



저작자표시-비영리-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.

다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



비영리. 귀하는 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 없습니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#)

문학석사 학위논문

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

페르시아어 부정명사구의 의미론

2014년 2월

서울대학교 대학원

언어학과 언어학전공

카스러이 킬라크저니 더부드

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

지도교수 남승호

이 논문을 문학석사 학위논문으로 제출함

2013년 12월

서울대학교 대학원

언어학과 언어학전공

카스러이 킬라크저니 더부드

더부드 카스러이의 문학석사 학위논문을 인준함

2014년 1월

위원장	고희정	(인)
부위원장	남승호	(인)
위원	곽새라	(인)

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

by

Davood Kasraie Kilakjani

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

at

Seoul National University

January 2014

Thesis Supervisor



Seungho Nam

Thesis Committee



Heejeong Ko



Saera Kwak

Abstract

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

Kasraie Kilakjani, Davood

Department of Linguistics

The Graduate School

Seoul National University

This thesis addresses the distribution and interpretation of indefinite pronouns and noun phrases in Persian in a variety of contexts hitherto not fully explored. I claim that what Haspelmath (1997) classified as Persian *generic-noun-based indefinites* had certain holes and to show the true nature of indefinite pronouns in Persian they must be divided into two classes - generic-noun-based indefinites and numeral *one*-based indefinites. I call the latter *yek* series and the former *-i* series. I claim that the two series of indefinites in Persian are not fully identical contrary to what is often assumed in the literature and this can also be understood from the behavior of indefinite pronouns and be extended to ordinary indefinite NPs in a certain degree.

I claim that the *yek* series show emphatic vs. nonemphatic contrast in both positive and negative contexts. The emphatic form indicates the specificity of the indefinites and brings about a wide scope reading and allows them to be epistemically or scopally specific. In negative contexts the emphatic form can bring a positive polarity reading in addition to marking specificity.

The *yek* series can also be used as minimizers (a type of negative polarity items) with a unique accentuation pattern different from the emphatic forms. Minimizing *yek* series invoke a scalar implicature. This behavior of *yek* series can be extended to singular *yek* indefinite NPs as plural ones do not show

(non-)emphatic contrast and cannot be used as minimizers. But, as plural indefinite NPs are presuppositional they can bring the positive polarity reading in negative contexts.

In contrast, the *-i* series show the (non-)emphatic contrast just within limited positive contexts. But they lose this contrast in negative contexts as they inherently interpret as indefinite existentials inside the scope of negation. Being interpreted inside the scope of negation does not mean that they are negative polarity items because they appear in both positive and negative contexts as indefinite existentials and unlike broad NPIs they do not show a free choice reading. I claim that this behavior of *-i* series too, can be extended to singular *-i* indefinite NPs. Plural *-i* indefinites do not have emphatic form but as they are presuppositional indefinites, they can bear a positive polarity reading.

The suffix *-i* can optionally co-occur with the *yek* series pronouns, but for ordinary *yek* NPs it is found that there is some restriction depending on the context. The study of the distribution of indefinite pronouns and indefinite NPs shows that the distribution of *-i* is sensitive to whether the speaker wishes to convey an exact value, or an ‘approximation’ of the value. I also discuss how the ‘approximation’ effect might interact with the specific reading of the accusative marker *rā* in Persian.

Keywords: Persian Indefinites, Indefinite Pronouns, Negative Polarity, Positive Polarity, Specificity

Student Number: 2011-24256

Table of contents

Abstract	i
List of tables	v
List of abriviations.....	vi
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Indefinite pronouns.....	2
1.2 Emphatic vs. non-emphatic contrast.....	3
1.3 Specificity	6
2. Indefinite Pronouns in Persian	9
2.1 Re-classification of Persian indefinite pronouns.....	9
2.2 Distribution and meaning of <i>-i</i> series indefinite pronouns.....	12
2.2.1 <i>-i</i> series in (non-)veridical contexts	13
2.2.2 <i>-i</i> series with highlighted supplementary FCI	18
2.2.3 <i>-i</i> series' scopal behavior	20
2.3 Distribution and meaning of <i>yek</i> series indefinite pronouns.....	29
2.3.1 <i>yek</i> series and their scopal behavior	30
2.3.2 <i>yek</i> series as minimizers.....	39
2.4 Semantic condition on distribution of indefinite pronouns.....	43
2.5 Summary: a comparison between <i>-i</i> series and <i>yek</i> series.....	44
3. Indefinite pronouns versus indefinite noun phrases.....	46
3.1 <i>-i</i> series indefinite pronouns and <i>-i</i> indefinite NPs	46

3.2 <i>yek</i> series indefinite pronouns and <i>yek</i> indefinite NPs	48
4. Approximation, indefiniteness and Specificity	52
4.1 Distributions of <i>-i</i> and the notion of Approximation	52
4.2 Indefinites and specificity	55
5. Conclusion	58
References.....	60
국문 초록.....	64

List of Tables

Table 1.	(Non-)emphatic contrast of Greek's quantifier.....	3
Table 2.	Comparative distribution of emphatics and non-emphatics in Greek.....	3
Table 3.	Possible (non-)specific contexts.....	7
Table 4.	<i>-i</i> series of indefinite pronouns.....	12
Table 5.	Distribution of <i>-i</i> series in (non-)veridical contexts.....	18
Table 6.	The scopal behavior of <i>-i</i> series in positive contexts.....	24
Table 7.	The scopal behavior of <i>-i</i> series in negative contexts.....	28
Table 8.	<i>yek</i> series indefinite pronouns.....	29
Table 9.	<i>yek</i> series' scopal behavior in positive contexts.....	34
Table 10.	<i>yek</i> series' scopal behavior in negative contexts.....	39
Table 11.	Licensing contexts for minimizing <i>yek</i> series.....	42
Table 12.	Differences between the <i>-i</i> series and the <i>yek</i> series.....	45
Table 13.	Similarity and differences of <i>-i</i> series and <i>-i</i> indefinite NPs.....	48
Table 14.	Similarities and differences of <i>yek</i> series and <i>yek</i> indefinite NPs.....	51

List of Abbreviations

ACC	Accusative marker
CL	Classifier
DEC	Declarative
DUR	Durative
EZ	Ezafe marker
HON	Honorific
IMP	Imperative
IMPF	Imperative
IND	Indefinite
INT	Interrogative
NEG	Negative
NOM	Nominal
NP	Noun phrase
PERF	Perfective
PL	Plural
PP	Past participle
SG	Singular
SUB	Subjunctive

1. Introduction

Persian has two kinds of indefinite marker and it has long been thought that they are the same. This study shows that they are not fully identical. Following Haspelmath (1997), I use the term ‘indefinite pronoun’ to indicate the relevant pronouns for the sake of convenience. Haspelmath used the term indefinite pronoun as a broader term to refer to quantifiers, negative polarity items, etc., and this serves as a useful starting point to an investigation of the meaning and distribution of the *-i* series and *yek* series indefinite pronouns and eventually the *-i* and *yek* indefinite NPs.

In the first chapter, I offer a background for the indefinite pronouns and the importance of prosody and speakers knowledge (specificity) in their interpretation. In the second chapter, I claim that Haspelmath’s classification for Persian indefinite pronouns is not correct. I show that Persian has two distinct series of indefinite pronouns which I call the *-i* series and *yek* series. My claim is that contrary to the *yek* series, the *-i* series are inherently indefinite existentials which do not show an emphatic vs. nonemphatic contrast in negative contexts but do partially in positive contexts. The emphatic form facilitates a wide scope reading for both series. Also, I show that the indefiniteness of the *yek* series is such that they can be interpreted as PPIs or minimizers each with different accentuation. In the third chapter, I discuss how the scopal behavior of the two series can be extended to other *-i* or *yek* indefinite NPs. In the fourth chapter, I discuss the behavior of *-i* and explain its relation with specificity in indefinite NPs. And in the last chapter I offer a summary and the conclusion.

1.1. Indefinite pronouns

Haspelmath (1997) sought to characterize indefinite pronouns by studying extensive data from 40 languages. Indefinite pronouns refer to one or more unspecified person, object, place, etc., which typically occur in what is known as an ontological series (person, thing, place, time, manner, etc). In narrower terms, it can refer to quantifiers, polarity items etc. According to Haspelmath, this includes the English *some* series (*somebody, something, somewhere...*), *any* series (*anybody, anything...*) and *no* series (*nobody, nothing...*); Russian -*to* series (*kto-to* ‘somebody’ *čto-to* ‘something’ *gde-to* ‘somewhere’...) and -*nibud* series (*kto-nibud* ‘anybody’ *čto-nibud* ‘anything’...), among many others.

In the functional sense, Haspelmath uses the term for pronouns “whose main function is to express indefinite reference...which are distinguished from personal pronouns, demonstrative pronouns, relative pronouns and interrogative pronouns” (Haspelmath 1997: 9-13). He also mentioned that indefinite pronouns “should not be understood in their etymological sense (replacing a noun)” (Haspelmath 1997: 9-13).

From a formal point of view, he distinguishes indefinite expressions and indefinite pronouns. For example, lexical indefinites are different from indefinite pronouns prosodically, e.g. *something* and *some thing* (' - - vs. - '-), morphologically (**somethings* vs. *some things*) and syntactically (*something important* vs. *some important thing*) (Haspelmath 1997: 9-13).

Mid scalar quantifiers like *few, several, many*, generic pronouns like *one*, universal quantifiers like *all, every*, and identity pronouns/determiners like *other, same* although traditionally considered as indefinite pronouns were not the subject of investigation in Haspelmath’s work. He also mentioned a mixed

functional-formal definition for indefinite pronouns. From a functional point of view “they can be characterized as INDEFINITE and from a formal point of view can be characterized as PRONOUNS, i.e. grammatical elements” (Haspelmath 1997: 9-13).

