STATUS AND USES OF EDIN 'ONE' IN CONTEMPORARY BULGARIAN

ANDREI STOEVSKY

Department of English and American Studies

*To my good friend and colleague, Christo Stamenov,
on the occasion of his 75th anniversary*

Andrei Stoevsky. STATUS AND USES OF EDIN 'ONE' IN CONTEMPORARY BULGARIAN

Transpositions of the numeral *edin* 'one' have resulted in the existence of three grammatical homonyms in contemporary Bulgarian – a numeral, an indefinite pronoun and an indefinite article. In the written language, resolution of the homonymy is problematic as the three are morphologically indistinguishable; the only exception preventing the homonymy from being complete is the plural form *edni* which, according to some more traditionally-minded authors, cannot logically belong to the paradigm of the numeral. Syntactically, the homonyms cannot be differentiated because all of them occupy the same position and function as determinatives. A widely-used lexical substitution test using the indefinite pronouns *njakoj* 'someone' or *njakakăv* 'some kind of' is shown not to be fully reliable. Semantic differentiation can also be problematic in that often more than one meaning is present. It is against this background that we join the vexed discussion whether Bulgarian has a grammaticalized indefinite article in the first place. After many years of denial, an increasing number of Bulgarianists seem inclined to accept the existence of an indefinite article, even though with some reservations. As is often the case with three member mixed-type categories, one of which is the definiteness/indefiniteness category (**D/I category**), while the grammatical status of the synthetically opposed members is uncontested, recognizing the grammatical status of the analytically opposed member may present a problem in that the complete grammaticalization of the function word may be

challenged. Using a test developed by Croft 2000, we reach the conclusion that with regard to a number of parameters the grammaticalization of *edin* as an indefinite article is partial and uneven.

Keywords: parts of speech, transposition, indefiniteness/definiteness, grammaticalization

Андрей Стоевски. СТАТУС И УПОТРЕБИ НА *ЕДИН* В СЪВРЕМЕННИЯ БЪЛГАРСКИ ЕЗИК

В съвременния български език рекатегоризацията на числителното един е достигнала етап, при който паралелно съществуват три омонимични части на речта. В писмения език числителното, неопределителното местоимение и неопределителният член са морфологически неразличими; омонимията не е пълна, поне според традиционно установилото се стандартно мислене, което отхвърля възможността *един* да бъде форма и на числителното. В синтактичен план разграничаването на омонимите се затруднява от това, че в роля на зависими (dependents) и трите заемат еднаква позиция и функционират като детерминативи. Широко използваният заместващ лексикален тест с *някой/някакъв* невинаги дава категоричен отговор. В немалко случаи се разчита на семантиката, но там има напластяване на значения. На този фон навлизаме в дискусията за съществуването на неопределителен член *един*. След дълги години на отричане, в по-ново време известен превес сред българистите има становището за съществуване на такъв неопределителен член, но се изказват и определени резерви. Както нерядко се получава при тричленни категории от смесен тип, каквато е категорията определеност/неопределеност, проблемът се появява не при синтетично изразената част на опозициите, а в аналитичната част, доколкото се оспорва граматикализацията на функционалната дума. На базата на стандартен тест (по Крофт 2000) стигаме до заключението, че граматикализацията на *един* е непълна и неравномерна спрямо определен брой параметри.

Ключови думи: част на речта, определеност/неопределеност, транспозиция, граматикализация

§ 1. Status of *edin*[1] in contemporary Bulgarian

Sometimes innocently simple questions lead to lengthy discussions. The question in this case is: 'What is the part-of-speech (**PoS**) assignment of *edno* in *Edno ptičence mi kaza, če dnes imash rožden den*, 'A little birdie told me that it was your birthday today'? The short answer to this question is that Bulgarianists are divided on the morphological categorization of *edin* when its primary function is not numerical, i.e. when it is not a numeral. Opinions vary between **indefinite pronoun**, **particle** and **indefinite article**. With regard to semantics, the fact that *edin* can express some kind of 'indefiniteness' was recognized as early as 1835 by

---

[1] *Edin* (masc.) will be used as a representative form. The other forms of the numeral, as well as of homonymous grammatical transpositions, are *edna* (f.), *edno* (n.), and *edni* (pl. – as in *edni očila* 'one pair of spectacles').

Neofit Rilski in his *Bolgarska grammatika* (p. 60) – for a discussion see (Stojanov 1987: 4). Some of the examples quoted by Stojanov include:

(1) Dojde   edinъ   stranenъ   čelovêkъ.
    Came   one   strange man
    'Some strange man showed up.'

(2) Ubili   včera   na   poleto   edinъ   čelovêkъ.
    Killed   yesterday   in   the field   one/some   man
    'Someone was killed out in the fields yesterday.'

The two examples above are significant for at least two reasons: (1) early 19 c. grammarians were aware of the use of *edin* to express indefiniteness, (2) the attestation of such usage indicates that the evolution from the numerical to the indefinite meaning of *edin* should not be attributed to the strong cultural influence of West European languages at the beginning of the 20c., though the intensive contacts may have reinforced an already existing tendency. N. Rilski notes a similarity between the indefinite use of *edin* in Bulgarian and of ενα in Greek, thus becoming the first in a long line of linguists to discuss *edin* in contrast to other languages. Changes in the semantics of *edin* may have been detected a long time ago, but has the process of grammaticalization reached maturity? Comparisons with the indefinite articles in French and German have over the years produced radically different reactions. One group, intent on preserving the purity of the Bulgarian language, focused on examples of unnatural Bulgarian influenced by French, which St. Mladenov labelled "unnecessary French mania" (quoted from Stankov 1984:205)[2]; it is important to stress, however, that while finding mannered speech annoying may be fully justifiable, attempts to prove that indefinite *edin* is always a nonessential element clearly raise objections. Another group points both to similarities and dissimilarities between the uses of *edin* in Bulgarian and of the indefinite articles in French, German and English, and comes to different conclusions regarding the status of *edin*. In the discussion that follows we shall examine the motivation for those different conclusions, as well as for not expressing any opinion at all.

Let us start with the easier part and consider briefly the possible reasons for the reluctance of some authors either to express an opinion or to be involved in a debate. The most trivial reason is entirely extra-linguistic – taking sides, even in a scientific debate, may be seen as being confrontational. Different strategies are adopted. Initially, Burov (2004: 355) refuses to take sides in the discussion regarding the status and uses of *edin* but ultimately declares his position without any shade of doubt – " …the form *edin* in Bulgarian has the status of an indefinite

---

[2] A modern translation loan from German which occasionally appears in film credits is *edin film na* < *ein film von* followed by the name of the film director.

article, because it is the only grammatical means for expressing the pragmatic indeterminacy of specified objects" (Burov 2004: 368–369). Unlike Burov, who wants to be scholarly without being seen as combative, other authors occasionally adopt a strategy of genuine non-commitment by playing down the significance of the PoS description of *edin*. Sometimes this is done for the sake of expediency – the author may be focused on the uses of *edin* and does not want to be detained by a lengthy discussion on the PoS status of 'indefinite' *edin*. This is the "whatever strategy", i.e. whatever the status of a particular element might be, let me make a number of interesting observations on the uses (see Stamenov 1984: 65–66). Sometimes, finding themselves handicapped by classificatory problems, authors become dismissive of the significance of taxonomies in general. Even Stankov and Ivanova (1989: 14), whose goal it is to give a definitive answer to the general question whether or not Bulgarian has an indefinite article, are sympathetic to the view expressed by Guentcheva that "the problem whether *edin* should be labelled an indefinite article, an indefinite pronoun, an indefinite particle, etc. is simply a matter of taxonomy" (Guentcheva 1987: 576). We can agree with this position only in one sense – that there are well-recognized problems with linguistic taxonomies; we cannot support the view, however, that certain linguistic elements defy categorization and that whatever decision is taken it is bound to be arbitrary, therefore the assignment of an element to one or another frame of reference is something of an irrelevance. (Re)categorization is important for at least two reasons: (1) it is a single word characterization that stands for a whole bundle of features, and (2) it is a recognition that a process of semantic change that has been under way for some time has reached a point beyond which the element acquires a new identity.

§ 1.1. A theoretical detour

We are forced to take this detour for two reasons: (1) because a discussion of *edin* is inextricably linked to some terminological and conceptual issues of general linguistics, and (2) because it is of some interest to see how questions about the status of *one* are resolved with regard to the grammar of English. The re-labelling of the term *parts of speech* as *word classes* (Quirk et al. 1985 among many) or *lexical categories* (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 22) may be partially justified[3], but the problems concerning the defining criteria still remain. The PoS lists given in different grammar books reflect not only which criteria are prioritized, but also the level of

---

[3] *Parts of speech* may have been criticized because *part* is not specific enough and *speech* needs to be replaced by *language*, but it has the undeniable advantage of being recognized as a term for a particular type of classification. Note that *word class* (Quirk et al. 1985) and *lexical category* (Huddleston and Pullum 2002) are terms that are not specific enough and may equally refer to topical vocabularies, where the classes include words with related meanings (e.g. Longman Lexicon of Contemporary English).

generality at which the authors operate. What we have just said can be illustrated by comparing PoS lists in the two most authoritative grammars of contemporary English, (Quirk et al. 1985) and (Huddleston and Pullum 2002). In the first of the two grammars (p. 67), an initial contrast is drawn between closed and open class members, which in turn has resulted in three separate verb categories – *modal verb*, *primary verb*, and *full verb*. Similar subcategorization has taken place in the second grammar, where the word class *conjunction* has been replaced by *coordinators* and *subordinators* (p. 22)[4]. While some traditional parts of speech are missing from the lists due to category splitting, others are absent due to incorporation into some mega-category: thus the articles, as well part of the pronouns, the "attributive" ones, are included in the super-ordinate category of *determiner* (Quirk et al. 1985: 67) or in the even larger class of *determinative* (H.&P. 2002: 22). Not only do PoS lists vary from one grammar to the next, but the terms themselves are not used in a consistent way. Note the reversed roles in the relation between *determinative* and *determiner*, as defined by Quirk et al. (1985: 253) and by Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 54) – 'function vs. item typically realizing the function' in the first grammar, and 'lexical category vs. function in NP structure' in the second grammar. Occasionally, the term *determinative* is substantivized by Quirk et al. (1985: 253 and elsewhere), which makes the usage largely indistinguishable from that in H&P 2002. Apart from the inconsistency in the use of the terms *determinative* and *determiner*, there is the more fundamental problem of treating these mega-categories as one of the parts of speech –*determinative* in H&P (2002: 22) and *determiner* in Quirk et al. (1985: 67). While setting up a separate syntactic function, that of *determinative* (*determiner*), to be distinguished from that of the traditional *attributive/modifying/adjectival* function is a positive step, setting up a new part of speech by giving priority to syntax to the exclusion of the other criteria presents numerous problems. Quirk et al. have included the articles and various pronouns in the class of determiners but the "lesser category" of numerals is excluded, even though they are said to function as postdeterminers[5] (Quirk et al.1985: 1239), e.g. *All the five performances were well attended.* One problem, which could have been anticipated, is how to deal with the so called independent use of pronouns, if all pronouns are included in the "lexical" class of determinatives, as has been done by Huddleston and Pullum. The two authors think they have found a solution by introducing the concept of the fused-head[6] construction (H&P 2002: 410):

---

[4] Pointing to the heterogeneous nature of word classes, Quirk et al. (1985: 73) similarly think that there is "a case to be made for splitting the conjunction class into subordinators and coordinators".

[5] Just a brief note for the few who may not be familiar with this grammar: *Postdeterminer* here indicates final position within the group of determiners, not a postposition in relation to the head.

[6] These are seen as uncontroversial in nominal relative clauses, *What (= The thing that) worries me most is ...*

Fused-head NPs are those where the head is combined with a dependent function that in ordinary NP's is adjacent to the head, usually a determiner or internal modifier:

Where are the sausages? Did you buy [some] yesterday?   [determiner-head]

So instead of having a disjunctive relationship between determiner and head, corresponding to the dependent and independent uses respectively, as is the case in traditional grammar, *some* is claimed to have preserved its characteristics of a determiner (at least semantically – A.S.) even when functioning as head. Note that the idea of fusion can prove useful in the analysis of *edin* as an indefinite article. Thus on the analogy of (3) below, we can claim a fusion of an indefinite and numerical component in the semantics of *edin* in (4):

(3)   *(Njakakvi) dve* deca hvárljali snežni topki po kolite.[separate express. of Q+Indef.]

       (Some kind) two kids were throwing snow balls at the cars

       'Two kids were throwing snow balls at the cars.'

(4)   **Njakakvo edno/Edno* dete hvárljalo snežni topki po kolite.[fusion of Q+Indef.]

       *Some kind one/One   kid was throwing snow balls at the cars.

