ABOUT A SPECIOUS DIRECT OBJECT DOUBLING IN ROMANIAN

Adina DUMITRU[G]

Abstract*: The present paper represents an attempt to review the most important opinions about the syntactic and morphological status of the indefinite element in several Romanian constructions. The common element of these constructions is the presence of the indefinite element, at the morphological level, and the emphatic feature at the semantic level.*

Keywords*: indefinite pronoun/adjective, agreement, apposition.*

1.1. The starting point of the present paper is an assertion in GALR which regards the direct object clause doubling and the specious direct object doubling in complex sentences like ***Altceva*** *n-avem ce vinde*, where "the indefinite pronoun *altceva* is moved to the first position from the relative – infinitive construction" (GALR, II:387). The movement of the indefinite element in the relative – infinitive construction (***Altceva*** *n-avem ce vinde*. ← *N-avem ce vinde* ***altceva.***) can be proved and the occurrence of both types of sentences in Romanian represents a valid argument. It is asserted that the indefinite pronoun does not function as a direct object in the regent and this structure does not illustrate the direct object clause doubling. However, this argumentation referring to the former position of the indefinite element does not offer an answer to the question about its morphological and syntactic status. Is it an indefinite pronoun or an indefinite adjective? What syntactic function does it have? Is the indefinite pronoun a head or an adjunct in the group it belongs to?

1.2. The attempt to find an answer to these questions has led to other constructions which include an indefinite element and its behavior seems to be similar to that in the relative – infinitive constructions. Firstly, the equivalence between infinitive mood and subjunctive mood prove that the structure consisting in a relative pronoun and an indefinite element can occur also in other relative clauses: ***Altceva*** *n-avem ce să vindem.*

Then, considering the homonymy of relative pronouns and interrogative pronouns, the structure including such pronouns and an indefinite is also present in some interrogative sentences: *Ce* ***altceva*** *să vindem?*

The following types of structures could be distinguished: relative pronoun + indefinite pronoun; interrogative pronoun + indefinite pronoun; negative pronoun + indefinite pronoun. The first of these structures occurs both in relative-infinitive constructions and in relative clauses with the verb-predicate in the subjunctive mood.

The group formed by a relative/interrogative pronoun and an indefinite pronoun develops two subcategories of structures, according to the position of their components in the sentence:

a. relative/interrogative pronoun + indefinite pronoun – a continuous group, in which the elements are placed one next to another.

Ce altceva *să fac? Nu ştiu* ***cine altcineva*** *ar putea veni.*

b. relative/interrogative pronoun…+…indefinite pronoun – a discontinuous group, in which the elements are separated by other parts of the sentence.

[*] University of Pitesti, adina_elena_dumitru@gmail.com

BDD-A14493 © 2014 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:57:35 UTC)

***Ce** să fac **altceva**? Nu am **ce** să fac/face **altceva**. Nu am **cui** să îmi spun păsul **altcuiva**.*

2.1. Language researchers' opinions regarding the morphological status of the indefinite element in these structures, as well as the syntactic function it is assigned, vary according to the type of structure that is approached.

Considering the first type in the series mentioned above, the structure which includes a relative pronoun and an indefinite element, I. Pomian asserts that there is a connection between the infinitive – relative clauses and the rhetoric interrogative sentences due to a special common value assigned to the relative pronoun and the interrogative pronoun.

*N-avem ce să vindem **altceva**. N-avem ce **altceva** să vindem. Ce să vindem **altceva**?*

What connects these structures in a semantic perspective is the role of universal quantifier developed by the interrogative word and the relative word. "In use, the interrogative words get the role of universal quantifiers: *care, cine – nimeni, niciunul/toţi; ce, cât – nimic/tot; unde – nicăieri/pestetot, oriunde; când – niciodată/întotdeauna; cum – nicicum/oricum*. Similarly, the relatives in the infinitive structures get the same values of quantification and the relatives in the infinitive constructions are similar to the connectives that are typically interrogative (*care, cine, ce, unde, când, cum, încotro*)" (Pomian, 2006:196).

