The Unlikely Plurals of One in Bavarian and Miskito

Frans Plank

dedicated to Frau Rosa Wiendl, who, some fifteen years ago, told me that
"Fo Schdraubing han aa oa kema"

1.   Number in indefinites

One way of getting indefinite pronouns is to take them from the cardinal numeral 'one', either by combining this numeral with some other element (such as a generic noun or an interrogative, negative, or another indefinite element) or by simply using the bare numeral also as an indefinite pronoun. In his dissertation that does much to clarify the typology of indefinite pronouns, Haspelmath (1993: 30, 180) concludes that this base, while far less common than two others, viz. interrogative pronouns and generic nouns, is nonetheless widespread; he mentions about twenty languages, from his sample of 100, as having 'one'-based indefinite pronouns of one kind or another.[1]

 One aspect of the grammar of indefinite pronouns that Haspelmath does not pay much attention to—perhaps because it seemed to him so obviously irrelevant—is number marking. As is well known, this species of pronouns is not very keen on overtly distinguishing number, quite unlike personal pronouns, which are well-established at the top of the hierarchy of numberworthi-

---

[1]Since Haspelmath does not acknowledge clearly attested uses of the bare numeral 'one' as an indefinite pronoun in quite a few languages in his sample, he may somewhat underestimate the popularity of this third type of base. See also Lehmann (1982: 50-57) on 'one'-based indefinites.

ness (at least as far as the major numbers are concerned).[2] It is the very 'indefiniteness' of these pronouns that militates against their full exploitation of the potential of number contrasts: their number meaning is often invariably either singular or plural or dual, or also vague or indeterminate; and their form accordingly is often invariable as to number, with number-agreeing verbs being either in the same invariable number or alternating between the numbers available when an indefinite pronoun indeterminate as to number occupies the position of an agreement-trigger.[3] They have been aptly subsumed by Serge Karcevski (quoted in Haspelmath 1993: 172) under the rubric of 'ignorative pronouns' together with interrogative pronouns, which tend to be somewhat indifferent to number too. Paradigmatic contrasts in the (not always well delimited) domain of indefinite pronouns predominantly relate to 'ontological' categories such as those of person, thing, place, time, amount, manner, and reason (distinctions likewise favoured by interrogative pronouns), or to 'series', defined in terms of functional or contextual features such as specificity of reference, speaker's knowledge of the referent, or limitations on the choice of referent (which are at the centre of Haspelmath's typology), and not so much to number.

Now, owing to the meaning of their source, indefinite pronouns based on the numeral 'one', that ostensibly archetypical *singulare tantum*,[4] should be the ones least amenable to number inflection—less so than indefinites based (i) on generic nouns such as 'person', 'thing', 'place' etc., since such source nouns themselves are not unlikely to distinguish number, or also (ii) on interrogative pronouns, since number distinction, while not at a premium here either, still squares better with having interrogative force than with having the meaning 'one'.

---

[2]See Corbett (1994) on 'major' vs. 'minor' numbers, and Smith-Stark (1974) and Plank (1987) on numberworthiness in general.

[3]In Old Georgian, for example, the interrogative-based indefinite pronoun *vinme* 'someone, some' does not itself distinguish number when it is used as a clitic, but number-agreeing verbs in construction with such indefinite subjects or objects do (Boeder 1994: 468).

[4]Ignoring the possibility of numeral 'one' developing, or retaining, related meanings such as 'alone', 'single', or 'only', which are less hostile to pluralization. And see also below on what may come of 'one' when inflected for number.

While non-suppletive plurals or also duals of indefinite pronouns with bases other than the numeral 'one' are not exactly plentiful, especially in Europe, they do exist. For example, interrogative-based *vin-me* 'someone' in Old Georgian is *vietni-me* in the plural when it is not a clitic (cf. interrogative *vin/viet* 'who? (Sg/Pl)'). In Burushaski (whose indefinite article *-en/-an* is 'one'-based), the indefinite and interrogative pronoun *mɛn* 'any, some; who?' is commonly understood to be plural, with an optional suffix *-ik* to reinforce the plural reference, and the explicit singular of this indefinite-interrogative is *menʌn*.[5] In Susu (Mande family, Niger-Congo phylum), the indefinite pronoun *nde* 'someone, a certain' takes the regular nominal plural suffix *-e*, *ndee* 'some; several'; it is presumably generic-noun-based and certainly not 'one'-based (*keren* 'one').[6] In Ho (a close relative or even dialect of Mundari, of the Munda family), *jai* 'anyone at all', *jáni* 'anyone', and all other indefinite pronouns referring to persons —none based on the numeral *mi(ad)* 'one'—take the regular dual and plural suffixes when such number distinction is felt desirable (*já-king/já-ko* 'anyone at all (Du/Pl)' etc.).[7]

'One'-based indefinite pronouns also live up to expectations insofar as, by contrast, they often do not have a plural or a dual, or at least no morphologically straightforward ones. A few cases in point are English *(some-)one* and its equivalents in German (*(irgend-)einer*), Welsh (*rhywun:rhyw* 'kind' + *un* 'one'), Irish (*(h)aon*, identical to the numeral), Modern Greek (*énas*, identical to the numeral; *kan-énas* 'anybody'), Turkish (*biri* or *birisi*, with the numeral *bir* followed by the 3rd person singular suffix *-i* and optionally also 3rd person plural possessive *-si*, thus 'one of him, of them'), Hungarian (*egy*, identical to the numeral), Maltese (*wieħed/waħda* (Masc/Fem), identical to the numeral in form but not in position), Coptic (*wa/wi* (Masc/Fem), identical to the numeral), and

---

[5]See Lorimer (1935: 153ff). In Berger's (1974: 26) later description of Yasin-Burushaski *men* is recorded as not overtly distinguishing singular and plural, but, curiously, its non-personal counterpart *bo/bótan* 'what?, something' is now partnered with a plural, *bótek*.

