

On the history of the indefinite pronoun *altcineva* ‘someone else’ Grammatical observations

Adrian Chircu*

Faculty of Letters, “Babeş–Bolyai” University, Str. Horea 31, 400202 Cluj-Napoca, Romania

Article info

History:

Received December 19, 2017

Accepted January 17, 2018

Published April 27, 2018

Key words:

diachronic grammar

syntagm

lexicalization

dynamic syntax

indefinite pronouns

quantifiers

Abstract

Within the present study, we aim to look at the way in which the indefinite pronoun *altcineva* ‘someone else’ has come to being in Romanian. Its linguistic bearings are mainly discussed from a diachronic perspective, that can help us understand the evolutionary stages of this compound pronoun, starting from a process of syntagmatization on the basis of the Latin model, and ending in a lexicalization on Romanian grounds. In order to perform an analysis on the basis of objectivity and actuality, we have prioritized the investigative leads in recent grammars of the Romanian language, be they diachronic (Frâncu, 2009, Stan, 2013; SOR) or synchronic (GALR; GBLR; RGR; GR).

For the accomplishment of this goal, we have made use of a representative sample of old writings (mainly from the 16th and 17th centuries), that illustrate the dynamics of the old language, as well as the mutations that occurred over time. Our research has led to interesting and novel *à la fois* results pertaining to the structural peculiarities, the semantic compatibility and the syntagmatic association or the syntactic implications of the pronoun in question.

1. Preliminaries

Some changes in morphosyntactic interpretations have occurred during the last decade, in the field of Romanian linguistics, in the sense that the center of interest is no longer exclusively represented by descriptions of parts of speech and of their synchronic relationships. Instead, tackling language facts from a diachronic perspective facilitates a proper understanding of the formation and function of certain lexical units or of some particular grammatical structures within the system. These structures either existed from the start in Romanian, or have developed at a later time due to a winding evolution.

1.1. Within morphological classes, apart from the verb, the most complex, as well as the most interesting, is the pronoun, which possesses a rich and heterogeneous inventory of items that have come to be used in various and, at times, limited ways. Niculescu (1965) mentions that “the particularities of the pronominal inflexion in Romanian does not consist in the existence or nonexistence of a certain element, but it especially consists of a different use of the inventory of Latin borrowed forms, as well as the functional value that is attributed to each element in the makings of the system” (p. 39).

1.2. As for pronominal categories, the one that stands out is that of indefinites, whose members have appeared in large numbers in the realm of the Romanian language, alongside the obvious necessities of both supplementing the losses that have occurred from Latin to Romanian, as well as the need to give nuances to significations (Stoica, 2011, p. 445). From this point of view, the linguists that have focused on the existence of some Latin pronouns or the appearance of others in Romanian have noticed that “the indefinite pronouns and indefinite adjectives exhibit more peculiarities and irregularities due to the fact that they constitute a more heterogeneous class than other pronouns” (Gheție, 1997, p. 129), and due to the fact that they are characterized by certain instabilities (Frâncu, 2009, p. 286). In the pages of SOR,

*Email address: adrianchircu@yahoo.fr.

G. Pană Dindelegan and her collaborators observe that, with respect to quantifiers, “the specific features of OR¹ quantified nominal phrases involve the inventory, form, word order, and values of quantifiers and the formal marking of the agreement between quantifiers and nouns” (SOR, p. 356).

1.3. Within the boundaries of this formal complexity and syntactic behavior also lies the indefinite quantifier *altcineva* ‘someone else’ which underwent an interesting evolution that remained unrevealed until recently and upon which we shall focus in the following pages, in an attempt to illustrate its structural and functional peculiarities.

2. From the Latin pronouns *alter* and *qui* towards Romanian and other Romance languages

The constituents of the compound *altcine(va)* ‘someone else’ are of Latin origin and are commonly found, in a large amount, in the whole of Romania.

2.1. For instance, Wilhem Meyer-Lübke marks down in the pages of his dictionary (REW 382) the following descendants of Lat. ALTER: Rom. *alt*, Dalm. *yultro*, It. *altro*, Srd. log. *atteru*, Egd. *oter*, Friul. *altri*, Fr. Prv. *autre*, Cat. *altre*, Sp. *otro*, Pt. *outro*, to which other forms may be added, often old or dialectal forms that were not pointed out by the aforementioned linguist: OCat. *altro*, Cat. dial. (Perpignan) *altru*, Cors. *altru*, Srd. Cpd. *atru* (*aturu*, *ateru*), Srd. Gal. *altu*, Dalm. *jualtro*, Prv. *aurre*, *autre*, Glc. *outro*, Astur. *oitre*, *utru*, Cal. *àutru* (*avtru*, *atru*), Gasc. *àut* (*àute*, *àude*), OLeon. Rioj. Ara. Nav. *otre*.

2.2. Lat. QUI (REW 6953) underwent a similar development, its forms differing in allocation (Väänänen, 2006, p. 126): on the one hand, a selection of the Nominative-type form appears (It. *chi*, OSrd. Log. *ki*, Egd. *k'i*, Fr. Prv. Cat, OSp., OPt. *qui*), and on the other, an Accusative of *quem*, traceable in Rom. *cine* ‘who’, OSrd. Log. *ken*, Srd. Cpd. *kini*, Srs. *kuin*, Cat. Maj. *kin*, Sp. *quien*, Pt. *quem*, Dalm. Abr. *kenunge*, Glc. *quen*.