At this point we need to make some more general statements. Before we can discuss lexico-grammatical transpositions from one PoS to another, we need to have well-defined categories in the first place. What is needed is a clear indication whether the categories in the PoS list are of the same rank. The determinatives in H&P 2002 and the determiners in Quirk et al. 1985 are clearly mega-categories which in the first case include all pronouns, the article, and the numeral and in the second case – some pronouns and the article. The whole discussion here is about the eventual grammaticalization of the numeral *edin* to the status of indefinite pronoun or indefinite article but if we were to operate solely on the level of the mega-category of *determinative*, we would not be able to register any progression, because whatever changes have taken place, they have done so at the level of subcategories. What we find in H&P2002 is that traditional categories which initially remain invisible by not being listed among the lexical categories (H&P 2002: 22) reappear at a later stage. It is essential therefore, to have transparency of the categories and of the defining criteria on which the PoS lists are based. To go back to an earlier point – syntax may be very important when word classes cannot be differentiated paradigmatically, but the total reliance on syntax may have some unwanted consequences. A well-known example is that of the category of the numerals – the unity and very existence of the category, based on semantics and word-formation, will be compromised if the ordinals are excluded from the class on the grounds that syntactically they behave like adjectives. The numeral *edin/one* is an especially interesting case because it is like an elderly parent who shares a flat with his/her children, pronouns and articles, whose territory has been

greatly reduced and whose presence is unobtrusive, yet the genes in the children keep constantly reminding us of the parent. As we shall see from the very extensive quotation below, the status of the numeral is reduced to that of a sibling under the guise of determinative. The analysis bears some trademark features of modern American and partly British linguistics – a certain lack of a historical perspective and use of PoS terminology[7] in syntactic descriptions. Payne et al. (2013) provide a summary of the properties of "the three items spelled *one*", which are described as "three distinct lexemes with *one* as their orthographic base form; they differ morphologically, syntactically and semantically". We shall quote the summary in full because it can serve as a good basis for comparison with the treatment of *edin* in Bulgarian.

Table 1. The three items spelled *one* in English (Payne et al. 2013: 797)

a. Pronoun

CATEGORY:	regular third-person singular indefinite pronoun
INFLECTION:	*one* (plain case), *one's* (gen. case), *oneself* (reflexive)
MEANING:	'an arbitrary person' (compare French *on*, German *man*)
NOTES:	As with pronouns generally, no plural form.

b. Determinative:

CATEGORY:	indefinite cardinal numeral determinative
INFLECTION:	uninflectable
MEANING:	'1' or 'some' or 'a(n)' or 'sole'
NOTES:	Obligatory when functioning as determiner. Omissible when functioning as modifier with the meaning 'sole'. Anaphoric to a whole NP when used with no head noun.

c. Noun

CATEGORY:	regular common countable noun
INFLECTION:	*one* (plain sg.), *ones* (plain pl.), *one's* (gen. sg.), ones' (gen. pl.)
MEANING:	Anaphoric; something like 'instance thereof', referring back to some type or class referred to in the discourse or salient in the context.

This is a good analysis in that it takes into account multiple features, both formal (morphological and syntactic) and semantic to identify three separate lexemes. One of the main problems, however, is that the three lexemes are too separate, i.e. the analysis fails to demonstrate that they are related. They are not related because they share the same "orthographic base form", but because they are all rooted in one specific number. What is very special about *one/edin* is its duality, to put it in a paradoxical way. On the one hand, by indicating singularity it singles out individuals from a set/class, it specifies. On the other hand, just like any mathematical concept,

---

[7] A good example is the analysis of sentence structure as NP + VP, rather than the traditional 'subject + predicate'.

it is abstract, it indicates quantity and QUANTITY DOES NOT HAVE A FACE. Quantity is divorced from the bundle of features which identify an individual – in this sense quantity is by definition indefinite[8]. It is only a logical consequence of this duality of *one* that this numeral as well as other categories derived from it can indicate 'specific indefiniteness'.

Before turning our attention to the Bulgarian scene, let's consider briefly the first NOTES. The NOTES under Pronoun make the claim that pronouns *generally* [emphasis added] have no plural forms. This is definitely untrue in the universal sense; when interpreted as *on the whole*, the statement applies to a language-specific feature of English[9]. In Bulgarian for example, all pronouns vary for number. Another point which deserves special attention is the claim (see second NOTES) that an anaphoric *one* when used with no head noun may remain a determinative, rather than being necessarily transformed to a noun. The authors devote a short subsection (Payne et al. 2013: 798, §3.2) on the *confusion of countable noun with determinative*. Consider the following two examples:

(5) John has a blue glass, but Alice does not have one.

(6) John has a blue glass, but we could not find another one for Alice.

Payne et al. claim that in (5), *one* is a determinative because it stands for the entire NP *a blue glass*, most importantly, including *a* , "not [just] the Nom *glass*, or the Nom *blue glass* ", so presumably, if we go back to the analysis in H & P 2002 discussed above[10], the anaphoric *one* represents a fusion of the determinative *a* + the modified head. In (6) the determinative is *another*, so *one* has to be treated as a noun.

§ 1.2. Back to the status of *edin* in Bulgarian

In trying to establish the identity of the offspring of the numeral *edin* in Bulgarian, we are faced with two very common problems: the first has to do with the fact that PoS transpositions often result in grammatical homonymy[11], and the second – with the difficulty to decide whether the process has advanced to the stage when we can claim that Bulgarian has developed an indefinite article. Let us briefly consider each of the problems in turn. First, as is well known, partial homonymy

---

[8] Fodor and Sag (1977: 483) point out, but "are not quite sure why", that **One student in the** *syntax class cheated on the exam* inclines more strongly towards a non-referential understanding of the subject than *A student in the syntax class cheated on the exam.*

[9] Note, however, that the ones that do vary for number, such as personal pronouns, demonstratives and reflexives have very high frequency of occurrence.

[10] Note that one of the co-authors in Payne et al. 2013 is G. Pullum.

[11] There is, of course, some uneasiness when using this term because homonyms are supposed to be semantically unrelated.

allows morphological differentiation of word classes, while total does not. The situation with *edin* in Bulgarian can be described as a case of total, or almost total homonymy. As was already mentioned in Footnote 1, *edin* makes a three-way gender distinction in the singular (*edin* (m.), *edna* (f.), *edno* (n.)) and has a gender-neutral form for the plural (*edni*). Two points of contention must be mentioned – the first is more peripheral and concerns the plural form *edni*, the second is absolutely crucial for the current discussion, and concerns the existence of total paradigmatic homonymy between the indefinite pronoun *edin* and the indefinite article. Just a few brief comments on *edni*: The form is clearly seen as being internally contradictory in that it combines a root indicating singularity and an inflection signalling plurality. What is worth noting is that the contradiction is found objectionable, by some authors, only as a plural form of the numeral, but not as a form of the indefinite pronoun (or article); presumably, there is a logical conflict only when the focus is on numericalness, but not when reference is to some subset of a class containing more than one member. Broadly speaking, Bulgarianists seem to fall into one of two groups with regard to their treatment of the form *edni* – the first make a passing reference to *edni*, pointing out that the numeral *edin* is exceptional[12] in having a form for the plural (Andrejčin 1942: 346 and 1978: 281), (Stojanov 1964: 266), (Andrejčin, Popov, Stojanov 1977: 164), (Gramatika 1983: 180), (Pašov 1989: 80), (Bojadžiev, Kucarov, Penčev 1998: 329), (Kucarov 2007: 76); the second group, (Maslov 1981: 179), (Scatton 1983: 168), (Hauge 1999: 75), (Nicolova 2017: 194) take the view that "*Edni* can be accepted as a numeral only when combined with pluralia tantum nouns, denoting countable objects consisting of two parts" (Nicolova, ibid.); otherwise, "when used with other types of nouns the form *edni* will no longer be a numeral, but an indefinite pronoun or an indefinite article" (Maslov 1982: 367). Nicolova has included Maslov's *edni* čorapi in a sentence of her own:

(7) Tja   vze   samo   *edni*   *čorapi*.

     She   took   only   one-PL   socks

     'She took only one pair of socks.'

This type of analysis has some interesting consequences. Consider the following pair of sentences:

(8) Kupih   *si*   edni   čorapi.

     Bought   me-Dat.   one-PL   socks

     'I bought myself a pair of socks.'

_____

[12] This small group of exceptions also includes the numerals for 1000, 1 000 000, 1 000 000 000 etc. (Andrejčin 1942:346), (Kucarov 2007: 76). For some distinctions concerning 1000 see (Andrejčin 1942:354) and (Pašov 1978: 395).

(9) Kupih *na decata* edni čorapi, no te ne haresaha cveta.

Bought to the children one-PL socks but they not like the colour.

'I bought some socks for my children but they did not like the colour.'

The use of *some* in the English translation seems to lend support to the type of analysis suggested by Maslov and his followers – there is no indication of the exact number of pairs of socks that the father bought for his children, so indefiniteness has set in. At the same time, however, there is no doubt that the form *edni* indicates plurality. The reference is to *one particular* instance of buying socks (*plural*). Note that the interpretation of (7) as referring to a single pair of socks is reinforced by *samo* 'only'. Linguists who are concerned about the internal contradictions contained in the form *edni* should be reminded that this is not a unique case; another obvious example are the secondary imperfectives in Bulgarian, which contain a perfectivizing prefix and an imperfectivizing suffix, e.g. *iz*-pi-*va*-m 'be drinking up – Pres.1p.sg.'.

As was already mentioned, formal differentiation of *edin* as **a numeral**, **an indefinite pronoun** or **an indefinite article** is not possible due to total paradigmatic homonymy. The standard procedure in such cases is to look for distinctive characteristics elsewhere, primarily in syntax. Position and function are not always distinctive, at least not in traditional terms, because, when used as dependents, all three are said to function as preposed adjectives. If we introduce a more discriminating analysis, and draw a distinction between determinatives and premodifiers, all three once again will fall into one and the same class, that of determinatives. It is only when *edin* is used independently, that its status seems to be narrowed down to a choice between a numeral and indefinite pronoun, as these two can also be nominal. What complicates matters even further is that PoS transpositions are not necessarily linked to syntactic functions. In many cases 'an X is not converted to a Y', but rather 'an X is used as a Y'[13]. So the cardinal numeral *edin* is said "to be used as" or "to function as" an indefinite pronoun in contexts such as the following:

(10) Edin den kučeto lipsa. (Gramatika 1983: 204)

One day the dog vanished.

(11) Edna ciganka mu kazala. (Kucarov 2007: 99)

One gypsy woman him-DAT. told.

'A gypsy woman told him (once).'

Kucarov (2011: 57) also points out that "*edin* often functions as an indefinite pronoun or an indefinite article, e.g. ***Edin čovek otvori vratata***, 'A (*Lit.* One) man

---

[13] For a more extensive discussion of this issue, see (Huddleston 1984: 94–96).

opened the door', and ***Edna** pisatelka nikoga ne bi kazala takova nešto,* 'A (*Lit.* One) woman-writer would never say such a thing'".[14] We need to elaborate on a few key points regarding the role of syntax in the PoS identification of *edin*. One line of argumentation, which seems more logical, is to say that *edin* cannot have the status of an article when used independently, because an article always needs a nominal host to specify. The alternative line of argumentation is to claim that in such cases there is an implicit host, so the possibility of *edin* being an article, a fused Det. + N, should not be discounted. Consider the implicit host *hora* 'people' in the following example:

(12) Dojdoha edni   (hora)   "za malko"   i   mi   zagubiha tri   časa.

     Came   one-PL (people) "for a moment" and   me-DAT   wasted   three   hours

     'Some folks popped in "for a moment" and wasted three hours of my time.'

Note that in this example *edni* is not a pro-word standing for some antecedent. Note also that reference resolution is easy when the implicit host is a general-human participant; moreover, there are several clues in the context. More traditionally-minded linguists, however, are unlikely to accept that an article can be used independently and represent a fused substantive. Instead, the articles, as part of the larger class of the determiners, are treated as dependents by definition, while the independently functioning elements are pronouns. Thus *some* is a determiner in (13), but an indefinite pronoun in (14):

(13)   Some rolls have been eaten.   [determiner][15]

(14)   Some (of the rolls) have been eaten.   [indef. pronoun] (Quirk et al. 1985: 383)

---

[14] Judging from the examples, Kucarov seems to differentiate the indefinite pronouns from the indefinite article in terms of the opposition *specific vs. generic.* Note that specific reference here allows for pronominal substitution of *edin* by the indefinite pronoun *njakoj* (N) or *njakakǎv* (Adj.) – ***Njakakǎv*** čovek otvori vratata, but generic reference does not – ******Njakakva** pisatelka ne bi kazala takova nešto.* This is only to be expected with nouns in the singular because in a generic context the quantifier has to be universal, not existential – Compare: **Some woman- writer would never say .../No woman-writer would ever say such a thing.* Note, however, that the familiar equivalence *not -some = all-not* gives us the fully acceptable ***Edva li njakoja** pisatelka bi kazala* **njakoga** *takova nešto,* 'It is highly unlikely that X would ever say Y'. Note also, that the Bulgarian *edin* parallels the special faculty of the English indefinite article *a/an* to be used in certain (not all!) generic contexts.

[15] The question which remains unanswered is what exactly is the PoS assignment of *some* in this case. As was pointed out earlier, strictly speaking the term *determiner* is not a PoS description but is used to designate a functional/syntactic megacategory, which includes the articles, various pronouns and the negative particle *no*. Quirk et al. (1985: 256) have labelled *some* 'an assertive determiner', which leaves them open to the criticism of inconsistency in that *determiner* is used both as an umbrella term and as a designation for a subcategory. Dušková (1997: 43) is of the opinion that the unstressed *some* should be included in the article system of English.

Another syntactic test, besides checking the ability of an item to function independently, is based on distinctive collocations. In English, for example, the use of *one* with the definite article is treated as a sign of substantivity; whether this substantivity results in a PoS recategorization is a separate issue. In Bulgarian the use of the suffixal definite article on *edin* present us with some interesting problems. Presumably the use of the definite article should eliminate from the list of possible PoS choices the two indefinites, i.e. the indefinite pronoun[16] and the indefinite article, leaving us with the numeral as the only choice. In one type of context, just as in English, *one/edin* is perceived as definite because it represents one member in a two-member set, typically *edinijat-drugijat* '(the) one – the other':

(15)   *Ednata*   buza   na   deteto   beše   červena.

       One.DEF-F.   cheek   of   the child   was   red

       'One of the child's cheeks was red.'

