

Grammatical Replication and Borrowability in Language Contact

Grammatical Replication and Borrowability in Language Contact

edited by

Björn Wiemer
Bernhard Wälchli
Björn Hansen

De Gruyter Mouton

ISBN 978-3-11-027009-9
e-ISBN 978-3-11-027197-3
ISSN 1861-4302

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2012 Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin/Boston

Printing: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen

⊗ Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Preface

The idea of composing a volume devoted to grammatical replication and borrowability in language contact was born as early as 2005 at the annual meeting of the *Societas Linguisticae Europaea* during a workshop organized by Björn Wiemer and Björn Hansen. Both this workshop and this volume have been particularly inspired by the ideas of Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva. The fact that it took a couple of years to finish this volume has been conditioned by the needs of a maturation process (not only in the technical sense introduced into grammaticalization theory by Östen Dahl). The last years have brought about an increasing amount of literature engaged in the relation between grammatical borrowing and language contact. Nonetheless, there have remained gaps to fill and we are convinced that the authors of this volume make a substantial contribution to the general discussion. Apart from this, a large part this volume concentrates on contact phenomena into which Slavic languages are involved.

We are much indebted to Volker Gast, the editor of the *Trends in Linguistics* series, and Birgit Sievert from de Gruyter Mouton, who assisted us during the whole editorial process with her profound expertise. We would also like to thank everybody else involved in the making of this volume at de Gruyter Mouton for their support. Next, we would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their many useful comments. We are particularly indebted to Bridget Drinka (University of San Antonio, Arizona) for (partially recurrent) proof-reading of the whole volume and many valuable comments. Furthermore, we are very grateful to Veronika Wald (University of Regensburg) for her conscientious and competent work in formatting the entire volume. Needless to say, all editorial shortcomings that might have remained unnoticed on the next nearly 670 pages fall exclusively under our responsibility and / or the responsibility of the respective authors.

The Editors.
Mainz / Stockholm / Regensburg
December 2011

Contents

Preface.....	v
Addresses of contributors	xi
A. Introduction	
1. Contact-induced grammatical change: Diverse phenomena, diverse perspectives	3
<i>Björn Wiemer and Bernhard Wälchli</i>	
B. Survey on grammaticalization and language contact in Slavic languages	
2. Assessing the range of contact-induced grammaticalization in Slavonic	67
<i>Björn Wiemer and Björn Hansen</i>	
C. General issues	
3. An integrative model of grammaticalization	159
<i>Tania Kuteva and Bernd Heine</i>	
4. Processes of grammaticalisation and ‘borrowing the unborrowable’: Contact-induced change and the integration and grammaticalisation of borrowed terms for some core grammatical construction types	191
<i>Anthony P. Grant</i>	
5. Grammaticalization clines in space: Zooming in on synchronic traces of diffusion processes	233
<i>Bernhard Wälchli</i>	

D. Noun phrase

6. The grammaticalization of an indefinite article in Slavic micro-languages 275
Walter Breu
7. On the grammaticalization of the definite article in Colloquial Upper Sorbian (CUS) 323
Lenka Scholze

E. Modality and evidentiality

8. The grammaticalization of evidential markers in Garifuna..... 357
Geneviève Escure
9. What is ‘contact-induced grammaticalization’? Examples from Mayan and Mixe-Zoquean languages 381
Volker Gast and Johan van der Auwera
10. The Yiddish modal system between Germanic and Slavonic. A case study on the limits of contact induced grammaticalization 427
Björn Hansen and Sandra Birzer
11. Modality in an areal context: The case of a Latgalian dialect..... 465
Nicole Nau

F. Tense-aspect and voice

12. The Balkan perfects: Grammaticalization and contact 511
Bridget Drinka
13. The “recipient passive” in West Slavic: A calque from German and its grammaticalization 559
Markus Giger

G. Clause linking and predication

14. Conditional and reason clauses in Sierra Popoluca:
 The influence of Náhuatl and Spanish 591
Salomé Gutiérrez Morales

15. Verb serialization in northeast Europe: The case of Russian
 and its Finno-Ugric neighbours 611
Daniel Weiss

Subject index 647
 Language index 655
 Author index 663

6. The grammaticalization of an indefinite article in Slavic micro-languages

Walter Breu

1. Introduction¹

The existence of article systems is not typical for the Slavic language family as a whole. One exception is the completely developed (postposed) definite article in the Balkan languages Bulgarian and Macedonian. We additionally can detect a trend towards the emergence of a definite article in the peripheral areas of West Slavic, North Russian and Slovene. In most cases, these definite articles only stand in opposition to the absence of articles, although in the case of Macedonian the first signs for an indefinite article have also been detected. Otherwise, article functions in Slavic, so far as they are expressed at all, are rendered by demonstratives or the numeral/indefinite pronoun *ONE*. They also coincide in part with secondary functions of the theme-rheme structure or with verbal aspect.

In light of the geographical area and the histories of these languages and dialects, the rare emergence of article systems in Slavic has, as a rule, probably been caused by language contact (substrate, adstrate). In the present paper two Slavic minority languages, both in a state of absolute language contact, will be compared and contrasted: Molise Slavic (MSL) in southern Italy² and Colloquial Upper Sorbian (CUS) in eastern Germany.³

MSL is traditionally spoken in three bordering villages of the Province of Campobasso in the Region of Molise, each demonstrating a different degree of language preservation: Acquaviva Collecroce (the main village of the Slavic speaking population), Montemitro (smaller and more conservative), and San Felice (with only a few older people still speaking Slavic). While there are clear dialectal differences between these villages, especially in phonetics/phonology but also in morphology, their article systems seem to be identical. The examples in the present paper are given in the dialectal form of Acquaviva.⁴

Since the emigration of the ancestors of the contemporary speakers of the language from Dalmatia approximately 500 years ago, MSL has been under the influence of the Molisian dialect of Italian, which was joined by Standard Italian influence about 150 years ago.⁵ From a genetic standpoint,

it can be assigned to the Štokavian-Ikavian dialect group⁶ of the South Slavic languages. Italian is the sole dominant high-variant language (umbrella language, *Dachsprache*) for MSL, which is mainly used only orally, whereas the genetically closely related Standard Croatian language is of no relevance in everyday life and is almost completely unintelligible to untrained speakers.

CUS can be regarded as the everyday colloquial language of the Catholic Sorbian population in the south-western part of the greater Sorbian language area in Upper Lusatia, with the rural communes of Crostwitz and Ralbitz/Rosenthal as its centre.⁷ In contrast to the situation in Molise, a cross-regional Upper Sorbian standard language also exists here. Due to its functions as the language of education and writing, it is in fact the language of prestige in the Sorbian language area. Yet it only has a relatively small influence in everyday life, and its purist tendencies, going back to the 19th century, have hardly had any effect on CUS. Furthermore, they have not been able to impede even greater assimilations to German and its local variant, in more recent times. The *Dachsprache* function for CUS has been taken over to a great extent by Standard German. As speakers of CUS also have the Upper Sorbian Standard language as a means of writing Sorbian, the writing barrier is less than in the case of MSL, and personal messages, which are similar to the spoken language such as e-mails or mobile short messages in recent years, show characteristic features of CUS.

Due to their widely independent development, the everyday vernaculars of both minorities can be treated as independent language systems, especially since, in many respects, CUS and MSL are structurally much closer to their respective contact languages than the languages they are genetically related to.

The dominant contact languages of MSL and CUS, Italian and German, have well-developed article systems both in their dialectal as well as in their standard forms. In broad terms, the German and Italian definite and indefinite articles correspond to one another, even if differences do exist when they are examined in more detail. The main objective of the present paper is to offer a parallel investigation of the main features of the indefinite article in both micro-languages, compared with the systems of their contact languages, starting off with common functions of this category.⁸

2. Preliminary theoretical and terminological considerations

The scientific discussion with regard to article functions shows many contradictions from a terminological standpoint. Concepts such as “determinate, definite, indefinite, referential, specific, general, narrow scope, wide scope, semi-referential” do not necessarily always refer to the same phenomenon, or they are sometimes even rejected. I will thus first clarify the use of the most important concepts in the context of the present paper, but will refrain from a detailed discussion of the terms. Altogether, I will try to manage with as few terms as possible.

On the formal (morpho-syntactical) level I will distinguish between “determinate” and “indeterminate” nominal phrases, which means “an article exists” or “no article”. If an article is present, it can be “definite” or “indefinite”. Here one should particularly bear in mind that “determinate” is not equated with “definite” in the present paper, as is often the case.

As regards content and function, a distinction is to be made between “individuating” and “generic” use (in the broadest terms).⁹ In the case of individuating use, one must distinguish between such situations in which the listener already knows the referent (of the noun), which would be a case of “definiteness”, and such situations in which he or she does not know the referent, which would be a case of “indefiniteness”.

In the case of indefiniteness, we can further distinguish between “referential” and “non-referential” use of a nominal phrase. As for definiteness, I will always assume referentiality for the sake of simplicity. A definite nominal phrase such as *the house* refers to a house familiar to both the speaker and the listener, while the indefinite NP *a house* refers to a house unknown to the listener. But it is possible that this house exists also for the speaker only in terms of an idea without a concrete referent, such as “I would like a house”. A well-known example of a different degree of referentiality for the indefinite article is: *She wants to marry a millionaire*. In the case of referentiality, the sentence could be continued with *but he does not want to*, while in the case of non-referentiality it might go as follows: *but she cannot find one*.

Total correspondence of article usage in the respective dominant language is not a necessary prerequisite to prove the existence of articles in the micro-languages. Even with regard to recognized article languages, the definite article behaves differently from language to language, for example concerning mass nouns in non-anaphoric use. Here one might compare the variation in German *die Milch* ~ \emptyset *Milch*, *die Angst* ~ \emptyset *Angst* as opposed to the obligatory definite article in Italian *il latte*, *la paura* and the absence

of the article in English *Ø milk, Ø fear*. Another example of multi-language variation results from the usage of the definite article for personal names in Modern Greek (or Bavarian) and its absence in English. Despite such differences, no one would deny that all mentioned languages possess a definite article.

Thus, also with regard to the indefinite article in the two micro-languages, it is a matter of determining on the basis of individual criteria how far grammaticalization has progressed. It is particularly important to determine the extent to which the presumed indefinite article goes beyond the function of referentiality and also assumes non-referential and generic functions. Moreover, the indefinite article ultimately cannot be regarded as isolated. Instead the systems as a whole must be incorporated at least to some extent, and we especially have to ask whether a definite article also exists in MSL and CUS, as is the case in other European languages with an indefinite article.

3. Morphological Paradigms of *ONE*

The numeral *ONE*¹⁰ is the typical base form from which both indefinite pronouns as well as indefinite articles are derived. In order to better understand the examples, which should ultimately show that both Slavic micro-languages discussed here have an indefinite article, I shall first discuss the respective complete paradigms of *ONE*.

3.1. The paradigm of *ONE* in Molise Slavic

Despite hundreds of years of language contact with “caseless” Italian, MSL has basically maintained its case system. Apart from the vocative, which is irrelevant here, only the locative is missing by comparison to SCR.¹¹ The loss of this case or its merger with the accusative is a result of language contact according to the Italian model of a lacking distinction between “position” and “direction” (Breu 1998: 345).

In table 1, the indefinite pronoun *nike* ‘several’, which has been restricted to the plural in MSL, is included in the declensional paradigm of *ONE*. In etymological terms, it is related to Serbo-Croatian *neki* ‘any’, in dialects also *niki*, which is used in the singular as well.

Table 1. Full paradigm of *ONE* in Molise Slavic

	Sing. masc.		Sing. fem.		Sing. neutr.		Plural masc./fem.	
	LF	SF	LF	SF	LF	SF	LF	(pron.)
Nom.	<i>je'na</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>je:'n^a</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>je'na</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>je:'n^e</i>	<i>nike</i>
Gen.	<i>je'n(o)ga</i>	–	<i>je'ne</i>	–	–	–	<i>je'n(i)hi</i>	<i>nikihi</i>
Dat.	<i>je'n(o)mu</i>	–	<i>je:'n^u</i>	–	–	–	<i>je'n(i)mi</i>	<i>nikimi</i>
Acc.	=N./G.	<i>na</i>	<i>je:'n^u</i>	<i>nu</i>	<i>je'na</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>je:'n^e</i>	=N./G.
Instr.	<i>je'n(i)me</i>	–	<i>je'no:m</i>	–	–	–	<i>je'n(i)mi</i>	<i>nikihi</i>

LF is the abbreviation for the “long form” which exists in all cases, while SF stands for the morphologically defective “short form”; in terms of form, both rows can be distinguished by the loss of the beginning syllable *je-* in the SF. While I will for the most part refrain from an indication of prosodic features in the following examples, they have been explicitly incorporated into table 1¹²: a missing accent sign stands for initial stress with a normal (falling) accentuation, while an acute stands for rising stress with the main accentuation on the previous vowel and a secondary stress on the following vowel. The superscript denotes a voiceless (whispered) vowel. A colon signifies length, while parentheses stand for the optionality of the vowel concerned. “N./G.” specifies that in the case of animates, and virilia in particular, the form of the accusative, which is normally homonymous with the nominative, varies with that of the genitive. The parenthesized vowels within the long forms can only be omitted when *ONE* is used attributively, while they are obligatory when it is used independently.¹³ As a rule, all indicated (attributive) forms can also appear unstressed. In this case, the feminine and plural forms are lacking vowel length and the final reduced vowels turn into full vowels: *jena*, *jenu* or *jene*.