In terms of this last constituent, namely *cine* ‘who’, it may be observed that Romanian is similar, in many respects, to the Ibero-Romance linguistic field. Bartoli’s theory of lateral areas (1925) seems to fit this case, and it is a theory that was adopted by Pușcariu (1976, p. 212) as well, due to the fact that the descendants of the interrogative-relative pronoun *qui* have an Accusative form as opposed to central Romance languages that exhibit pronominal forms descending from the Nominative.

2.3. Within the realm of Romanian, the indefinite particle *-va* was added to the second element of the compound, namely *cine* ‘who’ (Densusianu, 1962, II, p. 125); *-va*’s origin must be sought for in the paradigm of the verbal forms of the verb *a vrea* ‘to want’ (*-va* < *vare* < *voare* < lat. VOLET; Lombard, 1938, p. 203–205; Stoica, 2011, p. 446), which has multiple uses at a morphological level. This complementary value of verbs meaning ‘a vrea’ [to want] is not exclusive to Romanian, but is found in other languages as well (Haspelmath, 1997, p. 159)².

The role of the affix is to signal a nuance of uncertainty³ regarding the recognition of the identity of a person (*cineva*, *careva* ‘someone’), of an object (*ceva* ‘something’), of a circumstance (*undeva* ‘somewhere’, *cumva* ‘somehow’, *cîndva* ‘sometime’) or of a quantity (*cîtva* ‘somewhat’). Hence, the scalar focus particle *-va* must be rendered as a marker of a special type of indefinite pronouns or adverbs suggesting indeterminacy (Haspelmath, 1997, p. 158).

¹Old Romanian.

²Lombard (1938, p. 204) mentions that there exists a similar affix in Albanian (*do*), of verbal origin (vb. *dua* ‘to love, to like, to want, to wish, to desire something’). It attaches to some indefinite pronouns (*kush-dó*, *tsili-dó*, *sikush-do*, *sitsili-do*, etc.).

³Manoliu Manea (1968, p. 111) considers that *-va* is an index of non-delimitation and that “it plays the role of an explicit determinant of the *cine*, *ce* [who, what] series”, and that it is possible for explicit determinedness to occur as well (*cineva dintr-un noi* ‘one of us’).

In time, the particle *și* ‘and’—deriving from Lat. IPSE (Dimitrescu, 1974, p. 154), which had come to be commonly used in the Eastern part of the Roman Empire, often to suggest insistence—has attached itself to the newly compounded form, in addition to other members of the pronominal class.

2.4. Similar formal and/or functional syntagms appear not only in Latin (*qui alter*), but in Romance languages of the Gallic-Italic linguistic field as well (It. *qui altro, altro qualcun, qualcun altro*; Fr. *qui (d’) autre, quelqu’un d’autre*; Cors. *chi altru* etc.)⁴. However, over centuries, the *qui magis* ‘more than one of them’ syntagm has spread within the Ibero-Romance territories; it is different in structure, but not in function (Sp. *quién más*, Pt. *quem mais*, Cat. *qui més*, Glc. *quen máis*, etc.). These examples prove that we are dealing with an inherited syntactic characteristic, which has subsequently experienced a certain detachment from the original model.

2.5. In sustaining the aforementioned arguments, Le Goffic’s (2015) observations on the relationships between interrogative and indefinite pronouns can also be brought to the fore. He states that in these situations, we are dealing with both similarities and differences. With respect to similarities, it seems that a variable, which opens up various approaches, traceable in any language (interrogation, indefiniteness, subordination etc.) emerges. In relation to dissimilarities, they are related to function and evolution. Furthermore, from a diachronic perspective, the class of interrogatives is a stable one, but that of indefinite pronouns is “extrêmement instables, ils constituent des séries paradigmatiques aux contours souvent flottants ou incertains, souvent en relation de chevauchement partiel et/ou de concurrence” (Le Goffic (2015), p. 132).

3. Current theoretical debates on quantifiers

In order to perform an appropriate interpretation of the syntagmatic association of the two quantifiers (*altul* ‘other’ + *cineva* ‘someone’), we believe that we should investigate whether certain semantic-functional factors that may have led to the lexicalization of the autonomous syntagm may be identified⁵. As can be noticed, the set is made up of two existential quantifiers, which has facilitated, to a certain degree, their fusion within the linguistic structure under investigation, despite certain semantic differences.

3.1. On the one hand, *alt(ul)* ‘other’ is a separative [+ Separative] and has the following semantic traits: [– Approximation], [+ Relative], [+ Unique], [– Discursively linked], [± Human], on the other, *cineva* ‘one’ comprises the following lexicalized oppositions⁶: [– Separative], [– Approximation], [– Relative], [– Unique], in addition to a qualitative assessment [– Discursively linked], [+ Human], [– Spec.] (GALR, I, p. 256).

3.2. It should also be noted that both terms are used in the formation of the syntagm in question, due to their inclusion of the “semantic idea (presupposition) of the existence of some elements (the quantifying elements)” (GBLR, p. 144). This association is far from haphazard, as both *cineva* ‘one’, as well as *altul* ‘other’, does nothing other than operate a successive selection: not *cineva* ‘someone’, but *altcineva* ‘someone else’: a different person than the one initially referred to.

3.3. In the pages of the GR, the alternative *altul* ‘other’, is described from a similar perspective, being regarded as an indefinite of a double categorization, a lexical and a functional one, and that in the case of a nominal ellipsis, “assumes a special form (incorporating the bound-morpheme definite article)” (p. 300).

⁴For further information on certain details related to this type of Romance languages syntagms, see also Avram (2005, p. 162–167).