Note that each member in a correlative pair is definite in one sense, by virtue of representing one side in a binary contrast, but it is still indefinite in another, by not specifying which of the two sides it represents. The use of the definite article with such correlatives is quite varied. The article is omitted in a more general context such as *ot edna strana ... – ot druga strana*, 'on (the) one hand – on the other hand'[17] , but is non-omissible in *Ednata strana obvinjava drugata v korupcija*, 'The one side accuses the other of corruption'. Another interesting case can be illustrated by the following example, *Tja go celuna po buzata* (= *po ednata buza*), 'She kissed him on the cheek', where the use of the definite article obviously does not suggest that the recipient has one cheek only. What has not been said so far, and has largely been overlooked or ignored by Bulgarianists (except for Hauge 1999:51), is that *edin* can also be categorized as a **reciprocal pronoun** when paired with *drug* 'another'. The situation is not very different from that in English, where the pair can be used both non-reciprocally and reciprocally:

(15)   We overtook *one* car after *another*. [nonreciprocal] (Quirk et al. 1985: 387)

(16)   Nie izprevarvahme kolite *edna* sled *druga*, dokato nakraja ni sprja KAT.

       'We overtook one car after another until we were stopped by the traffic police.'

---

[16] Some of the indefinite pronouns, denoting indefinite quantity or number, can be articled in anaphoric or cataphoric use – *njakolko – njakolko**to**, nekolcina – nekolcinata* (for more: Nicolova 1983:36), but not the one indicating identity – *njakoj – *njakoj**to*. Compare with English: *a few – the few*, but *someone – *the someone*.

[17] Our search in the Corpus of Contemporary American English produced 1488 occurrences of this expression without the article as opposed to 5420 articled ones.

Perhaps a good way to illustrate reciprocity is by citing three lines from a well-known nursery song about the two little hands that have to wash one another to achieve the best cleaning effect:

(17)   te   se   mijat   naj-dobre
       they   REFL.   wash   best
       ednata   mie   *drugata*   [reciprocal in context]
       one   the   washes   other.the
       i   dve**te** – lice**to**.
       and   two.the   – face.the
       'They wash each other best
         and together they wash the face.'

It may be asking too much from a nursery song to be very precise on reciprocity – in this case, partly due to the reflexive verb, we assume that the action takes place in both directions. The problem, to the extent that there is one, comes from the fact that on the one hand in instructions to young children the tasks need to be segmented into stages and that the situation requires use of the definite article with reference to body parts; on the other hand, if we are to achieve reciprocity, we need a reflexive verb in the plural + the unarticled forms, e.g. *mijat se edna druga*.

The discussion above has shown that some syntactic distinctions which are valid for the English *one* are also valid for the Bulgarian *edin*: independent use rules out determiner/article status[18] and collocation (suffixal in Bulgarian) with the definite article rules out the two indefinites (article and pronoun)[19]. Bulgarian and English are also similar in that the determinatives precede the premodifiers , e.g. *edna mnogo seriozna greška*, 'one very serious mistake'. Our interest, however, is not centered so much on the distinction between determinatives and modifiers, but on the differentiation between three subclasses within the determinatives – *edin* as a numeral, an indefinite pronoun or an indefinite article. In English, the numeral *one* may be "a slightly emphatic equivalent of the indefinite article", e.g. *a mile or two = one or two miles* (Quirk et al. 1985: 273–274); when *one* functions as a substitute form, the difference between the numeral and the pronoun is also one of stress – the numeral being stressed and the pronoun – unstressed (Quirk et al. 1985: 869); the identification of the indefinite article is unproblematic, because it is a distinct form (*a* or *an*). In Bulgarian stress definitely plays a role, but the distinctions do not seem to be all that clear-cut. More on this will be said below. Our final point on the

---

[18] However, in H&P's theory "the determinative *one*, like cardinal numerals in general, can occur as a fused head" (H&P 2002: 1513).

[19] Just a reminder of a point made earlier: *Toj počti ne čuva s ednoto uho*, 'He is nearly deaf in one ear', does not specify which of the two ears is affected.

treatment of *one* in English has to do with the distinction between polysemy and homonymy. Reference to three major modern English grammars shows that the authors are all keen to make a clear distinction between the various manifestations of *one* (Quirk et al. 1985:386; Longman Grammar 1999:71; H&P 2002:1513). Quirk et al. seem to be more inclined to treat the different functions of the "versatile word" *one* as a case of polysemy, without explicitly saying so; the other grammars distinguish between two (LG) or three homonyms (H&P).

§ 1.3. Review of opinions on the status and uses of *edin*

A brief look at the References will show that *edin* is mostly discussed in connection with the category **definiteness/indefiniteness (D/I)**. Some surveys of this category are more historical (Pǎrvev 1975) and (Kucarov 2007), the first of which makes only a passing reference to *edin* (ibid., p.70), while the second is much more up to date, strikes a good balance between objective presentation of the views of various authors and Kucarov's own running commentary, and most importantly for us, devotes several pages on the treatment of *edin*. Many of the other references are valuable because they are not general D/I discussions, but are focused entirely on *edin*. Perhaps we should single out (Stankov 1995) as one of the most extensive discussions, but even very short papers, like (Hauge 1981/1983), may represent important contributions. Our review will start with a presentation of some minority views; the rest will be devoted entirely to the differentiation between numeral, indefinite pronoun and indefinite article.

A good point of departure for this review of opinions is a quotation from (Jespersen [1924]1965: 113), stating a well-known fact:

> Whenever an indefinite article is developed, it seems always to be an unemphatic form of the numeral *one*.

The origins of the indefinite article may be undisputed, but the question whether the numeral *edin* has developed into a fully-fledged indefinite article is a matter of debate. What is very much a single voice in this debate is (Šamraj 1989:87), whose only comment on *edin* in this book is that "it is a lexical means for expressing the meaning of limitedness". Unlike this brief comment, contained in a footnote, an earlier publication, (Šamraj 1987:157), has a whole subsection (§ 1.1.2) devoted to *edin*. Limitedness is discussed in some detail, but the grammatical status of *edin* remains unspecified – usually the appositional categorization is "the **form** *edin*" and on one occasion (ibid., 160) – Jespersen's "the unemphatic numeral" *edin*.

Another minority view, this time advanced by Georgiev ([1967] 1978 and 1993), is that *edin* is **an indefinite particle** when included in a triangular relationship with the definite article and the zero article. The very inclusion of *edin* in this triad would

normally suggest that it should be treated as an article, and it seems that Georgiev's position has shifted somewhat in this direction from his earlier publication in1967 to that in 1993. (Georgiev 1967) is important in that it is one of very few proper argumentative discussions on the status of *edin*. From the very beginning, he points out that the numeral *edin* (ѥдьнъ – ѥдинъ) was developing new meanings, besides its quantitative one, already in Old Bulgarian. As a result of this development Modern Bulgarian has several homonyms, which need to be distinguished. Georgiev (1967) claims that these have the status of an indefinite particle (which has not acquired all the characteristics of an indefinite article), an indefinite pronoun and a numeral. As might be expected there are lists of criteria distinguishing each homonym from the rest. What is missing, however, is a justification for treating *edin* as a particle in the first place. Judging by the reference to (Andrejčin 1942: 140), it is quite obvious that (Georgiev [1967] 1978: 397) has adopted Andrejčin's position without realizing its vulnerability. One need not refer to (Gilin 1982) to see something that should be patent to anybody – the term *particle* is used rather indiscriminately to free forms, i.e. words belonging to a particular PoS category, to elements showing various degrees of adhesion to a host word[20], and even to morphemes, which may be word-formative or form-formative (Andrejčin 1942: 140, Gramatika 1983: 473, Nicolova 2017: 666–667). Particles, in the Bulgarian tradition, which is very different from that of say English grammars, constitute an extremely heterogeneous class. The following quotation is indicative of some very serious problems:

> Particles are very difficult to define and to distinguish from other word classes, especially interjections and adverbs and most often the distinction is made intuitively, without any explicit criteria. (Nicolova 2017: 661)

The only formal criterion Bulgarianists seem to agree on is that particles are invariable. But so are prepositions, which is why some English grammarians, e.g. (Quirk et al. 1985: 1150)[21], divide the particles into prepositional and adverbial. As far as Georgiev's position is concerned, it cannot be accepted because morphologically *edin* is variable, and syntactically it functions as a determinative. However, many points which are part of Georgiev's (1967) argumentation for not treating *edin* as an article have become central to the subsequent debate.

---

[20] Starting with morpheme-like comparative and superlative proclitics *po-* and *naj-* in Bulgarian, which do not allow insertion, and moving to the relatively freer postfixes in the English "phrasal verbs" which allow insertion, e.g. 'They *brought* them *up* as Christians'. Note that the presence or absence of hyphenation in Bulgarian does not reflect differences in cohesion but the systemic/grammatical nature of *po-* and *naj-* with adjectives, as opposed to the more restricted occurrence with other parts of speech: *po-visok* 'taller', *po muzikant* ' better musician'.

[21] There are some partial similarities between the Bulgarian *particles* and the so called *inserts* (Longman Grammar 1999: 1082).

Georgiev follows standard procedures to check whether grammaticalization has taken place: he checks whether *edin* has been integrated in a system of formal oppositions, and whether its use as part of these oppositions has become obligatory. As usual in triangular oppositions, *edin* is contrasted to the other two members – the zero article and the definite article. *Edin* is shown to be interchangeable with the zero article in some syntactic functions but not in others; moreover, there are additional factors involved, affecting the presence or absence of *edin* (Georgiev [1967] 1978: 400–1). Interchangeability with the zero article essentially means that in some of the contexts *edin* is nonobligatory, which leads Georgiev, and many other authors, to conclude that the process of grammaticalization has not run its full course. Quite predictably, the contrast of *edin* with the definite article shows that, apart from in some generic contexts, substitution of one for the other brings about a semantic change. We would also like to consider Georgiev's attempt to distinguish "the particle" *edin* from the homonymous indefinite pronoun. This is by no means an easy distinction to make and the attempt is not very successful. First, the indefinite pronoun is said to express "lexical indefiniteness", while the particle expresses "syntactico-communicative indefiniteness", the latter being more abstract (Georgiev [1967]1978: 407]. It is true that we expect the meaning to be more abstract when *edin* functions as an indefinite article, but in practice semantically-based distinctions can be very elusive. What is expected to help out in this situation is a lexical substitution test, which involves the replacement of *edin* with the typical indefinite pronoun *njakoj* 'someone', *njakakắv* 'some (kind of)'. The possibility for *edin* to be successfully replaced by *njakoj* is taken as an indicator that the lexical meaning of indefiniteness has not been weakened, hence *edin* should be treated as an indefinite pronoun (Georgiev[1967]1978: 406) – *Gledaše go **edno** (njakakvo) oko, goljamo, prepắlneno ot mắka,*'A (*Some) big eye, full of sadness was looking at him …'. We consider this substitution significant, unlike Georgiev's other tests for distinguishing the "particle *edin*" from the indefinite pronoun *edin* (ibid., 1978: 407)[22]. We need to expand the discussion a bit, despite restrictions on space. Perhaps, what should be noted first is that, if we broaden the context of the example above, the substitution of *edno* for *njakakvo* becomes very problematic. Here is the original text from Yovkov's story *Drugoselec*[23] and the corresponding English translation:

---

[22] Surely, we cannot take seriously a test, the first and most important one, that states that *edin* is an indefinite pronoun because it cannot be followed by articled modifiers or an articled head-noun. As is well-known, Bulgarian is peculiar in having the so called affix-hopping, so that the definite article is moved to the front-most position in the NP, unless it is a modifying adverb – *mojat dobắr prijatel*, 'my.the good friend', *mojata mnogo stara kola,* 'my.the very old car', *mnogo starata mi kola,*'(Lit.) very old.the to me car'.

[23] The English title of this story is *Stranger*.

(18)	Toj klekna do padnalija kon. Posle sedna, vze glavata mu i ja turi na kolenete si.

Gledaše go **edno** oko, prepálneno s máka i vátre v nego sveteha láčite na zvezdite."
(Yovkov 1956, v. 3, 395)

"[…] He sat down, took the horse's head and laid it on his knee. **A** big eye, full of pain looked at him, and in it the light of the stars was reflected." (Yovkov 1965: 40)

The scene describes a specific event and the referent (the horse) is fully recognizable to its owner. A much more appropriate context which would normally allow substitution of *edin* by *nja*-pronouns often involves some change, resulting in reduced recognizability or total unrecognizability. Consider the following example:

(19)	*Pred men stoeše edna/njakakva pálna žena, kojato njamaše ništo obšto s momičeto, koeto bjah običal.* 'In front of me stood a (Lit. one/some kind of) stout woman who had nothing in common with the girl I used to love'.

The context that is more revealing is not the one where substitutability is possible, as in (20) below, but rather, where it is not, as in (21). Someone standing by my kitchen window may observe that:

(20)	*Edna/njakakva kotka se peče na slánce várhu pokriva na kolata ti.* 'A/Some cat is sunbathing on the roof of your car.'

(21)	*Njakoj/*Edin čovek maj se e opitval da razbie ključalkata.* 'It seems someone has been tempering with the lock'

First note that in (20), where we have direct visual evidence[24], both *edna* and *njakakva* are acceptable – specific reference may be typical of *edin*, but it does not preclude *njakakav*. However, in (21), where the evidence is inferential, only *njakoj* is acceptable. So if we take the opposition between *edin* and *njakakáv/njakoj* to be in terms of specific vs. nonspecific, *njakakav* is the unmarked member of a privative opposition. This also comes to show that the indefiniteness of *edin* has been weakened when compared to that of *njakakáv*, i.e. inferential evidence requires the stronger indefinite form. Note also that *njakoj* is far less common than *njakakáv* with specific reference, though not entirely impossible[25]:

---

[24] Note that second hand information, which in Bulgarian is expressed by special non-witness verbal forms, is treated as direct evidence in this case: *Na pokriva na kolata imalo edna/ njakakva kotka.*

[25] Ro Hauge (1981: 115) claims that "the attributive njakoj/njakoja/njakoe" cannot be used to express specific indefiniteness. However, the Bulgarian National Corpus provides examples: E.g., *Istinski monah li e tozi pãt ili pak njakoj mošenik?,* 'Is this a real monk or once again some kind of imposter?