When comparing the relative – infinitive clauses with the partial rhetorical interrogative sentences, the combination with an indefinite element is noticed and it is considered to be a specific feature to these types of sentences. Regarding the rhetorical interrogative sentences, it can be pointed out that "the relative *care*, frequently associated with the indefinite *altul/alta* is accepted in the position of interrogative word. This phenomenon represents a characteristic of the partial questions" (*ibidem*: 197)

Care altul te-ar mai ajuta? Nu-i care.; Pe care altul să-l susţin? N-am pe care.; Care alta va fi mai elegantă? Nu-i care.

The association between rhetorical questions and relative – infinitive clauses explains only the semantic behavior of both types of pronouns, but it does not indicate the syntactic position they are assigned. Still, this role of universal quantifier which is common to the two types of pronouns allows the combination with an indefinite element having an emphatic relevance. This very particularity in a semantic perspective could be the key in rendering a particular syntactic approach on the function of the indefinite element.

2.2. Regarding the structure which includes an interrogative pronoun followed by an indefinite pronoun, professor D. Irimia asserts that the very presence of the indefinite pronoun *altul/alta* represents the premises for considering the question it occurs in to be a rhetorical interrogative sentence. In his opinion, this constituent becomes a pronominal adjective. One of the "particularities in sentence organizing that establish its identity of rhetorical question" is "the association between the interrogative elements with the adjective *altul/alta* or with compound adverbs formed with it" (Irimia, 1997: 363)

Care alta este mai frumoasă?

So, the indefinite pronoun is considered to turn into an adjective and, as a result, its syntactic function is adjectival attribute. This solution could be accepted on the condition of considering this occurrence of the forms *altul/alta* to be an exception, because Romanian grammars, including the academic grammars, state that these forms function only as pronouns, while *alt/altă* are their adjectival correspondents. Another

BDD-A14493 © 2014 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:57:35 UTC)

aspect which needs clarifying is the order of the components in the pronominal or noun group; no indefinite pronominal adjective occurs after its regent:**fată altă/alta, *copil fiecare, *om orice, *cadou vreun,* except the indefinite *toți/toate*. Both the form *altul/alta* and the postposition (after the regent) represent arguments that should be considered when analyzing this structure in a syntactic and morphological perspective.

2.3. As far as the structure negative pronoun + indefinite pronoun is concerned, certain grammarians proposed that the morphological analysis should consider both components to be pronouns, but there is no indication regarding which syntactic functions are assigned to them.

***Nimic altceva** nu avem de vânzare. N-avem **pe nimeni altcineva** să trimitem. Nu putem spune **nimănui altcuiva**.*

Within "the groups such as *nimic altceva, nimeni altcineva, nimeni altul* [...] both components are pronouns, disregarding their involvement in an exceptive construction" (Neamțu, 1999: 93) The main arguments for this interpretation of the structures which are very similar to the previous groups may be those mentioned above. The form of the indefinite elements is specific to the pronoun and does not occur with an adjective value in any other structure. Besides, the position in the pronominal group is not specific to the indefinite pronominal adjective. The case inflection marks could be added to this list of arguments, as they strengthen the pronominal value of the indefinite element.

***Nimeni altcineva** nu a venit. Nu am spus **nimănui altcuiva**.*

If the second element in this type of structures is a pronoun, then its syntactic function is an attribute; still, the grammar studies do not specify what type of pronominal attribute it is.

2.4. All the structures above include an indefinite element that is combined with a pronoun and all of them have a specific semantic feature, which consists in intensifying the meaning of the relative/interrogative/negative pronoun. Let us consider the following arguments that refer to all of these structures:

A. Both components in these structures have case inflection marks: *N-am cui spune altcuiva. Cui altcuiva să spun? Nu am spus nimănui altcuiva.*

B. Only the indefinite pronoun/adjective can be deleted in the structures including a relative/interrogative pronoun, which can be explained because of the syntactic role of the relative pronoun at the complex sentence level and the pragmatic and syntactic function of the interrogative word in the other type of structure: *N-am cui spune. Cui să spun?* With the structure negative pronoun + indefinite element, both components can be deleted: *Nu am spus nimănui. Nu am spus altcuiva.*

These can lead to the conclusion that the indefinite element is an adjunct in the noun group, while the other component is a pronoun and functions as the head in the group. The solution proposed by D. Irimia when referring to the indefinite element following an interrogative pronoun in rhetorical interrogative sentences could be valid only for that type of structure an only if this situation is regarded as an exception, while considering the indefinite element to be a pronoun seems to appear as a more satisfactory solution. This approach is adopted also in the academic grammar.

