

Extending the typology: negative concord and connective negation in Persian

JOHAN VAN DER AUWERA¹, SEPIDEH KOOHKAN²

¹UNIVERSITY OF ANTWERP, ²TARBIAT MODARES UNIVERSITY

Submitted: 26/11/2021 Revised version: 9/02/2021

Accepted: 14/02/2021 Published: 14/04/2022

Abstract

This paper aims to advance the general understanding of negative concord (as in English *We don't need no education*) and connective negation (as in English *neither ... nor*) through an analysis of Persian. For negative concord with indefinites the analysis highlights differences between human vs. non-human and pronominal vs. nominal negative concord. It also deals with the problem that *hič*, the word that arguably marks negation in negative indefinites, also has a non-negative emphatic meaning in questions. For the relation between negative concord and connective negation the paper suggests the importance of two new parameters: (i) are the connective negator and the normal clausal negator similar? and (ii) can one of two negatively connected phrases precede the verb and the other follow it?

Keywords: negative concord; connective negation; negative indefiniteness; negative polarity; emphasis

1. Introduction

In this paper we intend to increase our understanding of negative concord and of its relation to connective negation through the lens of Persian. So we study how Persian expresses what corresponds to English *nobody* and the like and we focus on whether Persian has structures like substandard English *we don't need no education*. This clause contains two negative markers, viz. *don't* and *no education* and one takes them to agree with each other or 'to be in concord'. Languages can have obligatory negative concord, nowadays called 'strict', or not obligatory or 'non-strict' negative concord.

Persian is interesting for three reasons: (i) Persian has non-strict negative concord, but it is of a special kind, (ii) the strategies that Persian uses for *nobody*, *nothing* and *no education* are not identical, (iii) the marker that turns the indefinite into a negative indefinite has a non-negative emphatic use in questions. We also investigate how Persian connective negation, our term for ‘neither ... nor’ structures, relates to negative concord.

The Persian examples are transliterated with the system described on http://www.eki.ee/wgrs/rom1_fa.htm. We use the same system in the references, except for the names of authors, where we keep the spelling that the authors themselves use. For glossing we rely on the Leipzig Glossing Rules (<https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php>). For the sake of uniformity, we ‘retransliterate’ and ‘regloss’ examples from the literature according to the said systems. In one example from earlier Persian we use ‘New Persian’ for the language from 700 onwards, with first ‘Early New Persian’ and then ‘Classical Persian’ (Windfuhr 2009: 9; Windfuhr & Perry 2009: 533). ‘New Persian’ follows ‘Middle Persian’. By itself, ‘Persian’ stands for the contemporary language, also known as ‘Farsi’, as spoken in Iran. The language has various dialects, e.g. Isfahani, Mashhadi, Shirazi, Yazdi, Qazvini, Tehrani, etc. The dialect that we discuss is dominant in the national media, which is very close to the dialect spoken in Tehran and which is the native variant of one of the authors. All our contemporary examples are in the informal (spoken) register.

2. Negative indefiniteness

2.1. ‘*Nobody*’

How does one express negative indefiniteness in Persian? The matter is complex. (1) sketches at least the four main strategies to express what corresponds to English *nobody*.¹

¹ In (1) the negative indefinite is subject. The syntactic function is not relevant: when the negative indefinite is object, for instance, we find the same four strategies.

- (1)
- | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|-------------|------------------|--|
| a. | <i>hič-kas</i>
NIND-HUM.SG | } | <i>zang</i> | <i>na-zad-∅.</i> | |
| | | | <i>ring</i> | NEG-hit.PST-3SG | |
| b. | <i>hič-kas-i</i>
NIND- HUM.SG-IND | | | | |
| c. | <i>hič-ki</i>
NIND- INT.HUM.SG | | | | |
| d. | <i>kas-i</i>
HUM.SG-IND
'Nobody called.' | | | | |

The strategies in (1a) and (1d) are mentioned by Haspelmath (1997: 282-283) and Rasekh-Mahand (2015: 209). Haspelmath also includes (1b) and he adds that the pattern in (1d) can be preceded by *yek* 'one'. *Yek-i* may also occur on its own.

- (2)
- | | | | | | | |
|----|--|------------------|------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------|
| a. | <i>ye</i> | <i>kas-i</i> | <i>n-ist-∅</i> | <i>az</i> | <i>in</i> | <i>be-pors-e</i> |
| | one | HUM.SG-IND | NEG-be-3SG | from | PROX | SBJV-ask.PRS-3SG |
| | <i>dār-i</i> | <i>či-kār</i> | <i>mi-kon-i!</i> | | | |
| | have.PRS-2SG | INT.NHUM-task | IPFV-do.PRS-2SG | | | |
| | 'There isn't anybody to ask him what you are doing.' | | | | | |
| b. | <i>yek-i = o</i> | <i>na-did-am</i> | <i>ke</i> | <i>az</i> | <i>in</i> | <i>xoš = eš</i> |
| | one-IND = ACC | NEG-see.PST-1SG | REL | from | PROX | like = 3SG |
| | <i>bi-yā-d.</i> | | | | | |
| | SBJV-come.PRS-3SG | | | | | |
| | 'I didn't see somebody who likes him.' | | | | | |

The use of *yek* demands more research: we assume that the above constructions make the indefinite outscope negation, conveying that 'somebody to ask him what you are doing was not there' in (2a) and 'somebody who likes him was not seen' in (2b).

In the strategies in (1) we see two morphemes that diachronically relate to the numeral 'one'. The *-i* suffix derives from *aiva* 'one' (Briceño Villalobos 2019: 131) and it now functions as a marker of indefiniteness. *Hič* derives from *aiva* 'one', too, with

aiva followed by a free choice marker **-cid*, which originally was an additive and/or scalar marker ‘also, even’ (Briceño Villalobos 2019: 133). The current status of *hič* is controversial. We consider its appearance in (1) to mark negative indefiniteness, glossed as ‘NIND’, but the matter is complex and will be dealt in some detail in section 2.4. In (1c) we see *-ki*. We hypothesize that *-ki* is the interrogative human pronoun *ki* ‘who’, *pace* Mahootian & Gebhardt (1997: 211), who derive it from *kas*. We posit that *hič-ki*, a relatively new and informal construction, is built on the crosslinguistic frequent pattern of an indefinite formation with an interrogative pronoun (Haspelmath 1997: 26-27, 170-176; Van Alsenoy 2014: 26-27) with, in this case, the form *hič*, which serves negative indefiniteness, as it does with *-kas* and *-kas-i* in (1a) and (1b). The fourth morpheme we see in the indefinites in (1) is *kas*. This is historically an indefinite pronoun, ultimately based on an interrogative stem. At least since Middle Persian (Juan Briceño Villalobos, p.c.) *kas* is a hybrid form, advancing towards noun status on a degrammaticalization path (cf. Willis 2007; Norde 2009: 143-145). The progression is rather strong: at least for the contemporary language Lambton (1957: 33), Lazard (1992: 124), Haspelmath (1997: 283) and Yousef (2018: 71) all simply consider it to be a noun. It is not quite a normal noun yet, though. It cannot function in a sentence like (3).

- (3) *ye *kas=e / ādam=e jālebi=o did-am.*
 one HUM.SG=EZ human=EZ interesting=ACC see.PST-1SG
 ‘I saw an interesting person’.

Also, when we compare the expression of indefiniteness of *kas* with that of ‘normal’ nouns (in Table 1 below), we will see that *kas* does not behave like a normal noun. The intermediate pronoun – noun status of *kas* is reflected in the Boyle (1966) grammar. In the section on indefinite pronouns (Boyle 1966: 25) *kas* is first glossed as ‘someone’, but then Boyle goes on to call it a ‘noun’, but one that can ‘serve as a pronoun’. The treatment in Mace (2003: 74) is similar: *kasi* is mentioned in the section of pronouns, but not as a pronoun but as an ‘indefinite noun’. Cross-linguistically, the distinction between generic nouns and indefinite pronouns meaning ‘somebody’ or ‘something’ is often not a sharp one (see e.g. van der Auwera & Krasnoukhova 2021), to the extent even that Haspelmath (2005) includes both nominal and pronominal counterparts to e.g. *somebody* as ‘indefinite pronouns’. In this paper we steer clear of this issue and gloss *kas* as ‘human, singular’ (‘HUM.SG’). It is clear, however, that *kas*

is not indefinite by itself. In examples (1a), (1b) and (1d) it is made indefinite by either *hič-* or *-i* or by both.

- (4) **kas zang na-zad-Ø.*
 HUM.SG ring NEG-hit.PST-3SG
 ‘Nobody called.’

2.2. ‘Nothing’

In (5) we show how Persian expresses what corresponds to English *nothing*.