Besides the existence of a short form and the total loss of the original *-d-* in the stem, cf. SCR *jedn-*, the masculine nominative singular form *jena* is particularly striking in comparison to the SCR standard languages. The merger of the dative and accusative singular in the feminine forms can also be found in other inflected types of words, see Breu (1998: 345). As elsewhere in MSL, the original nominative forms in the plural have been substituted by those of the accusative. The *i*-extension in the gen./dat./instr. plural (cp. SCR *jednih*, *jednim*) applies to pronouns and adjectives in general. It has, presumably, been transferred to these forms from the noun, where it developed due to language contact; see Breu (1998: 347). Despite the loss of the neuter in the nouns, this gender has been maintained in the singular of *ONE*.¹⁴

3.2. The paradigm of *ONE* in Colloquial Upper Sorbian

The entire case system of Standard Upper Sorbian is also found in CUS. There are only differences in the individual forms which are due in part to the “Catholic” dialect basis of CUS, but some of them are also independent developments of CUS. Although there are still different dual forms for the noun and the adjective in CUS, they are merged with the plural in the paradigm of *ONE*:

Table 2. Full paradigm of *ONE* in Colloquial Upper Sorbian

	Sing. masc.	Sing. fem.	Sing. neutr.	Plural/Dual
Nom.	<i>jen</i>	<i>jena</i>	<i>jene</i>	<i>jene</i>
Gen.	<i>jeno</i>	<i>jenej</i>	<i>jeno</i>	<i>jenych</i>
Dat.	<i>jenom</i>	<i>jenej</i>	<i>jenom</i>	<i>jenym</i>
Acc.	= N./G.	<i>jenu</i>	<i>jene</i>	= N./G.
Instr.	<i>jenom</i>	<i>jenej</i>	<i>jenom</i>	<i>jenemi ~ jenymi</i>
Loc.	<i>jenom</i>	<i>jenej</i>	<i>jenom</i>	<i>jenech ~ jenych</i>

Just like those in MSL, the forms of *ONE* in CUS are also characterized by the complete absence of the *-d-* in the stem; cf. *jedyn* (NOM.SG.M), *jedna* (NOM.SG.F), *jedne* (NOM.SG.N and NOM.PL.) in Standard Upper Sorbian. Unlike the standard language, the instrumental and locative singular use *-om* (instead of *-ym*) for the masculine and neuter, thus the same form as the dative, which unlike the standard *jednomu* has lost its final vowel. The same holds for *jenej* (GEN.SG.F), which in contrast to the standard form *jedneje* merges with the dative, instrumental and locative. In the genitive singular masculine / neuter we find a contraction of the standard form *jednoho*. The instrumental plural variant *jenemi* has developed by an analogical adaptation to the nominative. The use of the genitive in the masculine accusative is obligatory for animates just like in Standard Upper Sorbian, but unlike MSL, while in the plural, where it is restricted to virilia (male persons), it is optional.

4. *ONE* in MSL and CUS in comparison to Macedonian

As already stated in the introduction, out of all Slavic languages the existence of a more or less grammaticalized indefinite article has only been shown for Macedonian (the Bulgarian situation could be similar). To be more exact, Macedonian assumes a middle position from a typological

Slavic standpoint because, unlike languages completely lacking articles such as Russian, the use of *ONE* is in many cases (but not always) required obligatorily for the expression of indefiniteness. For the sake of comparison, it is worthwhile to analyze several basic cases from the seminal article on the supposed Macedonian indefinite article by Weiss (1996), by translating some of his examples – in part shortened – to MSL and CUS.¹⁵ The translations were obtained by explicitly questioning several informants for each language. After having given evidence of the principal existence of an indefinite article in the two micro-languages, I will also provide original examples in order to investigate more specific properties of the category. For purposes of assessing the influence of the contact languages, I will add the corresponding German and Italian sentences. On the other hand, I will refrain from giving interlinear tagged versions, as the English translation should normally be sufficient for understanding the argumentation. The use of the indefinite article in English, which mostly coincides with that of German and/or Italian, will not be discussed.

4.1. Individuative (non-generic) functions of *ONE*

4.1.1. Referential functions

I will start off with the referential functions of indefinite articles. Example (1) is a typical beginning of a fairy-tale, by which a referent is established that will play a role later on in the narration. Just like in Macedonian (Weiss 1996: 433), the article is compulsory in both micro-languages, too. *Ø signals here and in the following that a *zero*-article (i.e. omitting the indefinite article) is not possible in the relevant function:¹⁶

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|-------|--|----|
| (1) | a. | CUS | <i>To bēše jemo jena stara žona.</i> | *Ø |
| | | Ger. | <i>Es war einmal eine alte Frau.</i> | *Ø |
| | b. | MSL | <i>Biša nu votu na žena stara.</i> | *Ø |
| | | Ital. | <i>C'era una volta una donna anziana.</i> | *Ø |
| | | | ‘There once was an old woman.’ | |

The beginning of a fairy tale is a conventionalized case of the introduction of a referent, in which other Slavic languages also use *ONE*, for instance Russian. However, as a rule it remains optional there. The same is true for Standard Upper Sorbian, where – contrary to CUS – the omission of *ONE* is also accepted; cp. *Bēše jónu Ø stara žona* as corresponding to (1a).

Contrary to other Slavic languages, *ONE* is also frequently used in Macedonian for rhematic reference outside the introduction of fairy tales. But its inclusion is not compulsory in these cases (Weiss 1996: 433), while neither in MSL nor in CUS it can be **absent in this meaning** (for other readings, see below), e.g. in (2):

- (2) a. CUS *Najmóle jo **jen** tolsty muž nutř šišoľ.* *Ø
 Ger. *Plötzlich kam **ein** dicker Mann herein.* *Ø
 b. MSL *Sfe skup je uliza **na** ljud tusti.* *Ø
 Ital. *D'improvviso entrò **un** uomo grasso.* *Ø
 'Suddenly a fat man came in.'

Another case of referential determinateness appears in the scope of verbs like 'want', 'look for'. Example (3) refers to a friend who actually exists and whom the speaker is familiar with. The sentence could thus for example be continued with "he was still here a minute ago". The use of *ONE* is compulsory in this interpretation in the two micro-languages, while it would be ungrammatical in other Slavic languages, e.g. in Russian.¹⁷

- (3) a. CUS *Ja pótam **jeno** přečela.* *Ø
 Ger. *Ich suche **einen** Freund.* *Ø
 b. MSL *Ja jiskam **na** mičicij.* *Ø
 Ital. *Cerco **un** amico.* *Ø
 'I am looking for a friend.'

4.1.2. Non-referential functions

A *zero*-article in (3) would, actually, be possible in Macedonian, but it would result in a non-referential interpretation. The sentence could then be continued, for example, with "but I can't find one", while "he was still here a minute ago" would be ungrammatical.¹⁸ Contrary to this, CUS and MSL – just like German and Italian – require *ONE* in both cases; see the clearly non-referential example (4). As shown here, *ONE* can optionally be substituted by an indefinite pronoun in such cases:¹⁹

- (4) a. CUS *Ja cem **jeno** přečela měć.* *Ø ~ někajko
 Ger. *Ich möchte **einen** Freund haben.* *Ø ~ irgendeinen

- b. MSL *Ja ču jimat **na** mičicij.* *Ø ~ koji
 Ital. *Voglio avere **un** amico.*
 ‘I would like to have **a** (= any) friend.’

Another case of non-referentiality can be found in hypothetical conditional sentences, where *ONE* is again excluded in Macedonian as it is in other Slavic standard languages, whereas it is obligatory in both micro-languages:

- (5) a. CUS *Dyš tybe **jen** pólcaj slóši, tón tybe zašperwe.* *Ø
 Ger. *Wenn dich **ein** Polizist hört, sperrt er dich ein.* *Ø
 b. MSL *Si ta čuje **na** polidzjot, ta meče pržuna.* *Ø
 Ital. *Se ti sente **un** poliziotto, ti mette in prigione.* *Ø
 ‘If **a** (= any) policeman hears you, he will lock you up.’

We find a similar distribution of the use of *ONE* in a situation of choice between two (or more) elements as in the question in (6), but here CUS also permits the *zero*-article. This can be explained by the direct juxtaposition of the two choices, where the German contact language also allows the omission of *ONE*.²⁰

- (6) a. CUS *Što dyrm ja tybi kupić, **jeno** psyka habo **jenu** kóčku?*
 ~ Ø/Ø
 Ger. *Was soll ich dir kaufen: **einen** Hund oder **eine** Katze?*
 ~ Ø/Ø
 b. MSL *Što mam ti kupit: **na** kučič o **na** mačič?* *Ø/*Ø
 Ital. *Che ti devo comprare: **un** cane o **un** gatto?* ~Ø/~Ø
 ‘What should I buy you: **a** dog or **a** cat?’

Inquiring whether a referent exists or not, also presupposes, of course, that he/she is unknown to the speaker. Unlike Macedonian (and all other Slavic Standard languages, including Upper Sorbian), we once again regularly find *ONE* in CUS and MSL:

- (7) a. CUS *Dawe po was **jen** lékar?* *Ø
 Ger. *Gibt es bei euch einen Arzt?* *Ø
 b. MSL *Di sta vi je **na** medik?* *Ø
 Ital. *Da voi c'è **un** medico?* *Ø
 ‘Is there **a** doctor by you (nearby, in your village)?’

In (8) we are dealing with a case of a non-referential request. The same distribution applies as in (7):

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|-------|------------------------------------|----|
| (8) | a. | CUS | <i>Zawołaj jeno lěkara!</i> | *Ø |
| | | Ger. | <i>Ruf einen Arzt!</i> | *Ø |
| | b. | MSL | <i>Zov na medik!</i> | *Ø |
| | | Ital. | <i>Chiama un medico!</i> | *Ø |
| | | | ‘Call a doctor!’ | *Ø |

I refrain here from a series of further cases of non-referentiality which are distinguished by Weiss (1996), e.g. when an action is iterated or when there is variation in the discourse world. The result is always the same: while in MSL and CUS, using *ONE* is obligatory just as in the respective contact language, it is missing in Macedonian (like in all Slavic Standard languages). The only case of non-referentiality in which *ONE* is allowed in Macedonian is when it functions as a numeral like in example (9). The other languages, of course, also concur with this usage:

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|-------|--|----|
| (9) | a. | CUS | <i>Šeproš še jenu holcu!</i> | *Ø |
| | | Ger. | <i>Lade noch ein Mädchen ein!</i> | *Ø |
| | b. | MSL | <i>Mitaj još nu divojku!</i> | *Ø |
| | | Ital. | <i>Invita ancora una ragazza!</i> | *Ø |
| | | | ‘Invite one more girl!’ | |

In CUS and MSL – as well as in their contact languages – this sentence is, of course, ambiguous, as it can also mean ‘Invite also a girl (not only boys)’, with *ONE* as an indefinite article.

4.1.3. Usage of *ONE* with mass nouns

Up to now, only count nouns were dealt with. As for mass nouns, which are not countable in their basic meaning, a prerequisite for the use of an indefinite article is a greater degree of abstraction, since it must additionally take on an individualizing function. With regard to the languages analyzed here, I will take as my starting point the noun phrase ‘(a) low soft grass’ from a literary example quoted by Weiss (1996: 447).²¹ In CUS the indefinite article is rejected here, contrary to German, where it is optional,²² while MSL, in principle, allows for it analogously to Italian.²³

- (10) a. CUS *Tam běše Ø niska mechka trawa.* *jena
 Ger. *Dort war Ø niedriges weiches Gras.* (~ ein)
 b. MSL *Nonda biša Ø trava niska friška.* ~ na
 Ital. *Là c'era Ø erba bassa fresca.* ~ un'
 'There was Ø low soft grass there.'

With regard to the penetration of *ONE* into the area of mass nouns, CUS has thus lagged behind MSL, as far as the specific case of (10) is concerned. For *ONE* to be accepted in German (and in Italian/MSL) with mass nouns, the specification by the attribute is decisive, and even in CUS there are cases like *To jo jena dobra woda* 'This is a good water', in which *ONE* is possible with an attributed mass noun.

In addition, *ONE* appears in both micro-languages when items are individualized by quantification (and enumeration), thus e.g. *jene mloko* (CUS), *jena mblika* (MSL) in terms of 'a (bottle of) milk'. In such cases *ONE* is, of course, used as a number, not as an article. As for pure mass nouns, where its interpretation as a number is excluded, CUS/MSL as well as German/Italian rule out the use of *ONE*.²⁴

4.1.4. Usage of *ONE* with abstract nouns

In both micro-languages, abstract nouns behave like concrete nouns with the same distinction between count nouns and mass nouns. As in the Macedonian example *edna informacija* (Weiss 1996: 447) 'an information' = 'a piece of information', an individualization of this mass noun by means of *ONE* is normal in MSL (*na informacijuna*) and CUS (*jena informacija*), too. In CUS, the omission of *ONE* is even rejected here, which could mean that 'information' cannot be interpreted as a mass noun in this language:

- (11) a. CUS *To jo tej jena informacija.* *Ø
 Ger. *Das ist auch eine Information.* ~ Ø
 b. MSL *To je pur na informacijuna.* ~ Ø
 Ital. *Anche questa è un'informazione.*²⁵ ~ Ø
 'That is also a piece of information.' lit. "an information"

In other cases of abstract nouns, Macedonian still clearly prefers Ø according to Weiss (1996: 448), while both our micro-languages always allow *ONE* for individualizations, analogously to the respective contact lan-

guages, for example also in (12), where it appears with its emphatic function, underlining an emotional state already indicated by the context:

- (12) a. CUS *Menš, sym ja **jen** strach mě!* ~ Ø
 Ger. *Mensch, habe ich **eine** Angst gehabt!* ~ Ø
 b. MSL *Jo, sa jima **na** strah!* ~ Ø
 Ital. *Uh, ho avuto **una** paura!* ~ Ø
 ‘Man, was I afraid!’ lit. ‘got **a** fear’

As seen above in the case of ‘information’, abstract and concrete nouns are not always ranked among count nouns and mass nouns in the micro-languages in the same way as in the respective contact languages. Another case of such a difference is (13), where informants did not supply an article, but when questioned, they allowed for the indefinite article, obligatory in German, as a less-appealing option. In (14) it was not even accepted at all, which raises the question whether we are dealing here with generic rather than with individuating use:

- (13) a. CUS *Ja mam Ø kramf we nowe.* ~ *jen*
 Ger. *Ich habe **einen** Krampf im Bein.* *Ø
 ‘I have **a** cramp in my leg’
 b. CUS *Ja sym wot Jana Ø onšis dóstal.* ~ *jen*
 Ger. *Ich habe von Jan **einen** Anschuß bekommen.* *Ø
 ‘I was dressed down by Jan.’
 (14) CUS *Sy zno ty Ø fyreršajn činila?* **jen*
 Ger. *Hast du schon **einen** Führerschein gemacht?* ~ Ø?
 ‘Have you already done your driving test?’
 lit. ‘made (**a**) driving license’

In spite of such differences in the classification of nouns, it can nevertheless be claimed that the usage of *ONE* for mass and abstract nouns in the micro-languages does not differ significantly from its usage in the dominant languages.

