

DOI <https://doi.org/10.17234/SRAZ.68.4>

UDC 811.135.6'367

UDC 811.135.1'367

Original scientific paper

Received on 28 August 2023

Accepted for publication on 19 October 2023

The issue of the postpositional article in Balkan sprachbund and the case of Istro-Romanian

Mirna Bičanić

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb

mirnabicanic882@gmail.com

This paper aims to investigate the origin, development, and usage of the postpositional articles in Istro-Romanian, one of the Romanian historical dialects, a likewise dislocated member of the Balkan sprachbund. First, based on the available literature, the evolution of the postpositional articles in the Romance languages will be demonstrated, followed by the evolution of the articles in Romanian and Istro-Romanian, and the languages of the Balkan sprachbund. Afterwards will follow a corpus-based analysis of the similarities and dissimilarities regarding the usage of the postpositional articles in Romanian and Istro-Romanian. It will be based on the parallel texts in Romanian and Istro-Romanian from the Densusianu's and Pușcariu's collections. To distinguish as accurately as possible the stages of Istro-Romanian articles, Greenberg's methodology will be used. That is, his cycle of the grammaticalization of the articles will be applied. It is expected that the analysis will show that despite many centuries of foreign influence, the usage of the postpositional articles in Istro-Romanian is congruent to the usage of the postpositional articles in Romanian and other languages of the Balkan sprachbund.¹

Keywords: postpositional article, Balkan sprachbund, Romanian, Istro-Romanian, balkanisms

1. Introduction

Latin, like Proto-Indo-European, did not have articles.² This lack is connected to the syntactic declension system of Latin and words having more autonomy. Apart from Greek, the category of articles is a recent phenomenon, and as

¹ I would like to use this opportunity to extend my gratitude to all those who have helped me with writing this paper: my mentor Dražen Varga for his immense help and advice, Petar Radosavljević for his help with finding literature, the anonymous reviewers who have shown some resources I was not aware of, and to Mateusz Zawadzki, for his proofreading skills.

² Roman writers were aware of the difference when compared to Greek articles, and Quintilian famously said *sermo noster articulos non desiderat* (Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, 1, 4, 19).

far as Greek is concerned, a Semitic influence has been hypothesised (Putzu, Ramat 2011:32-33).³ Even so, already in pre-classical Latin, some instances point to the emergent Romance articles. Namely, in the anaphoric and deictic functions of the distal Latin demonstrative pronouns *ille*⁴, and *ipse* from which Romance articles (mostly) originated.⁵ Those functions are likewise substantivisation, especially whilst quoting indeclinable words. For example, *illud stertit volui dicere* “that he is snoring, I wanted to say” (Plautus, *Miles gloriosus*, 819); or *removen-dumque censeo illud dissimulantem* “and I think that *dissimulantem* needs to be removed” (Cicero, *Ad Atticum* 6 1, 11). Likewise, it can be found in the constructions where *ille* connects the noun to the adjective: *porcus ille silvaticus* “that wild pig” (Petronius, *Satyricon*, 40). The use of the demonstrative in such a position was called by some authors *gelenspartikel* (Tekavčić 1970:127-128).

Even though in the early texts wherein embryos of the Romance articles can be found, the use of *ille* and *ipse* was almost identical, today the vast majority of the Romance languages use *ille* as a foundation for their articles. However, in the Middle Ages, there were two large areas that were using *ipse*-based articles for forming the definite article: a large territory comprising of Sardinia and south Italy, and the other including Catalonia, Gascony all the way to the Alps. *Ipse* in the anaphoric position was frequent in late Latin of all provinces. These days only Sardinia and parts of Catalonia base their articles on the *ipse*, rather than *ille* (Tekavčić 1970:182-183).⁶

Romance languages likewise differ as per the position of the article relevant to the noun. The whole of western Romania forms the article (indefinite and definite) before the noun⁷, whilst only Romanian (which includes all Romanian dialects) forms the definite article after the noun. That is one of the main fea-

³ *There appears to be a geographical East-West gradient in the sequence in which the Def.Art. is attested. It is worth noting that all the great civilization movements in the Mediterranean including the spread of writing, show the same gradient, at least until the establishment of Rome's Mediterranean Empire. Leaving aside for obvious reasons of space all observations of a historical, cultural and sociolinguistic nature, it must be noted that languages belonging to different families and originally marked by considerable structural differences, in a rather limited chronological and geographical context, develop similar strategies for marking definiteness and for the type of nominal phrase; in contrast they show considerable typological discontinuity with their own preceding stages* (Putzu, Ramat 2011:32-33)

⁴ As claimed by Greenberg, the sources of definite articles typically are such distal demonstrative pronouns (Greenberg 1990:252). They can also arise from the “weakened” demonstrative (typically a distal demonstrative), or a third person demonstrative. Indefinite articles typically arise from unity numeral *one*. The definite article is more widespread than indefinite (De Mulder, Carlier 2011:1-2).

⁵ Some Romance languages developed double article systems – for example, Balearic Catalan and Picard. Balearic Catalan uses *ille* and *ipse* for the formation of its articles, while Picard uses *ecce* and *ille* (Bernstein, Ordóñez, Roca 2021:1).

⁶ This refers to the Catalan dialects in the Balearic islands and parts of the mainland, alongside Costa Brava (Bernstein Ordóñez, Roca 2021:2).

⁷ An interesting fact is that typically in languages there is at least 200 years' discrepancy between the consistent use of definite and of indefinite articles (Keenan 2011:1).

tures of the Balkan sprachbund, which Romanian is sharing with some other languages of the Balkan sprachbund – Albanian, Bulgarian and Macedonian. Istro-Romanian, like the other historical Romanian dialects, follows this paradigm and the goal of this paper is to explore to what extent its usage corresponds to the usage of the Daco-Romanian (standard Romanian) dialect.

This paper will start with an introduction to the subject which will be followed by an introduction to Greenberg's methodology of grammaticalisation of articles. Then the evolution of definite Romance articles and of Romanian and Istro-Romanian articles will be shown. Afterwards, a comparative corpus-based analysis will ensue, wherein the texts from Densusianu and Pușcariu's collections in Istro-Romanian and their translation to (Daco)Romanian will be examined. The usage of definite articles will be contrasted, and it will be ascertained whether the usage in Istro-Romanian is still congruent to the usage in Romanian and the other languages of the Balkan sprachbund. Likewise, considering that some of the articles (possessive and connective) have been differently categorised by different authors, and are of conflicting and somewhat disputable nature, to differentiate them as accurately as possible, Greenberg's stages of grammaticalisation of articles will be used.

There has been research into the origin and evolution of Romance, Romanian, Istro-Romanian articles and postpositional articles in the languages of the Balkan sprachbund, by Zvezdana Vrzić in Croatia and the USA, Oana Uță and Martin Maiden in the UK, Adina Dragomirescu, Ionuț Geană and Alexandru Nicolae in Romania among the others, some of it from the generative point of view. Zegrean in her doctoral dissertation from 2012 ("Aspects on the Syntax of Istro-Romanian") also used generative approach while exploring the syntax of the Istro-Romanian. Still, there have not been many corpus-based, typological investigations of the same subjects. Therefore this paper aims to fill in that void.

2. Greenberg's cycle

Considering the wider number of articles in different stages of grammaticalization in Romanian and Istro-Romanian, there was a need for some kind of tool to differentiate them as accurately as possible. For that purpose, Greenberg's cycle (or stages) was used, in his paper originally from 1978: "How Does a Language Acquire Gender Marks?". In it, he proposed several stages and two systems on the languages of the west Atlantic group of Niger-Congo, but this system can be applied to other languages as well. The stages are: zero stage – the stage of the demonstrative pronoun, which is followed by the first stage (1) definite article, the second stage (2) is non-generic article and the third (3) is noun marker. In other words, the cycle starts as a distal demonstrative with no marker, followed by the first stage, which is the definite article, followed by the non-generic article and ends with a class prefix (Greenberg 1990:252).

The different systems are covert and overt: overt are the ones in which the nouns already bear gender markings, and covert are the ones with nouns hav-

ing no gender markings. Covert systems can further be distinguished into those that used to have gender markings, like French, or those that never had them, like the Northern Caucasian languages (Greenberg 1990:245).

While it is clear that all dialects of Romanian belong to the overt system, at what stage are some of the articles is open to debate.

3. Postpositional article

Postpositional articles exist, apart from the Balkan area, also in Scandinavian languages, Basque, Armenian, south Arabic dialects, western Aramaic, Somali, Housa, Oromo and many Berber dialects (Kovačec 1988:24).⁸ Those are very different linguistic traditions, geographically very distant from one another. Every attempt at finding one source of diffusion of this linguistic phenomenon was proven to be impossible (Banfi 1985:64).