1.2 Emphatic vs. non-emphatic contrast

Some indefinites can bear a different meaning according to the stress that they take. For example Giannakidou (1999:376) claimed that Greek indefinites shown in the table below, with an emphatic reading (capital letter) are universal quantifiers while with a nonemphatic reading (small letter) are just indefinite existentials:

Table (1), (Non-)emphatic contrast of Greek’s quantifier

kanenas/ KANENAS	anyone, anybody/ no one, nobody
tipota/ TIPOTA	anything/ nothing
pote/ POTE	ever/ never
puthena/ PUTHENA	anywhere/ nowhere
katholu/ KATHOLU	at all/ not at all

The different interpretation made by (non-)emphatic reading can be illustrate by the table below: (Giannakidou 1999:380)

Table (2), Comparative distribution of emphatics and non-emphatics in Greeks

Environments	Emphatic	Nonemphatic
Negation	OK	OK
<i>before</i> -clause	OK	OK
<i>without</i> - clause	OK	OK
DE quantifiers	*	OK
Yes-no/ constituent question	*	OK
Conditional	*	OK

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

Restriction of \forall	*	OK
<i>too</i> -clause	*	OK
S-comparatives/superlatives	*	OK
Future	*	OK
Strong intentional verbs	*	OK
Modals	*	OK
Imperatives	*	OK
Habituals	*	OK
Disjunctions	*	OK
<i>perhaps</i> -clause	*	OK
Negative verbs	*	OK

Also, Giannakidou (2011) argues that in English it is accented *some* that gives rise to positive polarity readings. She called it emphatic and denoted this with capital letters. In all the examples below, *SOME* results in positive polarity¹ readings:

- (1) a. John didn't call **SOMEONE** #not > some
 b. Nobody called **SOMEONE** #no one > some
 c. John came to the party without **SOMEONE** #without > some

Giannakidou (2011) claims that cases which are not accented (nonemphatic) take narrow scope readings and therefore have simply an indefinite reading.

¹ Positive polarity items (PPI), have been studied in the works of Baker (1970), Szabolcsi (2004), Nilsen (2003) and Ernst (2009), among others. The Sentences below are some examples of PPIs:

- i. a. Bill didn't eat **some** vegetable
 b. $\exists x$ vegetable (x) $\wedge \neg$ ate (b, x)
 ii. a. John arrived **already**
 b. #John didn't arrive already

As I show in the examples above, PPIs like *some*, *already* and *would rather* refuse to be in the scope of Negation. Semantically, it is known as an existential quantifiers which are interpreted out of the scope of negation ($\exists \neg$).

- (2) a. I don't think that John *didn't call someone* $\sqrt{\text{not}} > \text{not} > \text{some}$
 b. No one thinks that John *didn't call someone* $\sqrt{\text{no one}} > \text{not} > \text{some}$
 c. I am surprised that John *didn't call someone* $\sqrt{\text{surprise}} > \text{not} > \text{some}$
 d. I regret that John *didn't call someone* $\sqrt{\text{regret}} > \text{not} > \text{some}$
 e. If we *don't call someone*, we are doomed $\sqrt{\text{if (not)}} > \text{some}$
 f. Every boy who *didn't call someone* . . . $\sqrt{\text{every (not)}} > \text{some}$
 g. Only John *didn't call someone* $\sqrt{\text{only}} > \text{not} > \text{some}$
 h. Few boys didn't call someone $\sqrt{\text{few}} > \text{not} > \text{some}$

Emphatic *some* in (2) results either in ungrammaticality (2a, b) or a wide scope reading. Giannakidou also said that emphatic *some* can be the equivalent to *a particular* or *a certain* to indicate specificity and wide scope reading:

- (3) a. Sue didn't talk to a certain Norwegian — his name is Otto
 b. Sue didn't talk to a particular Norwegian — his name is Otto
 c. Sue didn't talk to SOME Norwegian — his name is Otto

(Giannakidou 2011: 1701)

Giannakidou further claims that the emphatic SOME is highly referential and it can favor the positive polarity reading.

Other studies also show that prosody has an effect on interpretation of indefinites. Yun (2012: 290) claims that in Korean prosodic phrasing determines whether a *wh*-word gets an interrogative reading or an indefinite reading. The indefinite use of *wh*-phrases, like genuine indefinites, can take a wide scope over other operators/quantifiers, which can be forced by phonological prominence.

Haspelmath (1997) says that as a semantic factor, the knowledge of the speaker (specificity) is sometimes relevant in choosing between different indefinite series.

(6) John wants to buy a laptop

In (6) if John wants to buy a certain laptop (Sony for example), then the sentence receives the specific interpretation but when John has not decided yet and has no particular laptop in mind then it is nonspecific. Haspelmath (1997:45) predicts the contexts which an indefinite pronoun can possibly have a specific reading. The following is a partial table of his analysis:

Table (3), possible (non)specific contexts

Perfective past, ongoing present	'Want', future, Distributive	Imperative	question, conditional	In the scope of negation
Specific possible		Specific impossible		
(Nonspecific Impossible)	Nonspecific possible			

Von Heusinger (2011) identifies seven types of specificity. Without deeper discussion here, an introduction of the relevant parts for the purposes of my study shall suffice. The following summarizes his typology of specificity:

(i) Referential specificity: This notion suggests that specificity can be expressed as a contrast between a reading that allows existential entailment and a reading that does not.

(ii) Scopal specificity: This notion suggests that certain indefinites have the ability to escape scope islands such as the conditional, while a universal quantifier cannot escape. It often also includes referential specificity.

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

(iii) Epistemic specificity: This notion suggests that specificity expresses the contrast between speaker's knowledge.

(iv) Specificity as familiarity: This notion suggests that specificity is sometimes associated with different types of familiarity such as D-linking, partitivity, and presuppositionality, and in this case the indefinite can be part of a previously introduced set.

(v) Specificity as topicality: This notion suggests that specificity is related to topicality and the topical element can be understood as a specific expression.

(vi) Specificity as noteworthiness: This notion assumes that presentatives like *this* signal that the speaker intends to assert a noteworthy property of the referent.

(vii) Specificity as discourse prominence: This notion refers to an aspect of discourse prominence, namely “referential persistence” or “topic shift”.

Haspelmath's generalization must not be accurate since von Heusinger (2011) mentioned, scopal specificity causes an indefinite to escape out of the scope of a conditional. Also Haspelmath mentioned that nonspecific reading of the indefinites in past and ongoing present is impossible while I show in the second chapter that, it is not true in Persian. Thus, it is more appropriate to consider it a cross-linguistic generalization.

2. Indefinite Pronouns in Persian

Haspelmath (1997: 27) classifies Persian indefinite pronouns as *generic-noun-based indefinites* and says “there is nothing special about them and they are made of $-i$ ², the same indefinite marker that makes indefinite noun phrases”. Although he doubted that they are indefinite pronouns at all, he said that the grammaticalized combination of a generic noun phrase and indefinite marker is not limited to Persian. He exemplifies indefinite pronoun *somebody* vs. indefinite noun phrase *some body* etc., which are distinct forms. He also mentioned *iš* ‘anyone, no one’ in Hebrew, is originally derived from *iš* ‘man’ but now they are lexically different and have different syntactic properties. Discussing whether what Haspelmath called *Persian indefinite pronouns* are really indefinite pronouns or just simply indefinite noun phrases is not the subject of this paper. I use the umbrella term *indefinite pronoun* for the sake of convenience. However there is a certain hole in his classification which I address in the next section.

2.1 Re-classification of Persian indefinite pronouns

Haspelmath (1997) classifies indefinite pronouns according to their derivational bases into three groups: *interrogative-based indefinites*, *generic-noun-based indefinites* and *one-based indefinites*. He classifies Persian *yek-čiz-i* and *čiz-i* ‘something’ both as generic noun based indefinites. He did know that the enclitic indefinite marker $-i$ can combine with both words, but perhaps what he did not know is that *ye(k)*³ ‘one’ in Persian is another kind of indefinite marker and when they both combine with a generic noun, $-i$ can be optional⁴. This, mentioned by lot of scholars including Ghomeshi (2003):

² In Persian, $-i$ followed by a vowel is pronounced /yi/

³ In colloquial Persian the numeral *yek* ‘one’ is often pronounced /ye/

⁴ During present and the following chapter I will show that $-i$ is optional for

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

“The numeral *yek* ‘one’ is used as a maker of indefiniteness... *yek* can co-occur with *-i* or replace it entirely. This means that there are three ways in which indefiniteness can be expressed.”

- (7) a. ketāb-i b. *yek* ketāb c. *yek* ketāb-i
book-IND a book a book-IND
a book a book a book

Ghameshi (2003: 64~65)

Ghameshi considers two facts that favor *yek* being an indefinite marker. Unlike all other numerals first, *yek* does not have to appear with a classifier and second, it can co-occur with plural marking:

- (8) a. se-*(tā) ketāb
three-* (CL) book
Three books

b. *yek*-(*tā) ketāb
one-(CL) book
A book

Ghameshi (2003: 64~65)

- (9) *yek* ketāb-hā-i
one book-PL-IND
Some (certain) books

Ghameshi (2003: 64~65)

The reasons that she offers about *yek* being an indefinite marker are partially tenable but there are points that need to be clarified. First, the example (8) it is not proper example to show the incompatibility of the indefinite use of *yek*. Indefinite NPs containing *yek* in Persian can bear a cardinal number reading and an indefinite (non-)specific reading. As Ghameshi mentioned *yek* in its indefinite use is incompatible with classifiers but not in cardinal number

yek series indefinite pronouns but not for indefinite nouns.

2. Indefinite Pronouns in Persian

reading. The problem with example (8) is that the classifier *tā* is not compatible with *yek* because it doesn't have any pragmatic usage (**yek-tā*). However, it is compatible with other classifiers but not in its indefinite form:

- (10) a. ruzi yek- (jeld) ketāb mi-xune
 per day one-(CL) book DUR-read.3.SG
 “S/he reads one book per day”
- b. Šāhnāme yek-(*jeld) ketāb-e
 Š one -(CL) book-is.3.SG
 “Šāhname is a book”

Secondly, in colloquial Persian *hā* can be combined with Plural NPs as a way of indicating referentiality:

- (11) a. se-tā sib rā xordæm
 three-CL apple ACC ate.1.SG
 “I ate three apples”
- b. se -tā sib-hā rā xordæm
 three-CL apple-PL ACC ate.1.SG
 “I ate the three apples”

Thus, it is not true that other numerals are incompatible with the plural marker *hā*. But what indicates that *yek* is an indefinite marker is that it actually occurs with plural NPs although it is expected not to do that. Accordingly, *yek* is an indefinite marker because in its indefinite form is incompatible with classifiers (10b) and it occurs with both singular (9) and plural NPs (11b).