⁵Prévost & Fagard (2007, p. 6) believe that “la lexicalisation tend à mettre l’accent sur la forme d’arrivée, lexicale, et accorde [...] une importance moindre aux mécanismes à l’œuvre, même si, parmi eux, la coalescence est souvent considérée comme décisive”.

⁶Also see Manoliu Manea (1968, p. 109–113).

3.4. It is noticeable that the terms used in the formation of the initial syntagm have different values, their sole commonality being [– Approximation]. Moreover, in the [+ Relative] / [– Relative] opposition, the entities in the scope of quantification are visible in themselves (*unul* ‘one’, *cineva* ‘someone’) or by relating them to other entities in the scope of quantification, from which they differ in some respects (*altul* ‘other’, *altcineva* ‘someone else’)” (GALR, I, p. 255).

3.5. Due to the semantic analysis of these existential quantifiers, certain featural incompatibilities have been erased or diminished, hence facilitating the formation of the compound *altcineva* ‘someone else’.

4. *Altineva*: from syntagmatization towards lexicalization in the old language

In the main works of historical Romanian grammar, the evolution of indefinite compounds is investigated sequentially, the authors mainly limiting themselves to a description of the inventory and the specific showcasing of some general characteristics of the class (Avram, 2005, p. 162–167; Popescu-Marin, 2007, p. 254–256) and paying less interest in their syntactic behavior, be it related to a group center or to an adjunct.

4.1. For instance, Stan (2013) finds that “some types of combinations between quantifiers and pronominal determiners became obsolete in old times” and also mentions that “certain topical variants of quantifiers in relation to pronominal determiners did not impose themselves in the language (*alte multe fi-vor* ‘many others shall be’, GS, 27^v, p. 318)” (p. 54), whereas G. Pană Dindelegan *et al.* claim that “at the beginning of the old period, the constraints of the distribution of definite/non-definite forms of determiner *alt(ul)* ‘other’ were not fixed. Thus, in structures with overt nominal heads, there appear not only article-less forms, which generalized as adjectives (*altă țară* ‘other country’, DÎ, 33, 241^v, p. 130), but also definite forms (*altul oarecarele giurământu* ‘other.DEF any-other vow’, CV, 67^v, p. 362), which specialized as pronouns; in the structures in which the determiner is used pronominally, the adjectival form is also available (*va face curvie una cu altă* ‘will sin one with the other’, Prav.1581, 205^v–206^r, p. 162)” (SOR, p. 303).

4.2. A careful study of our old writings illustrate that concerning the appearance of the quantifier under scrutiny in this research (*altcineva* ‘someone else’), we are dealing with a complex and lengthy process, during which essential transformations occurred.

It is most likely that before the formation of the syntagm in question, the process of the association between *cine* ‘who’ and the particle *-va* ‘some’ was about to come to an end, by the looks of 16th century documents⁷. Through the formation of *cineva* ‘someone’ and other similar quantifiers, a part of the complex Latin pronominal system which suffered significant losses, is somewhat rebuilt. For instance, in Romanian, there is no trace of the Lat. *aliquis, aliqua, aliquid, aliquod; quispiam, quepiam, quidpiam; qui, quæ, quod; quidam, quedam, quoddam; quis (quæ), quid (quod); quisquam, quequam, quodquam (quidquam)*.

4.3. Therefore, the compound form (*altcineva* ‘someone else’) is the result of the fusion of its constituents and finds its explanation in the fact that *cineva* ‘someone’ had the meaning of ‘any person; a person that we do not know’, whereas for designating a different other unknown person a determiner is needed to clarify its meaning. Thus, through the medium of the indefinite *altul* ‘other’, the possibility of designating a different other person emerges; another unknown person or whose identity we do not want to reveal/mention the identity of (*Altineva a fost acolo, nu el* ‘Someone else was there, not him’).

4.4. The compound *altcineva* ‘someone else’ is mentioned as early as the 16th century, in both religious and secular writings⁸, but not frequently, only sporadically, which suggests the fact that at the time, its use had not been established:

⁷Avram (2005, p. 163) notices that in Romanian there exists “a series of more complex compounds, constructed with *other* + an indefinite compound of a relative stem”.

⁸To identify the examples, we have scanned a large amount of texts, including collections of texts (for instance, CLRV or

- (1) *E să Ilie și Pavel sau altu-cineva cătră ceriu s-au fost luați* (CC², 515, p. 461)
‘It is that Ilie and Pavel or **some-other** to the skies taken-were’
- (2) *n-au avut, nice de la Aron vodă, nice de la altucineva* (DÎ, 58, 2^r, p. 180)
‘they did not have it, not from Aron the king, nor from **someone else**’

4.5. Similarly, one may observe that these few occurrences prove that *altcineva* ‘someone else’ was not formally established at the time, hesitations emerging even within the same text, and especially in situations of Datives and Genitives:

- (3) *nu altui cuiva, dentr-acela adeveritu, spre una de elușu* (CC², 459, p. 409)
‘not to **someone else**, but that which were true, to one of his’

4.6. However, in the following two centuries, the pronominal form begins to establish itself and becomes widespread, although we did identify hesitations in usage, in texts representative of the 17th century, especially in Oblique cases that pose the issue of intra-syntagmatic concord, as shall be seen. It may be observed that in Oblique cases (6–10), the autonomy of the constituents is easier to identify than in direct ones (4–5):