(22)   *Vidjah njakoj (njakakâv čovek) da vliza v kâštata i se obadih na policijata.* 'I saw
       someone/some man enter the house and I called the police.'

The comparison of *edin* with the indefinite pronoun *njakoj/njakakâv* is interesting
in more than one way. So far the logic of the usual argumentation has been that
intersubstitutability of the two shows that *edin* should be treated as an indefinite
pronoun. What we have argued is that the indefiniteness has been weakened and
that there is a connection between *edin* and visuality. In what follows we shall make
a connection between visuality and intensification.

§ 1.3.1. Intensification, discreteness, physicalism and visuality

Stankov (1995: 126–129) distinguishes between two types of intensifying
function of *edin* – (1) with concrete nouns, and (2) with abstract nouns. We shall
consider each one in turn.

Several authors receive due credit for their contribution to the discussion of
intensification – (Nicolova 1978: 182), (Maslov 1981: 163; 1982: 171) and (Stamenov
1987: 430–431; 2000: 73–76). Stamenov deals with the intensifying function of *edin*
quite extensively, so let us consider briefly some of his main points. First he picks up
Maslov's idea (1981: 163) "that the indefinite article *edin* can attribute exclusiveness
to the host noun", which has become known as the "eminent use", and elaborates on
it in a pragmatic vein, pointing out that besides the positive connotation of excellence
and exclusivity, the interpretation of some utterances could be ironic. Consider the
following example, which is a modification of one of Stamenov's examples:

(23)   A   v   stajata   na   sina   mi,   edna čistota,   edin   red –
       And   in   the room   of   son   Poss.   one   cleanliness one   tidiness –
       edva   možeš   da   stigneš   do   prozoreca.
       hardly can-2P   to   reach-2P.   to   the window
       'And in my son's room it's so clean and tidy – you can hardly get to the window.'

Stamenov introduces the term **ironic-eminent** for this kind of use. The focus is
similarly on the negative connotations of *edin* when it is contrasted to the zero article
in predicative use. Note, by the way, that this type of opposition is an acknowledgement
that *edin* is treated as an article. The battery of examples includes minimal pairs of
kernel SVC_s sentences such as *Ivan e učitel/glupak,* 'Ivan is a teacher/a fool' and
ones with *edin* added – *Ivan e edin učitel/glupak,* 'He is not much of a teacher'.
Crucially, the interpretation of the latter sentences depends on the intonation, which
of course is a well-recognized factor in ironic statements. As has been pointed out by
Nicolova (1978: 182), and many others, the negative connotation is due to a specific
intonation pattern; another factor which is obvious from some of the examples, but

has not been sufficiently recognized is the role of various particles (here they are again!), which, small as they are, can radically change the meaning:

(24) *Toj* **påk** *e edin mošenik* (ne može nikogo da izlåže). Stamenov 2000: 73)

He hardly is one cheat (he can't take anybody in)

'He is hardly a cheat – he cannot take anybody in.'

Similar reversal of meaning is observed in English when we add the idiomatic expression *my foot*, as in *Your prices are the best in town, my foot.* Consider also the negative connotation imparted by the interjection *i* in Bulgarian:

(25) *I* toj e *edin učitel.* 'He is not much of a teacher.'

One word that has caught Stamenov's attention is *samo* 'only', and as is common in discussions related to pragmatics, *samo* is examined in the context of scalarity. Thus, *Toj e samo edin učitel* ,'He is only a teacher', presupposes some hierarchy of professions in which the teaching profession occupies a relatively low rank (Stamenov 2000: 75). We shall try to stay focused on *edin* without going too much into semantic subtleties – what should be clear from this last example is that *edin* besides its intensifying function, which is less obvious in some cases, also performs a classifying function – it assigns the subject-referent to the class of teachers, which is typical for articles. To conclude this subsection, let us ask the most fundamental question: How can we account for the intensifying (expressive) effect of *edin* when used with concrete NPs functioning as subject complements? On the whole the generally accepted position is that predicative expressions are ascriptive[26], i.e. the communicative purpose is attributive rather than referential; it is not accidental therefore that nouns alternate with adjectives in this position. The predicative default then is one of non-salient referentiality. Bulgarian seems to behave perfectly in that predicatively used NPs take the zero article. What is more, Bulgarian disallows referentiality in a neutral ascriptive context, such as (26), but is flexible enough to remove the restriction when this becomes necessary, as is the case with a postmodifying restrictive clause [as in (27)]:

(26) *Stojan Grigorov e (*edin) učitel.* 'Stojan Georgiev is (*one) a teacher.'

(27) *Stojan Georgiev e edin učitel, kojto na vremeto mi davaše častni uroci.*

'Stojan Georgiev is a teacher who used to give me private lessons.[27]'

Sentence (27) is marked both formally and semantically in relation to (26). Basically what we have in this case is foregrounding of referentiality in a predicative context,

---

[26] We shall not discuss the equative at this point.

[27] The two examples are slightly modified versions of the ones given by (Stamenov 2000: 71.). For similar distinctions in English, see also (H&P 2002: 383).

where it is normally backgrounded. We believe therefore that there is a correlation between the foregounding of referentiality and the intensifying effect of *edin* in certain contexts. The precise mechanism for this type of foregrounding will be explained below. The contexts can be varied – some are explicitly evaluative, e.g. *Toj e glupav/glupak/edin glupak*, 'He is foolish/*lit.* fool/*lit.* one fool', others depend more on the broader context and the intonation, as has already been explained (e.g., *Toj e edin učitel ... čudo* (Stamenov 2000: 79) – 'He is the kind of teacher who works miracles'). The introduction of *edin* may be linked to exclusivity, when the noun-predicative is unattended by premodifiers (compare the emphatic forms of the indefinite article in English – *He is a* [ei] *man*!), or it may be emotionally neutral or otherwise when premodifiers are present – *Toj e edno obiknoveno momče*, 'He is just an ordinary boy', or *Toj e edno tǎpo kopele*, 'He is a stupid son of a bitch'. Ascriptive predicative complements behave as third-order entities, which in the words of J. Lyons (1977: 445), "are unobservable" (unlike first-order and second-order entities), and they are "such that 'true', rather than 'real' is more naturally predicated of them". Thinking of the intensifying function of *edin*, we believe that expressivity is typically associated with what is real and observable, rather than otherwise. When functioning as an article, *edin* is basically selectional[28], and the intensification is achieved either by selecting an individual that is very prominent within the class/set to which he/she/it belongs, or by selecting an individual that is the result of some kind of partitioning – (1) qualitative: due to modification of the head noun or (2) quantitative: due to partitioning of a mass noun. The visualization of a scene is enhanced not only by adding modifiers to the head noun, but also by deictic adverbs, as in this mock conversation between Winnie-the-Pooh and Piglet:

(28)   Mečo Puh: – *Prasčo, kakvo praviš*?   Pooh: 'Piglet, what are doing?'

(29)   Prasčo: – *Ami ništo,   Mečo, jam   **tuka**   edni   portokalovi korički.*
                Well nothing Pooh eat-1P **here**   one-PL   orange   peelings
       Piglet: 'Nothing much, Pooh, I'm just **here** eating **these**   orange   peelings.'

(http://forum.muzikant.org/topic/29955-%D0%B2%D0%B8%D1%86%D0%BE%D0%B2%D0%B5-%D0%B7%D0%B0%D0%BC%D1%83%D0%B7%D0%B8%D0%BA%D0%B0%D0%BD%D1%82%D0%B8/page-117)

---

[28] Selection presupposes that the head noun denotes a set consisting of at least two members, which should preclude the use of *edin* with nouns having unique reference. However, as is well-known, there are a number of cases, where *edin* does occur with proper names. Some are the result of semantic shifts, i.e. recategorization, e.g. from person to people sharing his/her name, where *edin* is a numeral rather than an article; others are cases of exemplification, e.g. *edin Vapcarov* in a conversation about talented Bulgarian poets who have been killed.

It should be said that there are native speakers of Bulgarian, who, if asked over the phone what they were doing, would not use *tuka* in their response. Some of my respondents said that they would not use a modifier, instead they "would simply say": *Jam portokal*, 'I am eating an orange', and when pressed to use a modifier, they prefer to use the indefinite pronoun *njakakắv* – *Jam njakakva tvắrda pắržola*, 'I am eating some tough steak'. Both *edin* and *njakakắv* introduce an entity, and the combination of a specifier and modifier brings out the physicality of the referent; in addition, *njakakắv* also has a pejorative connotation[29].

After dealing with the intensifying function of *edin* with concrete nouns, we shall briefly look at combinations with abstract nouns. Stankov (1995:128) claims that in some cases where *edin* and *njakakắv* are omissible and are used as intensifiers, they should be considered indefinite pronouns and not indefinite articles. First, it is important that we keep the omissibility criterion apart from the semantics. Given that grammatical categories are obligatorily expressed, omissibility will always be considered a strong argument against the treatment of *edin* as an article. Looking at the semantic aspect of *edin*, Stankov is keen to emphasize the indication of indefiniteness. Consider his example:

(30) *Njakakvo   neobjasnimo vắlnenie   izpắlvaše sắrceto   j.*
      Some kind of inexplicable excitement   filled   the heart   her
      'Some inexplicable excitement filled her heart.'

In Stankov's example the indefiniteness expressed by *njakakvo* is further reinforced by the adjective *neobjasnimo*. But we can easily provide an example where indefiniteness is not prominent at all:

(31) *Edno sắvsem   objasnimo čuvstvo na gordost ispắlni sắrceto   j.*
      One   thoroughly explicable sense   of pride   filled   the heart   her
      'A thoroughly understandable sense of pride filled her heart.'

The function of *njakakvo* in (30) and *edno* in (31) are identical – they flesh out a feeling, an abstract concept, and in a way make it more tangible. We fully agree with Burov's analysis of Stankov's example when he points out that that *edin* in this case "has a specifying function" and that "the abstract continuum can be specified as an event" (Burov 2004:363).

---

[29] Note that while *njakakắv* often expresses pejorativeness, that connotation is context sensitive. Consider: *Šte ti zvắnna po-kắsno, če v momenta gledam njakakắv/edin mnogo interesen film. Žalko če izpusnah načaloto.* 'I'll call back later, O.K? I am watching some very interesting film right now. Pity, I missed the beginning.'

§ 1.3.2. The grammaticalization of edin – from numeral to indefinite article

On the whole, synthetically expressed grammatical categories receive automatic recognition, while analytically expressed ones are subjected to further scrutiny and have to prove their grammatical credentials. Modern Bulgarian has *mixed system determination*, a term which we have borrowed from (Lyons 2003: 77), but which will be employed here in a rather different way. Lyons uses the term to describe languages which "have both a bound definite article and a free-form one; in most cases the two are complementary to each other". In other words, what Lyons has in mind are alternative ways of expressing a **sub**-category, that of the definite article; in contrast, we shall operate with the term *mixed system categories*, in which some subcategories are expressed synthetically and others – analytically. The tense system of Bulgarian is a good example, with some synthetic tense forms and an analytical future tense. As is well-known, whether a given heterogeneous category will be described as two-member or three-member depends on the assessment of function words (grammatical vs. lexical)[30] and often on how much weight is given to various competing factors. If we assume that the Bulgarian D/I category makes a three-way distinction between a suffixed definite article, a zero and an indefinite article (*edin*), it is only the last one that has its grammatical credentials contested. Comparisons of Bulgarian with languages such as German and French have shown that the process of grammaticalization of the singular numeral to indefinite article is not as advanced as in the other two languages. The contrasts between the D/I members seem to be more obvious in some contexts, and less so in others. The impression that the contrasts are not as systematic as they should be, that they are too context-dependent, and most importantly, the total paradigmatic homonymy should account for the considerable diversity of opinions among Bulgarianists.

We shall attempt a brief summary of these opinions, being fully aware of the risks of some misrepresentation in cases where the author's position has not been explicitly stated. Due care is taken to be as precise as possible by including quotations and qualifications. Note that except for (1) below, all page reference are to non-numeral categories.

1. **Numeral only** (stressed or unstressed): "**lexical** means for expressing limitedness" (Šamraj 1989: 87) and "unemphatic numeral" (Šamraj 1987: 160).

2. **Numeral and indefinite pronoun**: (Andrejčin 1942: 368; 1978: 299) – *only dependent use of IP; (Stojanov 1964: 290) – "the numeral *edin* is used as IP"; (Stojanov 1987: 10) – Num. or IP; (Gramatika 1983: 204); (Rå Hauge 1999: 68); (Pašov 1978: 386) – "semantically a numeral, but morphologically a pronoun-adjective, which agrees in gender and number with the host-noun".

---

[30] For example, a reappraisal of the status of *will* has led to a reduction of the simple tenses in English from three to two.

3. **Numeral, indefinite pronoun, particle**: (Georgiev [1967] 1978) – it is also "a special indefinite lexeme, which is functionally diverse and is partially similar to the indefinite article in other languages" (ibid.: 398); (Georgiev 1993: 274–275) – "lexico-morphologically diverse, lacking specialization only as marker of indefinite specification/individualization, fails to qualify as an indefinite article, even though occasionally acquires such status".