According to Haspelmath (1997), *one* as indefinite marker is widely used in English, French, Catalan, Maltese, Welsh, Arabic and many other languages and can also occur in series. Accordingly, I consider the optional use of *-i* with *yek* under a united class of *one based indefinites* ex., *yek-čiz-(i)*. This leads us to a new classification for Persian indefinite pronouns: generic-

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

noun-based and *one*-based indefinite pronouns. I call the latter *yek* series and the former *-i* series.

Ghomeshi (2003) considers three ways of expressing indefiniteness in Persian. However, I show that whether *-i* co-occurs with *yek* or not, it does not lead to ungrammaticality for indefinite pronouns, while for some *yek* indefinite NPs it does.

2.2 Distribution and meaning of *-i* series indefinite pronouns

The *-i* series consists of a generic noun and *-i*, which is an indefinite marker:

Table (4), *-i* series of indefinite pronouns

Ontological category	Indefinite pronoun
Person	kæs-i
Thing	čiz-i
Place	jāy-i
Kind	gune-i
Manner	jur-i, tor-i
Time	gāh-i, vāqt-i, zæmān-i

The *-i* series can appear in either positive or negative contexts:

- (12) a. kæs-i umæd
 person-IND came.3.SG
 “Someone came”
- b. kæs-i næ-yumæd
 person-IND NEG.came.3.SG
 “*No one* came”

In (12a), *kæs-i* is equivalent to *someone*, and in (12b) it is equivalent to *no-one*⁵.

⁵ This does not mean that they are n-words but rather simply means that under

The *-i* series have this interesting property of appearing in both positive and negative contexts. This might make the reader think that they are polarity sensitive items. To address this issue, in the following section, I will place them in (non-)veridical contexts to see if they are negative polarity items. Also, I examine them with negation placed in embedded clauses, matrix clauses, and in the presence of other operators and interveners to see if they can have a positive polarity reading.

2.2.1 *-i* series in (non-)veridical contexts

According to the non-veridicality approach of Zwarts (1995) and Giannakidou (1998, 1999, and 2001) a negative polarity item⁶ (NPI) can be licensed in nonveridical contexts. A nonveridical operator shows an uncertainty or a lack of commitment:

- (13) a. Paul has possibly seen a snake $\not\rightarrow$ Paul saw a snake
 b. Paul may hit Frank $\not\rightarrow$ Paul hit Frank
 (Giannakidou 2001:107)

In (13), the uncertainty or lack of commitment, cause the entailment to fail. *Paul has possibly seen a snake* or *Paul may hit Frank* does not entail that he saw a snake or he hit Frank.

Nonveridical contexts include: negation (anti-veridical), questions, disjunction, habituais, Generics, volitional verbs, modal verbs, imperatives,

negation they have the meaning of an indefinite existential under the negation, which equals *no-N* because semantically $\neg\exists$ equals to $\forall\neg$).

⁶ NPIs are triggered or licensed inside the scope of negation:

- i. a. *Bill has **ever** read War and Peace
 b. Bill hasn't **ever** read War and Peace

(Giannakidou 2009:1661)

A strict NPI like *ever* can just be licensed in negative context but a broad NPI like English *any* appears in all nonveridical contexts.

- (16) kæs-i umæd?
 person-IND came.3.SG.Q
 “Did anyone come?”

Subjunctive mood in Persian is compatible with modals and intentional verbs. Taleghani (2008: 80) mentioned that subjunctives also appear inside the embedded clauses of (non-)control verbs. This means that some DE operators (conditionals, *without* clause, *before* clause), habituals, etc, are also compatible with subjunctive. Without exception, all the occurrence of *-i* series in subjunctive contexts result in an indefinite existential reading:

- (17) mi-xām kæs-i-o be-binæm
 DUR-want.1.SG person-IND-ACC SUB-see.1.SG
 “I want to see someone”

- (18) æge kæs-i bi-ād mi-gæm
 if person-IND SUB-come.3.SG DUR-tell 1.SG
 “I’ll tell if someone comes”

- (19) qæbl.æz-in.ke kæs-i bi-ād ræft.
 before-that person-IND SUB-come3.SG went.3.SG
 “S/he left before someone came”

- (20) bedune-in.ke kæs-i be-dune ræft
 without-that person-IND SUB-know left.3.SG
 “S/he left without someone knowing”

- (21) sob-hā ādæt dāre čiz-i be-xune
 morning-PL habit has thing-IND SUB-read.3.SG
 “S/he used to read something every morning”

However, conditionals⁸ and modals⁹ appear in different tense formation but

⁸ Conditional can appear in different tense formations. Windfuhr (1979: 92) offers a following chart (revised)

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

this does not change their appearance as indefinite existential:

- (22) a. æge kæs-i umæd mi-gæm
 if person-IND came3.SG DUR-tell.3.SG
 “I will tell if someone came”
- b. bāyæd kæs-i-o ferestād
 Must person-IND-ACC Sent.3.SG
 “someone must be sent”

The *-i* series also give an indefinite existential reading with future verbs:

- (23) kæs-i xāhæd āmæd
 person-IND will.3.SG came.3.SG
 “Someone will come”

The restriction of a universal quantifier is also a licensing environment for NPIs. The *-i* series when headed by universal quantifier also give an indefinite existential reading:

- (24) hær-kæs čiz-i xord
 every-person thing-IND ate.3.SG
 “Everyone ate something”

An NPI like *any* gives a free choice^{1 0} (FC) reading in imperative, modal, and generic contexts:

Real	IMPF		{ mirævi ræfti berævi ræfte bāši miræfti ræfte budi	If you are going
(Indicative)	PERF			If you will go
Possible	IMPF	æge		If you go
(Subjunctive)	PERF			If you have gone
Irreal	IMPF			If you would go
(Conditional)	PERF			If you would have gone/had gone

⁹ *bāyæd* ‘must’ can also appear in infinitive sentences

^{1 0} FCIs give a freedom of choice and can be interpreted as ‘no matter who/ which, ...’

- (25) a. Pick up any apple
 b. Anybody can do it
 c. Any bird usually flies

In contrast, the *-i* series do not give FC readings in these contexts:

- (26) a. *kæs-i-o be-frest
 person-IND-ACC IMP-send.2.SG
 Intended meaning: “send anybody”
- b. *kæs-i mi-tune be-xune
 person-IND DUR-can.3.SG SUB-read.3.SG
 Intended meaning: “Anyone can read”
- c. *kæs-i mæʔmulæn mi-re mædrese
 person-IND usually DUR-go.3.SG school
 Intended meaning: “Anybody usually go to school”

Here, it is necessary to mention that the examples above are ungrammatical with the intended FC reading but they are grammatical when they have an indefinite existential reading (*send someone, someone can read, someone usually goes to school*).

Interestingly, the *-i* series are completely grammatical in veridical contexts:

- (27) kæs-i umæd
 person-IND came.3.SG
 “Someone came”

These data show the fact that the *-i* series are indefinite existentials. The negative polarity reading in the negative context is the result of the indefinite existential appearing within the scope of negation ($\neg\exists$). Their appearance in veridical contexts as indefinite existentials, reassures us that they are not NPIs. The above mentioned data can be summarized as below:

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

Table (5), distribution of *-i* series in (non)veridical contexts^{1 1}

Context	Relevant Reading
Affirmative	IND
Negation	IND
Interrogative	IND
Negative predicate	IND
Imperative	IND
Subjunctives	IND
Conditionals	IND
Modal	IND
Future verbs	IND
Relative clause headed by UQ	IND
Generics	IND

At this point, the reader might be confused about the use of what is known in the literature as supplementary FCIs with indefinites. In Persian *hær* ‘any, every’ can function as a supplementary FCI. In the next section, I address this issue in detail.

2.2.2 *-i* series with highlighted supplementary FCI^{1 2}

In the last section I showed that the *-i* series are neither strict nor broad NPIs. Further evidence for them to be indefinite existentials comes from their distribution in contexts which they tend to show FC readings, such as with modals, conditionals and clausal subjects. But I show that they are inherently indefinite existentials and this flavor of FC reading comes from when they are continued by the FCI *hær* ‘any, every’.

The *-i* series do not have universal force since they give indefinite existential reading in generic contexts. However the situation gets fuzzy when the *-i* series, as in the following contexts, are highlighted with *hær* ‘any,

^{1 1} Here, IND indicates the indefinite existential reading.

^{1 2} An FCI that follows an existential statement is called a supplementary FCI (Jennings1994)

every’:

- (28) a. *bāyæd čiz-i bo-xori, hær-čiz-i*
 must thing-IND SUB-eat.3 any-thing-IND
 “You must eat something, anything”
- b. *kæs-i-o be-frest, hær-kæs-i*
 person-IND IMP-send.2.SG any-person-IND
 “Send somebody, anybody”
- c. *æge kæs-i umad be-gu hær-kæs-i*
 if person-IND came.3.SG IMP.tell any-person-IND
 “Tell (me) if someone came, anyone”
- d. *mi-xæm kæs-i-o be-binæm,*
 DUR-want.1.SG person-IND-ACC SUB-see.1.SG
hær-kæs-i
 any-person-IND
 “I want to see someone, anyone”

Using supplementary FCI shows that they do not have FC readings themselves. They are indeed existential statements:

- (29) Pick a card, any card.

