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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 Drobota – located on the Danube near modern Turnu Severin in northwestern Oltenia (Romania) – contains "a Latin misunderstanding or misparsing in Moesia Inferior of *druţi-ta, a definite noun phrase with postponed 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 postponed 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, Koptar (1829: 86, 106) focused particularly on the postponed 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 herscht, aber mit dreierlei Sprachmaterie..." This is arguably the earliest formulation of the prin-

principle 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 Trubetzkoy (1923, 1928) to formulate the Sprachbund as an explicit theoretical construct in contrastdistinction to the genetic model as an explanation of language change and relationships. Although Trubetzkoy 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 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 Romance languages, Greek, and Turkish (which, although an adstrate language, is nonetheless relevant here) describe grammaticalizations of the respective etymological numerals meaning ‘one’, usually unstressed, as indefinite articles, e.g., Newmark et al. (1982: 150–51), Grave 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 unul/ unulă ‘one M/F’ 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, në is used with certain locative prepositions: Hippi mbi çati ‘He climbed on the roof’ Hippi mbi në çati ‘He climbed on a roof.’ The indefinite article is used with predicate nominatives only when they are modified: Ai ishte djale ‘He was a boy’ Ai ishte në djale i vërtetë ‘He was a real boy’ (Newmark et al. 1982: 150). In Romanian, ‘one’ is used with predicate nominatives to distinguish referential from generic/attributive: Ionescu este colon ‘Ionescu is a colon’ [by profession], Ionescu este un colon ‘Ionescu is a colon [a pranxter]’ (Grave et al. 1966: 109).

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

‘The indefinite article is used more sparingly in Greek than in English; i.e. 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: ημών φορτήμα τι ΑI am a student; τι οικία σας της ‘They are building a house’; καθάρως ουρανός αστραπάς δε φοβάται ‘A clear sky is not afraid of lightning’. Examples: σας ζητά ενας κύρος και μια κυρία ‘A gentleman
and a lady are asking for you'; μιας φίλης μας της εκλει-
ποιεί την τρώνε. 'They stole the handbag of a friend of
ours'; Βρήκαμεν ενα σκύλο στο δρόμο και τον φέραμε
σπίτι. 'We found a dog on the street and brought him
home.'; αυτό το καπέλο ενάντι ενός νομίσμα 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 εμείς καλάς φοιτήστε ‘I am a good stu-
dent’ or εμείς φοιτήστε της ανθρωπολογίας ‘I am a student of anthropology’. On the other hand, as an identifying referential, ‘one’ occurs in contexts such as the following: εμείς ενός φοιτήτης της ανθρωπολογίας στο Πανεπιστήμιο
Θεσσαλονίκης και σας γράφω για να σας ζήσουν μια συμβούλη ‘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 [ενός] ενός φοιτήτης ‘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 bahçe ‘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; Igl 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, j:

(1) De má (je)k 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 indef[i]nite 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 Kalojel dialect of Bulgaria, in which jekš 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 controversi-

al. According to Avugstina (1998: 15): ‘The existence of an indefinite article in Bulgarin, addressed, for example, in Friedeman 1976, is still a controversial issue and a matter of on-going linguistic discussion.’ Fried-
eman (1976) was originally read at the First Bulgarian-American Conference on Bulgarian 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 in-
definite 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 Andreichin [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 referen-
tial, i.e., specific; the relation between emphasis and refer-
ence also seems to work for the second nominative clau-
use. The use of edin with proper names, where the usage is clearly nonreferential, might be discounted as a special case. The distinction between a referential indefinite artic-
le 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
readily omissible and less likely to be sanctioned unanimously 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 -(j)iļ and nominative -(j)iļt) and the removal of edin used as an indefinite marker. Strictures against such uses of edin taught to children in Bulgarian public schools (Valentina Izmirlieva, Columbia University, personal communication) and prescribed in handbooks 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 adding 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 Bojadžiev, Kucarov and Penchev (1998: 470) stated:

"Не е решен въпросът с т. нар. неопределителен член в българския език. Става дума за неопре-

5 Thus, for example, at the Second International Congress of Bulgarian Studies, four papers dealt exclusively with this question (Stamenov 1987, Hauge 1987, Ginina 1987, Mislak 1987) and many others addressed the issue, e.g., Lakova 1987: 423). A recent dissertation (Zidarova 1994) was devoted entirely to the subject, but a complete survey of the literature is beyond the scope of this paper.

deliten като един, една, едно, един, някой, никой, и др. Ако се приеме наличието на такъв член (той, разбира се, не може да бъде неопределителен, щом има формално немаркиран неопределителен форми от типа книга — трябва да му се търси друго наименование), категорията би станала трилична (книга, една книга, книгата), тъй като не може да се пренебрегне формално немаркиран член, нито пък да се декларира тъждество между него и члена, маркиран с един или някой.