3.1. GALR position regarding the indefinite element in these structures can be found in the section dealing with the pronominal group, more specific in the subsection referring to the amplified pronominal group. "The appositive relation which the pronouns are involved in sometimes generates particular significations, different from the appositive relation with a noun base: emphasis (***Cine altcineva** putea fi?; **Cine altul** decât el?; Nu fusese **nimeni altul / altcineva** decât el.*) [...] separation of an entity from

BDD-A14493 © 2014 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:57:35 UTC)

other members of a class and its individualization (***Eu unul*** *nu mă duc acolo.;* ***Ce altceva*** *mai avem de făcut?;* ***Oricine altcineva*** *poate veni.; Accept* ***orice altceva*** *în afară de scuze...*)" (GALR, II, 2005: 103).

If this approach on the considered structures represents a unitary view and could be satisfactory up to a certain point, the next assertion in the same paragraph seems to be very different and even opposite to the previous one: "Also the combinations of two pronouns such as *nimeni altul, orice altceva, oricine altcineva* [...] have the status of quasi-phrases" (*ibidem*). It means that the groups already mentioned are quasi-phrases, too.

So, is the group a phrase that can be syntactically analyzed or is it a phrase that represent one syntactic unit? This question has to be logically raised after the association of those two different assertions in the same chapter and the same paragraph in the academic grammar.

If the group formed by the two pronouns is a phrase, or a quasi-phrase, then the discontinuity of its elements in the sentence proves the opposite: ***Ce*** *mai avem de făcut* ***altceva****?* Moreover, the presence of case inflection marks with both components of the group shows that its phrase status is questionable: ***Cui altcuiva*** *să spunem?*

Considering the combination of these two pronouns a syntactically decomposable group seems to be a more acceptable solution, but the next issue that needs discussing regards the syntactic roles of the two pronouns.

3.2. Conclusions

The starting point of the present paper was the structure consisting of a relative pronoun and an indefinite pronoun/adjective, aiming to argue the syntactic and morphological status of the latter. During researching the solutions offered in traditional and modern grammar studies, other similar structures including an indefinite element proved to raise the same problems when trying to establish whether the indefinite is a pronoun or a pronominal adjective. The similarities between relative/interrogative pronoun + indefinite element and negative pronoun + indefinite element could be found both at the syntactic level and at the semantic level.

The most proper approach seems to be that formulated initially in relation to the negative + indefinite structure, as it can be extended to the other two types of structures, too. There are arguments for considering the indefinite element a pronoun, and counterarguments to its adjective value. The main issue regards the form of the indefinite element, which is a specific pronominal form, different from those forms of indefinite adjective. Then, the position of the indefinite element does not argue for its adjective value; sometimes, it is placed immediately after the other pronoun (*N-avem pe cine altcineva trimite. N-avem pe cine altcineva să trimitem.*), sometimes it is placed at a certain distance from the pronoun that is supposed to be its regent (*N-avem pe cine trimite pe altcineva. N-avem cui spune altcuiva.*).

But, if the pronoun value of the indefinite element is agreed upon, at the morphological level, there is still doubtful whether it functions as a doubling word for the relative/interrogative/negative pronoun or its syntactic function is an attribute. GALR approach place these structures in the area of apposition, as it discusses them in the section dealing with the pronominal group amplified by apposition. The series of arguments for considering the indefinite pronoun to function as an apposition could begin with the very morphological status of this component of the group. However, after the assertion referring to the appositional relation between these pronouns, there is another which mention that "interpreting the groups such as *cine altul, ce altceva, eu însumi* as being realized by apposition or by subordination is questionable" (GALR, II,

BDD-A14493 © 2014 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:57:35 UTC)

2005: 103). The reasons why the interpretation of this type of structures is uncertain are not offered by the authors, but the difficulties of determining the nature of the relation between the two pronouns are obvious.

