

ЈУЖНОСЛОВЕНСКИ ФИЛОЛОГ

КЊ. LXXVII, СВ. 1

ISSN 0350-185X

UDC 808

SERBIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND ARTS
AND
SASA SERBIAN LANGUAGE INSTITUTE

SOUTH SLAVIC PHILOLOGIST

Vol. LXXVII, No. 1

Editorial Board

*Dr Rajna Dragičević, Dr Victor Friedman, Dr Najda Ivanova,
Dr Vladan Jovanović, Dr Aleksandar Loma, Dr Alina Maslova,
Dr Sofija Miloradović, Dr Miroslav Nikolić, Dr Slobodan Pavlović,
Dr Predrag Piper, Dr Slobodan Remetić, Dr Jelica Stojanović,
Dr Sreto Tanasić, Dr Zuzanna Topolińska, Dr Anatoly Turilov,
Dr Jasna Vlajić-Popović*

Editor-in-Chief

Rajna Dragičević

BELGRADE

2021

ISSN 0350–185X

UDK 808

СРПСКА АКАДЕМИЈА НАУКА И УМЕТНОСТИ
И
ИНСТИТУТ ЗА СРПСКИ ЈЕЗИК САНУ

ЈУЖНОСЛОВЕНСКИ ФИЛОЛОГ

КЊ. LXXVII, СВ. 1

Уређивачки одбор

*др Јасна Влајић-Појовић, др Рајна Драгићевић, др Најда Иванова,
др Владан Јовановић, др Александар Лома, др Алина Маслова,
др Софија Милорадовић, др Мирослав Николић, др Слободан Павловић,
др Предраг Пијер, др Слободан Реметић, др Јелица Сијојановић,
др Срејто Танасић, др Зузана Тојолињска, др Анајолиј Турилов,
др Викџор Фридман*

Главни уредник
Рајна Драгићевић

БЕОГРАД
2021

Први број *Јужнословенског филолога* изашао је 1913. године, у Београду. Часопис су покренули Љубомир Стојановић и Александар Белић, чланови Српске краљевске академије. Први уредник *Јужнословенског филолога* био је Александар Белић. Од броја XVIII часопис издају Српска академија наука и уметности и Институт за српски језик САНУ.

CIP - Каталогизација у публикацији
Народна библиотека Србије, Београд

808

ЈУЖНОСЛОВЕНСКИ ФИЛОЛОГ = South slavic philologist / главни уредник Рајна Драгићевић. - [Штампано изд.]. - Књ. 1, св. 1/2 (1913); књ. 2, св. 1/2 (1921)-књ. 11 (1931); књ. 12 (1933)-књ. 17 (1938/1939); књ. 18, св. 1/4 (1949/1950)- . - Београд : Српска академија наука и уметности : Институт за српски језик САНУ, 1913; 1921-1931; 1933-1939; 1950- (Београд : Планета принт). - 24 cm

Полугодишње. - Текст ћир. и лат. - Друго издање на другом медијуму:
Јужнословенски филолог (Online) = ISSN 2406-0763
ISSN 0350-185X = Јужнословенски филолог
COBISS.SR-ID 615183

Секретар Уређивачког одбора
др Владан Јовановић

Рецензенти

др Миливоје Алановић, др Јасна Влајић-Поповић, др Јасмина Грковић-Мејдор,
др Рајна Драгићевић, др Владан Јовановић, др Милош Ковачевић,
др Александар Милановић, др Мотоки Номаћи, др Слободан Павловић,
др Предраг Пипер, др Људмила Поповић, др Слободан Реметић, др Стана Ристић,
др Драгана Вељковић Станковић, др Јелица Стојановић, др Марија Стефановић,
др Срето Танасић, др Божо Ћорић, др Данко Шипка, др Гордана Штрбац

Ово издање финансирало је Министарство просвете, науке и технолошког развоја Републике Србије према Уговору број 451-03-68/2020-14/200174 који је склопљен са Институтом за српски језик САНУ.

Прихваћено на седници Одељења језика и књижевности САНУ 24. марта 2021.

Издају

Српска академија наука и уметности, Кнез Михаилова 35, Београд
Институт за српски језик САНУ, Кнез Михаилова 36, Београд

Лектура и коректура
Дивна Продановић

Припрема за штампу
Давор Палчић (*palcic@eunet.rs*)

Штампа
Планета принт
Виноградски венац 9, Београд

Решењем Министарства за науку, технологију и развој Републике Србије, број 413-00-724/2002-01 од 17. 7. 2002. године, ова публикација је ослобођена пореза на промет.