$\text{IMP}_i \exists x [\text{card}(x) \ \& \ \text{pick-up}(\text{you}, x) \ \& \ \text{antecedent clause}]$
 $\forall y [\text{card}(y) \ \rightarrow \ \diamond_i \text{pick-up}(\text{you}, y)]$ *supplementary clause*

(Dayal 2004: 33)

In (29) *a card* does not mean *any card*. This is *any* in supplementary clause that gives a freedom of choice and invokes FC reading. The *-i* series in the antecedent clause too, are not capable of showing FC reading. That is why, they need the supplementary FCI. The *ye*k** series^{1 3} can appear with supplementary FCIs as well:

^{1 3} For more about the *ye*k** series, refer to section (2.3)

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

- (30) yek-kæs-i-o be-frest, hær-kæs-i
one-person-IND-ACC IMP-send any-person-IND
“Send somebody, anybody”

Supplementary FCIs were used by some researchers like Dayal (2004) in favor of universal *any* while some (Giannakidou 2001) used them against universal *any*. In either case, it does not change the fact that the antecedent clause has an indefinite existential reading.

2.2.3 –*i* series’ scopal behavior

The –*i* series can be emphatic in certain contexts and this makes them bear a wide scope reading and be specific. However, the –*i* series act like what Haspelmath (1997) cross linguistically generalized; they do not show specificity in imperatives, question, conditionals and negations. The wide scope reading in these contexts is impossible for the –*i* series and an emphatic reading does not bring any changes in meaning:

- (31) čiz-i/ČIZ-I oftād?
thing-IND fell.3.SG.Q
a. čiz-i/ ČIZ-I: “did anything fall?”
b. Unavailable: “did a certain thing fall?”
- (32) čiz-i/ČIZ-I bi-ændāz
thing-IND IMP-through
a. čiz-i/ČIZ-I: “Through something”
b. Unavailable: “There is something that I want you to through it”
- (33) æge čiz-i/ČIZ-I oftād be-gu
if thing-IND fell SUB-tell.2.SG
a.čiz-i/ČIZ-I : “Tell me if something fall”

b. Unavailable: “There is something such that if that fall you tell me”

In (31), (32) and (33), the *-i* series element cannot bear a wide scope reading and an emphatic reading does not bring any changes in meaning.

The generalization that Haspelmath made in his work was a cross linguistic one and within a limited contexts. This means contexts where *-i* series can give narrow scope reading and be nonspecific can be extended. The *-i* series do not show wide scope reading with *hær* ‘any, every’, *bištær-e* ‘most of’, numerals, *hædd-e æqal* ‘at least’, *hædd-e ækæsr* ‘at most’ and *fæqæt* ‘only’. In all the examples below, the emphatic reading *ČIZ-I* does not have any effect in meaning:

(34)	{	hær-kæs-i			
		every-person-IND			
		hædd-e æqal	do næfær		
		at least	two persons		
		hædd-e ækæsr	do næfær		
		at most	two persons		
		se næfær		čiz-i/ČIZ-I	xord(ænd).
Three persons		thing-IND	ate.3.SG(PL)		
		bištære	pesær -hā		
		most of	boy-PL		
		fæqæt	pesar-hā		
		only	boy-PL		

a. *čiz-i/ČIZ-I*: “(Everybody, ((at least, at most) two persons), three people, most of the boys, only boys) ate something”

b. Unavailable: “There was a certain thing such that (everybody, ((at least, at most) two persons), three people, most of the boys, only boys) ate it”

This is also true when they are with *qæbl.æz* ‘before’. The example below

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

cannot have the specific reading:

- (35) qæbl.æz-in.ke čiz-i /ČIZ-I be-ge ræft
 before-that thing-IND SUB-tell went.3.SG
 a. čiz-i/ČIZ-I: “S/he left before saying something”
 b. Unavailable: “There is something such that s/he left before saying it”

In all the examples above the *-i* series element cannot be specific and this means they cannot have wide scope reading. However, the *-i* series can show wide scope reading in the past tense sentences when they are emphatic. This is because the speaker is committed to identifiability of the *-i* series element and deliberately violates the conversational maxims:

- (36) a. dær zemestān-e sāl-e 1979 KÆS-I āmæd
 in winter-EZ year-EZ someone came.3.SG
 KÆS-I ke bā xod bəhār āværd...
 someone that with himself spring brought.3.SG
 “In the winter of 1979, someone came... someone who brought the spring with himself”
 b. kæs-i be.næzd-e išān āmæd-o
 someone to-EZ him/her.HON Came.3.SG-and
 goft...
 said.3.SG
 “Someone came to him/her and said...”

Considering the historical fact, the speaker has a certain person in mind and that is why the emphatic form *KÆS-I* can be used in (36a). But this is not the case in (36b) where the speaker is narrating an event and does not necessarily have a certain person in mind.

- (37) bæʔd.æz-in.ke čiz-i /ČIZ-I goft ræft
 after-that thing-IND Told.3.SG went.3.SG
 a. čiz-i: “S/he left after saying something”

- b. ČIZ-I: “There is something such that s/he left after saying it”

bæʔd.æz ‘after’ can contain an *-i* series element with an emphatic reading because the verb has the past form. The sentences with an ongoing present tense can also be identifiable for the speaker:

- (38) *kæs-i/ KÆS-I* *dāre* *mi-ād*
 person-IND has DUR-come.3.SG
 a. *kæs-i*: “Someone is coming”
 b. *KÆS-I*: “There is a certain person such that he is coming”

In the example above (38b) shows an emphatic form which indicates that it is specific. Future sentences along with epistemic modals are among other contexts in which the *-i* series can show (non-)specific contrast:

- (39) (*sāyæd, bāyæd*) *čiz-i /ČIZ-I* *bi-ofte*
 (might, must) thing-IND SUB-fall.3.SG
 a. *čiz-i*: “Something (might, must) fall”
 b. *ČIZ-I*: “There is something such that it (might, must) fall”
- (40) *čiz-i /ČIZ-I* *xāhæd* *oftād*
 person-IND will.1.SG fell.3.SG
 a. *čiz-i*: “Something will fall”
 b. *ČIZ-I*: “There is something such that it will fall”

Although, in future sentences and with epistemic modals the speaker is not committed to the existence or identifiability of the *-i* series element, but as they can be related to epistemic knowledge of the speaker they can bear a wide scope reading and therefore be specific as in (39) and (40).

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

Table (6), the scopal behavior of *-i* series in positive contexts

Context	NSR of nonemphatic <i>-i</i> series	WSR of emphatic <i>-i</i> series
question, conditional, imperative	O	X
subject with Numerals, <i>every, at least, most</i>	O	X
subject with <i>no, at most</i>	O	X
<i>Before</i>	O	X
<i>After</i>	O	O
past, ongoing present tense	O	O
future tense, epistemic modals	O	O

Contrary to positive contexts, the *-i* series in negative contexts do not show (non-)emphatic contrast even with the emphatic reading or with the maximized presupposition:

- (41) John čiz-i /ČIZ-I næ-xord
 J thing-IND NEG-ate.3.SG
 a. čiz-i /ČIZ-I: “John didn’t eat anything”
 b. Unavailable: “There was something such that John didn’t eat it”
- (42) kæs-i /KÆS-I æz dust-hā-m næ-yumæd
 person-IND from friend-PL-mine NEG-came.3.SG
 a. kæs-i /KÆS-I: “None of my friends came”
 b. Unavailable: “There was a friend of mine who didn’t come”

Ungrammaticality of (41b) and (42b) is due to their unavailability of wide scope reading but when the indefinite existential is interpreted inside the scope of negation and has a meaning equivalent to *no one* they are grammatical. When negation is in the matrix clause and the *-i* series element is in the embedded clause they also give a meaning equivalent to *no-N*:

- (43) fekr ne-mi-konæm John čiz-i /ČIZI ro xorde
 think NEG-DUR.do.1.SG J thing-IND ACC eat.PP
 bāše
 be-SUB.3.SG
 a. čiz-i /ČIZI: “I don’t think John had something”
 b. Unavailable: “There is something such that I don’t think John had it”

In (43a), when negation is in the matrix clause, it can license an *-i* series element and give a meaning equivalent to *no-N*. But it cannot take a wide scope reading and escape out of the scope of negation. The same is true when negation is in the embedded clause (44b) or it is in both matrix and embedded clause as in (45b):

- (44) fekr mi-konæm John čiz-i / ?ČIZI ro næ-xode
 think DUR-do.1.SG J thing-IND ACC NEG-eat.PP
 bāše
 be-SUB.3.SG
 a. čiz-i: “I think John didn’t have anything”
 b. ? ČIZI: “There is something such that I think John didn’t have it”
- (45) fekr ne-mi-konæm John čiz-i/ ČIZ-I ro
 think NEG-DUR.do1.SG J thing-IND ACC
 næ-xorde bāše.
 NEG. touch .PP be-SUB.3.SG
 a. čiz-i /ČIZI: “I don’t think John didn’t have anything”
 b. Unavailable: “There is something such that I don’t think John didn’t have it”

With negation in both the matrix and embedded clauses, it cannot receive a positive polarity reading in (45b). However, (45a) with a nonemphatic indefinite entails that John ate everything due to the cancelation of negations. In the same fashion, no operator or restrictor causes the *-i* series to bear a positive polarity reading:

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

- (46) { hič-kæs
no-person
čiz-i/ ČIZ-I ro næ-xord.
fæqæt John thing-IND ACC NEG- ate.3.SG
only J
- a. čiz-i /ČIZI: “(nobody, only John,) didn’t eat anything”
b. Unavailable: “There is something such that (nobody, only John,) didn’t eat it”

The examples above with *hič-kæs-i* ‘no one’ *fæqæt* ‘only’ demonstrate that they cannot help the *-i* series bear a positive polarity reading in negative context. This means, the wide scope reading causes ungrammaticality. Also, *teʔdādi* ‘a few’, *bištær-e* ‘most’, *hædd-e æqæl* ‘at least’, *hædd-e ækæsr* ‘at most’ *qæbl.æz* ‘before’, do not help *-i* series element to show a (non)specific contrast in negative context as in (47):

- (47) { teʔdādi æz pesær hā
a few from boy-PL
bištær-e pesær-hā
most-EZ boy-PL
hædd-e ækæsr do næfær
at most two persons čiz-i/ ČIZ-I ro na-xordænd.
thing-IND ACC NEG-ate.3.PL
hædd-e æqæl do næfær
at least two Person
se næfær
three Person
- a. čiz-i /ČIZI: “(a few of boys, most of the boys, ((at least, at most) two persons), three persons) didn’t eat anything.”
b. Unavailable: “There was something such that (a few of boys, most of the boys, ((at least, at most) two persons), three persons) didn’t eat it”

