затоа, на Третиот црковно-народен собор, одржан во Охрид на 17 и 18 јули 1967 година, било прогласено возобновување на автокефалноста на Македонската православна црква. Но, Српската православна црква, за жал, се уште, и понатаму, го попречува нејзиното прифаќање од страна на другите православни цркви.46 

Но, Македонската православна црква, со свот свој живот и активност, преку светите богослуженија и обреди, преку негувањето на православната традиција и обичаите, со својата организационска структура е во целосна согласност со другите православни цркви. Уште повеќе тоа се однесува на нејзиното запазување на догматското учение, а тоа беше подвличено и од епрарите на неколку православни цркви, кои неодамна беше посетени од делегација на Македонската православна црква. За охрабрување е што при сите тие средби е давена целосна поддршка на возобновената самостојност на нашата Света црква. Тоа се, секако, и најбитните услови што нашата црква оправдано, веруваше, искорак до вбројат во заедницата на православните цркви. Освен тоа, нашата Македонска црква постои и деествува во самостојна и независна држава Република Македонија, а 17-то правило на 4. и 38. на 5-б. Вселенски собор истакнува дека црковните граници треба да се распоредуваат според државните.47 Со други зборови, тоа не значи ништо друго тику дека на секоја независна држава ја следи самостојна православна црква, се разбира доколку таа ги исповнува потребните услови. Заотак сметаме дека на сите сестрински православни цркви добро им се познават највисоките црковни норми (каноните, односно одлукуите на вселенските, помесните собори и авторитети во вселенската црква, како и досегашната практика во историјата на помесните православни цркви), па оттука, ќе повториме: силно веруваме дека и не е далеку денот кога и нашава Македонска православна црква ќе биде прифатена како рамноправна членка во семејството на православните цркви и дека идните сеправославни празнувања и јубилејни чествувања ќе ги одбележува во заедница со сите помесни православни цркви. Амин! Така нека биде!

46 Исто, 159-170.
47 Ј. Белчовски, Исторически основи на автокефалноста на Македонската Православна Црква, Скопје 1986, 131.

Victor A. Friedman

THE INDEFINENESS OF ‘ONE’ IN ITS MACEDONIAN AND BALKAN CONTEXT*
Неопределеноста на 'еден' во неговиот македонски и балкански контекст.

Бројот 'еден' во македонскиот јазик се употребува со значење кои одговараат на неопределенит член во тие јазици каде што неопределеноста се противставува на определеноста како граматичка категорија. Знаеме дека во старословенски, староречки и латински нема таква употреба на бројот 'еден'. Исто така, од една страна има можности дека определеноста веќе била граматикализирана на балканска почва пред да дојдат Римјаните, а од друга страна знаеме дека таква употреба веќе е присутна во најстарите старотурски паметници од осмот век. Покрај овие факти, употребата на бројот 'еден' со значење на неопределеност е најмногу застапена во турскиот, албанскиот, и романскиот, во гърчки и бугарски нешто понезастапена -- како и во македонскиот -- станува се поретка и поретка на словенска јазична територија кога се оди на север и запад преку Србија и Хрватска. Од септо тоа се дојде до заклучокот дека употребата на бројот 'еден' како десемантизиран знак на неопределеноста е значајно застапен во македонскиот литературен јазик а истовремено и најверојатно, имајки го предвид целот балкански контекст, еден балканизам којот досега не беше идентифициран како таков.