4.1.5. Summary of the individuating functions

With regard to the non-generic sphere, Weiss (1996: 439) argues against the grammaticalization of an indefinite article in Macedonian due to the

restriction of *ONE* to referentiality. As for MSL and CUS, on the other hand, the analysis above should have eliminated any doubts that these micro-languages have an indefinite article just like their dominant adstrate languages. The “critical threshold” for attaining the status of an article in terms of the obligatory use of *ONE* in the sphere of non-referentiality has clearly been exceeded.

4.2. Generic functions

In the following, the analysis will be extended to the realm of generic use in the broadest sense, thus including comparative constructions, definitions, predication, noun incorporation (into the overall verbal meaning), etc. Here, according to Weiss (1996) Macedonian *ONE* also behaves like an indefinite article. Once again, several examples given by Weiss will initially provide the basis for the analysis, although original sentences from MSL and CUS will be taken into account to a greater extent.

The use of *ONE* as the subject (15), which is possible in all mentioned languages, refers to a typical representative of the class:

- | | | | | |
|---------|-----|---|---|-----|
| (15) a. | CUS | <i>Jena</i> <i>dobra rajka džěčo wučī.</i> | *∅ | |
| | Ger | <i>Ein</i> <i>gutes Spielzeug erzieht das Kind.</i> | ~ ∅ | |
| | b. | MSL | <i>Na džokatol dobri učī dita.</i> | (∅) |
| | | | <i>Un buon giocattolo educa il bambino.</i> | *∅ |
| | | | ‘A good toy educates the child.’ | |

In German, *ONE* can also be left out, which equally results in a generic interpretation but without the nuance of the reference to the typical representative of the category. In CUS this possibility was rejected. In MSL indeterminateness is indeed also possible, but this is in conjunction with the usage of the definite article in Italian, see below.²⁶

When stating a standard for comparison like ‘child’ in (16), *ONE* is optional in Macedonian, but obligatory in CUS, MSL and their contact languages:²⁷

- | | | | | |
|---------|------|-----------------------------------|--|----|
| (16) a. | CUS | <i>Ty sy naiř kař jene džěčo.</i> | *∅ | |
| | Ger. | <i>Du bist naiř wie ein Kind.</i> | *∅ | |
| | b. | MSL | <i>Ti jesi jindženuv kana na dita.</i> | *∅ |
| | | Ital. | <i>Tu sei ingenuo come un bambino.</i> | *∅ |
| | | | ‘You are naive like a child.’ | |

However, in both micro-languages indeterminateness is not always ruled out in comparative constructions. The possibility of leaving out *ONE* depends on the concrete noun, or is due to their use in idioms. Along these lines, the *zero*-article is possible in CUS for ‘elephant’ as a standard for comparison in (17a), while ‘lion’ in (17b) has been converted into a component of an idiomatic expression to the extent that *ONE* is even rejected:

- (17) a. CUS *Tón jo tak sylny kaj **jen** elephant.* ~ Ø
 Ger. *Er ist so stark wie **ein** Elefant.* *Ø
 ‘He is as strong as **an** elephant.’
- b. CUS *Ja sym lódný kaj Ø law.* *jen
 Ger. *Ich bin hungrig wie **ein** Löwe.* *Ø
 ‘I am hungry like **a** lion.’

In both cases a definite generic article would be possible in German (*der Elefant / der Löwe*), though, at least for many speakers. Here we could put forth a hypothesis to be further elaborated below that the German definite article in generic function is equated with indeterminateness (*zero*-article) by bilingual speakers. If this presumption is correct, it would considerably reduce the discrepancy between CUS and German with regard to the generic indefinite article.

We can find fluctuations in the usage of *ONE* in comparative standards in MSL, too. For instance, in (18a) most informants rule out indeterminateness, while others allow for it. In (18b) the absence of the indefinite article is due to the idiomatic character of *tovar* in this expression. The use of *ONE* is not completely excluded, but the resulting phrase would rather be interpreted as a spontaneous new construction. The Italian translation shows that here, once again, the generic use of the definite article in the dominant language can play a role:

- (18) a. MSL *Si rabija sfedni kana **na** tovar, sa si razboljan aš star.*
 (~ Ø)
- Ital. *Hai lavorato sempre come **un** asino, ora sei malato e vecchio.*
 ‘You always worked like **a** mule, and now you’re sick and old.’

- b. MSL *Kjikjarijaš kana Ø tovar kada prdi.* ~ *na?*
 Ital. *Parli come l'asino quando spetezza.* ~ *un?*
 'You talk like **a/the** donkey when it farts.' (= without thinking)

As for mass nouns, a "typical representative" in comparative constructions, expressed by *ONE*, is normally excluded. Yet in the original MSL sentence (19) and in contrast to Italian, *ONE* is possible, which in the opinion of the informants is completely synonymous with \emptyset . In particular, the assumption of a "singular of sort" was disavowed. Other examples of this type with an optional *ONE*, ungrammatical in Italian, were given spontaneously: *slak kana (na) med*, *(na) cukar* 'sweet like honey, sugar', *noge kana (na) led* 'feet like ice'. This is thus a further case of partial penetration of the indefinite article into the class of mass nouns, which offers proof of a very intense desemantization of *ONE*. On the other hand, in MSL \emptyset concurs with the obligatory use of the generic definite article in Italian. The *zero*-article in CUS seems to cover both possibilities existing in German (\emptyset and definite article):

- (19) a. MSL *Je feram kana Ø ocat.* (ironically for "weak") ~ *na*
 Ital. *È forte come l'aceto.* **un*/* \emptyset
 b. CUS *Tón jo sylny kaj Ø kisało.* **jen*
 Ger. *Er ist so stark wie Ø Essig.* ~*der* /**ein*
 'He is as strong as \emptyset vinegar.'

Both micro-languages agree with their dominant languages with regard to the obligatory use of *ONE* in (20), in which – unlike (16) – the comparison is only implicit, but refers once again to a typical representative (ideal example) of the category as a basis for comparison. According to Weiss (1996: 442) *ONE* is obligatory in this case in Macedonian, too:

- (20) a. CUS *Ja sym šo činil, štož móže **jen** nan činć.* * \emptyset
 Ger. *Ich habe alles getan, was **ein** Vater tun kann.* * \emptyset
 b. MSL *Sa činija tuna ono, ka more čit **na** tata.* * \emptyset
 Ital. *Ho fatto tutto quello che può fare **un** padre.* * \emptyset
 'I did everything that **a** father can do.' * \emptyset

An obligatory *ONE* in CUS and MSL as well as in the dominant languages can also be found in the "prescriptive" predication in (21), while the indeterminateness in (22) generally expresses "descriptive" predication (for

each representative of the entire category), and once again evidently in accordance with the use of the definite generic article in the dominant contact languages:²⁸

- (21) a. CUS **Jen** Serb *nebži*.
 Ger. **Ein** Sorbe *lügt nicht*.
 ‘A (real) Sorb does not lie.’
- b. MSL **Na** *Zlav ne goriva laž*.
 Ital. **Uno** *Slavomolisano non dice bugie*.
 ‘A (real) Molisian Slav does not lie.’
- (22) a. CUS \emptyset Serb *nebži*.
 Ger. **Der** Sorbe *lügt nicht*.
 ‘The Sorb does not lie.’ (= Sorbs don’t lie.)
- b. MSL \emptyset *Zlav ne goriva laž*.
 Ital. **Lo** *Slavo non dice bugie*.
 ‘The Molisian Slav does not lie.’ (= Molisian Slavs don’t lie.)

The descriptive predication is closely related to the (generic) “definition of classes” as in (23). Let us first take a look only at the subject-NP:

- (23) a. CUS **Jen** *tigor jo jene zvěřjo*. $\sim \emptyset$
 Ger. **Ein** *Tiger ist ein Tier*. $\sim \text{der}/*\emptyset$
- b. MSL \emptyset *Tigra je na nimaldža*. $*na$
 Ital. **La** *tigre è un animale*. $*una$
 ‘The tiger is an animal.’

Unlike in German, *ONE* is optional in CUS, and \emptyset seems to be even the more common choice. On the other hand, in German the definite article is possible, too (and preferred by many). In Italian the definite article is even compulsory in generic definitions, excluding *ONE*, which is also not possible in the subject in MSL.

In all languages mentioned in (23), however, *ONE* is normally obligatory in the predicate. Only in MSL did several informants claim that \emptyset might also be possible, if “animal” is viewed as a “quality”.²⁹

The use of the indefinite article in the subject is excluded in CUS and MSL as well as in their model languages, when, as in (24), the class (of elephants) in its entirety is meant:

- (24) a. CUS *Ø Elefant jo we Ojrope wotemrěl.* *jen
 Ger. *Der Elefant ist in Europa ausgestorben.* *ein
 b. MSL *Ø Elefant je skumbarija Leuropa.* *jen
 Ital. *L'elefante si è estinto in Europa.* *un
 'The elephant has become extinct in Europe.' (Elephants have...)

When specifying the class affiliation of an individual as in (25) both in CUS and in Standard German, the indefinite article is excluded, whereas MSL, in line with Italian, allows it, even though not requiring it obligatorily – contrary, for example, to English and partly to Southern German dialects:

- (25) a. CUS *Ta jo Ø študentka/ Ø wučerka.* *jena³⁰
 Ger. *Sie ist Ø Studentin/ Ø Lehrerin.* *eine
 b. MSL *Ona je na študentesa / Ø profesoresa.*
 Ital. *Lei è una studentessa / Ø professoressa.*
 'She is a student/ a teacher.'

As one recognizes in this example, there is, actually, a certain variation between *ONE* and *Ø* in MSL just like in Italian, which appears to be governed by the respective lexeme. The general rule is that the article-less form is preferred for career denominations, e.g. for *gvardija* 'policeman', *profesor* 'professor'. Using *ONE* is regarded as pejorative here ("that kind of guy", "not a real one"), while conversely *Ø* turns a predicate like 'pupil, student' into a profession. In all analyzed languages, on the other hand, a further specification, for instance by a relative sentence or limiting attributes, requires the use of *ONE*.³¹

At first sight, the pejorative interpretation in MSL concurs with the general feature of "judgement" (Weiss 1996: 444–445) expressed by an optional *ONE* in the Macedonian predicate in (26), in opposition to *Ø* for the neutral case:

- (26) a. Mac. *Toj e eden mnogu umen čovek.* ~ Ø
 b. CUS *Tón jo jen jara mudry muž.* *Ø
 Ger. *Er ist ein sehr kluger Mann.* *Ø
 c. MSL *On je na ljud čuda ndelidžent.* *Ø
 Ital. *Lui è un uomo molto intelligente.* *Ø
 'He is a very intelligent man.'

Yet in the other mentioned languages, *ONE* is compulsory in all readings of (26). Moreover this would also hold for ‘man’, when used as a non-attributed, neutral predicate, as well as for a clearly judgemental *ty sy jen wóslik* (CUS) or *jesi na tovar* (MSL) ‘You are a donkey’.³² The judgement by *ONE* thus remains an exceptional case.

All in all, there obviously is a broad spectrum of usage of *ONE* in class predications in different languages, which spans from “always” in English (and Southern German) over different degrees of affected NPs from Standard German onto CUS, Italian/MSL and Macedonian to “never” in Russian. Whether that can be equated with a continually decreasing degree of grammaticalization in this sub-area, seems to be rather unlikely.

Exceptional cases in which CUS and to a lesser extent MSL allow for the absence of *ONE* in contrast to an obligatory indefinite article in the dominant languages should be reserved for a more in-depth investigation. For instance, prepositions seem to have a certain influence on the use of the generic indefinite article, because *ONE* is optional or unacceptable with prepositions in some cases.

In MSL the general distribution seems to be parallel to Italian, whereas for CUS a German model is often missing. Thus, for example, the optional usage of *ONE* in CUS concurs with the dominant language in cases like (*jena*) *poľna huba* ‘a full mouth’ = German (*ein*) *voller Mund*, but the corresponding German variation in combination with prepositions, e.g. *mit einem vollen Mund* vs. *mit Ø vollem Mund* ‘with one’s mouth full’ (lit. ‘with (a) full mouth’) can be expressed in CUS only without *ONE*: *s Ø poľnej hubu* (**jenej*).