- (4) *de la stăpâniri sau de la alt cineva a tocni moara* (SD, p. 301)
‘from rules or **from any other** to bargain the mill’
- (5) *Nu sămt eu Dumnedzău nice altul cineva de noi* (CazV., 77^v, p. 378)
‘Not am I God nor **some other** of us’
- (6) *Un om de va vrea să lase altuicuiua vreun lucru* (Prav.1646, p. 75)
‘If a man shall want to leave to **someone else** some thing’
- (7) *din partea altcuiva dintre acei, care au o apreciable experiență* (AI,O, p. 401)
‘from **someone** of them, that have a sizable experience’
- (8) *acela face prepus cum să dea altuicuiua să se otrăvească* (Prav.1652, p. 244)
‘he does beforehand how to give to **someone else** to poison’
- (9) *iară nu cu altă eparhie a altuicuiua* (Prav.1652, p. 400)
‘and not with one other diocese **of some other**’
- (10) *iară nu altuicuiua, că cătră tine grăiaște* (EÎ, 262, p. 300)
‘and not to **someone else**, but to thee speaketh’

In these examples, it is noticeable that, often, there are syntagms composed of terms that are characterized by morphological independence and syntactic dependency. In time however, the form of the pronominal quantifier *altul* ‘other’ undergoes an evolutionary process that results in a formal semblance to the adjective (*alt* ‘other’), and not a functional one (*alt* ‘other’ has the value of *altul* ‘the other’). Even if in some cases (1–2), *-l* ‘the’ is missing (*altu* ‘other’), the grammatical information is encoded, precisely as in the case of common nouns in the spoken language, by the flexionary form *u* (GBLR, p. 89), which, similarly to the full constituent *-ul*, differentiates pronouns from adjectives (GBLR, p. 147) and encapsulates the former into the type 1 category, where “the grammatical oppositions are denoted through flexionary forms which clearly express the gender, number and case” (GALR, I, p. 262). In Oblique cases, an almost generalized omission of the pronominal particle *-a*, can be noticed in the structure of the existential quantifier *altul* ‘other’ (instead of *altuia* ‘to someone else’, there is *altui*).

4.7. Cases in which the main constituent of the syntagm (*cineva* ‘someone’) is accompanied by the particle *-și* (*cinevași/cinevaș* ‘someone’) have a relatively small number of occurrences, but are relevant for investigating those aspects pertaining to the formation of the compound form we are interested in. In such

LRM), however, in the *Corpus*, we have only included those that carried linguistically relevant information for our investigation. In essence, the texts belong to some stylistically different registers (religious, administrative or literary texts), both translations, as well as original writings.

situations, the role of *-și* is not only that of demarcating a pronominal class, but also of stabilizing the part of speech, of which it is a structural part. It is noticeable that, once again, in Oblique cases, the autonomy of *cinevași* ‘someone’ is much more evident, probably also due to the fact that the indefinite form is felt as sluggish, particularly because its structure contains four constituents⁹:

- (11) *ce ca cînd ară munci pre alt cinevaș, așa să ne pare noao* (CC², 66, p. 68)
‘that as if he would labour onto **someone**, so should appear to us’
- (12) *nici că zice altcinevași fără numai acest Pătrașcu țiganu* (AJ, 845, p. 921)
‘not that **someone else** mentions, apart from this Pătrașcu the gipsy’
- (13) *dîndu-i altcinevași banii, să fie volnic a da casile* (AJ, 531, p. 590)
‘**someone else** giving him the money, to be free to give the houses’
- (14) *nici le-au dat altui cuivași danie, ci au rămas dă a să stăpîni* (AJ, 408, p. 452)
‘and they did not give to **some other** gifts, but remained to rule’
- (15) *vreo bănuială asupra Dinului Căprescul sau a altui cuivași* (AJ, 682, p. 641)
‘some suspicion about Dinului Căprescul or **some other one**’
- (16) *că nu scrie în diiată că-l lasă Lipoveanului sau altui cuivași* (AJ, 518, p. 576)
‘that it is not written in the testament that it shall be left to the Lipovean or to **some other one**’

4.8. What also appears interesting to us is the following example in which an association between a form of the plural of the alternative (*altor* ‘to others’) and the indefinite *cinevași* ‘someone’, that has a singular form is made, but to which a plural meaning is attached. It is likely that what we are dealing with is an analogical structure that came into being from using the primary form of *cine* ‘who’ with a plural meaning. Dimitrescu (1974, p. 184) identifies more writings in which this value occurs, mentioning that *cine* ‘who’ was used for the singular, as well as for the plural (*cine mă văzură* ‘(they) who saw me’, CP¹, 51^r, p. 135 / *cire iubiți Zeul* ‘they who love the God’, PS, 159^r, p. 201), a use that is not observable in modern Romanian:

- (17) *ei vrea să margă asupra altor cuivaș* (CC, ITR, 71^r, p. 193)
‘they wish to go unto **some others**’

4.9. It is not frequent that the set occurs together with determiners, its adjuncts having an adjectival or pronominal value. In cases such as these, the group center is made up of both constituents (*altul + cineva* ‘other + one’) or, implicitly, by the compound form *altcineva* ‘someone else’):

- (18) *în pilda a altui cuiva păcătos ca-ntr-o oglindă a o privi poate* (CD, p. 139)
‘in the parable of **some other sinner** like into a mirror may look in’
- (19) *sau pre altcineva oarecarele vei tu* (Mărg., 153^r, p. 426)
‘or **unto any other one** you will’
- (20) *veri altcineva a lui, să nu hulească pre Dumnezeu* (Mărg., 147^r, p. 410)
‘**any other one of him**, to not slander God’

4.10. In only one clause we identified the compound *someone else* ‘one other’ used as an adjective. The usage is atypical, because compound pronouns based on *cine* ‘who’ do not fall under this category. We assume that we are dealing with a process of conversion due to the confusion with an existential quantifier of a similar calibre, namely *altul* ‘the other’, used much more frequently and of more general aspects [\pm Human] and often compatible with those of *altcineva* ‘someone else’ [+ Human], which is one of its non-separative correspondents (GALR, I, p. 258):

⁹Without giving any examples from old writings, Avram (2005, p. 163) also mentions an over compound form of five constituents (*vrealcineva* ‘some other persons’).