The grammaticalization of expressions of definiteness is one of the oldest Balkanisms both in terms of possible attestation and in terms of identification

*This research was aided by a grant for East European Studies from the American Council of Learned Societies with funding from the US Department of State/Research and Training for Eastern Europe and the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union Act of 1983 (Title VIII).
as such. Thus, for example, Hamp (1982:79) concludes after careful etymological argument that the name of the ancientsite of Drobeta — located on the Danube near modern Tumu Severin in northwestern Oltenia (Romania) — contains “a Latin misunderstanding or misparsing in Moesia Inferior of *drunjatā, a definite noun phrase with postpose article.” As such, it gives “direct evidence in the Roman period of one of the most notable syntactic constructions of the Balkan Sprachbund, i.e. a specimen from the autochthonous language of the model of the Romanian postposed article which was calqued out of Latin materials.” Moreover, it constitutes “direct attestation for the common possession of this important feature linking modern Albanian with Moesia Inferior.” Similarly, Kopitar (1829:86, 106) focused particularly on the postposed definite article as the most striking example of his characterization of the linguistic territory of what today we could call Balkan Romance, Balkan Slavic, and Albanian as an area where “nur eine sprachform herrscht, aber mit dreierlei Sprachmaterie…” This is arguably the earliest formulation of the principle of areal linguistics underlying the concept of the Balkan Sprachbund. 1 In this paper, however, I shall examine what can be regarded as the inverse of grammaticalized definite reference, namely grammaticalized indefinite reference.

I shall argue that indefiniteness is expressed by the numeral ‘one’ in Macedonian in such a way that its semantic bleaching is not unlike the fully grammaticalized phenomenon of the indefinite article in languages where it exists as such. Moreover, historical evidence and the nature of modern parallels among the various Balkan languages support the view that the use of ‘one’ as an indefinite marker, while widespread in the languages of the world, is nonetheless an areal phenomenon in its Balkan context, i.e. a Balkanism, although it has not been identified as such in any of the standard handbooks. In addition to these observations, it is noteworthy that Macedonian occupies a specifically intermediate position among the Balkan languages in this respect. Unlike certain classic Balkanisms — e.g. the loss of the infinitive (Joseph 1983:242-43) or the grammaticalization of object reduplication (Friedman 1994) — for which the Macedonian system represents the most consistent type, the Macedonian use of eden as an indefinite marker is more like the limitation of special verbal forms to da-clauses, in terms of which Macedonian is midway between Albanian and Romanian on the one hand and Bulgarian and Greek on the other (see Friedman 1986a). 2

The status of eden as an indefinite marker has been analyzed by Topolińska (1981-82) and Weiss (1996) as well as Friedman (1993:268, 291) and Minova-Gjukova (1994:59-60, 118-129). General typological questions of the use of the numeral ‘one’ as an indefinite article have been addressed recently by Lyons (1999:89-99) and Haspelmath (1997:29). Weiss (1996:451) observes that, contrary to the implicational schema given in Givón (1984:333), according to which a grammatical marker does not normally encode non-adjacent meanings — DEFINITE > REFERENTIAL-INDEFINITE > NONREFERENTIAL-INDEFINITE > GENERIC — Macedonian eden can be generic or referential-indefinite but not nonreferential-indefinite. This is seen in examples such as (1) and (2) cited in Weiss (1996:436): 3

(1) Има ли кая вас лекар / некој лекар / *eden лекар?
‘Is there a doctor at your place?’

(2) Викни лекар / некој лекар / *eden лекар!
‘Call a doctor!’

Topolińska (1981-82:712) also makes the point that Macedonian eden is a semantically bleached referential and generic marker whose use is broadening among younger Macedonians (cf. also Naylor 1981-82:538).

As is the case in Greek and Albanian (Kazazis and Pentheroudakis 1976), Macedonian eden in its specific-referential function, is grammaticalized to the point that it can even trigger object reduplication:

1 Infinitive loss and future formation were the other features. Regardless of the fact that in Greek (and Roman) the definite article is postposed, and that definiteness occurs in the Serbian/Croatian adjective and thatpost-posed articles occur in Scandinavia and Euskara — and also North Russia — in the Balkan context the postposed definite article is a Balkanism. See my comments at the end of this work on areal versus typological criteria (also Hamp 1977).