Also apart from prepositions, *ONE* occasionally shows a behaviour which deviates from that of the dominant language, for example in the generic field, even when accepting the hypothesis, put forth above, of a correspondence between the generic definite article with indeterminateness in the two micro-languages. For example, the original sentence (27) was expressed with the zero-article, unacceptable in German (just like the definite article). Here, unlike in German, the optionality of *ONE* in CUS allows for a distinction, between a referential (*jenu*) and a generic (*Ø*) interpretation:

- | | | | |
|------|------|---|---------------|
| (27) | CUS | <i>Mó mamó wězo Ø kowejmošinu.</i> | : <i>jenu</i> |
| | Ger. | <i>Wir haben natürlich eine Kaffeemaschine.</i> | *Ø, *die |
| | | ‘Of course, we have a coffee machine.’ | |

Example (28) is a further case of this. Here the zero-article is obligatory in CUS in reference to the general existence of train connections (fully ge-

neric), whereas *ONE* refers to a single train connection (restrictedly generic). A referential interpretation is ruled out due to the “multi-directional” verb of motion *jěždzić* ‘go (several times or in different directions)’ and the word order:

- (28) CUS *To ta gor žan problem nejo: po nas Ø (: jen) ča jěždzi.*
 Ger. *Das ist doch gar kein Problem: bei uns verkehrt ein Zug. *Ø*
 ‘This is not a problem at all: a train passes through here.’

Only in very isolated and probably lexically restricted cases does the use of articles in MSL and Italian also differ in a similar fashion. Thus, *Ø* in (29) *alberg* ‘hotel, accommodation’ is interpreted by speakers of MSL as generic, while *ONE* produces an individuating non-referential reading. This difference can also be pinpointed in German (and to some extent in English), whereas *ONE* (*Cerco un albergo*) is obligatory in Italian:

- (29) MSL *Jiskam Ø alberg. ≠ Jiskam na alberg.*
 Ger. *Ich suche Ø Unterkunft. ≠ Ich suche eine Unterkunft.*
 ‘I am looking for lodging/shelter.’ ≠ ‘I am looking for a lodging.’

On the other hand, though, *ONE* is optional in Italian (for the majority of the surveyed persons) and in MSL in many cases, where it cannot be left out in German, e.g. *cerco (un) parcheggio = jiskam (na) parkedž* (Ger. only *ich suche einen Parkplatz*) ‘I am looking for a parking space’ or *questa è (un’) autostrada = ova je (na) autoštrada* (Ger. only *das ist eine Autobahn*) ‘this is a motorway’. Non-determinateness expresses the mere category affiliation, while *ONE* underlines (besides the referential interpretation in the first example, which of course is also possible) the character of an “element of the class”, be it in terms of non-referentiality or in terms of the generic element of a class. Perhaps the aforementioned ability of the Italian language to convert nouns into qualitative adjectives plays a role also in this case. One should also recall the rules with regard to the class predications, in particular job titles, for which its use greatly varies both language-internally and from one language to the other. All this supports the argument that a completely grammaticalized indefinite article does indeed demonstrate generic functions, but that – just as in the case of mass nouns – we cannot expect absolute agreement between the individual languages in this case.

As a whole, we can thus ascertain that both micro-languages CUS and MSL have reached the same level of grammaticalization as the dominant languages German and Italian also with respect to the generic nominal phrases including definitions and predications. In many cases, the indefinite article is compulsory even in constructions in which Macedonian, the Slavic standard language with the best-reported initial signs of an indefinite article,³³ allows for it only optionally, if at all.³⁴

The usage of *ONE* with the functions of an indefinite article in the singular, including generic use, is summarized in Table 3. However, this is only a very rough overview, in which all three listed functions – in particular with regard to generic use – could be further subdivided, in line with the individual cases illustrated:

Table 3. Use of the “indefinite article” in the singular

	referential	non-referential	generic
Macedonian	(+)	–	(+)
German/CUS	+	+	+
Italian/MSL	+	+	+

4.3. *ONE* in the plural and dual

In Standard German the indefinite article does not have a plural form, in contrast, for instance, to the (suppletive) plural *irgendwelche* from *irgendein* ‘any’. The plural of *ONE* is expressed by \emptyset ; the same is true for Italian, especially in its local varieties, where even the partitive construction of the type *delle mele* ‘apples’ does not exist.³⁵ Contrary to all other languages in this paper, the Sorbian varieties have a third number grammeme, the dual. It continues to be used also in CUS, although (contrary to the Standard) not independently, but only for nouns and adjectives governed by *dwaj* (fem./neuter *dwě*) ‘two’ and *wobaj / wobej* ‘both’ (see Scholze 2008: 126-139).

In the following, the actual use of the plural (and dual) of *ONE* in MSL and CUS will be discussed, but I will refrain from a discussion of all the theoretically possible functions of a plural indefinite article.³⁶

Analogously to the respective dominant languages, pure article functions of *ONE* are absent in the plural of both micro-languages. There is, indeed, a morphologically regular plural (*jene* etc.) both in MSL as well as CUS – cp. the paradigms in Tables 1 and 2 above – but unlike *někotre* and

nike/koje ‘some, few, several’, it cannot be used when referring to the plural:

- (30) a. CUS *Tam su (někotre) muže.* **jene*
 Ger. *Dort sind (einige) Männer.*
 b. MSL *Onesu (nike/koje) ljuda.* **jene*
 Ital. *Lì ci sono (alcuni/degli) uomini.*³⁷
 ‘There are (a few) men.’

The morphological plural form *jene* is only used attributively for pluralia tantum, functioning there as an indefinite article for single referents, which formally are expressed by the plural, e.g. CUS *jene durje* ‘a door’, *jene kachle* ‘an oven’,³⁸ MSL *jene vrata* ‘a gate’, *jene grine* ‘a back’.³⁹

In addition, there is in both micro-languages a “judgemental” function of the morphological plural of *ONE* in terms of “such, that kind of”. It is optional and only strengthens a judgement already indicated by the context.⁴⁰

- (31) a. CUS *To su **ći jene** rapaki!* ~ Ø
 Ger. *Das sind dir **Ø** (derartige) Lausbuben!*
 ‘They are [you] **Ø** (such) rascals!’
 b. MSL *Je na raca do **jenhi** čeljadi štranihi!* ~ Ø
 Ital. *È una razza di (certune) persone strane!*
 ‘It is a bunch of **Ø** (such) strange people!’

The fact that *jene* in this case can even be used additionally to concrete numbers in CUS, including *dwaj* ‘two’ (governing the dual), offers evidence that this is not a normal indefinite article, an assumption probably also true for the emphatic use of *ONE* in the singular as in example (12) above:

- (32) CUS *To su **ći jene dwaj** rapakaj!* ~ Ø
 Ger. *Das sind dir **Ø** (derartige) zwei Lausbuben!*
 ‘They are [you] **Ø** two (such) rascals!’

In CUS one might be tempted to judge *někotre* as the suppletive plural of *ONE*. However, just like the corresponding German form *einige*, it is an indefinite pronoun. The same thing can be said for MSL *koje*, which can be equated with Italian *qualche* ‘several, certain’. On the other hand, such a judgement could be more plausible for *nike*, which unlike its cognate in SCR, *neki*, no longer has a morphological singular. But it is still not clear

whether it has really passed the boundary to become a plural indefinite article. The speakers equate it with the Italian partitive plural *dei* (masc.), *delle* (fem.) in the Standard and \emptyset in the local varieties, but also with *alcuni* ‘several’: *sa pola kupit nike stvare = sono andata a comprare delle/alcune cose* ‘I went to buy (a few) things’. Moreover, it is only optional even in a referential context, e.g. *je čija (nike) ritrata* ‘he took (some) pictures’.

Incidentally, the use of plural *ONE* as an independent pronoun is phraseologically bound in all analyzed languages. Thus, like in German (*die einen... die anderen* ‘some... the others’), *ONE* in CUS is restricted to (*te*) *jene... (te) druje*, lit. ‘(the) ones... (the) others’. The same holds for its attributive use: (*te*) *jene ludžo... (te) druje ludžo* (Ger. *die einen Leute... die anderen Leute*) ‘some people... other people’, lit. ‘(the) one people... (the) other people’. A similar construction also exists in MSL, i.e. *jene... druge* lit. ‘ones... others’, which corresponds to Italian *gli uni... gli altri* ‘some... others’. However, it is confined to generic use, e.g. *jene jesu vaka, druge jesu vaka* ‘some (fem.) are like this, some (fem.) are like that’, which is a statement on the class of women as a whole, rather than a juxtaposition of two specific groups. Each reference to a specific group must be rendered with *nike... druge* or *koje... druge*. Unlike in Italian, some speakers also use doubled *jene... jene* instead of *jene... druge*. An analogous alternative to *druge* also exists in form of the constructions with doubled *nike* or *koje*, which can be equated with Italian *alcuni... alcuni* ‘some... some’ here and is accepted by all speakers.

4.4. Peculiarities of the use of *ONE*

To conclude the analysis of the use of *ONE* in the two micro-languages, we should discuss a few characteristic special cases. For example, in CUS *ONE* is missing for quantities such as *kusk* ‘a bit’, while *jen kusk* with an article means ‘a piece’. The borrowed word *hawfn* (< Ger. *Haufen*) ‘a pile = many’, e.g. \emptyset *hawfn ludžo* ‘many people’, generally only appears as a quantity, while ‘a pile’ in its substantival sense can only be expressed by the genuine Slavic *jena rómada*. In MSL there is a similar opposition, but its distribution is different: *na mala* means ‘a bit’,⁴¹ while indeterminate *mala* means ‘little, not much’. The model for this opposition is Italian *un poco ≠ poco*. In the same way, the optionality of *ONE* in *ein bißchen* ‘a bit’ in local colloquial German could have been the trigger for the opposition in CUS.

ONE is absent when referring to ‘half’, both in CUS, cp. (33), and in MSL, cp. (34):

- (33) CUS *Ha pon za Ø pol lěta jo tón tej nuř.*
 Ger. *Und dann in **einem** halben Jahr ist er auch rein.*
 ‘And then in **a** half of a year he also went in (to the army).’
- (34) MSL *Sa rabija Ø po dana.*⁴²
 Ital. *Ho lavorato Ø mezza giornata. (? una)*
 ‘I worked half **a** day.’

While the CUS form is perhaps a conservative relic without an external model, there is an Italian model for MSL, cp. the Italian translation in (34), normally used without *ONE*. For some speakers *ONE* is, however, possible as a lesser used variant.

The indefinite article is also avoided with ‘such’. For example, it was absent in the original CUS sentence (35). Yet on inquiry *ONE* was indeed accepted, but it was interpreted as a number or in terms of “a specimen of several items to select from” or, at least, with a negative connotation:

- (35) CUS *Dórm sej ja Ø tajku chěžku kupić?*
 Ger. *Soll ich mir **ein** solches Haus kaufen?*
 ‘Should I buy such **a** house?’

In MSL only a part of the speakers allows for NPs such as *nu talu hižu* ‘such a house (acc.)’, while others replace them by constructions such as *nu hižu taka* with the adverbial form *taka* ‘so’. Indeterminate *Ø talu hižu* is interpreted as ‘this house’.⁴³

The pronoun ‘(an)other’ in combination with *ONE* also plays a special role in MLS. While *jen druj* ‘another’ is perfectly normal in CUS, *ONE* is avoided or at least postponed in MSL.⁴⁴

- (36) MSL *Mitaj još Ø drugu (~ drugu **jenu**) divojku! *jenu drugu*
 Ital. *Invita ancora un'altra ragazza!*
 Eng. ‘Invite **one** more other girl!’

As for negation, *ONE* is seldom in CUS, because there is a special negation adverb *žan* ‘not one, no’ (cp. German *kein*). Just like *ONE* in affirmative sentences, *žan* cannot be left out, despite the obligatory negation of the verb

(= double negation). Only in cases of direct confrontation such as in (37b) is *ONE* also possible in negative sentences – like in German:

- (37) a. CUS *Ja nimam žane awto.* (*nimam* = ‘do not have’) *Ø
 Ger. *Ich habe kein Auto.* *Ø
 ‘I have **no** car.’
- b. CUS *Ja nimam jene awto, hale jene koleso.* ~žane Ø
 Ger. *Ich habe nicht ein Auto, sondern ein Rad.* ~kein *Ø
 ‘I do not have **a** car, but rather a bicycle.’

In MSL we find *ONE* in marked negative sentences, corresponding to the Italian negation adverb *nessuno* ‘none at all, not one’, see (38a). The negation can optionally be strengthened further by an additional *mang* (cf. *manco* in colloquial Italian). On the other hand, the *zero*-article is used in unmarked negations as in (38b), which, however, is a case of analogy to the (generic) definite article used in Italian here:

- (38) a. MSL *Nimam jenu maginu.* ~ *mang jenu*
 Ital. *Non ho nessuna macchina.*
 ‘I don’t have **a** (=any) car (at all)’
- b. MSL *Nimam Ø maginu.*
 Ital. *Non ho la macchina.*
 ‘I don’t have **a** car.’

MSL uses the neuter singular form of *ONE* also to specify approximate numerical quantities:⁴⁵ *na desat čendimetri* ‘about ten centimetres’. CUS allows for the combination of *ONE* with numbers, too. However, the form used here in the nominative, *jene*, should be interpreted rather as plural than as (the homonymous) neuter singular.⁴⁶ Moreover, *ONE* is totally optional here, without any concrete meaning or connotation: *jene dwaceći tomatow* = *dwaceći tomatow* ‘twenty tomatoes’.