- (21) *de-l va lua altul cineva om de a besearicii*¹⁰ (DVS, 214^r, p. 189)
‘if he may be taken by **some other** man of church’

4.11. A similar functional compatibility can be observed in situations where *nimeni* ‘no one’ is associated in certain syntagms with *altul* ‘other’ or *altcineva* ‘someone else’ (Chircu, 2014, p. 53–67), the negative substituting “nouns of «personal gender» as well as names of other animate or inanimate personified objects, that belong from a semantic point of view to the paradigm in which the relative-interrogative pronouns *cine*(?) ‘who(?)’ and the indefinite pronouns *cineva*, *oricine* ‘someone, anyone’, belong as well” (Dominte, 2003, p. 72):

- (22) *nimini altcinevași să nu să amestece fără’ dă numai vătafu* (AJ, 177, p. 193)
‘**no other one** should get involved apart from the bailiff’
(23) *den vreme că nime altul n-au știut acia taină, fără numai hatmanul* (CAM, 311, p. 146)
‘since **no other** knew about that concealment, apart from the marshal’
(24) *nu este altul nimenea fără mine* (CPop.³, 43^r, p. 215)
‘there is **no other** without me’
(25) *nimănuu altuia ca mie, nu iaste vestit și mărturisit a o ispiti* (VI, 204^v, p. 233)
‘**to no one other** as to me, it is not meant and told to tempt her’

4.12. In the following example, it is still noticeable that in between the two alternatives (*altul* ‘other’ and *altcineva* ‘someone else’), there used to be a difference in meaning, as they seem to be used in the same utterance (‘you, or him or another completely unnamed person’):

- (26) *cînd vei vedea pre tine, sau pre altul, sau den slugile tale, sau din coconii tăi, sau pre altcineva din casa ta că să jură adease* (Marg, 1691, 73^v, p. 218)
‘when you shall see yourself, or **other** of your servants, or of your gentlemen, or **another** of your house to oftentimes swear’

4.13. It seems that in some areas, at the beginning of the 19th century, the constituents of *altcineva* ‘someone else’ would have kept their autonomy, which suggests that the pronouns were still considered two different elements, with grammatical self-sufficiency:

- (27) *poate el încredința vînzarea lor altuia cuiva* (AB, 6, p. 192)
‘he may entrust their trade to **some other**’

4.14. The archaic structure of *cine alt*(ul) / *alt*(ul) *cine* ‘who other / other one’, has remained in Romanian as a trace of the Latin structure *qui alter*, that is generally present in interrogatives¹¹, and have a correspondent in Italian (*chi altro*); it has been increasingly competing more and more with the compound pronominal form (*altcineva* ‘someone else’):

- (28) *Cine altul va răsîpi sîmnele grăitorilor din pîntece...?* (MVTs, 25, p. 559)
‘**Who other** will squander the signs of the speakers of the wombs...?’
(29) *Cine alt va zice ție aceastea care-ț zic eu?* (Mărg., 16^r, 63)
‘**Who other** will tell you these [words] that I say?’

¹⁰The syntagm is slightly ambiguous, and may be interpreted as an apposition as well (*de-l va lua altul cineva* [,] *om de a besearicii* ‘if he may be taken by **some other** [,] man of church’).

¹¹See above, the discussion under §2.5.

5. The morphosyntactic interpretation of *altcineva*

The morphosyntax of the compound under investigation has not been researched sufficiently from a diachronic perspective, despite the fact that a series of structural peculiarities can be observed, such as the double-marked inflexion—on the one hand, in the first constituent, and on the other, in the second—or the absence of pronominal formatives.

5.1. From the start, we observe that the old language structures contradict the morphosyntactic behavior of the indefinite *altcineva* ‘someone else’, as described by Giurgea (2010) with reference to the current state of the language. He states that in contemporary Romanian, the existential quantifier *cineva* ‘someone’, together with *altul* ‘other’ give rise to certain pronominal compounds that are perceived as simple syntactic entities and that “l’analyse de ces formes comme des composés (au lieu de *alt ceva* ‘autre quelque chose’, *alt* + NP ?) est soutenue par la flexion casuelle; tandis que *alt* prénominal reçoit des désinences casuelles (pour le genre et le nombre, on peut toujours dire que *ceva* et *cineva* ne sont que des masculins singuliers), les formes *altcineva* et *altceva* ne présentent que la flexion casuelle qui caractérise la deuxième partie: oblique *altcuiva* comme *cuiva* ‘à/de quelqu’un’, absence d’une forme oblique pour *altceva* comme pour *ceva* (Giurgea, 2010, p. 164)”.

