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1. Introduction

While the grammaticalization of expressions of definiteness is one of the oldest Balkanisms both in terms of possible attestation and in terms of identification as such, that which can be regarded as the inverse of grammaticalized definite marking, namely grammaticalized indefinite marking, has never figured in the catalogue of Balkanisms. Thus, for example, Hamp (1982: 79) concludes after careful etymological argument that the name of the ancient site of Drobey - located on the Danube near modern Turnu Severin in northwestern Oltenia (Romania) - contains "a Latin misunderstanding or mispriming in Moesia Inferior of *drūxā-tā, a definite noun phrase with postposed 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, Koplár (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 prin-
picle of areal linguistics underlying the concept of the Balkan Sprachbund. In the history of Balkan linguistics, it was the Balkanization of the East South Slavic nominal system that first prompted Trubetzkoj (1923, 1928) to formulate the Sprachbund as an explicit theoretical construct in contradistinction to the genetic model as an explanation of language change and relationships. Although Trubetzkoj referred to the loss of case marking and the rise of definiteness marking, the use of the numeral meaning ‘one’ to mark indefiniteness in Balkan Slavic is also considerably more developed than in the other Slavic languages and resembles the semantic bleaching of the fully grammaticalized phenomenon of the indefinite article in languages where it exists as such. In this paper, using comparative evidence, I shall argue that indefiniteness is grammaticalized in Balkan Slavic (and Romani). The historical evidence and the nature of modern parallels among the various Balkan and Slavic languages support the view that this phenomenon, while widespread in the languages of the world, is nonetheless areal (contact induced) rather than typological, in its Balkan context, i.e. a Balkanism, although it has not been identified as such in any of the standard handbooks from Sandfeld (1930) to Demiraj (1994). Moreover, in both the Balkan and Slavic contexts, Macedonian occupies a specifically intermediate position in this respect. Unlike certain classic Balkanisms – e.g. the loss of the infinitive (Joseph 1983: 242–43) or the grammaticalization of object

1 Infinitive loss and future formation were the other features. Regardless of the fact that in Greek (and Romani) the definite article is preposed, and that definiteness occurs in the Serbian/Croatian adjectival and that postposed articles occur in Scandinavia and Euskara – and also North Russia – in the Balkan context the postposed definite article is a Balkanism. Cf. my comments below on areal versus typological criteria.

2 I am using the term indefinite marker – in contradistinction to indefinite article – in a different sense from Hasepelmah’s indefiniteness marker (1997: 22). Hasepelmah uses the term indefiniteness 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.). I am using indefinite marker to mean a bearer of the grammatical meaning of indefiniteness that is not as fully grammaticalized as an indefinite article, i.e. semantically bleached and subject to rules of obligatory occurrence (cf. Topolińska 1981: 82–705 and Lyons 1999: 276; and, more generally, Traugot and Heine 1991), but is more grammaticalized than an indefinite pronoun. Thus, for example, in Balkan Slavic, the indefinite marker is obligatory in some specific-referential contexts, but it is omitted or possible in nonreferential contexts where a language such as English would require an article, e.g. Macedonian Vikni lekar ‘Call a doctor’.
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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 1985). I shall also demonstrate that differences in the prescription versus description of ‘one’ as an indefinite marker are motivated to some extent by linguistic ideology (in the sense of Silverstein 1979, Friedrich 1989, Woolard and Schieffelin 1994, Friedman 1997).

2. ‘One’ in the Non-Slavic Balkan Languages

Grammars of Albanian, the Balkan Romance languages, Greek, and Turkish (which, although an adstrate language, is nonetheless relevant here) describe grammaticalizations of the respective etymological numerals meaning ‘one’, usually unmarked, as indefinite articles, e.g. Newmark et al. (1982: 150–51), Graur et al. (1966: 108–11), Atanasov (1990: 201), Householder et al. (1964: 96), Lewis (1967: 53–54). Aromanian grammars do not treat the status of unulun in ‘one M/E’ as an indefinite article explicitly, although Vrabie (2000: 101) glosses it with the English indefinite article and it clear from publications and texts that it has this function.

In each of the non-Slavic Balkan languages, the use of ‘one’ as an indefinite article has language-specific peculiarities. Thus, for example, in Albanian, nje is used with certain locative prepositions: Hipi mbi çati ‘He climbed on the roof’ Hipi mbi nje çati ‘He climbed on a roof.’ The indefinite article is used with predicate nominatives only when they are modified: Ai ishte djatë ‘He was a boy’ Ai ishte nje djatë së vërtetë ‘He was a real boy’ (Newark et al. 1982: 150). In Romanian, ‘one’ is used with predicate nominatives to distinguish referential from generic/attributive: Ionescu este un clon ‘Ionescu is a clown [by profession]’, Ionescu este clon ‘Ionescu is a clown [a prankster]’ (Graur et al. 1966: 109).

For Greek, Householder, Kazazis, and Koutsidas (1964: 96) write:

"The indefinite article is used more sparingly in Greek than in English; it is not used for example, with predicate nouns, often not with indefinite direct objects, and generally not in proverbs and popular sayings when an entire class is meant and not a specific member of that class: emu phoitiç ti am a student’; xistoume spon ‘They are building a house’; katharos oronas sterases dé oforta ‘A clear sky is not afraid of lightning’.

Examples: oas zeta enos koros kai mia koría ‘A gentleman
and a lady are asking for you'; μιας φήσης μιας της εκλε-φαν την τούνα 'They stole the handbag of a friend of ours'; Βρήκαμε ενε σκύλο στο δρόμο και τον φέραμε σπίτι 'We found a dog on the street and brought him home.' αυτό το καπέλο είναι ενός κυρίων που μένει εδώ 'This hat belongs to a gentleman who lives here.'

According to Kazazis (personal communication) modified predicate nominatives ordinarily do not take 'one', as in είμαι κάποιος φοιτητής 'I am a good student' or είμαι φοιτητής της ανθρωπολογίας 'I am a student of anthropology'. On the other hand, as an identifying referential, 'one' occurs in contexts such as the following: είμαι ενός φοιτητής της ανθρωπολογίας στο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσπολικής και σας γράφω για να σας ζητήσω μια συμβολή 'I am a student of anthropology at the University of Salonika and I am writing to you to ask for your advice.' Similarly, to the question Ποιος είναι; 'Who is it?' (e.g., on the phone, at the door) one can answer [είναι] ενός φοιτητής 'It's a student.'

In Turkish, the syntax of bir 'one' disambiguates specificity and class membership: güzel bir bahçe 'a beautiful garden' (as opposed to an ugly one), bir güzel bahçe (as opposed to a beautiful meadow or ugly forest), bir bahçeşi gördüm 'I saw a [specific] garden' (Lewis 1967: 54, 248).

Balkan Romani and other significantly Balkanized dialects such as those belonging to the Vlax group are described as using 'one' as an indefinite marker (Boretzky 1992: 21, 163–203; Boretzky 1994: 31, 189–258; Hancock 1995: 56; Igla 1996: 42, 45, 252–75; Matras 1994b: 44–49). Boretzky (personal communication) also observes that in the Romanian-influenced Vlax Romani of Vojvodina, jek 'one' is not obligatory as an indefinite marker, but when it occurs, it does so in a reduced form, k:

(1) De ma ([jelk] phabaj
Give me an apple

Boretzky (personal communication) also notes that the Romani dialects of Greece sometimes copy the Greek use of the definite article in generics. According to Sampson (1926: 405), however, Romani 'one' is 'never used to express the indefinite article 'a', 'an' ' or 'is rarely used in any dialect' (p. 151). The first statement is based on a dialect in significant contact with Welsh, which does not have an indefinite article, while the second is clearly not born out by the empirical evidence of later research such as the sources cited above or the Kalajdiz dialect of Bulgaria, in which jelk much more common than in dialects spoken outside the Balkans (Hristo Kyuchukov, personal communication).