[6]And not interrogative-based either (cf. *mundun* 'which?', plural *mundue*). See Friedländer (1974: 29f).

[7]As determiners or modifiers *ja*, *ján* etc. do not inflect for number, for there is no noun-phrase-internal number agreement in Ho. *Miad* 'one' is sometimes being used in determiner function as a specific-indefinite pronoun, but only in singular noun phrases (e.g. *miad ho* 'a certain man'). See Burrows (1915).

Samoan (*tasi*, again identical to the numeral).[8] In Hungarian *egyvalaki/egyvalami* 'someone / something', morphologically complex but otherwise equivalent to *valaki/valami*, the 'one'-element even prevents its co-constituents from pluralization (**egyvalakik/*egyvalamik*), which they are perfectly capable of on their own (*valakik/valamik*).

Should a distinctively plural or dual form be called for when 'one'-based indefinite pronouns such as these lack one, 'one' has to be got rid of or neutralized one way or another. One means to this end is simply to drop it; this is what English does to the complex indefinite pronoun *someone* (*I didn't notice that someone was missing – ... that some were missing*), and even simple *einer* is reduced to zero in this manner in the Palatinate dialect of German (*Aus Pirmasens ist einer gekommen – Aus Pirmasens sind Ø gekommen* 'from Pirmasens has someone / have some come'). Another strategy is to replace 'one' by a different stem; it is adopted in Standard German (*Aus Pirmasens sind welche gekommen*, *welch* being interrogative[9]) as well as in English (where *some* does duty for **ones* in constructions such as *Kepler was looking for a black hole, and he found one – Kepler was looking for black holes, and he found some/*ones*). Finally, 'one' may be neutralized, as it were, by being combined with a grammatically singular plurality expression, as in German (*ein paar* 'some', literally 'one pair'). The second strategy is perhaps the most common, making number marking in indefinite pronouns fertile soil for suppletion, of the kind that is not due to gradual phonetic divergence. However, the paradigmatic ties between the singular and non-singular stems tend to be considerably less close than in the case of personal pronouns, which are also prone to suppletion.

Evidently, then, 'one' in indefinite pronouns dearly loves to stay in the singular, for otherwise the most popular strategy in such circumstances would surely have been another one, viz. simply to pluralize or dualize 'one' by whatever more or less regular morphological means available.

---

[8]*One* and *einer* and the like may permit plurals, but arguably they are not indefinite pronouns when they do: cf. *Take the blue ones* or *the lion's young ones*, where *one* behaves more like a common noun than a pronoun; *die einen – die anderen* 'the ones – the others'.

[9]The generic-noun- and interrogative-based alternatives to de-numeral *ein* in German, *jemand* and *wer*, also happen to lack straightforward plurals, and also require interrogative-based *welche* here.

2.   Plural ones

However, it is not entirely impossible for 'one' actually to form a plural or also a dual more or less regularly, as pronouns go, when being turned from a numeral into (the constituent part of) an indefinite pronoun.   As always when something is not quite run-of-the-mill, the question is whether this may happen anywhere, anytime, anyhow.   In view of what is known about the gradual nature of grammaticalization of the numeral 'one' on the one hand and about the reluctance of indefinites to inflect for number on the other, the optimist's expectation is that the answer will not be in the affirmative.

Encouragingly, there in fact appear to be some general conditions that 'one'-based indefinite pronouns must meet, individually or cumulatively, in order to be entitled to inflect for non-singular numbers.

First, the less transparent the formal and semantic relationship between the indefinite pronoun 'one' (or the 'one'-constituent of the indefinite pronoun) and its original numeral source has become in the course of time, the easier it appears to be for indefinite 'one' to diverge from numeral 'one' even further in acquiring a plural or also a dual. Thus, while the specific-indefinite pronoun *wieħed/waħda* (Masc/Fem) 'someone, a certain' of Maltese, which is identical to the numeral 'one' in anything but position (as a determiner it precedes its noun while numeral *wieħed/waħda* follows it), does not pluralize, the inherently negative indefinite pronoun *ħadd* 'no one, anyone' does, giving *uħud* (Borg 1994: §2.3); diachronically, *ħadd* is also 'one'-based, going back to Classical Arabic *ʔaħad* 'one', but synchronically the relationship of *ħadd* to the Maltese form of the numeral 'one', itself deriving from *ʔaħad*, is so tenuous as not to prevent it from pluralizing.[10] In dialectal Northern German, *sone* in set phrases such as *Es gibt sone und sone* 'there are such ones and such ones' (see Behaghel 1923: 408) looks like it involves, historically, a plural of *ein* '(some-)one' (*so + eine*; Singular *son < so + ein*); synchronically, however, indefinite *son(e)* is at best opaquely related to numeral (or also indefinite-article) *ein*, there being no corresponding full form **so + eine*.

Second, it seems to help the 'one'-based indefinite pronoun to overcome its typical numerical reserve if the actual carrier of the plural marking is not

---

[10]Notwithstanding the use of *il-Ħadd* as the name of the first day of the week, Sunday (Haspelmath & Caruana 1994: Footnote 10). The dual generally does not extend to pronouns in Maltese.