САДРЖАЈ

Студије и расправе

Александр Б. Лома: Порекло речи <i>мазија</i> 'челик'	9
Александр Б. Лома: Происхождение слова <i>мазија</i> 'сталь'	26
Aleksandar B. Loma: The Origin of the Word <i>Mazija</i> [Steel]	27
Најда И. Иванова: Погледи Јована Стерије Поповића на језик псевдонауке у комаду <i>Судбина једног разума</i>	29
Найда И. Иванова: Взгляды Йована Стерии Поповича на язык псевдонауки в пьесе <i>Судбина једног разума</i>	49
Najda I. Ivanova: On Jovan Sterija Popović's Conception of the Language of Pseudoscience Propounded in the Play <i>Судбина једног разума</i> [The Destiny of One's Reason]	49
Радмило Н. Маројевић: Лексичка хомонимија као лингвотекстолошки проблем (на грађи Његошевог <i>Шћейана Малог</i>)	51
Радмило Н. Мароевич: Лексическая омонимия как лингвотекстологическая задача (на материале поэмы «Щепан Малый» Петра Негоша)	73
Radmilo N. Marojević: Lexical Homonymy as a Problem of Linguistic Textology (Based on Njegoš's Epic <i>Stephen the Little</i>)	73
Ана Кречмер: Нека размишљања о словенском глаголу (типолошки приступ)	75
Анна Кречмер: Некоторые размышления о славянском глаголе (типологический подход)	95
Anna Kretschmer: Some Thoughts on the Slavic Verbal System (a Typological Approach)	96
Motoki Y. Nomachi: The Kashubian Indefinite Marker <i>Jeden</i> 'One' and Its Grammaticalisation	97
Мотоки Номати: Неодређени маркер <i>jeden</i> 'један' у кашупском језику и његова граматикализација	109
Мотоки Номати: Неопределенный маркер <i>jeden</i> (один) в кашубском языке и его граматикализация	110
Јулија Л. Шапић: О пространственных фрагментизаторах в функции временной локализации	111
Јулија Л. Шапић: О просторним фрагментизаторима у функцији локализације времена	124
Juliya L. Šarić: On Spatial Fragmentisers as Temporal Localisation Markers	125
Јована Б. Јовановић: Пејоративи у номинацији човека у српском језику	127
Јована Б. Јованович: Пейоративные названия лиц в сербском языке	160
Jovana B. Jovanović: Pejorative Terms for People in the Serbian Language	161

- Ана В. Миленковић: Концептуализација примарних емоција у српском језику (на примеру глагола са значењем *радосићи*, *туже*, *сјраха* и *љуињје*) 163
- Ана В. Миленкович: Концептуализација первичних емоциј у србском јазыке (на примере глаголов со значением *радости*, *печали*, *страха* и *гнева*) 184
- Ana V. Milenković: The Conceptualisation of Primary Emotions in the Serbian Language (the Case of Verbs Expressing *Joy*, *Sadness*, *Fear* and *Anger*) 185

Некролози

- Академик Милорад Радовановић (1947–2020)
(Предраг Пипер) 187
- Владимир Павловић Гутков (1934–2020)
(Срето З. Танасић) 193

Хроника

- Међународна научна конференција *Лексикографија и лексикологија у свейлу актуелних љроблема*. Институт за српски језик Српске академије наука и уметности. Београд, 28–30. октобар 2020. г.
(Јована Б. Јовановић) 199

Прикази и критика

- Радивоје Младеновић. Говор северношарпланинске жупе Сирињ. *Српски дијалектолошки зборник LXVI/1* (2019): стр. 1–1047 (Марина С. Јуришић) 219
- Бојана Вельовић. Синтакса глаголских облика у говору Тутина, Новог Пазара и Сјенице. *Српски дијалектолошки зборник LXVI/1* (2018): стр. 1–476 (Радивоје М. Младеновић) 227
- Недељко Богдановић. Пастирски речник југоисточне Србије. *Српски дијалектолошки зборник LXVI/2* (2019): стр. 638–739 (Татјана Г. Трајковић) 233
- Славянская дэрыватаграфія*. А. А. Лукашанец (нав. рэд.). Мінск: Нацыянальная акадэмія навук Беларусі, Інстытут мовазнаўства імя Якуба Коласа, Беларускі камітэт славістаў, Камісія па славянскім словаўтварэнні пры Міжнародным камітэце славістаў, 2020, 362 с. (Бильана Ж. Марић) 237
- Милош Ковачевић. *Кроз синтаксу српскога језика*. Подгорица: Матица српска – Друштво чланова у Црној Гори, 2020, 387 стр. (Марина М. Николић) 244

Стана Ристић, Ивана Лазић Коњик. <i>Когнитивни ѝравац у српској еѝнолингвистици – ѝочеци развоја и акѝуелни ѝроблеми</i> . Београд: Институт за српски језик САНУ, 2020, 403 стр. (Гордана Р. Штрбац)	249
Слободан Новокмет. <i>Називи живоѝиња у српском језику: семантичка и лингвокулѝуролошка анализа</i> . Београд: Институт за српски језик САНУ, 2020, 340 стр. (Драгана М. Ратковић)	262
Санја Krimer-Gaborović. <i>Prepoznavanje i imenovanje boja u engleskom i srpskom jeziku</i> . Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, 2019, 351 str. (Ивана Лазић Коњик)	271
<i>Кругови Ирене Грицкаѝ (семантичко-грамаѝичка исѝраживања савременог српског језика)</i> . Рајна Драгићевић (ур.). Београд: Савез славистичких друштава Србије, 2020, 587 стр. (Весна С. Николић)	282

Библиографија

Библиографија за 2019. годину расправа и дела из индоевропске филологије и опште лингвистике која су изашла у Србији, Црној Гори и Републици Српској (Ана В. Голубовић)	295
---	-----

Регистри

Регистар кључних речи LXXVII књиге <i>Јужнословенског филолога</i> , св. 1	409
Регистар имена LXXVII књиге <i>Јужнословенског филолога</i> , св. 1	411
Напомена	449

ISSN 0350-185X, – Књ. 77, св. 1 (2021), стр. 97–110

UDK: 811.162.2'367.62

COBISS.SR-ID: 43825929

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2298/JFI2101097N>

Примљено: 28. септембра 2020.