3. 'One' in Balkan Slavic

In Balkan Slavic, however, this status of 'one' is somewhat controversial for Bulgarian, according to Avgustinova (1998: 15): 'The existence of an indefinite article in Bulgarian, addressed, for example, in Friedman 1976, is still a controversial issue and a matter of on-going linguistic discussion.' Friedman (1976) was originally read at the First Bulgarian-American Conference on Slavic Studies (Madison, May 1973), and in that paper I concluded:

'The two principal points of contention with regard to the use of edin as an indefinite article center on the differences between descriptive and normative grammar and between specific and nonspecific reference. It is clear that edin is used by educated Bulgarians with the grammaticalized, delexicalized function characteristic of an indefinite article. The real question involves the extent of this usage, i.e., the degree of grammaticalization of edin into an indefinite article. The kinds of usage frowned upon by Andreichen [1942: 141, 1961: 181], Brezinski [1969: 49–52], and sometimes Maslov [1956: 96] are all nonreferential, i.e., instances in which edin is unambiguously an indefinite article, where its only replacement would be the general form. The kinds of usage described as obligatory by Borodich [1961] and Ivanchev [1957] are referential: If the object is placed before the verb and the subject, then it is being emphasized in such a way as to be only referential, i.e., specific; the relation between emphasis and reference also seems to work for the second nominative clause. The use of edin with proper names, where the usage is clearly nonreferential, might be discounted as a special case.4 The distinction between a referential indefinite article and an indefinite adjective or pronoun is a hazy one at best. Hence the normativists and descriptivists are not as much at variance as would first appear. Edin is used as an indefinite article in Bulgarian, especially in a semantic or syntactic context which demands a referential indefinite article. When functioning nonreferentially, edin is more

---

4 The use of edin with proper names can be explained by their being definitiva tautum, i.e., their inherent definiteness is not indicated by a definite article, so their use as common nouns requires their explicit indefinitizing, which is accomplished by the indefinite article edin.
readily omissible and less likely to be sanctioned unani-
mously by grammarians."

At the end of my paper, Vladimir Georgiev supported my conclusions by stating that the two most common actions of proofreaders at Bulgarian publishing houses are corrections in the use of masculine definite articles (the artificial literary distinction between oblique {-jy̞ːt} and nominative {-jy̞ːt} and the removal of edin used as an indefinite marker. Strictures against such uses of edin taught to children in Bulgarian public schools (Valentina Izmir-
lieva, Columbia University, personal communication) and prescribed in hand-
books of correct usage (e.g., Brezinski 1968: 49) indicate that indefinite marker usage is widespread colloquially despite its sanctioned or debatable nature for grammarians. The debate has continued more or less unabated and unchanged—except for the adducing of occasional additional example and argument—right up to the end of the second millennium.5

After reviewing the literature that I discussed in Friedman (1976) as well as material published subsequently, Mayer (1988: 121) concludes:

"The fact that the use of edin is obligatory in indefinite NPs expressing specificity when the NP does not carry logical stress, at least in initial position, as well as in a non-specific use with personal names denoting members of a class means that there is an indefinite article in Bulgarian, although its range is more limited than, for example, in English. However, the fact that edin can function as an indefinite article in other uses, namely in non-specific and generic NPs, lends further support to its existence, despite the fact that these uses are far less frequent and in some cases even marginal (e.g., in the predicate nominative function)."

Nonetheless, a decade later Bojadjiev, Kucarov and Penchev (1998: 470) stated:

"Не с решен въпросът с т. нар. неопределителен член в българския език. Става думата за неопределителен член като edin, edna, edno, edn, някак, някак, и др. Ако се приеме наличието на такъв член (той, разбира се, не може да бъде неопределителен, щом има формално незначителни неопределители форми от типа книга трябва да му се търси друго название), категорията би ставала тричлена (книга, една книга, книгата), тъй като не може да се пренебрегне формално незначителният член, нито пък да се декларира тъждество между него и члена, маркиран с edin или някак.

По наше мнение, на този етап от развитието на български език не е логично да се приеме наличието на неопределителен член от типа edna или книга.

Мистото му е в периферията на функционално-семантичното поле на категорията."6

Peripheral or not, the arguments for grammatical status remain valid.

For Macedonian, Koneski (1967: 325) treats eden as an indefinite pronoun that is distinguished from the numeral by the lack of stress in the former. However, eden has been analyzed as an indefinite marker by Topolifis (1981–82) and Weiss (1996) as well as Friedman (1993: 268, 291) and Minov-

6 "The question of the so-called indefinite article in Bulgarian is unresolved. The discussion here concerns "indefinites" such as one/a, a certain/some or other, etc. If we accept the presence of such an article (of course, it cannot be "indefinite" insofar as there exist formally unmarked indefinite forms of the type book – one must seek a different term for it), the category would become three-membered (book, a book, the book), so that one cannot differentiate the formally unmarked article, nor can one declare a victory between it and the article marked with one/a or a certain/some or other.

"In our opinion, at this stage of the development of the Bulgarian language it is not logical to accept the presence of an indefinite article of the type edna kniga. Its place is on the periphery of the semantic functional field of the category." I should note in passing that the argumentation here is rather flawed, since njekoj si has a clear lexical specifying meaning, whereas edin, when used as an indefinite determiner is bleached of its meaning of 'one', i.e. it is grammaticalized (and can also be non-specific, cf. Avgusti-
nova 1998). Thus, a comparison between the two lexical units is inappropriate. The presence of clicitization or absence of stress (cf. Hauge 1977: 98–99), while useful in arguing for grammaticalization, is not a requirement. Examples cited in Tisheva (1999) from journalistic prose make it clear that edin certainly functions in that register of Bulgarian as an indefinite article."
that Macedonian *eden* is a semantically bleached referential and generic marker whose use is broadening among younger Macedonians (cf. also Naylor 1981/82: 538). Moreover, 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:

(2) Ja baram edna marka, no je 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 Konesti to Z. Topolinska, personal communication from Z. Topolinska), itself an indication of the process of the grammaticalization of *eden* as an indefinite marker in colloquial Macedonian.

In Southern West South Slavic, i.e. the former Serbo-Croatian, the use of *jedan* ‘one’ and its co-forms (*jedna*, etc.) as a marker of indefiniteness are more characteristic of the Serbian standard than the Croatian, like the use of the imperfect (see Collins 1990). Unlike the use of the imperfect, however, the use of *jedan* as an indefinite marker is not a preservation but rather an innovation, although, like the preservation of the imperfect, it is also characteristic of Balkan Slavic. As indicated above, the rise of ‘one’ as an indefinite marker may be connected with the rise of the definite article, which occurs only in the

7 The South Slavic continuum can be divided, for heuristic purposes with a basis in historical phonological, morphological, and syntactic developments, into East South Slavic (Macedonian and Bulgarian) and West South Slavic (Slovenian and the former Serbo-Croatian). All those dialects south of Slovenian, north of Macedonian, and west of Bulgarian can thus be classified as Southern West South Slavic, henceforth SWSS. Greenberg (1996) has shown convincingly that the differentiation of SWSS dialects is based on geographic distribution rather than ethnicity. This fact was behind the terminological shift to *Eastern variant* and *Western variant* during the period of the second Yugoslavia. At the same time, however, it is convenient to use the terms *Serbian* and *Croatian* (and *Bosnian*) to refer to the various SWSS dialects of the republics/countries that bear these names. The data used for this study had the conscious intent of conforming to either a Croatian or Serbian norm. I shall therefore use the term SWSS when referring to the geographic complex of dialects and the terms *Serbian*, *Croatian*, and *Bosnian/Croatian* when referring to the specific literary varieties that are being compared here (with the understanding that these terms have a geographic basis). Current Anglophone International Community practice uses the term *Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian* (BCS), but since none of our data are explicitly Bosnian, we will not have use for this collocation. Henceforth, I shall also simply use *jedan* to stand for all the possible inflectional forms of the word.

southeast of SWSS territory. When we turn to the standard grammars of Serbian/Croatian from the mid-twentieth century, we find that if the problem of the use of *jedan* as an indefinite marker is discussed at all – and it is frequently ignored – there is a differentiation between a prescriptive Croatian approach and a prescriptive Serbian one, resembling the situation for the imperfect described by Collins (1990). This difference is illustrated by the following two quotations, the first from a Croatian-oriented grammar, the second for Serbian-oriented one:

 [...] mnogi današnji pisci kvare jezik upotrebljavajući broj jedan bez ikakve potrebe prema njemačkom artikulu ein, franc. un, ital. uno,“8 (Maretić 1963: 510)

Броj jedan се врло често у нашем језику употребљава -- не да се њим означи број, него више као нека врста неодређеног члана, (Stevanović 1986: 313)9

It is interesting to note that this same difference is reflected in Bulgarian prescriptive debates, where, for example, Brezinski (1968: 49) criticizes the “unmotivated” use of *edin* and makes exactly the same comparisons with the French and German indefinite articles. I shall return to the problem of comparison with West European as opposed to Balkan languages at the end of this article.

