**CONNECTIVE NEGATION: SYNCHRONY AND DIACHRONY**

Convenors: MENA B. LAFKIOUI (École des hautes études en sciences sociales & CNRS, Paris) & JOHAN VAN DER AUWERA (University of Antwerp)

Keywords: negation, connection, correlative constructions, negative concord, contact convergence, synchrony, diachrony

**Background**

Let 'connective negation' ('CONEG') be the term for the constructions illustrated in (1), both modern versions of the advice of Polonius in Shakespeare's *Hamlet.*

(1)   a.   Be neither a borrower nor a lender.

   b.   Do not be a borrower or a lender.

The versions in (1a) and (1b) differ in that (1a) uses the dedicated *neither .... nor* construction, whereas (1b) uses the ordinary negator *not* and the ordinary disjunctor *or*. Neither construction has been the subject of much study, compared to the voluminous literature devoted to other types of negation. This is evident from the fact that Déprez & Espinal's otherwise comprehensive 2020 *Oxford handbook of negation* devotes no attention at all to 'connective negation'.

Thus, connective negation needs more scrutiny, and not only for its dedicated types, the reason being that the difference is not always easy to make. Consider Persian (van der Auwera & Kookhan 2022: 25-26):

(2)   *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.'

(3)   *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.'

In (2) the clausal-initial negators *na* are rendered as 'neither/nor' and one may speak about a dedicated strategy. In (3) one could propose a translation without 'neither/nor', for we here see the ordinary verbal clitic *na-*. But one could also argue (see e.g., Salaberri 2022: 680) that the two *na*'s are the same and that in (2) 'really' means (lit.) 'not I came to you, not you waited for me'.

English *neither ... nor* are uncontroversially dedicated markers, but much remains unclear. Is *neither ... nor* also inherently emphatic, as argued by Haspelmath (2007) and Salaberri (2022), or is there rather a sense of negated addition (van der Auwera & Van Olmen Forthc) or even both? Is it important that the construction has (at least) two elements, justifying a term like 'correlative negation' (Gianollo 2018), in which case *non plus* in (4) is difficult to accommodate? *Non plus* is also difficult to accommodate if one insists that the connectors of connective negation have to be conjunctions.

(4)      French (Serge Gainsbourg,
         https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Je_t%27aime..._moi_non_plus)

         A:   *Je*    *t'aime.*          B:   Moi    *non plus.*

              I      you love                Me     CONEG

              'I love you.'                  'Me neither'

**Objectives**

The description of the background easily feeds into the objectives of the workshop.

First, we aim to advance the decision making on the terminology: is the plurality of terms a hindrance or do some terms merit their existence in virtue of the plurality of the constructions themselves? Should emphasis or correlation be definitional criteria of the phenomenon, or should they be taken as criterial only for subtypes? Should we require that elements combined negatively be at the same structural level or not? If we do, the Quirk et al. (1985: 938-939) 'mixed' construction in (5), with *neither* scoping over a predicate and *nor* over a clause, will be excluded.

(5)      Mary was *neither* happy *nor* was she sad.

Second, with contributions on typologically varying languages, we will increase the understanding of synchronic variation. We particularly welcome the study of languages for which connective negation has never or hardly been studied (the indigenous languages of Mexico and South America, and even Sinitic and Tamazight). The aim is to amend or enrich the typological proposals in Bond (2011), Salaberri (2022), and van der Auwera & Van Olmen (forthc.), foreshadowed by Jespersen (1917: 103-116). At least four issues will be in focus, and their relevance can be illustrated with Croatian.

(i) how do markers of connective negation differ with respect to what they scope over? In Croatian, *ni ... ni* is used for noun phrases, but *niti ... niti* is used for clauses.

(ii) how does connective negation interact with negative polarity and negative concord? When the connective negation has clausal scope, one would expect it to relate to negative polarity and negative concord in the same way as non-connective clausal negation. At least in Croatian, this is not the case: non-connective clausal negation goes with negative concord, but connective clausal negation does not.

(iii) when two constituents are negatively connected, do both get marked, do they get marked in the same way, and if there is variation, what does it depend on? So, in Croatian, when *ni ... ni* follows the finite verb, the first *ni* is optional, but obligatory when *ni ... ni* precedes it.

(iv) can the markers of connective negation be ambiguous? Croatian *ni* can also mean 'not even'. French *non plus* is no less interesting, for it also means 'no more'. Estonian *ega* also functions as a negative question particle (Tamm 2015: 411, 424-425).

Third, as for a better understanding of the pathways through which languages acquire connective negation constructions, we have high hopes for fine-grained historical work on Italian, French, Sinitic and the Balkan languages. The diachronic variation is not independent of synchronic variation, of course. The study of this ambiguity directly poses the question of whether one use historically derives from the other, with the etymology of a connective marker offering clues to an earlier ambiguity. Of special interest are pathways of contact convergence, the importance of which is suggested by the fact that Russian *ni* has been borrowed in some coterritorial Finnic languages (see section 4.5. of some of the chapters in Miestamo *et al.* (eds) 2015). Romance *ni* is more 'successful' still. It seems to have been borrowed in various languages of Mexico and South America (Salaberri 2022: 677), but also in Tamazight (aka Berber). In the languages of Mexico and Latin America, Romance *ni* is also frequently borrowed with a 'not even' meaning and, as the glossing for the Cavineña example in (6) suggests, the borrowing of the two uses may be related.

(6)    Cavineña (Tacanan, Guillaume 2008: 107)

*Aijama=pa=tuna-ja*          ***ni**=jae*       ***ni**=e=rima.*

NEG.exist.at.all=REP=3PL-DAT    NEG.even=fish    NEG.even=NPF-meat

'They say that they really have neither fish nor meat.'

Below is a list of planned contributions to the workshop, followed by the corresponding abstracts.

**Abbreviations**

CONEG 'connective negation', DAT 'dative', NEG 'non-connective negation', NPF 'noun prefix', PL 'plural', POT 'potential', REP 'reportative'

**References**

Bond, Oliver. 2011. Negation in clause linkages. In Julia Sallabank (ed.) *Language documentatioin and description* Volume 9. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 77-120.

Déprez, Viviane & M.Teresa Espinal. (eds.). 2020. *The Oxford handbook of negation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gianollo, Chiara. 2018. *Indefinites between Latin and Romance.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Guillaume, Antoine. 2008. *A grammar of Cavineña.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Haspelmath. Martin. 2007. Coordination. In Timothy Shopen (ed.) *Language typology and syntactic description*. Volume 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-51.

Jespersen, Otto. 1917. *Negation in English and other languages.* København: Høst & Søn.

Miestamo, Matti, Anne Tamm & Beáta Wagner-Nagy (eds.) 2015. *Negation in Uralic languages.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Salaberri, Iker. 2022. A cross-linguistic study of emphatic negative coordination', *Studies in Language* 46.647-717.

Tamm, Anne. 2015. Negation in Estonian. In Miestamo, M., Tamm A. & Wagner-Nagy B. (eds.) 2015. *Negation in Uralic languages.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 399-431.

van der Auwera, Johan & Sepideh Kookhan. 2022. Extending the typology: negative concord and connective negation in Persian, *Linguistic Typology at the Crossroads* 2.1-36.

van der Auwera, Johan & Daniel Van Olmen. Forthc. In Maj-Britt Mosegaard Hansen & Richard Waltereit (eds.) *Cyclical change in grammar and discourse.* Oxford University Press.