'one' itself but the constituent with which this numeral has been combined to yield an indefinite pronoun. Thus, in Icelandic, *einhver* 'someone' has plural *einhverir*, with the first element, *ein* 'one', uninflected. (Above, the analogous complex indefinites **egyvalakik/*egyvalamik* of Hungarian were seen to be less successful at pluralization, though.) By contrast, *einn* on its own, which is also an indefinite pronoun as well as being the numeral 'one', does not pluralize. Similarly, in Old English, *ǣnig* 'any' and negative *nǣnig* (< *ne+ǣnig*) are occasionally pluralized in self-sufficient, non-determiner uses; however, it is not the numeral base *ān* itself, which remains invariable (with umlaut due to the suffix), but the word derived from it by means of adjectival (originally perhaps diminutive) *-ig* that shows the number contrast. When *ān*-based indefinite pronouns remain without such a suffix, as in *nān* 'no one' (< *ne+ān*) and positive *o(o)n*, the latter recorded in this function only since Middle English times, they again lack plurals.

Third, the mere presence of a co-constituent in a complex indefinite pronoun, and especially one that itself inflects for number, appears to encourage 'one' to part company with its former numeral self and accept plural marking. Thus, the indefinite pronouns *uns/une* (Masc/Fem) of Old French, identical with the numeral 'one', lacked a plural, and other stems—*(li) auquant* (< Latin *aliquanti* 'quite a few')—had to be resorted to when a plural was required. In Modern French, 'one' is no longer alone but forms part of a complex indefinite pronoun (*quelqu'un/quelqu'une* Masc/Fem), and both of its constituents now pluralize (*quelques-uns/quelques-unes*).

Fourth, being negative may also help an indefinite pronoun to acquire a non-singular number that eludes its positive counterpart. Thus, in German, negative *keiner* 'no one', adding an element of unclear etymology to *einer* 'someone' but being otherwise identical to it, has also added the plural: *keine/*eine fehlten* 'none/some were missing'. Maltese *ħadd* is an example of a morphologically non-complex negative indefinite pronoun that pluralizes; but it is related to the numeral 'one' only opaquely (see above). Interestingly, Haspelmath (1993: 181) suggests that 'one'-based indefinite pronouns tend to get restricted to negative-polarity and direct negative functions—which, if true, would thus help to create one favourable condition for their elaboration of number marking.

Fifth, it is apparently conducive to number distinction in a 'one'-based indefinite pronoun if this pronoun can be used as a determiner, rather than being limited to a self-sufficient use as a noun phrase of its own, and if determiners

have to agree with their nouns in number in the language concerned, whether they like it or not.[11] This is the situation in Spanish (and analogously in Portuguese and Rumanian), where *alguno* or also plain *uno* 'some(-one)' and *ninguno* 'no(-one)' (< Latin *alic-unus, nec-unus*) have regular determiner/modifier plurals in agreement with any plural nouns (*algunos/unos amigos* 'some (MascPl) friends'), which they keep when they occur on their own without an accompanying noun (*algunos/unos lo dicen* 'some (MascPl) say so'). By contrast, the less referential indefinite pronoun *alguien*, which is also 'one'-based but cannot be used in determiner function, does not inflect for plural (nor for gender). Czech is comparable (and so are Upper and Lower Sorbian as well as Lithuanian,[12] other Western Slavic and Baltic neighbours of German), although the plain numeral *jeden/jedna/jedno* 'one' (Masc/Fem/Neut) is here only at the beginning of its second career as an indefinite; its regular plural (*jedni/jedny/ jedna*) is authorized by its use in determiner function, as an indefinite pronoun and also as an emergent indefinite article, agreeing with nouns in number (and case, gender, and animacy).

It is also by virtue of agreement within the noun phrase that another kind of word that commonly springs from the numeral 'one', the indefinite article (see e.g. Givón 1981), may possibly acquire non-singular marking. Nonetheless, the evidence from languages such as English (*a(n)*), German (*ein*), French (*un(e)*), Israeli Hebrew (*-ħad/-aħat* Masc/Fem, limited to specific-indefinite noun phrases), or Maltese (*wieħed/waħda*, being limited to animates in its capacity as an indefinite article), where other determiners and/or modifiers agree with nouns in number, suggests that 'one'-based indefinite articles tend to continue to remain defective with respect to number, preferring 'zero' or suppletive plural forms, such as [sm̩] in English or *des* in French. In languages not given to noun-phrase-internal number agreement, 'one'-based indefinite articles will not be the only determiners to develop an agreeing habit, regularly or by way of suppletion; thus, Hungarian *egy* or Turkish *bir* are confined to singular

---

[11]Recall from above (Footnote 7) that no such support is required for indefinite pronouns in Ho, which are not 'one'-based: determiners and modifiers in this language do not number-agree, but self-sufficient indefinites regularly inflect for dual and plural all the same.

[12]And to a lesser extent also Polish, whose indefinite uses of numeral 'one' are more rudimentary.

noun phrases.[13] Even languages such as Spanish, Portuguese, and Rumanian that do have regular plurals of 'one'-based indefinite articles also allow the zero option, or actually prefer it when any quantificational nuances are to be avoided; and in French *des* easily prevailed over *un(e)s*, which used to be a highly marked alternative but never really caught on (e.g. *unes hautes portes* 'a-FemPl high-FemPl gate-FemPl'). Apparently, if agreement requirements can get 'one'-based indefinite articles to pluralize or dualize at all, they succeed preferably or exclusively in the company of *pluralia* or *dualia tantum* that admit a singular reading (as in *unes vespres* 'a-FemPl vespers-FemPl', to illustrate again from earlier French; see Gamillscheg 1957: 74).