Прихваћено: 27. јануара 2021.

Оригинални научни рад

Motoki Y. Nomachi*

Hokkaido University

Slavic-Eurasian Research Center

THE KASHUBIAN INDEFINITE MARKER *JEDEN* ‘ONE’ AND ITS GRAMMATICALISATION

This article analyses the use of the indefinite marker *jeden* ‘one’ in contemporary Kashubian, which has often been treated simply as an indefinite article in previous studies. A synchronic description has been presented in the first part of this paper, comparing the use of the indefinite marker in Kashubian with that in Polish, Upper Sorbian and German. The second part deals with the diachronic change in Kashubian in this respect. The main conclusion of this paper is that Kashubian has never developed the indefinite article *per se*, while its usage was far more frequent in the past, which could be explained by the emergence of the German influence.

Keywords: Kashubian, indefinite marker, language contact, German, Upper Sorbian, Polish.

1. INTRODUCTION

According to Friedrich Lorentz (1870–1937), one of the grammatical features that characterise Kashubian in the context of language contact with German is the use of articles, namely the demonstrative pronouns *tän/nän* [that] as definite articles and the numeral *jedän* [one] as an indefinite article (LORENTZ 1958a: 41; see also 1958b: 305, 558; 1969: 546). The examples of the use of the indefinite article in (1) to (4) are taken from Lorentz (1958b: 305), who presents a separate dictionary entry for the article, differentiating it from the numeral one.¹

* mnomachi@slav.hokudai.ac.jp

¹ This article was originally written for a Festschrift dedicated to Prof. Ruselina Nitso-lova, which was planned several years ago but has never materialised. It is also an expanded and revised version of a section in a book chapter of mine titled “Placing Kashubian on the

- (1) *Traf'it* *na* *droze* *řednėw^o* *xłopa.*
meet.PST.SG.M on road.LOC.SG.F one.ACC.SG.M guy.ACC.SG.M
[He met a guy on the road.] (masculine singular)
- (2) *Bėla* *rowz* *ředna* *b'alka.*
be.PST.SG.F time one.NOM.SG.F woman.NOM.SG.F
[Once upon a time there was a woman.] (feminine singular)
- (3) *Ředno* *zeck^o* *řło* *na* *řag^oodā.*
one.NOM.SG.N child.NOM.SG.N go.PST.SG.N onto berry.ACC.PL
[A child went to pick berries.] (neuter singular)
- (4) *Na* *p^ouřtkax* *řeřkajā* *řednī* *lėze.*
on farm.LOC.PL live.PRS.3PL one.NOM.PL people.NOM.PL
[Some people live there on a farm.] (masculine plural)

Proto-Slavic possessed neither definite nor indefinite articles (KRÁMSKÝ 1972: 187–191). In general, articles and similar constructions are found only in Slavic languages that have had close contact with languages possessing articles, such as Romance and Germanic languages (cf. WACKERNAGEL 2009: 558), as in the colloquial variety of Upper Sorbian (SCHOLZE 2008; BREU 2012), Czech (KRÁMSKÝ 1972), Burgenland Croatian (NEWKLOWSKY 1978), Molise Slavic (BREU 2012), Resian Slovene (BENACCHIO 2015), Macedonian (WEISS 2004; FRIEDMAN 2015), and Bulgarian (NITSOLOVA 2008 and many others).² Indeed, Serbian/Croatian has similar constructions with the lexeme *jedan* [one], but the scope of the usage is much narrower than in the abovementioned languages (cf. Ivić 1971, 1990), whose development could be regarded as a language-internal one.

It then stands to reason that the abovementioned phenomena in Kashubian likely emerged in the context of long and intense language contact with German.³ However, as pointed out by Nau (1995: 114), it remains unknown whether the article-like items in Kashubian are really to be treated precisely as articles, since Lorentz did not make a clear distinction between their being numerals or articles, and the examples in (1) to (4) may ultimately also appear

Language Map of Europe” published in *Slavic on the Language Map of Europe: Areal and Historical Dimension* (De Gruyter, 2019). With regard to the writing system for Kashubian (except for the Slovincian dialect and examples (1)–(4)), I will henceforth in this article use the standardised one, typical of the contemporary literary standard.

² In some Russian dialects, especially in the northern dialect, a sort of post-posed-article-like construction occurs, but its grammatical and semantic status remain disputable.

³ Needless to say, German does not have an indefinite article in the plural. Thus, the phenomenon cannot simply be assumed to be a copy of the German indefinite article usage, but it may be an extension of indefinite marker usage caused by the influence of German, although (4) does not necessarily reflect a “Germanic” feature, as it occurs in Slavic languages as well.

in other Slavic languages that lack a grammaticalised indefinite article. Thus, I will henceforth in this article use the term *indefinite marker*, following Friedman (2015: 130), allowing for the possibility that the status of an indefinite marker is not that of an indefinite article.