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|--------------------|---|-------------------|
| (5) | a. | <i>hič-či</i> | } | <i>na-goft-Ø.</i> |
| | | NIND-? | | NEG-say.PST-3SG |
| | b. | <i>hič-čiz-i</i> | | |
| | | NIND-NHUM.SG-IND | | |
| | c. | <i>čiz-i</i> | } | |
| | | NHUM.SG-IND | | |
| | | ‘He said nothing.’ | | |

The strategy in (5c) is listed by both Haspelmath (1997: 282-283) and Rasekh-Mahand (2015: 209) and the former also lists the one in (5b). Enriching or replacing the indefinite forms with *yek* seems possible under the same circumstances as for ‘nobody’ – see (2). Like for humans, we see an old interrogative stem turning into a noun (Boyle 1966: 25; Lazard 1992: 124). Neither Haspelmath (1997: 282-283) nor Rasekh-Mahand (2015: 209) list the form *hič-či* of (5a), but instead mention a *hič-čiz* form, which is not used in the variety we deal with. One could propose that *hič-či* is a short form of *hič-čiz*, but *hič-či* could also be a short form of *hič-čiz-i*. *Hič-či* could furthermore derive from *hič-če*, in which *če* is a non-human interrogative, and under this analysis *hič-či* is a counterpart of *hički* shown in (1c).

Interestingly, Boyle (1966: 25), Lazard (1992: 125) and Yousef (2018: 75) all mention a bare *hič* strategy. This is not accepted in the variety that we study, except in set phrases like *be hič* ‘for nothing’ or *hič šodan* ‘be destroyed’ (lit. ‘nothing become’).

- (6) a. *ham = ro be hič foruxt-Ø.*
 all = ACC to NIND.NHUM.SG sell.PST-3SG
 ‘(S)he sold everything for nothing.’
- b. *hame zahmat-ā = m hič šod-Ø.*
 all effort-PL = 1SG.POSS NIND.NHUM.SG become.PST-3SG
 ‘All my efforts are destroyed.’

Earlier, bare *hič* did have the ‘nothing’ use.

- (7) 10th century (Afshar & Afshari eds. 2006: 135)
tork = e bičāre hič ne-mi-dānest-Ø.
 Turk = EZ poor NIND.NHUM.SG NEG-IPFV-know.PST-3SG
 ‘Poor Turk knows nothing.’

For both human and non-human indefiniteness we see that negation can be expressed solely on the verb – (1d) and (5c). The negative verb then combines with the form that is also used for positive indefiniteness. The latter use is illustrated in (8).

- (8) a. *kas-i zang zad-Ø.*
 HUM.SG-IND ring call.PST-3SG
 ‘Somebody rang the bell.’
- b. *čiz-i goft-Ø.*
 NHUM.SG-IND say.PST-3SG
 ‘He/she said something.’

This means that *kas-i* and *čiz-i* are polarity-neutral. That specific and negative indefiniteness can use the same, polarity-neutral marking is cross-linguistically well-attested: it is arguably even the most frequent strategy world-wide (van der Auwera & Van Alsenoy 2016, 2018).

2.3. Negative noun phrases

Neither Haspelmath (1997) nor Rasekh-Mahand (2015) pay attention to nominal negative indefiniteness. As (9) shows, nominal negative indefiniteness differs from the pronominal one.

- | | | |
|-----|--|--|
| (9) | a. * <i>hič</i> <i>dānešāmuz</i>
NIND student | } <i>emtehān = o qabul na-šod-∅.</i>
exam = ACC pass NEG-become.PST-3SG |
| | b. <i>hič</i> <i>dānešāmuz-i</i>
NIND student-IND | |
| | c. * <i>dānešāmuz-i</i>
student-IND | |
| | d. * <i>dānešāmuz</i>
student | |
- ‘No student passed the exam.’

The nominal pattern with *hič* but without *-i* in (9a) corresponds to pronominal (1a) and, possibly, (5a), but whereas the pronominal strategies are grammatical, nominal (9a) is ungrammatical.² The two pronominal and the nominal b examples, with *hič* and *-i*, are all grammatical. The strategy with *-i* but without *hič*, i.e., (1d) and (5c) for the pronouns, are grammatical, but the nominal one, i.e., (9c), is not, at least in the intended ‘no student’ sense – it is grammatical when it means that a student didn’t pass the exam. Then there is the bare nominal use in (9d). Bare pronoun uses with *kas* or *čiz* are ungrammatical – see (1d) and the discussion around (6) and (7). The bare nominal use is ungrammatical too, i.e., in the intended sense, for we get a definite sense – ‘The student didn’t pass the exam’. In the plural, however, an indefinite generic sense is possible.

- (10) *dānešāmuz-ā emtehān = o qabul na-šod-an.*
 student-PL exam = ACC pass NEG-become.PST-3PL
 ‘Students didn’t pass the exam.’

² Mahootian & Gebhardt (1997: 89, 160, 211) list three examples of *hič* in front of a bare noun. This divergence could be due to dialect or register differences.

This sentence needs a special context, for it is or was not a generic property of students to fail exams. A clearer use of the generic sense is illustrated in (11) and (12a), and in (12b) the generic sense does not require a plural.

- (11) *ali ketāb ne-mi-xun-e.*
 Ali book NEG-IPFV-read.PRS-3S
 ‘Ali doesn’t read books.’
- (12) a. *gorbe nun ne-mi-xor-e.*
 cat bread NEG-IPFV-eat.PRS-3SG
 ‘A cat doesn’t eat bread.’
- b. *gorbe-hā nun ne-mi-xor-an(d).*
 cat-PL bread NEG-IPFV-eat.PRS-3PL
 ‘Cats don’t eat bread.’

(11) is an example of Kwak’s (2010: 62). Her translation is ‘Ali doesn’t read a book’, which fails to bring out the generic sense. A study of the interaction of negation and generic readings goes beyond this study. Suffice it for us to note that a generic reading lifts the need for negative concord, though the negative concord version allows a generic reading too.

- (12) c. *hič gorbe-i nun ne-mi-xor-e.*
 NIND cat-IND bread NEG-IPFV-eat.PRS-3SG
 ‘No cat eats bread.’

The expression of nominal negative indefiniteness thus contrasts with the expression of pronominal negative indefiniteness. We have already noted that the expression of negative indefiniteness is sensitive to the human - non-human parameter and we now see that the pronoun – noun parameter is even more important. We summarize the patterns in Table 1. In all cases the verbs are negative.

Pronominal		Nominal
human	non-human	
		N
<i>hič</i> -HUM.SG- <i>i</i>	<i>hič</i> -NHUM.SG- <i>i</i>	<i>hič</i> -N- <i>i</i>
<i>hič</i> -HUM.SG	<i>hič</i> -NHUM.SG	
<i>hič</i> -INT.HUM.SG		
HUM.SG- <i>i</i>	NHUM.SG- <i>i</i>	

Table 1: Negative indefiniteness in Persian

That Persian allows a nominal strategy without *hič* for a generic reading is interesting. That nominal and pronominal strategies can be different is not new. ‘We the linguists’ have been aware of this since the seminal work of Bernini & Ramat (1992: 201-226; 1996: 181-199). Without using the term ‘negative concord’, they discuss negative concord in European languages with pronouns and nouns in the same chapter. They analyse seventeen European languages as exhibiting obligatory or, in the current jargon, ‘strict’ negative concord for pronouns, but there is not a single one that they analyse as having strict negative concord for nouns. Bernini & Ramat (1992; 1996) also discuss the non-strict pronominal negative concord that depends on word order, as illustrated with Italian (13), which has negative concord when the negative indefinite follows the verb, but not when it precedes.

(13) Italian (Indo-European)

- a. **(Non) ho visto nessuno.*
 NEG have.PRS.1SG see.PTCP.PST.MSG NIND.HUM
 ‘I have not seen anybody.’
- b. *Nessuno mi (*non) ha visto.*
 NIND.HUM 1SG.ACC NEG have.PRS.3SG see.PTCP.PST.MSG
 ‘Nobody has seen me.’

They do not discuss this parameter for nouns, for lack of space, but it is clear from their example, shown in (14), that negative concord works in a different way.

(14) Italian (Indo-European; Bernini & Ramat 1992: 227; 1996: 199).

- a. *Giovanni* *(*non*) *mangia* *nessun pesce*.
 Giovanni NEG eat.PRS.3SG no fish
 ‘Giovanni doesn’t eat any fish.’
- b. *Giovanni* *non* *mangia* *pesce*.
 Giovanni NEG eat.PRS.3SG fish
 ‘Giovanni doesn’t eat fish.’