5.2. In a chapter from a subsequent collective study (RGR), the same author resumes the same discussion on the internal non-flexionary aspect of the compound *altcineva* ‘someone else’ in modern Romanian, claiming that *altcineva* ‘someone else’ and *altceva* „can be analyzed as compounds because this *alt*– is uninflected and does not appear in its regular position: direct case (NA) *altcineva* ‘alt somebody’, oblique case (GD) *alt(*ui)cuiva*” (RGR, p. 152), but our examples (3, 6–10, 14–18, 27) prove that, in the old language, the use of the pronoun in the Genitive and Dative cases comes across as natural:

- (30) *din spunerea și din cugetul mieu sau altuicuiva* (VRC, III^v, p. 187)
‘from my sayings and from my thinking or of **someone else**’

5.3. Despite the arguments invoked in RGR, our exemplifications suggest that, in the beginning, inflection did exist, being doubly marked in the syntagm under investigation, both in the encountered free forms, as well as in compound ones. The visible inflection of the two terms does none other than show us that the two terms are, in fact, pronouns, *altul* ‘other’ fulfilling a naming role. In this sense, the following instances are relevant, and we can also notice that the two constituents must be considered pronouns, as there exist a series of unambiguous grammatical markers, such as the masculine inflection, and the causal and pronominal flexionary forms, evident in both NA, but especially in GD:

- (30) *altul cineva din crieri le-au plăzmuț, unul ca acela nici al nostru* (CII, 249^v, p. 316)
‘**someone else** from writings had planned, one like that nor ours’
(31) *de va fi și altul cinevaș făcut ca acealea din romani* (CC, IȚR, 13^r, p. 153)
‘if there shall be **some others** made like those from the Romans’
(32) *sînt roabă Domnul mieu Isus Hristos, iară nu altuia cuiva* (DVS, 300^r, p. 259)
‘I am the servant of my Lord Jesus Christ, and of **not some other**’

5.4. Therefore, we may observe that the association of the two quantifiers (*altul* ‘other’, *cineva* ‘someone’), as a result of a process of progressive lexicalization, results in the compound (*altcineva* ‘someone else’) which is part of the existential quantifier class, and is a marker of “differentiation in relation to another entity of the domain of quantification (thus being likened to differentiating pronominal demonstratives), being non-separative correspondents of the separative *altul* ‘other’ (*Alt cineva vrea să-ți spună altceva* ‘Someone else wishes to tell you *another thing*’)” (GALR, I, p. 258).

5.5. Unlike other syntagmatic associations of indefinite quantifiers, we notice that the first position is taken up by *altul* ‘other’, whereas the second one by *cineva* ‘one’, which allows us to speculate that in the

case of *altul* ‘other’ we are dealing with a fixed word order and with a process of specialization that clarifies the meaning of *cineva* ‘one’. The pronoun *altul* ‘other’ is an adjunct with a pronominal value, and not with an adjectival one, as may seem when doing a surface-level interpretation.

5.6. Without providing too many details, and without making a diachronic analysis, Van Peteghem (1999) foresees the pronominal value of this type of constituents in Italian (*Chi altri/altro* potrebbe farlo? ‘Who else could do it?’), stating that “étant donné que *altro* a également une valeur pronominale en italien, il pourrait s’agir là d’un emploi pronominal, et non pas d’un emploi adjectival” (1999, p. 245). She notices a similar syntactic behavior in the case of Romanian, which is similar to Italian in this respect, differentiating quite well “la forme pronominale indéfinie *altul* de la forme adjectivale *alt*, et c’est en effet *altul* qui apparaît comme modificateur des pronoms interrogatifs et indéfinis” (1999, p. 245).

5.7. In the case of the syntactic function performed by the two constituents, we assume to rather be in the presence of a phenomenon of syntactic doubling of the function of *cineva* ‘one’ (subject (2), object (10), etc.), *altul* ‘other’ fulfilling not only a naming role, but an anticipatory one as well, just like in the case of direct and indirect objects, where the entire grammatical information is reiterated.

A similar doubling of the grammatical function of indefinite pronouns can be noticed in the case of complementary syntagms in the current language: *cine altcineva* ‘who else’ și *cui altcuiva* ‘to whom other’, where an identical syntactic behaviour exists. However, in this case too, it cannot be said of the situation to be that of an agreement, but rather a reiteration of the grammatical information in both constituents, just like Giurgea (2010) states when discussing the Oblique case of the structure *cine altcineva* ‘who else’. He believes that “le N grammatical est épilé deux fois” and that “le mouvement du N grammatical ressemble au mouvement des clitiques, étant déterminé par un besoin de l’élément qui se déplace plutôt que de la cible” (2010, p. 166).

6. Conclusions

As can be understood from the linguistic facts investigated, *altcineva* ‘someone else’ has lexicalized in a complex and gradual process, especially due to some structural peculiarities. Even though the model of production is of Latin origin, its evolution owes a great deal to the specificity of Romanian, which has detached itself from related Romance languages, being much more innovative at a morphological level, as well as at a syntactic one, due to the rich inflexion that characterizes it.

An important role in comprising the compound *cineva* ‘someone’ was taken upon by the relative-interrogative pronoun *cine* ‘who’, which drifted towards the sphere of the indefinites, alongside the indefinite particle *-a*’s attachment that is characteristic of a significant number of members.

In time, the presence of the grammatical information within the structure of the two pronouns has been sensed as redundant, a tendency of moving it to the back of the compound being noticeable. The evolution of the initially constituted syntagm has been, in its initial stages, an oscillating one, the flexionary suffixes for gender and case of the alternative being eliminated, this leading to a subsequent fusion of the compound *altcineva* ‘someone else’. What have proven to be more resilient to compounding are however the forms of the pronouns in Oblique cases, which in time, have focused their grammatical information towards the end of the new compound (*altcuiva* ‘to someone else’s’).