Furthermore, sociolinguistic changes in Kashubia deserve attention. Lorentz conducted his fieldwork and analysed his material almost a century ago, when German was the official language and all Kashubs were bilingual (in Kashubian and German) or even trilingual (in Kashubian, German, and Polish) and were undergoing a strong Germanisation process (cf. TREDER 2005: 16–22), which continued until the end of WW II. This multilingual situation is reminiscent of the German-Sorbian language contact situation, in which German as the dominant and donor language influenced Sorbian as the non-dominant and recipient language. But after WW II, this Germanisation process ceased completely, being replaced by a strong Polonisation process; the influence of Polish has inevitably affected almost all levels of the language, from the phonology to the lexicon, with all Kashubs being bilingual in Polish and Kashubian, and often more fluent in the former than the latter (cf. HENTSCHEL 2003: 67).

Thus, it appears worthwhile to analyse the usage of the Kashubian indefinite marker ‘one’ in comparison with that in German, Sorbian, and Polish, with attention to diachronic change since the time of Lorentz. According to Belaj and Matovac (2015: 7), it is not surprising that Sorbian language that has been in contact with German has developed or replicated the German indefinite article, but one may wonder if this idea is also valid for Kashubian.

Considering these issues, in the first section below, I offer a theoretical framework for the analysis of the indefinite marker ‘one.’ The second section analyses the indefinite marker ‘one’ in contemporary German (Ger), Colloquial Upper Sorbian (CUS), Kashubian (Kas), and Polish (Pol), based on the research of Breu (2012) on CUS as a starting point for comparison. The third section deals with diachronic changes in the usage of the indefinite marker ‘one.’⁴

⁴ In this article, for contemporary Kashubian, I use my own material collected from consultants in North, Central, and South Kashubia. In addition, Lorentz’s (1924) dialect texts are used for the analysis of diachronic change. For Polish, I have consulted with two linguists based in Warsaw. I would particularly like to express my sincere gratitude to Grzegorz Schramke and Jaromira Labudda for many discussions and examples.

2. DEFINING AN INDEFINITE ARTICLE AND ITS CLASSIFICATION

2.1. Definition

In his monograph on the article and the concept of its definiteness in language, Krámský (1972: 29) concludes as follows: “To give a precise definition of article which would be valid for all languages that possess an article in some or other form, would be, in the present state of research on this problem, a very difficult, if not impossible, task.”

From a formal viewpoint, one might think that the obligatoriness (and absence under certain specifiable conditions) could be one of the possible formal features of indefinite articles. In addition, in many cases, articles show morphological simplification and phonological reduction (cf. LYONS 1999: 89–90); therefore, formal reduction could also be a good candidate for a criterion. Indeed, CUS clearly reflects both features (BREU 2012: 280).⁵ In contrast, Kas and Pol do not show such features. However, these cannot be absolute criteria. For instance, according to Benacchio (2015: 166), in the Resian Slovene dialect, an indefinite article is used for a generic function that can be regarded as the highest degree of grammaticalisation of indefinite article usage (cf. HEINE, Kuteva 2006: 105); phonetic reduction also occurs, but it is not obligatory without a clear reason. Thus, the abovementioned two criteria could not be absolute. In this article, with some attention to the formal aspects, I will adopt the working definition of an indefinite article proposed by Heine and Kuteva (2006) for cross-linguistic research on European languages. According to Heine and Kuteva (2006: 98), indefinite articles are “nominal determiners whose functions include that of marking specific indefinite reference. Specific indefinite reference typically involves a speech act in which the referent of a noun phrase is identifiable for the speaker but is presented by the speaker in such a way that it is left unidentified for the hearer.”⁶

2.2. Evolution and Classification of the Functions of an Indefinite Marker

According to Lehmann (1995: 52), it is most probable, both theoretically and empirically, that a grammaticalised item passes through an intermediate stage on its way to becoming an indefinite article, namely that of a numerically neutral indefinite determiner (see also SCHROEDER 2006: 556). According to Heine (2012: 134. See also HEINE 1997: 71–77), cross-linguistically, the

⁵ According to Dryer (2005: 158), in a spoken variety of German, *einen* [one] in *Ich habe einen Hund gekauft* [I bought a/one dog] could be pronounced without stress if it is an indefinite article, which is not the case with a numeral.

⁶ Schroeder (2006: 555) defines this as follows: a morphological device (free morpheme, enclitic morpheme or affix) with the primary function of denoting the indefiniteness of noun phrases.

following evolution model is probable, where stage 1 is the oldest and stage 5 is the most recent:

Stage 1: The numeral – An item serves as a nominal modifier denoting the numerical value ‘one’.

Stage 2: The presentative marker – The item introduces a new participant presumed to be unknown to the hearer, and this participant is then taken up as definite in subsequent discourse.

Stage 3: The specific marker – The item presents a participant known to the hearer, irrespective of whether or not the participant is expected to come up as a major discourse participant.

Stage 4: The non-specific indefinite marker – The item presents a participant whose referential identity neither the hearer nor the speaker knows.

Stage 5: The generalised definite article – The item can be expected to occur in all contexts and on all types of marking, proper nouns, predicative clauses, and so on.

According to Heine (2012: 135; 1997: 71), this model can be interpreted in two ways, namely either in terms of the diachronic evolution of an indefinite marker or with a synchronic implication. If a language has an indefinite marker of a given stage, this may imply that it also has one of more indefinite markers of the previous stages. In this context, however, the possibility of a different path of grammaticalisation must be borne in mind, particularly in a recipient language with contact-induced grammaticalisation, as is the case with Macedonian (WEISS 2004). In the following section, I will analyse Ger, CUS, Kas, and Pol, starting from Stage 2, given that it is obvious that the target languages do possess the numeral ‘one’ which has a quantificational function. In addition, I will not deal with Stage 5, because German does not reach this stage, which implies that it is most probable that CUS and Kas do not have it either.