In (14) the indefinite nominal is postverbal, so if nominal negative concord functioned like the pronominal one, negative concord should be obligatory. But it is not, as is shown in (14b), and the versions with and without negative concord have a different meaning. What is more, Bernini & Ramat (1992: 227; 1996: 199) give (14b) a generic paraphrase, viz. ‘not eating fish is a characteristic of John’. So in this respect the non-concordial nominal patterns of Farsi and Italian might be identical or, at least, similar. However, this needs more research. Schwarze (1995: 768), for example, describes the difference between (14a) and (14b) differently. He does not appeal to a +/- generic parameter but to +/- partitive and +/- emphatic parameters. In particular: the concordial pattern in (14a) goes with a partitive or an emphatic sense, absent in the non-concordial pattern in (14b). Is ‘non-partitive non-emphatic’ the same as ‘generic’? If (14a) can be partitive, how is its partitivity different from the construction with the partitive *di* determiner, illustrated in (14c)?³

(14) Italian (Indo-European)

- c. *Giovanni non mangia del pesce dal 1997*
 Giovanni NEG eat.PRS.3SG PART.DEF.M.SG fish from.DEF.M.SG 1997
 ‘Giovanni hasn’t been eating fish since 1997.’

It is clear that 30 years after Bernini & Ramat (1992) the presence or absence of nominal negative concord is still on the agenda (see also van der Auwera & De Lissers 2010; van der Auwera, to appear).

³ On Italian partitives see Garzonio & Poletto (2020) and Cardinaletti & Giusti (2020) and the references therein.

2.4. The status of *hič*

Whether the indefinite is a noun or a pronoun, it can be preceded by *hič*. Judging by the current literature this constellation allows three analyses: either *hič* is negative and then the collocation with a negative verb is a matter of negative concord, as in substandard English (15a), or *hič* is a negative polarity item ('NPI'), as in standard English (15b), or it is an in-between item, which sometimes shows negative behavior and sometimes negatively polar behavior.

- (15) a. *You ain't seen nobody yet.*
 b. *You haven't seen anybody yet.*

Each of the three views is represented in the literature. Mansouri (2004) and Kwak (2010) advocate the first analysis, Taleghani (2008: 89) and, probably but implicitly, Erschler & Volk (2011: 135), are in line with the second one. Kahnemuyipour (2017: 7) as well as, implicitly, Haspelmath (1997: 282-284) adopt the third one. Interestingly, Turkish borrowed Persian *hič*, it functions in a similar (though not quite identical) way and we may find the same three approaches: a negative analysis in Jeretič (2018; Görgülü 2020), a negative polarity one in Kelepir (2001: 155-167; Görgülü 2017), and an (implicit) in-between view in Haspelmath (1997: 196, 286-287) (cf. also Suleymanova & Hoeksema 2018: 193, adopting this analysis for Azerbaijani *heç/hiç*).

The NPI analysis is *prima facie* supported by the fact that a form such as *hič-kas* can also occur in polar questions, as in (16).⁴ We gloss this use of *hič* as 'NPIND' ('negatively polar indefinite').

- (16) *hič-kas* *zang* *zad-Ø?*
 NPIND-HUM.SG ring hit.PST-3SG
 'Did anybody call?'

Interrogatives are NPI contexts. If the interrogative use shows that *hič-kas* is an NPI, it supports the view that it is an NPI in negative sentences too. We do, after all, see English *anybody* in questions too:

⁴ What is to be discussed in this section is also valid for the other constructions with *hič*. For simplicity's sake the examples all use the *hič-kas* form.

(17) *Did anybody call?*

The parallel with *anybody* is limited, however. There is only one non-negative NPI context that *hič-kas* appears in and in this respect it differs from English *anybody*. The latter is allowed in the NPI contexts of conditionals and comparatives, as in (18a-b).

- (18) a. *If anybody calls, let me know.*
 b. *He can sing better than anybody I know.*

Perhaps *hič-kas* had a wider use earlier. Thus (19) shows a conditional use, no longer possible in present-day Persian (20).⁵

(19) Early New Persian (11th c.) (Ahmadi Givi 2001: 1586)

rasul goft-∅: agar hič-kas az išan tamiz
 prophet say.PST-3SG if NPIND.HUM.SG from 3PL discernment
dārad-∅ ān xodāvad=e šotor ast-∅.
 have.PRS-3SG that God=EZ camel be.PRS-3SG

‘The prophet said: “If any of them has the sense of discernment, that is the God of the camel”.’

(20) *payāmbār goft-∅ age qarār bāš-e kas-i*
 prophet say.PST-3SG if arrangement be.SBJV-3SG HUM.SG-IND
 **hič-kas tašxis be-d-e, un xodāy=e šotor=e.*
 NPIND-HUM.SG discriminate SBJV-give-3SG DIST God=EZ camel=3SG

‘The prophet said: “If anyone is going to judge, that is the God of the camel”.’

But, independently of whether there was this wider use or independently of the extent of the wider use, for both the interrogative and the negative use one could adopt an NPI analysis.

This cannot be the whole story though. Kwak (2010) convincingly argues that

⁵ It is noteworthy that the contemporary language has a special negative use of *age* ‘if’, as in (a) – a variation on an example in Anvari (2003: 520).

(a) *be xodā age hič-kas hazer bāš-e in kar=o bo-kon-e.*
 to God if NIND-HUM.SG ready be.SBJV-3SG PROX task=ACC SBJV-do.PRS-3SG
 ‘I swear to God that nobody is ready to do that task.’

when *hič-kas* appears in a negative context, it is truly negative, and not just negatively polar. She appeals to tests that distinguish between the two types of elements. We illustrate these with English, and then come to Persian. First, English *nobody* is negative and *anybody* is negatively polar, and in a negative context, only the former can be modified by *almost*.

- (21) a. *I called almost nobody.*
 b. **I didn't call almost anybody.*

This test shows that *hič-kas* is negative.

- (22) *man taqriban be hič-kas zang na-zad-am.*
 1SG almost to NIND-HUM.SG ring NEG-hit.PST-1SG
 'I called almost nobody.'

Second, in elliptic answers, the 'nobody' sense is conveyed with a bare *nobody*, but not with a bare *anybody*. The same holds for *hič-kas*.

- (23) A: *Who came?* B: *Nobody / *Anybody.*

- (24) A: *ki umad-Ø?* B: *hič-kas.*
 INT.HUM.SG come.PST-3SG NIND-HUM.SG
 'Who came?' 'Nobody.'

Of course, Persian *hič-kas* and English *nobody* are still different, for in (1) *hič-kas* shows negative concord and *nobody* does not.

If *hič-kas* is negative and if the non-elliptic clause requires a negative on the verb, then this pattern is a negative concord pattern. There are different types of negative concord. It is clear that the negative concord is 'non-strict' – (1d), (5c), (11) and (12a-b) are examples without *hič* – yet not in the 'classical' sense, illustrated with Italian (13). Classical non-strict NC depends on the position of the indefinite relative to the verb. This does not seem to be relevant, since in Persian the verb comes late.⁶ There are many other types of non-strict negative concord, but what we find in Persian is

⁶ The basic word order in Persian is now arguably moving towards SOV (Dabir Moghaddam 2013: 129), but this does not affect the negative marking on the indefinite.

not included in the typology of van der Auwera & Van Alsenoy (2018) nor in the extensions discussed in van der Auwera (2017). In Haspelmath's (1997) 40-language sample, there are parallels in Hindi (1997: 180-181) and Turkish (1997: 286-297). Hindi, like Persian, allows a polarity neutral pronoun (like *kas*), viz. *koi*, with a negative verb, but the pattern it alternates with, viz. *koi* followed by an originally additive-scalar particle *bhii*, has many more uses than the interrogative one found in Persian (Bhatia 1978: 60; Lahiri 1998; Kumar 2006). So Hindi is similar but not identical – and the same goes for Oriya, discussed by Van Alsenoy (2014: 493-496), and probably other Indo-Aryan languages (Bhatia 1978: 68). Turkish *hiç* is also similar but different. Whereas there is alternation for *bir şey* 'something' (lit. 'one thing') in the example from Haspelmath (1997: 287), represented as in (25), for 'nobody', as in (26), *hiç* cannot be dropped.⁷

(25) Turkish (Turkic; Şahin Beygu, Nisan Ece Gümüş p.c.)

- | | | | |
|----|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| a. | <i>Hiç bir şey</i>
NIND one thing | } | <i>gör-me-di-m.</i>
see-NEG-PST-SG |
| b. | <i>Bir şey</i>
one thing
'I didn't see anything.' | | |

(26) Turkish (Turkic; Şahin Beygu, Nisan Ece Gümüş, p.c.)