4. Historical Comparative Data: The Bible

As indicated above, the use of ‘one’ as an indefinite marker is a feature shared to varying degrees by the Balkan languages and is likewise a feature not inherited from their respective ancestral languages, when such are attested. In this section, I examine comparative evidence from nine passages from the Gospels all of which display indefinite article usage in English, which in this respect is typical of a language with a highly grammaticalized indefinite article, i.e. one in which the article’s use is obligatory in a wide variety of contexts.10

8 ‘[...] many modern writers ruin the language by using the numeral ‘one’ without any need, under the influence of the German article ein, French un, Italian uno;’

9 ‘The numeral one is used quite frequently in our language, not with a numerical meaning but more like some type of indefinite article.’  

10 The Gospels represent, perhaps, the only text extent in almost all the ancestral and modern languages relevant to this paper. Although modern translations are
The passages (Mk 6:27, Jn 9:1, Mt 4:8, Mt 4:18, Mt 8:2, Mt 8:5, Mt 8:9, Mt 8:19, Mt 8:24) are given in English below and in Appendix 1 in the following languages (in order of occurrence there and in Table 1): Bulgarian (B), Macedonian (M), Serbian (Sr), Slovene (Sv), Czech (Cz), Russian (Ru), Old Church Slavonic (OCS [Codex Zographensis]), New Testament Greek (G), Latin (L), Romanian (Rmn), Albaniun (A), Turkish (T), Romani (Arli dialect [Balkan group]; Ri-A), and Romani (Gurbad dialect [Vlax group]; Ri-G).11 The order and choices of languages represent all of South Slavic from south to north, both Balkan and non-Balkan, followed by one representative each of West and East Slavic—the choice of Czech being dictated in part by the fact that as West Slavic languages go it is closer to South Slavic than Lekhite and, at the same time, has had its own influences from a language with a definite article (German). The next three languages represent ancestral stages for three of the four classic Balkan linguistic groups, followed by modern representatives of non-Slavic Balkan languages, both classic (Romanian and Albanian) and marginal (Turkish and Romani). In the case of Romani, we have examples from dialects influenced by Balkan and non-Balkan Slavic, respectively.

Table One summarizes the results from the New Testament data given in Appendix 1. The languages are presented in the order given in the appendix. An X indicates presence on an indefinite marker in the passage in question, a 0 indicates absence. An asterisk indicates that the indefinite item is animate, while a dagger indicates that it is the subject of the sentence. Indefinites are classed in terms of concepts such as SPECIFIC, REFERENTIAL, IDENTIFYING, CATEGORIZING, GENERIC, etc. Avgustinova (1998) uses the terminology identifying-specific (‘a certain one’), identifying-nonspecific (‘any one’), and
categorizing-generic (‘any and all’) for Bulgarian edin.12 The first two are the most common usages, but there is also one categorizing-generic example that represents the typical situation. A superscript /s/ indicates identifying-specific in Avgustinova’s (1998) terminology, a superscript /g/ indicates her categorizing-generic, while lack of a superscript indicates identifying non-specific. Data for languages with indefinite articles are given in bold face, those for languages with what we are calling here indefinite markers are italic and bold face, while data for languages with no grammaticalization of indefiniteness are plain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Sr</th>
<th>Sn</th>
<th>Cz</th>
<th>Rs</th>
<th>OCS</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Rmn</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Ri-A</th>
<th>Ri-G</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk 6:27</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 9:1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 4:8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 4:18</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 8:2/3*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 8:5/6*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 8:9+*</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 8:19+*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 8:24+</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English

Mk 6:27 And immediately the king sent an executioner, and commanded his head to be brought
Jn 9:1 And as Jesus passed by, he saw a man which was blind from his birth
Mt 4:8 Again, the Devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain
Mt 4:18 he saw two brethren ... casting a net into the sea
Mt 8:2 And behoid, there came a leper and worshipped him
Mt 8:5 there came unto him a centurion
Mt 8:9 For I am a man under authority

11 All translations were made from the original languages except the Romani, which were translated from Bulgarian (Arli, Metkov 1995) and Serbian (Gurbed, Dimić 1990). It is worth noting that Zographensis tends to use μνήμη for the indefinite specifier, whereas καθάρισμα is more common in Codex Marius. (I wish to thank Cynthia Vakareliyska, University of Oregon, for this observation.) In our sample, however, the two codices agreed completely in terms of the usage under consideration here. The translation into Modern Greek followed New Testament Greek usage too slavishly to be useful, and so it is omitted. See note 4 above on the use of ‘one’ as an indefinite article in Greek.

12 Avgustinova (1998: 4–5), bases her categorization on Shamrai (1989) and makes two sets of distinctions aside from definite (unique) vs indefinite (non-unique): limited (identifying) vs non-limited (categorizing) and within the latter specific/non-specific and within the latter generic/non-generic. She views the Bulgarian indefinite article as having three main uses: identifying specific (clearly opposed to the definite article), identifying non-specific, and categorizing generic. Here REFERENTIAL can be taken as the equivalent of ‘identifying’.
Table 1. Presence of 'one' Marking Indefiniteness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*</th>
<th>✧</th>
<th>✧</th>
<th>✧</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>= animate, ✧ = subjec, ✧ = specific, ✧ = generic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examples summarized in Table 1 illustrate the three possibilities for the grammaticalization of indefiniteness: 1) None, represented by the ancient languages (Latin, New Testament Greek, Old Church Slavonic) and the non-Balkan Slavic languages (Serbian, Slovene, Czech, Russian); 2) Full (indefinite article), represented by Albanian, Romanian, and Turkish; 3) Partial (indefinite marker) represented by Balkan Slavic and Balkan Romani. In Mt 8:19, the numeral 'one' is used in all the languages except Slovene to mean 'a certain' or 'one of the class of'. The substitution of an indefinite pronoun in the Slovene translation illustrates the indefinite pronominal usage of 'one' that is the starting point for grammaticalization into an indefinite marker. The patterns in Romanian, Albanian, and Turkish are almost identical to English. The absence from Mt 4:18 in Albanian and Turkish is due to different grammatical constraints that incorporate such objects into the verb either as definite objects (Albanian) or as unmarked accusatives (Turkish). The Romanian exception is the only example of a categorical-generic indefinite article in our small corpus, and in Romanian, as in Modern Greek, such usage is avoided.

The Balkan Indic (Romanian) and Balkan Slavic examples provide interesting patterns that are mid-way between the absence of the ancient and non-Balkan Slavic languages and the full grammaticalization of English and the non-Slavic Balkan languages. Although Macedonian has an unambiguously grammaticalized indefinite marker, as indicated by the fact that it can trigger object reduplication in its specific meaning (cf. example 2), it has a lower frequency of usage than in the Bulgarian examples – only four occurrences out of nine: All of them are animate and specific-identifying, and it is arguable that object quality in Mk 6:27 is different from that of Jn 9:1, i.e. the act of sending involves an effect of agent on patient, whereas in seeing it is the patient that can be said to affect the agent by being seen. All of the Bulgarian uses in our small sample are identifying, but Avgustinova (1998: 8) has examples of gene-

This is reflected in many of the world’s languages by the use of oblique (e.g. dative or ablative) cases for the agents of verbs of perception such as seeing, hearing, and feeling.

---

14 The following is cited in Avgustinova (1998:8) and also Friedman (1976):

(i) Един вълк никога не се решава да умре от глад пред едно стадо овци 'A wolf never decides to die of hunger in front of a flock of sheep'

In the 1923 revision of the Bulgarian Gospel translation, edin was replaced by the lexical indefinite marker някой си in Mt 8:5. This is may have been due to normative structures that discourage the use of edin as an indefinite article mentioned above.