3. A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CONTEMPORARY GER, CUS, KAS, AND POL

3.1. Stage 2: The Presentative Marker

Consider a typical fairy tale introduction, as in (5). A new participant, who is most probably known to the speaker but not the hearer, is introduced here. As the story continues, this referent becomes known to both speaker and hearer as a definite entity.

(5)		
Ger:	<i>Es war einmal eine alte Frau.</i>	*∅
CUS:	<i>To beše jemo jena stara žona.</i>	*∅
Kas:	<i>Běla so róz jedna stara bialka.</i>	or ∅
Pol:	<i>Pewnego razu była sobie ∅ stara kobieta.</i>	or jedna
	[There once was an old woman.]	

According to Breu (2012: 281), in Ger and CUS, the use of an indefinite marker is obligatory. As has been observed by Sychta (1968: 92), Kashubian fairy tales also usually begin with a sentence that includes *jeden*, but sentences without *jeden* also occur, such as *Běla so róz ∅ bialka*. In Pol, one could ultimately add *jeden* or *pewien* [certain] to the sentence like *Pewnego razu była sobie jedna/pewna stara kobieta*, but it does not seem required to the same degree as in Kas.

3.2. Stage 3: The Specific Marker

As (5) may be argued to be a somewhat phraseological construction, it is worthwhile exploring a further case in which ‘one’ is used for indicating a participant in the discourse who is known to the speaker but presumed to be unknown to the hearer, as in (6):

(6)		
Ger:	<i>Ich suche einen Freund.</i>	*∅
CUS:	<i>Ja pótam jeno přécěla.</i>	*∅
Kas:	<i>Jô szukóm jednégò drěcha.</i>	or ∅
Pol:	<i>Szukam jednego kolegi.</i>	or ∅
	[I am looking for a friend.]	

Again, in this context, in both Ger and CUS, the use of ‘one’ is obligatory, in contrast to the case of Kas and Pol, in which the indefinite marker ‘one’ is optional.

3.3. Stage 4: The Non-specific Marker

A further extension of a referential function may manifest itself in introducing in discourse a participant whose referential identity is unknown to both speaker and hearer, as in (7), or whose identity is unimportant to either, as in (8):

(7)		
Ger:	<i>Ich möchte einen Freund haben.</i>	*∅
CUS:	<i>Ja cem jeno přécěla měć.</i>	*∅
Kas:	<i>Jô bė chcól miec ∅ drěcha.</i>	*jednégò

Pol:	<i>Chcialbym miec ø przyjaciela.</i>	*jednego
	[I would like to have a (= any) friend.]	
(8)		
Ger:	<i>Ruf einen Arzt!</i>	*ø
CUS:	<i>Zawołaj jeno lëkara!</i>	*ø
Kas:	<i>Zawòlôj ø dochtora!</i>	*jednégò
Pol:	<i>Wezwij ø lekarza!</i>	*jednego
	[Call a doctor!]	

In (7), there appears to be a clear distinction between the two groups of languages, Ger and CUS on the one hand, and Kas and Pol on the other. It comes as no surprise that the distribution of ‘one’ in these languages is the same in (8) as in (7). In the latter languages, the use of ‘one’ as an indefinite marker is not allowed, although ‘one’ can be inserted if it functions as the numeral ‘one.’

The following cases with the generic meaning may be regarded as the semantically most “bleached” function, which is used in comparative constructions, definitions, predication, noun incorporation, etc. (see BREU 2012: 287). Here, let us consider two representative examples, namely comparative constructions, as in (9), and the definition of classes, as in (10).

(9)		
Ger:	<i>Du bist naiv wie ein Kind.</i>	*ø
CUS:	<i>Ty sy naifkaż jene dżéćo.</i>	*ø
Kas:	<i>Të jes lekòwiérny jak ø dzeckò.</i>	*jedno
Pol:	<i>Jesteś naiwny jak ø dziecko.</i>	*jedno
	[You are as naive as a child.]	

(10)		
Ger:	<i>Ein Tiger ist ein Tier.</i>	*ø
CUS:	<i>Jen tigor jo jene zwěrjo.</i>	or ø
Kas:	<i>ø Tigris je zwiérzácém.</i>	*jeden
Pol:	<i>ø Tygrys to zwierz.</i>	*jeden
	[The tiger is an animal.]	

In both cases, Ger and CUS share the presence of ‘one’ as an almost obligatory element of the sentence. In contrast, both Kas and Pol do not permit the use of ‘one’ as a generic marker.

To sum up, at least contemporary Kas shows much the same distribution of functions for ‘one’ as does Pol, with both remaining in Stage 3 (the specific marker), while Ger reaches Stage 4 (the non-specific marker), and CUS

closely follows Ger, including its obligatoriness and formal reduction in these contemporary languages. Thus, if we treat an indefinite article as an indefinite marker having all five stages of usage, then Ger and CUS may be said to have an indefinite article, but Kas and Pol may not. On the synchronic level, it may even be difficult to discern any particular German influence on the usage of the indefinite marker in contemporary Kas.

