The Romani Indefinite Article in Its Historical and Areal Context

In; Was ich noch sagen wollte...” A Multilingual Festschrift for Norbert Boretzky on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday (Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung, Supplements, Studia typologica 2), ed. by Birgit Igla and Thomas Stolz. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. 2001. 287-301.

VICTOR A. FRIEDMAN
Slavic Dept., University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637
vfriedm@midway.uchicago.edu
Balkan linguistics, reference, language contact

I first met Professor Norbert Boretzky at the Fourth International Seminar for Macedonian Language, Literature and Culture in Ohrid in 1971. I had just finished my first year of graduate school, and it was my first stay in Macedonia. Professor Boretzky showed me unfailing kindness during those pleasant weeks on the shores of Lake Ohrid, and I remember with pleasure our many conversations. Our paths did not cross again for many years, although I was aware of his many important works in Balkan linguistics (e.g., Boretzky 1966, 1975, 1976), and we corresponded from time to time. The First International Congress of Romani Linguistics (Hamburg, 1993) gave us a chance to meet again, and our shared interest in Romani has enabled us to meet more often. Professor Boretzky has contributed some of the most important works of modern Romani linguistics (e.g. Boretzky 1989, 1992, 1994 1995, Boretzky and Igla 1994, to name just a few). In this paper dedicated to Professor Boretzky's honor I shall combine Balkan and Romani topics by examining a phenomenon that has not been treated as a Balkanism in any of the handbooks from Sandfeld (1930) to Demiraj (1994), but one that is nonetheless amenable to such treatment and raises the crucial question of typological versus areal linguistics, namely the rise of the use of 'one' as an indefinite determiner (article). I shall argue that such a development can be treated as a Balkanism in Romani and other Balkan languages.

The grammaticalization of expressions of definiteness is one of the oldest Balkanisms both in terms of possible attestation and in terms of identification as such. Thus, for example, Hamp (1982:79) concludes after careful etymological argument that the name of the ancient site of *Drobeta* — located on the Danube near modern Turnu Severin in northwestern Oltenia (Romania) — contains "a Latin misunderstanding or misparsing in Moesia Inferior of **druu`ā̆ tā*, a definite noun phrase with postposed article." As such, it gives "direct evidence in the Roman period of one of the most notable syntactic constructions of the Balkan Sprachbund, i.e. a specimen from the autochthonous language of the model of the Romanian postposed article which was calqued out of Latin materials." Moreover, it constitutes "direct attestation for the common possession of this important feature linking modern Albanian with Moesia Inferior." Similarly, Kopitar (1829:86, 106) focused particularly on the postposed definite article as the most striking example of his characterization of the linguistic territory of what today we could call Balkan Romance, Balkan Slavic, and Albanian as an area where "*nur eine sprachform herrrscht, aber mit dreierlei Sprachmaterie...*" This is arguably the earliest formulation of the principle of areal linguistics underlying the concept of the Balkan Sprachbund. As indicated above, however, that which can be regarded as the inverse of grammaticalized definite reference, namely grammaticalized indefinite reference, has never figured in the catalogue of Balkanisms, just as Romani itself is usually excluded from the canon of Balkan languages in the various handbooks (but cf. Kostov 1973, Friedman 1985, Joseph 1983, Matras 1994a, Igla 1996, and many works by Professor Boretzky). Nonetheless, the marking of indefiniteness by means of a grammaticalized numeral 'one' is arguably a feature shared to varying degrees by the Balkan languages and is likewise a feature not inherited from their respective ancestral

languages, when such are attested. This characterization includes Balkan Romani and other significantly Balkanized dialects such as those belonging to the Vlax group (cf. Boretzky 1993:21, 163-203; Boretzky 1994:31,189-258; Hancock 1995:56; Igla 1996:42, 45, 252-75; Matras 1994b:44-49).