The emergence of the article in Latin is closely correlated to its structure becoming increasingly analytical, which can also be seen in the loss of declension and case endings.⁹ It is difficult to pinpoint exactly when demonstratives became fully grammaticalised as articles. Some point to their anaphoric and deictic use already in Plautus' time (3rd/2nd century BC), Cicero's letters (1st century BC), and works of Petronius Arbiter (1st century AD) (Müller 1924:1-59). Others place it in somewhat later times starting with Apuleius (2nd century AD) (Löfsted 1932/33:39), or even later, starting with 700 AD (Lerch 1940:113-190). Considering such differences in opinion, the question arises whether the development of the articles is to be placed in the pre-Romance, Latin phase or post-Latin Romance phase (Dimitrescu et al 1978:225-226). This shift means moving towards the stage (2) of the Greenberg's cycle (Greenberg 1990:252).

4. Postpositional definite article(s) in Romanian

Postpositional Romanian article developed from the vulgar Latin distal variants *illus, illa, illum* of Latin demonstrative *ille, illa, illud* in the unmarked position, which is also the source of the pronouns *el, ea* in the marked position. Definite article in Romanian includes (apart from the already mentioned definite article *-l, -le*) *-a, -i, -le*.¹⁰ The so-called possessive articles (*genitival*) *al* (preposition *a + ille*), *a, ai, ale* are called "possessive modifiers" by Lyons (Lyons 2003: 80),

⁸ From the typological point of view, the grammatical category of articles is not too common – as claimed by Dryer, about one-third of the world's languages use articles (Dryer 1989:87). Likewise, about 8% of the languages have both definite and indefinite articles and their spread is geographically speaking very unequal, with a high incidence in western European countries (De Mulder, Carlier 2011:1).

⁹ A similar occurrence of the loss of morphological markers alongside the appearance of the articles happened in Germanic languages (De Mulder, Carlier 2011:1).

¹⁰ According to standard Romanian dialectology, *-u* has been the general article, and the loss of *-l* is typical for all Romanian varieties (Rusu (ed) 1984:219-220).

whilst the (typically called) connective article *cel, cea, cei, cele*¹¹, (*ecce + illum*, that can loosely be translated as “behold that”) Greenberg calls “improper articles”. He sees them as redundant anaphoras, and their origin traces to topicalized sentences (Greenberg 1990:252). Lyons calls them “free form determiners” (Lyons 2003:75). Giurgea, on the other hand, calls them “strong definite articles, that are used when owing to the syntactical reasons, suffixes cannot be used” (Giurgea 2013:120).

The possessive article, apart from being used to express possession, also is used with ordinal numbers¹², while the connective article is used with adjectives. The possessive article has two variants – the variable one, which changes in conformity with the gender and the number – *al, a, ai, ale* and the invariable one – *a*. The possessive forms are also used to mark the genitive case on the determiner phrase whose head is a quantifier or a number. For example, *cartea a cinci colegi* (“book. the GEN five colleagues”) or *opinia a multi oameni* (“opinion. the GEN many people”). Those variants were found as early as the sixteenth century and there are differing explanations concerning which one is older (Densusianu 1961:169-170).

Origin and evolution of the postpositional articles in Romanian (Dimitrescu et al. 1978:237-238)

Masculine gender		Feminine gender	
Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
<i>-l, -le</i> (from <i>illus</i>)	<i>-i</i> (from <i>illi</i>)	<i>-a</i> (from <i>illa</i>) The article <i>-a</i> was at first added to the unmarked form of the noun, while later it phonetically evolved by eliminating the unmarked form	<i>-le</i> (from <i>illae</i>)
	<i>(illi-ili-il'-i)</i>	<i>-ll+a</i> in the unmarked position disappears: <i>stella</i> becomes <i>stea</i>	

Origin and evolution of the possessive article (*genitival*) in Romanian (Dimitrescu et al. 1978:237-238)

Masculine gender		Feminine gender	
Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
<i>al</i> (<i>ad+illum</i>)	<i>ai</i> (<i>ad+illi</i>)	<i>a</i> (<i>ad+illa</i>)	<i>ale</i> (<i>ad+illae</i>)

¹¹ As specified by Tomić, *cel, cea, cei, cele* are non-clitic articles, and not demonstratives (Tomić 2006:132).

¹² Ordinal Romanian numbers are formed by combining enclitic and proclitic articles: namely, they are formed with a possessive *al* after which follows the cardinal number, enclitic article, and particle *-a*. For example: masculine nouns – *al șaptelea* (the seventh), for feminine *a șaptea* (Dimitrescu et al. 1978:247).

Origin and evolution of the connective article in Romanian
(Dimitrescu et al. 1978:237-238)

Masculine gender		Feminine gender	
Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
<i>cel (ecce+illum)</i>	<i>cei (ecce+illi)</i>	<i>cea (ecce+illa)</i>	<i>cele (ecce+illae)</i>

Proposed chart of the Romanian articles based on Greenberg's cycle

Stage 0 (demonstrative)	Stage 1 (definite article)	Stage 2 (specific article)	Stage 3 (noun marker)
<i>illus, illa, illum</i>	<i>al, a, ai, ale</i>	<i>cel, cea, cei, cele</i>	<i>-l, -le, -a, -i, -le</i>

For Romanian, stages of distal demonstratives (*illus, illa, illum*) and enclitic articles *-l, -le, -a, -i, -le*, which are in zero and (3) stages, are quite clear, but the problem arises when trying to accurately ascertain the position of the connective (*cel, cea, cei, cele*) and possessive articles (*al, a, ai, ale*). As already stated, Greenberg calls them "improper" articles and claims them to be cases of redundant, intra-clausal anaphora, and sees their origin in topicalized sentences (Greenberg 1990:265). Considering that a similar kind of connective articles exist in Greek and Albanian, it seems to be a balkanism shared among the three languages. A similar construction was found in Vulgar Latin of that area too, as mentioned previously – *porcus ille salvaticus*, which was named *gelenspartikel* by some authors (Tekavčić 1970:127-128). In this analysis, they will still be treated as proper articles, even if unusual ones, and placed tentatively at the stage (2) of specific articles. This kind of article seems to encode more specificity than definiteness, hence they were not put in the stage (1) of definite article. Nonetheless, since possessive articles display more definiteness than specificity, they are placed in stage (1) of a definite article. But, it depends on the context: Lyons gives examples of a clear definiteness in *noua carte a scriitorului* "the writer's new book", but he also mentions that when used with the numerals the definiteness resides in a numeral instead (Lyons 2003:80-81).

5. Postpositional definite article(s) in Istro-Romanian

In Istro-Romanian, there are postpositional definite articles for masculine and for the so-called neuter/ambigenous nouns: *-u, -i, -le*, and for the feminine nouns *a, -le*.¹³ In the north (Žejane) there is a difference between singular non-articulated nouns ending in *-e* and articulated feminine nouns ending in *-a*, but in the south, (Šušnjeвица) such differentiation has been lost (Kovačec in Rusu (ed) 1984:567). As the masculine nouns are concerned, in singular, apart from the suffixes *-u*, and *-le*, there are also allomorphs *-(v)u*, with certain nouns: *bo – bovu* ("ox"). In the plural, in Žejane, with *-i*, also *-le* can be used, likewise with the

¹³ Likewise, there is latent *-l* article observable in some vocative masculine forms like *omule, dommule* etc. (Kovačec in Rusu (ed) 1984:569).

nouns that were neuter (ambigenous) in the past, but have since changed into the masculine gender. Also, those masculine nouns that end in *-ure* in plural get the suffix *-le*: *lup – lupure – lupurle* “wolfs”; *corb – corbure – corburle* “crows” (Kovačec 1998:284).

Even so, some masculine nouns in plural which end in *-i*, do not have a special marking that would distinguish the determinate from the indeterminate nouns: *socri* “father in law”, *hlapți* “sluge”. Such case likewise refers to the loanwords from Italian ending in *-o*: *nono – noni* (“grandfather – grandfathers”), *impiegato – impiegati* (“employee – employees”) and Croatian: *dečko – dečki* (“boy – boys”). Insofar as the feminine nouns are concerned, in case that distinction is preserved (namely in the southern villages of Šušnjevića and Nova Vas), the suffix for the article in the singular is *-a*: *o căse – căsa* (“house”); nouns *o ml’â* (“young sheep”), *o vițe* (“young cow”) can have suffixes *-vu*: *ml’âvu, vițevu, ste – stevu* (“star”), *ne – nevu* (“snow”).¹⁴ These feminine nouns actually follow masculine pattern: *bo – bovu* (“ox”), where *v* is occurring due to epiphonic and syllable structure reasons (Geană 2020:176). Nevertheless, those same nouns in the southern villages can have these variants as well: *o ste – stela, o stele – stela* and *o vițe – vițela*. Likewise, some pseudo-diminutive forms can be found: *stelița, vițelița* (Kovačec 1971:97).