We thus consider that such specific analyses are necessary for understanding the formation of parts of speech of a complex structure, due to the fact that they illustrate the way in which they have formed and evolved, in addition to attesting the appropriate interpretation from a syntactic perspective.

Bibliography

A. Corpus

- AB = Mihail, P. & Mihail, Z. (1993). *Acte în limba română tipărite în Basarabia*, vol. I (1812–1830), precedate de Bibliografia tipăriturilor românești din Basarabia (= BTRB), Editura Academiei Române, București.
- AI,O = Antim Ivireanul, *Opere*, ediție critică și studiu introductiv de G. Ștrempel, Editura Minerva, București, 1972.
- AJ = *Acte judiciare din Țara Românească* [1775–1781], ediție întocmită de Gh. Cronț et al., Editura Academiei Române, București, 1973.
- CAM = Pseudo-Amiras, *Cronica anonimă a Moldovei* [1661–1729], studiu și ediție critică de D. Simionescu, Editura Academiei Române, București, 1975.
- CazV. = Varlaam, *Carte românească de învățătură*, vol. II (*Textul*), ediție îngrijită și glosar de S. Toma, prefață și studiu introductiv de D. Zamfirescu, Editura Roza Vinturilor, București, 2011.
- CC² = Coresi, *Cartea cu învățătură* [1581], publicată de S. Pușcariu și Al. Procopovici, vol. I (*Textul*), Atelierele Grafice Socec & Co., București, 1914.
- CC,IȚR = C. Cantacuzino, *Istoriia Țării Rumânești*, ediție critică, studiu filologic, studiu lingvistic, glosar și indice de nume proprii de O. Dragomir, Editura Academiei Române, București, 2006.
- CD = D. Cantemir, *Divanul sau gîlceava înțeleptului cu lumea sau Giudețul sufletului cu trupul*, text stabilit, traducerea versiunii grecești, comentarii și glosar de V. Cîndea, postfață și bibliografie de Al. Dușu, Editura Minerva, București, 1990.
- CI = D. Cantemir, *Istoria ieroglifică*, ediție îngrijită de P. P. Panaitescu și I. Verdeș, Editura Minerva, București, 1973.
- CLRV = Mareș, Al. (coord.) (2016). *Crestomația limbii române vechi*, vol. I (1521–1639), ediția a II-a revăzută și adăugită, Editura Academiei Române, București.
- CP¹ = Coresi, *Psaltirea slavo-română* [1577], în comparație cu psaltirile coresiene din 1570 și din 1589, text stabilit, introducere și indice de Stela Toma, Editura Academiei Române, București, 1976.
- CPop.³ = *Cele mai vechi cărți populare în literatura română*, vol. III (*Călătoria lui Zosim la blajini, Bertoldo*), studii filologice, studii lingvistice, ediții și glosar de M. Stanciu-Istrate și M. Georgescu, Editura Minerva, București, 1999.
- CV = *Codicele Voronețean*, ediție critică, studiu filologic și studiu lingvistic de Mariana Costinescu, Editura Academiei Române, București, 1981.
- DÎ = Chivu, Gh., Georgescu, M., Ioniță, M., Mareș, Al. & Roman-Moraru, Al. (eds) (1979). *Documente și însemnări românești din secolul al XVI-lea*, Editura Academiei Române, București.
- DVS = Dosoftei, *Viața și petrecerea sfinților* [Iași, 1682–1686], text îngrijit, notă asupra ediției și glosar de R. Frentiu, Editura Echinox, Cluj[-Napoca], 2002.
- EÎ = *Evangelhie învățătoare* [Govora, 1642], ediție, studiu introductiv, note și glosar de A.-M. Gherman, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2011.
- GS = *Gromovnic* (popa Stanciu, 1636), în Mareș, Al. (coord.) (2006). *Cărți populare din secolele al XVI-lea – al XVIII-lea. Contribuții filologice*, Fundația Națională pentru Știință și Artă, București, p. 313–320.
- LRM = Mazilu, D.H. (coord.) (2003). *Literatura română medievală*, Editura Academiei Române & Editura Univers Enciclopedic, București.
- Mărg. = Ioan Gură de Aur, *Mărgăritare*, ediție îngrijită, indice de nume și glosar de R. Popescu, Editura Libra, București, 2001.
- MVTS = Munteanu, E. (coord.) (2016). *Vechiul Testament – Septuaginta*. Versiunea lui N. Spătarul-Milescu [1683–1686] (Ms. 45, BAR Cluj), Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, Iași.
- Prav.1581 = *Pravila ritorului Lucaci* [1581], text stabilit, studiu introductiv și indice de I. Rizescu, Editura Academiei Române, București, 1971.
- Prav.1646 = *Carte românească de învățătură* [1646], ediție critică, ediția a fost întocmită de A. Rădulescu et al., Editura Academiei Române, București, 1961.
- Prav.1652 = *Îndreptarea legii* [1652], ediția a fost întocmită de A. Rădulescu et al., Editura Academiei Române, București, 1962.
- PS = *Psaltirea scheiană comparată cu celelalte psaltiri din sec. XVI-XVII traduse din slavonește*, edițiune critică de I.-A. Candrea, 2 vol., Atelierele Grafice Socec & Co, București, 1916.
- SD = *Documente din vechiul ocol al Cîmpulungului Moldovenesc*, culese, adnotate și publicate de T.V. Stefanelli, Librăriile Socec & Co și C. Sfetea, București, 1915.
- VI = Stanciu-Istrate, M. (2013). *Reflexe ale medievalității europene în cultura română veche. Varlaam și Ioasaf în cea mai veche versiune a traducerii lui Udriște Năsturel*, Editura Muzeului Literaturii Române, București.
- VRC = Varlaam, *Opere. Răspunsul împotriva catihismusului calvinesc*, ediție critică, studiu filologic și studiu lingvistic de Mirela Teodorescu, Editura Minerva, București, 1984.

