'One' as an Indefinite Marker in Balkan and Non-Balkan Slavic
Victor A. Friedman
American Contributions to the Thirteenth International Congress of Slavists. ed. by Alan
Timberlake and Michael Flier. Bloomington, IN: Slavica. 2003. 93-112.

1. Introduction

While the grammaticalization of expressions of definiteness is one of the oldest Balkanisms both in terms of possible attestation (Hamp 1982:79) and in terms of identification as such (Kopitar 1829:106), that which can be regarded as the inverse of grammaticalized definite marking, namely grammaticalized indefinite marking, has never figured in the catalogue of Balkanisms. 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.[1]   I shall argue here that indefiniteness is grammaticalized in Balkan Slavic (and Romani).[2] 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 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. 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 or the grammaticalization of object reduplication, 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 certain modal particles, in terms of which Macedonian is midway between Albanian and Romanian on the one hand and Bulgarian and Greek on the other. I shall also argue that differences in the prescription versus description of 'one' as an indefinite marker are motivated to some extent by linguistic ideology.

2. 'One' in the Non-Slavic Balkan Languages

Grammars of Albanian, the Balkan Romance languages, Greek, and Turkish describe grammaticalizations of the respective etymological numerals meaning 'one', usually unstressed, 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 *un[u]/[u]nă* 'one M/F' as an indefinite article explicitly, although Vrabie (2000:101) glosses it with the English indefinite article and it is 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, *një* is used with certain locative prepositions to distinguish definite from indefinite reference: *Hipi mbi çati* 'He climbed on the roof' *Hipi mbi një çati* 'He climbed on a roof.' The indefinite article is used with predicate nominatives only when they are modified: *Ai ishte djalë* 'He was a boy' *Ai ishte një djalë i 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 clovn* 'Ionescu is a clown [by profession]', *Ionescu este un clovn* 'Ionescu is a clown [a prankster]' (Graur et al. 1966:109).

For Greek, Householder, Kazazis, and Koutsodas (1964:96) write that the indefinite article is not used with with predicate nouns, often not with indefinite direct objects, and in some generic contexts. According to Kazazis (personal communication) modified predicate nominatives ordinarily do not take 'one', but as an identifying referential, 'one' occurs in contexts such as the following: ειμαι ενας φοιτητης της ανθρωπολογιας στο Πανεπισθημιο Θεσσαλονικησ και σας γραφω για να σας ζητησω μια συμβουλη '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 ειναι; 'Who is it?' one can answer [ειναι] ενας φοιτητης '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 bahçesi 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 (e.g., Boretzky 1992:21, 163-203; Hancock 1995:56; Igla 1996:42, 45, 252-75). 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 ([je]k) phabaj
        'Give me an apple'

According to Sampson (1926:405), however, Romani 'one' is "never used to express the indef[inite] 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 Kalajdži dialect of Bulgaria, in which *jekh* much more common than in dialects spoken outside the Balkans (Hristo Kyuchukov, personal communication).

3. 'One' in Balkan Slavic

In Friedman (1976) I concluded that *edin* as an indefinite marker is obligatory in certain referential contexts and proscribed by normativists in nonreferential ones. Vladimir Georgiev (personal communication) supported my conclusions by stating that the two most common actions of proofreaders at Bulgarian publishing houses are corrections in the use of the artificial distinction between oblique and nonoblique masculine definite articles and the removal of *edin* used as an indefinite marker. The strictures against such uses of *edin* which are taught to children in Bulgarian public schools (Valentina Izmirlieva personal communication) and which are prescribed in handbooks of correct usage (e.g., Brezinski 1968:49) indicate that indefinite marker usage is widespread colloquially despite its proscription or debatable nature for grammarians. 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:

> "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."

Peripheral or not, the arguments for grammatical status remain valid (cf. Avgustinova 1998:15, Zidarova 1994).

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 Topolińska (1981-82), Friedman (1993:268, 291), Minova-Ǵurkova (1994:59-60, 118-129), Povarnicina (1996), and Weiss (1996). Topolińska (1981-82:712) makes the point that Macedonian *eden* is a semantically bleached referential and generic marker whose use is broadening among younger Macedonians (cf. also Naylor 1981/82:538). 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)   Ја барам една марка, но не ја најдов.
         '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, there is a tendency in formal writing to eliminate article-like uses of *eden*, (Blaže Koneski to Z. Topolińska, personal communication from Z. Topolińska). This in itself is 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' as a marker of indefiniteness is more characteristic of the Serbian standard than the Croatian, like the use of the imperfect (Collins 1990).[3] Unlike the use of the imperfect, however, the use of *jedan* as an indefinite marker is not a preservation but rather an innovation, although both are 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 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 descriptive Serbian one, resembling the situation for the imperfect:

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

> Број *један* се врло често у нашем језику употребљава — не да се њим означи број, него више као нека врста неодређеног члана, (Stevanović 1986:313)

Bulgarian prescriptivism criticizing the "unmotivated" use of *edin* also cites the influence of French and German indefinite articles (Brezinski 1968:49).