        All the standard grammars of Albanian, the Balkan Romance languages, Greek, and Turkish (which, although an adstrate language, is nonetheless relevant here) describe grammaticalizations of the respective etymological numerals meaning 'one', often with reduced stress, as indefinite articles. In Balkan Slavic, however, this status is less readily accepted. I argued for that status of Bulgarian *edin*, (*edna,* etc.) as an indefinite article in Friedman (1976), and (Mayer 1988:121) concludes: "The fact that the use of *edin* is obligatory in indefinite NPs expressing specificity when the NP does not carry logical stress, at least in initial position, as well as in a non-specific use with personal names denoting members of a class means that there is an indefinite article in Bulgarian, although its range is more limited than, for example, in English." Nonetheless, Avgustinova (1998:15) writes: "The existence of an indefinite article in Bulgarian, addressed, for example, in Friedman 1976, is still a controversial issue and a matter of on-going linguistic discussion." As an example we can cite Bojadžiev, Kucarov, and Penčev (1998:470), who state *"Ne e rešen văprosăt s t. nar. neopredelitelen člen v bălgarskija ezik. [...] Po naše mnenie, na tozi etap ot razvitieto na bălgarski ezik ne e logično da se prieme naličieto na neopredelitelen člen ot tipa edna kniga. Mjastoto mu e v periferijaata na funkcionalno-semantičnoto pole na kategorijata."* ('The question of the so-called indefinite article in Bulgarian is unresolved. [...] In our opinion, at this stage of the development of the Bulgarian language it is not logical to accept the presence of an indefinite article of the type *edna kniga* ['a book']. Its place is on the periphery of the semantic functional field of the category'.) The fact that in Macedonian, unlike in Bulgarian, *eden* triggers object reduplication as a marker of specificity is a powerful argument for its grammaticalized status (cf. Friedman 1993 and Naylor 1989/1990).

        For my data I took a series of nine passages from the New Testament[1] all of which display indefinite article usage in English, which in this respect can be taken as a typical language with a very highly grammaticalized indefinite article, i.e. one in which the article's use is obligatory in a wide variety of contexts. The passages (Mk 6:27, Jn 9:1, Mt 4:8, Mt 4:18, Mt 8:2, Mt 8:5, Mt 8:9, Mt 8:19, Mt 8:24) are given in Appendix One in the following languages (in order of occurrence): English (E), Romani (Arli dialect [Balkan group]; Ri-A), Romani (Gurbet dialect [Vlax group]; Ri-G), Bulgarian (B), Macedonian (M), Russian (Rsn) Serbian (S), Old Church Slavonic (OCS), New Testament Greek (G),[2] Albanian (A), Romanian (Rmn), Latin (L), and Turkish (T).

---

[1]The choice of text was dictated in part by the fact that both synchronically and diachronically a wide variety of languages are available in translation. All translations were made from the original languages except the Romani, which were translated from Bulgarian (Metkov 1995) and Serbian (Dimić 1990).

[2]The translation into Modern Greek followed New Testament usage too slavishly to be useful. On the use of 'one' as an indefinite article in Greek see Householder, Kazazis, and Koutsodas (1964:96), who state: "The indefinite article is used more sparingly in Greek than in English; it is not used for example, with predicate nouns, often not with indefinite direct objects, and generally not in proverbs and popular sayings when an entire class is meant and not a specific member of that class: εἶμαι φοιτητὴς 'I am a student'; χτίσουμε σπίτι 'They are building a house'; καθαρὸς οὐρανὸς ἀστραπὲς δὲ φοβᾶται 'A clear sky is not afraid of lightening'. Examples: σᾶς ζητᾶ ἕνας κύριος καὶ μιὰ κυρία 'A gentleman and a lady are asking for you'; μιᾶς φίλης μας τῆς ἔκλεφαν τήν τσάντα 'They stole the handbag of a friend of ours'; Βρήκαμε ἕνα σκύλο

These data are supplemented by Appendix Two, which contains examples from a series of readers (Matras 1996) in three dialects of Romani (in the order given in Appendix Two): Kelderash/Lovari and Gurbet (both of which belong to the Vlax group), followed by Leshaki (Northern Group).

A comparison of the relevant data in Appendix One is summarized in Table One. The languages are presented in the order given in the appendix (except that English is at the end of the table but the beginning of the appendix). An X indicates presence on an indefinite marker in the passage in question, a O indicates absence. An asterisk indicates that the indefinite item is animate, while a dagger indicates that it is the subject of the sentence. A superscript /s/ indicates identifying-specific in Avgustinova's (1998) terminology, a superscript /g/ indicates her categorizing-generic, while lack of a superscript indicates identifying non-specific. The results are grouped by typeface: Data for languages with unambiguous indefinite article are given in bold face, those for languages with no indefinite article are plain, and those that pattern in between are italic and bold face.