По наше мнение, на този етап от развитието на български език не е логично да се приеме наличието на неопределителен член от типа една книга. Мястото 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 Topolinska (1981–82) and Weiss (1996) as well as Friedman (1993: 268, 291) and Minova-Gurkova (1994: 59–60, 118–129). Topolinska (1981–82: 712) makes the point

6 ""The question of the so-called indefinite article in Bulgarian is unresolved. The discussion here concerns "indefinites" such as onela, 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 onela 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 njakoj 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 grammaticaled (and can also be non-specific, cf. Avgustinova 1998). Thus, a comparison between the two lexical units is inappropriate. The presence of cliticization 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 Penthe-roudakis 1976), Macedonian *eden* in its specific-referential function, is grammaticalized to the point that it can even trigger object reduplication:

(2)  
Ja baram jedna 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*, (Blāže Koneski to Z. Topoliška, personal communication from Z. Topoliška), 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 *Serbian/Croatian* when referring to the specific literary variants 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 inflecional forms of the word.

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 (Sn), Czech (Cz), Russian (Ru), Old Church Slavonic (OCS [Codex Zographensis]), New Testament Greek (G), Latin (L), Romanian (Rm), Albanian (Al), Turkish (T), Romani (Arli dialect [Balkan group]; Rl-A), and Romani (Gurbet dialect [Vlax group]; Rl-G). 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 Lekhitic 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, an O 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 occasionally archaizing and therefore not useful as examples of modern data, such differences as do exist in modern texts can be counted as relevant. Translations of the Gospels into Sanskrit exist but were not available to me, but, like Ancient Greek, Latin, and Old Church Slavonic, it did not use ‘one’ as an indefinite marker, nor did Middle Indic (Masica 1991: 248). The use of unstressed etymological ‘one’ to mark indefiniteness in Neo-Indic languages of South Asia is an independent development and, unlike the situation in Romani, was not accompanied by the development of a definite article (Masica 1991: 370–71).

11 All translations were made from the original languages except the Romani, which were translated from Bulgarian (Arli, Melkov 1995) and Serbian (Gurbet, Dimić 1990). It is worth noting that Zographensis tends to use καθάρι for the indefinite specifier, whereas καθάντα is more common in Codex Marianus. (I wish to thank Cynthia Vakareliyska, University of Oregon, for this observation.) In our sample, however, the two codices agree 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.

categorizing-generic (‘any and all’) for Bulgarian edin. 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.

### 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 behold, 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

---

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 former 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’.
Mt 8:19 And a certain scribe came
Mt 8:24 And, behold, there arose a great tempest in the sea

Table 1. Presence of ‘one’ Marking Indefiniteness

* = animate, † = subject, • = specific, § = generic

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 categorial-generic indefinite article in our small corpus, and in Romanian, as in Modern Greek, such usage is avoided.

The Balkan Indic (Romani) 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 generic-categorizing as well. The Romani examples reflect that of the dominant language of the country in which the translation was published. Thus the Bulgarian Arli translation patterns exactly like the Bulgarian version, whereas the Gurbet version is almost identical to the Serbian in its usage, the identifying-specific usage of Mt 8:5 being the only exception. Appendix 2 (from Matras 1996) contains a series of examples from two Vlax Romani dialects (Kalderash/Lovari and Gurbet) and one Northern dialect (Leshaki) illustrating clearly the relative greater frequency of ‘one’ as an indefinite marker in the Vlax dialects. The data in appendix Two, however, show that the use of jekh as a grammatical marker of indefiniteness is much more restricted in the Northern dialects that have been spoken outside the Balkans for a longer period of time and among contact languages that do not have indefinite articles. Thus the use of jekh in Leshaki is about half of what it is in Kalderash/Lovari or Gurbet. We can therefore class the Gurbet Gospel translation with the modern Greek as unduly influenced by the source language.

5. Modern Comparative Data: Baj Ganjo and Sud’ba Cheloveka

This section contains comparative data taken from the first chapter of the Bulgarian novel Baj Ganjo (Konstantinov 1895). The corpus contains four Serbian/Croatian translations – Two Croatian (1909, 1917) and Two Serbian (1907, 1955) – as well as Macedonian (1967), Slovenian (1942), Czech (1953), Russian (1968), Albanian (1975), Modern Greek (1922), Romanian (1964), and Turkish (1972). Although the sample contains about 1300 words in the original, it shows a consistency of patterning that agrees with other sources. 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 show usages of ‘one’ consistent with a fully grammaticalized definite article (Turkish had 48 occurrences followed by Albanian with 35 and Romanian with

13 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 овці
‘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 njakoji-ti is Mt 8:5. This is may have been due to normative strictures 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 in usage 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 \textit{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 would 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 мисленстваха в бъдеще да не си играя с перото, макар че лично аз не виждам как един хронист може да не си играе с перото!