4. Historical Comparative Data: The Bible

The use of 'one' as an indefinite marker is a feature shared to varying degrees by the Balkan languages that is not inherited from the attested respective ancestral languages. 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.[4] The passages are given in English and Old Church Slavonic with data for the he following languages (in order of occurrence) in Table 1: Bulgarian (B),

Macedonian (M), Serbian (Sr), Slovene (Sn), Czech (Cz), Russian (Rs) , Old Church Slavonic (OCS [Codex Zographensis]), New Testament Greek (G), Latin (L), Romanian (Rmn), Albanian (A), Turkish, (T), Romani (Arli dialect [Balkan group]; Ri-A), and Romani (Gurbet dialect [Vlax group]; Ri-G).[5] 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 an indefinite 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. An X indicates presence on an indefinite marker in the passage in question, a O indicates absence. An asterisk indicates that the indefinite item is animate, while a dagger indicates that it is the subject of the sentence. For the classification of indefinites, Avgustinova (1998) uses the terminology identifying-specific ('a certain one'), identifying-nonspecific ('any one'), and categorizing-generic ('any and all') for Bulgarian *edin*.[6] 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.

Passage	B	M	Sr	Sn	Cz	Rs	OCS	G	L	Rmn	A	T	Ri-A	Ri-G	E
Mk 6:27*[s]	*X*	*O*	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	**X**	**X**	**X**	*X*	O	**X**
Jn 9:1*[s]	*X*	*X*	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	**X**	**X**	**X**	*X*	O	**X**
Mt 4:8	*X*	*O*	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	**X**	**X**	**X**	*X*	O	**X**
Mt 4:18	*O*	*O*	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	**X**	**O**	**O**	*O*	O	**X**
Mt 8:2*†[s]	*X*	*X*	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	**X**	**X**	**X**	*X*	O	**X**
Mt 8:5*†[s]	*X*	*X*	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	**X**	**X**	**X**	*X*	X	**X**
Mt 8:9*†[g]	*O*	*O*	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	**O**	**X**	**X**	*O*	O	**X**
Mt 8:19*†[s]	*X*	*X*	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	**X**	**X**	**X**	*X*	X	**X**
Mt 8:24†	*O*	*O*	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	**X**	**X**	**X**	*O*	O	**X**

Table 1. Presence of 'one' Marking Indefiniteness
*=animate, †=subject, [s]=specific, [g]=generic

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
Mt 8:19   And **a certain** scribe came
Mt 8:24   And, behold, there arose **a** great tempest in the sea
Old Church Slavonic [Zographensis]
Mk 6:27 і абиє посълавъ ц͞рь воина , повелѣ принести главѫ єго

Jn 9:1   і мимо иды видѣ ч͞ва слѣпа отъ р͞са .

Mt 4:8	пакы понѧтъ его неприѣзнь на горѫ высокѫ ѕѣло
Mt 4:18	видѣ дъва братра .. въметанѭшта мрежѧ въ море
Mt 8:2	і се прокаженъ пристѫпь кланⷶ̑ѣаше емоу
Mt 8:5	пристѫпи къ нⷷ̑емоу сътьникъ
Mt 8:9	азъ чк҃ъ есмь подъ владыконѫ
Mt 8:19	і пристѫпь **единъ** кънижьникъ
Mt 8:24	і се трѫсъ вели бысть въ мори

Table 2: Test Sentences in English and OCS

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 a categorical-generic indefinite article, and such usage is avoided in Romanian, as in Modern Greek.

The Balkan Indic (Romani) and Balkan Slavic examples provide 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 the fact that Macedonian *eden* can trigger object reduplication in its specific meaning (cf. example 2), and is therefore arguably more grammaticalized, 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.7 All of the Bulgarian uses in our sample are identifying, but Avgustinova (1998:8) has examples of generic-categorizing as well. Example (3) is cited in Avgustinova (1998:8) and also Friedman (1976):

(3)　　**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 *njakoj-si* in Mt 8:5. This is may have been due to normative strictures that discourage the use of *edin* as an indefinite article mentioned above.

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. Data from Matras (1996), with a series of examples from two Vlax Romani dialects (Kalderash/Lovari and Gurbet) and one Northern dialect (Leshaki) illustrate clearly the relative greater frequency of *jekh* 'one' as an indefinite marker in the Vlax dialects as opposed to 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 half of what it is in Kalderash/Lovari or Gurbet (eleven occurrences versus twenty-five; the two Vlax dialects pattern identically in

this respect). 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) and Sholokhov's *Sud'ba cheloveka* (1956). The *Baj Ganjo* 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. For example, Topolińska (1981-82:713-15) provides thirty-two examples of the use of *eden* as an indefinite marker from the Macedonian translation of *War and Peace* of which 29 correspond to zero in the Russian original (the other three correspond to the French indefinite article in the original). 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 32).[8] 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 pronominal modifier meaning 'a certain', illustrated by example (5). Example (4) shows a generic predicative use of an indefinite article, which only occurs in two of the three Balkan languages with true indefinite articles (Turkish and Albanian; on Romanian see §2) as well as a nonreferential specific indefinite article in those languages that corresponds 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). The Serbian/Croatian translations show a transition between grammaticalized indefinite marking and lexical indefinite expressions. These will be discussed in greater detail below.[9]