—	Ri-A	Ri-G	B	M	Rsn	S	OCS	G	Rmn	A	L	T	E
Mk6:27*^{s}	X	O	X	O	O	O	O	O	X	X	O	X	X
Jn9:1*^{s}	X	O	X	X	O	O	O	O	X	X	O	X	X
Mt4:8	X	O	X	O	O	O	O	O	X	X	O	X	X
Mt4:18	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	O	X
Mt8:2*†^{s}	X	O	X	X	O	O	O	O	X	X	O	X	X
Mt8:5*†^{s}	X	X	X	X	O	O	O	O	X	X	O	X	X
Mt8:9*†^{g}	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	X	X
Mt8:19*†^{s}	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Mt8:24†	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	X	O	X	X

TABLE ONE: PRESENCE OF INDEFINITE MARKER

Despite the small size of the sample used for Table One, it is nonetheless clear that certain patterns can be seen to emerge. The absence of grammaticalized indefinite articles in all ancient languages (Latin, New Testament Greek, Old Church Slavonic) and also from the non-Balkan Slavic languages — represented here by Russian and Serbian — is clearly illustrated by the absence of such forms from all the passages except Mt 8:19, where the numeral 'one' is used in all the languages to mean 'a certain' or 'one of the class of'.[3] On the other hand, the patterns in Romanian, Albanian, and Turkish are almost identical to English. The absence from Mt 4:18 in Albanian and Turkish is due to different grammatical constraints that incorporate such objects into the verb either as definite objects (Albanian) or as unmarked accusatives (Turkish). The Romanian exception is the only example of a categorical-generic indefinite article in our small corpus, and in Romanian, as in Modern Greek, such usage is avoided.

The Indic and Balkan Slavic languages provide interesting patterns that are mid-way between the utter absence of the ancient and non-Balkan Slavic languages and the full grammaticalization of English and the non-Slavic Balkan languages. Although

---

στὸ δρόμο καὶ τὸν φέραμε σπίτι; 'We found a dog on the street and brought him home.'; αὐτὸ τὸ καπέλο εἶναι ἑνὸς κυρίον ποὺ μένει ἐδῶ 'This hat belongs to a gentleman who lives here.'"

[3]Although Sanskrit is not represented here (translations of the Bible into Sanskrit exist but were not available to me), it, too, had no indefinite article, nor did Middle Indic (Masica 1991:248). The use of unstressed etymological 'one' to mark indefiniteness in Neo-Indic languages of South Asia is an independent development and, unlike the situation in Romani, was not accompanied by the development of a definite article (Masica 1991:370-71).

Macedonian has the most unambiguously grammaticalized indefinite marker, as indicated above, it has the lower frequency of usage in the Balkan Slavic examples — only four occurrences out of nine: All of them are animate and specific-identifying, and it is arguable that object quality in Mk 6:27 is different from that of Jn 9:1, i.e. the act of sending involves an effect of agent on patient, whereas in seeing it is the patient that can be said to affect the agent by being seen.[4] All of the Bulgarian uses in our small sample are identifying, but Avgustinova (1998) has examples of generic-categorizing as well.

When we turn to the Romani examples we find that the usage seems to reflect that of the dominant language of the country in which the translation was published. Thus the Bulgarian Arli translation (Metkov 1995) patterns exactly like the Bulgarian version, whereas the Gurbet version (Dimić 1990) published in Novi Sad is almost identical to the Serbian in its usage, the identifying-specific usage of Mt 8:5 being the only exception. Other Vlax dialectal texts, however, indicate that *jekh* is also used in those dialects as a true indefinite aritcle (see Boretzky 1994:31,189-258; Hancock 1995:56; Matras 1994b:44-49, as well as Appendix Two). We can therefore discount the data from Dimić (1990) as being unduly influenced by Serbian in the same way that the Modern Greek Gospels are overly influenced by New Testament Greek. The data in appendix Two, however, show that the use of *jekh* as a grammatical marker of indefiniteness is much more restricted in the Northern dialects that have been spoken outside the Balkans for a longer period of time and among contact languages that do not have indefinite articles. Thus the use of *jekh* in Leshaki is about half of what it is in Kelderash/Lovari or Gurbet.

What then, are we to make of these data? Can it be argued that the indefinite article represents a Balkan phenomenon, or does the presence of such a grammatical category in languages of Western Europe and South Asia argue for a typological rather than an areal explanation? (Cf. Hamp 1977 on this important distinction.) It is clearly the case that the ancestral languages of Balkan Slavic, Balkan Romance, Balkan Indic (i.e. Romani), and Modern Greek did not possess indefinite articles. We cannot be sure of the ancestor of Albanian, but the possible existence of a definite article in the language of Lower Moesia (Hamp 1982) allows us at least to speculate upon the possibility that an indefinite article might also have been present. The evidence of Old Turkic (Tekin 1968:145) indicates that *bir* was already involved in such usage at a time when its functional equivalents were not so employed in the Balkan languages.