4. **Numeral and indefinite article**: (Nicolova 1978: 437) and (Nicolova 1986: 172) – *Edin* is not included among the indefinite pronouns because "the question about the status of *edin* as an article still remains unresolved"; there is no equivocation, however, in (Nicolova 2008: 79) and Nicolova 2017: 123) – "Bulgarian has an indefinite article *edin/edna/edno/edni* ".

5. **Numeral, indefinite pronoun, article**: The authors' commitment to the existence of an indefinite article in Bulgarian varies considerably, which requires some differentiation.

(a) high commitment: (Maslov 1981: 161–3 /Maslov 1982: 169–171) recognizes the existence of an indefinite article, but points out that in contrast to West European languages its use is optional. Kucarov (2007: 453 and 2011: 50) includes the "so called "indefinite article"" in two grammatical oppositions. Penčev (1984: 26) differentiates between $edin_1$, the numeral, and $edin_2$, which is a quantifier that "is not a notional word, but a marker for the category definiteness". Burov (2004: 353) differentiates between specific indefiniteness, expressed by the article *edin*, and non-specific indefiniteness, expressed by the zero article. (Lakova 1995: 20) – "the indefinite pronoun-adjective *edin* when used adnominally has developed into an indefinite article"; also (Lakova 2002: 195); (Stankov & Ivanova 1989: 22), (Stankov 1995: 104 and elsewhere).

(b) tentative commitment: (Ivančev 1957: 516 and 1978: 203) – while some uses are indicative of the appearance of an indefinite article, the process is still not sufficiently comprehensive, which shows that it is still at a rudimentary stage; (Scatton 1983: 168) – "numeral [...] used as IP and perhaps as an indefinite article"; (Koseska-Toszewa 1990: 154); (Bojadžiev, Kucarov, Penčev 1998: 470) and (Kucarov 2007: 451) – "there is no logical justification for the claim that contemporary Bulgarian has developed an indefinite article"[31], the indefinite article's position is still "in the periphery of the functional-semantic field of the category"; (Revzin 1978: 208) – insufficient regularity of usage points to incomplete grammaticalization , hence intermediate status – "pronoun-article".

The list should be extended with two more authors, who may not have made very explicit statements about their stand on the status of *edin*, yet the main thrust

---

[31] On the basis of this statement, Kucarov should be excluded from this group – clearly, he does not find the process of grammaticalization complete. Yet, he suggests a system of oppositions [(def. vs. **indef.**) vs. zero](Kucarov 2007: 453), which is presented as "an alternative variant".

of what they have argued is that in certain types of context *edin* functions as a typical article and is in contrast with the definite article and the zero – (Stamenov [1984]2000, 58–70; and [1985]2000: 71–80), (Guentcheva 1987).

On the whole, the eighties mark a trend towards greater recognition of *edin* as an article. The shift in thinking is reflected in more recent dictionaries, e.g. BTR-2004, but not in vol. 4 of the multivolume RBE (1984), because the guidelines for the latter were laid down in 1966.

Not all of the authors in the list above have found it necessary to justify their PoS categorization of *edin*. Often information has to be gleaned from occasional status indicating appositions[32] or separate PoS differentiations (Stankov 1995: 128). Among the authors who have discussed status issues in greater or lesser detail are: (Georgiev [1967] 1978), (Revzin 1978), (Penčev 1984: 25,75), (Stojanov 1987), (Kucarov 2007: 407–451). We shall take into account the existing contributions, but instead of commenting on each of a number of authors we propose to provide a more systemic and coherent assessment of the process of grammaticalization of *edin* from numeral to article. Both PoS assignment and grammaticalization follow the same well-established procedure of looking for specific features at each of the linguistic levels. The specific model to be followed here is that (Croft 2000: 157), whose grammaticalization processes are of three major types – phonological, morphosyntactic and functional; each of these is further subdivided into paradigmatic and syntagmatic.

Table 2. Grammaticalization processes of *edin* modelled on (Croft 2000: 157)

Phonological

Paradigmatic:	*attrition*: **Yes (partial)** – Loss of stress and some vowel reduction, but no material erosion (no contraction).
Comment:	Following (Jespersen 1965 [1924]:113), loss of stress has been given considerable weight when contrasting the numeral *edin* and the article. See (Penčev 1984:75) and (Revzin 1978:199) among many.
Syntagmatic:	*coalescence*: **No** – Word (free form).
Comment:	It is easy to appreciate the significance of this process when we consider the transformation in Bulgarian of the postposed demonstrative pronoun to a suffixed definite article.

Morphosyntactic:

Paradigmatic:	*obligatorification*: **Yes (partial) – only in certain contexts**.
Comment:	This criterion has assumed crucial importance for the recognition of *edin* as an indefinite article. Omission is unacceptable, for example, in the following sentence:

---

[32] Sometimes they are not PoS appositions at all, e.g. "the word-form (BG. *slovoformata) edin*" (Grozeva 1979: 15).

(32) *Edno   dete   si   ima   nužda   ot   bašta.*
     One   child   DAT   has   need   of   father
     'A child needs a father.'

However, omission is perfectly acceptable in the following example, which is a shorter version of one provided by Kabakčiev (1990: 45):

(33) V   kabineta   mi   me   čaka   (edin)   pacient.
     In   the surgery my   me   wait 3Pers.   (one)   patient.
     'I've got a patient waiting for me in the surgery.'

We are trying to keep the *Comments* in this table as brief as possible; more will be said on grammatical obligatoriness below.

paradigmaticization: open class > closed class > invariant meaning – **Yes**
  Comment: *Edin* is part of a three-member closed set with the definite article and the zero article. Paradigmaticization suggests that the contrast between the members of the set is maintained most of the time and is only occasionally suspended (neutralized); however, the absence of total obligatoriness, comes to suggest that the process has not established sufficiently deep roots everywhere.

Syntagmatic: *rigidification* [word order] – **Yes**

  Comment: The position of *edin* is fixed to that of a determinative – initial position within the NP[33]. Postnominal position is rare and is largely restricted to poems – e.g. *pesnička edna* 'one little song'. There is also certain rigidification within the group of determinatives – *edni moi/*?moi edni prijateli* 'some friends of mine', *edni sedem/*sedem edni godini* 'one-PL. seven years'[34].

  loss of independent syntactic status > morphological fusion > loss – **Qualified No**

Whatever changes have taken place, they are still at the initial stage, i.e. there is no morphological fusion. Typically, numerals, indefinite pronouns and articles

_____

[33] Postnominal position is rare and is largely restricted to poetry.
[34] Note that translating *edni* by *some* will not be correct because *some* tends to be approximative in such cases – *some* (=about) *seven years ago*. Agreement patterns are rather different in the two languages: English disallows a plural when *one* is a dependent, and the singular in such contexts is not all that common either –e.g., *If I could shake off but **one seven years** from these old arms and legs* [enTenTen13]. Besides the plural *edni*, Bulgarian allows a singular neuter *edno*, which is approximative semantically and adverb-like morphosyntactically – e.g. *Sigurno ima **edno dvadeset godini** otkak ne săm hodil na more*, 'It must have been some twenty years since I last went to the seaside'.

function as dependents, but they are sufficiently independent to be treated as words. Note that even in cases where *edin* is obligatory, and consequently is treated as an article (in a prepositional phrase – Stankov 1984:198), omission of the noun may be possible:

(34) A: Hodiš li ošte po selata? 'Do you still go round villages?'

(35) B: Včera bjah   v   edno.   (bjah v *edno selo/*selo*)
      Yesterday was-1P   in   one

The examples which are of greater interest to us, however, are the ones where the cohesion between article and host noun is so strong, that neither can function on its own. Consider the following example:

(36) *Edna nošt* si legnah rano. 'I went to bed early one night.'

Functional

Paradigmatic: *extension of semantic range>loss of function* – **Yes**

> *Comment* Generally speaking grammatical meanings are broader and more abstract than lexical ones. If we consider the path of grammaticalization – numeral>indefinite pronoun>indefinite article, each stage marks greater degree of abstraction: from indication of singularity to indefiniteness and finally to individuality (classification)/property ascription/genericness. As far as the 'loss of function' is concerned, the meaning is definitely not numerical in the example *One night I went to bed early*, but there is often backgrounded numericity that can be easily foregrounded. Consider the following conversation between two witnesses of an ATM robbery and a police inspector:

(37) A: Vidjah *edin* visok mâž   pred   bankomata.
      Saw-1SG   one   tall   man   in front of   the ATM
      'I saw this tall bloke by the ATM.'

(38) B: *Dvama* bjaha – drugijat stoeše na âgâla   na bankata.
      Two (men) were – the other stood at the corner of the bank
      'There were two – the other bloke was standing
      at the corner of the bank.'

B's reaction clearly shows the presence of backgrounded numericity in A's use of *edin*.

202

Syntagmatic: *idiomaticization*: compositional & analyzable > noncompositional & analyzable >unanalyzable – **SOME**

        Comment: Compositionally *edin* is a simple form and moreover, it is not the result of a collapse of some more complex syntactic structure. The extension of the semantic range, noted above, suggests some degree of idiomaticization; when used referentially, to express specific indefiniteness, the original numeric meaning is still transparent; it seems to be less transparent in nonreferential generic use, i.e. in cases where *edin* is equivalent to *any*, not *one*:

(39)   *Edin politik trjabva da znae kak da se dârži na obštestveni mesta.* 'A politician should know how to behave in public'.

This type of transposition, whereby a singular numeral-turned-article develops a generic use, is not uncommon, but what is specific to Bulgarian is that such statements are exclusively modal. In a more general sense, we may look at the various modalizations of *edin* as examples of idiomaticization. Sometimes lexical selections are linked to specific grammatical structures. For example, one fact, which seems to have remained unnoticed, is that the selection of *edin* vs. *njakoj* in *da*-questions distinguishes conducive (bias-encoding) from open (neutral) questions:

(40)   Da me e târsila edna žena s kučence? 'Has a woman with a puppy been looking for me?'

(41)   Njakoj da me e târsil? 'Has anyone been looking for me?'

One final point on modalization. *Edin* is involved in all three types of quantification – unique, existential and universal. Most Bulgarianists mention modality explicitly only in connection with the use of modal predicates in generic statements, as in (39) – *Edin politik **trjabva da znae** kak da se dârži na obštestveni mesta*. But *edin* occurs also in existential statements to express possibility:

(42)   Edna pnevmonija   može da ti   dojde ot ništo.
            One pneumonia   may to you-DAT   come of nothing
            'You can catch pneumonia just like that.'

We shall also argue that the use of *edin* for intensification, or the so called "eminent use", discussed in§1.3.1., should also be treated as modal. The effect in this case is due to a combination of unique quantification and a particular intonation pattern. This is part of a broader understanding of modality which also includes emotional attitudes towards the predication.

Summary of results from Table 2: Yes (3), Yes –Partial (3), No (2).

The processes of grammaticalization are well-developed in certain areas, such as extension of semantic range, rigidification of word order and formation of paradigmatic oppositions; they are only partially developed in two different senses – in terms of degree of maturation and in terms of scope of operation. Maturation is still at a very early stage with regard to phonological attrition (no material erosion) and at some more intermediate stage of idiomatization, with distinct functional specification, yet quite transparent original meaning. Scope of operation concerns the obligatorification of *edin* as an article – the use of *edin* as an indefinite article is obligatory in certain contexts (Revzin 1978: 201–5, Stankov 1984: 198), which are determined by syntactic function, lexical selection and information structure (FSP); as has been pointed out by many, the scope of operation is narrower than in some west European languages, and not only that – in some areas it is not as systematic. Finally, there are two negative answers in Table 2, referring to similar processes on different levels – the first concerns the absence of phonological coalescence between *edin* and the host word, the second – the absence of morphological fusion. Looking at the combination of parameters, **the total picture is one of uneven grammaticalization**.