2 I am using the term ‘indefinite marker’ in a slightly different sense from Haspelmath’s indefiniteness marker (1997:22). Haspelmath uses the term definiteness marker to refer to that part of an indefinite pronoun or collocation that carries the meaning of ‘indefiniteness’ (e.g. English some, any, Macedonian ne-, bilo, i da e, etc.). Here I am using the term to mean a bearer of the grammatical meaning of indefiniteness that may or may not be fully grammaticalized, i.e. semantically bleached and subject to rules of obligatory occurrence (cf. Topolińska 1981-82:705 and Lyons 1999:276; and, more generally, Traugott and Heine 1991).

3 The indefinite pronoun некој ‘some’ lends a nuance of some kind of to the sentence, but in the context of the type of sentence being illustrated does not need to be translated into English here. Similarly, the sentence would be grammatical if eden were taken to mean ‘one’ as opposed to, e.g. ‘five’. In speech, this would be clarified by stress and intonation (cf. Koneski 1967:176,325).
(3) Ja baram edna marka, no ne ja najdov
‘I’m looking for a [specific] stamp, but I couldn’t find it’ (Friedman 1993:291)

It is also worth noting that in the editing of Macedonian for publication, just as is the case in Bulgarian (Friedman 1976), there is a tendency in formal writing to eliminate article-like uses of eden, (Blaze Koneski to Z. Topolincka, personal communication from Z. Topolincka), itself an indication of the process of the grammaticalization of eden as an indefinite marker in colloquial Macedonian.

While the processes of the grammaticalization of eden in its function as an indefinite marker and the general question of the nature of an indefinite article vis-à-vis indefinite pronouns are all worthy of further examination, my primary purpose here is rather to place the Macedonian use of eden as an indefinite marker in its Baltic context. In order to do this, I compared parallel translations of the Bible (Ancient Greek, Latin, Old Church Slavonic, Albanian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Romanian, Turkish)4 and the Bulgarian novella Baj Ganjo (Konstantinov 1895) with Albanian, Modern Greek, Macedonian, and Romanian translations. I took as my samples nine passages from the Gospels which, in the English version, contained indefinite articles (Jn 9:1; Mk 6:27; Mt 4:8; ; Mt 4:18; Mt 8:2; Mt 8:24; Mt 8:5; Mt 8:9; Mt 8:19) and Chapter One of Baj Ganjo (over 1300 words in the original). While much larger corpora will be necessary for conclusive results, even this small and random sample shows consistancy of patterning that is highly suggestive.5 Examples included all types of usages with all types of noun phrases.

The results of the comparison show that, leaving to one side differences owing to idiomatic translation or minor semantic deviations, Albanian, Romanian, and Turkish pattern almost exactly like English (eight out of nine) in terms of indefinite article usage in the Bible translations and show considerably more uses of ‘one’ as an indefinite marker than the Bulgarian original in Baj Ganjo (Turkish with 48 followed by Albanian with 35 and Romanian with 32).6 Among Bulgarian, Greek, and Macedonian, in both the Bible translations (for Bulgarian and Macedonian) and in Baj Ganjo, Bulgarian had slightly more uses of ‘one’ as an indefinite marker than Macedonian (6 vs 4 in the Bible, 13 vs 10 in Baj Ganjo) and there were no instances of non-correspondence in which ‘one’ was present in the Macedonian but absent in the Bulgarian. In the case of the Greek translation of Baj Ganjo, the number of correspondences to the Bulgarian original was the same as in Macedonian, but the places were somewhat different. The relevant phrases are given as examples (4)-(7). In all of these languages, however, the usage was visibly more facultative and restricted than in Albanian, Romanian and Turkish.7

4The Modern Greek translation of the Bible turned out to be too archaic to be useful.
5Topolincka (1981-82:713-15) provides thirty-two examples of the use of eden as an indefinite marker from the Macedonian translation of War and Peace of which 29 correspond to zero in the Russian original (the other three correspond to the French indefinite article in the original).
6In the use of ‘one’ as an indefinite marker, just as in the use of definite articles, there is never total isomorphism in usage between one language and another.
7The description of ‘one’ as an indefinite marker given for Greek in Householder, Kazazis, and Koutsoudas (1964:96) is similar to the situation Balkan Slavic and Balkan Romani (as opposed to English and other Balkan languages; see Friedman Forthcoming).
‘Baj Ganjo leaned over his saddle-bags with his back to me, pulled out half a wheel of kashkaval cheese, cut himself a delicate slice, cut a huge slab of bread aswell, and began to chew with a wonderful appetite.’