I would argue that, like the grammaticalization of definiteness, object reduplication, infinitive replacement, analytic comparative adjectives and futures using 'will', all of which are to be found in Western Europe, the rise of the indefinite article in the Balkan languages, including Balkan Romani, took place during the period when these languages were in contact with one another, and thus constitutes a Balkanism in this sense. As Topolińska (1995) notes: "Analytic markers of referentiality emerge in periods of convergent development, in conditions of creolization, while synthetic markers are instruments of linguistic divergence." The fact that this development did not go as far in Balkan Slavic and Balkan Indic as it did in the other Balkan languages (including here Turkish) may be due to the later impetus given to this development. It should also be kept in mind that for Balkan Slavic there is the additional ideologically based discouragement of such usage (e.g. Brezinski 1968:48, see Friedman 1976 for other references) motivated both overtly by the perception that it imitates West European languages and perhaps covertly by the fact that such usage is different from

---

[4]This is reflected in many of the world's languages by the use of oblique (e.g. dative or ablative) cases for the agents of verbs of perception such as seeing, hearing, and feeling.

the rest of Slavic, especially the prestigious Russian (for Bulgarian) and Serbian (for Macedonian -- at least until 1991) and resembles the surrounding non-Slavic Balkan languages. It is certainly the case that colloquial usage is greater than literary usage. (The Modern Greek New Testament is also a case in point in this regard; cf. note two.) The striking differences in various Romani dialects can be attributed to influences from other languages either through literal translation, as in the case of Dimić (1990), or later contact, as in the case of Leshaki illustrated in Appendix Two.

       Although Avgustinova (1998:15) refers to "striking typological parallels" in the use of indefinite articles in the various Balkan languages, Hamp's (1977) distinction among areal, typological, and genetic linguistics — particularly between areal and typological in this instance — is crucial in understanding these phenomena in a broader context. That the developments are convergent is undeniable. Once a genetic explanation is ruled out by evidence, as is the case with indefinite articles in the Balkan languages, convergence in the absence of contact or multilingualism must be treated as typological, but convergence in the presence of such factors has the possibility of an areal explanation. And thus I conclude that the situation of the Balkan indefinite article, including that of Romani, is comparable to that of Balkan infinitive replacement as analyzed by Joseph (1983). Joseph (1983:242-43) points out that although infinitive replacement is found in all the Balkan languages and may well constitute a Balkanism in the sense of a shared innovation due to contact, it is also the case that Albanian and Romanian have new or reinterpreted infinitival constructions, Bulgarian and Greek retain a few traces of old ones, and only Macedonian has completely eliminated the category (but cf. Čašule 1989 on the use of the verbal noun). Similarly, it can be argued that Romanian and Albanian (and Turkish) show the highest degree of grammaticalization of indefiniteness, followed by Greek. Romani, like Balkan Slavic, shows weaker but nonetheless significant degrees of grammatical marking for indefinite specificity. The fact that indefinite articles are considered more a colloquial than a literary feature in at least some Balkan languages and that their use, e.g. in Bulgarian, is overtly discouraged by normativists is another argument in favor of a contact origin, despite the occasional ideological appeal to Western European languages. And so, the use of *jekh* (*jekhe,ek*, etc.) in Balkan Romani (and other Romani dialects) as an indefinite article can be argued to represent part of a heretofore unacknowledged Balkan phenomenon, and the comparison with other Balkan languages in turn argues for the grammatical status of the phenomenon.

<div align="center">REFERENCES</div>

Avgustinova, T. 1998. Determinedness and Replication Potential of Nominal Material in Bulgarian. *Balkanistica* 11.1-17.

Bojadžiev, T., I. Kucarov, J. Penčev. 1998. *Săvremenen bălgarski ezik.* Sofija.

Boretzky, N. 1966. Perfect und Plusquamperfekt in einem nordostalbanischen Dialekt. *Beiträge zur Südosteuropa-forschung*, 101-102. Munich.

Boretzky, N. 1975. *Der türkische Einfluss auf das Albanische.* Teil 1. Wiesbaden.