The same situation happens when *æge* ‘if’ and *bæʔd.æz* ‘after’ is combined:

- (48) *æge* *čiz-i/ČIZ-I* *ro* *næ-xore* *mi-mire*
 if thing-IND ACC NEG.SUB- ate DUR-die.3.SG
 a. *čiz-i /ČIZI*: “If s/he don’t eat anything s/he will die”
 b. Unavailable: “There is something such that if s/he don’t eat it s/he will die”
- (49) *bæʔd.æz-in.ke* *čiz-i/ ČIZ-I* *ro* *næ-xord* *mord*
 after-that thing-IND ACC NEG- ate deid.3.SG
 a. *čiz-i /ČIZI*: “After s/he didn’t eat anything s/he died”
 b. Unavailable: “There was something such that after s/he didn’t eat it, s/he died”

Numerals, imperatives and interrogatives in negative contexts too, are unable to help the *-i* series bear a specific reading. Therefore *-i* series are ungrammatical with wide scope reading and cannot receive a positive polarity reading:

- (50) *čiz-i/ČIZ-I* *næ-xær.*
 thing -IND IMP.NEG-buy
 a. *čiz-i/ ČIZ-I*: “Don’t buy anything”
 b. Unavailable: “There is a something such that I don’t want you to buy it”
- (51) *čiz-i/ ČIZ-I* *næ-gofti?*
 thing-IND NEG.said.2.SG.Q
 a. *čiz-i/ ČIZ-I*: “Didn’t you say anything?”
 b. Unavailable: “Is there something such that you didn’t say?”

hær-kæs-i ‘every, any’ also cannot help the *-i* series element to have specific reading. But it can prevent non-emphatic *-i* series indefinites from being licensed inside the scope of negation. This gives a distributive reading to *-i*

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

series element. Thus, still a nonspecific reading is obtained.

- (52) hær-kæs-i čiz-i/ČIZ-I næ-xord
 every-person-IND thing-IND NEG-eat.3.SG
- a. čiz-i/ČIZ-I: “every person didn’t eat something”
 b. Unavailable: “There is something such that everybody didn’t eat it”

In all the examples above, the *-i* series element in negative context, can receive a focal accent but it does not bring the wide scope reading for them. Although, the *-i* series can bear an emphatic reading in limited positive contexts but they lose this contrast in negative contexts as in all the examples above:

Table (7), the scopal behavior of *-i* series in negative contexts

Context		NSR of non-emphatic <i>-i</i> series	WSR of emphatic <i>-i</i> series
Negation (matrix, embedded, embedded & matrix)		O	X
Nonassertive (question, conditional, imperative)	+NEG	O	X
(subject with Numerals, <i>at least, most, every</i>)		O	X
(subject with <i>no, at most</i>		O	X
(<i>before, after</i>)		O	X

The data in this section suggests that the *-i* series do not have an (non-) emphatic contrast when it comes to negative contexts. In fact the wide scope reading for them causes ungrammaticality in negative contexts. This means that in negative contexts, they cannot be specific or act as presuppositional

indefinites which indicates they cannot have positive polarity reading. Having a wide scope reading is the only requirement of PPI-hood and that means escaping out of the scope of negation and being interpreted as such. By definition, this reading cannot be understood in any context.

2.3 Distribution and meaning of *yek* series of indefinite pronouns

The *yek* series of indefinite pronouns consists of the numeral “one”, a generic noun, and an optional *-i*. The occurrence of optional *-i* does not bring any change in the meaning^{1 4} for the *yek* indefinite pronouns:

- (53) *yek-čiz-(i)* *xordæm*
 one-thing-(IND) ate.1.SG
 “I ate something”

Table (8) represents the related *yek* series of indefinite pronouns:

Table (8), *yek* series indefinite pronouns

Person	<i>yek-kæs-*(i)</i>
Thing	<i>yek-čiz-(i)</i>
Place	<i>yek-jā(i)</i>
Kind	<i>yek-gune(i)</i>
Manner	<i>yek-jur(i), ye(k)-tor-(i)</i>
Time	<i>yek-væqt(i), yek-zæmān-(i)</i>

In this section I will show that the *yek* series can have an (non)emphatic contrast in both positive and negative contexts. The emphatic form brings a wide scope reading, and it can indicate their specificity. In negative context

^{1 4} In chapter 3 I will show that *-i* can be optional with the *yek* series as indefinite pronouns. However for *yek* indefinite NPs, *-i* is not optional.

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

the emphatic form bring a positive polarity reading. The *yek* series can also be used as minimizers with an accentuation different from the emphatic form.

2.3.1 *yek* series and their scopal behavior

yek ‘one’ is originally a numeral which also grammaticalized as an indefinite marker. Similar usage of numeral *one* as an indefinite marker can be found cross-linguistically like the examples below from English:

- (54) a. I am just one player on the team
b. We will come one day
c. Late one evening...

In Korean, *one* can be ambiguous between a specific and nonspecific reading:

- (55) hagsayng tul-i motwu chayk-ul ilk-ess-ta
student PL-NOM all book read.PAST.DEC
“All the students are reading a book (nonspecific)”

- (56) hagsayng tul-i motwu han chayk-ul ilk-ess-ta
student PL-NOM all one book-ACC read-PAST-DEC
a. All the students read a book.
b. There is a book such that all the students read it.

In (56), when *han* ‘one’ is absent the only possible reading is nonspecific reading but when the numeral *one* is combined in (57), it can be specific or nonspecific but a stress on *han* ‘one’ does not have any effect on the interpretation. In some languages like German, a stress on *one* can indicate a specific entity:

- (57) a. alle lesen Ein Buch
 all read one Book
 “Everyone reads one book”
- b. alle lesen EIN Buch
 all read one Book
 “There is one book such that everybody reads”

In (57a) when *one* is unstressed, *lesen* can be stressed to show that everyone is reading not skimming. The word *Buch* ‘book’ also can be stressed to emphasize that they are reading *a book* not *a magazine*. But when the stress is on *ein*, it can refer to one particular book that everybody reads.

In Persian as well, the *yek* series indefinite pronouns with an emphatic form can be specific. Using the emphatic form, the speaker is deliberately violating one of the conversational maxims. This property for *yek* series is that strong that contrary to the *-i* series it can be applied in all the positive context and even question:

- (58) yek-čiz-(i)/ YEK-ČIZ-(I) bærāy-e bæčče mi-xæri?
 one thing-(IND) for-EZ kid DUR-buy.2.SG.Q
 a. yek-čiz-(i): “Would you buy something for the kid? (anything)”
 b. YEK-ČIZ-(I): “Would you buy some certain thing for the kid?”

Imagine the following scenarios which might apply to the sentences above: “A wife asks her husband to buy some unspecified object for the child to eat or to play.” In this case, the supplementary FCI can be added after the question which indicates anything can be satisfying. In this cases, the husband simply replies that “*ok, I will buy something*” (58a).

But the second scenario might be:

“A wife asks her husband to buy a specific object for the kid” In this case he asks “*what do you want me to buy?*”

The second readings which indicates a specific object in question is the result

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

of the emphatic form. Specific indefinites In question are not an odd phenomenon and it can be seen in other languages as well. One example comes from Korean:

- (59) a. chayk ilk-e po-si.ulatoryo? Korean
book read try -HON.would.you. please
“Would you read a book?”
- b. chayk han kwon ilk-e po-si.ulatoryo?
book one CL read try-HON. would.you.please
“Would you read a certain book?”

In (59a), the speaker asks the hearer to read a book. What the speaker expects from the hearer is to read a book and any book would be satisfying. But when the question is combined with the numeral *one* the interpretation of the question with the nonspecific reading is hard to obtain.

The *yek* series can have the emphatic form in imperative sentences as well:

- (60) yek-čiz-(i)/ YEK-ČIZ-(I) be-xær
one-thing-(IND) IMP-buy
a. yek-čiz-(i): “Buy something”
b. YEK-ČIZ-(I): “There is something such that I want you to buy it”

In (60b), the emphatic reading indicates that the speaker wants the hearer to buy a certain object while nonemphatic (60a) does not suggest this.

hær-kæs-i ‘everyone, anyone’, *hædd-e æqal* ‘at least’, *hædd-e æksær* ‘at most’, *se* ‘three’, *bištær-e* ‘most’ and *fæqæt* ‘only’ in the subject place do not prevent the *yek* series to have emphatic form. The similarities between all the sentences with an emphatic *yek* series is that they can naturally be continued by *væ un N-e* ‘and that is N’ while with nonemphatic reading is rather odd. The sentences without emphatic reading are not capable of showing this:

- (61) { hær-kæs-i
every-person-IND

se næfær
three persons

bištære pesær -hā
most of boy-PL yek-čiz-(i)/ YEK-ČIZ-(I) xord(ænd)
one-Thing-(IND) ate.3.SG(PL)

fæqæt pesar-hā
only boy-PL

hædd-e æqal do næfær
at least two persons

hædd-e æksær do næfær
at most two persons

a. yek-čiz-(i): “(Everybody, ((at least, at most) two persons),
three people, most of the boys, only boys) ate something”
b. YEK-ČIZ-(I): “There was something such that (everybody,
((at least, at most) two persons), three people, most of the boys,
only boys) ate it”

Unlike the *-i* series, when the *yek* series are emphatic, they can escape the scope islands of conditionals:

- (62) æge yek-čiz-(i)/ YEK-ČIZ-(I) be-ge mi-koshæn-esh
If one-thing-(IND) SUB-tell DUR-kill.3.SG- him
a. yek-čiz-(i): “If he tells something they will kill him”
b. YEK-ČIZ-(I): “There is something such that if he tells it, they will kill him”

In (62b) saying just a certain thing would make the referent to face the consequences while in (62a) saying something, anything at all, would bring this result. *qæbl.æz* ‘before’ in subject place as well, does not prevent the *yek*