In the southern villages neuter (ambigenous) nouns have been well preserved and the suffix for the postpositional article is *-le*: *un pițor, pițoru* (“a/the leg”), in the plural *pițore, pițorle*. Adjectives can also get *-le* as a suffix for articles: *mare – marle* (“a/the big”), *pârvi – pârville* (“a/the small”). When a noun is accompanied by an adjective in a prepositional form which is ending in *-e* (in Žejane likewise in *-i*) suffix *-le* refers to the whole syntagm: *an mare om – mârle om* (“big man – the big man”); *an pârvi frâte – pârville frâte* (“a/the small brother”). In some cases, suffix *-le* signifies only a singular masculine object: *un iâco mârle șârpe* (“a very big snake”) (Kovačec in Rusu (ed) 1984:567). There are also lexicalised syntagms like *verdele spir* (“hawthorn”) that literally means “the green thorn” (Kovačec 1998:273). Oftentimes, the sense of determination is additionally expressed via demonstratives *česta, sta, čela*: *česta bogātu frate* (“the rich brother”), *čela mâre potoc* (“the big stream”). When an adjective is a substitute for a noun, determination is likewise expressed by a preceding demonstrative: *čela micu* (“the little one”). The adjective in such cases may or may not bear a postpositional article *-u*, zero article or *-e* for masculine and *-e* or *-a* for feminine forms (Kovačec in Rusu (ed) 1984:567).

¹⁴ These nouns’ endings in *-vu* correspond phonetically to the similar endings in Aromanian and Banate Romanian dialects in *-ao*: *steao, neao*, from *steauă, neauă* (Pușcariu 1926:146).

The chart for Istro-Romanian postpositional article forms, taken from Geană (Geană 2020:176)

Case	Gender	Singular	Plural
N≡ACC	M	-u, (-u), -le	-i, -le
N≡ACC	F	-a, -vu	-le

In Istro-Romanian the possessive article comes only in the invariable form *a*, and there is a likewise a connective article *čela*. Istro-Romanian shows additional means of demonstrating the determination of nouns and adjectives by using prepositional demonstratives *česta*, *čela*, *ča* as additional articles¹⁵, presumably by copying the Italian model. For example: *česta bogatu frate* “that rich brother” (“il fratello ricco”). Such usage usually appears in the phrases wherein Croatian would use the long, determinate adjective, signifying possible Croatian influence as well: *čela micu* (“the little one”) (Kovačec 1998:273).

Chart of postpositional articles in Šušnjevića, Nova Vas (Kovačec 1998:272)

	Singular		Plural	
	Indefinite	Definite	Indefinite	Definite
masc.gend.	(un) om (un) frâte (un) socru (un) lup (un) preft	omu frâtele socru lupu preftu	omir frăț socri lup preft	omiri frăț socri lupi prefti
ambig.	(un) cus (un) žăzet	cusu žăzetu	cusure žăzete	cusurle žăzetele
fem.gend.	(o) căse (o) vâke (o) mul'ere	căsa vâca mul'era	căse vâč (N) mul'er	căsele vâčile mul'erle
(neuter)	(srebro)	(srebro)	-	

Chart of postpositional articles in Žejane (Kovačec 1998:272)

	Singular		Plural			
	Indefinite	Definite	Indefinite		Definite	
masc. gend.	(un) om (un) frâte (un) socru (un) lup (un) preft (un) cus (un) žăzet	omu frâtele socru lupu preftu cusu žăzetu	omir frăț socri (lup) preft	omure lupure prefure cusure žăzete	omiri frăț socri (lupi) prefti	omurle lupurle prefurle cusurle žăzetele

¹⁵ The orthography differs from author to author with some writing *česta*, *čela*, *ča* and some *țesta*, *țela*, *ța* or *cesta*, *cela*, *ca*. However, there is the issue of different realizations in the north/Žejane (pre-palatal affricate) versus south/Šušnjevića (dental affricate). The original orthography from the sources has been preserved throughout this paper.

fem. gend.	(o) căsa (o) vâca (o) mul'ăre	căsa vâca mul'ăra	căse vâč mul'er	căsele vâčile mul'erle
(neuter)	srebro testo pitańe	srebro testo pitańa	- - pitańa (?)	- - -

Chart of connective articles in Istro-Romanian (Kovačec 1998:272)

Singular				Plural			
<i>čela</i>	<i>česta</i>	<i>ča</i>	<i>časta</i>	<i>čel'i</i>	<i>češt'i</i>	<i>čăle</i>	<i>čăste</i>

Chart of possessive articles in Istro-Romanian (Kovačec 1998:272)

Singular possessive							
		1. pronoun		2. pronoun		3. pron (refl)	
		masc gend	fem gend	masc gend	fem gend	masc gend	fem gend
Sg	N/A	a mev (a me)	a me/a ma/a mă	a tev	a ta/a tă	a sev/ (a se)	a sa/a sã
Pl	N/A	a mel'	a mele	a tel'	a tăle	a sel'	a sele

Plural possessive							
		1. pronoun		2. pronoun		3. pron (refl)	
		masc gend	fem gend	masc gend	fem gend	masc gend	fem gend
Sg	N/A	a nostru	a nostra	a vostru	a vostra	a sev (a se)	a sa/ a sã
Pl	N/A	a noșt'i	a nostre	a voșt'i	a vostre	a sel'	a sele

Irreflexive forms for the 3. pronoun							
		masc gend	fem gend	masc gend	fem gend	masc gend	fem gend
Sg	N/A	(-u, -le) a lui	(-a) a lui	(-u, -le) al' ei	(-a) a l'ei	(-u, -le) a lor	(-a) lor
Pl	N/A	(-i) a lui	(-le) a lui	(-i) a l'ei	(-le) a l'ei	(-i) a lor	(-le) a lor

Proposed chart of the Istro-Romanian articles in compliance with Greenberg's cycle, based on literature

Stage 0 (demonstrative)	Stage 1 (definite article)	Stage 2 (specific article)	Stage 3 (noun marker)
<i>illus, illa, illum</i> <i>čela, česta, ča, časta,</i> <i>čeli, česti, čale, časte</i>	<i>a</i> <i>(čela, česta, ča, časta,</i> <i>čeli, česti, čale, časte)</i>	<i>čela, česta, ča, časta,</i> <i>čeli, česti, čale, časte</i>	<i>-u, -i, -le, -a, -le</i> <i>-vu</i>

The chart considerably resembles the Romanian chart, with some exceptions. First, the possessive article being used solely in its invariable form *a* has been tentatively put in the stage (1) of a definite article, since it usually appears in the contexts where it is displaying definiteness. Second, a group of distal demonstratives used as a secondary means of determination (*čela, česta, ča*) were

likewise placed at the stage (1) of definite articles, since they are displaying more definiteness than specificity. The connective articles (*čela, česta, ča*) have been placed at the second stage (2), of a specific article, as they are displaying more specificity than definiteness. The enclitics *-u, -i, -le, -a, -le* have been placed at stage (3) of a noun marker.

6. Mechanisms of the article formation in the Balkan area

There are several mechanisms of the postpositional articles formation and clasification in the Balkan area.

Banfi mentions ways of forming the definite article in the south Slavic languages of the Balkan area, Macedonian and Bulgarian, wherein the definite article is only enclitic. For example, in Bulgarian: *trup-at* ("the body"), *žena – žena-ta* ("a/the woman"), *pero – pero-to* ("a/the feather"). In Macedonian and some Bulgarian dialects there are triple systems of enclitic suffixes *-t, -v, -n* for Macedonian, and *-t, -s, -n* for some Bulgarian dialects (at Rodhopi, around Tran and near Serbian border) (Tomić 2006:89).¹⁶ Some examples for Bulgarian are: ма̀ждѹт (general determination: "man"), ма̀ждѹс (for closer objects: "this man"), ма̀ждѹн (for more distant objects: "that man"). Examples from Macedonian, from the area of Trana, are: *-t, -v, -n*: ма̀ждѹт ("this man" with determinite article), ма̀ждѹв ("that man"), ма̀ждѹн ("that man over there"). In a similar vein, the definite articles can be formed in Romanian and Albanian, with the postpositional article: Albanian *shok – shok-u* ("a/the comrade, friend"), *vajzë – vajza* ("a/the girl"), Romanian *om – om-ul* ("a/the man"), *fată – fata* ("a/the girl"). However, the article can also be formed in the copulative position: Albanian *vajzë e urtë* ("virtuous girl"). Another way can be found in Greek, wherein the determinate article is a proclitic: ὁ ἄνθρωπος ("the man"). Nonetheless, the article can be also found in the copulative position: ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ χαλός ("the good man") (Banfi 1985:64-65).