Finally, another peculiarity of CUS is the use of *ONE* in the functions of the German “impersonal” pronoun *man*. The oblique cases of the referential pronoun *ONE* ‘one (person)’ are used as suppletive forms of the defective *man* in Standard German, too.⁴⁷ But unlike in German, where in the nominative we have an opposition between *einer* ‘one person’ : *man* ‘people (in general), they, you’, in CUS all forms are always ambiguous for both concepts, for instance in the nominative example (39):

- (39) CUS *Jen praj, zo ma farar jenu přécelku.*
 ‘They say (~ a person says) that the priest has a girlfriend.’
 (lit. “one says...”)
 Ger. *Man (≠ einer) sagt, daß der Pfarrer eine Freundin hat.*

5. On the age of the indefinite article in CUS and MSL

As the indefinite article is a new development both in MSL as well as CUS, it would be an interesting problem to investigate how old this phenomenon is. With respect to CUS, evidence for the referential, the non-referential, and the generic use of *ONE* can be found already in the most ancient Upper Sorbian texts from the 16th and 17th century, i.e. before the rise of the purist tendencies of the 19th century in Standard Upper Sorbian; for some examples see Breu (2003a: 55–56).

The use of the article in CUS could, of course, be a natural further phase of this initial stage. However, when analyzing the question of the age of the indefinite article in CUS more carefully, we should also take into account that the older generation of contemporary speakers is obviously behind the younger generation in terms of the use of *ONE*, and perhaps in some cases even behind the ancient texts, which often are translations from German. Here are four examples from an original narrative of an 80 year-old speaker, for which an inquiry with younger informants resulted in the obligatory usage of *ONE* instead of \emptyset :

- (40) *Te zowizo \emptyset džowku trebeja.*
*Die brauchen sowieso **eine** Tochter.*
 ‘They need **a** daughter (maid, housekeeper) anyway’
- (41) *Hynó, sy ja krónoł \emptyset kartu, zo dyrn ja nutř.*
*Also, ich habe **eine** Karte bekommen, daß ich rein muß.*
 ‘Well, I got **a** card that I have to go in (to the army).’
- (42) *Ha to bě \emptyset wulka móš nutřka.*
*Und da war **eine** große Maus drinnen.*
 ‘And there was **a** big mouse inside.’
- (43) *To bě \emptyset wulka pekarna bóla.*
*Das war **eine** große Bäckerei gewesen.*
 ‘That had been **a** large bakery.’

An overall analysis of the narrative demonstrates, nevertheless, the very frequent use of *ONE* as an indefinite article in the language of the older generation, and, upon inquiry, the narrator himself did not rule out the use of *ONE* in these examples. The criterion for the optional use of *ONE* in the clearly referential examples (42) and (43) seems to be the existence of an attribute. On the other hand, cases such as (40) are perhaps not to be conceived as individuating (referential), but rather as generic (*džowka* as type). Even (41) could accordingly be regarded as generic instead of referential, in line with a translation like “I was notified (by card)” without specifying the ‘card’ as such. This possibility of a differentiation for [\pm referential] was dismantled to a considerable extent by means of a further assimilation to German among younger speakers. However, one must recall the distinction with an optional *ONE* in the generic context for (27), mentioned above, which is rather similar to the interpretations in the language of conservative speakers given here.

As for MSL we cannot fall back on such a long tradition as in CUS. Fortunately, though, a large body of texts exists in Rešetar (1911) which can be examined with respect to the usage of articles. A preliminary analysis did not reveal any striking deviations in the use of the article in these records, which are several generations old. Nor can we detect any significant differences between the generations nowadays in terms of the use of *ONE*, as opposed to what was found in CUS. Thus, it appears that the indefinite article was grammaticalized at a comparatively early point in time in the first centuries after the immigration of the Molise Slavs to Italy.

As concerns SCR, the Slavic standard language(s) most closely related to MSL, Ivić (1971) dealt with the article-like functions of *ONE*. Apart from the fact that the informants I consulted classified most examples from Ivić’s compilation as “archaic” or at best “regional” variants, the examples primarily concern pronominal (including indefinite-pronominal) usage.⁴⁸ However, she also discovers initial signs of a referential (rhematic) function (Ivić 1971: 110). Yet *ONE* is also optional in her referential contexts and even ruled out under certain circumstances, as her example *videli smo najzad Ø pravu, živu žirafu* (Ivić 1971: 106) ‘finally, we saw a real living giraffe’ shows, in which the indefinite article would be absolutely compulsory in MSL.⁴⁹

My own analyses have revealed that *ONE* in SCR does indeed appear with article functions, when the interpretation of \emptyset as **definite** has to be avoided. That holds, for example, for the referential example (3) above ‘I am looking for a friend’, SCR *tražim Ø prijatelja*, which – without *ONE* – is preferably (though not obligatorily) interpreted as **the** [= my] boy-

friend'. On the other hand, the omission of *ONE* in the corresponding Bulgarian example *tārsja edin prijatel* was described as “non-referential” by my Bulgarian informants (like in Macedonian). However, in the non-referential example (4) ‘I would like to have a (= any) friend’ we regularly find \emptyset in SCR as well as in Bulgarian, while using *ONE* is interpreted as a number. Again in clear contrast to the obligatory *ONE* in MSL, the same also holds for the non-referential question (7) ‘Is there a doctor nearby you?’ and even for the non-referential command in (8) ‘Call a doctor!’, where ambiguity with determinateness could arise.

Thus, initial steps towards a partial opposition “*ONE* = indefinite-referential” vs. “ \emptyset = definite” to avoid misinterpretations could be traced back to an older stage of Serbian/Croatian. On such an historical basis, *ONE* could have developed further into a full-fledged indefinite article in MSL.⁵⁰

In the Balkan Slavic languages Bulgarian and Macedonian this kind of opposition did, of course, not exist, due to their having a definite article. Accordingly, what the South Slavic languages have in common is their tendency to create an indefinite-referential “article”, which can become compulsory in the case of ambiguity with regard to non-referentiality. This tendency is favoured in SCR – which, unlike Bulgarian and Macedonian, does not possess a definite article – in particular in the case of ambiguity with definiteness. On the other hand, this ambiguity does not seem to play a role for Russian, for instance, as can be seen in the fact that there is no tendency to develop a referential “indefinite article”.

6. The article systems of CUS and MSL

6.1. Zero-article and definite article

6.1.1. *The diasystem of the articles in Molise Slavic*

Although the present paper is dedicated to the grammaticalization of an indefinite article in the two micro-languages, I will now briefly characterize the other two members of the article system, because only by doing so are we able to properly understand the role of \emptyset in the examples above. As already indicated, \emptyset is not simply to be equated with the absence of an indefinite article; rather it can entail cases in which the *zero*-article in the micro-languages is equivalent to a definite article in the dominant languages. This is not simply a theoretical working model of linguists, but is

part of the language competence of the consistently bilingual speakers of both micro-languages.

MSL does not have an explicitly expressed definite article. In comparison to Italian and in opposition to the grammaticalized indefinite article, its functions are expressed by indeterminateness in MSL. Particularly in the case of count nouns, direct equivalency exists between the Italian definite article and the Molisian Slavic *zero*-article for the speakers of MSL. On the other hand, speakers hardly take any cognizance of the formal equivalence of \emptyset to Italian indeterminateness.

Therefore, any affirmative answer of informants with regard to the possibility of omitting *ONE* must first be cross-checked with translations containing the definite article. A juxtaposition such as *na žena : \emptyset žena* is predominantly understood as *una donna : la donna* ‘a woman : the woman’. As was already mentioned in passing, for many of the examples cited above, the specification ** \emptyset* is to be relativized to the extent that \emptyset indeed is possible, but only in the function of the definite Italian article, both in individuating (non-generic) as well as generic contexts. Whenever in the latter case Italian allows for both the definite article as well as indeterminateness, the speakers of MSL regard their *zero*-article as ambiguous.

Hence, when the indefinite article is omitted, the rhematic-referential example (2b) above, *na ljud tusti*, must be interpreted the same way as the Italian (and English) definite article: *\emptyset ljud tusti* ‘the fat man’. If sentence (5b) is restructured to *Si ta čuje \emptyset polidzjot, ta meče pržuna* (instead of *na polidzjot*), the non-referential indefinite interpretation is lost, resulting in a definite reading corresponding with Italian *il poliziotto* ‘the policeman’.

In (6b) indeterminateness is also possible in both cases: *Što mam ti kupit: \emptyset kučić o \emptyset mačić?* In this case we could again be dealing with individuating definiteness, but additionally also with the generic function in line with the two meanings of Italian *il cane o il gatto* with a definite article. In the same way, the *zero*-article is also possible in (7b): *Di sta vi je \emptyset medik?* Just like the definite article in the corresponding Italian form *Da voi c'è il medico?* the MSL *zero*-article again has two functions here: expressing individuating definiteness and generic class reference.⁵¹ In none of these cases does \emptyset mean non-referential indefiniteness, which is expressed exclusively by the indefinite article.⁵²

The same double function is fulfilled by the *zero*-article in the transformed sentence (8b) *zov \emptyset medik* = Ital. *chiama il medico* (individuating-definite and generic). By contrast, in (20b) \emptyset would be interpreted unambiguously as individuating-definite: *Sa činija tuna ono, ka more čit \emptyset tata* = Ital. *Ho fatto tutto ciò che può fare il padre* ‘I have done everything that the

father can do (either the speaker himself or the actual father)'. As for the generic examples with definitions, for instance, the obligatory *zero*-article in (23b) *Ø Tigra je na nimaldža* 'The tiger is an animal', which corresponds to the Italian definite article (*la tigre*), is another case of the generic function of the Italian definite article being assigned to the *zero*-article in MSL.

In the grammatical diasystem of the bilingual speakers⁵³ we thus have the distribution of articles between MSL and Italian given in table 4, which can also be equated with an analogous distribution of their functions. Here the denomination "definite *zero*-article" seems to be justified for *Ø* in MSL when it corresponds to the Italian definite article, in contrast to the case of "real" indeterminateness when neither language in this grammatical diasystem uses the definite article.⁵⁴

Table 4. Diasystematic distribution of the articles in MSL : Italian

MSL	indefinite		<i>Ø</i>
		==	
Italian	indefinite	definite	<i>Ø</i>

The following short passage from the beginning of the retelling of a picture story by an MSL speaker is an example of the interplay of the articles in this micro-language. The Italian translation shows the exact correspondence of the elements of the article systems of the two contact languages in line with Table 4. We find, among other things, the rhematic introduction of the two referents "doctor" and "policeman" in the first sentence by means of the indefinite article and their thematic resumption in the second and the third sentence by means of the definite *zero*-article. In the third sentence we find the indefinite article with one of its generic functions, in this case in a standard of comparison (after the preposition *do*, governing the genitive):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1. <i>Ovo je na štorija tra na medik aš na vidžil.</i></p> <p>2. <i>Ø Medik je ferma Ø magin^u, lodžikamend in Ø divjet d' sošt. P'ke one mislu ka moru fermat di je je.</i></p> <p>3. <i>Ø Vidžil, ka je veča teštard do jenga (GEN.SG) medik^a, mu hočas^a čit Ø kondravendzjon^u.</i></p> | <p>1. <i>Questa è una storia tra un medico e un vigile.</i></p> <p>2. <i>Il medico ha fermato la macchina, logicamente in Ø divieto di sosta. Perché loro pensano che possano fermarsi ovunque.</i></p> <p>3. <i>Il vigile, che è più testardo di un medico, gli voleva fare la contravvenzione.</i></p> |
|---|--|

4. *Mendr mu čini Ø kondravendzjon^u*, 4. *Mentre gli fa la contravvenzione,*
riviva jope Ø medik... *arriva di nuovo il medico...*

English (based on the Italian article system): 1. this is a story between **a** doctor and **a** policeman. 2. **The** doctor has stopped **the** (=his) car in **Ø** “no-parking”. Because they think that they can stop everywhere. 3. **The** policeman, who is more stubborn than **a** doctor, wanted to make (=write) him **the** (=a) ticket. 4. While he is making him **the** ticket, **the** doctor arrives again...

6.1.2. *The diasystem of the articles in Colloquial Upper Sorbian*

In CUS the diasystematic relationships are more complicated. There indeed does exist a definite article *TÓN* (*tón* masc., *ta* fem., *te* neuter and plural), but it only expresses part of the functions of the German definite article. Even a rough analysis shows that the definite article of CUS, which developed from a demonstrative, is mainly restricted to pragmatic (anaphoric, thematic) functions.⁵⁵ It is thus used in particular to denote the theme and is in turn in a state of interplay with the indefinite article in its referential (rhematic) function. Thus, after being introduced with the rhematic indefinite article, the noun *muž* in example (2a) above *Najmóle jo jen tolsty muž nutř šišol* ‘Suddenly **a** fat man walked in’ requires the definite article in CUS (*tón muž* ‘the man’) when the theme is resumed.

However, if inherent (= semantic) definiteness already exists, because of the noun referring to an absolute or situational unique to the discourse world, then we find the *zero*-article in CUS. For example, ‘this is the table’ is to be rendered in CUS with *to jo Ø blido*, if the generally known and presumed table in a house is meant (semantically-determined), but with *To jo te blido*, if one is dealing with a table that has just been introduced in the preceding text (pragmatically-determined). The form *tón* is also not permitted in generic statements.⁵⁶ From this it follows that, for the bilingual speakers of CUS, the *zero*-article can correspond to both indeterminateness as well as a (semantic/generic) definite article as compared to German.

If we omit the indefinite article in CUS in (5a), we again wind up with a grammatical sentence with the definite article interpretation ‘the policeman’, just like in MSL: *Dyš tybe Ø pólcaj slóši, tón tybe zašperwe*. Unlike in MSL though, the speaker can only be referring to a policeman well-known in the discourse world (e.g. the “village policeman”), and not be thematically referring back to a policeman introduced in the context before. In the latter case *tón pólcaj* with the pragmatic definite article would have

to be used. In opposition to MSL, *ONE* cannot be left out in CUS in question (7a) *Dawe po was jen lěkar?* ‘Is there a doctor nearby you?’, just as the definite article in German – unlike in Italian – is not permissible here in any interpretation. However, analogously to MSL, the command (8a) can be changed to *Zawolaj Ø lěkara!*, which corresponds to German *Ruf den Arzt!* ‘Call **the** doctor’, though once again only with reference to a doctor who is well-known in the discourse world, i.e. semantically-determined (= *our, the one here*); otherwise the form *to lěkara* with the definite article (acc.) would have to be used. Even in the case of negation in (37a) *Ja nimam žane awto* ‘I have no car’ the function of semantic definiteness of the *zero*-article can easily be recognized when *žane* is replaced by *Ø*. A sentence like this is interpreted by the informants as ‘I don’t have our car / the car (corresponds to definiteness inherent to the discourse world)’.