И не посочвайки не играя перо в будуеще, хотя я лично не виждам как могу един хронист играе перо! (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 Paducheva, 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 faithfulness to the original with a style that sounds best in English. At times, therefore, the translation will not be completely literal for the sake of literary quality. Such minor differences will not affect my arguments.
l. După ce fu ajutat să-și dezbrace sumanul, bai Ganiu își azvîrli pe umeri o pelerină belgienă și toți exclamari: "Iată-î, în sfârșit, și pe bai Ganiu european sadea?" [Rrmn]

m. E ndihmuaj bai Ganen të hjëte nga shpatullat e tij gjenë turke dhe ky veshi një pardesies belgiene. Atëhre të gjitë thanë se bai Ganen qe bëra 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 Гани в кантората на един български търговец и го оставих там, а сам се качих на трамвая и отидох в Шенбрун.[B]

b. Го одведох бай Гани в канцелариата на един български търговец и го оставих там, а јас се качив на трамвај и отидох во Шенбрун.[M]

c. Я отвез бай Гани в контору к одному българскому тор-
говцу, а сам сел в трамваи и поехал в Шенбрунн. [Rs]

d. Odvedem Baj Ganju jednom bugarskom trgovcu u dućan i ostavim ga tamo, a ja sjedim na tramvaj, pa u Schönbrunn. [Cr '09]

e. Odevo sam baj Ganja u trgovinu trgovaca Bugarina, te ga ondje ostavio, a sam se popeh na tramvaj i odvezoh u Senbrun. [Cr '17]

f. Одавна бая Гани у реду код једног бугарског трговаца и оставих га тамо, а сам се похам на трамвај и одех у Шенбрун.[Sr '55]

g. Odtvedem Baja-Ganja jednom bugarskom trgovcu u dućan i ostavim ga tamo, a ja sedim na tramvaaj, pa u Shoenbure. [Sr '07]

h. Povedel sem baj Ganja v prodajalnico nekoga bolgarskega trgovaca in ga pustil tam, sam ja sem skočil na tramvaj in se odpeljal v Schönbrun. [Sn]

i. Zaved jsem baj Gaňa do účtárny jednoho bulharského obchodníka, nechal jsem ho tam, sám jsem nasedl 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.

k. Огледен sonra Bay Ganlijü bir Bulgar tüccarının yahyane-
sine götürlıp braktım. Ben de, tramvaya binip Schönbrölne gittim.[T]

l. Е јооа bai Ganen te një tregetar bullgar dhe e lashë atje, ndërsa vetë shkoj me tramvaj në Shënbrun.[A]

m. A doua zi i lui lue pe bai Ganiu cu mine, il dusei la biorul unui negustor bulgar, il lasai acolo, iar eu mă urcai într-un tramvai și pornii spre Schönbrunn. [Rrmn]

'İ took Baj Garjo to the office of a certain Bulgarian merchant and left him there, then I hopped on a tram and went to Schönbrun.'

In the case of the Greek translation, 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 with the translations in the other Balkan languages as examples (5)-7) and in all the languages in (8). In examples (5-6) the other Slavic languages all use the instrumental case, while in (6) none of them have any lexical indicator of definiteness. In (8) there was a difference among the Serbian/Croatian translations, which will be discussed below.

(5) a. с един ленив глас [B]

b. со мрзлив глас [M]

c. me tsemelakat gonf [G]

d. tembel bir sesle [T]

e. me një zë të phlogësht [A]

f. cu glas monoton [Rrmn]

'with a lazy voice'

(6) a. с един тон, нетръпчив изразение. [B]

b. с тон што не тръп никакъв приговор. [M]

c. me tönun mi ekdesjkameno antiptrin. [G]

d. me një ton ti till, qe s'duronte kundërshim. [A]

e. pe un ton care nu ingăduia tăgada. [Rmmn]

'In a tone of voice that would not brook contradiction.'