Boretzky, N. 1976. *Der türkische Einfluss auf das Albanische.* Teil 2. Wiesbaden.

Boretzky, Norbert. 1989. Zum Interferenzverhalten des Romani. *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationforschung* 42.357-74.

Boretzky, N. 1992. *Bugurdži: Deskriptiver und historischer Abriss eines Romani-Dialekts.* Wiesbaden.

Boretzky, N. 1994. *Romani : Grammatik des Kalderaš-Dialekts mit Texten und Glossar.* Wiesbaden

Boretzky, N. 1995. Interdialectal Interference in Romani. *Romani in Contact: The History, Structure, and Sociology of a Language*, 69-94. Amsterdam.

Boretzky, N. and B. Igla. 1994. *Wörterbuch Romani-Deutsch-Englisch: Mit einer Grammatik der Dialektvarianten.* Wiesbaden.

Brezinski, S. 1969. *Ezikova kultura.* Sofija

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

Demiraj, Sh. 1994. *Gjuhësi ballkanike.* Skopje.

Friedman, V. 1976. The Question of a Bulgarian Indefinite Article. *Bulgaria: Past and Present*, Vol. 1, 334-40. Columbus.

Friedman, V. 1985. Balkan Romani Modality and Other Balkan Languages. *Folia Slavica* 7,3.381-389.

Friedman, V. 1993. Macedonian. *The Slavonic Languages.* 249-305. London.

Hamp, E. 1977. On Some Questions of Areal Linguistics. *Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 279-282. Berkeley.

Hamp, E. 1982. The Oldest Albanian Syntagma. *Balkansko ezikoznanie* 25,1.77-79.

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

Householder, F.W., K. Kazazis, A. Koutsoudas. 1964. *Reference Grammar of Literary Dhimotiki.* Bloomington.

Igla, B. 1996. *Das Romani von Ajia Varvara.* Wiesbaden.

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

Kopitar, J. 1829. Albanische, walachische und bulgarische Sprache. *Jahrbücher der Literatur* 46.59-106.

Kostov, K. 1973. Zur Bedeutung des Zigeunerischen für die Erforschung grammatischer Interferenzscheinungen. *Balkansko ezikoznanie* 14,2.99-113.

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

Matras, Yaron. 1994a. Structural Balkanisms in Romani. *Sprachlicher Standard und Substandard in Südosteuropa und Osteuropa,* 195-210. Wiesbaden.

Matras, Yaron. 1994b. *Untersuchung zu Grammatik und Diskurs des Romanes: Dialekt der Kelderaša/Lovara.* Wiesbaden.

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

Mayer, G. 1988. *The Definite Article in Contemporary Standard Bulgarian.* Wiesbaden.

Naylor, K. 1989/1990. On the form of the Macedonian article. *Makedonski jazik* 40/41:381-87.

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

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

Topolińska, Z. 1995. Convergent Evolution, Creolization and Referentiality. *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers, Volume 1*, 239-47. Amsterdam.

BIBLES

Albanian. 1980. Besëlidhja e re, transl. Don Simon Filipaj. Ferizaj: Drita.

Bulgarian. 1912. Biblija. Carigrad: BFBS.

English. King James Version. (Philadelphia: The Gideons, 1955).

Greek. Received Text. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1972).

Latin. Vulgate. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994).

Macedonian. 1990. Sveto Pismo. Skopje: BFBS.

Old Church Slavonic. Codex Zographensis. ed. by V. Jagić Berlin: Weidmann, 1879. (reprinted University of Graz, 1954).

Romani (Arli). 1995. O Nevo Zaveti, transl. Suljo Metkov. Sofia: Union of Seventh Day Adventists of Bulgaria.

Romani (Gurbet). 1990. Nevo Sovlahardo Ćidipe, transl. Trifun Dimić Novi Sad: Dobra Vest.

Romanian. 1924. Biblia. Bucharest: BFBS.

Russian. 1926. Biblija. St. Petersburg: BFBS. (Holy Synod Text).

Serbian. 1847. Novi Zavjet, transl. Vuk St. Karadžić Vienna: Jermanski manastir. (reprint Belgrade: Prosveta, 1969).

Turkish. 1969. Kitabı mukaddes. Istanbul: BFBS.