15 In 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.
32).\textsuperscript{16} Occurrences in the Bulgarian original (12), as well as the Greek (10) and Macedonian (10) translations are more consistent with the concept of indefinite marker elaborated above. There were no instances of non-correspondence in which ‘one’ was present in the Macedonian or Greek but absent in the Bulgarian. The non-Balkan Slavic translations – Slovene, Czech, and Russian – pattern just like the Bible translations, i.e., ‘one’ does not occur at all in the Slovene and once each in the Russian and Czech in the function of an indefinite pronoun modifier meaning ‘a certain’, illustrated by example (4). Example (3) shows a generic predicative use of an indefinite article, which only occurs in the languages with true indefinite articles (Turkish, Albanian, Romanian) as well as a nonreferential specific indefinite article in those languages that correspond to an indefinite marker in the languages where ‘one’ is partially grammaticalized (Bulgarian, Macedonian, Greek), and complete absence in the languages where the indefinite use of ‘one’ is lexical, i.e., pronominal (Russian, Slovene, Czech).\textsuperscript{17} The Serbian/Croatian translations show a transition between grammaticalized indefinite marking and lexical indefinite expressions. These will be discussed in greater detail below.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{16} In the use of ‘one’ as an indefinite marker, just as in the use of definite articles, there is never total isomorphism between one language and another.

\textsuperscript{17} In example (3), native speakers of Bulgarian felt that edin could not be omitted, and that replacing it with an indefinite pronoun or definite article would change the register or sense. Native speakers of Czech felt that jeden could only be used numerically in such a context. In general, Czech jeden only gave numerical or pronominal readings. In the case of example (4), the omission of edin as an indefinite pronoun in Bulgarian renders the effect of word stress that the merchant was Bulgarian and not, e.g., Serbian or Russian. The following example illustrates the fact that edin can function generically in Bulgarian but not in Russian:

(ii) И не посветиха в бълдеше да не си играя с перото, макар че лично аз не виждам как един хронист може да не си играе с перото! И не посветиха в бълдеше да не си играя с перото, когато аз лично не виждам как един хронист играе с перото! (Nitsolova 2000)

‘And they advised me not to play with my pen in the future, although, personally, I do not see how a chronicler can not play with his pen.’

In this example, the Bulgarian author had translated ‘one’ into Russian, but a Russian colleague, Elena Padacheva, pointed out that edin was unacceptable in this context.

\textsuperscript{18} English translations will be normally based on the Bulgarian original. Minor variations among the different versions will be ignored. I shall attempt to combine faith-

---

(3) a. Помогнаха на бай Ганя да смъкне от плещите си агарянската ямурлук, наметна си тог една белягска мащия – и всички рекоха, че бай Ганьо е вече изл европейец. [Bg]

b. На бай Ганьо му помагнаха да го смие од грб агарянското ямурлук, си наметна една белягска мащия и сите рекоха дека бай Ганьо е вече изл европейец. [M]

c. Помагла бай Ганьо сброси с плеч турската бурка, накивка на него белягски плет – и не признали, че бай Ганьо вече изл европейец. [Rs]

d. Помогио Бай Ганю, да баци с ледя агарянски орлетак, метне ти о на се белягски орлетак – и си реши, да е бай Ганю потпуни Европејц. [Cr ’09]

e. Помози бай Ганю с ледя скитани стариини ямурлук, па обуши белягски кеп – и си и се дели, да е бай Ганю први превев Европејц. [Gr ’17]

f. Помогоше баја Ганьо да збаци с ледя турску кабаници, а он ти се откри гелбеско пелерином и син узнаваше како је баја Ганьо постао већ прави Европејц. [Sr ’55]

g. Помогоше баја-Ганьо, да смадари с плеш агарянску чоку, огра ви он една белягска мащия – и си рекоше, да е баја-Ганьо јапопланиш од власти деге пето. [Sr ’07]

h. С помошта других је бай Ганю вин и плеш агарянски ямурлук; нелси се белягски плес – и си рекли, да е бай Ганю и сет Европејц. [Sn]

i. Помоши јаме бай Ганови шодит с рамену турскако ямурлук. Премотид си белягско пелерину – а вичхи пропрали, ќе ќе тед’ з нејдо доконал Европан. [Cz]

j. Њвођен ја Май Гмин по зврзост ото на плетот ви то ватриово адиброворо спарфофи, (димоплакти) авто одо ехне спако на една белягска мащия и се отли овое енос, си с Май Гмин сто ги овсе воство Европа- тос. [G]

k. Бай Гани уе онузнадани Турк кепененичи квармаси ик ик шард етим. Сретна бир Белчка палеоу гиинце, гоенкир: - Бай Гани вишуват бир Арунапи бенеди, дедери. [T]
l. După ce fu ajutat să-şi dezbrace sumanul, bai Ganiu iși azviri pe uneri o peleterină belgiană și țoți exclamari: "Iată-l, în sfârșit, și pe bai Ganiu european sadeat!" [Rmn]

m. E ndihmuau bai Ganon të hiqte nga shpatullat e tij gunën turke dhe ky veshi një pardesy belgiane. Atëherë të gjithë thanë se bai Ganua qe bërë një evropian i vërtetë. [A]

   "They helped Baj Ganjo take the heavy felt-Turkish cloak off his shoulders, he put on a Belgian frock-coat, and everyone said that Baj Ganjo had become a real European."\(^{19}\)

(4) a. Заведох бай Ганя в кантората на един български търговец и го оставих там, а сам се качих на тролва и отидох в Шенбрун. [B]

b. Го овелов бай Гано во канцеларијата на един бугарски търговец и го оставих таму, а јас се качив на тролва и отидох во Шенбрун. [M]

c. Я отвел бай Ганно в контора к одному болгарскому торговцу, а сам сел в тролва и поехал в Шенбрун. [R]

d. Оведем Бaj Ganju jednom bugarskom trgovcu u dućan i ostavim ga tam, a ja sjednem na tramvaj, pa u Schönbrunn. [Cr]\(^{19}\)

e. Odveo sam baj Ganja u trgovinu trgovca Bugarina, te ga ondje ostavio, a sam se popeh na tranvaj i odvezoh u Šenbren. [Cr] \(^{17}\)

f. Оведох бай Гань у радио код једног бугарског трговца и останих га тамо, а сам се погох на трговци и одх в Шенбрун. [Sr] \(^{55}\)

g. Оведем Байа-Ганя једном бугарском трговцу у дућан и оставим га тамо, а ја седнем на трговак и п у Шенбрун. [Sr] \(^{07}\)

h. Povedel sem baj Ganja v prodajašno nekogu bolgarskega trgovca in ga pustil tam, sam ja sem skočil na tramvaj in se odpeval v Schönbrunn. [Sn]

i. Zavedel jsem bai Gaňa do účtárny jednoho bulharského obchodníka, nechal jsem ho tam, sám jsem nasled do tramvaje a jel do Schönbrunnu. [Cz]

---

\(^{19}\) It is worth noting that my English rendering illustrates how subtleties of translation can affect individual examples. I could have translated the last phrase "quite the European" or "completely European" and still have been true to both the meaning and the style of the original.

---

\(^{20}\) Czech omitted the phrase in (5), while Slovene uses the preposition z together with the instrumental.
(7) a. присвешеве един нов джеп [B]
b. шене нов джеб [M]
c. ерпево шо каговоруге тошп [G]
d. бир се диктигни [T]
e. по геепе неже шепге те ри [A]
f. фесеа а бузарар нор [Rmn] ‘he was sewing a new pocket’

(8) a. Бай Ганьо приклекна над дигите си гърбом към мене, извади половината кашкавала, отряза си една деликатно късчо, отряза и един огромен резен хляб и почна да мляска с един чудесен апетит, [B]
b. Бай Ганьо се наведе над дисагите, ми го сврти грбот, извади половината кашкавала, си пресече едно танко парчецце, пресече и едно огромно парче леб и почна да мляска с еден чудесен апетит, [M]
c. Бая Ганьо приклекна уз своите бисаге, открепт мени леђима, извади половина котура кацкавала, отреза једно танко парче, отсече и огроман комад хлеба и почне да мляска с једин невероватен апетит, [Sr ’55]
d. Бай Ганжа је шеучу на своје торбе, окренува ми лиджа, извади пал котаца кацкавала, одреже прсличен комад одреже и груну комадину крива и стани јединим апетитом да миља, [Cr ’09]
e. Бай Ганьо се нануо над бисаге присма а ледима мени, извади по пише кашкавала и одрезао танки комадничак. Ут одаливно и велики комад кнута па роцезо звакати, да је милота [Cr ’17]
f. Бая-Гане чучуку свого бисаге, откренивши ми леба, извади половина котура кацкавала, отсече прсличен комад, отсече и груну режан хлеба и запушта с људлим апетитом. [Sr ’07]
g. О М. Г. пронесе ужоре ста дива ву козу, у врнугар ужору пре эм, бзжош месо пла макед, екошу ена “дивме” комат, екошу и ена кумео џеме и архе во ма мо шуаролнез би теоматину ореж. [G]

21 Native speakers of Bulgarian disagreed over the stylistic implications of omitting ‘one’ in the original: Some felt that in (5), (6) and the last occurrence in (8) its presence was important to add emotive affect, while others felt it was pleonastic. In the first occurrence in (8), the usage was felt to be disambiguating (otherwise деликатно could be interpreted as an adverb) while the remaining occurrences were felt to be stylistically more specifying but nonetheless inessential. It is worth noting that elsewhere in the same chapter Konstantinov uses тон without edin:

(iii) с тон, в които звучеше съжаление за моята наивност
‘in a tone of voice that expressed pity for my naivety.’