20 Czech omitted the phrase in (5), while Slovene uses the preposition z together with the instrumental.
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i. Baj Gana u u më gjinë pranë hejbeve të tij me kurrijin të kthyer nga unë, nxori gjysëm pite kaškavalë, preu prej saj një jetëze të hollë, preu pastaj një copë të madhe bukë dhe filloi të përrnijë me zhurnë dhe shije të qëndritëshëm, [A]

j. Baj Ganiu ingenunche pe desagi, cu spatele la mine, scoase o jumulate de roșii de cășcău, din care tâie o bucată subți- rică, să vezi prin ea, la un codru mare de piine și iștepu să plăcăci cu o poltă de invidiat, [Rmn]

k. Baj Gano presel pe kotorki dëna svoimi sumkami, spinvo ko mine, dostal pokrokov ovečkog srca, otrezal sebe točeniky kosček, otrezal ogranom pomol pokriva i davan uopusmat za obe škiki, s apetitetom čvakja, [Rmn]

l. Baj Ganjo je pokleknal nad svojo bisago s hrtbom proti meni, izvelkel pol šrule kaškavala in si odrežal delikaten košček, potem se velikanski kos kruha in jel mlaskati s šudežnim tekom, [Sr]

m. Baj Gažu pridelpl k dvojpridrk zade ki mnë, vynald pôl bočniku kaškavalu, ukrojli si tenoučký kousek, ukrojli také veliký krajil čleba a začal s báječnou chuti mlaskat, pri čemž nađovali hned jednu, hned zas druhou tvář a občas natáč křik, aby mohli under spokojit suchý čleb. [Cz]

‘Baj Ganjo leaned over his saddle-bags with his back to me, pulled out half a wheel of kaškaval cheese, cut himself a delicate slice, cut a huge slab of bread as well, and began to chomp away with a marvelous appetite.’

In examples (5), (6), and (8), the item in question is an abstract noun, whereas in (7) 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.21 The

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 delikatno could be interpreted as an adverb) while the remaining occurrences were felt to be stylistically more specifying but nonetheless ommissible. It is worth noting that elsewhere in the same chapter Konstantinov uses ton without edin:

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

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 (5), which simply used the expression \textit{karsılık 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.\textsuperscript{22} 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 \textit{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,

\textsuperscript{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. Konstintinov’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 Kazazis (University of Chicago, personal communication), the quality of the Greek translation meets modern standards.

One, given here as (9), is translated into all four as well as Macedonian and the non-Slavic Balkan languages, and not into non-Balk Slavic:\textsuperscript{23}

\begin{itemize}
  \item [(9)]  
  \begin{enumerate}
    \item a. \textit{az преспокойно се разположих при една маса и си поръчах закуска и пиво}. [B] 
    \item b. \textit{преспокойно се расположил на една маса и си порачал ядене и пиво}. [M] 
    \item c. \textit{удобно се уволн у \textit{jednu} столику крај стола и нaručim zakuse i pivo}. [Cr ‘09] 
    \item d. \textit{lagodno sjedoh s \textit{jednom} stolu i naručim malo jela i čašu piva}. [Cr ‘17] 
    \item e. \textit{ja седех комотно за \textit{jedan} сто, и поручих мезе и пиво}. [Sr ‘07] 
    \item f. \textit{раззурим се краj \textit{jednom} стола и наруним мезе и пиво}. [Sr ‘55] 
    \item g. \textit{я спокойно сел за столик и заказах себе пиwa с закуской}. [Rsn] 
    \item h. \textit{sem se udobno namestit pri mizi i si naročil zakusko in pivo}. [Sn] 
    \item i. \textit{proto jsem se docela klidně usadil ke stolu a objednal si přesně dva pivo}. [Cs] 
    \item j. \textit{για το απογευματινό συσκευασία ενα ενυ τραπέζι και παρτήρησα κάτι ξεχειρίστη και μπύρα}. [G] 
    \item k. \textit{bir masanın başına geçip kuruldum. Kahvaltı ve birə ismarladım} [T] 
    \item l. \textit{m așezai liniștit la o masă și comandai o bere și niște gustări} [Rmn] 
    \item m. \textit{me qetësinë më të madhe zura një} tryezë dhe porosita pak meze e bërët [A] 
  \end{enumerate}
  \begin{itemize}
    \item I settled myself comfortably at a table and ordered a snack and a beer
  \end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{23}According to native speakers of Bulgarian, \textit{edin} is obligatory in the position. Lack of \textit{edin} would require the preposition \textit{na} and have an adverbial meaning of manner or purpose (e.g. \textit{sednexe na masa do 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. Няма джеб, няма нито, ами беше се поразпра жалко дрешката ми, та турх и едно паричче... [B]
b. Какав джеп, нема джепа, али ми се учинила мала скула, па уздирих jednu zadricnu. [Cr '09]
c. Нема джепа, нема нити; али ми се ра спарала одежда, па го учи сам срби пон и крпич... [Cr '17]
d. Какав цеп, нема джепа, али ми се беше дрешка мало порашила, те уздирих jednu закройцу... [Sr '07]
e. Какав цеп, нитшта нема, него ми се беше мало распарала хаљинка, па турх jednu закройцу... [Sr '55]
f. Не е, не цеб, ништо не е, та јам ми се беше подопнарали алиштево и ставих eднo парче... [M]
g. Не крмна, нер а распоролась, одежонка, ну, заплату поставили... [Rsn]
h. Ни зеп, ни ни, ampak obleka se mi je nekaj strgala, pa sem podložil krpico... [Sn]
i. Žadnou kapsu, nie takového, jen se mi to kapánek rozprávalo, tak jsem na to dal zaplatu... [Cz]
j. Oute trošť rádo oute tísote oálo, mnoh ćešteštec ožegovu to pohoyo nov kai errravn na v na mikro koupála... [G]
k. Sen parand haber ver. Hirkam orasi sükülümüsti de, yama vuruyordum. [T]
l. Jo, jo as xhep s'po qep dhe asgje s'kam, po ja mu gris këtu e po i vinja një copë. [A]
m. Nu-i buzunar, frate... Nu-i nimi... S-a rupt nițeluș căpătu-șeala, și-î-am pus un pelicu. [Rmn]
‘What pocket? There’s no pocket! It’s just that my jacket got a little torn so I basted on a patch.’