§ 1.3.3. *Edin* vs. zero article – arguments, some statistics and explanations

In the context of Bulgarian linguistics "uneven grammaticalization" means that when it comes to taking a stand whether Bulgarian has an indefinite article or not, some authors do not feel confident enough to express an opinion, while those who do, focus either on the *yeses* or the *noes* to arrive at opposite conclusions. As Stankov (1995: 87) rightly points out, "the question occupying central position in the debate is about the **facultative vs. nonfacultative** use of the forms *edin*, *edna*, *edno* as part of the NP in certain types of context". Strong support for the recognition of an indefinite article in Bulgarian was expressed as early as 1957 by Ivančev (1957: 516), who specifies the contexts where an indefinite article is obligatory – "where the unarticled form [i.e. the zero – A.S.] is void of meaning and therefore unusable, or where the unarticled form cannot indicate a single indefinite object". Ivančev, however, goes on to say something which is to become a recurrent theme in the argumentation of the "*no* camp": "all sorts of qualifications need to be taken into account, because the phenomenon lacks the necessary all- inclusiveness". Mayer (1988), whose article deals with only one type of generic sentences, notes the following:

> …the infrequent use of *edin* as an indefinite article in non-specific and generic meanings means that the semantic range of the Bulgarian indefinite article is far narrower than that of the English indefinite article. (Mayer 1988: 244)

The narrower range of the Bulgarian *edin*-as-article is a fact recognized by many authors contrasting Bulgarian with English, French and German. At the same time, there seems to be considerable agreement among Bulgarianists on the point that *edin* has become mainly specialized in expressing "specific indefiniteness"[35]. Does this mean that specific indefiniteness is obligatorily expressed by *edin*? The short answer is: 'No'. Stankov (1995: 132) points out that it is often the zero article that "has an affinity for rhematically used nouns introducing a new object on the scene – e.g. *Toj postroi kašta* 'He built a house'", because the meaning in this case is more qualitative (i.e. indicating properties of the class) rather than referential. Similarly, in a contrastive context, the logical stress "underscores the signifying aspect of meaning", not the referential aspect – e.g. *Na dârvoto kacna vrana, a ne gâlâb* 'The bird that perched on the tree was a crow, not a pigeon'. Such contrastive contexts are rather special in that on the one hand the situation involves specific reference, while on the other, the identification of the rhematic participants involves class distinctions. The complexity of this utterance comes from the fact that the communicative intention of the speaker is to make a generic contrast, i.e. between two species, while the sentence itself contains spatial (*na dârvoto*) and temporal (Past tense marking on the verb *kacna*) specification. The reason why *edin* cannot be used in this context is that its primary function is to single out individuals and not to refer to classes; when used generically, *edin* is transposed, and transpositions are contextually conditioned[36]. There are numerous cases where the omission of *edin* from a sentence does not lead to ungrammaticality, which is seen as clear evidence for non-obligatoriness; what Stankov, as well as other proponents of the indefinite article in Bulgarian, have been keen to point out, however, is that *edin* and the zero article are not in free variation. *Edin* is typically referential and mainly used to express specific indefiniteness, while the zero expresses merely "significativeness" (Stankov 1995: 109) and although this presupposes nonreferentiality, the spaciotemporal markers in the context may induce referential (specific) interpretation. The aim is to justify the existence of *edin* and the zero, by assigning functional/semantic territory to each of them, while allowing transpositions in both directions[37]. The same idea is expressed much earlier by Ivančev (1957)1978: 207), who claims that "whenever a name is used without an article, it is essentially abstract, general and indefinite", yet the overall meaning of the sentence is often concrete and pointing to something particular, which "may cast a shadow of particularity over the unarticled rhematic word:

---

[35] A different position is taken by (Penčev 1984:76), who distinguishes between two types of definiteness – "individualizing", expressed by the definite article *–ât,* and "nonindividualizing", expressed by *edin.*

[36] One type of context disallowing generic use of the indefinite article in English and of *edin* in Bulgarian is "when attributing properties which belong to the class or species as a whole: *A tiger is becoming almost extinct." (Quirk et al. 1985: 281–282). "In its generic function *a/an* picks out ANY REPRESENTATIVE MEMBER OF THE CLASS." (ibid.)

[37] For a discussion on directions of substitution see (Stoevsky 2013: 309).

(43) Toj hvârli *kamâk* . – Lit. "He threw stone." → 'He threw a stone.'

(44) Udarih go s željazo. Lit. "Hit him with iron." → 'I hit him with an iron bar.'"

Despite being unarticled, *kamâk* and željazo are construed as referential, which is also helped by the discreteness of the objects. Compare (43) above with (45) below, where the referent is not discrete and the context is ascriptive:

(45) Naj-rannite sečiva sa bili praveni ot *kamâk*. 'The earliest tools were made from stone.'

Note that if we are to insert *edin* before the italicized nouns in (43)-(45) above, the meaning will remain largely unaffected in (43) and (44), while in (45) the meaning will change substantially, suggesting that all tools were made from one particular type of stone (e.g. flint).

The picture that emerges from this part of the discussion on the facultativeness of *edin*-as-article shows that **we need to distinguish three different situations: (1) omission of the article results in ungrammaticality, (2) omission brings about a semantic change, (3) omission is functionally unimportant, i.e. *edin* and the zero are in free variation.** The next important question is this: Given the total distribution of *edin*-as-article, how large is the segment of each of the three groups? To give an accurate answer to this question would require composing an inventory of all contextual factors affecting the selection of *edin*. The next step would be to assess the interaction between the different factors, i.e. competing motivations. And the final step would be to examine the statistics provided by corpus linguistics. A lot has already been done in assessing the role of TAM categories – correlation between tense and referential vs. nonreferential use, correlation between verbal aspectuality and object boundedness (i.e. aspectual harmony[38]), correlation between the use of *edin* and modality in generic statements. Other distinctions which also bear on the use of *edin*, include concrete/abstract, discrete/nondiscrete, singular/plural, lexical deictics. One category which seems not to have received much attention is voice. Our own rather impromptu search of a passive which is common in describing traffic incidents „"aux. + *blâsnat ot* 'knocked down by'" produced some rather surprising statistics. Strictly speaking, the search was aimed at finding out the frequency of *edin* in a context where its use is facultative – e.g. *Beše blâsnat ot (edna) kola* ' (X) was knocked down by a car'. The result is as follows:

---

[38] For more on lexicogramatical harmony and disharmony see Stoevsky 1983.

Table 3. Frequency of use of *edin* in a PP after *blâsnat/a/o/i* (*ot*) 'knocked down by'

Corpus: <u>Bulgarian Web 2012 (bgTenTen12. TreeTagger v2)</u> Search Engine: Sketch Engine Date:10 May 2018				
	Total	Def.	*Edin*	Zero
Aux. + *blâsnat ot* (masc.)	383	25	1	357
Aux. + *blâsnata ot* (fem.)	221	23	1	197
Aux.+ *blâsnato ot* (neut.)	133	3	0	130
Aux. + *blâsnati ot* (pl.)	111	9	0	102
Total	842	60	2 (0,24%)	780

(Note: Aux. → *e/sa/beše/bjaha/e bil(-a,-o)/sa bili/bil(-a,-o)/bili*).

The results in Table 3 convincingly show that even though *edin* may be grammatically acceptable as part of the prepositional phrase, it is hardly ever used to indicate the causer of a traffic incident in this type of passive structure and with this particular verb. To some extent this may seem surprising, given that traffic incidents, unless we are hypothesizing about the risks of one, are typically specific events and *edin*-as-article is said to primarily indicate specific indefiniteness. The 780 occurrences of the zero lend further support to Stankov's observation, mentioned earlier, about the affinity of the zero for the rhematic internal arguments. The traffic scene above may have turned out to be somewhat idiosyncratic, so before making any further comments on the significance of the figures in Table 3, let us consider the additional evidence in Table 4, where *edin* is also facultative and the prepositional phrase once again occupies the end-focus position.

Table 4. Frequency of use of *edin* in a PP after *zapoznahme se(na)*
'We first met at + NP'

Corpus: <u>Bulgarian Web 2012 (bgTenTen12. TreeTagger v2)</u> Search Engine: Sketch Engine Date:10 May 2018				
	Total	Def.	*Edin*	Zero
Zapoznahme se na + NP	69	25	17(24%)	27

E.g. *Zapoznahme se na moreto (def.)/kupon (ø)/edna konferencija.*
    'We first met at the seaside/at a party/at a conference.'

It would be totally unscientific to make any sweeping generalizations on the basis of the data presented in the last two tables, yet there are some conclusions to be made. First, a comparison of Table 3 and Table 4 shows that percentagewise (and purely incidentally!), *edin* is 100 times more common in Table 4, which is partly due to verbal (lexical) licensing, but may also have something to do with the different semantic roles of the prepositional complements. What is of primary importance to us, however, is not so much the fact that lexical selection affects

the use of *edin*, but the fact (most obvious in Table 3) that the presence of *edin*, where it is grammatically facultative, is less than 1%. In many cases therefore, it is misleading to claim, simply on the grounds of acceptability, that *edin* and the zero are intersubstitutable without pointing out the overwhelming preponderance of the zero in usage. Sometimes the contrast between *edin* and zero is one of referentiality vs. nonreferentiality respectively, as in (46) and (47) below, in other cases the zero is nominally nonreferential but is construed as referential due to deictic markers (both grammatical and lexical) in the text, as in (48):

(46) Târsja edin prijatel. 'I am looking for a friend of mine'.

(47) Târsja si prijatel(ka). 'I am looking for a friend.'

(48) Toj se obadi na prijatel. 'He phoned a friend.[39]'

Several important conclusions can be drawn on the basis of (46) – (48) above. First, when we compare the Bulgarian sentences with their English translations, we find that Bulgarian is much more sensitive to the contrast between referentiality and nonreferentiality; by contrast, English uses the indefinite article in all three sentences; note also that 'I am looking for a friend' is ambiguous. Second, the zero is used both nonreferentially, which is predictable, but equally, can be construed referentially with the help of the context. This is significant in two ways – (1) the zero covers a lot of ground, (2) it functions as a default, as unmarked. There seems to be nothing particularly remarkable about that – it is both morphologically and semantically unmarked. What is remarkable is not the morphology, but what looks like a disproportionately large segment of the usage covered by the zero. Usually, the neutralization of privative oppositions is carried out under some fairly restricted conditions. However, the use of the zero in referentially specific contexts (presumably the preserve of *edin*) is widespread. In a discussion on the competition between *edin* and the zero, Nicolova (2017: 151) gives examples of contexts where *edin* is either non-omissible, or is becoming more common than the zero, which is taken as "an indication of **a certain degree of grammaticalization**". This seems to be very much in line with our own conclusions about the rather patchy picture of grammaticalization presented in Table 2. Given that all natural languages are dynamic systems and partial grammaticalizations are universal, one would expect

---

[39] Important insight can be gained about *edin* as a specifier from the pro-drop variant of (48):
    (48[1]) Obadi se na prijatel.
    In the written language (48[1]) is ambiguous. In the spoken language the ambiguity is resolved due to different stress placement:
    (48[2]) O'badi se na prijatel. –'He phoned a friend'.
    (48[3]) Oba'di se na prijatel! – 'Phone a friend!'
    If we insert *edin* in (48[1]) and google *Obadi se na edin prijatel*, all six results turn out to be preterital. By contrast, contestants in a popular TV game show have as one of their options to seek help "Oba'di se na prijatel!", which is non-specific (=*na njakoj prijatel*) and allows them to phone one of three preselected friends.

general linguistics to have developed a standard solution about the status of partially grammaticalized analytical forms, yet practices vary from language to language. Let us consider the argumentation of two Bulgarianists for whom *edin* cannot be denied the status of an indefinite article on the grounds of partial grammaticalization. Nicolova's position is "that the competition between the noun phrases with *edin* and with zero article does not deny the existence of an indefinite article since the competition between two members of a particular category is not at all uncommon, cf. for instance the competition between perfective and imperfective aspect in some cases, or between some tenses [40]"(Nicolova 2017: 151–152). Stankov (1984: 203) insists that "the fact that *edin* has become specialized in expressing only part of the meanings of the category of indefiniteness[41] cannot be considered a substantive argument to deny *edin* the status of an indefinite article. In the uses that it has, *edin* is grammaticalized, i.e. it is void of lexical meaning and expresses relations, forming a semantic opposition with the definite article". Stankov basically reiterates Ivančev's (1957) position, discussed earlier (at the beginning of § 1.3.3). We believe that a lingering numerical meaning of oneness should not be seen as an impediment to recognizing the functioning of *edin* as an indefinite article[42]. There are numerous examples of anaphoricity where an articled NP has as its antecedent an NP introduced by *edin*[43], a fact which legitimizes the article status of *edin*. What has been seen as a problem is not that *edin* has become specialized in expressing only specific indefiniteness, but that it does not do so obligatorily. In contexts where semantically possible, the main reason for suspending the contrast between specific and nonspecific indefiniteness and using the unmarked zero seems to be economy. First, as was already indicated in Table 2, attrition in Bulgarian is only partial – the forms may be unstressed but they remain disyllabic; in English and French they are monosyllabic, and in German all forms of the definite article are monosyllabic, while some indefinites are disyllabic because of case (and, of course, gender) marking. A native speaker of Bulgarian will certainly find the presence of *edin* obtrusive in a sentence such as *V edno sofijsko učilište edna učitelka nakazala edin učenik da stoi v edin âgâl edin čas* ' A teacher in a Sofia school punished a

---

[40] For a good discussion of the suppression of feature contrasts of multi-member categories see (Gerdžikov 1974: 35; 2013: 63; 2013: 107).

[41] Stankov (1984: 203) distinguishes between *general indefiniteness*, expressed by the zero article, from *concrete indefiniteness*, expressed by *edin*. Note the difference in bracketing between Stankov and Kucarov – [(*edin*)$_{con}$: (zero)$_{gen}$]$_{indef}$: (-*ât,-jat; -ta; -to*)$_{def}$], [(def. : indef.)$_{con}$: (zero)$_{noncon}$](Kucarov 2007: 453).

[42] Note that both in English and in Bulgarian the use of the indefinite article is dependent on the countability of the head noun – E.g. *Imaš (*edin)* šokolad na nosa,' You've got chocolate on your nose'; *Kupih i edin* šokolad, 'I bought her a bar of chocolate'.

[43] Consider the following child-parent discourse: *Tate, može li **edin** vâ**pros**?* 'Daddy, can I ask you a question?', *Kazvaj si bârzo vâprosa, če trjabvaše otdavna da si v legloto.* 'Be quick with the question because you should have been in bed long ago.'

student to stand in the corner for an hour'. Note that *edin* can be totally eliminated from that sentence: Ču li za *onazi učitelka v Sofia, kojato nakazala njakakǎv učenik da stoi v ǎgǎla na stajata cjal čas,* 'Did you hear about that teacher in Sofia who punished some student to stand in the corner of the room for a whole hour'. The use of the zero may be due not only to the insufficient attrition of *edin*, but also to the fact that the contrast between specificity and nonspecificity is suppressed and the zero as unmarked member is used in its generic sense to simply indicate indefiniteness, while the indication of specificity is left to the heavily marked Bulgarian verb. This distribution of the information load means that *edin* can become more involved in marking rhematic focus at the level of the sentence (most conspicuously in cases of intensification), rather than necessarily marking specific indefiniteness at the phrase level, even though the two intersect. One issue which we would like to discuss at this point is the claim that when *edin* has specific reference the entity that has been introduced into discourse is identifiable to the speaker but **not to the hearer**.