It further confirms the potency of the agreement factor that even the numeral 'one' itself may be in a non-singular number when it co-occurs with a grammatically non-singular noun whose meaning is compatible with such singular quantification in languages that enforce agreement under such un-usual circumstances; Greenlandic Eskimo (which is otherwise irrelevant here because it lacks 'one'-based indefinite pronouns) is one of them: *puisi ataasiq* 'seal (Sg) one (Sg)' – *qamutit ataatsit* 'sledge (obligatorily Pl) one (Pl)'. In a variation on this agreement theme, Finnish and Estonian pluralize 'one' and other numerals in the company of plural nouns, inducing the reading 'one group of' (cf. Finnish *yksi kenka* 'one-SgNom shoe-SgNom' – *yhdet kengat* 'one-PlNom shoe-PlNom', i.e. 'one group/pair of shoes'; Hurford 1994). Signifi-cantly, however, when 'one' occurs as the constituent of a higher numeral, in a position (preferably, though not exclusively, final) that is potentially accessible to inflection, agreement does not normally manage to force it into the plural. In Italian (or the Slavonic languages[14]), for example, the noun is forced into the singular instead by such numeral-final 'one' (*ventuno cavallo* 'twenty-one-MascSg horse-MascSg', with gender agreement triggered by the noun, as

---

[13]Actually, *bir* may combine with plural nouns in Turkish, which renders the reference vaguer than it would be if the noun were singular (Lewis 1967: 54): *bir şey* 'something' – *bir şeyler* 'something or other' (lit. 'a thing-Pl').

[14]When 'one' is not in the final position of complex numerals here, it remains uninflected (i.e. nominative singular), and the following noun is in the genitive plural, as is the rule with numerals above 'four'; compare Czech *jedenadvacet knih* 'one(MascSgNom)-on-twenty book-GenPl' with its less common alterna-tive, *dvacet jedna kniha* 'twenty one-FemSgNom book-FemSgNom'.

usual). In French (and Spanish[15]) nouns are plural here and numeral-final singular 'one' agrees with them only in gender (*vingt et un chevaux* 'twenty and one-MascSg horse-MascPl'). In German, nouns are likewise plural but numeral-final 'one' evades the agreement dilemma altogether by ceasing to inflect, opting for the basic form without desinence (masculine/neuter singular nominative) or for the invariable counting form (*mit hundert(und)ein/ hundert(und)eins Pferden* 'with hundred(-and)-one horse-PlDat';[16] compare *mit einem Pferd* 'with one-NeutSgDat horse-NeutSgDat').

There is possibly a sixth condition favourable to number distinction in 'one'-based indefinites, and that is that their source word itself has regular non-singular numbers. Since languages sometimes form certain higher numerals by inflecting lower numerals for number (with 'twenty' in Semitic, for example, re-sulting from putting 'ten' in the dual), it would not seem logically impossible for the numeral 'one' likewise to have a regular plural or dual (independent of agreement). The dual of 'one' would accordingly mean 'two ones' (i.e. 'two' or 'both'), and its plural would yield an existential quantifier with the numerically non-specific meaning 'a few, several, some'. However, for whatever reason (presumably to do with the real meaning of 'one', involving notions such as identity, wholeness, and exclusiveness and thus setting it apart from the genuinely serial numerals), such non-specific quantifiers are rarely produced by applying regular number inflection to 'one'; rather than 'one' being inflected

---

[15]And also in Italian if an adjective intervenes between 'one'-final numeral and noun: *ventuno belli cavalli* 'twenty-one-MascSg beautiful-MascPl horse-MascPl'. Rumanian is similar, but 'one' agrees here in gender when it is final (*două zeci ş i unu de oameni* 'twenty and one-MascSg of man-MascPl' – *două zeci ş i una de fete* 'twenty and one-FemSg of girl-FemPl, with the partitive preposition *de* that is used above 'twenty') as well as when it is non-final (*unsprezece oameni* 'one(MascSg)-on-ten man-MascPl' – *osprezece fete* 'one(FemSg)-on-ten girl-FemPl', with the determiner forms *un/o* rather than the counting forms *unu/una*), differing in this last respect from the Slavonic or also Balkans pattern of numeral formation that is being applied to the Romance numeral morphemes.

[16]The 'Italian' alternative is a third, but extremely marginal possibility, perhaps confined to the title of the *Arabian Nights*, *Märchen aus tausend und einer Nacht* 'tales from thousand and one-FemSgDat night-FemSgDat' (note the unusual three-word, unhyphened spelling of the numeral).

for non-singular, it is the numerals 'two' and 'three' that may serve as dual or paucal and multal quantifiers ('a couple/few', 'many'; see Pott 1862: 96). In Israeli Hebrew, *aḥadim/aḥadot* 'some, several' is of such origin, though, with the regular masculine and feminine plural suffixes *-im* and *-ot* added to *eḥad/aḥat* one (MascSg/FemSg)'. These plurals being present in the quantifier that is thus formed from the numeral 'one', the 'one'-based indefinite pronoun *af eḥad* 'anyone, no one' (*af* < 'even') is entitled to make use of them too. (As mentioned above, the 'one'-based indefinite article *-ḥad/aḥat* remains without plural.)