As for the generic cases, it suffices to fall back on the example (23a) *Jen tigor jo jene zwěrjo* ‘A tiger is an animal’. As described above, the indefinite article in the subject-NP can indeed be left out here in CUS, contrary to German. On the other hand, German allows for the definite article (*der Tiger* ‘the tiger’), while *tón tigor* is ruled out in CUS. We have another – indirect – argument for the CUS *zero*-article corresponding to the German definite article in its generic function in the second NP ‘an animal’, in which German *ONE* can neither be omitted nor replaced by the definite article, which logically entails that the *zero*-article is ruled out for every function in CUS. The other generic cases with a definite article in German but *Ø* in CUS are subject to similar rules, e.g. in (22a) *Ø Serb nebži* ‘The Sorb does not lie’ (generic) vs. *Tón Serb nebži* (idem, pragmatic definiteness). That leads us to the clear-cut conclusion that the *zero*-article in CUS assumes not only the function of expressing the semantic definiteness of individual entities, but also the generic function of the German article, while it does not express its function of pragmatic definiteness.

On the basis of their functions, we can thus sum up the distribution of the articles in the grammatical diasystem of bilingual speakers of CUS as in Table 5. It should be kept in mind that the definite articles of German and CUS correspond to one another only in the case of paradigmatic definiteness. In all other functions of the German definite article, CUS uses the *zero*-article, which could again be called “definite *zero*-article” with respect to the diasystem of the bilinguals. It could be added that in Standard Upper Sorbian there are no article oppositions at all. All distinctions in Table 5 are thus equally expressed by indeterminateness:

Table 5. Diasystematic distribution of the articles of CUS : German

CUS	indefinite	definite	Ø
German	indefinite	definite	Ø

\parallel \parallel \parallel
 \parallel \parallel \parallel

The following short passage from the retelling of the same picture story as above for MSL (with omissions),⁵⁷ is an example of the interplay of the articles in CUS. The German translation shows the correspondence of the elements of the article systems of the two contact languages, here in line with table 5. Among other things, we find the rhematic introduction of “a man” (the *doctor*) by the indefinite article in sentence 1 and its thematic resumption by the definite article in sentence 4, while the policeman is introduced in sentence 1 by the definite article in its deictic function (the speaker pointed at the picture in question; the indefinite article would, of course, also be possible). Another case of the rheme-theme interplay is that of the *štrafcetl* ‘ticket’ in the sentences 1 and 4. In sentence 2 we find the predicative use of the indefinite article with *lěkar* ‘doctor’ and in sentence 5, there is a case of the definite *zero*-article with a non-specified individual⁵⁸ and another one with reference to a (semantically definite) part of the body, both with a corresponding definite article in German:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1. <i>Also jow jo jen muž; tón widži, ka tón pólicist ce jóm jen štrafcetl dać...</i></p> <p>2. <i>Ha da tón chěťř bejži ha jóm pókaza, zo jo wón jen lěkar, ha zo wón em dyrbjal najskěre tam parkwać, dókejž bě to jen nuzny pad.</i></p> <p>3. <i>Hale tón pólcaj jóm praj, zo jo to Ø „Parkverbot“...</i></p> <p>4. <i>Pon tón jóm tón štrafcetl pisa... ha tón lěkar jón em za...</i></p> <p>5. <i>Ha hlada na Ø časnik,... ha jowo šepótle, Ø dowbu (= do hubu) hlada...</i></p> | <p>1. <i>Also, hier ist ein Mann, der sieht, wie ihm der Polizist einen Strafzettel geben will...</i></p> <p>2. <i>Und da läuft er schnell und zeigt ihm, daß er ein Arzt ist, und daß er eben wahrscheinlich da parken mußte, weil es</i></p> <p>3. <i>Aber der Polizist sagt ihm, daß es Ø „Parkverbot“ ist...</i></p> <p>4. <i>Dann schreibt er ihm den Strafzettel... und der Arzt nimmt ihn eben...</i></p> <p>5. <i>Und schaut auf die Uhr... und untersucht ihn, schaut in den Mund...</i></p> |
|---|--|

English (based on the German article opposition): 1. well, here is **a** man; he sees that **the** policeman wants to give him **a** ticket. 2. and therefore he runs quickly and shows him that he is **a** doctor and that he probably had to park there, because it was **an** emergency. 3. but **the** policeman tells him that this is Ø “no-parking”. 4. then he writes him **the** ticket, and **the** doctor takes it. 5. And he looks at **the** (=his) watch and examines him, looks into **the** (=his) mouth...

6.2. The indefinite article in MSL: violation of a typological universal

In Molise Slavic we find the very specific situation that there is an indefinite, but no (formally expressed) definite article. This seems to be a more or less unique case among the languages of the world and contradicts an established universal rule: “IF there is a grammaticalized indefinite article, THEN there is also a definite article”.⁵⁹

The particular case of MSL can in my opinion be explained by the situation of intensive language contact. While attempting to emulate the Romance article system by means of an adaptation of its semantic structure,⁶⁰ an “accident” happened, which ultimately thwarted the usual sequence of the grammaticalization of a “definite article” before the “indefinite article”. The modern-day system could have come about as follows:

We could take for granted as a “genetic” diachronic constant of Slavic that neither article develops independently in this language family (see the introduction above), due to a typologically relevant feature of pertinacity (inertia) in this respect. In the language contact situation in the Molise area (adstrate situation) bilinguals learned to distinguish between article functions. Consequently, they strove to adapt their language to the Romance model.⁶¹ Due to the polysemy of *ONE* (*uno* = numeral + indefinite article) in Italian,⁶² a polyseme form parallel to Italian (Molisian) as the donor language to express the indefinite article was easily found in early *MSL as a receiver language L_1 . The result is the emergence of an indefinite article homonymous with the numeral *jena* in modern MSL (as the modified language L_1'):⁶³

Table 6. Development of the indefinite article in Molise Slavic

Ital. (L_2)	*MSL (L_1)		MSL (L_1')
<i>ONE</i>	<i>ONE</i>	\Rightarrow	<i>ONE</i>
↙ ↘	↓		↙ ↘
number indefinite article	number		number indefinite article

Later on, MSL *jena* as an indeterminate article was optionally shortened to *na*, *nu* in the nominative and accusative. There are three motivations for this: 1. there should generally be the shortest possible means of expression for articles, as they are used extremely frequently, 2. a long and short form also exist in Standard Italian and in the Molisian dialect, 3. the alternation *jesa* ~ *sa* ‘I am’ etc. in the present tense of the verb ‘to be’ provided a

model within the language for the optional omission of the initial syllable *je*.

The optional shortening of the article form thus led to the emergence of a situation which is strikingly close to that of the morphological system of the Romance contact varieties, but with a clearly different way of shortening – as illustrated in table 7, on the basis of the nominative forms (without the remains of the neuter). Furthermore, the allomorphic conditions retain their language-specific character.⁶⁴

Table 7. The morphology of the indefinite article in Romance and Molise Slavic

	attributive		independent	
	masc.	fem.	masc.	fem.
Ital.	<i>uno, un</i>	<i>una, un'</i>	<i>uno</i>	<i>una</i>
Mol.	<i>nu, n'</i>	<i>na, n'</i>	<i>unə</i>	<i>unə</i>
MSL	<i>jena, na</i>	<i>jena, na</i>	<i>jena</i>	<i>jena</i>

The “accident”, which is ultimately responsible for the violation of the universal rule mentioned above, took place during the attempt to develop a definite article by means of the analogical adaptation of the semantic structure in the historical (and modern) situation. As is shown in table (8), the extension of meaning of the form of the demonstrative pronoun, which is generally to be expected in accordance with a well-known grammaticalization path, was in fact not possible here, because in Italian the necessary link between the demonstrative and the definite article is missing:⁶⁵

Table 8. Failed development of a definite article in Molise Slavic

Ital. (L ₂)		MSL (L ₁ = L ₁ ')	
<i>QUELLO</i>	<i>IL</i>	<i>TA</i>	?
↓	↓	↓	⋮
DEM	definite article	DEM	*definite article

Hence, on the one hand, no direct polyseme model for the analogical polysemization in the replica language MSL could be found in the model language. On the other hand, a universally possible language-internal development of a demonstrative to the definite article was inhibited, because it would have resulted in the disruption of the parallelism of the functions of the demonstrative in the model and replica language.⁶⁶ Consequently,

non-determination in opposition to the indefinite article remains the sole form of expression for the functions of a definite article in MSL.⁶⁷

6.3. The development of the article system of CUS

In Colloquial Upper Sorbian the article system apparently emerged by means of structural adaptations without any problems. The indefinite article arose by adapting its semantic structure to that of the dominant language German, in the same way as that of MSL was adapted to Italian, i.e. the polysemy of *ONE* as a numeral and indefinite article was attained by a corresponding extension of functions of the numeral (see table 9). Unlike in MSL and analogously to German *DER* (*der, die, das*), the original demonstrative *TÓN* could also expand its scope of functions to the definite article, because, in contrast to Italian *QUELLO*, German *DER* has both demonstrative as well as article functions (table 10).

Table 9. Development of the indefinite article in Colloquial Upper Sorbian

German (L ₂)	*CUS (L ₁)		CUS (L ₁ ')
<i>ONE</i>	<i>ONE</i>	⇒	<i>ONE</i>
↙ ↘	↓		↙ ↘
number indefinite article	number		number indefinite article

Table 10. Development of a definite article in Colloquial Upper Sorbian

German (L ₂)	*CUS (L ₁)		CUS (L ₁ ')
<i>DER</i>	<i>TÓN</i>	⇒	<i>TÓN</i>
↙ ↘	↓		↙ ↘
DEM definite article	DEM		DEM definite article

Even though the definite article of CUS which came about this way did not assume the entire scope of functions of its German counterpart, the article system of CUS stands to a lesser extent in conflict than MSL with the implicative universal which states that an indefinite article develops only after the definite article. It could be added that the limitation of *TÓN* to pragmatic definiteness is an intermediate stage which has already been overcome under certain conditions; see Breu (2004: 32–42) and Scholze (this volume).

Given the situation in CUS, the aforementioned universal should, at least, be attenuated to: “IF there is a grammaticalized indefinite article, THEN there is also a pragmatic definite article”. But even for this version, the article system of MSL would be a clear exception. Perhaps the development (or reinterpretation) of a definite *zero*-article should be integrated into the universal, too, so that it would state that the exceptional development of an indefinite article before a definite one automatically causes the absence of an article to be interpreted as “definiteness”, at least in appropriate contexts where other languages (especially the dominant language in contact situations) use a definite article.

7. Conclusion

The present paper has shown that a full-fledged indefinite article with referential, non-referential, and generic functions has developed in Molise Slavic (MSL) and in Colloquial Upper Sorbian (CUS). In both Slavic micro-languages, language contact provided the impetus for this development against the resistance of a diachronic constant of Slavic. As a whole, language contact was also responsible for the specific structure of the concerned article systems. Thus, in the case of MSL the structural conditions of Italian provoked the violation of a supposed universal implication for the chronology of the development of articles – the emergence of a definite article before a (fully developed) indefinite article.

Against this background, we should bear in mind that both MSL as well as CUS are in an adstrate situation, which, unlike substrate situations, like those on the Balkans, is regarded as the less “severe” case of language contact, from which one primarily would only expect lexical borrowings. The case of the article systems of CUS and MSL shows that an intensive, century-long influence can also have a significant impact on the grammar of a minority language by means of the adaptation of its semantic structure to that of the majority languages, the typical way of copying the system of a model language in a replica language. Even though the development of an indefinite article from *ONE* and of a definite article from demonstratives corresponds to well-known grammaticalization paths, it is reasonable to claim that language contact is an indispensable prerequisite if Slavic languages are to develop articles, since a diachronic constant exists which blocks or at least slows down the emergence of article systems; other Slavic languages lacking intensive contact with “article languages” have not taken these paths, or only followed it to a very small degree.

“Diachronic constants” of languages or language groups are not at all a mystical assumption of linguists. They follow from comparative analyses of languages, and they can be overcome or changed by language contact. Besides the rise of articles, another case of this type of strong contact influence in one of the micro-languages analyzed in the present paper can be found in the field of verbal aspect and tense, where the relevant Slavic diachronic constant is not based simply on inertia but on a rule saying that the imperfect in Slavic languages disappears before the aorist. In Molise Slavic, having lost its aorist but showing a productive imperfect, we, however, find the exact opposite (Breu 2005b: 41f.), again due to Romance influence violating the Slavic diachronic constant in question.

