This paper proposes that destressed *odin* ‘one’ in Russian is an emerging indefinite article which marks specificity (1), and provides an analysis of the felicity conditions on its use.

(1) Masha vyshla zamuzh za odnogo lingvista.
   #‘Mary married one linguist.’ [cardinal reading]
   ‘Mary married a specific linguist.’ [specific reading]

Semantically, specific *odin* (*odin*-sp) behaves like specificity markers cross-linguistically (cf. Lyons 1999), requiring widest scope. Pragmatically, the felicity of *odin*-sp depends on identifiability: (2) is pragmatically odd because fish are not normally identifiable. This is captured by the *speaker identifiability condition* in (3b) (cf. Abusch and Rooth 1997, Farkas 2002 for similar proposals concerning the English *a certain*). The semantics in (3a) accounts for the scope-taking properties of *odin*-sp.

(2) Petr pojmal (#odnu) ogromnuju rybinu.
   ‘Peter caught one huge fish.’   [fine on cardinal reading]

(3) a. **semantics:** A sentence of the form \([odin \alpha] \beta\) expresses a proposition only in those utterance contexts \(c\) where the speaker intends to refer to exactly one individual \(y\) which is \(\alpha\) in \(c\), and the felicity condition in (3b) is fulfilled. Then, \([odin \alpha] \beta\) is true at an index \(i\) if \(y\) is \(\beta\) at \(i\) and false otherwise.

   b. **pragmatics:** the speaker is able to name an identifying property \(\varphi \in D_{(s,e)}\) such that \(\varphi(w_c)(y) = 1\) and \(\forall z[(\alpha(w_c)(z) = 1 \text{ and } z \neq y) \rightarrow \varphi(w_c)(z) \neq 1]\), and \(\varphi \neq \alpha\) and \(\varphi \neq \beta\).

The conditions in (3) have further empirical consequences regarding the obligatory **indefiniteness** of *odin*, which cannot be used with unique referents (4).

(4) K nam zashla odna Petina kuzina/podругa/#mat’.
   ‘A cousin/friend/#mother of Peter’s came by’

The indefiniteness of *odin* is derived from (3b): when the set contains only one element, using *odin* to indicate identifiability violates the Gricean Quantity Maxim. It will be shown that further support for this analysis comes from copular possessive constructions (cf. Kondrashova 1996).