(11) a. В това време под свода на градата влизаше медлено един трен [B]
b. Во тоа време под сводот на станицата влегува место пелека eднo воз [M]
c. U тaj čas ulazi polagano u kolodvorski svod jedan vlak [Cr '09]
d. U тaj čas ulazio je polako pod svod kolodvora jedan vlak [Cr '17]

‘One’ as an Indefinite Marker in Balkan and Non-Balkan Slavic

(12) a. Ех, да има сега някои да ме почерпи едно вине [B]
b. Eh da ima tkojed, da mi doda nešto vina [Cr '09]
c. Eh, da ima sada tkojed, da me počasti časićom vina. [Cr '17]
d. Eh, da ima kogod da mi doda jedno вине [Sr '07]
e. Eh, da je sada neko da me časti jedno vinićem [Sr '55]
f. Eh, da ima sегa nekoj da me česti eднo вине [M]
g. Эх, кабы кто познее стаканчик вина! [Rsn]
h. Eh, če bi mi kdo zdajče počastil z vincem. [Sn]
i. Ted' kdyby mě tak někdo pohostil vínkem! [Cz]
j. Aχ, και να ειλικρινές κυνήγα να με κράφτε τώρα ενα γιουςάκι! [G]
k. Ahh! Šimdi bir bardakçık şarap içme geçip oturdu. [T]
l. Eh, tē kisha tani praně njē njeri qē tē mē gostiste me njē shishkē vēre! [A]
m. Hei, acum sâ-mi făcă cineva cînte cu un vinisor! [Rmn]
‘Eh, now 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-
tion in a play or some other emphatic focus. This also appears to be the case in SWSS. It could be argued that in (4e and g) and (10c and d) Rujanac is purposefully attempting to differentiate his Croatian and Serbian versions of the same material in accordance with prescriptive norms such as those articulated by Mašetić, cited above. In (12) however, both Croatian translations eschew la can whereas it is present in both the Serbian ones. Finally, in (8) we see a difference that may be due to the greater freedom in representing colloquial speech Serbian norms, especially more modern ones. If these examples are examined from a semantic point of view, we see that almost all have concrete referents, ‘appetite’ in (12e) being the one exception. Example (4) is highly specific and referential while (10) also refers to a specific, concrete object. In (12), the glass of wine is only potential and not specific or referential. In example (8) we actually have three occurrences in the Bulgarian original and only two correspondences in the latest Serbian (8c), but of those two, one actually has a non-concrete reference (‘appetite’), while the other resembles (10). What emerges from this picture is a continuum typical of indefinite article development: The most highly specific, referential, and concrete are the most likely to occur with ‘one’ in a non-numerical function. Moreover, taking Bulgarian as the South Slavic literary language with the highest degree of article-like usage of ‘one’, we see that the Serbian and Croatian usages form a continuum with the Bulgarian and Macedonian, with the Serbian closer and the Croatian more distant.24

A comparison of Albanian (1978), Turkish (1969), Greek (1986), Romanian (1985), Bulgarian (1981) and Macedonian (1970) translations of the Russian novella *Sud’ba 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’ ([*odr/*in-*) occurs 44 times in the Russian original, but only one usage is of the indefinite pronoun type, the remainder being numerical or quantifying. Macedonian had a total of 61 occurrences of *ed[e]n*- of which 11 were indefinite markers while Bulgarian had a total of 75 occurrences of *ed[e]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

24 Cf. also Ivlić (1971) on the intermediate nature of *jedan* as an indefinite marker.

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.26 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).
Here the point is that *eden* cannot be used with a nonreferential indefinite meaning. I found that in general the judgments of Weiss’s 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 Topolilínska (1995) 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 indefinitely 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 reinterpreted infinitival constructions, Bulgarian and Greek retain a few traces of old ones, and only Macedonian has completely eliminated the category (but cf. Căsuță 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 *Stiga pi*! literally ‘It suffices [to] drink’, i.e. ‘You’ve had enough to drink’.