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

series element to have wide scope reading:

- (63) qæbl.æz-in.ke yek-čiz-(i) / YEK-ČIZ-(I) be-ge mord
 before-that one-thing-(IND) SUB-tell died.3.SG
 a. yek-čiz-(i): “Before she says something she died”
 b. YEK-ČIZ-(I): “There was something such that before saying it, s/he died”

The tense of the verb as well as epistemic modals does not have any effect on emphatic form of the *yek* series indefinite pronouns:

- (64) $\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{yek-kæs-(i) /YEK-KÆS-(I)} \\ \text{one-person-(IND)} \end{array} \right\} \begin{array}{l} \text{um æd} \\ \text{came3.SG} \\ \\ \text{(sāyæd, bāyæd) } \quad \text{bi-yād} \\ \text{(might, must) } \quad \text{SUB-come.3.SG} \end{array}$
 a. yek-kæs-(i): “Someone (came, ((might, must) come))”
 b. YEK-KÆS-(I): “There is someone such that he (came, ((might, must), come))”

Emphatic form in the examples above brings a wide scope reading. The summary of above mentioned data can be summarized in the table below:

Table (9), *yek* series’ scopal behavior in positive context

Context	NSR of non-emphatic <i>yek</i> series	WSR of emphatic <i>yek</i> series
question, conditional, imperative	O	O
subject with Numerals, <i>every</i> , <i>at least</i> , <i>most</i>	O	O
subject with <i>no</i> , <i>at most</i>	O	O
<i>before</i> , <i>after</i>	O	O
past, ongoing present tense	O	O
future tense, epistemic modals	O	O

The *yek* series keep this (non-)emphatic contrast also in negative contexts: The emphatic form results in a wide scope reading while the non-emphatic one brings indefinite reading as in the example below:

- (65) didæm John yek-čiz-(i)/ YEK-ČIZ-(I) næ-xord
 saw.1.SG J one-thing-(IND) NEG-are.3.SG
 a. yek-čiz-(i): “I saw John didn’t eat something” (but I don’t know what)
 b. YEK-ČIZ-(I): “There was something such that I saw John didn’t eat it ” (his medicine)

(65) with a nonemphatic *yek-čiz-(i)*, indicates that the speaker saw that John didn’t eat a nonspecific object. In this case, the indefinite interprets inside the scope of clausemate negation. But when it is emphatic, the speaker saw what exactly John did not eat. Also, the sentence can be naturally continued by *væ un N-e* ‘and that is N’. Only in this case the *yek* series element can be interpreted out of scope of negation and bear a positive polarity reading. With the negation in the matrix clause and the *yek* series element in the embedded clause it cannot bear an emphatic form. Thus, the clause mate condition for the *yek* series and seems vital:

- (66) næ-didæm yek-čiz -(i)/ *YEK-ČIZ-(I) ro xorde
 NEG-saw.1.SG one-thing-(IND) ACC eat.pp
 bāši.
 SUB-be.2.SG
 a. yek-čiz-(i): “I did not see that you ate something”
 b.*YEK-ČIZ-(I): “There is something such that I didn’t see you eat it”

In (66b), *YEK-ČIZ-(I)* with the emphatic form causes ungrammaticality while a nonemphatic *yek-čiz-(i)*, is grammatical. This means that, the wide scope reading of *YEK-ČIZ-(I)* when it’s in embedded clause and negation is in the matrix clause is impossible. *YEK-ČIZ-(I)* is also ill-form when negation is in

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

both embedded and matrix clause^{1 5}:

- (67) *næ-didæm* John *yek-čiz-(i)/ *YEK-ČIZ-(I)* *ro*
 NEG-saw.1.SG J one-thing-(IND) ACC
 na-xorde *bāšē*.
 NEG-eat-PP be-SUB.3.SG
 a. *yek-čiz-(i)*: “I didn’t see that John refuse to eat something”(he ate anything)
 b. **YEK-ČIZ-(I)*: “There is something such that I didn’t see that John refuse to eat it”

In both (66) and (67) the sentence with the emphatic form cannot naturally be continued by *væ un N-e* ‘and that is N’. However, as long as the negation and the *yek* series indefinite pronouns are in the same clause they can bear a specific reading. (68) shows the situation with *hič-kæs* ‘nobody’ and *fæqæt* ‘only’:

- (68) { *hič-kæs*
 nobody
 yek-čiz-(i)/ YEK-ČIZ-(I) *næ-xord*.
 fæqæt John one-thing-(IND) NEG- ate
 only J
- a. *yek-čiz-(i)*: “(Nobody, only John) didn’t eat something.”

^{1 5} With some ECM-type verbs like *moʔtæqed budæn* ‘to believe’ and *fekr kærdæn* ‘to think’, in the matrix clause, the emphatic reading might be possible since they directly relate to the speaker’s epistemic knowledge and can be specific:

fekr *ne-mi-konæm* *yek-čiz-(i)/ ?YEK-ČIZ-(I)*
 think NEG-DUR-DO.3.SG one-thing-(IND)
gofte *bāšī*.
 tell-PP be.SUB.2.SG

- a. *yek-čiz-(i)*: I don’t think that you said something.
 b. *?YEK-ČIZ-(I)*: There is something that I don’t think you have said it.

- b. YEK-ČIZ-(I): “There was something such that (nobody, only John,) didn’t eat it”

In the presence of other quantifiers like *teʔdādi* ‘a few’, *bištær-e* ‘most of’, *hædd-e æqæl* ‘at least’ and *se* ‘three’ as well, the *yek* series are capable of emphatic reading:

(69) {	teʔdādi	æz	pesær	hā		
	a few	from	boy-PL			
	bištær-e		pesær-hā			
	most-EZ		boy-PL			
					yek-čiz-(i)/ YEK-ČIZ-(I)	næ-xordænd
					one-thing-(IND)	NEG-ate.3.PL
	se	næfær				
	three	person				
	hædd-e æqæl	do	næfær			
	at least	two	person			
	hædd-e æksær	do	næfær			
	at most	two	person			

a. yek-čiz-(i): (a few of boys, most of the boys, three persons ((at least, at most) two persons)) didn’t eat something.

b. YEK-ČIZ-(I): There was something such that (a few of boys, most of the boys, three persons , ((at least, at most) two persons)) didn’t eat it.

The *yek* series indefinite pronouns can escape the scope island of the conditionals and universal quantifiers i.e. *hær-kæs-i* ‘every, any’ and be specific by the emphatic form:

(70)	æge	yek-čiz-(i)/ YEK-ČIZ-(I)	næ-xore	mi-mire.
	if	one-thing-(IND)	NEG- ate	DUR-die.3.SG

a. yek-čiz-(i): “If he doesn’t eat something he will die”

b. YEK-ČIZ-(I): “There is something such that if he doesn’t eat it he will die”

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

- (71) hær-kæs-i yek-čiz-(i)/ YEK-ČIZ-(I) næ-xord
 every-Person-IND one-thing-(IND) NEG-eat.3.SG
 a.yek-čiz-(i): “Everybody didn’t eat something”
 b.YEK-ČIZ-(I): “There was something such that everybody didn’t eat it”

bæd.æz ‘after’ also, cannot prevent the *yek* series to bear emphatic form and have an wide scope reading:

- (72) bæd.æz-in.ke yek-čiz-(i)/ YEK-ČIZ-(I) næ-xord mord
 after-that one-thing-(IND) NEG- ate deid.3.SG
 a. yek-čiz-(i): “After s/he didn’t eat something s/he died”
 b. YEK-ČIZ-(I): “There was something such that after s/he didn’t eat it”

However, in negative imperative sentences just an emphatic specific reading is possible.

- (73) *yek-čiz-(i)/ YEK-ČIZ-(I) næ-xær
 one-thing-(IND) IMP.NEG.buy.3.SG
 a. *yek-čiz-(i): “Don’t buy something”
 b. YEK-ČIZ-(I): “There is something that I want you not to buy it”

Here, the speaker does not want the hearer not to buy an unspecified object in (73a). The speaker knows exactly what s/he does not want (73b). That is why the only possible reading is an emphatic one.

Asking a favor from the hearer in a negative context is not common in Persian. They might be used to express a polite request but they cannot bear the emphatic form and nor can it be specific:

- (74) yek-čiz-(i)/ *YEK-ČIZ-(I) bærā bæčče ne-mi-giri?
 one-thing-(IND) for kid NEG.said.2.SG.Q
 a. yek-čiz-(i): “Won’t buy something for the kid?”
 b. *YEK-ČIZ-(I): “would you not buy a certain thing for the kid?”

In this context the speaker asks for an unspecified object and anything would be satisfying.

Table (10), *yek* series' scopal behavior in negative context

Context		NSR of non-emphatic <i>yek</i> series	WSR of emphatic <i>yek</i> series
Negative	Embedded	O	O
	Matrix	O	*
	embedded & matrix	O	*
Nonassertive	Question	O	O
	Conditional	O	O
	Imperative	*	O
(subject with Numerals, <i>every</i> , <i>at least</i> , <i>most</i>)		+NEG	O
(subject with <i>no</i> , <i>at most</i>)			O
<i>after</i>			O

2.3.2 *yek* series as minimizers

Minimizers, denote a minimal quantity or content. According to Horn (1989: 400), minimizers “occur in negative contexts and the negation denotes the absence of a minimal quantity, and hence the presence of no quantity at all”.

(75) She didn't say **a word**. = She didn't say anything (at all).

The *yek* series with an accentuation different from the emphatic *yek* series can be used as minimizers. They can be combined with *hæm* or *hættā* ‘even’, but this reading occurs independently from their existence since they are not NPIs in Persian:

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

- (76) a. John hæm næ-yumæd
J even NEG-came.3.SG
“Even John didn’t come”
- b. John hæm umæd
J even came.3.SG
“Even John came”

hæm ‘even’ in both positive and negative contexts shows that it’s not an NPI in Persian. I demonstrate their use as minimizers with *yeK* in capital letters i.e. *YEK-čiz-(i)*:

- (77) John YEK-čiz-(i) dorost næ-goft.
J one-thing-(IND) correct NEG-said.3.SG
“John didn’t answer a single thing correct”

In (77) the minimum expectation is that John answers at least one question right. In other words, answering a single thing is more likely than not saying anything at all. By negating the sentence, this minimum expectation disappears. And this is how minimizers invoke a scalar implicature. Knowing that the *yeK* series can have a minimizer reading with proper accentuation raises this question that where they can obtain this reading?