However, Konstantinov’s use of edin to specify a tone of voice was felt by some Bulgarians to be particularly characteristic of his style.
Greek goes with Macedonian in (5) and (6) but with Bulgarian in (7). The non-Slavic Balkan languages all agree with the Bulgarian except the Turkish version of (6), which simply used the expression korşilik verdi, which can be translated ‘retorted’. In (8), the Greek omits the indefinite marker with the abstract noun ‘appetite’ while the Albanian uses a different expression (literally ‘with [a] marvelous noise and gustatory delight’).

The SWSS material is closer to the East South Slavic than is the rest of Slavic, and the Serbian is closer than the Croatian, although none of the versions use ‘one’ as an indefinite marker as frequently as do Bulgarian or Macedonian. Of the twelve examples with ‘one’ in the Bulgarian original that can be identified as indefinite markers, five are not translated into any of the Serbian/Croatian versions. These examples illustrate several distinct usages of ‘one’ in Bulgarian not corresponding to Serbian/Croatian. We can generalize them, however, into two types: one is the use with non-concrete objects (5) and (6), the other is with concrete objects (3 and 7). Examples (5) and (6) are stylistically marked in Bulgarian. In example (3), my native Bulgarian consultants felt that the object by itself was too non-referential, some sort of specifier or definer was needed, and that ‘one’ was the most neutral, whereas in the case of (7) the value of edin was felt to be close to numerical and, according to my consultants, the item was potentially omissible thanks to the contextual specificity of ‘new’. Apparently, in example (3) the qualifier ‘Belgian’ serves a similar specifying or referential function in the Serbian/Croatian translations but not in the Bulgarian. We can thus venture a preliminary suggestion at this point that a difference between Bulgarian on the one hand and SWSS on the other is the degree of contextual referentiality invested in qualifying adjectives. Of these,

---

22 The translations themselves contain a variety of interesting and noteworthy features that are beyond the scope of this paper. One issue worth addressing here, however, is that of time period. Konstantinov’s original and three of the four translations all date from 1895-1917, i.e. they reflect the Serbian/Croatian literary language(s) prior to the establishment of the first Yugoslavia, and the Bulgarian original itself is more than a century old. In some respects, both the language of the original and of the translations reflect vocabulary and usages that are now obsolete. The question therefore arises whether or not the use of ‘one’ in such texts is consistent with contemporary usage. In the case of the Bulgarian original, I checked with various native speakers born after World War Two, and each judged the occurrences of ‘one’ to be consistent with current usage. In the case of the Serbian/Croatian translations, it may be the case that various factors have influenced the translators’ choices, but the general tendencies are nonetheless clear. According to Kostas Kazantzis (University of Chicago, personal communication), the quality of the Greek translation meets modern standards.

---

23 According to native speakers of Bulgarian, edin is obligatory in the position. Lack of edin would require the preposition na and have an adverbial meaning of manner or purpose (e.g. sednexe na masa da jadem ‘we sat down at the table to eat’).
pronoun neki where the other versions have ‘one’, and in example (12) jedan is lacking in both Croatian versions and used in both Serbian versions. In (8) jedan (twice) occurs only in Paunović’s (1955) Serbian version.

(10) a. Njima držeb, njima ništvo, am bi se porazprala malo drževaka mi, ta turič edino parčalo... [B]

b. Kakav džep, nema džepa, ali mi se učinila mala skulja, pa udarit jednu zadrrpice. [Cr ‘09]

c. Nema džepa, nema ništva; ali malko mi se rasparala odjeća, pa hoću da pristijem ovu krpicu... [Cr ‘17]

D. Kakav čep, nema džepa, ali mi se beže dreška malo porasila, te udarit jednu zakrpincu... [Sr ‘07]

e. Kakav čep, ništvo nemu, nego mi se beše malo rasparała hačinka, pa turič jednu zakrpincu... [Sr ‘55]

f. Ne se, ne čeb, ništvo ne je, tuju mi se beše podotparalo alištevilo i stavlja edino parčilo... [M]

g. Nic karmaj, niet prełporolać, odejenska, nu, zalatu postavila... [Rsn]

h. Ni čep, nič ni, ampak obleka se mi je nekaj strgala, pa sem podpložil krpico,... [Sn]

i. Žadno kapsu, nici takového, jen se mi to kapánek rozparalo, tak jsem na to dal záplatu. [Cz]

j. Oute tétáy pádeó ouné títote állo, mýnon deóðhíuc álýgon to pouco mou kai erógoa ena mikro kopéda... [G]

k. Sen padarad haben ver. Hirkamin orasi sükünlüstitü de, yama vuruyordum. [T]

l. Jo, jo as xhep s’po gep dhe asgje s’kam, po je mu gris këtu e po i vinja njé cope. [A]

m. Nu-i buzunar, frate... Nu-i nimic... S-a rupt nițeluo căptușala, și-i am pus un petițiut. [Rmn]

‘What pocket? There’s no pocket! It’s just that my jacket got a little torn so I based on a patch.’

(11) a. V tova vreme pod svodja na garata blizaše medleno edin tren [B]

b. Vo toa vreme pod svodot na staničata blégvaže polak na jedno voz [M]

c. U taj čas ulazi polagano u kolodvorski svod jedan vlak [Cr ‘09]

d. U taj čas ulazio je polako pod svod kolodvora jedan vlak [Cr ‘17]

e. Ú to vreme pod staninči svod polako je ujazdo neki voz [Sr ‘07]

f. Ú taj par užasi polažano u staninči svod jedan voz [Sr ‘55]

g. Kad raz u to vreme pod svod vokala medlano vposlalj je ekad-fo-plaž [Rsn]

h. V tem pod občk postaje počasi pridnas vlak [Sn]

i. V te chvili zvoena vijžděl pod nádražní klenbu nejaký vlak [Cz]

j. Ten sobrem ekčinj evače na stjen na tos sobrem na časnu [G]

k. Atě čast ne sacion po hynte mengadake njé tren dje pěpfiyroni [A]

l. Bu sirađa garj bir tren giriyordu [T]

m. Ín vremea asta, sub cupula garii intra domol un tren [R]

‘At that moment a train came in slowly under the station vault.’

(12) a. Eć, da ima sèga njakoj da me počernji edino višće [B]

b. Eh da ima tkogod, da mi doda nešto vina [Cr ‘09]

c. Eh da ima sada tkogod, da me počasti čašćom vina. [Cr ‘17]

d. Ex da ima kogo da mi doda jedno višće [Sr ‘07]

e. Ex, da je séd neko da me chešte jedno vičesem [Sr ‘55]

f. Ex, da ima sèga nekoj da me chešte edino višće [M]

g. Ex, kabo kdo podneš stahančik vičisa! [Rsn]

h. Eh, če bi me kdo zdajte počastil z vinctem. [Sn]

i. Ted’ kdyby me tak někdo poholil vinkem! [Cz]

j. Aće, a kdo neupršeli kačnju na me krošač törka na krošači! [G]

k. Ah! Šimdi bir bardaček šapar isma gecip oturdu. [T]

l. Eh, te kisha tan pranë njè qeri te mè gostise me njè shëshkë ve! [A]

m. Hei, acum să-mi facad cineva cinste cu un vinisor! [Rmn]

‘Eh, now if only there were someone to treat me to a little glass of wine.’