29 Judezmo, on the other hand, retains the indefinite while the Balkan dialects of Turkish show a partial replacement.
area of 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 counter evidence 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 (Roman) 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 Roman), 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 Slovene, 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 cited 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: 49, 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 proscription 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 Topolniška (1981/82: 712) and Kazais (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 оржинникъ, комуто заповѣдь да донесатъ главата му;
Jn 9:1 И като заминашше видѣ едного человека слеп од рождения.
M 4:8 Пакъ го заважда дивошть на една планина много висока
4:18 видѣ двамина брата ... че кърлаха мрежа въ морето
M 8:2 И ето, единъ прокажень доиде при него
M 8:5 единъ стотникъ доиде при него
M 8:9 и азъ съмъ човъкъ подъ власть
M 8:19 И доиде единъ книжникъ
M 8:24 И, ето, голѣма буря се подигна на езерото

**Macedonian**

Mk 6:27 И веднаш, от какво испрати целат, царот вареди да я донесат глава негова.
Jn 9:1 Кога одеше виде еден слеп човек од неговото ражанье
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**Serbian**

Mk 6:27 Једнома просни па дрелата, и заповеди да донесе главу његову
Jn 9:1 И пролазеци види човјека слижана од родине.
M 4:8 Опет уз га джово и одведе на гору врло високо
4:18 видје два брата ... где му још мреже у море
M 8:2 И, човјек глубав додје
M 8:5 приступи к њему капетан
M 8:9 и јас човек под власт
M 8:19 И приступив један књижевник реће му
M 8:24 И гл, улица велика постале на мору

**Slovene**

Mk 6:27 Takoj je posal po rablja in ukazal, naj primese njegovo glavo.
Jn 9:1 Ko je šel mimo, je zagledal človeka, ki je bil sple od rojstva.
M 8:2 In glej, pristopil je gobavec,
M 8:5 je stopil k njemu stotnik
M 8:9 Kajti tudi sam sem pod oblastjo...
M 8:19 Tedaj pristopil neki pismouk
M 8:24 Na jezerju je nastal velik vihar,
M 4:8 Spet ga je hudi vzval s seboj na zelo visoko goro.
M 4:18 je zagledal eva brata...Metala sta mrežo v jezero

**Czech**

Mk 6:27 Protož král ten poslav hned kata, rozkázal přinést hlavu Janovu.
Jn 9:1 A pomijeje, uzel člověka slepěho od narození.
Mt 4:8 Opět požal ho dánob na horu vysokou velmi...
Mt 4:18 uzral dva bratry, ... anu poštět i sit do moře...
Mt 8:2 A aj, malomocný příšed,
Mt 8:5 přistoupil k němu setnik
Mt 8:9 Nebu j i já jsem člověk pod moci
Mt 8:19 A přistoupiv jeden zákonník
Mt 8:24 A jí, bouře veliká stala se na mori

Russian

Mk 6:27 И тотчас послав оруженосца, царь повелел принести голову его.
Jn 5:1 И проходя, видел человека слепого от рождения.
Mt 4:8 Они берут Его диавол на высшую гору
Mt 4:18 Он увидел двух братьев ... закидывающих сети в море
Mt 8:2 И вот, подошел прокаженный
Mt 8:5 к Нему подошел сотник
Mt 8:9 я и подвластный человек
Mt 8:19 Тогда один книжник подошел сказал ему
Mt 8:24 И вот, сделалось великое волнение на море

Old Church Slavonic [Zographensis]

Mk 6:27 и дани послал въ вдвои, повелъ принести главу его
Jn 9:1 и азъ видя вида вида сына отъ сада.
Mt 4:8 и пойшли Его диавол на гору высокую за ним
Mt 4:18 видахъ двухъ братвъ ... кь метаимыша лову въ море
Mt 8:2 и съ прокаженный приставъ клинашъ вилу
Mt 8:5 приставъ къ лову схватился
Mt 8:9 въ вида сомъ подъ властником
Mt 8:19 и приставъ единымъ клинашь
Mt 8:24 и съ тремъ вырычь ловъ въ мори

Greek

Mt 6:27 Καὶ εὐθὺς αποστείλας ο Βασιλεὺς σπειρολάτορα,
επέστειλεν να ενεγκυμανία την κεφαλήν αυτού
Jn 9:1 Καὶ παραγωνὶ εἶδον ἀνάραμον τυφλὸν εκ γενετῆς