- | | | | |
|----|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| a. | <i>Hiç bir-i</i>
NIND one.3SG.POSS | } | <i>gel-me-di.</i>
come-NEG-PST |
| b. | * <i>Bir-i</i>
one-3SG.POSS
'Nobody came.' | | |

So much for the use of negative *hiç-kas* in negative contexts and the alternation with polarity neutral *kas-i*. We still have to account for the interrogative use, illustrated in (16). Kwak, the linguist that argues for negative concord, does not discuss the interrogative use. If we now consider both the interrogative and the negative use, we propose that *hiç-kas* has a double status. In the negative context it is negative and in

⁷ Just like in Persian there are other alternatives, and they have *hiç*.

the interrogative context it is not. And, given the prominence in the literature of the diachronic scenario from NPIs to negative elements, already sketched in the above, a good bet would be that in interrogative contexts *hič-kas* is an NPI element. Just like for the analysis that takes both the interrogative and the negative uses to involve an NPI, the fact that the only non-negative use is an interrogative one is not a problem.

This is still not the full story. Though both interrogative *anybody* and interrogative *hič-kas* are negative polarity items, they are different, and not only because *anybody* has a wider use. Interrogative *hič-kas* also differs from interrogative *anybody* in that the former has an emphatic meaning, characterized by Lazard (1992: 125) and Yousef (2018: 75) by ‘at all’ and by Lambton (1957: 33) by ‘whatsoever’. (27) is Lambton’s example.

(27) *hič nān⁸ dār-id?*

NPIND bread have.PRS-2PL

‘Do you have any bread whatsoever / at all?’ / ‘Do you have ANY bread?’

Thus the emphasis can be said to bring in an element of ‘free choice’ or, a better term, ‘widening’ (Kadmon & Landman 1993).⁹ The *hič* question is furthermore – this is our observation – a biased one: it comes with the expectation of a negative answer and we hypothesize that this follows from the widening: by stressing that the hearer should do his/her best to consider every possible breadlike object, the speaker is preparing for a negative answer.

Interestingly, *hič* is also claimed to allow an adverbial widening sense – Lambton (1957: 34), Lazard (1992: 125) and Yousef (2018: 75). We think that this sense is associated with the positive use of a small number of verbs referring to cognitive processes, including ‘know’, ‘think’, ‘understand’, ‘doubt’ and ‘see’, and that it is

⁸ In Lambton’s example the noun does not carry the indefiniteness marker *-i*. In our variety of Persian the indefiniteness marker is necessary. A bare noun would be appropriate for a habitual or a generic reading.

⁹ ‘Widening’ is a better term because ‘free choice’ is strongly associated with a use of *any* as in *Anybody can do this* and *hič* does not allow this use.

dialectal,¹⁰ possibly influenced by Turkish or Kurdish.¹¹

- (28) a. *hič* *mi-dun-i* *age* *be-fahm-e* *či*
 at.all IPFV-know.PRS-2SG if SBJV-understand.PRS-3SG INT.NHUM
mi-š-e?
 IPFV-become.PRS-3SG
 ‘Do you know at all what will happen if (s)he understands (the truth)?’
- b. *hič* *mi-fahm-i* *dār-i* *či* *mi-g-i?*
 at.all IPFV-understand.PRS-2SG have.PRS-2SG INT.NHUM IPFV-say.PRS-2SG
 ‘Do you at all understand what you are saying?’

Negative (pro)nominal *hič* does not have the widening sense. Assuming that negative *hič* developed from negative polarity *hič*, the widening sense has bleached. Bleaching is frequently found in diachronies of negation. Thus in a classical Jespersen Cycle involving a minimal unit expression like French *pas* (originally) ‘step’, *point* (originally) ‘point’ or *mie* (originally) ‘crumb’, we see a ‘not at all’ sense, which comes from a ‘not even a minimal thing’ like a step, point or crumb. The ‘not at all’ sense then bleaches into the non-emphatic, i.e., non-widened ‘not’ (van der Auwera 2009). Something like this is a possible scenario for *hič*. The interrogative use is not merely a negative polarity sense, it is a negative polarity sense with widening. When this sense turned into a purely negative sense, it underwent two changes: it didn’t only lose the negative polarity sense, but the widening as well. That emphasis or widening

¹⁰ This needs more work. But at least we checked (28a) and b with 31 informants from different parts of Iran: four speakers from the North (Gilan province), 11 speakers from the West, (Kurdistan, Shahri-e Kord, Malayer, Tabriz), two speakers from the South (Jahrom and Sistan; two speakers), and 14 speakers from the center (Tehran, Irak, Qazvin, Yazd, and Isfahan). Except for the Kurdish informant and a Qazvini informant, whose native language is Turkish, they are all monolingual. Only three speakers accepted (28a), all from Shahri-e Kord in the West. (28b) fares better, with six speakers accepting it (four from Shahri-e Kord in the West, one from Jahrom in the South, and the bilingual Turkish Persian speaker from Qazvin in the center) and two speakers that are uncertain.

¹¹ For Turkish it is clear that the adverbial widening use is not restricted to verbs of cognition nor to an interrogative context (Kelepir 2001: 122; Görgülü 2017: 54). So adverbial *hič* has a wider use in Turkish than in Persian. Pronominal and nominal *hič*, however, seem more restricted in Turkish than in Persian. At least, native speakers disagree about the acceptability of the Turkish counterparts to (16) and (27) (Kelepir 2001: 164; Görgülü 2017: 54).

play a role in the development of negative indefinites is well-known (see e.g. Gianollo 2018:137-288; 2020: 554-55). It seems to us that the constellation in Persian, with an emphatic interrogative pronoun and a non-emphatic negative one, has not been documented yet.¹²

It is interesting to compare Persian with Dutch. In Dutch the negative ‘nobody’ pronoun is *niemand*. Its main use is negative, its morphology transparently says ‘NEG.iemand’, i.e., ‘not somebody’.

(29) Dutch (Indo-European)

Ik heb niemand gezien.
1SG have.PRS.1SG NIND.HUM see.PTCP.PST
‘I have seen nobody.’

But it also occurs in a question and it give the question a bias. This makes it similar to Persian *hič-kas*. The bias, however, when *niemand* is not stressed, is positive.¹³ In that respect it is just like the Dutch clausal negator (Geerts et al. 1984: 1063).

(30) Dutch (Indo-European)

- a. *Is dat niet de broer van Maria?*
be.PRS.3SG DIST.SG NEG DET.DEF brother.SG of Maria
‘Isn’t that Maria’s brother?’
- b. *Heb je daar niemand gezien?*
have.PRS.SG 2SG there NIND.HUM.SG see.PTCP.PST
‘Haven’t you seen somebody there?’

The positive bias can be visualized if we rephrase the questions in (30) with English

¹² A much discussed pattern, prominent in the work of Giannakidou (e.g. 1998), of a link between emphasis and negative indefiniteness is what we find in Modern Greek. Modern Greek negative indefinite pronouns can be emphasized prosodically. The emphatic version is strongly associated with the negative use, the non-emphatic version much less so, for it is allowed in a wide variety of NPI contexts. In Persian it is the non-emphatic use that is associated with negation.

¹³ When *niemand* is stressed, (30b) becomes a neutral question asking whether it is true or not that the hearer saw nobody.

tag questions that have a falling tone.¹⁴ The tag question separates the assumption, expressed in the declarative part, from the question, expressed in the tag, and the assumption is each time positive.

- (31) a. *That is the brother of Mary's, isn't it?*
 b. *You have seen somebody there, haven't you?*

So in Dutch it is the negative meaning of *niemand* and *niet* that gives the question the positive bias. We see the same thing with the Persian clausal negator.

- (32) *in barādar = e maryam n-ist-Ø?*
 PROX brother = EZ Maryam NEG.be.PRS-3SG
 'Isn't this Maryam's brother?'/ 'That is Maryam's brother, isn't it?'

In questions *hič-kas* is different from the Persian and Dutch clausal negators and from Dutch interrogative *niemand*: the latter three markers are negative in questions but the former, i.e., interrogative *hič-kas*, is not. Just why the presence of negation proper in a question can yield a positive bias is an issue that is beyond this paper – see Romero (2020) for a description of the state of the art. Beyond this paper is also the question how one should integrate the dimension of speaker bias on a semantic map or that of widening/emphasis, for that matter. These two issues were explicitly mentioned as tasks for later research in Haspelmath (1997: 82-86, 128) and they retain this status now – but see Van Alsenoy (2014: 321-346) for an attempt (cf. also Fălăuș 2013).