Lindstedt mentions two mechanisms of the article formation in the Balkan area: the enclitic as can be found in Bulgarian, Macedonian, Albanian and Romanian and connective articles, as can be found in Greek, Romanian and Albanian. Nevertheless, there is a difference when it comes to the position of the adjectives: in Romanian and Albanian, the adjective usually follows the head noun, and when an adjective specifier is added, the enclitic article does not move. However, when the Albanian or Romanian adjective is before a noun in a marked position, it can take postpositional article. For example, Romanian *om-ul bun* and also *bun-ul om* ("the good man") (Lindstedt 2014:7).

¹⁶ The Eastern and Northern Macedonian dialects do not show such three partite distinction, with the *-t* suffixes being the only set of definite articles (Tomić 2006:57). In some southern dialects, in the area of Bitola, the final consonants of the masculine form have been dropped, and there is only one form of masculine definite article, in *-o* (Tomić 2006:57-58).

Moreover, in the Balkan Slavic languages, the adjective comes before the noun, as can be seen in this Bulgarian example: *dobrij-ăt čovek* ("the good man"). Greek does not have such an enclitic article and in the unmarked word order the article comes before the noun phrase: *o kalos andras* ("the good man").¹⁷ But when the adjective is in the marked position behind the head noun, a reduplication of the article ensues: *o andras o kalos*. This is the second mechanism, the so-called connective article, and can be found in the marked position, between the noun and adjective or possessive. It can occur in Albanian, Romanian and Greek.¹⁸ Connective article in Greek could be the oldest model for the connective article in Albanian and Romanian.¹⁹ In Romanian it occurs often as an addition to the enclitic article: *omul cel bun* ("the good man"). In that example the usage of the connective article is optional, but when an adjective does not come directly after the head noun, connective article is obligatory: *duhul Domnului cel sfânt* ("the holy spirit of God"). Albanian and Romanian versions are closer to one another than either of them is to the Greek version. Still, Romanian connective article differs from Albanian according to its function: Albanian connective article can be used in situations where Romanian would not be used. Not only can it be used for expressions like *njeri-u i mirë* ("the good man", where *-u* is an enclitic determinate article while *-i* is a connective article), but also *një njeri i mirë* (with a proclitic indeterminate article *-një*). That kind of article can occur in front of the nouns even in the marked prenominal position: *vajz-a e mirë* ("good girl") where *-a* is the enclitic article, and *-e* is the connective article. However, the Albanian connective article differs from the typical "article". It was formed after the enclitic (definite) article, it is less grammaticalized, and can be used with various forms of adjectives and possessives (Lindstedt 2014: 175-178).

Slavic Balkan languages did not develop connective articles because their unmarked word order consisted of adjectives followed by nouns. However, in most southern Slavic dialects, under the influence of the Greek constructions, nouns can have double enclitic articles. Therefore, the Greek expression *i jortes i meyales* ("the great festivals") became in Macedonian *praznici-ti golemi-te* as can be seen on the title page of the Konikovo Gospel, written in Thessaloniki, in 1863 (Mazon, Vaillant 1938: 3-4).²⁰

¹⁷ This example, like all the others, is taken from the source in its original form.

¹⁸ Likewise, in Balkan Romani similar repetition of the article can occur – *o baro raklo* ("big boy") can become *o raklo o baro* (Lindstedt 2014:175).

¹⁹ Greek definite article, even though in the proclitic position, was the first that emerged in the Balkan region. Likewise, the Greek connective article was the first (chronologically speaking) connective article (Lindstedt 2014:175).

²⁰ *Gospod(i)novo i sfetágo Evayyélio na Bóga nášago gólema Criĳfa Hristjánof, iskáreno na búgarcko izík', tuvášno zbor na Vardaría. Za uf nedélite sáti za gudinata, i za sáti prazniĳiti golémite, za cela godina za liĳurgiata* (Mazon, Vaillant 1938: 3-4).

Chart of postpositional articles in Languages of the Balkan sprachbund (Steinke, Vraciu 1999:112-113)

Albanian

	Masc gend	Fem gend	Neut gend	Plural
N	-i, -u	-a	-t(e)	-i(e)

Bulgarian

	Masc gend	Fem gend	Neut gend	Plural
N	-ЪТ	-ТА	-ТО	-ТЕ

Macedonian

Masc gend	Fem gend	Neut gend	Plural
-ОТ	-ТА	-ТО	-ТЕ
-ОБ	-БА	-БО	-БЕ
-ОИ	-ИА	-ИО	-НЕ

Romanian

	Singular		Plural	
	Masc/Neuter gend	Fem gend	Masc/Neuter gend	Fem gend
N/A	-(u)l	-u(a)	-i	-le

7. Origin of the enclitic article in the Balkan area

Considering that the enclitic article appears in all four historical Romanian dialects, which have split before the tenth century, it must have formed very early (Kovačec 1988:37). Albanian article also must be very old since it is phonetically very reduced, as can be seen in the oldest Latin elements present in Albanian. For example, the relation between the indeterminate *ftua*, *ftue* ("quince") and determinate *fton-i* (from Latin *cotoneum*) can be explained only through the shift of the syllable ending – *fto-ni* (Barić 1959:25). There are many theories about the origin of the enclitic article: from substrate explanation to superstrate and adstrate theories. Likewise, exist theories involving Latin (or Slavic) sentence constructions as potential sources.

7.1. Substrate theories

These theories search for the origin of the enclitic article in the Daco-Thracian-Mysian substrate since some Thracian monuments kept relics of such a postpositional article. Romanian and Albanian inherit some elements from that substrate – that is, Dacic elements in Romanian and Thraco-Mysian in Albanian. However, there is a lack of data for these languages so any conclusion is unverifiable. It could only be said that the influence of the Thracic and Dacic

substrate is indisputable, but it is not clear to what extent or in which manner (Katičić 1976:152).

A frequent example of the shared Daco-Mysian ancestry between Albanian and Romanian is the lack of the determinate article after the prepositions (except after the preposition *cu*) (Banfi 1985:72-73). Likewise, both languages use proclitic articles instead of nouns. Apart from that, the genitive plural of the Albanian demonstrative (*atyrë, ketyrë*) has the analogue origin as the Romanian genitive plural *lor* (from Latin *illorum*). Based on these facts, Sandfeld thinks that the article developed simultaneously in both languages, reinforced because of the occasional tendency of vulgar Latin to use postpositional article.²¹ Sandfeld also considers (apart from mentioning possible Balkan-Armenian congruences)²², that development of the article in Bulgarian is a consequence of the Romanian influence.²³ Namely, in the Middle Ages Romanians and Bulgarians were in close contact, especially in the 13th century, during the Bulgarian second kingdom. Nevertheless, he considers Weigand's opinion of complete Romanian influence over Bulgarian to be an exaggeration, placing full affirmation of the Bulgarian article in the 17th century. In his opinion, the article in Bulgarian was developed after the Romanian article, but it is questionable which language affected Romanian and Albanian (Sandfeld 1930:168). If the article in Bulgarian did occur so late, it would mean independent development. Still, newer investigations of the history of Bulgarian have shown that postpositional articles developed in Bulgarian between the ninth and thirteen centuries, before the fall of the final jery, and after the voicing of the strong jery (for example: from *narodb-tb* to *narodbt*). Some Bulgarian chronicles from the eleventh century (John Skylitzes), likewise, *Codex Assemanianus* and Bulgarian manuscripts from the thirteenth century (*Evangelium* from Dobroševo), and some religious texts (prayers and psalms) from the ancient Bulgarian colony Sadmograd in Transilvania show that postpositional article was already used during those times (Banfi 1985:69).

²¹ That can be seen in the aforementioned late Latin texts of that time, like *Peregrinatio Etheriae: spelluncam illam* (*Peregrinatio* 3, 7); *ubi factus est vitullus ille* (*Peregrinatio* 5, 3).

²² As a confirmation of that theory, some investigations of the connections between the Armenian and Balkan linguistic areas can be reported. Regarding such explanations, Armenian (which has a postpositional article), and which is connected to Frigian (which is connected to the Thracian) has impacted the languages of the Balkan peninsula. Banfi also mentions such theories as per which Frigians were inhabiting the area of the Balkan peninsula into which Bulgarians would come in the Middle Ages. Such an interpretation would mean that it is a linguistic phenomenon that is connecting many languages in a chain reaction (Banfi 1985:65-66).

²³ Some ascribe the postpositional article *-a* in Romanian nouns of the masculine gender to the Thracic influence (Paliga 2015:74). Paliga mentions *tatã* (which was taken from the Latin *tata, ae, m* "dad") and *popã* (colloquially meaning "priest"), which explains as a relict of the Thracic article *-a*. Even though we cannot know the forms of the Thracic nouns, Paliga thinks that the existence of the postpositional article *-a* in some Romanian nouns of the masculine gender serves as proof for his interpretation (Paliga 2015:74).

The question is, how do such theories explain balkanisms in Greek, which never had the corresponding Illyric-Daco-Tracian-Mysian substrate? It is also questionable whether the existence of balkanisms in the Balkan Slavic languages can be explained via the influence of such a substrate. In the old church Slavonic of the tenth century, there were hardly any Balkanisms at all, even though the Slavs had already been by that time in the Balkan peninsula for a while.