4. DIACHRONIC ASPECTS OF THE USAGE OF 'ONE' IN KAS

Diachronically, to the best of my knowledge, there is no clear evidence that an indefinite marker in Kas ever advanced further than Stage 3, not even in the 17th and 18th century religious texts that were translated from German into a mixture of Kas and Pol during the time of strong Germanisation. Examples (11) and (12) are taken from *Der kleine Katechismus* [The Small Catechisms] translated by Pontanus (1643).

(11) Stage 3

Ger: *Da kam Jesus mit ihnen zu einem Hofe der hieß Gethsemane.*

Kas: *Tedy przyszed Jesus z nimi do jednego dworu ktory zwan Gethsemáne.*

[Then came Jesus with them to a garden, known as Gethsemane.]

(12) Stage 4

Ger: *Catechismus ist ein kurtzer Begriff der gantzen H. Schrift.*

Kas: *Catechismus jestá ø krotka Summá cálego swietego Pismá.*

[The catechism is a short summary of the entire Holy Bible.]

In the texts of the Slovincian dialect of Kas recorded in the 19th century, in which German influence may be presumed to have appeared far more freely than in the religious texts, there are no such examples, as is clear in (14), taken from Tetzner (1899: 234). In this context, it is worth noticing that Polabian (Plb), one of the heavily-Germanised West Slavic languages due to its linguistic contact with German, which became extinct in the mid-18th century, did not seem to replicate the German indefinite article either as in (15) or (16), taken from Polański and Sehnert (1967).⁷

⁷ It is important that Jan Parum Szulce (1678–1734) noted some examples in which 'one' seems to function as the indefinite article: *Tåd jq jadân staul, aíd sqdâ.* [There is a chair, go sit down.]. However, such examples might sound artificial even then, because Szulce always tried to translate examples from German to Polabian as literally as possible. See Lehr-Spławiński (1950: 224).

(14) Stage 4

Ger: *Du bist dumm wie ein Kalb.*Kas: *Ta jes glupi ak ø ciela.*
[You are as stupid as a donkey.]

(15) Stage 4

Ger: *Er ist ein Teutscher.*Plb: *Tò jq ø śost'ě.*
[He is German.]

(16) Stage 4

Ger: *Es stösst sich als ein Kobolt.*Plb: *Tãuci-sã kãk ø kobolt.*
[It comes across as a goblin.]

All this indicates that the case of the development of the indefinite article in CUS is rather unique among the Slavic languages that have experienced strong Germanization.

In Lorentz's texts, published in 1924, one can indeed find examples which would indicate that Kas 'one' reached Stage 4. The following example (17) was recorded in Pażęce, a village in Central Kashubia.

(17) Stage 4

*“Co wë chcelë miec za tã kòzq?” Tén gbùr mówil: „To je **jedna** krowa a nie **jedna** kòza”. Jak òn dali szedł z niq, przëszedł tén dru-dzi sztudent i mówil: „Jò kùpiã òd vas tã kòzq i dóm wom sztërë talarë”. Tén gbùr mówil: Jò mészlã, że to je **jedna** krowa a nie **jedna** kòza...”*

“What do you want to get for the goat?” The landlord said: “This is a cow, not a goat.” As he [the landlord] went on with it, another young guy approached [him] and said: “I want to buy the goat and I will give you four dollars.” The landlord said: “I think that this is a cow, not a goat...”

According to my consultants from Pażęce, today nobody speaks as in (17), and they themselves have not heard anything like that. Rather, a present-day Kashubian speaker avoids using ‘one’ in this context, and a grammatical sentence should be: *To je Ø krowa, a nie Ø kòza*. Examples like the one in (17) are very rare and out of the ordinary in Lorentz's text. One could even regard (17) as accidental or, perhaps, a hypercorrection due to the fact that Lorentz most probably conducted his research by speaking German with his Kashubian informants.

Thus, one could assume that Kas did not have a fully grammaticalised indefinite article comparable to those of Ger or CUS. However, historically, there appear to have been certain changes in the usage of ‘one.’ Compare the fairy tale fragment in (18), collected in the central Kas village of Thuczewo by Lorentz, and the same text in (19) “corrected” by a middle-aged contemporary Kas speaker of the same village in 2014.

(18) Lorentz’s original text

*Rôz szedł Ta gapa rzekła: „Nie ùstrzél mie, jô jem córka królewskô a jem przeklătô, ale tē mie mozesz zbawic.” Ten lesny pitôł sã: „Co jô móm robic, żebë ce zbawic?” Ta gapa ôdpòwiedza: „Biôj tã **je-****den** lesny w las ë widzôł **jednã** gapã a chcôł jã strzelac. drogã dali, tej tē przinđesz do **jedny** chalëpë. Tam sedzy **jedna** stôrô baba. Ôna cë dô jesc i pic, ale nie wez nick, bô czej tē bãdziesz jôdl a pił, tej tē mie nie bãdziesz mógl zbawic. Biôj przez tã chalëpã, tej przinđesz w **jeden** ôgród...*

(19) Lorentz’s text edited in contemporary Kas

*Rôz szedł **jeden** lesny w las ë widzôł **ø** gapã i chcôł do ni strzelac. Ta gapa rzekła: „Nie ùstrzél mie, jô jem córka królewskô, a jem przeklătô, ale tē mie mozesz zbawic.” Ten lesny pitôł sã: „Co jô móm robic, żebë ce zbawic?” Gapa ôdpòwiedza: „Biôj tã drogã dali, tej tē przinđesz do **ø** chalëpë. Tam sedzy **ø** stôrô baba. Ôna cë dô jesc i pic, ale nie wez nick, bô czej tē bãdziesz jôdl ë pił, tej tē mie nie bãdziesz mógl zbawic. Biôj przez tã chalëpã, tej przinđesz w **ø** ôgród...*

‘Once upon a time, a forester went into the forest. There he saw a crow and wanted to shoot it. The crow said: “Don’t shoot me! I am a princess and I am cursed, but you can save me.” The forester asked: “What should I do to save you?” The crow answered: “Go farther this way, and you will arrive at an old hut. There is an old woman sitting there. She will offer you something to eat and drink, but don’t take anything, because if you eat and drink, you will not be able to save me. Go through the old hut, then you will get to a garden...’