Romance and Slavic-Baltic plurals such as Spanish *unos* or Czech *jedni* might seem to have essentially the same motivation as Hebrew *aḥadim*. Arguably, however, despite their quantificational nuances, they are indefinite pronouns rather than pure quantifiers directly formed by pluralizing the numeral 'one'; their authorization must be different, then, probably coming from agreement requirements in determiner uses, as suggested above. In general, distinguishing indefinite pronouns from 'mid-scalar' quantifiers (as they are called by Haspelmath (1993: 9)) can be tricky; one context that singles out such quantifiers are explicit contrasts to universal quantifiers, as in *Have all (members) come or only **some**?*. This is a test that English *some* [sʌm] and Hebrew *aḥadim* pass and English *some* [sm̩] fails, and that Spanish *unos* and Czech *jedni* are not very comfortable with.[17]

In sum, what one would want to be able to claim in light of such observations is that indefinite pronouns based on the numeral 'one' will **not** be pluralizable or dualizable, other than perhaps by a loose kind of suppletion, as long as they (i) have not become formally dissociated from this numeral in any way, (ii) consist of nothing else but this numeral, (iii) are thoroughly positive, (iv) are unsupported by number-agreeing determiner uses of the indefinite pronoun (plus perhaps the indefinite article), and (v) do not have regularly number-inflected quantifiers based on 'one' as a model. There has got to be **some** difference between the numeral 'one' and the indefinite pronoun based on it before the pronoun can begin to inflect for plural or also dual, numbers normally so foreign to the original meaning of the numeral 'one' that their acquisition is unlikely to be the first step in the grammaticalization of the

---

[17]Haspelmath (1993: 9) suggests that mid-scalar quantifiers may diachronically derive from indefinite pronouns, but the reverse direction would generally seem more plausible—if indeed one directly derives from the other, rather than both deriving from a common source, numeral 'one'.

pronoun from this source—unless it is mediated by quantifiers that consist in number-inflected forms of 'one'.

To rephrase this diachronic expectation implicationally: **If an indefinite pronoun inflects for plural or also dual, it will differ from the numeral 'one' in other respects too** (maximally by having nothing whatsoever to do with it), **unless it is also used as a number-agreeing determiner or 'one' can be regularly inflected for number to form quantifiers;** or equivalently, **if an indefinite pronoun does not differ from the numeral 'one' in any other respect, it will not inflect for plural or dual either, unless it is also used as a number-agreeing determiner or 'one' can be regularly inflected for number to form quantifiers.**

Surveying gradual developments of indefinite determiners from the numeral 'one', Givón (1981: 50f) suggests that their very first step consists in the bleaching out of quantification—which is consistent with the present conclusion: if quantification is the first of all 'one'-features to go, one would certainly not expect to find indefinites differing from numeral 'one' only in that they inflect for number.

3.   Bavarian oa

As it happens, it is the recollection of my long-faded native idiom that faults this prognosis, however plausible and well-supported it might seem otherwise. Bavarian—in all its regional varieties, so far as I know—differs from Standard German, among many other memorable things, in that it lacks the interrogative-based indefinite pronoun *welche* (Pl; the singular *welcher* is interrogative only), which, as we have seen above, serves as the plural replacement of *(irgend-)ein*. Even more memorably, Bavarian instead pluralizes *ein* itself:[18]

Sg: Fo Schdraubing is aa oana kema.
       'from Straubing is also someone come'

---

[18]The elision of stem-final /n/ tends to cause nasalization, more or less perceptibly: /fõ, õã/; but this is immaterial here. Further indefinite pronouns in Bavarian are interrogative-based. For Standard German, Haspelmath (1993: 234) wrongly lists *ein* and *welche* only as determiner indefinite pronouns, and in fact only in combination with *irgend-*.

Pl: Fo Schdraubing han aa oa kema.
     'from Straubing are also some come'

Sg: Er is mid oana fo Schdraubing kema.
     'he is with someone (FemDat) from Straubing come'
Pl: Er is mid oa fo Schdraubing kema.
     'he is with some (PlDat) from Straubing come'

The counting form of the cardinal numeral 'one' is *oans*. Otherwise the numeral inflects in gender and case, with occasional formal differences depending on the presence or absence of a following noun (e.g. Masculine Nominative *oana* [independent] – *oa Bua* 'one boy', Feminine Dative *oana* – *oana Frau* 'one woman'). The indefinite article, while etymologically also deriving from 'one', is formally different from these various alternatives, in vocalism and sometimes otherwise too: Masculine Nominative *a Bua*, Feminine Dative *ara Frau*. (Peculiarly, a few out-of-the-way alpine varieties are on record as having retained the form with non-reduced stem diphthong, *oa*, as the plural of the indefinite article, which is normally zero; see Schmeller 1872: 88.) Unlike Spanish *uno* or Czech *jeden*, the indefinite pronoun *oana*/*oane*/*oans* (Masc/Fem/Neut) does not occur as a number-agreeing determiner; *oa Bua* has only the numeral reading. Bavarian's determiner indefinite pronoun is a combination of 'one' with *irgend*, as in Standard German, and the form that 'one' takes here, differing from the one that it takes in non-determiner *irgend*-combinations (*irgadoana* MascNom/FemDat), is that of the indefinite article: *irgada Bua* 'some boy' (MascNom), *irgadara Frau* 'some woman' (FemDat).