7.2. Superstrate/adstrate theories

A number of Bulgarian authors find that answer to this question in adhering to the superstrate/adstrate theories. They consider Bulgarian as the source of the postpositional article in the Balkan peninsula and think that Bulgarian postpositional article developed from the demonstrative pronoun with the anaphorical value. In other words, Bulgarian postpositional article deeply affected the Romanian system of articles, and all the forms of the Romanian articles developed because of the Bulgarian influence. As claimed by such a theory, Bulgarian continues the dialectal phenomenon from Praslavic, and it has been further emphasized by the influence of the neighbouring dialects (Banfi 1985:67-68).²⁴

Even if onesided theories of the exclusive Bulgarian influence on the surrounding languages are without a doubt farfetched, there is a possibility that Balkan Slavic languages deepened the idea of grammaticalised determination. Praslavic had, like the Baltic languages, developed a category of the determinate (long) adjectives which were expressed by the demonstrative suffix *ji* in the enclitic position. Therefore, there was a difference between *novo mesto* (indeterminate) and *novo-je mesto* (determinate), that is, between the indeterminate and determinate adjectives. In modern Bulgarian and Macedonian, that difference has disappeared, and long adjective is used only as a relic in some toponyms. For example, in Bulgarian, there are toponyms *Gorni Dăbnik*, *Dolni Dăbnik*, while the usual adjectives of the masculine gender are *goren* ("upper") and *dolen* ("lower"). Nevertheless, masculine determinate article in the Balkan Slavic languages is not affixed to their shorter (modern) but to more archaic longer form. Therefore, Bulgarian has *gornij-at etaž*, while Macedonian has *gorni-ot kat*. That shows that the new system of the articles evolved before the older system disappeared. Such optional enclitic Slavic demonstrative enriched the linguistic features in the Balkan region. Bulgarian *kniga-ta* ("book" with the determinate article) corresponds, for example, to the Polish *książka ta* "that book".²⁵ In old church Slavonic texts demonstrative *tu* (meaning "this, that"), which became the source of the article in the Balkan Slavic languages, often appears in the enclitic position: *mesto to* ("this place"), and it can also appear

²⁴ Such ideas propose a question – why, for example, (standard) Serbian or Croatian do not have an article considering numerous congruences with Bulgarian? Aside from that, Bulgarian and Romanian articles differ considerably, when their usage is taken into account (Ilie 1979:116-118).

²⁵ More common usage in Polish is *ta książka*.

in between adjectives and the head noun: *bogočistivy tu možu* ("this godfearing man"). It is difficult to accurately judge when the demonstrative *tu* was grammaticalised as an article. Even so, it is interesting to mention that in one codex from the 11th century *Codex Suprasliensis*, which is a translation from the Greek, *tu* sometimes corresponds to the Greek determinate article in the original text (Lindstedt 2014:176).

7.3. Theories regarding the configuration of the sentence

These theories can be divided into those who see the ancestry of the postpositional article in the inner arrangement, intonation or configuration of the Latin sentence, and into those who see the origin of the postpositional article in the inner configuration of the Slavic sentence, word order in the Bulgarian sentence and the position of the adjectives relevant to the noun. They usually separate development of the Bulgarian postpositional article from the development of the postpositional article in Romanian and Albanian.

Speaking of Latin influence, some have said that the typical structure of the noun group of the vulgar Latin in the Balkan area was *homo ille bonus*, as it is in Romanian, and hence the formation of the enclitic article. Demonstrative *ille*, which would come before the adjective, lost its original role by the 6th and 7th centuries, when it became one unit with the noun. Specified by such an explanation, when vulgar Latin transforms into so-called pra-Romanian, enclitic articles occur as a consequence of the nominal structure of the Romanian sentence (Ilie 1979:125).

Likewise, demonstrative in Latin would come after the noun usually in the context of some person or a name, since then the noun would be in the emphatic position. Statistic research purports that claim: *ille* would usually come before the noun, however, due to stylistic reasons or emphasis, precision or expressivity, sometimes would be positioned after the noun. In the late Latin text *Peregrinatio Aetherae*, *ille* is in the proclitic position 194 times, and in the enclitic position 80 times. In the opinion of Rosetti, Romanian kept the construction in the enclitic position (Rosetti 1986:234).

Some see the origin of the postpositional article in the order of the Latin sentence and think that the influence of the Bulgarian substrate can be discarded. As stated by such theories, it can be connected to the indirect influence of the Romanian and Albanian. They ascribe paradigms like *homo ille* versus *ille homo* to the falling intonation of the rhythmic group characteristic of eastern Romania, as opposed to the intonation of Western Romania. Owing to such a difference, in Western Romance languages, determinate articles are antepositional relevant to the noun (Banfi 1985:67).²⁶

²⁶ Sandfeld likewise comments on whether the Romanian article, as is visible in the determined noun *omul*, developed directly from *homo ille*, or it is a question of this kind of development: *homo-ille bonus* developing into *homo ille*. The article, in his opinion,

On the other hand, some think that the development and some usages of the Bulgarian article can be ascribed solely to the Romanian influence, mostly due to the order of words in a sentence and owing to the difference of the article usage in Romanian and Bulgarian. Contrastive analysis of the Bulgarian and Romanian articles point to their differences: Bulgarian has only postpositional articles²⁷, differs in the manner in which they are used, does not have a possessive article (*genitival*) or a connective article. Because of these differences some authors think that in the East the position of the article was always after the noun (*homo ille*), which is explained by the Romance influence, that has been exacerbated by the Bulgarian and Albanian adstrate (Ilie 1979:123).

Others, noticing the differences between Albanian, Romanian and Bulgarian, emphasized that the development of the article is a consequence of the word order, especially in Albanian and Romanian, namely the position of the adjective after the noun. In Bulgarian on the other hand, it is a consequence of the configuration of the Slavic languages. Therefore the origin of the article in these three languages is not shared (Ilie 1979:116-118).

8. Texts upon which the analysis is made

Based on the texts from the Pușcariu's and the Densusianu's collection a contrastive analysis will be done in order to ascertain as accurately as possible the difference in the usage of the articles.

The analysis will be executed on two separate groups of texts from Pușcariu's collection – the five texts in the southern (Šušnjevića) dialect of Istro-Romanian from 1906 which he also translated to Daco-Romanian, and the eleven texts in the northern (Žejane) dialect of Istro-Romanian involving the collaboration of Antonio Glavina and A. Viciu. Likewise, the contrastive analysis will be done on the Biblical texts from the Densusianu's collection from 1887²⁸, which include texts in three dialects and the version in Daco-Romanian from 1560 and 1795.

must have developed before the tenth century, most likely in the ninth (Sandfeld 1930:171-173).

²⁷ Tomić claims that Bulgarian and Macedonian also have indefinite articles based on the numeral *one*. They are in singular: *eden, edna, edno*, and in plural *edni* (Tomić 2006:55). She, nevertheless, mentions that their statuses have been questioned and that some authors prefer to call them "indefinite adjectives", seeing that they can co-occur with the definite articles and carry the definite articles: *Ednata žena dojde* "One of the women came". She insists on calling them articles nonetheless and claims that their rarer occurrence than, for example, in English, is due to Bulgarian and Macedonian having a three-way opposition: zero, definite and indefinite. Therefore, in many cases where English would use an indefinite article, Bulgarian and Macedonian would use the zero article. She gives an example of a Bulgarian sentence with a zero article and its translation into English: *Pred kaštata stoeše mlada žena* "In front of a house stood a young woman" (Tomić 2006:89).

²⁸ It is worth mentioning that Pușcariu also mentions and reproduces Densusianu's *Parable of the Prodigal Son*, but only partially (Pușcariu 1926:232-236)

The first group of texts from Pușcariu's collection consists of several narrative texts from Šušnjevića that differ in length, each having a translation in Daco-Romanian. However, not all texts have been translated into Daco-Romanian, and while some have been translated into Italian, some have not been translated at all, and these have not been included in the analysis. All the texts from one group start with a phrase "O vote" which corresponds to Daco-Romanian "Odată", by which folktales and myths would start in Romanian folklore. The stories in this collection indeed are folk tales and fairy tales, and closely resemble the Daco-Romanian folktale narrative tradition. They are informative and celebrate wisdom, and were spoken to the children by their parents due to their educational content. Their hero is usually an ordinary fellow, often a servant, (sometimes a girl), who outwits their masters. Or it is talking about a captive who outwits their abductor, or a monster, and owing to their ingenuity acquires a fortune and happiness. There are also some popular anecdotes and shorter folk stories called ("snoave")²⁹, in which the hero is similar to the hero called Păcală in (Daco)romanian *snoave*.³⁰ Some are very short, and talking about various superstitions, or monsters named Strige, Strigon, Vile, Ris, Morine, Ucodlac. There are also jokes, and descriptions of customs revolving weddings and Christmas (Pușcariu 1906:118).