In (18) and (19), the bold and underlined items reflect an indefinite marker of Stage 2 (the presentative marker). In contrast, the remaining instances of ‘one’ in (18), bold but not underlined, which function as indefinite markers of Stage 3 (the specific marker), are omitted in (19), although they could ultimately appear, but not necessarily, according to my consultants. It is also noticeable that the indefinite marker in Kas did not appear to reach Stage

4 (the unspecific article), as is clear when the *Kas jô jem ø córka królewskô* and the Ger *Ich bin eine Königstochter* [I am a princess] are compared.

This comparison has a number of implications. First, the degree of grammaticalisation of the indefinite marker ‘one’ in Kas may not have changed much, but the frequency of use of ‘one’ used to be quite high in the 19th century and later clearly decreased. As pointed out by Bybee (2007: 338), frequency is one of the driving forces in grammaticalisation. Thus, over the course of time, this driving force has been lost. Second, this change may serve as evidence that the grammaticalisation process in present-day Kas has been going on in the opposite direction, from Stage 3 (closer to Ger) towards Stage 2 (closer to Pol).

Although the limited scope of this article allowed for just one clear example, and there remain many unclear cases of the usage of the indefinite marker ‘one’ in Kas, the phenomena may possibly be explained in terms of the significant sociolinguistic changes in Kashubia after WW II, namely the cessation of the German influence and the rise of Polish as a dominant language.

5. CONCLUSION

My findings in this article may be summarised as follows:

1. Although Kashubian has been reported to possess an indefinite article that developed from the numeral ‘one’ under the German influence, this is not as fully grammaticalised as in German and Colloquial Upper Sorbian, both of which have structurally and functionally established it as an indefinite article, showing the typical grammaticalisation phenomena of obligatoriness and formal reduction. Rather, the situation in present-day Kashubian is closer to that in Polish.

2. Since the time of old attested texts in Kashubian, this language has reached only Stage 3 at the most, and no further grammaticalisation has occurred, even during the time of complete Kashubian-German bilingualism. However, the frequency of the usage of ‘one’ in Kashubian was far higher than in the 19th century, judging from the text recorded by Lorentz. This could be explained as a result of the German influence.

3. An analysis of text from a fixed-point observation in Tłuczewo revealed a tendency for ‘one’ to have been used less and less as time went by, leading to a reversal of grammaticalisation of the indefinite marker. This could be explained in terms of the loss of the German influence and the emergence of a strong Polish influence.

References

- BELAJ, Branimir and Darko Matovac. "On the article-like use of the indefinite determinars *jedan* and *neki* in Croatian and other Slavic languages." *Jezikoslovlje* 79, 2015: pp. 1–20.
- BENACCHIO, Rosanna. "Grammatikalizacija opredelennogo i neopredelennogo artiklja v slovenskom jazykovom areale." In: Ljudmila Popović, Dojčil Vojvodić i Motoki Nomači (eds.). *U prostoru lingvističke slavistike. Zbornik radova povodom 65 godina života akademika Predraga Pipera*. Beograd, 2015: pp. 161–174.
- BREU, Walter. "The grammaticalization of an indefinite article in Slavic micro-languages." In: Björn Wiemer, Bernhard Walchli, and Björn Hansen (eds.). *Grammatical Replication and Borrowability in Language Contact*. Berlin/Boston, 2012: pp. 275–322.
- BYBEE, Joan. *Frequency of Use and the Organization of Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- DRYER, Matthew. "Indefinite Articles." In: Martin Haspelmath, Matthew Dryer, David Gil, and Bernard Comrie (eds.). *The World Atlas of Language Structures*. Oxford, 2005: pp. 158–161.
- FRIEDMAN, Victor. *Macedonian Studies 2*. Skopje: Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 2015.
- HEINE, Bernd. *Cognitive Foundations of Grammar*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- HEINE, Bernd and Tania Kuteva. *The Changing Languages of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- HEINE, Bernd. "On polysemy copying and grammaticalization in language contact." In: Claudine Chamoreau and Isabelle Léglise (eds.). *Dynamics of Contact-Induced Language Change*. Berlin, 2012: pp. 125–166.
- HENTSCHEL, Gerd. "New minor "Abstandssprachen" under the roof of a genetically close literary language? The case of Polish vs. Kashubian, Silesian and Podhalean." In: Thomas Stolze (ed.). *Minor Languages: Approaches, Definitions, Controversies*. Bochum, 2003: pp. 59–74.
- IVIĆ, Milka. „Leksema JEDAN i problem neodređenog člana“. *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku Matice srpske* 14 (1), 1971: pp. 103–120.
- IVIĆ, Milka. "On the Slavic word for *one* in the predicate-noun determiner position." *Sāpostavitelno ezikoznanie* 5 (4–5), 1990: pp. 53–55.
- KRÁMSKÝ, Jiří. *The Article and the Concept of Definiteness in Language*. The Hague/Paris: Mouton de Gruyter, 1972.
- LEHMANN, Christian. *Thought on Grammaticalization*. München/Newcastle: Lincom Europa, 1995.
- LEHR-SPLAWIŃSKI, Tadeusz. *Chrestomatia słowiańska. Cz. II. Teksty zachodnio-słowiańskie*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo studium słowiańskiego Uniw. Jagiell., 1950.
- LORENTZ, Fryderyk. *Teksty pomorskie (kaszubskie)*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1924.
- LORENTZ, Fryderyk. *Gramatyka pomorska. Tom I*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1958a.