Latin

Mk 6:27 sed misso speculatore praecepit adferri caput eius in
discum et decollavit eum in carcere
Jn 9:1 et praeteriens vidit hominem caecum a nativitate
Mt 4:8 iterum adsumit eum diabolus in montem excelsum valde
Mt 4:18 vidit duo fratres ... mittentes rete in mare
Mt 8:2 et ecce leprosus veniens...
Mt 8:5 accessit ad eum centurio ...
Mt 8:9 et ego homo sum sub potestate
Mt 8:19 Et accedens unus scriba...
Mt 8:24 et ecce motus magnus factus est in mari

Romanian

Mk 6:27 A trimes îndată un otaș de pâză, cu poruncă de a aduce capul lui Iean
Jn 9:1 Cind trecea, Isus a văzut pe un orb din naștere
Mt 4:8 Diavolul L-a apoi pe un munte foarte înalt
Mt 4:18 Isus a văzut doi frați ... cari aruncau o mreajă în mare
Mt 8:2 Și un lepros s-a apropiat de El
Mt 8:5 s-a apropiat de El un sutaș
Mt 8:9 și eu sim om supt stă plinire
Mt 8:19 Atunci s-a apropiat de El un cărturar
Mt 8:24 Și deodată s-a stins pe mare o furtună atât de strâșnică

Albanian

Mk 6:27 Mbreuti monjëherë dërgoi një vrasës dhe urdhëroi t’ ia
sjellë kryet e Gjonit.
Duke kaluarrugës pa një njeri të verbët, që kishte lindur i verbët.

Djallë i côi sërisët në një mal shumët të lartë
Mt 4:8

Dje dy vëllezërt ... duke hedhur rrjetën në det
Mt 4:18

Dhe ja, një gërbulan iu afrua
Mt 8:2

Iu paraqit një centurion
Mt 8:5

Edhe unë që nuk jam tjetër, por një njeri i nënshtruar
Mt 8:9

Ndërkëq u afrua një skrib
Mt 8:19

Dhe ja, në det u çua një stuihi e madhe
Mt 8:24

Turkish

Mk 6:27

Kiral hemen muhañiz askerinden birini gönderip onun başını getirmesini emretti.

Jn 9:1

Ve geçerken anadan doğma kör bir adam gördü.
Mt 4:8

Übüs Ùsâyı çok yüksek bir dağa da göttürdü
Mt 4:18

iki kardesi ... denize ağ atalarırken gördü
Mt 8:2

Ve işte bir cumažli gelip...
Mt 8:5

bir yüzbaşı yalvararak...
Mt 8:9

Ben de emir altında bir adamim
Mt 8:19

Ve bir yazıcı gelip ona:
Mt 8:24

Ve işte enizde büyük bir firtına oldu
Romani (Arli)

Mk 6:27

Taj vednaga o thagar biçhaljgas iekes, kaske vakergjas te anel o şero leskoro;

Jn 9:1

Taj kana zanakhelas, dëhkjas ikehe kore bijando manuš
Mt 4:8

Pale Les ingeljas o beng ikehe bute uçeste veš,
Mt 4:18

dëhkjas e due phralen ... kaj çherevenas i mrezva
Mt 8:2

Taj, ake iek prokaçimo alo paš Leste
Mt 8:5

iek şelengoro baro, alo paš Leste
Mt 8:9

vi me sem manuš kas si inçaripe
Mt 8:19

Taj alo iek lîvalo
Mt 8:24

Taj, ake, baro vazdiba e pajneste ko cikin denizi,

Romani (Gurbet)

Mk 6:27

Athonaska biçhalda thagari muderitmatres te džal thaj te anel Jovanosko şoro;
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Jn 9:1

Thaj džikaj naçehelas dikhla e manušes, savo sas bijandamatar koro.
Mt 4:8

Palem indjardales o beng pe vući plain
Mt 4:18

dikhla duj phralen ... sar çhüden maçharendje astarde andre mora
Mt 8:2

Thaj dikh, melalo lepraratar pašunisardape leske
Mt 8:5

pašunisajlo leske jekh kapetano
Mt 8:9

taj me sijam baro manuš
Mt 8:19

Thaj sar avilo leste jekh ilarno
Mt 8:24

Thaj dikh, baro vazdipe morijaske pajendar dija pe mora

Appendix 2:

Comparison of Kelderash/Lovari, Gurbet, and Leshaki Romani
(Matras 1996)

Aj učo sar jekh kher
Taj uči sar jekh čer
I lučo syr jekh kher
‘And as large (tall) as a house’

So díchol po patreto? Me dikhav jekh vaza.
So díchol po slika? Me dikhav jekh vaza.
So dîkses pre daja blita? Me dikhav jekh vaza.
‘What do you see in the picture? I see a vase.’