The second group of texts from Pușcariu's collection consists of eleven texts of various lengths from Žejane, with the translation into Daco-Romanian by Antonio Glavina and Pușcariu. Some of them are folk tales, while some describe customs like making cheese, selling coal, rituals like weddings etc. (Pușcariu 1906:212-233).

Densusianu's collection consists of some Biblical texts written down in 1887: Parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15:11-32) in the Istro-Romanian dialects of Žejane, Šušnjevića, Brdo and a version of the same story from the Coresi Bible from 1560/1561 in the Daco-Romanian of that time.³¹ Likewise, there is a short excerpt from the Book of Jeremiah (The Book of Lamentations 1), with its version in the dialect of Brdo and the translation of it from the Bible printed in 1795.

9. Analysis

Even though the texts are over a hundred years old, the language has not changed so much that it would lead to faulty conclusions. There is a forty-year gap between the two collections, so hopefully, this gap will provide an additional diachronic dimension to the analysis. Namely, it will be interesting to

²⁹ As specified by Dex online, *snoave* are short folk tales that have anecdotal meaning. Accessed 15.05.2023. <https://dexonline.ro/definitie/snoav%C4%83>

³⁰ Păcală as a witty character appears (alongside another hero named Tândală) in Romanian folk tales and *snoave*. Accessed 15.05.2023. <https://dexonline.ro/definitie/pacala/definitii>

³¹ Coresi known also as Diaconul Coresi, was a translator and publisher of the first books in Romanian, from the XVI. century (Balăn 1913:69).

notice any changes in the language between the two collections. Likewise, the fact that there is a translation to Daco-Romanian makes a lucky happenstance for this language with little written material and even less translation into Daco-Romanian. These texts have been used precisely because these are the only collections with Daco-Romanian translations.

9.1. Analysis of the Pușcariu's collections

Pușcariu's collection is based on two corpora of texts – one is from the year 1904, with the informants from Žejane and the texts written down and translated to Daco-Romanian by Antonio Glavina. Its usage is expected to show typical characteristics of the northern Istro-Romanian dialects. It is worthwhile mentioning that the translation to Daco-Romanian was also done by Glavina, and shows a lot of "Istro-Romanianisms", as mentioned by Pușcariu himself (Pușcariu 1906:211). Likewise, the texts in Istro-Romanian show some markings of the Daco-Romanian influence. Namely, there was a case of a definite article ending in *-l*, since Daco(Romanian) editors sometimes daco-romanised their editions. The other group of texts is from the same year but mostly based on the dialect from Šušnjeвица, since Pușcariu asked Alois Belulovici to collect them, while he did the translations into Daco-Romanian. It is expected that they will reveal more accordances with the usage of the southern dialects. A few deviations from the expected have been found and mentioned.

9.1.1. Usage of the determinate article

The texts exhibit typical usage of postpositional articles for Istro-Romanian. They mostly correspond to the usage in Daco-Romanian with some deviations and differences when compared to Densusianu's collection, which will be listed below.

Žejane: There are instances of atypical double *-ii* suffix (typical for Daco-Romanian), for masculine nouns: two times *oclii* ("the eyes") – which has been translated into Daco-Romanian the first time as *ochii*, but the second time it lacks the article suffix: *ochi*; that sequence is followed by another in which the suffixes have been tripled – *ocliii* (which is a transcription of *-cl'* as *-cli*), that has been translated as *ochii*; likewise *priatelii* (with the double suffix *ii*) *seli* "his friends" appears twice and is translated twice as *amici săi*.

There was a case of a definite article ending in *-l* (likewise typical for Daco-Romanian): *kașul* ("the cheese"), which was *cașul* in the Romanian version. However, in the continuation of the text, the word was rendered as *kașu*, so it might have been an isolated case or a typo.

Šušnjeвица: There are a few examples of the definite article being used in Istro-Romanian, while in Daco-Romanian translation, the indefinite article was being used: *acu – un ac* "the needle" – "a needle", *ovu – un ou* "the egg" – "an egg", *pul'u – un puuiu* "the chicken" – "a chicken".

9.1.2. Usage of the adjectival article

Žejane: Adjectival usage follows typical usage of Istro-Romanian, however, it should be noted that adjectives at times come before the nouns, following the Croatian model. Therefore there is *tiraru fiu* “young son” versus Daco-Romanian *fiul tânăr*; *o mușată fetă* “a pretty girl” versus Daco-Romanian translation *o fată frumoasă*.

Šušnjevică: The texts from Šušnjevică suggest a different word order with regards to the position of the pronoun and no definite article in Istro-Romanian version when contrasted with its Daco-Romanian counterpart: *la țela hrast* “at that tree” versus *la copacul acela*. Similar examples of different order can be found: *un jedini fil’* – *un fiu unic* “a single son”, *se țate* – *tatăl său* “his dad”, *se betăr țate* – *bătrânul tatăl său* “his old dad”, *tot omu* – *omul întreg* “the whole man”.

9.1.3. Usage of the connective article

Žejane: There were not many examples of that usage, except for a few isolated examples in the short text named *Nuncsile* “the wedding (rites)”, which has been translated as “Nunta” in Daco-Romanian. Different orthography has been used, likewise the informant was different (Tonina lu Csone). The few examples, which are somewhat dubious to interpret due to the different orthography, are *muljarle csale betăr* “the old women” – *muierile (cele) bătrâne*, *cselji alcsi kuscri* – *(ceialți) cuscri* “the father-inlaws”. There were a few other examples of the same usage. Nonetheless, it is difficult to say whether in the other examples these pronouns (*cealalt*, *celalalt*, *celelalte*, *ceialți*) meaning “the other one” have also started to become grammaticalised as prepositional articles. Especially since it has been noticed only with this informant and the fact that demonstrative is sometimes omitted from Daco-Romanian translation and sometimes not.

Šušnjevică: As was mentioned by Kovačec (Kovačec 1998:271), Istro-Romanian uses prepositional demonstratives such as *ța*, *țela*, *țesta* grammaticalised as prepositional articles as a secondary means of determination. Kovačec mentions adjectives and substantivised adjectives “enriched” in such a manner, which can be seen in this text too: *țela mortu* – *mortul* “the dead one”. However, many nouns can also be enriched in the same manner, and the examples are even more frequent in the text, wherein the noun has no article, but uses antepositional demonstrative to express determination: *țela hlapăț* – *sluga* “the servant”, *țela țesar* – *împaratul* “the emperor”, *ța nopte* – *noaptea* “the night”, *țela hrast* – *copacul acela* “the/that tree”, *țastă fete* – *fata* “the girl”, *ța slame* – *paiete* “the hay”, *ța pâre* – *pânea* “the bread”, *țasta casete* – *lădița* “the drawer”, *țe gospodar* – *stăpânul* “the master”, *țale catke* – *șerpii* “the snakes”, *țela pul’* – *pasărea* “the bird”.

There are, likewise, examples with prepositional demonstratives bearing secondary determination accompanying nouns having a postpositional article: *țela dracu* – *dracul* “the dragon”, *ța omu* – *bărbatul* “the man”.

These texts likewise suggest a reversed order of the pronoun and no definite article in the Istro-Romanian version: *țasta ușe – ușa asta* “the/that door”, *țasta case – casa asta* “the/that house”, *țe coze – pielea aceea* “the/that skin”, *țesta bat – nuiaua asta* “the/this rod”, *ța carne – carnea aceea* (twice) “the/that meat”, *țale butil’ – sticlele acelea* “the those bottles”, *țesta starăț – moșul acesta* “the/that old man”, *țela loc – locul acela* “the/that place”, two times *ța deble – copacul acela* “the/that tree”, several times *țesta pul’ – pasărea aceea* “the/that bird”. However, with southern singular feminine nouns, it is impossible to examine whether they have the definite articles or not, since opposition between articulated and unarticulated forms has been lost. When translating, while the meaning is clear concerning the translation having just an articulated noun in the Daco-Romanian version, it is challenging to translate correctly when the translation involves both the demonstrative pronoun and the articulated noun. Therefore, either the translation is making an unnecessary distinction and it is always a case of an already grammaticalised prepositional article, with which the noun might or might not have an article. Or it is a case of two different stages of grammaticalization – one done fully and the articulation of the noun is not necessary, and one somewhere in between, so the speaker still feels the need to add the article.

Likewise, it is challenging to make a proper conclusion considering that the orthography varies from one informant to the other, and from one transcriber to the other.³² However, one can conclude that these demonstratives have been (in some cases at least) fully grammaticalised as prepositional articles, most likely following the Italian model.

9.1.4. *Usage of the possessive article (genitival)*

Žejane: In this collection, there do not seem to be examples of a possessive article.