As a numeral, *oana* is hard-pressed to come up with a plural. Like in Greenlandic Eskimo and elsewhere, but unlike in Standard Germany, only a very few nouns that are grammatically plural but can conceivably be given a singular reading may grudgingly force this numeral into the plural, with only the dative, moreover, having a distinctively plural form:

Nominative/Accusative
a.   oa Bua/oa Frau/oa Auddo is gnua
     'one boy/one woman/one car (Masc/Fem/Neut) is enough'
b.   oa Ferien/oa Alimendde/oa Masern han gnua
     'one holidays/one alimony/one measles (Pl) are enough'

Dative

a.   mid oam Bua(m)/oana Frau/oam Auddo hosd gnua
     'with one boy/one woman/one car have you enough'

b.   mid oa Ferien/oa Alimendde/oa Masern hosd gnua
     'with one holidays/one alimony/one measles have you enough'

Unlike in Israeli Hebrew, the numeral 'one' cannot be pluralized to yield a mid-scalar quantifier; plural *oa* clearly fails the quantifier test proposed earlier: *Han olle kema oda blos *oa?* 'Have all come or only some?'. And there is no overt indefinite article in plural noun phrases either; singular *a* thus alternates with zero (*a Bua – Buam(a)* 'a boy – boys').

When the indefinite pronoun, thus, acquired the plural form *oa* on a large scale, to supplement the singular inflections it had inherited from the numeral 'one' (with the inheritance of the plural of the numeral—*oa Masern* etc.—being negligible for all practical purposes), neither the indefinite article nor the determiner indefinite pronoun nor a mid-scalar quantifier had a hand in this.[19] The corresponding negative indefinite pronoun *koana/koa* 'no one (Sg/Pl)', whose plural is of earlier origin, might have served as an analogical model, though. In fact, in Old and Middle High German it was marginally possible to inflect indefinite *ein* for plural, but only in two circumstances: (i) in the company of *measles*-type nouns, plural in form but not necessarily in meaning, with the function of *ein* vacillating between those of the two emerging categories of a determiner indefinite pronoun and an indefinite article (Paul, Moser, Schröbler 1969: 349):

     so sint einu liute dabi, haizent Arimaspi
     'also are some/certain (PlNom) people (PlNom) nearby, [who] are
     called Arimaspans'

and (ii) as the first element of the newly created distributive pronoun *einero gihwelîh* 'one-GenPl each' (cf. Latin *unusquisque*).[20] These Old and Middle High

---

[19]Bavarian *oa* regularly corresponds to Standard German **eine/*einen* (NomAcc/Dat), which are also the written forms that tend to crop up when Bavarians use conventional German orthography rather than dialectal spelling (see Zehetner 1977: 93).

[20]This genitive plural *einero* may be due to contamination with *allero gihwelîh* 'all-PlGen each' (Behaghel 1923: 418).

German peculiarities of *ein* did not survive long, and are unlikely to have paved the way for the plural of the exclusively non-determiner pronoun *oana* in Bavarian.

The numeral *ein* was beginning to take on indefinite function in Old High German times, first in the capacity of a pronoun, then of an article as well, but continued to share the form of the source word in either case. Plurals of indefinite-pronoun *ein* are unattested in Bavarian writings of that period (see Schatz 1907: 142, Behaghel 1923: 407-419). The first pertinent examples adduced in Schmeller's *Bayerisches Wörterbuch* (1872: 87) are not actually Bavarian but East Franconian, the Middle German dialect that was Upper German Bavarian's north-western neighbour; they were culled from Hugo von Trimberg's *Der Renner*, a Middle High German text dating from around 1300 A.D.:

> Eine die des nahtes stelen / eine die nach minne quelen ...
> 'some who steal away by night / some who yearn for love ...'

Ostensibly unimpressed by such plurals, Schmeller comments that they represent an alternative to *einige* 'several'—which is not very illuminating because, notwithstanding their semantic similarity, *oa* is clearly no formal corruption of *einige*. They do not seem to have thrived in Franconian. They have survived and are doing extremely well today in Bavarian, without diverging a jot from the form of the numeral 'one', unlike the indefinite article and the determiner indefinite pronoun, whose relationship to their source has become opaque. If it weren't for its ability to pluralize, the self-sufficient indefinite pronoun *oana/oane/oans* would still be indistinguishable from the numeral *oana/oane/oans* after about a thousand years of a functional split (of sorts).[21]

Thus, none of the mitigating circumstances marshalled above for the extension of plural marking to 'one'-based indefinite pronouns apply in the case of Bavarian *oana/oane/oans*: there was (i) no formal dissociation from the numeral whatsoever, (ii) no morpheme whatsoever added to the numeral, (iii) no shift to negative, (iv) no number-agreeing determiner use worth mentioning (ignoring the trifling plural numeral 'one' with *measles*-type nouns as well as the

---

[21]Which bears intriguingly on Haspelmath's (1993: 168) observation that "indefinite pronouns are otherwise known to change at a very fast rate".

14

peculiar alpine varieties that marginally employ *oa* as a plural indefinite article), nor (v) a 'one'-Plural mid-scalar quantifier to serve as a model.[22]

4. Miskito oneone

Instances of regular plurals or duals of 'one'-based indefinite pronouns that do not meet any of our six enabling conditions appear to be rare. Apart from Bavarian *oa* I am aware of one other potential offender: *kumkum* in Miskito (Scott, Salamanca, et al. 1985), a language of Nicaragua belonging to the Misumalpan family within the Macro-Chibchan phylum. Presently I cannot ascertain whether the equivalents of *kum* in Matagalpa (extinct) and Sumo, the Misumalpan relatives of Miskito, or in languages of the Chibchan branch behave identically.

