende.
 people.sg
 'John and Mary, I think, are good persons.'

12. Alternatively, we could talk of RefP, which is very similar to Cardinaletti’s SubjP (cf. Beghelli and Stowell 1997).

- (85) **Nome, penze ji', je'* *bbuna ggende*
 nome think I, are.3rd.sg/pl good.pl people.sg
 'They, I think, are good people'

Parentheticals are inserted, according to Cardinaletti (2004), between the higher subject position SubjP and the lower one AgrSP. (85) in particular confirms once more our hypothesis that *nome* behaves like a weak pronoun.

The hypothesis, according to which *nome* is located in Spec, AgrSP, leaves some open questions. It is usually assumed that auxiliaries are located in T. If we adopt this view, a problem arises with respect to the location of *nome* in Spec, AgrSP. We have shown that *nome* always follows the auxiliary. If the auxiliary is in T and *nome* follows the auxiliary, then *nome* cannot be in Spec, AgrSP, because the AgrS projection precedes T. We discuss this apparent paradox in the next section.

6.5. *Nome and the auxiliary*

As shown in (57), here repeated as (86), *nome* can never precede the auxiliary *a*, nor can it follow the past participle:

- (86) a. A *nome arrivite*
 have.3rd.sg/pl nome arrived.pp.pl
 b. *A '*rrivite nome*
 have.3rd.sg/pl arrived.pp.pl nome
 c. **Nome a* '*rrivite*
 nome have.3rd.sg/pl arrived.pp.pl
 'Some people have arrived'

If the auxiliary is located in T, then *nome* must occupy a position which is lower than T. In Section 6.4, however, we have shown that *nome* occupies the Spec, AgrSP position, which is higher than T. This apparent paradox can be solved if we reconsider the position of the auxiliary in EA. Auxiliary selection in EA is not determined by the verb class. The usual pattern displays a selection of "be" for 1st and 2nd persons singular and plural, and "have" for 3rd persons, as we exemplified in (4), here repeated as (87):

- (87) Past tense (passato prossimo)
 1st person singular so' -ate *je so' magnate*
 2nd person singular si -ate *tu si magnate*
 3rd person singular a -ate *esse a magnate*
 1st person plural seme -ite *nu seme magnite*
 2nd person plural sete -ite *vu sete magnite*
 3rd person plural a -ite *jisse a magnite*

It seems to us that “be” has the status of a full verb, whereas *a* is a clitic form. That the two auxiliaries do not have the same status can be seen from the fact that the form *a* cannot appear in isolation, as (88) shows. This contrasts with the other forms, namely with the “be” forms, which can appear in isolation, as shown in (88):

(88) **A state jesse, a!*
 have.3rd.sg/pl been he.3rd.sg.Nom have
 ‘It has been HIM!’

(89) *Si ttu, si!*
 are.2nd.sg you.2nd.sg.Nom are.2nd.sg
 ‘It is YOU!’

In particular, compare the 3rd person form of “have” and “be”:¹³

(90) *Je’ esse, je’!*
 is.3rd.sg he.3rd.sg.Nom is.3rd.sg
 ‘It is HIM!’

(91) **L’a fatte esse, l’a!*
 it.3rd.sg-has.3rd.sg/pl done he.3rd.sg it.3rd.sg-has.3rd.sg/pl
 ‘It was HIM who did it!’

(90) and (91) strongly suggest that *a* is a clitic, because it cannot appear on its own and it cannot serve as a base for other clitics to attach to it, as in (91). (91) becomes grammatical, if *a* is followed by the past participle:

(92) *L’a fatte esse, l’a*
 it.3rd.sg-has.3rd.sg/pl done he.3rd.sg it.3rd.sg-has.3rd.sg/pl
fatte!
 done
 ‘It was HIM who did it!’

The fact that *a* is weaker than *je’* or any other form of the verb *esse* (“be”) is also witnessed by the weaker semantic content of *ave’*. As we observed in Section 2.3, *ave’* is only used as an auxiliary, and never as a full lexical verb. The expression of possession in EA is obtained by means of the verb *tene’* (“hold”). *Esse* is instead also used as a full verb, or in predicative constructions, not just as an auxiliary.

Since *nome* is also a weak element, it is impossible to dislocate it together with *a*:

13. Observe that the 3rd person form of *esse* (“be”) is used in predicative constructions, but not as an auxiliary.

- (93) **L'a* *nome fitte jisse, l'a nome.*
 it-have.3rd.sg/pl nome did.pp.pl they, it-have nome
 'It was THEM who did it.'

If *a* is a clitic, it does not necessarily need to attach to T. In particular, it can cliticise on the past participle, or on the element which follows it, for instance *nome*.

Further evidence for the fact that *a* is a clitic derives from the other forms of the verb *ave'* in combination with *nome*. If *nome* combines with a past imperfective to form the pluperfect paradigm, it precedes the auxiliary *ave'*:

- (94) *Me le nome 've ditte.*
 me.Dat it.masc.sg.Acc nome had.3rd.past.impf said.pp.sg/pl
 'Somebody had told me.'

This example is clear evidence of the "exceptional" status of *a*. Moreover, note that there is a clear contrast between the 3rd singular form of *ave'* and that of *esse*. In (95), a predicative construction, the 3rd person singular of *esse* follows *nome*:

- (95) *Nome jè bille quanda pro*
 nome is/are.3rd.sg/pl beautiful when pro
jè ggiuvene.
 is/are.3rd.sg/pl-3RD young.pl
 'Some people are beautiful when they are young.'