AppendixOne: Biblical Passages

English
Mk 6:27 And immediately the king sent **an** executioner, and commanded his head to be brought
Jn 9:1   And as Jesus passed by, he saw **a** man which was blind from his birth
Mt 4:8 Again, the Devil taketh him up into **an** exceeding high mountain
4:18 he saw two brethren ... castng **a** net into the sea
8:2 And behold, there came **a** leper and worshiped him
8:5 there came unto him **a** centurion
8:9 For I am **a** man under authority
8:19 And **a** certain scribe came
8:24 And, behold, there arose **a** great tempest in the sea

Romani (Arli)
Mk 6:27   Taj vednaga o thagar bičhalgjas **i e k e s**, kaske vakergjas te anel o šero leskoro;
Jn 9:1   Taj kana zanakhelas, dikhljas **i e k h e** kore bijando manuš
Mt 4:8 Pale Les ingeljas o beng **i e k h e** bute učeste veš,
4:18 dikhljas e due phralen .. kaj čhivenas i mrezva
8:2 Taj, ake **iek** prokažimo alo paš Leste
8:5 **iek** šelengoro baro, alo paš Leste
8:9 vi me sem manuš kas si inćaripe
8:19 Taj alo **iek** lilvalo
8:24 Taj, ake, baro vazdiba e pajneste ko cikno denizi,

Romani (Gurbet)
Mk 6:27   Athoska bičhalda thagari mudaritmatres te džal thaj te anel Jovanosko šoro;
Jn 9:1   Thaj džikaj naćehelas dikhla e manušes, savo sas bijandimatar koro.
Mt 4:8 Palem indjardales o beng pe vuči plain
4:18 dikhla duj phralen ... sar čhuden mačharendje astarde ande mora
8:2 Thaj dikh, melalo lepratar pašunisardape leske
8:5 pašunisajlo leske **jekh** kapetano
8:9 taj me sijam baro manuš
8:19 Thaj sar avilo leste **jekh** lilarno
8:24 Thaj dikh, baro vazdipe morijaske pajendar dija pe mora

Bulgarian
Mk 6:67   I tutaksi, provodi car¶t¶ **e d i n ¶** orȯnik¶, komuto zapov^da da donesat¶ glavata mu;
Jn 9:1   I kato zaminavawe vid^ **e d i n o g o** qelov^ka slep od rȯdenieto.
Mt 4:8   Pak¶ go zavȯda d¢vol¶t¶ na **e d n a** planina mnogo visoka
4:18 vid^ dvamina brat¢ ... qe xv¶rlaxa mrȧa v¶ moreto
8:2 I eto, **edin¶** prokȧen¶ doChde pri nego
8:5 **edin¶** stotnik doChde pri nego
8:9 i   az¶ s¶m¶ qov^k¶ pod¶ vlast§
8:19 I doChde **edin¶** kninik¶
8:24 I, eto, gol^ma bur¢ se podigna na ezeroto

Macedonian
Mk 6:27   I vednaw, otkako isprati chelat, carot naredi da ja donesat glava negova.

Jn 9:1   Koga odewe vide **eden** slep qovek od negovoto ra©a…e
Mt 4:8 Go odvede ©avolot potoa na mnogu visoka planina
4:18 ... gi vide dvajcata bråa ... kako frlaat mrȧa vo moreto
8:2 I ete, se priblȋi **eden** leprozen ...
8:5 ... se priblȋi do nego **eden** stotnik
8:9 i jas sum qovek podvlasten
8:19 Togaw se priblȋi do Isusa **eden** knȧnik
8:24 I ete, nastana golema bura vo moreto.

Russian
Mk 6:27   I totqas poslav orȯenosca, car§ povelel prinesti golovu ego.
Jn 9:1   I proxod¢, videl qeloveka slepogo ot rȯdeni¢.
Mt 4:8 Op¢t§ beret Ego diavol na ves§ma vysokuh goru
4:18 On uvidel dvux brat§ev ... zakidyvaȟix seti v more
8:2 I vot, podowel prokȧennyCh
8:5 k Nemu podowel sotnik
8:9 ¢ i podvlastnyCh qelovek
8:19 Togda **odin** knȧnik podowed skazal emu
8:24 I vot, sdelalos§ velikoe volnenie na more

Serbian
Mk 6:27   I odmah posla car dželata, i zapovjedi da donese glavu njegovu
Jn 9:1   I prolazeći vidje čovjeka slijepa od rodjenja.
Mt 4:8 Opet uze ga djavo i odvede na goru vrlo visoku
4:18 vidje dva brata ... gdje meću mreže u more
8:2 I gle, čovjek gubav dodje
8:5 pristupi k njemu kapetan
8:9 i ja sam čovjek pod vlasti
8:19 I pristupivši **jedan** književnik reče mu
8:24 I gle, oluja velika postade na moru