(4) a. Помогнаха на бай Ганя да смъкне от плещите си агарянския ямурлук, наметна си той **една** белгийска мантия — и всички рекоха, че бай Ганьо е вече цял европеец. [Bg]

 b. **една** белгиска манти ja [M]

 j. **ενα** βελγικòν μανδύαν [G]

 k. **bir** Belçіka paltosu giyince, görenler: — Bay Ganü büsbütün **bir** Avrupalıya benzedi, dediler. [T]

 l. **o** pelerină belgiană [Rmn]

 m. **një** pardesy belgjiane. Atëhere të gjithë thanë se baj 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.'[10]

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

b. во канцеларијата на **еден** бугарски трговец [M]
c. в контору к **одному** болгарскому торговцу [Rs]
d. **jednom** bugarskom trgovcu u dućan [Cr '09]
f. код **једног** бугарског трговца [Sr '55]
g. **једном** бугарском трговцу у дућан [Sr '07]
h.   v prodajalno <u>nekega</u> bolgarskega trgovca [Sn]
i. účtárny **jednoho** bulharského obchodníka [Cz]
j. εἰς τὸ κατάστημα **ἑνὸς** Βουλγάρου ἐμπόρου [G]
k. **bir** Bulgar tüccarının yazıhanesine [T]
l.   te **një** tregëtar bullgar [A]
m. la biroul **unui** negustor bulgar [Rmn]
'I took Baj Ganjo to the office of a certain Bulgarian merchant and left him there, then I hopped on a tram and went to Schönbrun.'

In example (4), 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. Slovene speakers were divided on the acceptability of using *en* in colloquial style. In the case of example (5), the omission of *edin* as an indefinite pronoun in Bulgarian renders the effect of stressing that the merchant was Bulgarian and not, e.g., Serbian or Russian. Example (6) illustrates the fact that *edin* can function generically in Bulgarian but not in Russian:

(6)   И ме посъветваха 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 мне посоветовали не играть пером в будущем, хотя я
лично не вижу как может ***один** хронист играть
пером!(Ницолова 2000)
'And they advised me not to play with my pen in the future, although personally I do not see how can a chronicler 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 *odin* was unacceptable in this context.
In the case of the Greek translation, which had the same number of correspondences to the Bulgarian original as the Macedonian, the places were somewhat different (see below). In examples (7-8) the other Slavic languages all use the instrumental case, while in (9) none of them have any lexical indicator of indefiniteness. In (10) there was a difference among the Serbian/Croatian translations which will be discussed below.

(7)   a. с **един** ленив глас [B]
k. tembel **bir** sesle [T]
l. me **një** zë të plogësht [A]
'with **a** lazy voice'

(8)   a. с **един** тон, нетърпящ възражение. [B]
k. me **një** ton të tillë, që s'duronte kundërshtim. [A]
m. pe **un** ton care nu îngăduia tăgada. [Rmn]
'in **a** tone of voice that would not brook contradiction.'

(9) a. пришиваше **един** нов джеб [B]
     j. ἔρραβε **μιὰ** καινούργια τσέπη [G]
     k. **bir** cep diktiğini [T]
     l. po qepte **një** xhep të ri [A]
     m. făcea **un** buzunar nou [Rmn]
         'he was sewing **a** new pocket'

(10) a. Бај Гањо приклекна над дисгите си гърбом към мене,
          извади половин пита кашкавал, отряза си **едно**
          деликатно късче, отряза и **един** огромен резен хляб и
          почна да мляска с **един** чудесен апетит, [B]
      b. **едно** танко парченце, пресече и **едно** огромно парче леб
          и почна да мласка со **еден** чудесен апетит, [M]
      f. **једно** танко парче, отсече и огроман комад хлеба и поче
          да мљаска с **једним** невероватним апетитом, [Sr '55]
      j. ἔκοψε **ἕνα** "δελικάτο" κομάτι, ἔκοψε καὶ **ἕνα** κόμματο ψωμὶ
          καὶ ἄρχισε νὰ μασᾷ θορυβωδῶς μὲ θαυμαστὴν ὄρεξιν, [G]
      k. Heybenin **bir** gözünden yarım kelle kaşạr peyniri cıkardı ve incecik **bir** dilim
          kesti. Cọban dilimi denen kalın **bir** dilim ekmek de keserek, ağzını sạpırdata
          sạpırdata büyük **bir** isțahla yemeye bașḷadı. [T]
      l. preu prej saj **një** jetëzë të hollë, preu pastaj **një** copë të madhe bukë dhe filloi të
          përtypej me zhurmë dhe shije të çuditëshme, [A]
      m. scoase **o** jumătate de roată de casçaval, din care tăie **o** bucățịcă subțịrică, să
          vezi prin ea, luă **un** codru mare de pîine sị începu să plescăie cu **o** poftă de
          invidiat, [Rmn]
          'Baj Ganjo leaned over his saddle-bags with his back to me, pulled out half a
          wheel of kashkaval cheese, cut himself **a** delicate slice, cut **a** huge slab of
          bread as well, and began to chomp away with **a** marvelous appetite.'