The 3rd person singular form of *esse*, thus, does not raise as high as the corresponding form of *ave'*. This supports our hypothesis that *a* has a special clitic status.

7. Conclusions

In this paper, we have examined in detail the indefinite pronoun *nome* in EA. After a short introduction to EA syntax in Section 2, we have introduced the characteristics of *nome* in Section 3 and have shown that *nome* is a weak subject pronoun, which renders it very peculiar when confronted with EA grammar, which lacks weak subjects (Section 4). The existence of *nome* supports the views that recognise the need for specialised subject positions. We have hence proposed that *nome* occupies the lower subject position AgrSP (Cardinaletti 2004).

University of Cambridge
University of Stuttgart

References

- Alexiadou, Artemis (1997). *Adverb Placement. A Case Study in Antisymmetric Syntax* [Linguistik Aktuell 28]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Battaglia, Salvatore (1981). *Grande Dizionario della Lingua Italiana*. XI. Torino: UTET.
- Beghelli, Filippo and Tim Stowell (1997). Distributivity and negation: The syntax of *each* and *every*. In: *Ways of Scope Taking*, A. Szabolcsi (ed.), 71–108, Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Belletti, Adriana (2003). Extended doubling and the VP periphery. Ms., University of Siena.
- Bigalke, Rainer (1996). *EA* [Languages of the World 74]. Munchen: LINCOM Europa.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David and Dianne Jonas (1996). Subject positions and the roles of TP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27: 195–236.
- Cardinaletti, Anna (1997). Subjects and clause structure. In: *The New Comparative Syntax*, Liliane Haegeman (ed.), 33–63. London: Longman.
- (2004). Towards a cartography of subject positions. In: *The Structure of CP and IP*, Luigi Rizzi (ed.), 115–165. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cardinaletti, Anna and Michal Starke (1999). The typology of structural deficiency. A case study of the three classes of pronouns. In: *Clitics in the Languages of Europe* [EALT/EUROTYP 20-5], Henk van Riemsdijk (ed.), 145–233. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Castiglioni, G. and S. Mariotti (1966). *IL. Vocabolario della lingua Latina*. Torino: Loescher.
- Chomsky, Noam (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1988). On *Si* Constructions and the Theory of *arb*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19: 521–582.
- (1999). *Adverbs and Functional Heads*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- D'Alessandro, Roberta (2004). Impersonal *si* constructions. agreement and Interpretation. PhD diss, University of Stuttgart.
- D'Alessandro, Roberta and Artemis Alexiadou (2002a). Inclusive and exclusive impersonal pronouns: A feature-geometrical analysis. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 27: 31–44.
- (2002b). *Nome*: A subject clitic in a Southern Italian dialect. Paper presented at the International Conference on Comparative Romance Linguistics, Antwerp.
- De Giovanni, Marcello (1974). *Studi Linguistici*. Verona: Anteditore.
- Egerland, Verner (2003). Impersonal pronouns in Scandinavian and Romance. Ms. University of Lund.
- Finamore, Gennaro (1893). *Vocabolario dell'uso EA*. Città di Castello: Arnaldo Forni.
- Giammarco, Ernesto (1965). Appunti per la classificazione dei dialetti abruzzesi e molisani. *Abruzzo. Rivista di Studi Abruzzesi* aIII (1–2).
- (1985). *LEA. Lessico Etimologico EA* [DAM, Dizionario EA e Molisano (V)]. Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- Hastings, Robert (1994). L'espressione del soggetto indefinito in un dialetto EA. *L'Italia dialettale* LVII (new series XXXIV).
- Jaeggli, Osvaldo (1986). Arbitrary plural pronominals. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4: 43–76.
- Kayne, Richard (1972). Subject inversion in French interrogatives. In: *Generative Studies in Romance Languages*, J. Casagrande and B. Saciuk (eds.), 70–126. Newbury House.
- (1975). *French Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kratzer, Angelika (2000). German impersonal pronouns and logophoricity. Paper presented at the *Generic Pronouns and logophoricity* conference, Sao Paulo.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2000). *A Comparative Syntax of the Dialects of Southern Italy: A Minimalist Approach*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Manzini, Maria Rita and Leonardo Savoia (2001). The syntax of object clitics: *si* in Italian dialects. In: *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays to Honour Lorenzo Renzi*, Guglielmo Cinque and Giampaolo Salvi (eds.), 234–264. North Holland.
- (2005a). Clitics: Cooccurrence and mutual exclusion patterns. In: *The Structure of CP and IP*, Luigi Rizzi (ed.), 211–250. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- (2005b). *I dialetti italiani e romance. Morfosintassi generativa*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- McCloskey, James (1996). On the scope of verb movement in Irish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14: 47–104.
- Poletto, Cecilia (2000). *The Higher Functional Field*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rohlf, Gerhard (1972). *Studi e ricerche su lingua e dialetti d'Italia*. Firenze: Sansoni.
- (1968). *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. Morfologia*. Torino: Einaudi.
- van Bergen, Linda (2003). 2003: *Pronouns and Word Order in Old English, with Particular Reference to the Indefinite Pronoun man*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Welton-Lair, Lisa K. (1999). The evolution of the French indefinite pronoun *on*: A corpus-based study in grammaticalization. Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University.
- Zec, Draga (2002). On the prosodic status of function words. *Working papers of the Cornell Phonetic Laboratory* 14.

Copyright of Probus is the property of *Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG*. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.