It is important to point out that our analysis of interrogative *niemand* does not imply that when an otherwise negative pronoun occurs in questions, it has to remain negative and bring along a bias. Negative pronouns can turn into NPIs. This kind of scenario can be the result of analogical pressure, with the negative pronoun adapting to the negative polarity pronouns in whose paradigm it entered. The change from negation to negative polarity can also be due to negative concord progressively locating the negative meaning solely on the clausal negator, thus allowing the negative pronoun to be reinterpreted as a negative polarity pronoun. The former

¹⁴ With a rising tone, we get a neutral question. The difference between the rising tone and the falling tone in English is thus parallel to the difference between stressing and not stressing the negative pronoun in Dutch. We are grateful to a reviewer for this observation.

scenario has been argued by Haspelmath (1997: 213-233) for Romance pronouns like Spanish *ningun* (see also Breitbarth et al. 2020: 161-164), the second one for Jamaican Creole *nobadi* (van der Auwera & De Lisser 2019; van der Auwera, to appear).

2.5. Conclusion

We have argued that Persian negative pronominal and nominal indefinites do not pattern the same way and that there is a difference even in the two pronominal constellations, i.e., the one for ‘nobody’ and the one for ‘nothing’. Each of them shows non-classical non-strict negative concord. For nominals, we have argued that negative concord is sensitive to genericity: a generic reading allows a non-concordial pattern. We have also suggested that *hič*, the morpheme that makes the pronoun or noun negative, is originally a negative polarity element with a widening component, which survives in questions. The *hič* that serves negative indefiniteness has narrowed the negative polarity to negation and it has lost the widening. These language-specific properties need to be accommodated in the general theory of negative concord and, more generally, negative indefiniteness.

Of course, many other things need to be investigated. Thus, we would want to find out whether the hypotheses can be extended to other negative indefinite words and phrases, like the counterparts to *never* or *nowhere*. One also needs a thorough study of ‘negative spread’, i.e., the co-occurrence of more than one negative indefinite. On this subject Haspelmath (1997: 221) claims that when a form with *hič* combines with a form without *hič*, the one with *hič* has to come first. Example (33) is Haspelmath’s.

(33)	a.	<i>kas-I</i> HUM.SG-IND	<i>čiz-i</i> NHUM.SG-IND	}	<i>na-šnid-Ø.</i> NEG-hear.PST-3SG
	b.	<i>hič-kas</i> NIND-HUM.SG	<i>hič-či</i> NIND-NHUM.SG	}	
	c.	<i>hič-kas</i> NIND-HUM	<i>čiz-i</i> NHUM.SG-IND	}	
	d.	* <i>kas-I</i> HUM.SG-IND	<i>hič-či</i> NIND-NHUM.SG	}	
		‘Nobody heard anything.’			

We found no support for this observation. In other words, the variant in (33d) is fine. Of course, there could be speaker variation and perhaps the variant in d is (for some speakers) less preferred.

We also need to study Haspelmath's 'indirect negation', i.e., the contexts in which the counterpart to a simple clausemate clausal negator is a superordinate negator, a negative verb like *lack* or a privative marker corresponding to English *without*. In the next section, we turn to another issue which has received little or no attention, viz., the expression of connective negation and its relation to negative concord. Last but not least, for the diachrony our cursory remarks invite serious corpus work on the older stages of the language.

3. Negative concord and connective negation

3.1. Cross-linguistic variation

Connective negation, also known as 'emphatic negative coordination' (Haspelmath 2007, Salaberri 2022) and 'correlative negation' (Briceño Villalobos 2019), is illustrated in (34) with *neither ... nor*.

(34) *The man neither went nor came. He stayed right there.*

A working definition has connective negators as elements that both connect and negate structurally identical elements and contain no additional semantics. Thus, *neither* is different from *and* and *not* in (35) – *and* only connects and *not* only negates. Similarly, in (36) only *neither* is a connective negator, different from *either* in (37) and independently of the fact that the first part of (36) does not contain a connective negator and the connection is expressed twice (i.e., with *and* and with *neither*).

(35) *The man did not come and he did not go. He stayed right there.*

(36) *The man did not come and neither did he go. He stayed right there.*

(37) *The man did not come and he did not go either. He stayed right there.*

Lest is not a connective negator either, even though it connects and negates, but the connected elements are structurally different and the structure has, in this case,

additional apprehensional semantics.¹⁵

(38) *The man showed me the map, lest I get lost.*

How this pattern interacts with negative concord has not been the subject of much work. What we know is based on languages in which the connective negator is clearly different from the clausal negator, viz. the Balto-Slavic ones, Spanish and French (see van der Auwera 2021, van der Auwera et al. 2021, and the references therein) as well as Turkish (Şener & İşsever 2003; Jeretič, 2018). Thus Spanish, for instance, has a clausal negator *no*, but the main connective negator is *ni*.¹⁶

(39) Spanish (Indo-European)

- a. *No he visto a nadie.*
 NEG have.PRS.1SG see.PTCP.PST.M.SG to NIND.HUM
 ‘I have seen nobody.’
- b. *No somos (ni) de izquierda-s ni de derecha-s.*
 NEG be.PRS.1PL CONEG of left-PL CONEG of right-PL
 ‘We are neither from the left nor from the right.’

What we also know is that one must make a distinction between at least three connective negator uses, which may or may not have dedicated markers. In (40) the connective negators scope over a finite verb. Van der Auwera et al. (2021) call it the ‘finite’ type, different from the ‘phrasal’ and ‘clausal’ types.

(40) Spanish (Indo-European)

Ni puedo ni debo exponer-la a ciertos riesgos.
 CONEG can.PRS.1SG CONEG must.PRS.1SG expose.INF-3SG.ACC.F to
 certain.M.PL risk.M.PL
 ‘I neither can nor should expose her to certain risks.’

¹⁵ This definition is similar to the one in Salaberri (2022), the main difference being that he follows Haspelmath (2007: 17-19) and requires the construction to encode emphasis. While we don’t deny that connective negation may be emphatic, we remain to be convinced that emphasis should be part of the definition.

¹⁶ All the examples in this section come from van der Auwera (2021) and van der Auwera et al. (2021).

(39b) illustrates the ‘phrasal’ type, the scoped phrases are *de izquierda-s* and *de derecha-s*. The third type is the ‘clausal’ type, and here the connective negators connect clauses. This is illustrated in Slovenian (41).

(41) Slovenian (Indo-European)

Niti programa ne zna napisati niti
 CONEG program.GEN.SG.M NEG know.PRS.3SG write.INF.PFV CONEG

kongresa ne zna narediti.
 congress.GEN.SG.M NEG know.IPFV.PRS.3SG make.INF.PFV

‘Neither does he know how to write the program nor does he know how to organize a congress.’

For each type there is variation as to how connective negation combines with negative concord. Thus, for the phrasal type, one would expect that when the language has negative concord with negative indefinites, it would exhibit the same type of negative concord with negatively connected phrases. This holds true for Latvian, for instance. It has strict negative concord for negative indefinites, and we see the same for negatively connected phrases: the connected phrases are, of course, negative, and so is the verb, independently of the order of the negative phrases and the verb.

(42) Latvian (Indo-European)

Nedz Telma, nedz Jozefs nespēja pakustēties.
 CONEG Telma.NOM.SG CONEG Jozefs.NOM.SG NEG.can.PST.3 PVB.move.INF.RFL

‘Neither Telma nor Jozefs could move.’

In Spanish, just like in Italian, illustrated in (13), negative concord is ‘classically’ non-strict with the position of the indefinite relative to the verb determining whether or not there is negative concord. This holds true for connective negative phrases too, but there is nevertheless something special, something ‘quirky’ (van der Auwera 2021), also related to word order. When the connective negative phrases follow the verb, the first connective negator may remain absent. This is illustrated in (39b) with the bracketed ‘(ni)’.

Another quirky feature is that when the first connective negator is absent, French and Spanish allow the construction to scope over negative indefinites. This is illustrated with French (43).

(43) French (Indo-European)

Rien ni personne changera ça.
 NIND.NHUM CONEG NIND.HUM change.FUT.3SG DIST.SG
 ‘Nothing or nobody will change that.’

For the clausal type, one might expect there to be no need for a clausal negator. In Lithuanian, for instance, connective clausal negators and ordinary ones are incompatible, as illustrated in (44) (cf. Jeretič 2018 for Turkish), but in Slovenian they are compatible – see (41).

(44) Lithuanian (Indo-European)

*Nei aš jam (*ne-)patinku nei jis*
 CONEG 1.SG.NOM 3SG.DAT NEG-like.PRS.IPFV.1.SG CONEG 3SG.NOM
*man (*ne-)patinka.*
 1SG.DAT NEG-like.PRS.IPFV.3SG
 ‘He does not like me and neither do I like him.’

In virtue of its clausal scope, one would furthermore expect a clausal connective negator to control negative concord inside the clause in the way an ordinary clausal negator does. But this is never the case – at least in the languages studied so far. Croatian, for instance, has strict negative concord with an ordinary negator, but not with the connective negator *niti*. In (45) *niti* goes with the Croatian ‘anybody’ and ‘somebody’ pronouns, but not with ‘nobody’.

