OLD PERSIAN NAIY

Old Persian has two standard negative particles: mā (< PIE *meH), for prohibitions, and naiy (<PIr. *nā-īd < PIr. *nā < PIE *ne) for declarative sentences. Naiy has as cognates the Avestan standard negation, nōīt, and the Vedic final conjunction, nēd (cf. Ved. nā). It seems that the weakening of PIr. *nā motivated the need of a pronominal reinforcement i-. We know of some other reinforced standard negative markers such as Lat. nōn < ne/o -oinom, Hitt. natta (<i,? no-to) or Alb. nuk (< EPA *nuka < * ne-κ Cuando). In this paper we present a diachronical analysis of the declarative standard negation naiy and we offer as well some explanations for marked peculiarities within the Old Persian negative system. Contrary to Avestan, Old Persian displays no other negative form. Even though Avestan presents coordinates OAv. naēdā / YAv. naēdā (< PIE *ne-<iH)-de; cf. Hom. Gr. oōētē), Old Persian has none and rather turns to the asyndetic repetition of the negative particle for expressing negative coordination. Nonetheless, Avestan, just like Old Persian, resorts more often to the repetition of the negative particle. Accordingly, Old Persian does not present the collocation NEG-kʷ e [negative marker + enclitic particle]. We propose that this feature is an isogloss common to the entire Indo-Iranian group. This evident absence of a negative coordinate with -kʷ e also seems to be the rule among the rest of the so-called satem languages. Thus, Indo-Iranian languages use the asyndetic reiteration of the negative marker to express negative coordination: Ved. nā…nā, OAv. nōīt… nōīt, OP. naiy…naiy. On the contrary, the collocation NEG-kʷ e is broadly attested in most centum languages: Lat. neque/nec, Os. nep, Myc. o-u-qe, Gr. oōtē, Olr. nach, Celtiber. nekue, Goth. nih and Toch. A/B mak. We also have Lyd. nik and Hitt. nēku, although this last one works as a negative rhetorical question marker and not as a connective form. Similarly, Old Persian shows neither negative quantifiers (cf. Av. naē-čim, naē-čiś and naē-kay) nor negative polarity items, which are lexical elements occurring only in negative contexts. There is just some sort of negative intensifier OP cinā that operates only in the presence of a negative marker (cf. Gr. πω and Myc. po-sti). Avestan has an alternative negative particle *nae- (<PIr. *ne-iH) which is only employed together with enclitics to develop new negative quantifiers and conjunctions. It appears that, since Old Persian does not possess such a particle, it does not develop any other n-word. Finally, we would like to treat language contact between Old Persian and Achaemenid Elamite, a non-Indo-European language, whose version in the Royal Inscriptions serves as a model for the Babylonian and Old Persian versions. Here we would like to provide some evidence that shows the mutual influence between Old Persian and Achaemenid Elamite in the form of linguistic interferences. We will see how Elamite structures such as the negative coordinate AchElam. a-ak in-ni and the negative quantifier AchElam. ak-ka-ri…in-ni will give us some important hints about the true nature of Old Persian negative system.
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