- LORENTZ, Friedrich. *Pomoranisches Wörterbuch*. Band I. Berlin: Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1958b.
- LORENTZ, Friedrich. *Pomoranisches Wörterbuch*. Band II-2. Berlin: Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1969.
- LYONS, Christopher. *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- NAU, Nicole. *Möglichkeiten und Mechanismen kontaktbewegten Sprachwandels unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Finnischen*. München: Lincom Europa, 1995.
- NEWKLOWSKY, Gerhard. *Die kroatischen Dialekte des Burgenlandes und der angrenzenden Gebiete*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978.
- NITSOLOVA, Ruselina. *Bärgarska gramatika. Morfologija*. Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Sv. Kliment Ohridski” Press, 2008.
- POLAŃSKI, Kazimierz and James Allen Schnert. *Polabian – English Dictionary*. The Hague/Paris: The Hague Mouton, 1967.
- PONTANUS, Michal. *Mały Catechism D. Marciná Lutherá niemiecko wândalski ábo slowięski*. Gdańsk, 1643.
- SCHOLZE, Lenka. *Das grammatische System der obersorbischen Umgangssprache im Sprachkontakt*. Bautzen: Domowina-Verlag, 2008.
- SCHROEDER, Christoph. “Articles and article systems in some languages in Europe.” In: Giuliano Bernini and Marcia L. Schwartz (eds.). *Pragmatic Organization of Discourse in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin, 2006: pp. 545–601.
- SYCHTA, Bernard. *Słownik gwar kaszubskich na tle kultury ludowej*. Tom 3. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1968.
- TETZNER, Franz. *Die Slowinzen und Lebakaschuben*. Berlin: UNIKUM Verlag, 1899.
- TREDER, Jerzy. *Historia kaszubszczyzny literackiej*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, 2005.
- WACKERNAGEL, Jacob. *Lectures on Syntax with Special Reference to Greek, Latin and Germanic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- WEISS, Daniel. “The rise of an indefinite article: The case of Macedonian *eden*.” In: Walter Bisang, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann and Björn Wiemer (eds.). *What Makes Grammaticalization? A Look from its Fringes and its Components*. Berlin/Boston, 2004: pp. 139–168.

Мотоки Номаћи
Универзитет Хокаидо
Словенско-евроазијски истраживачки центар

НЕОДРЕЂЕНИ МАРКЕР *JEDEN* ‘ЈЕДАН’ У КАШУПСКОМ ЈЕЗИКУ
И ЊЕГОВА ГРАМАТИКАЛИЗАЦИЈА

Резиме

У овом чланку се анализира употреба неодређеног маркера *jeden* ‘један’ у савременом кашупском језику, који је у ранијим радовима био често третиран као неодређени члан. У првом делу овог чланка аутор даје синхронизацију

опис неодређеног маркера у кашупском језику, поредећи га са еквивалентима у пољском, горњолужицком и немачком језику у духу теорије граматикализације Бернда Хајнеа. У другом делу овог рада се разматрају промене у употреби неодређеног маркера у том језику. Главни закључак истраживања јесте да неодређени маркер у кашупском језику никада није постао прави неодређени члан, иако је фреквенција његове употребе била доста висока до средине 20. века, што се објашњава утицајем немачког језика на кашупски.

Кључне речи: кашупски језик, неодређени члан, језички контакт, немачки језик, горњолужицкосрпски језик, пољски језик.

Мотоки Номати
Хоккайдский университет
Центр славянско-евразийских исследований

НЕОПРЕДЕЛЕННЫЙ МАРКЕР *JEDEN* (ОДИН) В КАШУБСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ И ЕГО ГРАММАТИКАЛИЗАЦИЯ

Резюме

В данной статье рассматривается употребление в современном кашубском языке неопределенного маркера *jeden* (один), который до сих пор часто считался неопределенным артиклем (членом). В первой части статьи дается синхроническое описание неопределенного маркера в названном языке в сопоставлении с польским, горнолужицким и немецким языками в свете так называемой теории граматикализации Б. Хейне. Во второй части анализируется изменение в его употреблении с диахронической точки зрения. Основной вывод данной статьи состоит в том, что, в отличие от горнолужицкого и немецкого языков, лексема *jeden* в кашубском языке никогда не была и не является неопределенным артиклем как таковым, хотя частота ее употребления росла до середины 20-го века по причине влияния немецкого языка на кашубский.

Ключевые слова: кашубский язык, неопределенный артикль, лингвистический контакт, немецкий язык, верхнесорбский язык, польский язык.