B. References

- Avram, M. (2005). *Despre câteva pronume și adverbe nehotărâte în limbile romanice*, in *Studii de morfologie a limbii române*, Editura Academiei Române, București, p. 162–167.
- Bartoli, M. (1925). *Introduzione alla neolinguistica (Principi – Scopi – Metodi)*, Leo S. Olschki Editore, Genève.
- Chircu, A. (2014). *Observații asupra sintagmelor alt nime și nime alt în limba română veche*, in Zafiu, R., Dragomirescu, A. & Nicolae, Al. (eds), *Limba română: diacronie și sincronie în studiul limbii române* (Actele celui de al 13-lea Colocviu Internațional al Departamentului de lingvistică, București, 13–14 decembrie 2013), vol. I (*Gramatică. Fonetică și fonologie. Istoria limbii române, filologie*), Editura Universității din București, București, p. 53–67.
- Densusianu, Ov. (1961). *Istoria limbii române*, vol. 1 (*Originile*), ediție îngrijită de J. Byck, Editura Științifică, București.
- Densusianu, Ov. (1962). *Istoria limbii române*, vol. 2 (*Secolul al XVI-lea*), ediție îngrijită de J. Byck, Editura Științifică, București.
- Dimitrescu, Fl. (1974). *Introducere în morfosintaxa istorică a limbii române*, Centrul de multiplicare al Universității din București, București.
- Dominte, C. (2003). *Negația în limba română*, Editura Fundației România de Mîine, București.
- Frâncu, C. (2009). *Gramatica limbii române vechi (1521–1780)*, Editura Demiurg, Iași.
- GALR = Guțu-Romalo, V. (coord.) (2008). *Gramatica limbii române*, 2 vol., tiraj nou, revizuit, Editura Academiei Române, București.
- GBLR = Pană Dindelegan, G. (coord.) (2016). *Gramatica de bază a limbii române*, ediția a II-a, Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, București.
- Gheție, I. (coord.) (1997). *Istoria limbii române literare. Epoca veche (1532–1780)*, Editura Academiei Române, București.
- Giurgea, I. (2010). *Pronoms, determinants et ellipse nominale. Une approche minimaliste*, Editura Universității din București, București.
- GR = Pană Dindelegan, G. (ed.) (2013). *The Grammar of Romanian*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Haspelmath, M. (1997). *Indefinite Pronouns*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Le Goffic, P. (2015). *Indéfinis et interrogatifs: le cas du français*, in “Langue française”, vol. 187, p. 111–136, [Crossref](#).
- Lombard, A. (1938). *Une classe spéciale des termes indéfinis dans les langues romanes*, in “Studia neophilologica”, vol. 11, p. 186–209, [Crossref](#).
- Manoliu Manea, M. (1968). *Sistematica substitutelor din limba română contemporană standard*, Editura Academiei Române, București.
- Manoliu Manea, M. (1993). *Gramatică, pragmasemantică și discurs*, Editura Litera, București.
- Niculescu, Al. (1965). *Individualitatea limbii române între limbile romanice*, vol. I (*Contribuții gramaticale*), Editura Științifică, București.
- Popescu-Marin, M. (coord.) (2007). *Formarea cuvintelor în limba română din secolele al XVI-lea – al XVIII-lea*, Editura Academiei Române, București.
- Prévost, S. & Fagard, B. (2007). *Grammaticalisation et lexicalisation: la formation d’expressions complexes*, in “Langue française”, vol. 156, p. 3–8, [Crossref](#).
- Pușcariu, S. (1976). *Limba română*, vol. I (*Privire generală*), prefață de G. Istrate, note, bibliografie de I. Dan, Editura Minerva, București.
- REW = Meyer-Lübke, W. (2009). *Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 7. unveränderte Auflage, Universitätsverlag Winter, Heidelberg.
- RGR = Dobrovie-Sorin, C. & Giurgea, I. (eds) (2013). *A Reference Grammar of Romanian*, vol. I (*The noun phrase*), John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam–Philadelphia.
- SOR = Pană Dindelegan, G. (ed.) (2016). *The Syntax of Old Romanian*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, [Crossref](#).
- Stan, C. (2013). *O sintaxă diacronică a limbii române vechi*, Editura Universității din București, București.
- Stoica, G. (2011). *Pronumele indefinit. De la latină la româna comună*, in Zafiu, R., Ușurelu, C. & Bogdan Oprea, H. (eds), *Limba română: ipostaze ale variației lingvistice*, Actele celui de-al 10-lea Colocviu al Catedrei de limba română (București, 3–4 decembrie 2010), vol. I (*Gramatică și fonologie. Lexic, semantică, terminologie. Istoria limbii române, dialectologie și filologie*), Editura Universității din București, București, p. 443–449.
- Väänänen, V. (2006). *Introduction au latin vulgaire*, Éditions Klincksieck, Paris.
- Van Peteghem, M. (1999). *L’indéfini «autre»: déterminant ou adjectif. Étude comparée français – espagnol – italien – roumain*, in “Cahiers de l’Institut de Linguistique de Louvain”, vol. 25, nr. 1–2, p. 235–250, [Crossref](#).