Šušnjevića: It barely appears in this collection, mostly forming ordinary numbers. They are formed either by using syntagms *ân prve – în cea dintâi* “the first”, *ân doua – în a doua* “the second”, *ân treia – în a treia* “the third”, or by using the connective article *ța prva fete – fata cea dintâi* “the first girl”.

9.2. *Analysis of Densușianu’s collection*

The texts from 1887 show typical usage of postpositional articles for Istro-Romanian. It mostly correspond to the usage in Daco-Romanian, with some deviations from the norm and differences in usage which will be listed below. A few non-orthodox suffixes can be found, which pertain more to typical Daco-Romanian usage.

³² Original orthography of each text has been preserved throughout this paper.

9.2.1. Usage of the determinate article

There are cases of the article endings in *-ii* for masculine nouns, while the typical Istro-Romanian ending for the postpositional article is *-i*: two times *porcii* “the male swine” (Brdo), one time *porcii* (Šušnjeвица) with Coresi likewise having two times *porcii*, whilst other villages have *porchele* “the sows” (Šušnjeвица, Žejane) and thereby rendering the pig feminine.

There are some differences between the usages of the articles amongst the villages: Brdo has *un de slughele* “one of the servants”, Šušnjeвица for the same syntagm has *ur de hlapti*; likewise Brdo has *graso vițelu* “the fat calf”, while Šušnjeвица has *ur gras vițe*; Brdo has *picorele lui* “his legs”, while Šušnjeвица has *a lui piciorc*.

9.2.2. Usage of the adjectival article

There are not many adjectives with the articles, however, there are some differences in usage between the villages. While in Brdo there is *mortu* “the dead one”, in Šušnjeвица it is *mort*; the text from Žejane has no article – *pitait gras vițe* “a fattened calf”, and Coresi has the version with the definite article *vițelulu hranitu*.

9.2.3. Usage of the connective article

There is very limited use of this kind of article. However, there were a few instances of the connective article (actually demonstrative *acesta*) being used instead of possessive in the dialect of Brdo: *acesta tev filiu* “your son”, while in Šušnjeвица there is *a tev filiu*. Unlike the texts from Pușcariu’s collection, the connective article does not seem to be used as a secondary means of determination.

9.2.4. Usage of the possessive article (genitival):

Dragomirescu and Nicolae have claimed, based on the corpora they were using, that generally speaking, in the south there are very few examples of genitival *a*, especially in Šušnjeвица (Dragomirescu, Nicolae 2018:157-158). In these texts, in Žejane, likewise the invariable possessive article *a* can be found: *a mev* (“mine”); *a lui cioie* (“his father”). However, a few can be found in Šušnjeвица as well. Nevertheless, there are some differences in usage between the villages. In Brdo there is a preference for stating possession without the possessive article, while Šušnjeвица preserves the invariable possessive *a*. So for example, while Brdo has *meu*, in Šušnjeвица it is *a meu*; Brdo has *tev*, while Šušnjeвица has *a tev*. In addition, in Brdo more of the syntactic forms can be found: *fratele tev* versus Šušnjeвица: *a tev frate*. Therefore, it can be stated that there seems to be a preference (albeit not an exclusive one) for the use of the invariable possessive article in Šušnjeвица, whilst Brdo does not show that preference.

9.3. Definite articles in Istro-Romanian versus in Daco-Romanian

	Istro-Romanian	Daco-Romanian
Postpositional definite article	+	+
Antepositional definite article	+	-
Possessive article	+	+
Connective article	+	+

9.4. Usage of the postpositional article considering the languages of the Balkan sprachbund

Istro-Romanian uses postpositional articles: *-u, -i, -le* for masculine and neuter gender, in case it has been preserved, and *-a, -le* for feminine which is very similar to Daco-Romanian usage. There are fewer discrepancies concerning the use of the definite article and its omission. When compared to the other dialects of Romanian, but also other languages of the Balkan sprachbund, the usage of the prepositional pronominal demonstratives for additional, secondary marking of determination is an innovation.

9.6. Proposed stages of Greenberg's cycle of articles based on text analysis

Stage 0 (demonstrative)	Stage 1 (definite article)	Stage 2 (specific article)	Stage 3 (noun marker)
<i>illus, illa, illum cela, cesta, ca, casta, celi, cesti, cale, caste cealalt, celalalt, celelalte, ceilalți</i>	<i>a cela, cesta, ca, casta, celi, cesti, cale, caste (cselji, csalje)</i>	<i>cela, cesta, ca, casta, celi, cesti, cale, caste</i>	<i>-u, -i, -ii, -le, -a, -le</i>

Compared to the previous chart of Istro-Romanian articles based on literature, this chart shows some discrepancies, but largely remains unchanged. The "*cela, cesta, ca*" determiner, used as a secondary means of determination, is placed in the first stage of a definite article. Since there is a possibility of other distal demonstratives (*cealalt, celalalt, celelalte, ceilalți*) being used as a secondary determination, even if in a small number of cases, they have been included in the chart and placed likewise in stage (1) of a definite article. The possessive article *a* barely appears in the text, and if it does, it displays definiteness, so it will be (tentatively) put in stage (1) of the definite article. The demonstratives that are used as connective articles (*cela, cesta, ca*) are likewise tentatively put at stage (2), of the specific article stage. All the markers of the suffixed clitics found in the text (*-u, -i, -ii, -le, -a, -le*) have been placed into the stage (3) of a noun marker.

10. Conclusion

A contrastive analysis has shown that, with regard to its use of the postpositional definite article (*-u, -i, -le* for masculine and neuter gender, in case neuter gender has been preserved, and *-a, -le* for feminine), Istro-Romanian acts in accordance with the other Romanian dialects, and with the other languages of the Balkan sprachbund that use the postpositional definite article.

Since in Romanian and Istro-Romanian there are some specific types of articles (possessive and connective articles) that are difficult to properly differentiate, and have been categorised in many different ways in literature, Greenberg's model of stages of the grammaticalization of articles has been used. It has been found that the article system in both languages greatly matches one another, but in Istro-Romanian, there is at least one additional set of distal determiners (*čela, česta, ča*) used as additional antepositional definite articles. These demonstrative pronouns have typically been used to form the connective article. However, in Istro-Romanian, they have been grammaticalised to form a prepositional definite article, before adjectives and nouns alike, most likely following the Italian pattern and enhanced by the similar use of Croatian long (definite) adjectives. Such adjectives and nouns might or might not bear an additional definite article, the translation to Daco-Romanian does not seem to make a distinction. Even so, the Daco-Romanian translation always translates the noun with the definite article, sometimes still adding the demonstrative. There was an isolated case of the other group of distal pronouns (*cealalt, celalalt, ceialți, celelalte*) being used in a similar (grammaticalised) vein as prepositional definite articles. Nevertheless, considering it was noticed solely with one informant, it is difficult to gauge accurately whether it was just an orthographic mistake since the orthography used for that speaker was different compared to the others. Without any additional information about such usage, it is challenging to accurately ascertain whether it has spread to members of his family or the wider community. This kind of innovation is not shared by Daco-Romanian or the other languages of the Balkan sprachbund that form postpositional articles in a similar vein.

Likewise, the difference is that due to the influence of the neighbouring Croatian and Italian dialects, the adjective usually occurs before the noun, but still bears the enclitic article. There were a few instances in the text of the suffixes for postpositional articles being used in more of a typical Daco-Romanian way (suffix *-ii*, and *-l* for masculine nouns), which might show that Istro-Romanian not so long ago resembled even more closely Daco-Romanian, unless it was a case of Daco-Romanianisms affecting the texts or some of the informants having such speech patterns. Considering its usage of other articles likewise used by other languages of the Balkan sprachbund, the usage of, for example, possessive articles seems to be a choice of the speaker, and it differs from village to village and from informant to informant.

A more accurate picture would emerge if other collections of texts would also have a translation into Daco-Romanian. Likewise, it would also help great-

ly if the orthography of these collections were more standardised, since in this manner it is hard to make a proper conclusion about certain usages. Especially when they refer to feminine nouns, since their articles end in vowels, and in southern villages the difference between articulated and non-articulated nouns has been lost. Likewise, there seem to be as many orthographic solutions as writers compiling the texts. Hopefully, this investigation has nonetheless probed deeper into the sometimes obscure Istro-Romanian morphology and opened the venue for more investigations.