In examples (4), (5), and (7), the item in question is an abstract noun, whereas in (6) it is a concrete inanimate that can be considered specific. In each case of non-correspondence, however -- including the Bulgarian original in which ‘one’ is used each time -- the indefinite marker is facultative.8

Like Latin and Ancient Greek, Common Slavic -- as represented by Old Church Slavonic -- almost never used the numeral ‘one’ as an indefinite marker, and on the rare occasion when the use of ‘one’ in these languages is not explicitly numerical, it corresponds to markedly specific English collocations of the type ‘a certain’. Example (8) was the only such usage in the sample:

(8) И пристигъл единъ къмникъ ...  
Kai proselthôn eis grammateus...  
Et accedens unus scriba...  
And a certain scribe came ... (Matthew 8:19)

Givón (1981:36) makes the point that the use of ‘one’ as an indefinite marker in what he calls Street Hebrew represents “the first, earliest stage in the development of ‘one’ as an indefinite marker, where it is used only to mark referential-indefinite nouns.” He defines Street Hebrew as “a dialect spoken by native speakers in informal contexts ...[that] is in some sense a ‘Creole’ having been developed by first generation speakers out of variable, considerably Pidginized input of non-native speech.” Givón, however, considers the development only as a typological phenomenon, citing its development in a broad range of languages. His approach is explicitly Bickertonian, assuming the development itself to be a type of “human-universal” (35), and he proposes discourse-related factors that explain the choice of ‘one’ as the source of indefinite articles. Without going into the vigorous debate surrounding the universalist approach to language change (see Thomason 1996 for many counter examples), we can note that Topolínska (1995) observes: “Analytic markers of referentiality emerge in periods of convergent development, in conditions of creolization, while synthetic markers are instruments of linguistic divergence.” The rise of the use of ‘one’ as an indefinite marker in Macedonian and in the other Balkan languages is clearly a development that, at the very least for Slavic, Hellenic, and Romance, took place in the context of contact with Turkish and the ancestor of modern Albanian. This is demonstrated by the absence of such usage from the attested ancestral languages as discussed in example (8). Moreover, it is worth noting that as one moves north and west from the centers of Balkan linguistic contact and innovation, the use of ‘one’ as an indefinite marker in the South Slavic languages decreases (see Friedman 2000). To this can be added the observation that facts noted by Weiss (1996:451) may in fact be connected with a language contact and its influence on internal development.

The historical and social factors surrounding the use of eden as an indefinite marker in Macedonian (and the other Balkan languages) were those of Balkan linguistic convergence. Thus, as in the rise of so-called evidentiality in Balkan Slavic and Albanian (see Friedman 1974,1986b), while internal structural and universal linguistic factors may have had a role to play, the fact remains that the development of eden as an indefinite marker in Macedonian occurred in the context of the rise of the Balkan linguistic league and the geographic distribution of the usage shows it to be stronger in East South Slavic than in west South Slavic. Hence, Macedonian eden as an indefinite marker can most likely be considered a Balkanism.

8Native speakers of Bulgarian disagreed over the stylistic implications of omitting ‘one’ in the original: Some felt that in (4), (5) and the last occurrence in (7) its presence was important to add emotive affect, while others felt it was pleonastic. In the first occurrence in (7), the usage was felt to be disambiguating (otherwise delikatno could be interpreted as an adverb) while the remaining occurrences were felt to be stylistically more specifying but nonetheless omissible. It is worth noting that elsewhere in the same chapter Konstantinov uses ton without edin:

(i) с тонъ, в който звучеше съжаление за моята наивност.  
in a tone of voice that expressed pity for my naïveté.'
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