Notes

1. The present paper is in many respects based on an earlier German version (Breu 2003a), written within the framework of the *Sonderforschungsbereich* (Collaborative Research Centre) 471 “Variation and Evolution in the Lexicon” at the University of Konstanz (Constance), supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG). Some additional information comes from Breu (2005a) and (2008). As the introductory chapter of the present volume covers the general debate on contact-induced grammaticalization, I will not elaborate on this theoretical issue outside the main subject of this paper.
2. The Slavic population themselves simply call this language *zlav* ‘Slavic’ or *naš jezik* ‘our language’, in adverbial form *na-našu* or *na-našo* ‘in our manner’.
3. A Sorbian denomination for this variety is *serbska wobchadna rěč* ‘Sorbian colloquial language’.
4. For an overview of the vocabulary and grammar of the Acquaviva variety, see Breu and Piccoli (2000).
5. For more on the situation of Molise Slavic in general, see Breu (1990).
6. The term “Štokavian” means that in MSL Protoslavlic **čbto* ‘what’ has developed into *što*, as in most dialects of the Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian continuum and also in Standard Bosnian, Serbian and Croatian, contrary to *kaj* in north-western Croatian dialects and *ča* on the Dalmatian islands. “Ikavian” refers to the pronunciation of Protoslavlic *ě* as [i] as in some Dalmatian dialects, contrary to Standard Croatian [je], [ije] and Standard Serbian [e].
7. For general information on CUS and its role among the Sorbian varieties, see Breu (2000: 51–54) and Šolčić (2005).
8. Here I cannot deal with general inquiries on the justification of the assumption of an indefinite article in German or Italian. Nor can I examine the theoretical

- question on the extent to which one is justified in separating indefinite article and quantifiers; see for example Vater (1982) and Lyons (1999: 33–36).
9. In light of the general terminological confusion, the denomination of the non-generic functions is particularly problematic. The term “specific” (cp. Hartmann 1982: 188), which has been used now and then for this, is understood by others in the sense of “referential” (for instance Lyons 1999: 35) or in the sense of “pragmatic” (cp. Ioup 1977). The term “individuating”, in contrast, appears to me to be unencumbered and also directly reflects the reference to an individual, which also applies in the case of non-referentiality (unknown individuals).
 10. For the sake of simplicity, the meta-form *ONE* will be used to summarize the realizations of numerals, indefinite pronouns and the indefinite article in the individual languages.
 11. I use the abbreviation “SCR” in the dual sense of “Standard Croatian” and “Serbo-Croatian” (= Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian).
 12. For more on the phonology of MSL and, in particular, the tonal system, see Breu (1999).
 13. When the parenthesized vowels are absent, the prosody changes. In the masculine singular form, the rising tone is replaced by the falling initial tone with additional vowel lengthening: *je:nga*, *je:nmu*, *je:nme*. In the plural, the contraction always takes place without lengthening, and the rising tone becomes optional: *je'nhi ~ jenhi*, *je'nmi ~ jenmi*.
 14. As a rule, the neuter has become an “impersonal” in MSL, which can never refer to a noun, but instead only appears with adjectives, adverbs, verbs and pronouns (Breu 2003b). Table 1 illustrates only the more or less frequently used neuter forms of the nominative and accusative. The oblique cases usually remain uninflected or are avoided. Only in the instrumental do some speakers use the special form *je'nom*.
 15. See Breu (2003a) for an explicit comparison with Weiss’s (1996) Macedonian examples. A more recent paper of Weiss (2004) is based, in principle, on the same examples but with a wider typological scope on the grammaticalization paths of indefinite articles in general.
 16. I will not elaborate on the grammatical peculiarities of both micro-languages outside the use of articles as, for instance, in example (1) the use of an expletive *to* in CUS analogously to German *es*, and in MSL the inversion of the original SCR word order by putting the adjective after the noun, just as in Italian. The same holds for peculiarities in the vocabulary, characterized by a large number of loanwords or calques, in (1) for example *jemo* ‘once’ in CUS instead of the Standard *jónu*, in MSL *nu votu* instead of SCR *jedanput*.
 17. For an implicit comparison with Russian in this and other cases see Breu (2008) with (articleless) Russian translations of MSL and CUS examples showing an indefinite article.
 18. It seems that an attribute or a relative clause makes *ONE* more acceptable in Macedonian (and Bulgarian) in the non-referential reading (Weiss 2004: 155).

19. In (3) this would be impossible in the referential reading of this ambiguous sentence, but the indefinite pronoun could be used to disambiguate it as non-referential.
20. In German the indefinite article can be absent when enumerating items and in contrasts, while it is compulsory for non-parallel nouns [or nouns not listed as parallel]. In Italian a similar rule seems to exist for many speakers, while in MSL *ONE* is obligatory even in such cases. This means that in this respect its use is even stricter than in the dominant language, due to the lack of the contrast rule.
21. The original example has *ONE* in Macedonian, but this is supposed to be a rare exception, since \emptyset is the norm in this language with mass nouns.
22. To give an equivalent to German *ONE* in (10), speakers of CUS proposed adding *tajka* ‘such (feminine)’. For more on the particular behaviour of *tajki* ‘such’ in combination with the indefinite article, see below.
23. Instead of ‘soft’, (10) is rendered with *friška/fresca* ‘fresh’ in MSL/Italian, because MSL *meka* ‘soft’ was rejected for being incompatible with *trava* ‘grass’.
24. In German dialects, however, especially in Bavarian, mass nouns are regularly linked with indefinite articles, e.g. *I brauch à gäed / àn sand* (* \emptyset) ‘I need (a) money / (a) sand’; see Glaser (1996: 151–158). Altogether though, this is a typological peculiarity, which contradicts the universal no. 1158 (formerly 1162) in the Konstanz “Universals Archive” (<http://typo.uni-konstanz.de/archive/intro/index.php>): IF the indefinite article is derived from the cardinal “one”, THEN non-numerable nouns cannot take an indefinite article.
25. In fact, the situation is a bit more complicated in Italian, as *ONE* is actually obligatory when using *questa*, i.e. the demonstrative agreeing in gender with *informazione*. On the other hand, it is missing when the non-agreeing “neuter” form *questo*, corresponding to MSL *to*, is used: *Questo è anche \emptyset informazione*.
26. The definite generic article may be found in German as well (*das gute Spielzeug*), even though not accepted by all speakers. Here we have a marked reference to the “category as a whole”, in contrast to the “typical representative” for the indefinite article and to unmarkedness with respect to this differentiation in the case of indeterminateness.
27. As for MSL, some informants accepted also the omission of *ONE*, and equated it with the use of *il bambino* in Italian with a generic definite article.
28. The speakers of both micro-languages avoid generic statements on entire classes of individuals in the singular, but instead prefer the indeterminate plural, possible also in German. The variation with the generic definite article, which exists in the German plural (*Deutsche* ‘Germans’ : *die Deutschen* ‘the Germans’), is however, excluded, which in turn concurs with the hypothesis that the *zero*-article also expresses the generic function of the definite article in CUS. As in Italian the definite article is obligatory also for generic statements

- in the plural, the MSL *zero*-article is conceived as expressing definiteness by the bilingual speakers, in this case, too.
29. One should note that in Italian *animale* can be used not only as a noun, but also as an adjective, which can evoke a parallel re-interpretation of *nimaldža* among (always bilingual) Molisian Slavs. When expressing “quality” the adjective and the generic noun are, of course, very close to one another.
 30. Compare this with the referential statement *To jo jena študentka* ‘This is a student (fem.)’, where *ONE* is also obligatory in CUS and in German.
 31. Compare the Macedonian opposition *Marko e Ø učitel* ‘Mark is a teacher’ vs. *Marko e eden učitel od moeto selo* ‘Mark is a teacher from my village’ (Weiss 1996: 445), existing in both micro-languages, too: *Marko jo Ø wučer* vs. *Marko jo jen wučer z mojej weski* (CUS), *Mark je Ø profesor* vs. *Mark je na profesor z moga grada* (MSL). Thus, by means of Ø : *ONE* in the element predication, in these languages, an opposition between the unmarked reference to the entire class (quality) and a marked reference to a subclass can be expressed.
 32. In MSL, *ONE* can indeed also be left out here, but *tovar* would then in turn assume the character of a predicative adjective, just like its Italian counterpart (*sei Ø asino*).
 33. Possibly, the grammaticalization process of *ONE* has gone still further in Bulgarian than in Macedonian, as some examples of Weiss (2004) seem to suggest, but still without reaching the level of CUS and MSL.
 34. Due to the attained status of grammaticalization in CUS and MSL, it is not possible to synchronically determine the sequence in which the individual article functions were adopted, i.e. whether here also the non-referential forms were the last remains of indeterminateness like in Macedonian, or rather the generic functions. For more on this, see Weiss (1996: 451) and his discussion of the “contiguous sections” in Givón (1984: 407), which imply a universal sequence of “non-referential” before “generic”, which, obviously, contradicts the situation in Macedonian. The “indefinite article” in Street Hebrew investigated by Givón (1981) is incidentally limited to referential article functions and thus does not allow for any conclusions on the diachronic sequence.
 35. Other languages indeed do demonstrate plural forms of *ONE*, for example Spanish (*unos amigos, unas amigas* ‘friends’), and they are not uncommon in German dialects either; cp. Bavarian *đi bà:m* ‘trees’ in opposition to the singular *à bà:m* ‘a tree’; cp. Glaser (1996: 158–162).
 36. As for Macedonian, Weiss (1996: 446) deals very briefly with the plural form *edni*, which is used much less frequently than its singular counterpart.
 37. The Msl. pronouns *nike* and *koje* correspond both to the Italian concepts of *alcuni* ‘several’ as well as the partitive *degli*.
 38. Formal dualia tantum, i.e. non-singularia showing dual endings, do not exist in CUS. Thus, there was no need to develop a dual form of *ONE* either. However, for nouns such as *chollow* ‘trouser(s)’ like for *Hose(n)* in German, it is possible to quantify them with *jen por chollowow* ‘a pair of trousers’ = *jene*

chollow ‘a trouser’ (plurale/duale tantum), but not for other terms such as *rota* ‘gate’ (plurale tantum). MSL allows for *para* ‘pair’ even when quantifying pluralia tantum not conceptualized (by modern speakers) as pairs, e.g. *dva para moždani* ‘two brains’, *dva para vrat* ‘two doors’. The function of an indefinite plural can only be expressed explicitly by *nike* (MSL) and *někotre* (CUS) also with pluralia tantum.

39. Cf. the use of a plural of *ONE* with pluralia tantum in Russian *odni vorota* ‘a gate’ or Macedonian *edni nožici* ‘a pair of scissors’, restricted to its function as a numeral, however.
40. The optional pronoun *certuni* ‘some, certain’, proposed by speakers of MSL to translate *jene* in (31b), is somewhat antiquated in Standard Italian.
41. As shown by the form *no malo*, which is used by conservative speakers and in general in the Montemitro dialect, without the formal merger of the original final *-o* with feminine *-a* (*akanje*), we are dealing with the neuter gender here.
42. The form *nu* (homophonous with the feminine accusative of *ONE*) could, indeed, be used in MSL, but it would be interpreted as the short form of *onu* ‘that (ACC.SG.FEM.)’. *ONE* is not completely excluded here in MSL (*na po*), but in this case we are dealing with its meaning of “approximate quantity”, i.e. ‘about half a day’, see below. Instead of *po* the substantive *polovca* could also be used: *Sa rabija Ø polovcu dana*, once again with the possibility of an insertion of *ONE* in the sense of an approximate quantity.
43. For Macedonian Weiss (1996: 440) cites *edna takva kuka* with an indeterminate article as sub-standard.
44. A Standard Italian model for this cannot be found. The post-position might be associated with dialect constructions of the type *aldunə* ‘another’, which consists of *OTHER* + *ONE*. However, these are only documented as pronouns (“con valore di sostantivo”; Rohlf’s 1968: 224). It is interesting that also in Old Italian the indefinite article usually was still not used with *altro*; see Presslich (2000: 188).
45. This usage can also be found in SCR (*jedno pet godina* ‘approximately five hours’) and in Macedonian (cf. Weiss 1996: 448) and should therefore be ranked among the genuine (South) Slavic relics of the use of *ONE*. Due to the *akanje*-development in Acquaviva, the form in question can once again only be clearly detected as neuter among conservative speakers and in the dialect of Montemitro: *no deset čendimetar* (Montemitro).
46. The homonymy is clearly disambiguated in favour of the plural when constructions with other grammatical cases are tested, e.g. in the genitive *wot jeny ch dwejoch litrow* ‘of two litres’. However, speakers are very reluctant to agree on this form, because the use of *ONE* outside the nom./acc. tends to be avoided here. But they insist, anyway, on the plural being the only possibility here.
47. In some German dialects *EIN* and *MAN* are distinguished also in oblique cases; e.g. in Palatinian (Pfälzisch): *do friert s äner ≠ do frierts ämə* (Ger. for both cases *da friert es einen*) lit. “here one-ACC freezes it” with the meanings

- 'somebody is cold / is freezing here' ≠ 'you (impersonal) are cold / are freezing here'; cf. *äner* = 'one-ACC', formally identical to the nominative *äner* ≠ *ämə* = accusative of (impersonal) *mär* (German *man*), formally identical to the dative of *äner* 'one'.
48. What is interesting is the plural use of *ONE* as a pronoun in terms of 'some, several', e.g. in *jedni pjevaju i ovako* 'some sing also like this', which is absolutely ruled out in MSL. As described above, the Molisian Slavic plural form *jedne* as a pronoun can only appear together with *druge* 'some... others' or (for some) when doubled, otherwise, *nike* or the indefinite pronoun *koje* must be used. Perhaps this use of *ONE* was blocked in MSL in compliance with the Italian form.
 49. Ivić's (1971: 107 fn. 17) claim that older writers from the coastal area imitate the use of articles in the Romance languages should be further investigated.
 50. How easy language contact can lead here to the strengthening of the existing tendency to form an indefinite article can be seen in the fact that one of my SCR informants who has lived in Germany since his birth tended to use *ONE* even in the case of non-referentiality, but also pointed out himself that this would be regarded as incorrect by his relatives in Bosnia.
 51. In Italian the generic function is expressed much more frequently by the definite article than in English, for example. Indeterminateness is even excluded in definitions pertaining to mass nouns; e.g. *l'argento è un metallo* (**Ø argento*) in contrast to English *Ø silver is a metal*. That is why the *zero-article* in *Ø sreba je na metal* has the characteristics of a definite article for bilingual Molise Slavs, too!
 52. Generic class reference and non-referential indefiniteness seem to be quite close to one another in (7b), however.
 53. The "grammatical diasystem" (or dia-grammar) of bilinguals is a theoretic model based on the hypothesis that multilingual speakers do not strictly separate the grammars of their two or more languages but combine them with each other in the most economical manner possible. It could be claimed that the grammars of the individual languages are derived from the common dia-grammar (as a psychological reality) by specific rules: the fewer the rules, the more economic is the management of the languages. In situations of "absolute" language contact, in which all speakers are bilingual, the reduction of language-specific rules seems to be the most important reason for language change. This is especially true with respect to minority languages, as the pressure of the language community to preserve their specific rules is relatively weak, given the high prestige of the dominant majority language. For the notion of "diasystem" cf. Weinreich (1954: 389-90).
 54. An explicit confirmation for the assumption that bilingual speakers of MSL perceive the absence of an indefinite article as a psychologically real "definite *zero-article*" can be found in the fact that in answering questions like "What does *žena* mean in Italian?" they always use the definite article, here "*la donna*" 'the woman' and not simply "*Ø donna*".