§ 1.3.4. Discourse-new and hearer-new information

As Chvany (1983: 71; 1996: 128) succinctly puts it, "D/I [definiteness/indefiniteness –A.S.] is closely bound with the information-bearing structure of discourse". What is peculiar though, is that it is not uncommon for authors to ignore the role of discourse and define indefiniteness solely as speaker-new information (Penčev 1984:75, Stankov 1987:412). According to Stankov (ibid.), "with regard to the opposition D/I, indefinite are objects that cannot be identified by one of the two participants in the speech act/ speaker or hearer/, or by both of them simultaneously." A very similar explanation of indefiniteness is given by Hawkins (1991:417), who discusses the indefinite NP in the following sentence:

"(1) I met a professor yesterday.

Even though the entity described by *a professor* may be quite 'definite' for the speaker, in the sense that it exists in his cognitive environment, it does not exist in the mutual cognitive environment shared with the hearer."

So why is it that the distinction discourse-new/discourse-old is eclipsed from the explanations of indefiniteness? The answer seems to be simple – because of implicational relations. The information that is new to the hearer is intended to be such by the speaker, i.e. it is also discourse-new, therefore, reference to discourse is seen as redundant. On the other hand, as has been explained by Ward & Birner (2006:156), "Information that is discourse-old but hearer-new is predicted not to occur, on the grounds that a speaker typically believes that the hearer is paying attention and thus what has been evoked in the discourse is also known to the hearer." Now, note that while hearer-new information implicates discourse-new, the converse is not necessarily true, i.e. it is possible to have discourse-new information which is intended to evoke

hearer-old information. Typically, the hearer-old information will be expressed by an articled NP, yet the use of *edin* is not completely excluded. Thus in a conversation about monuments and ideology the audience may be reminded of the following fact:

(49)   Predpolagam vsički si spomnjate mnogo dobre *edin pametnik*/pametnika na Lenin točno v centâra na Sofia. 'I suppose all of you remember very well a certain monument/the monument of Lenin right in the centre of Sofia.'

Examples such as the one above may not be all that common, but they are important in showing that *edin* is not entirely restricted to introducing hearer-new information; occasionally, *edin* may be used merely to introduce a discourse-new entity, the entity itself being familiar to the hearer. To put it in Strawsonian terms: In the vast majority of cases, *edin* underscores the application of the Principle of the Presumption of Ignorance, i.e. when the information conveyed is presumed to be new to the hearer; far less commonly, e.g. in reminders, *edin* underscores the Principle of the Presumption of Knowledge.[44]

§ 1.3.5. On the POS and syntactic status of remnants

The question about the status of remnants after ellipsis has exercised the minds of many. Given that *edin*-as-article and its host noun will be treated as an analytical way of expressing the D/I category, our special interest will be in the remnants after the heads of analytical forms[45]have been elided. Earlier we discussed a pair of sentences from (Quirk et al.1985), which will be repeated here for convenience:

(50)   Some rolls have been eaten.   [determiner][46]

(51)   Some (of the rolls) have been eaten.   [indef. pronoun] (Quirk et al. 1985: 383)

Note that in this case, in the theory of Quirk et al., the status of *some* has changed after the ellipsis of the parenthesized phrase. We shall refer to such remnants as *class-changing*.

---

[44] Generally speaking, the two principles operate simultaneously (Strawson 1971:76); however, the context may give greater prominence to one or the other.

[45] We shall not get into a discussion of what constitutes an analytical form. Assuming that *edin* can function as an indefinite article, a distinction is being made between synthetically expressed definiteness and analytically expressed specific indefiniteness.

[46] The question which remains unanswered is what exactly is the PoS assignment of *some* in this case. As was pointed out earlier, strictly speaking the term *determiner* is not a PoS description but is used to designate a functional/syntactic megacategory, which includes the articles, various pronouns and the negative particle *no*. Quirk et al. (1985: 256) have labelled *some* 'an assertive determiner', which leaves them open to the criticism of inconsistency in that *determiner* is used both as an umbrella term and as a designation for a subcategory. Duškova (1997: 43) is of the opinion that the unstressed *some* should be included in the article system of English.

Consider now the following example of reduction:

(52)   He asked me if I *had seen his wife*. I answered that I *had* not.

Note that in its function as a propredicate *had* preserves its status of an auxiliary verb. We shall refer to such remnants as *class-preserving*. Ideally, what we would have liked, for the sake of consistency, is identical treatment of remnants from analytical forms, regardless whether they are denominal or deverbal. However, a number of factors get in the way of uniform solutions after ellipsis. The first factor is that often the pro-words are not remnants from analytical forms, but substitutes, as in (53):

(53)   I asked them if they liked school. They said, they did not.

When we consider the substitutes of noun phrases however, we are already dealing with a separate word class, that of pronouns. Another factor, which was mentioned earlier, is that even when articles can be seen as remnants, as in (55) below, the traditional view is that they cannot preserve their status of articles, but should be treated as pronouns:

(54)   A: Da si viždal *edin čuk*? 'Have you seen a hammer anywhere?'

(55)   B: Maj vidjah *edin*, ama kâde beše. 'I think I saw one, but where.'

Not all authors adhere to the traditional view, however – some, such as Payne et al. (see Table 1) will treat *edin* in (55) as a noun, rather than a pronoun.

The principle of consistency in science, which we consider fundamental, seems to have some unfortunate consequences when it comes to recognizing the article status of *edin*. Since, traditionally, pronouns are said to be used both "attributively" and as independents, some authors (Pašov 1989: 80 and others in Group 2 under §1.3.2) presumably prefer to treat *edin* as an indefinite pronoun, which allows class preservation – i.e. the antecedent parallels the anaphor in terms of POS status. We find this kind of analysis unsatisfactory, because it obliterates the distinction in the antecedent between *edin* as an indefinite article and as an indefinite pronoun. The picture would not be complete, of course, without a reminder that *edin*-as- numeral can also be used both as a determinative/quantifier, as well as independently (as in the German example *Einer hat gefehlt*, 'One is absent' (DG 2002: 280)). Given that in all cases of ellipsis the antecedent should be recoverable, we would expect the unhosted *edin*, the remnant, to be treated as a substantivized X, where X corresponds to whatever the status of *edin* is in the antecedent. There is, however, one notable exception: a 'substantivized article', which at the moment sounds like a very exotic idea to many, the standard presumption being that the articles are by definition dependents. As Huddleston and Pullum put it:

A pro-form is an anaphor with little inherent semantic content of its own; the interpretation derives from the antecedent. (H&P 2002: 1461)

Semantically the interpretation of an anaphor may derive from its antecedent, but what about its POS status? The term *a substantivized X* is preferable to simply *noun* or *pronoun* in that the X provides information about the status of the antecedent. However, the combination '*substantivized + (cardinal) numeral/pronoun/article*' proves problematic. First the term *substantivized* itself is used in two different ways: first, to refer to nominal status achieved morphologically (e.g. *your → yours*), and secondly, to refer to nominal status resulting from performing a syntactic function typical for nominals, which may be further reinforced by typical collocations (e.g. *the gap between the rich and the poor*)[47]. It is worth noting that some authors find the syntactic substantivization of numerals problematic. Thus the authors of *Deutsche Grammatik* 2002 insist that:

> …a distinction should be made between cases where some **numerals are used as nouns**, as in *Einer hat gefehlt* 'Bul. – *Edin* otsâstva', also *Der eine hat gefehlt* 'Bul. '*Edinijat* otsâstva' 'One of them is absent' and cases where **the numeral has been substantivized**, […], as in *Ihr Mann hat die Fünfzig schon längst überschrtten* 'Her husband is well on the wrong side of fifty'. When substantivized the numeral declines as a noun and is capitalized. (DG 2002: 280–281)

Our own position is that remnant numerals when used as anaphors for NP antecedents are substantivized. We do not support the position of Gramatika (1983: 180), where the numerals *edno, dve, tri*, četiri, pet etc., as used in mathematics, are treated as substantivized – for us these cardinals have some inherent nominal features, although historically *edin* and *dva* are derived from adjectives.

Conclusion

The question which we asked at the beginning of this article was about the POS status of *edno* in the sentence *Edno ptičence mi kaza, če dnes imash roźden den*. The short answer to this question is that *edno* is an indefinite article. Some Bulgarianists think that *edin*-as-article is on the periphery of the DI functional-semantic category (Kucarov 2007:451). This may seem justifiable statistically and when we draw comparisons with the use of the indefinite article in a number of west-European languages. At the same time what is undeniable is that *edin* has traversed a certain distance along the path of grammaticalization, as a result of which it has acquired functions such as classifying, intensifying and generic, which distinguish it from the homonymic numeral and the indefinite pronoun. What is peculiar about *edin*-as-article is that the process of grammaticalization

---

[47] For a discussion on the degrees of nominalization of the adjectives in English and Bulgarian see (Stoevsky 2013: 312).

is both incomplete and uneven when assessed by the criteria in (Croft 2000) (see Table 2). We believe that the low frequency of use of *edin* most likely is due to insufficient attrition – it is a disyllabic word. In Bulgarian the competition between *edin* and the zero is often won by the zero for reasons of economy, but even more importantly, because much of the specifying information is carried by the verb. The use of *edin* in object NPs is occasionally required because perfectivity in the verb has to be matched by boundedness in the object. On the whole, there is nothing unique in that the numeral *edin* in Bulgarian has developed into an indefinite article – this is a general tendency observed in languages that may be related or unrelated to Bulgarian, many IE languages, Turkish and Chinese (Jespersen [1924] 1965: 113, Givon 1995: 48). The reason for this lies in the abstract nature of numerals, which favours grammaticalization, but also in the semantics of the number *one*, which favours individualization and specification. What is unique about Bulgarian is the relative distribution of the zero and *edin* in cases where the reference is specific. An interesting peculiarity of *edin*-as-article is the intensifying use in certain contexts, the so called "eminent use", where *edin* and a specific intonation pattern join forces to indicate that the referent is in some way exceptional. There are non-generic contexts in which distinguishing the indefinite article *edin* from the homonymous indefinite pronoun and the numeral remains problematic. This is due to the fact that all three function as determinatives, hence the decision is often based on semantics. A commonly used substitution test with the indefinite pronouns *njakoj* or *njakâv* proves helpful in showing not only that the indefinite article has not fully emancipated itself from the indefinite pronoun, but equally, where substitution is impossible, that *edin* has acquired distinctive characteristics. The contrast between *edin*-as-article and the indefinite pronoun is most obvious where specificity is due to visual perception and in cases of generic reference.

At various points in this discussion we have raised issues which are debated in general linguistics. Obviously, the POS status of *edin* cannot be determined without taking a broader look on the categorization of words as parts of speech. Reference to three of the most comprehensive modern English grammars, (Quirk et al. 1985), (Biber et al. 1999), (Huddleston and Pullum 2002), has shown diversity not only in what word classes are isolated, but also in the way these are grouped into megacategories. There are also terminological differences – for example, in the use of the terms *determiner* and *determinative* by Quirk et al. (1985) and Huddleston and Pullum (2002). We have adopted the term *determinative* both as an adjective to describe a certain syntactic function (indicating "what kind of reference an NP has" (Quirk et al. 1985: 64)), and as a noun, to refer to a large class of words which perform that function. The traditional label "attributive" has been abandoned when applied to *edin*, which is in line with making a distinction between *determination* and *modification*. While on the subject of breaking from tradition, the recognition of *edin* as an indefinite article represents one of the breaks from

tradition which took place mainly in the 80-ies. Support for *edin*-as-article remains qualified in varying degrees. The problems that have arisen are typical for hybrid categories (e.g. tense in English, D/I in Bulgarian), which include both synthetic and analytical oppositions. While the synthetic part is uncontroversial (past vs. nonpast in English), the analytical part, involving the expression of futurity (tense or not tense) remains debatable. For many Bulgarianists, when it comes to recognizing the grammatical status of *edin*, the make-or-break criterion remains obligatoriness of expression. However, when the expression of a grammatical category involves a separate word, not a morpheme, even obligatoriness may not be sufficient. Consider the following quotation from (Comrie 1985):

"However, obligatoriness is not in itself a sufficient criterion for assigning an opposition a grammatical status. In Norwegian, for instance, expression of the subject by means of a noun phrase is obligatory, as in *jeg kommer* 'I come', *du kommer* 'you come', *han kommer* 'he comes', but it would be a gross distortion of the traditional concept to argue that Norwegian thereby has a grammatical category of person and number." (Comrie 1985: 10–11)

This quotation from Comrie 1985 is not meant to downplay the importance of obligatoriness for assigning grammatical status to function words; what should have become obvious though, is that in cases where there are competing motivations, some take the upper hand and become established in the description of a particular language. The indefinite article *edin* may be something of a niche grammatical subcategory in contemporary Bulgarian, but it is a D/I subcategory nevertheless. Given the dynamics of languages, some categories will die out and others will become established. Linguistics simply has to catch up.

REFERENCES

Abbott 1997: Abbott, B. Definiteness and existentials. – *Language* 73/1997, 103–109.

Andrejčin 1942: Андрейчинъ, Л. Д. *Основна българска граматика.* София: Хемусъ, 1942.

Andrejčin 1978: Андрейчинъ, Л. Д. *Основна българска граматика.* София: Наука и из-куство, 1978.

Andrejčin, Popov, Stojanov 1977: Андрейчин, Л., К. Попов, Ст. Стоянов. *Граматика на българския език.* София: Наука и изкуство, 1977.

BTR 2004: Радева, В. *Български тълковен речник.* София: Хермес, 1977.

Biber et al. 1995: *See Longman Grammar* 1995.