The cardinal numeral 'one' in Miskito is *kum*; there is a parallel series of numerals borrowed from English, including *wan*. There is an indefinite pronoun that is identical to the indigenous numeral: *kum* 'someone', with its counterpart of the negative series being *kumisin* 'anyone, no one'. Other self-sufficient indefinite pronouns are generic-noun-based: *upla kum* 'someone' (literally 'people/person a'), *diara kum* 'something' ('thing a'—more on the indefinite article presently). Noun phrases are pluralized by the plural word *nani* (*mairin pláplara nani* 'woman nimble Plural'). This method is also used for noun phrases consisting of a personal pronoun (*yang nani* 'I Plural' (i.e. 'we')) or—crucially—of the 'one'-based indefinite pronoun, which in addition gets reduplicated: *kumkum nani* 'some'.[23]

The corresponding determiner indefinite pronoun is also *kum*; and to pluralize noun phrases containing it, either *kum* is reduplicated or the plural

---

[22]Incidentally, regularly number-distinguishing *oana/oa* of Bavarian, like its negative counterpart in Bavarian and Standard German, is at odds with Haspelmath's (1993: 31, 180) hypothesis that the reference of 'one'-based indefinite pronouns tends to be restricted to persons; *oana/oa* can refer to things and other cognitive categories just as well.

[23]Otherwise reduplication is used to form generalizing indefinite pronouns from interrogative pronouns (*yá* 'who?' – *yáya* 'whoever', *día* 'what?' – *día día* 'whatever'), and as one method of forming the absolute superlative of adjectives.

word *nani* is added: *mairin kum* 'woman some' – *mairin kumkum* 'woman some-Pl'; *piu nani kum* 'time Plural some' (i.e. 'some times'). There is no noun-phrase-internal agreement requirement here that might license the plural of the determiner; in fact, the reduplicated indefinite pronoun is the only number marker in such noun phrases because the plural word *nani*, otherwise obligatory, is excluded in this environment (**mairin kumkum nani*). This mutual exclusiveness of *nani* and the reduplication of determiner *kum* is all the more striking because noun phrases with the indefinite article require *nani*—and the indefinite article, if one is present, is again *kum*, and this *kum* obligatorily reduplicates in the plural: *utla kum* 'house a' – *utla kumkum nani*, or with the function words in reverse order, *utla nani kumkum* 'houses'. (An alternative way of pluralizing indefinite-article *kum* is to replace it by a different stem, *ap*: *utla ap nani*, *utla nani ap*.) While noun phrases with numeral 'one', indefinite pronoun 'some', and indefinite article are formally indistinguishable in the singular, there are certain distributional differences in the plural, then, to do with the relationship of reduplication and the regular plural word.

As to the possibility of a plural form of the numeral 'one' itself occurring in plural noun phrases, functioning as a mid-scalar quantifier 'a few, several' (something definitely out in the case of Bavarian *oa*), this would in fact be the only one of our conditions that might possibly have sanctioned the regular pluralization of the indefinite pronoun *kum*. On the information available for Miskito, it is hard to tell whether *kumkum nani* or, in determiner function, *mailin kumkum* has this quantificational meaning. The examples provided in *Miskitu bilu aisanka* (1985) and the Spanish glossing of *kumkum (nani)* by 'algunos, unos, ciertos' suggest that this plural might fail the contrast-to-universal-quantifier test for mid-scalar quantifiers.

So, all that seems to have happened to the numeral *kum* of Miskito when it was turned into an indefinite pronoun and indefinite article was that it acquired plural marking, of such kinds as could be got from the formal resources of the language. In decreasing regularity these plurals consist in the plural word *nani*, reduplication (*kumkum*), and suppletion (*ap*).

Reduplication is one technique that comes to hand naturally when there is a need for forms such as plurals, duals, and kindred categories. Nonetheless, the use to which reduplication of the numeral 'one' is being put in Miskito, in conjunction with the number word *nani*, appears to be uncommon. It is not mid-scalar quantifiers but distributive numerals or adverbs ('one each', 'one by one') and limiting or exhaustive modifications ('only one', 'only / all three') that

are commonly produced by reduplicating cardinal numerals, including 'one'. The formation of universal quantifiers or other totality expressions is another attested function of numeral reduplication, but one specific to 'one'. Yet another, more marginal use of reduplication with numerals is to form sums or products (schematically: 'two-two' = 4; 'thousand-thousand' = 1,000,000), but that sort of pluralization is again least popular with 'one'.[24]

And, looked at the other way round, when indefinite pronouns are formed by reduplication or some other kind of repetition, as especially generalizing ones frequently are, their bases are normally interrogative pronouns (e.g. Mikito *yáya* 'whoever', Latin *quisquis* 'whoever, anyone', Latvian *kā ds ne-kā ds* 'some(one) or other', Hindi-Urdu *koii na koii* ditto, Basque *nor edo nor* 'someone', Khasi *ka÷eyka÷ey* ditto, Sundanese *sahasaha* 'whoever', Thai *khrajkhraj* ditto, Malay *apa-apa* 'anything, nothing', *siapa-siapa* 'anybody, nobody', and *mana-mana* 'any, whatever') or sometimes also generic nouns (Susu *fefe* 'anything, whatever'), but rarely or perhaps never numerals 'one'.[25]

5.   One's perfectibility

What we are faced with in the case of number-inflecting indefinite pronouns that are based on the numeral 'one', irrespective of how different they are otherwise, is a pattern that points to a kind of development that would seem somewhat unusual. Disregarding the apparently rare instances where the numeral 'one' itself has a plural, meaning 'several' (as in Israeli Hebrew), the inflectional versatility of 'one' has increased rather than decreased with respect to number as it was grammaticalized to function as an indefinite pronoun (and perhaps article). Ordinarily, grammaticalization is assumed to involve the opposite kind of development, 'morphological degeneration' (see e.g. Lehmann 1982: 131f).