Both (9) and (11) involve objects that are concrete and highly specific albeit not definite. In both cases, the indefinite marker serves to concretize the item that is described. In the case of the table (9), the effect without ‘one’ would be adverbial rather than nominal. For (11), my Bulgarian consultants felt that the omission of ‘one’ would produce a dramatic effect, like the stage direc-
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archaizing did not interfere, in the Bible, are born out in this set of comparisons as well.

A significant difference between the Sholokhov and Konstantinov texts lies in the fact that whereas there were no Macedonian indefinite markers that did not correspond to Bulgarian ones in the Konstantinov corpus, in the Sholokhov corpus seven of the examples were common to both languages, but Macedonian had four markers where Bulgarian did not, while the Bulgarian had nine markers without Macedonian correspondents.25

6. Conclusion

General typological questions of the use of the numeral 'one' as an indefinite article have been addressed recently in Lyons (1999: 89–99), who considers the indefinite article to be a type of reduced quantifier, and Haspelmath (1997: 29, 183–84), whose treats indefinite articles as distinct from indefinite pronouns, but does not really address the problematic zone between the two. 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. Examples (13) and (14), are among those given by Weiss (1996: 436), are used to substantiate his point:27

(13) Ima li kaj Vas lekar / nekoj lekar / *eden lekar?
Is there a doctor at your place?

25 Of these nine, four had Macedonian equivalents that differed owing to factors other than the indefinite marker. An additional five examples had 'one' in Macedonian and/or Bulgarian corresponding to zero in Russian which could, in principle, be taken as indefinite markers. These all involved time expressions or some other sort of measurement, however, and were therefore omitted as too quantificational, although they arguably represent a transition between quantification and indefiniteness marking (cf. Lyons 1999: 95–106).

26 Writing about Bulgarian, Stamenov (1985: 43) cites the notion of gradation (cline) as relevant.

27 The indefinite pronoun nekoj '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).

A comparison of Albanian (1978), Turkish (1969), Greek (1986), Romanian (1955), Bulgarian (1981) and Macedonian (1970) translations of the Russian novella Sud ka cheloveka by Mikhail Sholokhov (1956) shows similar patterns of usage. The text contains twelve to fifteen thousand words (depending on the language owing to differences in degree of analytism). The root for 'one' (od|j|n-) occurs 44 times in the Russian original, but only one usage is of the indefinite pronominal type, the remainder being numerical or quantifying. Macedonian had a total of 61 occurrences of ed|j|n- of which 11 were indefinite markers while Bulgarian had a total of 75 occurrences of ed|j|n- of which 16 were indefinite markers. For the non-Slavic languages, I used a computer word count that did not distinguish indefinite from quantifying and idiomatic occurrences of the respective words for 'one', but even the raw figures are indicative of much higher proportions: Greek (174), Albanian (274), Romanian (317), and Turkish (452). The reversal of Romanian and Albanian may well be the result of problems with the word count rather than statistically significant. In any case, the general proportions observed in Baj Ganjo and, where

Cf. also Ivč (1971) on the intermediate nature of jedan as an indefinite marker.
Here the point is that *eden* cannot be used with a nonreferential indefinite meaning. I found that in general the judgments of Weiss’ consultants were substantiated by other Macedonians, and the use of *eden* in these contexts was rejected out of hand. However, some consultants accepted (13) but gave *eden* a referential reading. These same people accepted (14) in the context of a patient in a hospital. Although in such a context ‘doctor’ does not have a specific referent, one could nonetheless argue that the context provides the referentiality, or, perhaps a generic quality.

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 counterexamples), we can note that Topolińska (995) observes: “Analytic markers of referentiality emerge in periods of convergent development, in conditions of creolization, while synthetic markers are instruments of linguistic divergence.” Similarly, although Avgustinova (1998: 15) refers to “striking typological parallels” in the use of indefinite articles in the various Balkan languages, Hamp’s (1977) distinction among areal, typological, and genetic linguistics – particularly between areal and typological in this instance – is crucial in understanding these phenomena in a broader context. While the presence of grammaticalized indefinite markers in languages of Western Europe and South Asia could be used to argue for a typological rather than an areal explanation, the temporal and spatial patterns of distribution support the argument that grammaticalized indefinite markers in Southeastern Europe represent a Balkanism.

Like the grammaticalization of definiteness, object reduplication, infinitive replacement, analytic comparative constructions, and futures using a particle derived from an auxiliary meaning ‘want’ (=‘will’), all of which are to be found in Western Europe, the rise of the indefinite article in the Balkan languages, including Balkan Slavic and Balkan Romani, took place during the period when those various languages were in contact with one another, and thus constitutes a Balkanism in this sense. It can therefore be argued that the situation of the Balkan indefinite marker, including that of Balkan Slavic, is comparable to that of Balkan infinitive replacement. As analyzed by Joseph (1983), Joseph (1983: 242–43) points out that although infinitive replacement is found in all the Balkan languages and may well constitute a Balkanism in the sense of a shared innovation due to contact, it is also the case that Albanian and Romanian have new or reinterpret infinitival constructions, Bulgarian and Greek retain a few traces of old ones, and only Macedonian has completely eliminated the category (but cf. Časule 1989 on the use of the verbal noun in impersonal infinitive-like constructions). Similarly, it can be argued that Romanian and Albanian (and Turkish) show the highest degree of grammaticalization of indefiniteness, followed by Greek. Balkan Slavic and Romani show weaker but nonetheless significant degrees of grammatical marking for indefinite specificity. The fact that indefinite articles are considered more a colloquial than a literary feature in at least some Balkan languages and that their use, e.g. in Bulgarian, is overtly discouraged by normativists is another argument in favor of a contact origin, despite the occasional ideological appeal to Western European languages.

As seen in section Four, the ancestral languages of Balkan Slavic, Balkan Romance, Balkan Indic (Romani), and Modern Greek did not possess indefinite articles. We cannot be sure of the ancestor of Albanian, but the possible existence of a definite article in the language of Lower Moesia (Hamp 1982) allows us at least to speculate upon the possibility that an indefinite article might also have been present. The evidence of Old Turkic (Tekin 1968:145) indicates that *bir* was already involved in such usage at a time when its functional equivalents were not so employed in the Balkan languages. The rise of the use of ‘one’ as an indefinite marker in Balkan Slavic (and the other Balkan languages) is clearly a development that, at the very least for Slavic, Hellenic, Romance, and Indic took place in the context of contact with Turkish and the ancestor of modern Albanian. That the modern developments are convergent is undeniable. Once a genetic explanation is ruled out by evidence, as is the case with indefinite articles in those Balkan languages for which we have older documentation, convergence in the absence of contact or multilingualism is typological, but convergence in the presence of such factors has the possibility of an areal explanation. While it is indeed the case that West European Romance and Germanic languages also have such usages, the possibility of an

---

28 For example, in Bulgarian, constructions of the type *Sto pi! literally ‘It suffices [to] drink’, i.e. ‘you’ve had enough to drink’.  
29 Jedehtmo, on the other hand, retains the infinitive while the Balkan dialects of Turkish show a partial replacement.
areal origin in the Balkans in general and Balkan Slavic in particular is also suggested by the geographic and grammatical patterns of South Slavic: As one moves through South Slavic territory from south to north and from east to west away from the centers of Balkan linguistic contact and innovation, such usages of ‘one’ gradually decrease and virtually disappear by the time one reaches Slovenian. The counterevidence to Givón’s generalization may in fact be connected with a language contact and its influence on internal development. The fact that this development did not go as far in Balkan Slavic and Balkan Indic (Romani) as it did in the other Balkan languages (including here Turkish) may be due to the later impetus given to this development. We can also note here that Albanian, Romanian, Greek, and Turkish differ among themselves and from English with respect to their particular rules of usage.