55. For more detailed analyses of the functions of the definite article in CUS see Breu (2004) and Scholze (this volume).
56. The terminological differentiation between “semantic” and “pragmatic definiteness” was introduced by Löbner (1985: 298–312). We find an opposition between a “pragmatic” and a “semantic/generic” definite article for example also in North Frisian (see Ebert 1971) and in German dialects, e.g. in Rhenish and in Bavarian (Hartmann 1982 and Breu 2004: 45–48), although in all these cases, the semantic/generic functions are not expressed by \emptyset , but by a reduced form of the pragmatic definite article.
57. See Breu (2004: 42–44) for a reproduction of this picture story, which originally comes from *Welt der Wörter* (1991: 104), together with the full CUS text.
58. See Breu (2004: 27) for this special type of generic use (in the wider sense).
59. Here we are referring to the universal no. 1163 (formerly 1167) in the Konstanz “Universals Archive” (<http://typo.uni-konstanz.de/archive/intro/index.php>), which was less stringent in the original version provided by Heine (1997: 69): “If a language has a grammaticalized indefinite article, it is likely to also have a definite article, while the reverse does not necessarily hold true.” This generalized implication is based on an analysis of 106 language and is supposed to apply to 95% of them. “Aztec, Bambara, Gypsy, Rotuman, Sundanese” are cited as exceptions. Krámský (1972: 110–119) lists Turkish and a series of Iranian languages, which are supposed to have an indefinite but no definite article. As for Turkish, though, he downplays its affiliation with this group, because the definite accusative is distinguished from indeterminateness by means of a suffix, here. Furthermore, the use of *bir* ‘one’ is widely optional and also linked to special functions (such as emphasizing the adjective in the attribution). Weiss (1996: 426–427) claims for Modern Persian, another candidate possibly violating the universal, that the use of *ONE* in this language does not support the assumption of a fully developed indefinite article; see also Lyons (1999: 90–91), who only speaks of a use “limited to non-specific”, which coincides with non-referentiality in our terminology. With regard to the other cited languages, more detailed functional analyses are necessary in order to demonstrate whether they really have a fully grammaticalized indefinite article violating the mentioned universal rule in the same way as MSL. The same holds true for the 41 (or 42 in the online version <http://wals.info/feature/37>) of 566 languages with a claimed indefinite but no definite article in the WALS (2005) map 37, interestingly enough almost all outside Europe, where again such problematic languages as Turkish and Persian are included.
60. By “adaptation of the semantic structure” I understand the analogous reproduction of the polysemies of the model language in the replica language. By this procedure bilinguals achieve a simplification of their lexical and grammatical system (i.e. the diasystem for both their languages); cr. Breu (2003c).

61. This does not mean that a contact-independent development of the indefinite article would not at all have been possible in MSL (and CUS), as the grammaticalization path from the number *one* to an indefinite article is rather common in the languages of the world. But considering the fact that no Slavic language outside the strong contact areas has developed a fully ranged indefinite article, the foreign influence in the MSL contact situation initiated or, at least, considerably speeded up the grammaticalization of *ONE* as an indefinite article in this Slavic micro-language, following the well-known path. In other words, we may expect that the development of an indefinite article would not have happened if it were absent in the contact language.
62. For more on the development of the indefinite article from the numeral in Standard Italian, see Presslich (2000: 161–189), who points out, among other things, that it developed at a later point in time than the definite article.
63. The situation is further complicated by the fact that in borrowed expressions even concrete article forms can be borrowed from the foreign language, e.g. *nu-kwart* ‘a quarter’ from Molisian = ital. *un quarto*. The foreign article and the noun are regarded here as an inseparable unit, though, just like e.g. the initial *la* in *Ladžermanija* ‘Germany’, derived from the definite article in the dominant language (cp. Ital. *la Germania*), or *lu* in *Lubèldž* ‘Belgium’ (cp. Ital. *il Belgio*). This can certainly not be understood as a case of borrowing the indefinite and definite articles as such.
64. In both Standard Italian and the Molisian dialect, the required attributive form depends on the initial sound of the following word. On the other hand, in MSL the distribution of the two form types is characterized, as a rule, by free variation, even if as an article the short form is mostly preferred, and the (attributive) long form is preferably used as a (attributive) number. The long forms are obligatory in both languages for the number and the indefinite pronoun *ONE*.
65. Historically, the Italian definite article is, indeed, derived from the Latin demonstrative *ille* with remote deixis, cp. Rohlfs (1968: 99–108). But as a pronoun, *ille* was replaced by *quello* ‘that’. Thus a formal relationship between the demonstrative and the definite article no longer exists for speakers of Italian (and bilingual Molise Slavs), i.e. *quello* ≠ *il* (masc.), *quella* ≠ *la* (fem.), nor, of course, with other demonstratives such as *questo* ‘this’.
66. In Table 8, *quello* ‘that’ was used for Italian, whose direct MSL counterpart would be *oni*, because its meaning matches that of Latin *ille*, from which the masculine article *il* is derived. However, *ta* was used for MSL, which in deictic terms is least marked and thus (like its Bulgarian counterpart) would have been the most likely candidate for the language-internal emergence of a definite article.
67. Contrary to MSL, Resian, the Slovene-based micro-language in north-eastern Italy (in Val Resia, Region of Friuli Venezia Giulia), seems to have developed a kind of definite article, in spite of an apparently similar contact situation. See Benacchio (1996) for the data and Breu (2005a: 136–137) for a hypothesis to

explain the difference between the two Slavic minority languages in terms of their contact histories.

References

- Benacchio, Rosanna
1996 L'articolo nel dialetto resiano: Sulla questione della determinatezza nella lingue slave. In *Determinatezza e indeterminatezza nelle lingue slave*, Rosanna Benacchio, Francesca Fici and Lucyna Gebert (eds.), 43–59. Padova: unipress.
- Breu, Walter
1990 Sprache und Sprachverhalten in den slavischen Dörfern des Molise (Süditalien). In *Slavistische Linguistik 1989*, Walter Breu (ed.), 35–65. München: Otto Sagner.
- Breu, Walter
1998 Romanisches Adstrat im Moliseslavischen. *Die Welt der Slaven* 43: 339–354.
- Breu, Walter
1999 Phonologie und Verbkonjugation im Moliseslavischen. In *Slavistische Linguistik 1998*, Renate Rathmayr and Wolfgang Weitlaner (eds.), 47–76. München: Otto Sagner.
- Breu, Walter
2000 Der Verbalaspekt in der obersorbischen Umgangssprache im Rahmen des ILA-Modells. In *Slavistische Linguistik 1999*, Walter Breu (ed.), 37–76. München: Otto Sagner.
- Breu, Walter
2003a Der indefinite Artikel in slavischen Mikrosprachen: Grammatikalisierung im totalen Sprachkontakt. In *Slavistische Linguistik 2001*, Holger Kuße (ed.), 27–68. München: Otto Sagner.
- Breu, Walter
2003b Impersonales Neutrum im Moliseslavischen. In *Russistika – Slavistika – Lingvistika. Festschrift für Werner Lehfeldt zum 60. Geburtstag*, Sebastian Kempgen, Ulrich Schweier and Tilman Berger (eds.), 57–71. München: Otto Sagner.
- Breu, Walter
2003c Bilingualism and linguistic interference in the Slavic-Romance contact area of Molise (Southern Italy). In *Words in Time*, Regine Eckardt, Klaus von Heusinger, and Christoph Schwarze (eds.), 351–373. (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 143) Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Breu, Walter
 2004 Der definite Artikel in der obersorbischen Umgangssprache. In *Slavistische Linguistik 2002*, Christian Sappok, Marion Krause (eds.), 9–57. München: Otto Sagner.
- Breu, Walter
 2005a Il sistema degli articoli nello slavo molisano (SLM): eccezione a un universale tipologico. In *L'influsso dell'italiano sulla grammatica delle lingue minoritarie*, Walter Breu (ed.), 111–139. Rende: Centro Editoriale e Librario, Università della Calabria.
- Breu, Walter
 2005b Verbalaspekt und Sprachkontakt. Ein Vergleich der Systeme zweier slavischer Minderheitensprachen (SWR/MSL). In *Slavistische Linguistik 2003*, Sebastian Kempgen (ed.), 37–95. München: Otto Sagner.
- Breu, Walter
 2008 Razvitie sistem artiklej v slavjanskix mikrojazykax v absoljutnom jazikovom kontakte [The development of articles in Slavonic micro-languages in absolute language contact]. In *Deutsche Beiträge zum 14. Internationalen Slavistenkongress*, Sebastian Kempgen, Karl Gutschmidt, Ulrike Jekutsch, and Ludger Udolph (eds.), 75–88. (Die Welt der Slaven. Sammelbände 32) München: Otto Sagner.
- Breu, Walter and Giovanni Piccoli
 2000 *Dizionario croato molisano di Acquaviva Collecroce*. Campobasso: Naš Jezik.
- Ebert, Karen Heide
 1971 *Referenz, Sprechsituation und die bestimmten Artikel in einem nordfriesischen Dialekt (Fering)*. Bräist/Bredstedt: Nordfriisk Instituut (doctoral thesis, Kiel 1970).
- Givón, Talmy
 1981 On the development of the numeral 'one' as an indefinite marker. *Folia Linguistica Historica* II/1, 35–53.
- Givón, Talmy
 1984 *Syntax. A functional-typological introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Glaser, Elvira
 1996 Morphologie und Funktion des unbestimmten Artikels im Bairischen. In *Sprache an Donau, Inn und Enns*, Hans-Werner Eroms and Hermann Scheuringer (eds.), 149–169. (Schriften zur Literatur und Sprache in Oberösterreich 5) Linz: Landesverlag.
- Hartmann, Dietrich
 1982 Deixis and anaphora in German dialects: The semantics and pragmatics of two definite articles in dialectal varieties. In *Here and There. Cross-linguistic Studies on Deixis and Determination*, Jürgen Weis-

- senborn and Wolfgang Klein (eds.), 187–207. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Heine, Bernd
 1997 *Cognitive Foundations of Grammar*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ioup, Georgette
 1977 Specificity and the interpretation of quantifiers. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1: 233–245.
- Ivić, Milka
 1971 Leksema *jedan* i problem neodređenog člana [The lexeme *jedan* and the problem of the indefinite article]. *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* XIV/1: 103–120.
- Krámský, Jiří
 1972 *The Article and the Concept of Definiteness in Language*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton.
- Löbner, Sebastian
 1985 Definites. *Journal of Semantics* 4: 279–326.
- Lyons, Christopher
 1999 *Definiteness*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Presslich, Marion
 2000 *Partitivität und Indefinitheit. Die Entstehung und Entwicklung des indefiniten Artikels in den germanischen und romanischen Sprachen am Beispiel des Deutschen, Niederländischen, Französischen und Italienischen*. Frankfurt/Main: Lang.
- Rešetar, Milan
 1911 *Die serbokroatischen Kolonien Südtaliens*. Wien: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Rohlf's, Gerhard
 1968 *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. Morfologia*. Torino: Einaudi.
- Scholze, Lenka
 2008 *Das grammatische System der obersorbischen Umgangssprache im Sprachkontakt. Mit Grammatiktafeln im Anhang*. Bautzen: Domowina.
- Scholze, Lenka
 this vol. On the grammaticalization of the definite article in Colloquial Upper Sorbian (CUS).
- Šolčić, Leńka
 2005 Serbska wobchadna řeč mjez standardom a dialektom [Sorbian colloquial speech between standard and dialect]. *Lětopis* 52/2: 74–96.
- Vater, Heinz
 1982 Der „unbestimmte Artikel“ als Quantor. In *Sprachtheorie und Angewandte Linguistik*, Werner Welte (ed.), 67–74. Tübingen: Narr.

WALS

- 2005 *The World Atlas of Language Structures*, Martin Haspelmath, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil, Bernhard Comrie (eds.). Oxford: University Press.

Weinreich, Uriel

- 1954 *Is a structural dialectology possible?. Word* 10, 388-400.

Weiss, Daniel

- 1996 Die Geburt eines Artikels: zum Status von makedonisch *eden*. In *Slavistische Linguistik 1995*, Wolfgang Girke (ed.), 421–455. München: Otto Sagner.

Weiss, Daniel

- 2004 The rise of an indefinite article: The case of Macedonian *eden*. In *What makes Grammaticalization? A Look from its Fringes and its Components*, Walter Bisang, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann and Björn Wiemer (eds.), 139–165. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.