- (78) YEK-čiz-(i)-o dorost gofti?
one-thing-(IND)-ACC correct said.3.SG.Q
“Did you say even a single thing correct?”

They can appear in rhetorical questions. The answer to the question might be *yes* or *no*, although it’s more likely to expect that it’s *no*. Also, the speaker assumes that there is not any correct answer. They can also appear in strong DE-contexts:

- (79) a. *bedune-in.ke* *YEK-chiz-(i)* *be-ge,* *ræft*
 without-that one-thing-(IND) SUB-tell.3.SG went.3.SG
 “S/he left without saying a word”
- b. *æge* *YEK-čiz-(i)* *dorost* *mi-goft...*
 if one-thing-(IND) right DUR-told.3.SG...
 “If s/he would said just one thing right...”
- c. *qæbl.æz-in.ke* *YEK-čiz-(i)* *be-gæm* *ræft.*
 before-that one-thing -(IND) SUB-say.1.SG went.3.SG
 Intended meaning: “S/he left before I said anything”

In all these cases, *hæm* or *hættā* ‘even’ can be compatible with the minimizer use of the *yek* series, but it is enough to simply have a proper accent to obtain this reading. Giannakidou (2011) reported that minimizers can be used with directive propositional attitude verbs like *wish* as in *I wish he gave a damn*. The *yek* series can also appear in such a context where phrases like *ārezu kærdaen* ‘to make a wish’ or *kāš, ei kāš, kāš ke* ‘wish’ are involved:

- (80) *kāš* *ke* *YEK-čiz-(i)* *dorost* *mi-goft.*
 wish that one-thing-(IND) correct DUR-told.3.SG
 Intended meaning: “I wish John had answered a single question right”

The occurrence of a minimizing *yek* series with emotive verbs like *xošhāl budæn* ‘to be glad’, which are veridical, can be explained in terms of ‘rescuing’. In other words, a minimizing *yek* series indefinite pronoun is in the scope of a non-veridical expression at a level other than LF:

- (81) *xošhal-æm* *ke* *John* *YEK-čiz-(i)* *dorost* *goft.*
 glad-am.1.SG that J one-thing-(IND) correct told.3.SG
 Intended meaning: “I’m glad John said answered at least one question right”

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

(81) can be rescued^{1 6} under a context like this: *I expected him not to answer anything*. The *yek* series cannot bear a minimizer reading with *fæqæt* ‘only’ because they can neither have the appropriate accent nor be compatible with *hæm* or *hættā* ‘even’:

(82) **fæqæt* John YEK-čiz-(i) goft
 only J one-thing-IND said.3.SG
 Intended meaning: “only john said at least a word”

Note that (82), with an indefinite reading is grammatical (something), and only the minimizer reading is unavailable.

This is the accentuation on the *yek* series element that brings the differences in meaning which is unique for each element i.e. *yek-čiz-i* (non-emphatic, non-specific), *YEK-ČIZ-I* (emphatic, specific), *YEK-čiz-i* (minimizer). Thus, in all the examples above, when the presupposition of the minimum expectation fails the sentences are still grammatical.

The following are the contexts where the *yek* series can receive a minimizer reading:

Table (11), licensing contexts for minimizing *yek* series

Context	Statuses
Negation	O
Question	O
Conditional	O
Before clause	O
Without clause	O
Directive Propositional attitude verbs	O

^{1 6} Rescuing by nonveridicality (Giannakidou 2011: 1687):
 “A polarity item (PI) α can be rescued in the scope of a veridical expression β in a sentence S, if:
 (a) The global context C of S makes a proposition S’ available which contains a nonveridical expression β ; and
 (b) α can be associated with β in S”

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

- (85) a. ??YEK-jur-(i) be John næ-fæhmundi
one-manner-(IND) to J NEG-make understand.2.SG
Intended meaning: You didn't find a way to make John understand
- b. ??YEK-væqt-(i) hal-æm-o næ-porsidi
one-time-(IND) feeling-mine-ACC NEG-ask.2.SG
Intended meaning: You never asked how I was.

This can have a variety of reasons including the aspect of the verb or lack of pragmatic usage for time related indefinite pronouns. I also leave the possibility open that Persian indefinite pronouns did not grow fully in series. However, Here I deal with the meaning and distribution of indefinite pronouns to give a better understanding of their scopal behavior in general rather than their exceptional behavior.

2.5 Summary: a comparison between *-i* series and *yek* series

In the preceding sections, I showed that the *-i* series and *yek* series are two different classes of indefinite pronoun in Persian. Their similarities are limited to a certain positive contexts but they are interpreted differently in negative contexts.

I claimed that the *-i* series are inherently indefinite existentials, and the negative polarity reading in negative contexts is the result of the interpretation of an indefinite existential inside the scope of negation, and this does not mean that they are NPIs. They bear this indefinite existential reading in all (non-)veridical contexts. Using the supplementary FCI, *hær* 'any, every' with them does not mean that they bear a FC reading themselves. The *yek* series or any other singular indefinite NPs can be continued with the supplementary FCI. This actually confirms that they are indefinite existentials. I also showed

2. Indefinite Pronouns in Persian

that under no circumstances can the *-i* series bear a positive polarity reading as they always are interpreted inside the scope of negation.

The *yek* series and *-i* series have two major differences. First, the *yek* series in the emphatic form can be specific and in negative context this brings them a positive polarity reading. Secondly, the *yek* series can be used as minimizers with an accentuation different from when they result in a wide scope reading. They can have this reading without being necessarily combined with *hæm* or *hættā* ‘even’. In this case, they invoke a scalar implicature by negating the minimum expectation.

This is the accentuation on the *yek* series element that brings about the differences in meaning and or each element is unique i.e. *yek-čiz-(i)* (non-emphatic, non-specific), *YEK-ČIZ-(I)* (emphatic, specific), *YEK-čiz-(i)* (minimizer).

The following table is the summary of what I mentioned above:

Table (12), differences between the *-i* series and the *yek* series

Indefinite pronoun Indefinite pronoun	<i>-i</i> series	<i>yek</i> series	
Scopal behavior in negative contexts	$\neg\exists$ (IND-existential)	$\exists\neg$ (PPI)	$\neg\exists$ (Minimizer)
(Non-)Emphatic Contrast	Positive(partially)	Positive / negative	

3. Indefinite pronouns versus indefinite noun phrases

In this section I address some differences and similarities between indefinite pronouns and indefinite NPs since *-i* and *yek* can appear in noun phrases as well. The scopal behavior of the *-i* series can be extended to singular *-i* indefinite NPs but somewhat differently, plural *-i* indefinite NPs can give a wide scope reading although they cannot have an (non-)emphatic contrast in negative contexts.

The scopal behavior of the *yek* series, and singular and plural *yek* indefinite NPs is the same in that they both out-scope the negation and give positive polarity readings. The *yek* indefinite NPs can give a minimizer reading as only in the singular forms without *-i*. Also the plural forms fail to give a minimizer reading. Placing *-i* on *yek* indefinite NPs is not optional. Sometimes it is a necessity, like when it occurs in plural *yek* indefinite NPs. There are also contexts where its existence causes ungrammaticality i.e. minimizers or in a nominal predicate. In this section, I will show how the scopal behavior of the *-i* series and the *yek* series can be extended to the other indefinite NPs to a certain degree.

3.1 *-i* series indefinite pronouns and *-i* indefinite noun phrases

As it is known from the prior studies, the suffix *-i*, is an enclitic indefinite marker. Except for proper nouns, it can appear on any nominal. The *-i* series share a lot of similarities in scopal behavior with nouns phrases containing the *-i* indefinite marker by default:

- (86) mærd-i/ MÆRD-I umæd
man-IND came.3.SG
a. mærd-i : “A man came”
b. MÆRD-I: “There is a man such that he came”

3. Indefinite pronouns versus indefinite noun phrases

- (87) mærd-i/ *MÆRD-I næ-yumæd
 man-IND NEG-came
 a. mærd-i: “No man came”
 b. *MÆRD-I: “There was a certain man such that he didn’t come”
- (88) æge mærd-i/ *MÆRD-I umæd be-gu, hær- mærd-i
 If man-IND came3.SG IMP-tell any-man -IND
 a. mærd-i: “Tell me if a man came, it doesn’t matter who”
 b. *MÆRD-I: “There is a certain man such that if he came tell me”

They can have the same (non-)emphatic contrast in positive contexts that *-i* series indefinite pronouns have. The singular *-i* indefinite NPs lose this contrast in negative contexts (87) or in conditional (88). They are always interpreted as indefinite existential inside the scope of negation. However, the differences appear when indefinite noun phrases are in the plural form^{1 7} where they do not take an emphatic form i.e. **ČHIZ-HĀ-I* ‘some certain things’, **KETĀB-HĀ-I* ‘some certain books’. But, as the plural marker *hā* is presuppositional denoting pre-existence of an entity and therefore plural *-i* indefinite NPs are presuppositional indefinites^{1 8} they can give a positive polarity reading:

- (89) { čhiz-hā-i
 thing-PL-IND
 ro æz ketābxune bær-næ-dāštænd
 ketāb-hā-i ACC from library NEG-remove.3.PL
 book-PL-IND
 “They didn’t take Some (things, books) from the library”

^{1 7} Haspelmath (1997) considers plural indefinites as indefinite noun phrases.

^{1 8} Asarina (2011) says Presuppositional indefinites are PPIs, whereas non-presuppositional indefinites are not and an indefinite must be interpreted presuppositionally when:

(i) It is the subject of an individual-level predicate.

(ii) Maximize Presupposition forces a presuppositional interpretation.