However, pronouns arguably differ from adpositions, conjunctions, adverbs, classifiers, auxiliaries and the like in the way they are grammaticalized. Since pronouns in general tend to be the words that are inflectionally most active, inflectional morphology is more likely to be regenerated than to

---

[24]See Moravcsik (1978) and Pott (1862: 155-205) on reduplication with numerals.
[25]On the evidence of Pott (1862), Coyaud & Aït-Hamou (1976), Moravcsik (1978), Haspelmath (1993), and own probings.

degenerate in creating pronouns from other kinds of words or from syntactic constructions. Unlikely though such number inflection is in a word such as the plain numeral 'one' and its offspring, and no matter how unfavourable the circumstances, even that numeral may hasten to acquire a proper plural or dual, then, when it fancies itself a pronoun, if only an 'ignorative' one.

References

Behaghel, Otto (1923): *Deutsche Syntax. Eine geschichtliche Darstellung*. Vol. 1. Heidelberg: Winter.

Berger, Hermann (1974): *Das Yasin-Burushaski (Werchikwar). Grammatik, Texte, Wörterbuch*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Boeder, Winfried (1994): 'Kartvelische und indogermanische Syntax: Die altgeorgischen Klitika.' *Indogermanica et Caucasica*, ed. by Roland Bielmeier & Reinhard Stempel, 447-471. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Borg, Albert (1994): 'Distributive and universal quantification in Maltese.' In Borg & Plank, eds. (1994).

Borg, Albert & Frans Plank, eds. (1994): *The Maltese noun phrase meets typology*. Special issue of *Rivista di Linguistica*.

Burrows, Lionel (1915): *The grammar of the Ho language, an eastern Himalayan dialect*. Republished New Dehli: Cosmo, 1980.

Corbett, Greville G. (1994): 'Minor number and the plurality split.' In Borg & Plank, eds. (1994).

Coyaud, Maurice & Khaled Aït-Hamou (1976): 'Indéfinis et interrogatifs.' *Semantikos* 1; 3, 83-88.

Friedländer, Marianne (1974): *Lehrbuch des Susu*. Leipzig: Enzyklopädie.

Gamillscheg, Ernst (1957): *Historische französische Syntax*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Givón, Talmy (1981): 'On the development of the numeral "one" as an indefinite marker.' *Folia Linguistica Historica* 2, 35-53.

Haspelmath, Martin (1993): *A typological study of indefinite pronouns*. Doctoral dissertation, Freie Universität Berlin.

Haspelmath, Martin & Josephine Caruana (1994): 'Indefinite pronouns in Maltese.' In Borg & Plank, eds. (1994).

Hurford, Jim (1994): 'Finnish singular and plural numerals.' Unpublished paper.

Lehmann, Christian (1982): *Thoughts on grammaticalization. A programmatic sketch*. Vol. 1. (akup No. 48.) Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Köln.

Lewis, G. L. (1967): *Turkish grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lorimer, D. L. R. (1935): *The Burushaski language. Vol. 1: Introduction and grammar*. Oslo: Aschehoug.

Moravcsik, Edith A. (1978): 'Reduplicative constructions.' *Universals of human language*, ed. by Joseph H. Greenberg et al., vol. 3, 297-334. Stanford: Stanford University Pess.

Paul, Hermann, Hugo Moser, & Ingeborg Schröbler (1969): *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 20th edn.

Plank, Frans (1987): 'Number neutralization in Old English: Failure of functionalism?' *Explanation of linguistic change*, ed. by Willem Koopman et al., 177-238. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Pott, August Friedrich (1862): *Doppelung (Reduplikation, Gemination) als eines der wichtigsten Bildungsmittel der Sprache, beleuchtet aus Sprachen aller Welttheile*. Lemgo & Detmold: Meyer'sche Hofbuchhandlung.

Schatz, Josef (1907): *Altbairische Grammatik. Laut- und Flexionslehre*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Schmeller, Johann Andreas (1872): *Bayerisches Wörterbuch*. Vol. 1. München: Oldenburg, 2nd edn.

[Scott, Ernesto, Danilo Salamanca, et al.] (1985): *Miskitu bilu aisanka. Gramatica miskita*. Managua: Centro de Investigaciones y Documentación de la Costa Atlántica.

Smith-Stark, T. Cedric (1974): 'The plurality split.' *Papers from the 10th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by Michael W. La Galy et al., 657-671. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Zehetner, Ludwig G. (1977): *Bairisch*. (Dialekt/Hochsprache — Kontrastiv, Heft 2.) Düsseldorf: Schwann.

Author's address:

Frans Plank
Fachgruppe Sprachwissenschaft
Universität Konstanz
Postfach 5560
D-78434 Konstanz
Germany
e-mail: frans.plank@uni-konstanz.de

10 September 1994