(45) Croatian (Indo-European)

*Niti je *nikoga / ikoga /*
 CONEG be.PRS.3.SG NIND.HUM.ACC.SG / NPIND.HUM.ACC.SG /
nekoga vidio, niti ga
 IND.HUM.ACC.SG see.PTCP.PST.SG.M CONEG 3.SG.ACC.M
je djevojka upozorila.
 be.PRS.3.SG girl.NOM.SG warn.PTCP.PST.SG.F
 ‘He neither saw anybody/somebody nor did the girl warn him.’

The finite type behaves in a similar way. But there is one extra feature. If the clausal negator is expressed in a prefinite slot and the connective negator is of the finite type,

we have two contenders for the prefinite slot. The presence of the connective negator may make the presence of the ordinary superfluous (and even impossible), as in Spanish (40). But it may allow both, as with *ni ne* in French.

(46) French (Indo-European)

Je ne veux, ni ne peux répondre.
 1SG NEG want.PRS.1SG CONEG NEG can.PRS.1SG answer.INF
 ‘I don’t want to answer and I can’t either.’

From the earlier work we can formulate the generalizations in (47).

- (47) a. A clausal connective negator may make the ordinary negator superfluous, and it cannot control negative concord.
 b. A finite connective negator may make the ordinary negator superfluous, it may control negative concord in the same way as for negative indefinites, and a first connective negator may be absent.
 c. A phrasal connective negator must be controlled by negative concord in the same way as negative indefinites, but a first connective negator may be absent, and in that case it may scope over negative indefinites.

It must be stressed that these generalizations are only based on the Balto-Slavic languages, Spanish, French and Turkish. They have to stand up to typological testing and in future work we should also find out whether a structure that is possible is either frequent or rare. The generalizations in (47) are thus highly tentative but, at least, they show some parameters of variation.¹⁷ The generalizations are also not too forbidding – note the frequent use of the modal *may*. We will now check whether Persian stays within the bounds of this variation and we will see that it does not, at least not completely.¹⁸

¹⁷ With the grounding of the generalizations in Balto-Slavic, Spanish, French and Turkish there is also a strong European bias. We thus do not advance much on the state of affairs described by Haspelmath (2007: 17) for the study of connective negation at that time. At least, we now know, thanks to Salaberri (2022), that connective negation is not an exclusively European phenomenon.

¹⁸ Stilo (2004:321-322) already makes clear that the relation between connective negation and negative concord is interesting, but he does not go into detail.

3.2. Observations and hypotheses for Persian

In Persian the connective negator is *na*. It is a free-standing negator. It is similar to the ordinary negator *na*. The latter functions as a prefix when the predicate is verbal (and it has an allomorph *ne-*).¹⁹ In (48) we illustrate the ordinary clausal negator for both verbal and adjectival predicates.

- (48) a. (*unā*) *farār na-kard-an*.
 3PL escape NEG-do.PST-3PL
 ‘They didn’t run away.’
- b. (*unā*) *mariz na-bud-an*.
 3PL sick NEG-be.PST-3PL
 ‘They were not sick.’

Example (49) illustrates clausal connective negation.

- (49) *na man umad-am piš=e to, na to montazer=e*
 CONEG 1SG come.PST-1SG next.to=EZ 2SG CONEG 2SG waiting=EZ
man mund-i.
 1SG stay.PST-2SG
 ‘Neither did I come to you, nor did you wait for me.’

The meaning of (49) can also be expressed with connection marked with =*o* ‘and’ and negation with the non-connective prefixal *na*.

- (50) *man na-yumad-am piš=e to=o to montazer=e*
 1SG NEG-come.PST-1SG next.to=EZ 2SG=and 2SG wait=EZ
man na-mund-i.
 1SG NEG-stay.PST-2SG
 ‘I didn’t come to you and you didn’t wait for me.’

(49) shows that the clausal connective negator combines with a positive verb. This is in agreement with the generalization in (47a). We conjecture that the fact that the

¹⁹ In his world-wide sample study Salaberri (2022) remarks that this formal similarity seems prevalent in the Indo-Iranian languages.

connective negator and the ordinary negator are formally close militates against having *na* twice.²⁰

With clausal connective negation we get negative concord in the same way as with non-connective clausal negation. The example below is based on Mahootian & Gebhardt (1997: 76).

- (51) *na man čiz-i āvord-am, na to čiz-i dār-i.*
 CONEG 1SG NHUM.IND bring.PST-1SG CONEG 2SG NHUM.IND have.PRS-2SG
 ‘Neither did I bring anything nor do you have anything.’

In (51) *čiz-i* can be replaced by *hič-čiz-i* and *hič-či* as one would expect from Table 1. Negative concord with nominal indefinites and with human pronominal ones similarly shows the options of Table 1. This way Persian does not obey the generalization formulated in (47a), which states that clausal connective negation does not control negative concord. We suspect that the fact that Persian clausal connective negation does control negative concord is again due to the fact that ordinary and connective clausal negators are formally similar.

Example (52) illustrates the finite use of the connective negator.

- (52) *mard-e na raft-∅ na umad-∅. hamunjā vāysād-∅.*
 man-DEF CONEG go.PST-3SG CONEG come.PST-3SG there stay.PST-3SG
 ‘The man neither went nor came. He stayed right there.’

Again, we see that the verb is positive. (53) shows what we find with indefinites.

- (53) *na āvāz-i mi-xund-∅, na čiz-i mi-goft-∅.*
 CONEG song-IND IPFV-sing.PST-3SG, CONEG NHUM.SG-IND IPFV-say.PST-3SG
 ‘(S)he was neither singing nor saying anything.’

The rules for negative concord with finite connective negation are thus the same as with clausal connective negation. Persian conforms to the generalization in (47b).

²⁰ This does not rule out semantically double negation as in

(a) *na man = o did-∅, na na-did-∅.*
 CONEG 1SG = ACC see.PST-3SG, CONEG NEG-see.PST-3SG
 ‘He neither saw me nor didn’t see me.’

Note also that the generalization in (47b) allows a language not to express a first finite connective negator, but does not require it. In Persian a first finite connective negator must be expressed. So in this respect too, Persian conforms to the generalization in (47b).

We now turn to the phrasal use.

- (54) *na dānešāmuz-ā=ye bāhuš, na dānešāmuz-ā=ye tanbal*
 CONEG student-PL=EZ intelligent CONEG student-PL=EZ lazy
dars = o (na-)fahmid-an.
 lesson = ACC (NEG-) understand.PST-3PL
 ‘Neither the intelligent students nor the lazy students understood the lesson.’

Example (54) has to contain both phrasal connective negators. In this respect, phrasal connective negators are like the finite and clausal ones and they conform to the generalization in (47c). But in two other respects they do not conform: we do not get the negative concord found with an ordinary clausal negator.²¹ First, with (pro)nominal indefinites the indefinite need not be negative – see examples (1d), (5c), (11), (12a) and (12b). Negatively connected phrases, however, have to be negative. Second, with ordinary clausal negation the verb has to be negative. In (54), however, we see that the clausal negator may be absent, even preferably so. This way Persian resembles the non-strict negative concord of the Catalan type. In this language negative concord is obligatory for a postverbal negative indefinite, and optional for a preverbal one.

(55) Catalan (Indo-European)

- a. *Ningú (no) ha vist Joan.*
 NIND.HUM NEG have.PRS.3SG see.PTCP.PST.SG Joan
 ‘Nobody has seen Joan.’
- b. *Joan no ha vist ningú.*
 Joan NEG have.PRS.3SG see.PTCP.SG NIND.HUM
 ‘Joan has seen nobody.’

²¹ What is also special and needs more work is the intonational pattern. The negative verb seems to require a break after the first connective phrase, whereas the positive verb allows but does not require this break.

In Persian the negative concord with phrasal connective negation is similarly optional when the phrasal connective negators precede the verb. But there are differences, too. First, it is impossible for the phrasal connective negators to both follow the finite verb (be ‘right-dislocated’). So there is no constellation resembling the obligatory negative concord that we see in Catalan (55b). Second, it is, however, possible for one of the two connective negators to follow the verb and then the verb has to be positive (Najafi 2013: 400-401).

- (56) *na dānešāmuz-ā-ye bāhuš tu emtehān qabul*
 CONEG student-PL = EZ intelligent in exam accept
 (**na-*)šod-an, *na dānešāmuz-ā = ye tanbal.*
 (NEG-)become.PST-3PL CONEG student-PL = EZ lazy
 ‘Neither the intelligent students passed in the exam nor the lazy students.’