Bojadžiev 1970: Бояджиев, Т. Значение и употреба на един в рупските говори. – В: *Из-вестия на ИБЕ,* XIX/ 1970, 743–750.

Bojadžiev, Kucarov, Penčev 1998: Бояджиев, Т., И. Куцаров, Й. Пенчев. *Съвременен бъл-гарски език.* София: Петър Берон, 1998.

Burov 2004: Буров, С. *Познанието в езика на българите.* В. Търново: Фабер, 2004.

Chvany 1983: Chvany, C. On 'Definiteness' in Bulgarian, English and Russian. In: M. Flier (ed.), *American contributions to the ninth international congress of Slavists, 71, Kiev, September 1983. Vol. I: Linguistics*, 71–92. Columbus, OH: Slavica. [Also included in: Yokoyama, O., E. Klenin (eds.). 1996: *Selected essays of Catherine V Chvany*. Columbus, OH.: Slavica, 1996, 128–147.]

Comrie 1985: Comrie, B. *Tense*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Croft 2000: Croft, W. *Explaining language change. An evolutionary approach*. Harlow: Longman, 2000.

Deutsche Grammatik 2002: Petkov, P., A. Dimova, D. Slivkova-Steinkühler, E. Dentscheva, B. Igla. *Deutsche Grammatik im Vergleich mit der Grammatik der bulgarischen Sprache*, P. Petkov (Herausgeber). В. Търново: Faber, 2002.

Duškova 1997: Duškova, L. Expressing indefiniteness in English. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae –Phililogica* 5. *Prague Studies in English* XXII/1997, 33–50.

Fodor and Sag 1997: Fodor, J. D., I. Sag. Referential and quantificational indefinites. In: *Readings in the philosophy of language*, 1997, 475–521.

Georgiev [1967] 1978: Георгиев, С. Лексико-морфологическа модификация на първичното числително един в съвременния български език. – В: Pašov, ed. Пашов (съст.) *Помагало по българска морфология. Имена*. 1978, 397–410. София: Наука и изкуство.

Georgiev 1993: Георгиев, С. *Българска морфология*. В. Търново: Абагар, 1993.

Gerdžikov 1978: Герджиков, Г. За системно обусловените значения на граматическите категории. – В: *Славистични изследвания*, 4, 1978, 73–78. [Also in: Gerdžikov 2013, 55–66.]

Gerdžikov 2000: Герджиков, Г. Отношения между членами языковых корреляции. – *Съпоставително езикознание*, XXV/1, 2000, 56–69. [Also in Gerdžikov 2013:100–12.]

Gerdžikov 2013: Герджиков, Г. *Избрани студии и статии по езикознание*, съст. К. Алексова. София: Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски“, 2013.

Gilin 1982: Гилин, Р. Морфологична класификация на определителния член в българския език. – *Съпоставително езикознание*, VII/3, 1982, 16–22.

Givon 1995: Givon, T. *Functionalism and grammar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1995.

Gramatika 1983: *Граматика на съвременния книжовен български език*. Т. 2 – Морфология. София: Изд. на БАН, 1983.

Friedman 1982: Friedman, V. The questions of a Bulgarian indefinite article. – In: T. Butler (ed.), *Bulgaria – Past & Present*. Columbus, OH: American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, 1982, 334–340.

Guentchéva 1987: Guentchéva, Z. Edin «Un» et l'indetermination en bulgare. – *Revue des études slaves* LIX/3, 1987, 571–583.

Hawkins 1991: Hawkins, J. On (in)definite articles: implicatures and (un)grammaticality prediction. – *Journal of Linguistics*, 27/2 , 1991, 405–442.

Huddleston 1984: Huddleston, R. *Introduction to the Grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Huddleston & Pullum 2002/H&P 2002: Huddleston, R. and Geoffrey K. Pullum. *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Ivančev 1957/1978: Иванчев, Св. Наблюдения върху употребата на члена в българския език. – *Български език* VII/6, 1957, 499–524. [Also in: Pašov (ed.) 1978, 186–211.]

Jespersen [1924] 1965: Jespersen, O. *The philosophy of grammar*. New York: Norton, 1965.

Kabakčiev 1990: Кабакчиев, К. Отново за разновидностите на неопределеността в българския език: Концептуална неадекватност, терминологична непоследователност и други проблеми. – *Съпоставително езикознание*, XV/6, 1990, 41–49.

Kucarov 2007: Куцаров, И. *Теоретична граматика на българския език*. Пловдив: УИ „Паисий Хилендарски“, 2007.

Kucarov 2011: Куцаров, И. *Актуална морфология*. Пловдив: УИ „Паисий Хилендарски“, 2011.

Lakova 1987: Лакова, М. Синтактични позиции на неквантифицираните именни фрази в българското изречение. – В: *Втори международен конгрес по българистика. Съвременен български език. Доклади*, т. 3, 1987, 420–429. София: БАН.

Lakova 1995: Лакова, М. Конверсия при словоформи в съвременния български книжовен език в съпоставка с руския, полския и българския език. – В: В. Станков (съст.), *Проблеми на граматичната система на българския език*, т. 1, 6–50. София: АИ „Проф. М. Дринов“, 1995.

Lakova 2002: Лакова, М. *Принципът на конструктивизма в граматичната семантика на българското просто изречение*. София: АИ „Проф. Марин Дринов“, 2002.

Longman Lexicon 1981: *Longman lexicon of contemporary English*. McArthur, T. (author). Harlow: Longman, 1981.

Longman Grammar 1995: Biber, D., S. Johanson, G. Leech, S. Conrad, E. Finegan. *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow: Longman, 1995.

Lyons 2003: Lyons, Ch. *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Lyons 1977: Lyons, J. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Maslov 1981: Маслов, Ю. С. *Грамматика болгарского языка*. Москва: Высшая школа, 1981.

Maslov 1982: Маслов, Ю. С. *Граматика на българския език*. София: Наука и изкуство, 1982.

Mayer 1988: Mayer, G. Article use in generic *be*-sentences in Bulgarian and English. – In: A. Schenker (ed.), *American contributions to the tenth international congress of Slavists, Sofia, Sept. 1988. Linguistics*, 243–256. Columbus, OH: Slavica.

Nicolova 1978: Ницолова, Р. За значението на българските неопределителни местоимения. – В: Pašov (ed.) *Пашов (съст.) Помагало по българска морфология. Имена*. София: Наука и изкуство, 1978, 384–396. 435–44.

Nicolova 1978: Ницолова, Р. Интензифициращите местоимения в славянските езици. – В: *Славистични изследвания*, 4, 1978, 181–189.

Nicolova 1983: Ницолова, Р. Общото и специфичното в българската местоименна система в сравнение с другите славянски езици. – В: *Първи международен конгрес по българистика, София 23 май – 3 юни 1981. Доклади. Исторически развой на българския език*, т. 3, 34–40. София: БАН, 1983.

Nicolova 1986: Ницолова, Р. *Българските местоимения*. София: Наука и изкуство, 1986.

Nicolova 2017: Nicolova, R. *Bulgarian Grammar*. Translated by Ch. Stamenov. Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2017.

Pârvev 1975: Първев, Х. *Очерк по история на българската граматика*. София: Наука и изкуство, 1975.

Pašov (ed.) 1978: Пашов, П. (съст.). *Помагало по българска морфология. Имена*. София: Наука и изкуство, 1978.

Pašov [1964]1978: Пашов, П. По някои въпроси на числителните имена като части на речта. – В: Pašov (ed.) *Пашов (съст.) Помагало по българска морфология. Имена.* София: Наука и изкуство, 1978, 384–396.

Pašov 1989: Пашов, П. *Практическа българска граматика.* София: Народна просвета, 1989.

Pašov 1990: Пашов, П. Наблюдения върху българския определителен член в плана на израза. – *Език и литература,* XLV/5–6, 1990, 6–22.

Payne et al. 2013: Payne, J., G. Pullum, B. Scholz, E. Berlage. Anaphoric *One* and Its Implications. – *Language* 89/2013, 794–829.

Pearl & Mis 2016: Pearl, L., B. Mis. The Role of Indirect Positive Evidence in Syntactic Acquisition: A Look at Anaphoric *One*. – *Language* 92/1, 2016, 1–30.

Penčev 1984: Пенчев, Й. *Строеж на българското изречение.* София: Наука и изкуство, 1984.

Quirk et al. 1985: Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, J. Svartvik. *A Comprehensive grammar of the English language.* Harlow: Longman, 1985.

Ra Hauge 1981/1983: Ро Хауге, Х. За семантиката на неопределителното местоимение някой. – В: *Първи международен конгрес по българистика,* София, 23 май – 3 юни 1981. Доклади. Исторически развой на българския език, т. 2, 1983, 111–116. София: БАН.

Ra Hauge 1987: Ро Хауге, Х. Опит за тълкуване на генеричната употреба на един в българския език. – В: *Втори международен конгрес по българистика.* Съвременен български език. Доклади, т. 3, 1987, 442–446. София: БАН.

Ra Hauge 1999: Ra Hauge, K. *A Short grammar of contemporary Bulgarian.* Bloomington: Slavica, 1999.

Rečnik na bâlgarskija ezik [RBE 1977-]: Речник на българския език. София: Изд. на БАН, 1977-, т. 4 (1984). [Dictionary of the Bulgarian Language].

Revzin 1978: Ревзин, И. И. *Структура языка как моделирующей системы.* Москва: Наука, 1978.

Rilski 1835: Рилски, Неофит. *Болгарска граммати́ка.* Крагуевац, 1835.

Robins 1966: Robins, R. H. *General linguistics.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1966.

Šamraj 1987: Шамрай, Т. Типологична характеристика на категорията определеност/ неопределеност (върху материал от български и фински език). – В: *Годишник на Софийския университет,* ФСФ, Езикознание, т. 80–81/1987, 126–177.

Šamraj 1989: Шамрай, Т. *Членувани и нечленувани имена в българския език.* София: Народна просвета, 1989.

Scatton 1984: Scatton, E. *A Reference grammar of modern Bulgarian.* Columbus, OH: Slavica, 1984.

Stamenov 1984: Стаменов, Х. Някои наблюдения върху употребата на един за изразяване на неопределеност /в сравнение с английски език/. – В: *Втори колоквиум по български език,* 20–24 август 1984. Научни материали, част II/1984, 63–76. София. [Also in Stamenov 2001: 58–69.].

Stamenov 1987: Стаменов, Х. Показателят за неопределеност един и предикативната именна фраза. – В: *Втори международен конгрес по българистика.* Съвременен български език. Доклади, т. 3, 1987, 430–441. София: БАН.

Stamenov 2001: Стаменов, Х. Показателят за неопределеност един и предикативната именна фраза. – В: Stamenov, Ch. *Papers in English contrastive linguistics,* [1985]2001, 71–80.

218

Stankov 1984: Станков, В. За категорията неопределеност на имената в българския език. – *Български език*, XXXIV/1984, 195–205.

Stankov 1987: Станков, В. За семантичния инвариант на определителния член в българския език. – В: *Втори международен конгрес по българистика*. Съвременен български език. Доклади, т. 3, 1987, 410–419. София: БАН.

Stankov 1995: Станков, В. Семантични особености на на категорията неопределеност на имената в българския език. – В: В. Станков (съст.) *Проблеми на граматичната система на българския език,* т. 1, 1995, 87–150. София: АИ „Проф. Марин Дринов“.

Stankov, Ivanova 1989: Станков, В. и М. Иванова. За неопределените именни синтагми, изразяващи специфичност/неспецифичност. – *Български език*, XXXIX , 1989, № 1, 14–27.

Stoevsky 1983: Stoevsky, A. The use of lexical additives in the elicitation of grammatical meanings. – In: *University of Sofia English Papers*, v. II/1983, 238–266. Sofia: Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski", Faculty of Classical and Modern Philologies.

Stoevsky 2013: Stoevsky, A. Transposition: terminological status and scope. – In: Младенова, М., Р. Железарова (съставители). *Славянските езици отблизо.* Сборник в чест на 70-годишнината на доц. Янко Бъчваров. София: Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски“, 2013, 295–330.

Stojanov 1964/1977: Стоянов, С. *Граматика на българския книжовен език.* София: Наука и изкуство, 1964/1977.

Stojanov 1987: Стоянов, С. По въпроса за наличието на неопределителен член в българския език. – *Език и литература,* XLII, 1987, № 6, 3–10.

Strawson 1971: Strawson, P. F. Identifying reference and truth-values. – In: *Logico-Linguistic papers*. London: Methuen, 1971, 75–95.

Ward & Birner 1997: Ward, G., B. Birner. Response to Abbott. – *Language* 73/1997, 109–112.

Ward & Birner 2006. Ward, G., B. Birner. Information structure and non-canonical syntax. – In: *The handbook of pragmatics*, L. Horn and G. Ward (eds.).Oxford: Blackwell, 2006, 153–74.

Electronic corpora and literary sources

Bulgarian Web 2012 (bgTenTen12, TreeTagger v2). https://www.sketchengine.eu/bgtenten-bulgarian-corpus/

English Web 2013 (enTenTen13). https://www.sketchengine.eu/ententen-english-corpus/

Corpus of Contemporary American English. https://corpus.byu.edu/coca/

Yovkov 1956: Йовков, Йордан. *Събрани съчинения,* т. 3. София: Български писател, 1956.

Yovkov 1965: Yovkov, Yordan. *Short stories.* Sofia: Foreign Languages Press, 1965.

Note on translations
With few exceptions, the English translations are my own. Example (18) is translated by Marguerite Alexieva. i would like to tank Prof Michael Holman for some last-minute improvements to the translation of some of the examples.

Reviewers: *Professor Lilyana Grozdanova*
            Associate Professor Alexandra Bagasheva