Similarly, it can be argued that Romanian and Albanian (and Turkish) show the highest degree of grammaticalization of indefiniteness, followed by Greek (and Romani), while Bulgarian and Macedonian show weaker but nonetheless significant degrees. It is interesting to note in this regard that Bulgarian makes greater use of the indefinite marker than does Macedonian, which may have to do with the influence of Serbian on the latter in this regard. It is also true, however, that, both Macedonian and Bulgarian show a significant difference in the treatment of indefiniteness both from Common Slavic as represented by Old Church Slavonic and from the other modern Slavic languages, represented here by Slovere, Czech and Russian. With regard to the grammatical expression of indefiniteness, Balkan Slavic is closer to Balkan Romance, Greek, and Albanian than to the rest of Slavic. As with definiteness, the grammaticalization of indefiniteness is also found in West European languages, but given the respective histories of the relevant languages (i.e. the absence of grammaticalized indefiniteness from Ancient Greek, Latin, and Old Church Slavonic — and also Sanskrit),

30 here, too, it makes more sense — especially in Balkan Slavic — to see the influence of Balkan language contact in the rise of grammaticalized indefiniteness. The fact that it is more a colloquial than a literary feature and that its use is overtly discouraged by normativists is another argument in favor of a contact origin, despite the occasional ideological appeal to Western European languages.

There is also the issue of prescription versus description. According to Stephen Dickey of the University of Virginia and Tom Priestly of the University of Alberta (personal communications), use of ‘one’ as an indefinite marker is much more frequent in colloquial Croatian and Slovenian than in the published norm. This is certainly the case in the Slovenian texts we examined. In fact, our Slovene text even avoided pronominal uses of ‘one’. Moreover, ‘one’ as an indefinite marker is frequent in conversational Serbian (see, for example Hinrichs and Hinrichs 1995: 55—57). The linguistic (referential) and ideological (West European versus Balkan) functions of jedan as an indefinite marker in SWSS are explicitly indexed by Croatian and Bulgarian normativists. It should also be kept in mind that for Bulgarian in particular there is the additional normatively based discouragement of such usage (e.g. Brezinski 1968: 48, see Friedman 1976 for other references, cf. also Friedman 1997) motivated both overtly by the perception that it imitates West European languages and perhaps covertly by the fact that such usage is different from the rest of Slavic and resembles the surrounding non-Slavic Balkan languages. It is certainly the case that colloquial usage is greater than literary usage. The Modern Greek New Testament is similar, and Kuhlman (1997: 92) discusses the composition against ‘one’ as an indefinite marker in Katharevousa. It should also be kept in mind that for Balkan Slavic there is the additional ideologically based discouragement of such usage (e.g. Brezinski 1968: 48, see Friedman 1976 for other references) motivated both overtly by the perception that it imitates West European languages and perhaps covertly by the fact that such usage is different from the rest of Slavic, especially the prestigious Russian (for Bulgarian) and Serbian (for Macedonian — at least until 1991) and resembles the surrounding non-Slavic Balkan languages. It is certainly the case that colloquial usage is greater than literary usage. The striking differences in various Romani dialects can be attributed to influences from other languages either through literal translation, as in the case of Dimić (1990), or later contact, as in the case of Leshaki (illustrated in Appendix Two; Matras 1996) and Welsh Romani (Sampson 1926).

Thus, although normativism plays a differential role (both Bulgarian and Croatian grammarians argue explicitly against such usage, whereas it is acknowledged by grammarians of both Serbian and Macedonian), it would nonetheless seem to be the case that the use of ‘one’ as an analytic marker of referentiality in Slavic is associated with Balkan linguistic contact. Russian appears to be extremely conservative in this respect, reflecting that situation attested in Old Church Slavonic. In Czech, despite the definite referentiality of ten (Kresin 1993), indefinite referentiality does not appear to have developed to any significant degree. The historical and social factors surrounding the use of ‘one’ as an indefinite marker in Balkan Slavic (and the other Balkan languages) were thus those of Balkan linguistic convergence. As in the rise of so-called evidentiality in Balkan Slavic and Albanian (see Friedman 1978, 1986), while internal structural and universal linguistic factors may have had a role to play, the fact remains that the development of ‘one’ as an indefinite marker in Balkan
Slavic 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. Particularly striking in this regard is the tendency for the usage to be more frequent in Bulgarian than in Macedonian, thus making a consistently graded cline from east to west as well as north to south. Hence the rise of 'one' as an indefinite marker can most likely be considered a Balkanism despite the obvious typological parallels elsewhere in the world. In this regard, however, it is interesting to note that both Topolińska [1981/82: 712] and Kazazis (personal communication) refer to increased use of 'one' as an indefinite marker in the younger generation of Macedonian and Greek speakers, respectively. Such usage would clearly be the result of west European rather than Balkan languages, given the fact that in the Balkans today more young people know West European languages than other Balkan languages. Thus English may contribute to the furthering of a Balkan Slavic process begun by Turkish and, perhaps, the ancestor of Albanian.
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Appendix 1: Biblical Passages

**Bulgarian**

Mk 6:67 И тутаки, проводи царът единъ оръжникъ, комуто заповѣда да донесатъ главата му;
Jn 9:1 И като заминаваще видѣ единого человѣка слепъ от рождениято.
Mt 4:8 Пакъ го завояда дяволътъ на една планина много висока
4:18 видѣ двамин братя ... че хръщаха мрежа въ морето.
Mt 8:2 И ето, единъ прокаженъ дойде при него
Mt 8:5 единъ стотникъ дойде при него
Mt 8:9 и изъ съмъ човѣкъ подъ власть
Mt 8:19 И дойде единъ книжникъ
Mt 8:24 И, ето, голѣма бура се подигна на езерото

**Macedonian**

Mk 6:27 И веднаш, откако испрати целат, царот нареди да я донесат глава негова.
Jn 9:1 Кога одеаше виде еден слеп човек од неговото рафание
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Mt 4:8 Го одведе гаволот потоа на много висока планина
4:18 ги виде двицата брачка ... како фралав мрежа во морето
Mt 8:2 И ете, се приближки еден лепрозен ...
Mt 8:5 се приближки до него еден стотник
Mt 8:9 и яс сум човек подвластен
Mt 8:19 Тогаш се приближи до Исуса еден книжник
Mt 8:24 И ете, настана голема бура во морето.

**Serbian**

Mk 6:27 И одмах посла свр здѣлата, и заповѣди да донесе свр главу његову
Jn 9:1 Њи пролази увидѣ свр ѳѣвка сливѣ од роденија.
Mt 4:8 Опет узе га дјаво і одведе на гору врло високу
4:18 видѣ два брата ... гдје мећу мреже у море
Mt 8:2 Њи, ѳовек губав додје
Mt 8:5 приступи к њему капетан
Mt 8:9 и ја сам ѳовек под власти
Mt 8:19 Њи приступив ѳедан книжевник реће му
Mt 8:24 Њи, олуја велика постаде на мору

**Slovene**

Mk 6:27 Takoj je poslal po rablj na ukazal, nj pri mes njegovo glavo.
Jn 9:1 Ko je šel novo, je zagledal človeka, ki je bil slep od rojstva.
Mt 8:2 In gled, pristopil je gobavec,
Mt 8:5 je stopil k njemu stotnik
Mt 8:9 Kajti tud samm sed pod oblastjo...
Mt 8:19 Tedaj pristopil neki pismouk
Mt 8:24 Na jezeru je nastal velik vihar,
Mt 4:8 Spet ga je hudič vzeli s seboj na zelo visoko goru.
Mt 4:18 je zagledal dva brata... Metala sta mrežo v jezero

**Czech**

Mk 6:27 Protoz král ten poslav hned kata, rozkázal přinést hlavu Janovu.
Jn 9:1 A pomijeje, uzel člověka slepého od narození!
Mt 4:8 \( \text{Pālin paratāmbvēte auton o dūbābolos eis oros ψηλὸν λίαν} \)

Mt 4:18 \( \text{εἰδὲν δύο αὐθάρρου γάλλαντας αμφίβλητρους εἰς τὴν ἥλιασσαν} \)

Mt 8:2 \( \text{Καὶ ίδον ἄνθρωπον προσκόπον αὐτῷ} \)

Mt 8:5 \( \text{προσβήθησεν αὐτῷ εἰς τὴν κατανάλωσιν} \)

Mt 8:9 \( \text{καὶ γαρ εἰς αὐτόν εὔφρατος εἱμα τοῦ εὐσεβῶν} \)

Mt 8:19 \( \text{Και προσέλθων ἐκ γραμματείας εἰς αὐτῷ} \)

Mt 8:24 \( \text{Καὶ ίδον, σείσης μέγας εὐγένετο εἰς τῇ ἥλιασσα} \)