Some counterarguments to this approach on the apposition role of the indefinite pronoun can be formulated: the fundamental feature of the apposition, which consists of sharing the same referent with the base, can not be easily found with these structures. The result is that the terms can not stand one for another, they can not be replaced one by another and the deletion is possible only for one of the components in the group. Besides, the apposition marks can not occur in these structures: **Cine, adică altul, ar vrea?*

If the indefinite pronoun in these types of structures is an apposition, then it should be considered a special type of apposition, different from both the equivalence apposition and the attributive apposition. The particular type of apposition expressed by an indefinite pronoun which is related to a pronominal base would be the third type of nominal apposition in a syntactic perspective, an "indefinite pronominal apposition".

This type of apposition shares a characteristic with the equivalence apposition: the case agreement between the base and the apposition; still, while the agreement is optional with the equivalence apposition, with this third particular type of apposition expressed by an indefinite pronoun it is obligatory: **N-avem cui altcineva să spunem. N-avem cui altcuiva să spunem.*

The attributive apposition seems to be similar to this particular type of pronominal apposition with respect to the lack of the appositive marks. They can not occur with these structures as the two terms are not semantically equivalent, they do not have the same referent, one of them, the indefinite pronoun, brings an intensification of the quantifier. Another syntactic consequence of this situation placed at semantic level is that the base and the attributive apposition can not be reciprocally replaced and the indefinite pronominal apposition presents the same characteristic. The relative/interrogative/negative pronoun has the base role in any occurrence, while the indefinite is always the apposition.

The common feature which brings together these three types of appositions is the possibility of their deletion. All of them can be deleted, including the indefinite pronominal apposition (*N-avem ce zice altceva. N-avem ce zice*). What makes the indefinite pronominal apposition be a particular type, different from both equivalence and attributive appositions, is the possibility to separate the apposition from its base by placing other parts of the sentence between them.

The stylistic mark present in these structures makes them be more expressive than the correspondent structures where the indefinite pronoun does not occur. It is possible that this very feature of the structures to be the reason why GALR authors consider them quasi-phrases, expressions which are not neuter in a stylistic perspective. The intensification, the emphasis of the first element meaning is brought about by the indefinite pronoun which, in a semantic perspective, doubles the relative/interrogative/negative pronoun.

Bibliography

Avram, M., *Gramatica pentru toți*, Editura Academiei RSR, București, 1986

Bidu-Vrănceanu, A., Călărașu, C. *et alii*, *Dicționar general de științe. Științe ale limbii*, Editura Științifică, București, 1997

Cornilescu, A., *Concept of modern grammar. A generative grammar perspective*, Editura Universității București, București, 1995

BDD-A14493 © 2014 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:57:35 UTC)

GALR,I - Guţu Romalo, V., (Coordonator), *Gramatica limbii române, I, Cuvântul*, Editura Academiei, Bucureşti, 2005
GALR,II - Guţu Romalo, V., (Coordonator), *Gramatica limbii române, II, Enunţul*, Editura Academiei, Bucureşti, 2005
Găitănaru, Șt., *Gramatica actuală a limbii române*, Editura Tempora, Pitești, 1998
GBLR- Pană Dindelegan, G., (Coordonator) *Gramatica de bază a limbii române*, Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, Bucureşti, 2010
Gheorghe, M., *Limba română: Probleme teoretice și aplicații. O introducere în sintaxa modernă a complementelor*, Editura Universității Transilvania, Brașov, 2009
Irimia, D., *Gramatica limbii române*, Editura Polirom, Iaşi, 1997
Neamțu, G.G., *Teoria și practica analizei gramaticale*, Editura Excelsior, Cluj-Napoca, 1999
Pană Dindelegan, *Sintaxa grupului verbal*, Editura Aula, Brașov, 1999
Pomian, I., *Modalizarea, predicativitatea și expresivitatea în construcțiile relative infinitivale,* http://www.dacoromania.inst-puscariu.ro/articole/2006-2007_11.pdf

BDD-A14493 © 2014 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:57:35 UTC)