Old Church Slavonic
Mk 6:27 ¡ abié pos¶lav¶ c—r—§ vo¡na, povél^ prinésti glavõ égo
Jn 9:1` mimo idè vid^ q—v—a sl^pa ot¶ r—s—a .
Mt 4:8 pakè po¿ãt¶ égo népri^zn§ na gorõ vèsokõ ß^lo
4:18 vid^ d¶va bratra .. v¶méta¿õwta mréã v¶ moré
8:2 ¡ sé prokaén¶ pristõp§ klanâ^awé émou
8:5 pristõpi k¶ nâémou s¶t§nik¶
8:9 az¶ q—k—¶ ésm§ pod¶ vladèko¿õ
8:19` pristõp§ **édin¶** k¶ni§nik¶
8:24 ¡ sé trõs¶ veli bèst¶ v¶ mori

Greek
Mk 6:27 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἀποστείλας ὁ Βασιλεὺς σπεκουλάτορα, ἐπέταξεω νὰ ἐνεχθῆναι τὴω κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ
Jn 9:1 Καὶ παράγον εἶδεν ἄνθροπον τυφλὸν ἐκ γενετῆς
Mt 4:8 Πάλιν παραλαμβάνει αὐτὸν ὁ διάβολος εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν λίαν
4:18 εἶδεν δύο ἀδελφούς ... βάλλαντας ἀμφίβληστρω εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν
8:2 Καὶ ἰδού λεπρὸς ἐλθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ
8:5 προσῆλθεω αὐτῷ ἑκατόνταρχος
8:9 καὶ-γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθροπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν
8:19 Καὶ προσελθὼν **εἷς** γραμματεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ
8:24 Καὶ ἰδού, σεισμὸς μέγας ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ

Albanian
Mk 6:27 Mbreti menjëherë dërgoi **një** vrasës dhe urdhëroi t' ia sjellë kryet e Gjonit.
Jn 9:1 Duke kaluar rrugës pa **një** njeri të verbët, që kishte lindur i verbët
Mt 4:8 Djalli i çoi sërish në **një** mal shumë të lartë
4:18 pa dy vëllezër ... duke hedhur rrjetën në det
8:2 Dhe ja, **një** gërbulan iu afrua
8:5 iu paraqit **një** centurion
8:9 edhe unë që nuk jam tjetër, por **një** njeri i nënshtruar
8:19 ndërkaq u afrua **një** skrib
8:24 Dhe ja, në det u çua **një** stuhi e madhe

Romanian
Mk 6:27 A trimes îndată **un** otaş de pază, cu porunca de a aduce capul lui Ioan
Jn 9:1 Cînd trecea, Isus a văzut pe **un** orb din naştere
Mt 4:8 Diavolul L-a dus apoi pe **un** munte foarte înait
4:18 Isus a văzut doi fraţi ... cari aruncau **o** mreajă în mare
8:2 Şi **un** lepros s'a apropriat de El
8:5 s'a apropriat de El **un** sutaş
8:9 şi eu sînt om supt stăpînire
8:19 Atunci s'a apropriat de El **un** cărturar
8:24 Şi deodată s'a stîrnit pe mare **o** furtună atît de straşnică

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

Turkish
Mk:6:27 Kıral hemen muhafız askerinden **birini** gönderip onun başını getirmesini emretti
Jn 9:1 Ve geçerken anadan doğma kör **bir** adam gördü.
Mt 4:8 İblis İsayı çok yüksek **bir** dağa da götürdü
4:18 iki kardeşi ... denize ağ atarlarken gördü
8:2 Ve iştem **bir** cümazlı gelip...
8:5 **bir** yüzbaşı yalvararak...
8:9 ben de emir altında **bir** adamım
8:19 Ve **bir** yazıcı gelip ona:
8:24 Ve işte, denizde büyük **bir** fırtına oldu

Appendix Two: Comparison of Kelderash/Lovari, Gurbet, and Leshaki
(Matras 1996)