In examples (7), (8), and (10), the item in question is an abstract noun, whereas in (9) 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. Native speakers of Bulgarian disagreed over the stylistic implications of
omitting 'one' in the original: Some felt that in (7), (8) and the last occurrence in (10) 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 omissible. It is worth noting that elsewhere in the same chapter
Konstantinov uses *ton* without *edin:*

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

However, Konstantinov's use of *edin* to specify a tone of voice was felt by some Bulgarians to
be particularly characteristic of his style.The Greek goes with Macedonian in (7) and (8) but
with Bulgarian in (9). The non-Slavic Balkan languages all agree with the Bulgarian except the

Turkish version of (8), which simply used the expression *karşılık verdi* 'retorted'. In (10), the Greek and Albanian omit the indefinite marker with the abstract noun 'appetite'.

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.[11] 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 (7, 8), the other is with concrete objects (4, 9). Examples (7) and (8) are stylistically marked in Bulgarian. In example (4), native Bulgarian consultants felt that the object by itself was too non-referential, some sort of specifier was needed, and that 'one' was the most neutral, whereas in the case of (9) the value of *edin* was felt to be close to numerical and potentially omissible thanks to the contextual specificity of 'new'. In example (4), 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 (cf. Greek and Albanian). Of these, one, given here as (12), is translated into all four as well as Macedonian and the non-Slavic Balkan languages, and not into non-Balkan Slavic:[12]

(12) a. аз преспокойно се разположих при **една** маса и си
           поръчах закуска и пиво. [B]
      b. се расположив на **една** маса [M]
      d. se uvalim u **jednu** stolicu [Cr '09]
      e. sjedoh k **jednom** stolu [Cr '17]
      f. седох комотно за **један** сто [Sr '07]
      g. разурим се крај **једног** стола [Sr '55]
      j. ἐκάθησα εἰς **ἕνα** τραπέζι [G]
      k. **bir** masanın başına geçip kuruldum [T]
      l. mă aşezai liniştit la **o** masă şi comandai **o** bere [Rmn]
      m. zura **një** tryezë [A]
           'I settled myself comfortably at a table and ordered a snack and a beer'

This leaves six that show differential treatment. Of these, three are given in (7) and (12) above, and the others are given in (13), (14) and (15) below. In examples (5) and (12), *jedan* is lacking only in Rujanac's (1917) Croatian version, in (14) Rujanac's (1907) Serbian version uses the indefinite pronoun *neki* where the other versions have 'one', and in example (15) *jedan* is lacking in both Croatian versions and used in both Serbian versions. In (10) *jedan* (twice) occurs only in Paunović's (1955) Serbian version.

(13) a. Няма джеб, няма нищо, ами беше се поразпрала малко
           дрешката ми, та турих **едно** парцалче... [B]
      b. ставив **едно** парче... [M]
      d. udarih **jednu** zadrpicu. [Cr '09]
      f. ударих **једну** закрпицу... [Sr '07]
      g. турих **једну** закрпицу... [Sr '55]
      j. ἔρραψα **ἕνα** μικρὸ κουρέλι.. [G]
      l. po i vinja **një** copë. [A]
      m. i-am pus **un** peticut, [Rmn]

'What pocket? There's no pocket! It's just that my jacket got a little torn so I basted on **a** patch.'

(14) a. В това време под свода на гарата влизаше медлено **един** трен [B]

    b. влегуваше полека **еден** воз [M]

    d. ulazi polagano u kolodvorski svod **jedan** vlak [Cr '09]

    e. ulazio je polako pod svod kolodvora **jedan** vlak [Cr '17]

    f. улази полагано у станични свод **један** воз [Sr '55]

    i. vjížděl pod nádražní klenbu <u>nějaký</u> vlak [Cz]

    j. ἐκείνην ἔμβαινε σιγὰ σιγὰ εἰς τὸν σταθμὸν **ἕνα** τραῖνο [G]

    k. po hynte mengadale **një** tren [A]

    l. ağır **bir** tren giriyordu [T]

    m. intra domol **un** tren [R]

    'At that moment a train slowly came in under the vaulted roof of the station'

(15) a. Ех, да има сега някой да ме почерпи **едно** винце [B]

    b. **едно** винце [M]

    e. **једно** винце [Sr '07]

    f. **једно** винцем [Sr '55]

    j. **ἕνα** κρασάκι! [G]

    к. **bir** bardakcık sạrap [T]

    l. **një** njeri që të më gostiste me **një** shishkë verë! [A]

    m. **un** vinisọr! [Rmn]