Skiris jekh kopači? Na, jekh raca.
Crtos jekh kaš? Na, jekh raca.
Malines tu jekh rukti? Na, reca.
‘Are you drawing a tree? No, a duck’

Me sim jekh pajesko levo.
Me sem jekh pajesko lavo.
Me som jekh panitko lvo.
‘I am a sea lion.’

Kada si amari lumja. Amari lumja si jekh planeta.
Gada si amari phuv. Amari phuv si jekh planeta.
Daja si ajmary phuv. Jamari phuv sy jekh planeta.
‘This is our world/earth. Our earth/world is a planet.’

Me šuvav jekh phal katar e lada żi kaj e felastara.
Me thav jekh phal katar o sanduko dži ke pendžararva.
Côhuvač jekh baro phal moxtenestr až ki duđali.
'Put a big stick from the trunk to the window.'

Kadi si jekh vundžija pe jekh naj. O naj pe jekh vast. 
Goda si jekh bunčia pe jekh naj. O naj pe jekh vah. 
Dava sy jekh nay pry jekh gušt. Gušt pry 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 lav jekh baro gono aro. 
Me pekav jekh kolako mrne dejače. Me lav jekh baro džako aro. 
Me pekav mre dake marykla. Me lav jekh baro gono jažo. 
'I am baking a cake for my mother. I take a large sack of flour.'

Sas pe kaj nas pe jekh baro žiganja 
Sas pe kaj naj nas jekh bari životinja 
Sys peske baro kirmo 
'Once upon a time there was a big animal'

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

So kerel o Lazo? Vov kerel jekh podo. 
So ěrelo o Lazo. Vov ěrelo 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 xoxamno patreto. 
Si e linje banče? Gava si pale jekh xoxavní slika. 
Sy da kreski bange? Dava sy palo opščeno vizja. 
'Are the lines crooked? It is an optical illusion.'

Me sim o Eino. Me sim jekh Eskimo-šavoro. 
Me sem o Eino. Me sem jekh Eskimo-čhavoro. 
Me som Eino. Me som čhavoro-Eskimo 
'I am into. I am an Eskimo boy.'

Me trair ande jekh gav. Si amen jekh kher. 
Me trair ande jekh gav. Si amen jekh čer 
Me bešto som dry gav. Jamen sy kher. 
'I live in a village. We have a house.'

Ži kaj o Marso trobuj jekh raketa te tradel duj breš. 
Dži ko Marso trubul jekh raketa te tradel duj breš. 
Ko Marso mušnel duj berš raketa te tradl. 
'It takes a rocket two months to travel to Mars.'

Kado si muro dad. Les si jekh mustača. 
Kava si mno dad. Le si mustaka. 
Dava sy miro dad. Les sy ěhorja. 
'This is my father. He has a moustache.'

Me sičhuvava jekh buči 
Me sičivava jekh zanato. 
Me sykhlakirava man buty. 
'I learn a trade,'

Jekh šimjako si ande pinca. Muri loli taška si la jekh gropa. 
Jekh šimjako si ando podrumo. Mni loli tašna si la jekh xv. 
Jamen sy jekh myšo andry štaša. Andry miry loli khorba sy xev. 
'We have mouse in the basement. My red bag has a hole in it.'
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‘ЕДЕН’ КАКО ЗНАК НА НЕОПРЕДЕЛЁННОСТЯ БО БАЛКАНСКИТЕ И НЕБАЛКАНСКИ СЛОВЕНСКИ ЯЗИЦИ

(Резиме)

Бројот ‘еден’ во балканословенските јазици се употребува со значења коли одговара на неопределен имен во тие јазици каде што неопределено се спротивставува на определено како граматичка категорија. Се знае дека во старословенското, старогрчкото и латинскиот немаше таква употреба на бројот ‘еден’. Исто така, од една страна имен(ност) можност дека определеност 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 патници од осмот век. Покрај овие факти, употребата на бројот ‘еден’ со значење на неопределеност е најмногу застапена во турското, албанското, и романското, во грчки и бугарски некои понеазаписани -- како и во македонското -- и станува се поретка на јужнословенската јазична територија кога се од кон север и запад преку Србија и Хрватска. Покрај тоа, таквата употреба е значајно поетството во разговор спрема пишување, и можеме да ја дадеме забележката дека аналитичка референцијалност е особено характеристична за јазични конвергентни (контактни) ситуации. Од сеото тоа се доаѓа до заклучокот дека употребата на бројот ‘еден’ како десемантизиран знак на неопределеност, имајќи го предвид целокупниот балкански контекст, најверојатно може да се смета за еден балканизам којто досега не беше идентификуван како таков. Рускиот јазик во овој поглед е многу конзервативен, т.е. блиску до старословенското, додека чешкиот е малку по-неконзервативен, но не толку, колку што е хрватскиот. Во рефератот овие заклучоци се демонстрираат со податоци од споредби преводи и од телеска работа.