Sas pe kaj nas pe **jekh** baro žiganja
Sas pe kaj naj sas **jekh** bari životinja
Sys peske baro kirmo
'Once uopn a time there was **a** big animal'
   Aj učo sar **jekh** kher
Taj uči sar **jekh** ćer
I hučo syr **jekh** kher
'And as large (tall) as **a** house'
   Vov sas **jekh** Dinosauro.
Vov sas **jekh** Dinosauro.
Sys peske Dinosauro.
'It was **a** dinosaur.
   So kerel o Lazo? Vov kerel **jekh** podo.
So ćerel o Lazo. Vov ćerel **jekh** podo.
So kereł Lazo. Jov kereł mosto.
'What is Lazo doing? He is making **a** bridge.'
   So dičhol po patreto? Me dikhav **jekh** vaza.
So dićhol pe slika? Me dikhav **jekh** vaza.
So dikhes pre daja bilta? Me dikhav **jekh** vaza.
'What do you see in the picture? I see **a** vase.'
   Skiris **jekh** kopači? Na, **jekh** raca.
Crtos **jekh** kaš? Na, **jekh** raca.
Malines tu **jekh** rukh? Na, reca.
'Are you drawing **a** tree? No, **a** duck''
   Si e raja bange? Kodo si pale **jekh** xoxamno patreto.
Si e linije banđe? Gava si pale **jekh** xoxavni slika.
Sy da kreski bange. Dava sy pałe optično vizja.
'Are the lines crooked? It is **an** optical illusion.'
   Me sim o Eino. Me sim **jekh** Eskimo-šavoro.
Me sem o Eino. Me sem **jekh** Eskimo-čhavoro.
Me som Eino. Me som čhavoro-Eskimo
'I am eino. I am **an** Eskino boy.'
   Me traiv ande **jekh** gav. Si amen **jekh** kher.
Me traiv ande **jekh** gav. Si amen jekh ćer
Me bešto som dry gav. Jamen sy kher.
'I live in **a** village.' 'We have **a** house.'
   Kada si amari lumja. Amari lumja si **jekh** planeta.
Gada si amari phuv. Amari phuv si **jekh** planeta.
Daja si ajmary phuv. Jamari phuv sy **jekh** planeta.
'This is our world/earth. Our earth/world is **a** planet.'
   Ži kaj o Marso trobuj **jekh** raketa te tradel duj breš.
Dži ko Marso trubul **jekh** raketa te tradel duj breš.

Ko Marso mušyneł duj berš raketa te teadł.
'It takes **a** rocket two mopnths to travel to Mars.'
   Me sim **jekh** pajesko levo.
Me sem **jekh** pajesko lavo.
Me som **jekh** panitko lvo.
'I am **a** sea lion.'
   Kado si muro dad. Les si **jekh** mustaca.
Kava si mrno dad. Le si mustaka.
Dava sy miro dad. Łes sy čhorja.
'This is my father. He has **a** moustache.'
   Me sičhuvava **jekh** buči
Me sićivava **jekh** zanato.
Me sykhlakirava man buty.
'I learn **a** trade,'
   E mam si ande pinca. Voj phenel: "Jekh šimjako si ande pinca. Muri loli taška si la **jekh** gropa."
E mami si ando podrumo. Voj phenel: "Jekh šimjako si ando podrumo. Mrni loli tašna si la **jekh** xv."
Baba sy andry štał**a**. Joj deł godi: "Jamen sy **jekh** myšo andry štał**a**. Andry miry loli khorba sy xev."
Grandma is in the basement. She says: "We have mouse in the basement. My red bag has **a** hole in it."
   Me šuvav **jekh** phal katar e lada ži kaj e felastra.
Me thav **jekh** phal katar o sanduko dži ke pendžararva,
Čhuvav **jekh** baro phal moxtenestyr až ki dudali.
'I put **a** big stck from the trunk to the window.'
   Me pekav **jekh** bokoli mura dejake. Me lav **jekh** baro gono aro.
Me pekav **jekh** kolako mrne dejaće. Me lav **jekh** baro džako aro.
Me pekav mre dake marykla. Me lav **jekh** baro gono jažo.
'I am baking **a** cake for my mother. I take **a** large sack of flour.'
   Kadi si **jekh** vundžija pe **jekh** naj. O naj pe **jekh** vast.
Goda si **jekh** bundia pe **jekh** naj. O naj pe **jekh** vah.
Dava sy **jekh** nay pry **jekh** gušt. Gušt pry **jekh** vast.
'This is **a** nail on **a** finger. The finger on **a** hand.'
   Si kadi **jekh** rota?
Si li godi **jekh** rota?
Dava sy **jekh** rota?
'Is that **a** circle?'