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

Both (12) and (14) 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 example (12), 'one' is obligatory in this context.[13] For (15), Bulgarian consultants felt that the omission of 'one' would produce a dramatic effect, like the stage direction in a play or some other emphatic focus. This also appears to be the case in SWSS. It could be argued that in (5) and (13) 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 Maretić, cited above. In (15) however, both Croatian translations eschewed *jedan* whereas it is present in both the Serbian ones. Finally, in (13) we see a difference that may be due to the greater freedom in representing colloquial speech in 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 (10) being the one exception. Example (5) is highly specific and referential while (13) also refers to a specific, concrete object. In (15), the glass of wine is only potential and not specific or referential. In example (10) we actually have three occurrences in the Bulgarian original and only two correspondences in the latest Serbian (10), but of those two, one actually has a non-concrete reference ('appetite'), while the other resembles (13). 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.[14]

A comparison of Albanian (1978), Turkish (1969), Greek (1986), Romanian (1973), 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' (*od[i]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[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 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.[15]

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.[16] 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 (16) and (17), are among those given by Weiss (1996:436), are used to substantiate his point:[17]

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

(17)   Vikni lekar / nekoj lekar / *eden lekar !
         'Call a doctor!'

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 (16) but gave *eden* a referential reading. These same people accepted (17) 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) observes 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 a broad range of languages, and he proposes discourse-related factors that explain the choice of 'one' as the source of indefinite articles. Topolińska (1995), however, 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 between areal and typological 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.[18]

As seen in §4, the attested anceastors of the Balkan languages 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 the Balkan languages with attested ancestors is clearly a development that took place in the context of contact with Turkish and the ancestor of modern Albanian. While West European Romance and Germanic languages also have such usages, the possibility of an 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. The fact that 'one' as an indefinte marker is not as highly grammaticalized in Balkan Slavic and Balkan Indic (Romani) as in the other Balkan languages — and also the counterevidence to Givón's generalization about referential and generic usage — may be due to its later, contact-induced impetus.

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 took place during the period when those languages were in contact with one another, and thus constitutes a Balkanism in this sense. It can be argued that the situation of the Balkan indefinite marker is comparable to that of infinitive replacement, which, as Joseph (1983:242-43) points out, is not completely realized in any of the languages esxcept Macedonian (but cf. also Čašule 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, which show weaker but nonetheless significant degrees of grammatical marking for indefiniteness. The fact that indefinite markers are considered more a colloquial than a literary feature in these latter languages is another argument in favor of a contact origin.

The issue of prescription versus description is significant with regard to data collection. According to Stephen Dickey and Tom Priestly (personal communications), the use of 'one' as an indefinite marker is much more frequent in colloquial Croatian and Slovenian than in the published norm, although still not as frequent as in more southerly South Slavic. In fact, our Slovene text even avoided pronominal uses of 'one'. Moreover, 'one' as an indefinite marker is frequent in conversational Serbian (Hinrichs and Hinrichs 1995:55-57). The linguistic (referential) and ideological (West European versus Balkan) functions of *jedan* as an indefinite marker are explicitly indexed by Croatian and Bulgarian normativists. The Modern Greek New Testament is similar, and Kuhlman (1997:92) discusses the proscription against 'one' as an indefinite marker in Katharevousa. The 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 and Welsh Romani (Matras 1996, Sampson 1926).

Thus, although normativism plays a differential role in publications, nonetheless 'one' as a grammaticalized marker of indefiniteness in Slavic is associated with Balkan linguistic contact. Russian is 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. In South Slavic, the usage is begins marginally in colloquial Slovenian and literary Croatian and becomes increasingly grammaticalized to the south and east. The historical and social factors surrounding the use of 'one' as an indefinite marker in Balkan Slavic were thus those of Balkan linguistic convergence, and so while internal structural and universal linguistic factors may have had a role to play, the development 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 be considered a Balkanism despite the typological parallels elsewhere in the world. In this regard, however, it worth noting 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 be the result of West European rather than Balkan linguistc influence, 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 .

University of Chicago

NOTES

[1] I am using the term *indefinite marker* — in contradistinction to *indefinite article* — in a different sense from Haspelmath (1997:22). Haspelmath uses *indefiniteness marker* to refer to that part of an indefinite pronoun or collocation that carries the meaning of 'indefiniteness'. 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 but is more grammaticalized than an indefinite pronoun, i.e. semantically bleached and subject to some rules of obligatory occurrence (cf. Topolińska 1981-82:705, Lyons 1999:276). For example the indefinite marker in Balkan Slavic is obligatory in some specific-referential contexts but is omitted or omissible in nonreferential contexts where a language such as English would require an article, e.g. Macedonian *Vikni lekar!* 'Call a doctor!'

[2] Romani itself is usually excluded from the canon of Balkan languages (e.g., Sandfeld 1930:4, Asenova 2002:200), but other authors have argued for its inclusion, e.g. Weigand, (1894/95:78), Joseph (1983:252-253), Igla (1996).