Bibliography

- Balăn, Ioan. (1913). *Limba românească în cele dintâi cărți bisericești*, in *Cultura creștină*. Anul III. Nr. 3., pp. 69-76
- Banfi, Emanuele (1985). *Linguistica balcanica*. Bologna: Zenichelli
- Barić, Henrik (1959). *Istorija arbanaškog jezika*. Sarajevo: Naučno društvo NR Bosne i Hercegovine
- Bernstein, Judy B., Ordóñez, Francisco, Roca, Francisco (2021). Emphatic elements and the development of definite articles: evidence for a layered DP in early Romance, in: *Journal of Historical Syntax*, Volume 5, Article 2, pp. 1-32
- De Mulder, Walter; Carlier, Anne (2011). Definite articles, in *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Densusianu, Ovid (2002). *Dacia Preistorică*. București: Editura Arhetip
- Densusianu, Ovid (1961). *Istoria limbii române Vol. II. Secolul al XVI-lea*. București: Editura științifică
- Dimitrescu, Florica (ed.) (1978). *Istoria limbii române*. București: Editura didactică și pedagogică
- Ilie, Dan (1979). A propósito de la posposición del artículo rumano. *Revue de linguistique romane*, 43 (1979)
- Dragomirescu, Adina; Alexandru, Nicolae (2018). "Exprimarea genitivului și a posesivului în istroromână", in Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, Rodica Zafiu, Isabela Nedelcu (eds.), *Studii lingvistice. Omagiu Valeriei Guțu Romalo*, București, Editura Universității din București, p. 155-166.
- Dryer, Matthew S. (1989). Article-noun order, in *Chicago Linguistic Society* 25, pp. 83-97.
- Giurgea, Ion Tudor (2013). *Originea articolului posesiv-genitiv al și evoluția sistemului demonstrativelor în română*. București: Editura Muzeului Național al Literaturii Romane
- Katičić, Radoslav (1976). *Ancient languages of the Balkans*. The Hague: Mouton
- Keenan, Caitlin (2011). Greenberg revisited: Diachronic development of article systems & the structure of DP, in *13th International Diachronic Generative Syntax Conference*
- Kovačec, August (1971). *Descrierea istroromânei actuale*. București: Editura Academiei Socialiste România
- Kovačec, August (1988). Pojam jezičnog saveza i balkanski jezici, in *SOL*, No 6/1988. pp. 21-51

- Kovačec, August (1998). *Istrorumunjsko-hrvatski rječnik (s gramatikom i tekstovima)*. Pula: Znanstvena udruga Mediteran
- Geană, Ionuț (2020). Case Marking in Istro-Romanian. *Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai-Philologia* 65 (4), pp. 173-187
- Greenberg, Joseph H. (1990). How does a language acquire Gender Markers? In *On language, Selected writings of Joseph H. Greenberg*, 241-269. California: Stanford University Press
- Mazon, Andre; Vaillant, Andre (1938). *L'Evangeliaire du Kulakia – Un parler Slave du Bas-Vardar*. Paris: Librairie Droz
- Lindstedt, Jouko (2014). Balkan Slavic and Balkan Romance: from congruence to convergence. In Juliane Besters-Dilger, Cynthia Dermarkar, Stefan Pfänder & Achim Rabus (eds.). 2014. *Congruence in Contact-induced Language Change: Language Families, Typological Resemblance and Perceived Similarity*. Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter. Pp. 168–183.
- Lyons, Christopher (2003). *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Lerch, Eugen (1940). Gibt es im Vulgärlateinischen oder im Rumänischen eine "Gelenkspartikel"? in *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie (ZrP)*, LX (1940), pp. 113-190
- Löfsted, Einar (1932). *Syntactica*. Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins I. Lund C. W. K. Gleerup, Lund: 1928–1933
- Muller, Gilbert H. (1924). Indogermanische Forschungen. *Zeitschrift für Indogermanistik und historische Sprachwissenschaft*. XLII (1924), pp.1-59
- Paliga, Sorin (2015). Romanian definite article revisited, in *Linguistica* 39 (1)
- Popovici, Josif (1914). *Dialectele române din Istria. Partea 1A. Referințele sociale și gramatică*. Halle A.D.S. Editura autorului
- Pușcariu, Sextil (1905-1906). *Studii istroromâne (in colaborare cu M. Bartoli, A. Belulovici și A. Byhan)*, vol I. București: Cultura națională
- Pușcariu, Sextil (1929). *Studii istroromâne (in colaborare cu M. Bartoli, A. Belulovici și A. Byhan)*, vol III. București: Cultura națională
- Putzu, Ignazio; Ramat, Paolo (2011). Articles and quantifiers in the Mediterranean languages: a typological-diachronic analysis, in *Studia typologica* 1, *Aspects of Typology and Universals*, ed. by Walter Bisang, Akademie Verlag, Berlin 2001 pp. 99-132
- Rosetti, Alexandru (1986). *Istoria limbii române. Vol. I. De la origini până la începutul secolului al XVII-lea*. București: Editura Științifică
- Rusu, Valeriu (ed) (1984). *Tratat de dialectologie românească*. Craiova: Editura Scri-sul Românesc
- Sandfeld, Kristian (1930). *Linguistique Balquanique*. Paris: La societe de linguistique de Paris
- Steinke, Klaus, Vraciu, Anton (1999). *Introducere în lingvistica balcanică*. Iași: Editura Universității "Al. I. Cuza"
- Tekavčić, Pavao (1970). *Uvod u vulgarni latinitet (s izborom tekstova)*. Zagreb: Sveučilište u Zagrebu

Tomić, Olga Mišeska (2006). *Balkan Sprachbund Morpho-Syntactic Features (SNLT, volume 67)*. The Netherlands: Springer
Zegrean, Iulia-Georgiana (2012). *Aspects on the Syntax of Istro-Romanian* (doctoral dissertation). Venice: Ca' Foscari Università

Internet sites used

dex. online: <https://dexonline.ro/>

Problem postponiranoga člana u jezicima Balkanskoga jezičnoga saveza i slučaj istrorumunjskoga

U svrhu istraživanja problematike nastanka, razvitka i upotrebe postponiranoga člana u istrorumunjskome (-u, -i, -le za muški/srednji rod, ukoliko je srednji rod očuvan, te -a, -le za ženski), te njegova položaja u jezicima Balkanskoga jezičnoga saveza, prvo je prikazan nastanak i razvitak člana u romanskim jezicima, te u rumunjskome i istrorumunjskome. Potom su prikazane teorije o nastanku i razvitku postponiranoga člana u jezicima Balkanskoga jezičnoga saveza. Nakon toga, sa željom da se istraži upotreba postponiranoga člana (i ostalih vrsta članova) u istrorumunjskome, posebice u usporedbi s (dako)rumunjskim i ostalim jezicima Balkanskoga jezičnoga saveza koji koriste postponirani određeni član, načinjena je kontrastivna korpusna analiza grupe tekstova iz Pușcariuova (dvije zbirke tekstova iz 1905/6. te 1926.) i Densusianuova zbornika (iz 1887. godine). Iako su tekstovi s kraja devetnaestoga i početka dvadesetoga stoljeća, vrlo su rijetki primjeri tekstova na istrorumunjskome koji imaju prijevod na dakorumunjski. Njihova je vrijednost i u tome što oba zbornika sadrže govore i južnih i sjevernih sela, te u tome što pokazuju neke ponešto arhaične upotrebe člana koji više odgovaraju upotrebi u dakorumunjskome (nastavak -ii, -l za imenice muškog roda). Kako je bilo izazovno pravilno razvrstati već postojeće i novonastajuće članove, te precizno kategorizirati posesivne i vezne članove, korištena je Greenbergova metodologija tri stadija gramatikalizacije nastanka člana, od demonstrativa do općenitog markera određenosti. Analiza tekstova je pokazala da istrorumunjski u velikoj mjeri koristi postponirani član u gotovo identičnim situacijama u kojima to čini i dakorumunjski, te se može reći da je usklađen s jezicima Balkanskog jezičnog saveza po pitanju njegove upotrebe. Razlika je jedino u poretku riječi – pod hrvatskim i talijanskim utjecajem istrorumunjski često stavlja pridjev prije imenice, no član se svejedno sufigira u enklitichnome položaju. Što se tiče posesivnog člana, njegova upotreba varira od sela do sela, a koristi se samo njegov nepromjenjivi oblik *a*. Najveća je inovacija gramatikalizacija demonstrativa *čela*, *česta*, *ča* u anteponirani član, iza kojeg slijedi pridjev ili imenica koja može ili ne mora imati postponirani član. Ta je inovacija vjerojatno nastala prema talijanskom modelu anteponiranoga člana, te je dodatno pojačana upotrebom hrvatskih dugih (određenih) pridjeva. Primijećen je i izolirani primjer gramatikaliziranoga demonstrativa *cealalt*, *celalalt*, *ceialalți*, *celelalte* ("onaj drugi") kao dodatnog demonstrativa u službi definitivnoga člana. Međutim, teško je reći (posebice zbog problematične ortografije) je li stvarno riječ o dodatnome zametku određenoga člana, ili je riječ o izoliranoj upotrebi kod jednog informanta i/ili nepreciznome prijevodu na dakorumunjski.

Ključne riječi: postponirani član, Balkanski jezični savez, istrorumunjski, rumunjski, balkanizmi