**Latin**

Mt 6:27 \( \text{sed missae speculatorem praecedit adferri caput eius in disco et decollavit eum in carcerem} \)

Jn 9:1 \( \text{et praeteriens vidit hominem caecum a nativitate} \)

Mt 4:8 \( \text{iterum adsumit eiam diabolos in montem excelsum valde} \)

Mt 4:18 \( \text{vidit duos fraternos . . . mittenes rete in mare} \)

Mt 8:2 \( \text{et ecce leprosus veniens} \)

Mt 8:5 \( \text{accessit ad eum centurio} \)

Mt 8:9 \( \text{et ego homo sum sub potestate} \)

Mt 8:19 \( \text{Et accedens unus scriba} \)

Mt 8:24 \( \text{et ecce mexit magnus factus est in mari} \)

**Romanian**

Mt 6:27 \( \text{A trimes ȋnăta un otaș de pază, cu porunca de a aduce capul lui Ioan} \)

Jn 9:1 \( \text{Cind trecut, Isus a văzut pe un orb din naștere} \)

Mt 4:8 \( \text{Diavolu L-a dus apoi pe un munte foarte înalt} \)

Mt 4:18 \( \text{Isus a văzut doi frați . . . cari aruncau o mreajă în mare} \)

Mt 8:2 \( \text{Și un lepros s-a apropiat de El} \)

Mt 8:5 \( \text{s-a apropiat de El un sutaș} \)

Mt 8:9 \( \text{și eu simt ca supt stâna păine} \)

Mt 8:19 \( \text{Atunci s-a apropiat de El un căturar} \)

Mt 8:24 \( \text{Și deodată s-a stărit pe mare o furtună ațit de strășnică} \)

**Albanian**

Mt 6:27 \( \text{Mbre tregonjë dërgoj një vrasës dhe urdhëriot t' ia sjellë lynet e Gjonit.} \)

**Greek**

Mt 6:27 \( \text{Καὶ εὐθὺς αποστείλας ὁ Βασίλειος στεπανώτατος, ἐπέστησεν εἰς ενεχθήναι τὴν καταλήκτην αὐτοῦ} \)

Jn 9:1 \( \text{Καὶ παράγον εἰδὲν αὐθροικὸν τυφλὸν εἰς γενέτης} \)
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Jn 9:1 Thaj džikaj načehelas dikhla e manušes, savo sas bijan-
dimatar koro.
Mt 4:8 Palem indjardales o beng pa vuči plain
Mt 4:18 dikhla duj phralen ... sar chudun mačharendje astarde
ande mora
Mt 8:2 Thaj dikh, melalo lepratar pašunisardape leske
Mt 8:5 pašunisajlo leske jekh kapetano
Mt 8:9 taj me sijan baro manuš
Mt 8:19 Thaj sar avilo leste jekh lilarno
Mt 8:24 Thaj dikh, baro vazođe morijaske pajendar dija pe mora

Appendix 2:
Comparison of Kelderash/Lovari, Gurbet, and Leshaki Romani
(Matrás 1996)

Jn 9:1 Vege čer kretre.
Jn 9:2 Tariče četarap ino i kulo njele.
Jn 9:3 Thaj džikaj načehelas dikhla e manušes, savo sas bijan-
dimatar koro.
Jn 9:4 Tariče četarap ino i kulo njele.

Turkish

bk6:27 Kural hemen muhafız askerinden birini gönderip onun
başını getirmesini emretti
Jn 9:1 Ve geçerken anadan doğma kör bir adam gördü.
Mt 4:8 Ülbs Üsayi çok yüksek bir dağa da götürdü
Mt 4:18 iki kardeşi ... denize ağ atarlarken gördü
Mt 8:2 Ve iste bir cümsel gelip...
Mt 8:5 bir yüzbaşı yalvararak...
Mt 8:9 ben de emir altında bir adamım
Mt 8:19 Ve bir yazıcı gelip ona:
Mt 8:24 Ve iste enizde buýuk bir firtına oldu

Romani (Arlı)

Mk 6:27 Taj vednaga o thagar bičhalgjas iokes, kaske vakerjas te
anel o šero leskoro;
Jn 9:1 Taj kana zahekalhes, dikhljas ikeh e kore bijando manuš
Mt 4:8 Pale Les ingeljas o beng ikeh e bute učeste veš,
Mt 4:18 dikhlas o duj phralen ... jaj čhivenas i mrezva
Mt 8:2 Taj, ake iek prokažimo alo paš Leste
Mt 8:5 iek šelengoro baro, alo paš Leste
Mt 8:9 vi me sem manuš kas si inčaripe
Mt 8:19 Taj alo iek ličvalo
Mt 8:24 Taj, ake, baro vazođe e pajneste ko cikno denizi,

Romani (Gurbet)

Mk 6:27 Athoska bičhalda thagari mudaritmatres te džal thaj te
anel Jovanosko šoro;
Căhuva jekh baro phal moxtenestyr až ki dudali.
'I put a big stick from the trunk to the window.'

Kadi si jekh vundžija pe jekh naj. O naj pe jekh vast.
God si jekh bunčiš pe jekh naj. O naj pe jekh vah.
Dava sy jekh nay prj jekh gušč. Gušč prj jekh vast.
'This is a nail on a finger. The finger on a hand.'

Si kadi jekh rota?
Si li godi jekh rota?
Dava sy jekh rota?
'Is that a circle?'

Me pekav jekh bokoli mura dejake. Me lev jekh baro gono aro.
Me pekav jekh kolako mrne dešače. Me lev jekh baro džako aro.
Me pekav mre dake marykla. Me lev jekh baro gono žacho.
'I am basking a cake for my mother. I take a large sack of flour.'

Sas pe kj nas pe jekh baro żiganja
Sas pe kj nas jekh bari životinja
Sys peske baro kirmo
'Once upon a time there was a big animal'

Vov sas jekh Dinosauro.
Vov sas jekh Dinosauro.
Sys peske Dinosauro.
'It was a dinosaur.'

So kerel o Lazo? Vov kerel jekh podo.
So čerel o Lazo. Vov čerel jekh podo.
So kerel Lazo. Jov kerel mosto.
'What is Lazo doing? He is making a bridge.'

Si e raja bange? Kodo si pale jekh xoaxamno patreto.
Si e linje banče. Gava si pale jekh xoaxvni slika.
Sy da kreski bange? Dava sy pale optično vizja.
'Are the lines crooked? It is an optical illusion.'

Me sim o Eino. Me sim jekh Eskimo-savoro.
Me sem o Eino. Me sem jekh Eskimo-chavoro.
Me som Eino. Me som čhavoro-Eskimo
'I am eiro. I am an Eskimo boy.'
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‘Еден’ как знак на неопределеност во балканските и небалкански словенски јазици

(Резиме)

Бројот ‘еден’ во балканословенските јазици се употребува со значење кое одговара на неопределенот член во тие јазици каде што неопределеноста се противставува на определеноста како граматичка категорија. Се знае дека во старословенското, старогрчкиот и латинскиот немаако таква употреба на бројот ‘еден’. Исто така, од една страна има (постои) можности дека определеноста веќе била граматикализирана на балканска почва пред да дојдат Римјаните, а од друга страна се знае дека таква употреба на ‘еден’ како знак за неопределеност веќе е присутна во старогрчките паметниците од осмог век. Покрај овие факти, употребата на бројот ‘еден’ со значење на неопределеност е војногу застапена во турското, албанското, и романското, во грчки и бугарски вешто поезастапена — како и во македонското — и се наоѓа на неопределеноста на наборот на балканска територија кога се оди кон север и запад преку Србија и Хрватска. Покрај тоа, таквата употреба е значајно почеста во разговор спрема пишување, и можеме да ја додадеме забележката дека аналитичка референцијалност е особено карактеристична за јазички конвергентни (контынентални) ситуации. Отсито тоа се добива до заклучоциот дека употребата на бројот ‘еден’ како десимантизиран знак на неопределеноста, имајќи го предвид целокупниот балкански контекст, највероватно може да се смета за еден балканизам којот досега не беше идентификуван како таков. Рускиот јазик во овој поглед е многу конвергентен, т.е. блиск о старословенското, доека чешкиот е малку по неоконвергентен, но не толку, колку што е хрватскиот. Во рефератот овие заключоци се демонстрираат со податоци од споредбени преводи и од теренска работа.