[3] I shall use the term *Southern West South Slavic* (*SWSS*) for 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).

4 Although modern translations are occasionally archaizing and therefore not useful as examples of modern data, such differences as do exist in modern texts can be counted as relevant. Like Ancient Greek, Latin, and Old Church Slavonic, Sanskrit did not use 'one' as an indefinite marker, nor did Middle Indic (Masica 1991:248).

5 All translations were made from the original languages except the Romani, which were translated from Bulgarian (Arli, Metkov 1995) and Serbian (Gurbet, Dimić 1990). It is worth noting that Zographensis tends to use ѥтєрь for the indefinite specifier, whereas ѥдинь is more common in Codex Marianus. (I wish to thank Cynthia Vakareliyska for this observation.) In our sample, however, the two codices agreed. The translation into Modern Greek followed New Testament Greek usage too slavishly to be useful, and so it is omitted. Phrases with indefinite markers are given in Appendix 1.

6 Avgustinova (1998:4-5) 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'.

7 This is reflected in many of the world's languages by the use of oblique cases for the agents of *verbi sentiendi*.

8 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.

9 English translations will be normally based on the Bulgarian original.

10 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.

11 Konstantinov's original and three of the four Serbian/Croatian translations all date from before the end of world War I. 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 native speakers born after World War II, and all judged the occurrences of 'one' to be consistent with current usage. In the case of the Serbian/Croatian translations, various factors may have influenced the translators' choices, but the general tendencies are nonetheless clear. According to Kostas Kazazis (personal communication), the quality of the Greek translation meets modern standards. The Slovenian translation was stylitcially mixed (Tom Priestly, personal communication).

12 Slovene informants agreed that in colloquial style *en* would be acceptable.

13 Lack of *edin* would require the preposition *na* and have an adverbial meaning of manner or purpose (e.g. *sednexame na masa da jadem* 'we sat down at the table to eat').

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

15 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).

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

17 The indefinite pronoun некоj '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. 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).

18 Masica (1991:248, 370-71) notes that in Eastern (Bengali-Assamese-Oriya) Indo-Aryan and Sinhalese, morphological (as opposed to syntactic) marking of indefiniteness has arisen. In Sinhalese, there is a suffixed indefinite article (*-ek, -ak*) derived from 'one' whereas in the Eastern type definiteness is marked by a series of suffixed classifiers of non-Indo-Aryan origin, and when these classifiers are suffixed to *ek* 'one' the numeral becomes an indefinite article. These independent developments, unlike the situation in Romani, were not accompanied by the development of definite articles.

REFERENCES

Asenova, Petja. 2002. *Balkansko ezikoznanie*. Veliko Tŭrnovo.

Atanasov, Petar. 1990. *Le mégléno-roumain de nos jours*. Hamburg.

Avgustinova, Tania. 1998. "Determinedness and Replication Potential of Nominal Material in Bulgarian," *Balkanistica* 11:1–17.

Banfi, Emanuele. 1985. *Linguistica balcanica*. Bologna.

Boiadzhiev, Todor, Ivan. Kucarov, Iordan. Penchev. 1998. *Sŭvremenen bŭlgarski ezik*. Sofia.

Boretzky, Norbert. 1992. *Bugurdzhi: Deskriptiver und historischer Abriss eines Romani-Dialekts*. Osteuropa-Institut der Freien Universität Berlin Balkanologische Veröffentlichungen 21. Wiesbaden.

Brezinski, Stoian. 1969. *Ezikova kultura*. Sofia

Collins, Michael W. 1990. "An Analysis of the Frequency and Use of the Aorist and Imperfect in the Serbo-Croatian Language of the Press, 1907–1987." M.A. Thesis, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Chashule, Ilija. 1989. *Sintaksa na makedonskata glagolska imenka*. Skopje.

Friedman, Victor A. 1976. "The Question of a Bulgarian Indefinite Article," *Bulgaria: Past and Present*, ed. Thomas Butler, 334–40. Columbus.

—. 1993. "Macedonian," *The Slavonic Languages*, ed. Bernard Comrie and Greville Corbett, 249–305. London.

Givón, Talmy. 1981. "On the Development of the Numeral 'One' as an Indefinite Marker," *Folia Linguistica Historica* 2:35–53.

Givón, Talmy. 1984. *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction*, 1. Amsterdam.

Graur, Al, et al. 1966. *Gramatica limbii române,* 1. Bucharest.

Hamp, Eric P. 1977. On Some Questions of Areal Linguistics. *Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 279–82. Berkeley.

—. 1982. The Oldest Albanian Syntagma. *Balkansko ezikoznanie* 25:77–79.

Hancock, Ian. 1995. *A Handbook of Vlax Romani.* Columbus.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite Pronouns*. Oxford.

Hinrichs, Uwe and Ljiljana Hinrichs. 1995. *Serbische Umgangssprache*. Osteuropa-Institut der Freien Universität Berlin Balkanologische Veröffentlichungen 27. Wiesbaen.