This constellation is difficult to explain. What we see in (54) invites an explanation in terms of a version of ‘Neg Early’ principle.²² With respect to both Catalan (55a) and Persian (54) the Neg Early principle could be interpreted to imply that when the clause has special negative marking early in the sentence, the negation is sufficiently clear and it can dispense with a later general negative marker. In Persian (54) there are even two special negators and both come early, i.e., before the slot where the clausal negator could have come. In Persian (56) only one of the special negators precedes the slot for the clausal negator, so there should not be more tolerance for leaving the clausal negator unexpressed. But this is not the case. In fact, we see an obligation for leaving the clausal negator unexpressed. Perhaps a ‘Neg Late’ principle helps out. It could go as follows. In Persian a clausal negator needs an overt expression towards the end of the clause. In (54) the late exponent is the *na* on the verb, and the verb comes late. The Neg Late principle is relaxed by the Neg Early principle: prefinite but late *na-* is optional. In (56) the clausal negator is absent because of the early first connective negator. Neg Late does not come to ‘rescue’ to at least allow the clausal negator, for Neg Late is satisfied by the second connective negator. This has to be overt – Persian connective negators always are – and it comes later still than the

²² This principle goes back to at least Jespersen (1917: 5), when he argued that ‘[T]here is a natural tendency, also for the sake of clearness, to place the negative first, or at any rate as soon as possible, very often immediately before the particular word to be negated [*sic*] (generally the verb).’ It was called ‘Neg First’ by Horn (1989).

clausal negator. Whether this explanatory attempt is successful, it appears that the ‘split connective negation’ pattern shown by Persian (56) has not attracted any attention in the literature. What has also gone unstudied is the pattern shown in (57). Here the connective negators are resumed by a ‘neither of them’ element. The latter contains a *hič* element and we see the normal negative concord.

- (57) *na dānešāmuz-ā=ye bāhuš na dānešāmuz-ā=ye tanbal,*
 CONEG student-PL=EZ intelligent CONEG student-PL=EZ lazy
hič-yek/hič-kodum tu emtehān qabul na-šod-an.
 neither.of.them in exam accept NEG-become.PST-3PL
 ‘Not the intelligent students and not the lazy students, none of them passed in the exam.’

Finally, it will be remembered that at least in French and Spanish connective negators can scope over negative indefinites and that the first connective negator has to be absent. In Persian, connective negators can scope over negative indefinites too, but, different from French and Spanish, the first connective negator has to be present. We again see that, like in (54), the verb may be negative or positive. (58) illustrates this point with one choice for both ‘nothing’ and ‘nobody’. It seems that all choices are possible. The variants without *hič* seem most frequent, perhaps because they avoid the collocation of two negatives, viz. *na* and *hič*.

- (58) *na hič-čiz-i na hič-kas-i harf-i beh=eš*
 CONEG NIND-NHUM.SG-IND CONEG NIND-NHUM.SG-IND talk-IND to=3SG
(na-)zad-e.
 (NEG-)hit.PST-3SG
 ‘Nothing or nobody had told him/her anything’.

The meaning in (58) can also be expressed with non-connective negators. It is also possible to split the connective negators.

- (59) a. *hič-čiz-i=o hič-kas-i na-yumad-e-∅*
 NIND-NHUM.SG-IND = and NIND-HUM.SG-IND NEG-come.PST-PTCP-3SG
 b. *na hič-čiz-i umad-e-∅, na*
 CONEG NIND-NHUM.SG-IND come.PST-PTCP-3SG CONEG

hič-kas-i

NIND-HUM.SG-IND

‘Nothing or nobody has come.’

Again, the other alternatives for ‘nothing’ and ‘nobody’ are possible, and the ‘best’ ones seem to be the ones without *hič*. Still, double negative *na hič* structures are possible, and they are ‘more possible’ than their counterparts in French or Spanish, for in the latter the first connective negator has to be absent.

Like in the conclusion of section 2, we have by no means exhausted the topic. Like with negative indefinites, for instance, the issue of negative spread shows up. And it remains to be seen how connective negators interact with the various types of indefinite phrases discussed in section 2.

3.3. Conclusion

With respect to the existing generalizations on the relation between negative concord and connective negation, Persian is special for both the clausal and the phrasal use of connective negation. The clausal connective negator is interesting because it controls negative concord in the same way as the ordinary clausal negator. The phrasal connective negator is more interesting still, for it shows the relevance of a new parameter. Thus far the literature has shown the relevance of word order in terms of both of the negatively connected phrases either preceding or following the finite verb. Persian makes us aware of a third pattern: one of the two negatively connected phrases precedes the finite verb and the other one follows. Up to now the literature has appealed to a Neg Early principle. We tried to account for the resulting negative concord patterns in terms of a competition between a Neg Early and Neg Late principle. We have also shown that phrasal connective negator can connect negative indefinites, like in French and Spanish.

4. General conclusion

This paper offered an account of Persian negative indefiniteness and, more particularly, negative concord. The kind of negative concord shown in Persian is non-strict, but it is a subtype that has not been documented well, viz. a pattern that allows the negative verb to combine with either a negative or polarity neutral pronoun. We

have also seen that the negative concord for ‘nobody’ may be different from the one with ‘nothing’. We have documented how both types of pronominal negative concord differ from the one with noun phrases. That this may be the case is well-known but there is not much research. A thorny point is the analysis of the marker that makes the indefinites negative, viz. the *hič* marker. It is intriguing because *hič* has an emphatic non-negative use in questions. We described this use of *hič* as a widening negative polarity element and we hypothesize that the negative use derives from this, with a loss of widening and a narrowing from negative polarity into negation. The general typology should provide for this and show how the Persian constellation is different from superficially similar constellations in languages like Dutch, Spanish or Jamaican Creole.

We have also offered a first account of the relation between Persian negative concord and connective negation. We see that Persian does not fall within the bounds of variation sketched in earlier work. The Persian observations and hypotheses suggest that at least two new parameters should be attended to in future work: (i) the question whether or not the ordinary and the connective negators are formally similar, and (ii) the question whether one of two connectively negated phrases can be put before the finite verb and the other behind it. A Neg Early principle is commonly appealed in the study of negative concord; we have argued that Persian could be seen as motivating the effect of a Neg Late principle.

Though we think that this study is the most comprehensive one on Persian negative concord and connective negation so far, there are many tasks undone. In the synchrony we abstained from the study of *yek* ‘one’, the interaction between negation and genericity, and negative spread, to recall just three examples. We have seen that there is a lot of variation in the data. Crucially, negative concord is often non-strict, which invites a quantitative analysis of what steers the variation. It is also clear that even though we interpreted the synchronic data from a diachronic perspective and thus used some examples from the earlier stages of the language, a thorough diachronic study remains to be done.

Acknowledgments

Thanks are due to two reviewers and to Juan Briceño Villalobos (Santiago de Chile), Egbert Fortuin (Leiden), Chiara Gianollo (Bologna), Rajesh Kumar (Chennai),

Roohollah Mofidi (Qazvin), Masoud Mohammadirad (Cambridge) and Iker Salaberri (Bilbao).

Abbreviations

1 = first person	IND = indefinite	PART = partitive
2 = second person	INF = infinitive	PFV = perfective
3 = third person	INT = interrogative	PL = plural
ACC = accusative	IPFV = imperfective	POSS = possessive
CONEG = connective negation	M = masculine	PROX = proximal
DAT = dative	N = noun	PRS = present
DEF = definite	NEG = negation	PST = past
DET = determiner	NHUM = non-human	PTCP = participle
DIST = distal	NIND = negative indefinite	PVB = preverbal
EZ = <i>ezafe</i>	NOM = nominative	REL = relative
F = feminine	NPI = negative polarity item	RFL = reflexive
FUT = future	NPIND = negatively polar indefinite	SBJV = subjunctive
GEN = genitive	NEG = negative	SG = singular
HUM = human		

References

- Afshar, Iraj & Mehran Afshari (eds.). 2006. *Qesse Hossein Kord Shabestari bar asāse revāyate nāšenākhteye mosum be Hossein nāme* [The story of Hossein Kurd Shabestari, based on an anonymous story known as Hossein Name]. Tehran: Cheshme.
- Ahmadi Givi, Hasan. 2001. *Dastoore tārixie fe'l*. [The historical grammar of the verb]. *Volume II*. Tehran: Ghatreh.
- Anvari, Hasan. 2003. *Farhānge bozorge Soxan*. [The great dictionary of Sokhan]. Tehran: Sokhan.
- Bernini, Giuliano & Paolo Ramat. 1992. *La frase negativa nelle lingue d'Europa*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Bernini, Giuliano & Paolo Ramat. 1996. *Negative sentences in the languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bhatia, Tej Krishan. 1978. *A syntactic and semantic description of negation in South Asian languages*. PhD dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Boyle, John Andrew. 1966. *Grammar of modern Persian*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