Householder, Fred W., Kostas Kazazis, Andreas Koutsoudas. 1964. *Reference Grammar of Literary Dhimotiki*. Bloomington.

Igla, B. 1996. *Das Romani von Ajia Varvara*. Osteuropa-Institut der Freien Universität Berlin Balkanologische Veröffentlichungen 29. Wiesbaden.

Ivić, Milka. 1971. "Leksema *jedan* i problem neodredjenog člana." *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 14(1):103–20.

Jagić, V. (ed.). 1879. *Codex Zographensis*. Berlin (reprinted 1954, Graz).

Joseph, Brian. 1983. *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive*. Cambridge.

Kazazis, Kostas and Joseph Pentheroudakis. 1976. "Reduplication of Indefinite Direct Objects in Albanian and Modern Greek," *Language* 52:398–403.

Koneski, Blazzhe. 1967. *Gramatika na makedonskiot literaturen jazik*. Kultura.

Kopitar, Jernej. 1829. "Albanische, walachische und bulgarische Sprache," *Jahrbücher der Literatur* 46:59–106.

Kresin, Susan C. 1993. "Stylistic Variation in the Use of *ten*," *Varieties of Czech: Studies in Czech Sociolinguistics*, ed. Eva Eckert, 111–23. Amsterdam.

Kuhlmann, Peter. 1997. "Εἶς als Indefinitpronomen im Griechischen in diachroner Sicht," *Glotta* 1-2.76-93.

Lewis, Geoffrey. 1967. *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford.

Lyons, Christopher. 1999. *Definiteness*. Cambridge.

Maretić, T. 1963. *Gramatika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. 3rd ed. Zagreb.

Masica, Colin. 1991. *The Indo-Aryan Languages*. Cambridge.

Matras, Yaron (ed.) 1996. *Jekh, Duj, Trin... Romanes*. Hamburg.

Mayer, G. 1988. *The Definite Article in Contemporary Standard Bulgarian*. Osteuropa-Institut der Freien Universität Berlin Balkanologische Veröffentlichungen 14. Wiesbaden.

Minova-Ǵurkova, Liljana. 1994. *Sintaksa na makedonskiot standarden jazik*. Skopje.

Naylor, Kenneth E. 1981—82. "On the Use of the Articles in Macedonian and English," *Makedonski jazik* 32/33:533–39.

Newmark, Leonard, Philip Hubbard, Peter Prifti. 1982. *Standard Albanian.* Stanford.

Nitsolova, Ruselina. 2000. "Relevantnye leksemy v bolgarskix slozhnyx kontsesivnyx predlozheniiax." Ppaper delivered at Meeting of the Commission on the Grammatical Analysis of the Slavic Languages, International Congress of Slavists, Zurich, 22-24 October.

Povarnicina, Marina. 1996. "Kon upotrebata na *eden* kako pokazatel na neopredelenosta vo makedonskiot jazik," *Studia Linguistica Polono-Meridianoslavica* 8:59-67.

Sampson, John. 1926. *The Dialect of the Gypsies of Wales.* Oxford.

Sandfeld, Kristian. 1930. *Linguistique balkanique*. Paris.

Stamenov, Xristo. 1985. "Za upotrebata na *edin* kato pokazatel za neopredelenost v bŭlgarski ezik (v sravnenie s angliiski)," *Ezik i literatura* 40(3):33–44.

Stevanović, Mihailo. 1986. *Savremeni srpskohrvatski jezik*, 1. 5th ed. Belgrade.

Tekin, T. 1968. *A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic*. Bloomington.

Tisheva, Yovka. 2000. "On Cohesion and Co-reference in Bulgarian Newspaper Text," *Bulgarian Studies at the Dawn of the 21st Century: A Bulgarian-American Perspective. (Sixth Joint Meeting of Bulgarian- and North American Scholars. Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria, May 30 - June 2, 1999)*, ed. Anisava Miltenova, 85–92. Sofia.

Topolińska, Zuzana. 1981/82. Mak. *eden* —neopredelen chlen? *Makedonski jazik* 32/33:705–15

—. 1995. "Convergent Evolution, Creolization and Referentiality," *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers,* 1, 239–47. Amsterdam.

Vrabie, Emil. 2000. *An English-Aromanian Dictionary*. University, MS.

Weigand, Gustav. 1894/95. *Die Aromunen: Ethnographisch-philologisch-historische Untersuchungen über das Volk der sogennanten Makedo-Romanen oder Zinzaren* I. Liepzig.

Weiss, Daniel. 1996. "Die Geburt eines Artikels: zum Status von makedonisch *eden*," *Slavistische Linguistik 1995: Referate des XXI Konstanzer Slavistischen Arbeitstreffens* ed. W. Girke, 421–55. Munich.

Zidarova, V. 1994. "Neopredelitelno mestoimenie edin v bŭlgarski ezik." Doktorska disertaciia, Universitet Kliment Oxridski. Sofia.

TEXTS

Konstantinov, Aleko. 1895 [1973]   *Baj Ganjo*. Sofia. (reprinted 1973, Sofia)
—. 1907. *Baja-Ganje*. transl. Aksentii. B. Rujanac. Belgrade.
—. 1909. *Baj Ganjo*. transl. Fran Gundrum. Zagreb.
—. 1917. *Baj Ganjo*. transl. Aksentii. B. Rujanac. Zagreb.
—. 1922. *O Mpaï Gkanios*. Ο Μπαϊ Γκανιος.transl. H.V.Z. Athens.
—. 1942. *Baj Ganjo*. transl. Živan Žun. Ljubljana.
—. 1953. *Baj Gaňu*. transl.Zdenka Hanzová. Prague
—. 1955. *Baja Ganjo i druge pripovetke*. transl. Sinisha Paunović. Belgrade
—. 1964. *Bai Ganiu,* transl. Tudor Căliu and Ioachim Boscu. Bucharest.
—. 1967. *Bay Ganjo*, transl. Ǵorǵi Caca. Skopje.
—. 1968. *Bai Ganiu*. transl. D. A. Gorbova. Moscow.
—. 1972. *Bay Ganü*. transl. İsmail Ağlagül. Istanbul.
—. 1975. *Baj Gano*, transl. Dhurata Xoxa. Prishtina.
Sholokhov, Mikail. 1956. *Sud'ba cheloveka*. Moscow.
—. 1969. *Insanın alınyazısı*. Transl. Suat Dervi). Skopje.
—. 1970. *Sudbinata na čovekot*. Transl. Cvetko Martinovski. Skopje.
—. 1973. *Soarta Unui Om*. Transl. Viorel Afrim. Bucharest.
—. 1978. *Fati i njeriut*. Transl. Dhimitër Pasko Prishtina.
—. 1981. *Sădbata na choveka*. Transl. Asia Spirova. Sofia
—. 1986. *Ē moira enos anthropou*. Transl. S. I. Zakharopoulos. Athens.

BIBLES

Albanian. 1980. *Besëlidhja e re*, transl. Don Simon Filipaj. Ferizaj.
Bulgarian. 1912. *Bibliia*. Carigrad.
English. 1955. *Holy Bible (King James Version)*. Philadelphia.
Czech. n.d. *Bible Svatá aneb všecka svatá písma starého i nového zákona podle posledního vydání kralického v roku 1613*. Biblické dílo.
Greek. 1972. *Agion Evangelion (Received Text)*. Grand Rapids.
Latin. 1994. *Biblia Sacra (Vulgate)*. Stuttgart.
Macedonian. 1990. *Sveto Pismo*. Skopje.
Old Church Slavonic. 1979. *Codex Zographensis*. ed. by V. Jagić. Berlin. 1883. *Codex Marianus*. ed. V. Jagić Berlin.
Romani (Arli). 1995. *O Nevo Zaveti,* transl. Suljo Metkov. Sofia.
Romani (Gurbet). 1990. *Nevo Sovlahardo Ćidipe*, transl. Trifun Dimić. Novi Sad.
Romanian. 1924. *Biblia*. Bucharest.
Russian. 1926. *Bibliia (Holy Synod Text)*. St. Petersburg.
Serbian. 1847. *Novi Zavjet,* transl. Vuk St. Karadžić. Vienna.
Slovene. 1996. *Sveto Pismo Stare in nove zaveze; Slovenski standardni prevod iz vjernih jezikov*. Stvetopisemska družba Slovenije. Ljubljana.
Turkish. 1969. *Kitabı mukaddes*. Istanbul.

Резиме
'Еден' како знак на неопределеноста во балканските и не-балкански словенски јазици

Бројот 'еден' во балканословенските јазици се употребува со значења кои одговараат на неопределениот член во тие јазици каде што неопределеноста се спротивставувува на определеноста како граматичка категорија. Се знае дека во старословенскиот, старогрчкиот и латинскиот немаше таква употреба на бројот 'еден'.

Исто така, од една страна постои можност 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 старотурските паметници од осмиот век. Покрај овие факти, употребата на бројот 'еден' со значење на неопределеност е најмногу застапена во турскиот, албанскиот, и романскиот, во грчки и бугарски нешто понезастапена — како и во македонскиот — и станува се поретка на јужнословенската јазична 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 забелешката дека аналитична референцијалност е особено карактеристична за јазични конвергентни ситуации. Од сето тоа се доаѓа до заклучокот дека употребата на бројот 'еден' како десемантизиран знак на неопределеноста, имајќи го предвид целиот балкански контекст, може да се смета за еден балканизам којшто досега не беше идентификуван како таков. Рускиот јазик во овој поглед е многу конзервативен, т.е. блиску до старословенскиот, додека чешкиот е малку понеконзервативен, но не толку, колку што е хрватскиот. Во рефератот овие заклучоци се демонстрираат со податоци од споредбени преводи и од теренска работа.