- Breitbarth, Anne, Christopher Lucas & David Willis. 2020. *The history of negation in the languages of Europe and the Mediterranean. Volume II: Patterns and processes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Briceño Villalobos, Juan Eugenio. 2019. *Negation, indefinites, and polarity in early Greek and Indo-Iranian: a typological and comparative approach*. PhD dissertation, Complutense University Madrid.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Giuliana Giusti. 2020. Indefinite determiners in informal Italian: A preliminary analysis. *Linguistics* 58(3). 679-712.
- Dabir-Moghaddam, Mohammad. 2013. *Radešenāsīe zabānhāye Irāni*. [Typology of Iranian Languages]. Tehran: Samt.
- Erschler, David & Volk, Vitaly. 2011. On negation, negative concord, and negative imperatives in Digor Ossetic. In Agnes Korn, Geoffrey Haig, Simin Karimi & Pollet Samvelian, (eds.), *Topics in Iranian linguistics*, 135-150. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Fălăuș, Anamaria. 2013. Broaden your views, but try to stay focused: a missing piece in the polarity system. In Ivano Caponigro & Carlo Cechetto (eds.), *From grammar to meaning. The spontaneous logicality of language*, 81-107. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Garzonio, Jacopo & Cecilia Poletto. 2020. Partitive objects in negative contexts in Northern Italian dialects. *Linguistics* 58(3). 621-650.
- Geerts, G., W. Haeseryn, J. de Rooij & M.C. van den Toorn (eds.). 1984. *Algemene Nederlandse spraakkunst*. Groningen: Wolters Noordhoff.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 1998. *Polarity sensitivity as (non)veridical sensitivity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Gianollo, Chiara. 2018. *Indefinites between Latin and Romance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gianollo, Chiara. 2020. Evolution of negative dependencies. In Viviane Déprez & M. Teresa Espinal (eds.) *The Oxford handbook on negation*, 546-562. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Görgülü, Emrah. 2017. Negative polarity in Turkish: from negation to nonveridicality. *Macrolinguistics* 5: 51-69.
- Görgülü, Emrah. 2020. Negative sensitive items in Turkish: Negative polarity or negative concord? *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 21: 724-749.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite pronouns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Haspelmath, Martin. 2005. Indefinite pronouns, In Martin Haspelmath, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *The world atlas of language structures*, 190-183. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Also at <http://wals.info/chapter/46>)
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2007. Coordination. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description. vol II*, 1–51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horn, Laurence R. 1989. *A natural history of negation*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Jeretič, Paloma. 2018. Hybrid and optional Negative Concord in Turkish: A unified analysis. *Indiana University Linguistics Club Working Papers* 18
- Jespersen, Otto. 1917. *Negation in English and Other Languages*. Copenhagen: Høst & Søn.
- Kadmon, Nirit & Fred Landman. 1993. Any. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 16(4). 353-422.
- Kahnemuyipour, Arsalan. 2017. Negation is low in Persian: evidence from nominalization. *Proceedings of the 2017 conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association*.
- Kelepir, Meltem. 2001. *Topics in Turkish syntax: Clausal structure and scope*. PhD dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Kumar, Rajesh. 2006. *Negation and licensing of negative polarity items in Hindi syntax*. New York: Routledge.
- Kwak, Saera. 2010. Negation in Persian. *Iranian studies* 43(5). 621-636.
- Lahiri, Utpal. 1998. Focus and negative polarity in Hindi. *Natural Language Semantics* 6(1). 57-123.
- Lambton, Ann K. 1957. *Persian grammar*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Lazard, Gilbert. 1992. *A grammar of contemporary Persian*. Costa Mesa: Mazda Publishers.
- Mace, John. 2003. *Persian Grammar: for reference and revision*. London: Routledge.
- Mahootian, Shahrzad & Lewis Gebhardt. 1997. *Persian*. London: Routledge.
- Mansouri, Mehrzad. 2004. Nafy dar zabāne Farsi az manzare radešenāsie zabāni [Negation in Persian from a typological perspective]. *Proceedings of Allameh Tabatabaie University*, vol 186: 339-350.
- Najafi, Abolhasan. 2013 [1988]. *Qalat nanevisim* [Let's not write wrong]. Tehran: Nashre Daneshgahi.
- Norde, Muriel. 2009. *Degrammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Oryan, Saeid. 1997. *Nahve zabānhāye Irāni-e miyāne qarbi* [translation of Brunner's the Syntax of Middle West Iranian]. Tehran: Reseach Institutefor Islamic Culture and Art Language and Literature.
- Rasekh-Mahand, Mohammed. 2015. *Kārbodhāye moxtalefe zamāyere nakare dar barxi zabāhāye Iranie no.* [Semantic maps of indefinite pronouns in Iranian languages] In Mahmood Ja'fari Dehaghi & Nazanin Khalilipoor (eds.), *Majmoo'e maghalate dovvomin hamyeshbe beinolmelaliye zabanha va guyeshhaye Irani (gozashte va hal)* [Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Iranian Languages and Dialects (Past and Present)], 203-226. Tehran: Centre of the Great Islamic Encyclopedia.
- Report on the current status of United Nations Romanization systems for geographical names - Persian*, http://www.eki.ee/wgrs/rom1_fa.htm
- Romero, Maribel. 2020. Form and function of negative, tag, and rhetorical questions. In Viviane Déprez & M. Teresa Espinal (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of negation*, 235-254. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Salaberri, Iker. 2022. A cross-linguistic study of emphatic negative coordination (ENC). *Studies in Language*
- Schwarze, Christophe. 1995². *Grammatik der italienischen Sprache*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Suleymanova, Venera & Jack Hoeksema. 2018. Minimizers in Azerbaijani from a comparative perspective. *Folia Linguistica* 52(1). 177-211.
- Şener, Serkan & Selçuk İşsever. 2003. The interaction of negation with focus: *ne ... ne ...* phrases in Turkish. *Lingua* 113(11). 1089-1117.
- Stilo, Donald. 2004. Coordination in three West Iranian languages: Vafsi, Persian and Gilaki. In Martin Haspelmath (ed.), *Coordinating constructions*, 269-330. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Taleghani, Azita H. 2008. *Modality, aspect and negation in Persian*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Van Alsenoy, Lauren. 2014. *A new typology of indefinite pronouns, with a focus on negative indefinites*. PhD dissertation, University of Antwerp.
- van der Auwera, Johan. 2009. The Jespersen cycles, In Elly van Gelderen (ed.), *Cyclical Change*, 35-71. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- van der Auwera, Johan. 2017. Englishes, English Creoles and their negative indefinites, In Debra Ziegeler & Zhiming Bao (eds.), *Negation and contact: with special reference to Singapore English*, 115-149. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- van der Auwera, Johan. 2021. Quirky negative concord: Croatian, Spanish and French *ni*'s. *Jezikoslovlje* 22(2). 195-225.
- van der Auwera, Johan. To appear. Nominal and pronominal negative concord, through the lens of Belizean and Jamaican Creole, *Linguistics*
- van der Auwera, Johan & Tamirand Nnena De Lisser. 2019. Negative concord in Jamaican, *Ampersand* 6
- van der Auwera, Johan & Olga Krasnoukhova. 2021. How to do words with “things” – Multiple grammaticalization from ‘thing’ in Tupi-Guarani, *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 33(2). 69-98.
- van der Auwera, Johan, Motoki Nomachi & Olga Krasnoukhova. 2021. Connective negation and negative concord in Balto-Slavic. In Peter Arkadiev, Jurgis Pakerys, Inesa Šeškauskienė & Vaiva Žeimantienė (eds.), *Studies in Baltic and other languages. A Festschrift for Axel Holvoet on the occasion of his 65th birthday*, 44-64. Vilnius: Vilnius University Press.
- van der Auwera, Johan & Lauren Van Alsenoy. 2016. On the typology of negative concord, *Studies in Language* 40(3). 473-512.
- van der Auwera, Johan & Lauren Van Alsenoy. 2018. More ado about *nothing*: on the typology of negative indefinites. In Ken Turner & Laurence R. Horn (eds.), *Pragmatics, truth and underspecification: towards an atlas of meaning*, 107-146. Leiden: Brill.
- Willis, David. 2007. Syntactic lexicalization as a new type of degrammaticalization, *Linguistics* 45(2). 271–310.
- Windfuhr, Gernot. 2009. Dialectology and topics. In Gernot Windfuhr (ed.), *The Iranian languages*. 5-42. London: Routledge.
- Windfuhr, Gernot & John R. Perry. 2009. Persian and Tajik. In Gernot Windfuhr (ed.), *The Iranian languages*. 416-544. London: Routledge.
- Yousef, Saheed (with the assistance of Hayede Torabi). 2018. *Persian. A comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.

CONTACT

johan.vanderauwera@uantwerpen.be
sepideh.koohkan@gmail.com