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

As Plural *-i* indefinite NPs are presuppositional they do not give a meaning equivalent to *no-N*:

- (90) *KETĀB-HĀ-I-ro næ-xæridænd
 book-PL-IND-ACC bought.3.PL
 Intended meaning: “They didn’t buy any book”

(90) demonstrates that they cannot be interpreted inside the scope of negation. Accordingly, except plurals, the data above confirms that the scopal behavior of *-i* indefinite NPs and indefinite Pronouns is the same. The Following chart shows the similarities and differences between the *-i* series and *-i* indefinite NPs:

Table (13), similarity and differences of *-i* series and *-i* indefinite NPs

Indefinite pronoun Characteristics	<i>-i</i> series	<i>-i</i> indefinite NPs	
		Singular	Plural
Scopal behavior in negative contexts	¬∃	¬∃	∃¬
(non-)Emphatic Contrast	Positive ^{1 9}	Positive	X

3.2 *yek* series indefinite pronouns and *yek* indefinite NPs

The *yek* series and *yek* indefinite NPs also share similarities. They show (non-) emphatic contrast in both negative and positive contexts:

^{1 9} As I mentioned, *-i* series indefinite pronouns and *-i* indefinite NPs have partial emphatic distribution in positive contexts

3. Indefinite pronouns versus indefinite noun phrases

- (91) a. *yek-moælle(m)-(i)/YEK-MOÆLLEM-(I)* *umæd*
one-teacher-(IND) came.3.SG
a. “A teacher came”
b. “There is a teacher such that he came”

(91) can be specific or nonspecific according to the accentuation that it receives but plural *yek* indefinite NPs do not inherit this characteristic since they cannot be receive emphatic form (**YEK-KETĀB-HĀ-I* ‘some certain books’). Also the cardinal meaning in plural *yek* indefinite NPs totally disappears. But they can have positive polarity reading since they are presuppositional. This can be shown by maximized presupposition as in the example below:

- (92) *yek-ketāb-hā-i* *ro* *æz* *qæfæse* *næ-yāvord*
one-book-PL-IND ACC from shelves NEG-brought.3.SG
S/he didn’t bring some books form the shelves”

As the *yek-N-hā* form is presuppositional, it keeps its property in negative contexts. Also, the reasons why it cannot be interpreted inside the scope of negation stay the same. By default, the minimizer reading cannot be obtained:

- (93) *John *YEK-ketāb-hā-i* *næ-yāvord*
J one-book-PL-IND NEG-brought.3.SG
Intended meaning: John didn’t bring any books.

It is also of note that no other language can have minimizer in the plural form:

- (94) ?*John didn’t say words = John didn’t say anything

Further study between the *yek* series and *yek* indefinite NPs suggests that for some *yek* indefinites, *-i* is not optional. Plural *yek* noun phrases are required to have the *-i* enclitic:

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

- (95) *yek-ketāb-hā*(-i)*
one-book-PL-*(IND)
“Some certain books”

Although plural *yek* indefinite NPs cannot be minimizers, singular *yek* indefinites are so by default, but in this case *-i* for them is not optional. In fact, it causes ungrammaticality:

- (96) *YEK-moællem-(*i) næ-yumæd*
one-teacher -(*IND) NEG-came.3.SG
“Not even a teacher came”

Another case in which the *-i* indefinite causes ungrammaticality is in the predicate nominal. This is also mentioned by Ghomeshi (2003):

- (97) John *yek -moællem-(*i)-e*
J one-teacher-(*IND)-e
“John is a teacher”

In summary, the scopal behavior of a singular or plural *yek* indefinite noun is similar to the *yek* series pronouns. They show a (non-)specific contrast in positive and negative contexts. The singular form of *yek* indefinite NPs can be minimizers with a proper accentuation, but the appearance of *-i* as an indefinite marker causes ungrammaticality. This can also happen in predicate nominals. Thus, despite some distributional differences caused by the *-i* the indefinite marker, singular *yek* indefinite NPs can have the same scopal behavior as the *yek* series.

3. Indefinite pronouns versus indefinite noun phrases

Table (14), similarities and differences of *yek* series and *yek* indefinite NPs

Characteristics	<i>yek</i> series indefinite pronoun		<i>yek</i> indefinite NPs		
			Singular		Plural
Indefinite pronoun	$\exists \neg$	$\neg \exists$	$\exists \neg$	$\neg \exists$	$\exists \neg$
Scopal behavior in negative contexts	$\exists \neg$ (PPI)	$\neg \exists$	$\exists \neg$ (PPI)	$\neg \exists$	$\exists \neg$ (PPI)
Optionality of $-i$	N-(<i>i</i>)		N-(<i>i</i>), N-($*i$)	N-($*i$)	N- $h\bar{a}$ -($*i$)
(non-)Emphatic Contrast	Positive/ negative		Positive / Negative		X

4. Approximation, indefiniteness and Specificity

reader should note that though I call this a value, it does not necessarily have to be a cardinal number; it can also be a noun:

- (99) a. *se.tā sib xordæm*
three .CL apple ate.1.SG
“I ate three apples”
- b. *se.tā sib-i xordæm* (Colloquial Persian)
three .CL apple-IND ate.1.SG
“I ate about three apples”
- (100) a. *sæg pārs mi-kone*
dog bark DUR-do.3.SG
“Dog(s) bark” (generic)
- b. *sæg-i didæm*
dog-IND see.1.SG
“I saw a dog”
- (101) a. *mærd-hā ræftænd*
man-PL went.3.PL
“(all of) the men left”
- b. *mærd-hā-i ræftænd*
man-PL-IND went.3.PL
“Some men left”

In (99a) the exact amount of *se tā sib* ‘three apples’ is semantically weakened to *about three apples* in (100b), in (101a), the generic noun *sæg* ‘dog’ which is definite^{2 0}, is changed to an indefinite existential *a dog* in (100b), and in (101a) the exact amount of *(all the) men* is reduced to *some men* in (101b).

^{2 0} Genericity is often claimed to be definite (Krifka 1987). Thus a generic NP denoting a kind is definite, i.e., the kind is known to the speaker and the hearer.

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

And this semantically weakening is made by *-i* suffixation. This can also be shown in an axis as below:

(102)

	(Value – δ)	Exact Value
Cardinal Numbers:	<i>se tā-i</i> ‘about three’	<i>se tā</i> ‘three’
Generic nouns:	<i>sæg-i</i> ‘a dog’	<i>sæg</i> ‘dog’
Plural nouns:	<i>mærd-hā-i</i> ‘some men’	<i>mærd-hā</i> ‘men’

This shows that *-i* suffixation depends on what I call it the notion of Approximation. The notion of Approximation is the semantic weakening of a categorical reference. In (99a), (100a), and (101a) the values are exact, while in (99b), (100b), and (101b) there is a change of meaning by an approximation. The notion of Approximation can explain some other distributional behavior of indefinite NPs as well as examples of predicate nominals (Ghomeshi 2003) or the generic use of *yek*^{2 1}:

- (103) a. John (yek) *dānešāmuz-(*)i*-e
 J (one) student-(*)IND)-is
 “John is a student”
- b. John -o Jack do *dānešāmuz-(*)i*-and
 J and J two student-(*)IND)-are
 “John and Jack are two students”
- c. *yek doktor-(*)i* *bāyæd hæmiše be væzife-æš*
 one doctor-(*)IND) should always to duty-him
æmæl bo-kone
 act SUB-do-3.SG
 “A doctor should always do his/her duty”

^{2 1} The generic use of indefinites can be seen in English as well. For further studies refer to Cohen (2001).

4. Approximation, indefiniteness and Specificity

The examples above show that, *yek dānešāmuz* ‘a student’ in (103a) has the value of exact. This can be understood from the fact that *-i* causes ungrammaticality. This ungrammaticality also happens when *yek* ‘one’ is substituted by *do* ‘two’ in (103b). The generic use of *yek* also needs the value of exact to give the respective reading. Thus, *-i* is incompatible with generic use of *yek* in (103c).

4.2 Indefinites and specificity

In chapter 3, I showed that the *-i* series form a (non-)emphatic contrast within a decided positive contexts and this can be extended to singular *-i* indefinite NPs. I also showed that the *yek* series show a (non-)emphatic contrast in both negative and positive contexts and this can be extended to singular *yek* indefinite NPs. In their emphatic form, they can mark specificity. It is said that specificity for NPs in object place in Persian is marked by the accusative marker *rā*^{2 2} (Peterson 1974, Karimi 1996, and Headberg, Görgulu and Mameni 2011). Karimi (1996) suggests that *rā* is a functional head that checks a mixture of +specificity and “marked” case on a DP.

However, there are cases where in spite of existence of *rā* does not directly result in a specific reading:

- (104) *diruz se tā sib rā xord*
yesterday three CL apple ACC ate.3.SG
a. (se tā sib rā): “Yesterday, s/he ate three apples”
b. (se tā sib rā): “Yesterday, s/he ate the three apples”

With the non specific reading in (104a) the speaker asserts that three apples be en eaten but not three oranges (se tā sib rā). In the specific reading, the

^{2 2} In colloquial Persian, it often pronounced *o* after consonants and *ro* after vowels.

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

speaker is talking about the three apples which are familiar also for the hearer. It can be the three apples that hearer bought yesterday (*se tā sib rā*). The specificity for indefinite pronouns which are marked by *rā* can be examined:

- (105) a. John yek-kæs-i/kæs-i ro dust dāre væli
 J one-(person-IND) ACC love has but
 ne-mi-dunæm ki
 NEG-DUR-know 1.SG who
 “John loves someone but I don’t know who”
- b. John YEK-KÆS-I/KÆS-I ro dust dāre væ un
 J one-(person-IND) ACC love has and that
 un mādær-eš-e
 that mother-his-is.3.SG
 “There is someone that John loves and that is his mother”

Even though the indefinite NP is combined by *rā* in (105a) but their specificity can be denied as they are not in their emphatic form. But when the indefinites are in their emphatic forms their specificity cannot be denied. Thus, here the question is whether the specificity is marked by *rā*?

There are also cases which the indefinites cannot possibly bear a specific reading in spite the presence of *rā*:

- (106) a. *kas-i rā be-frest
 person-IND ACC IMP-sent.2.SG
 Intended meaning: There is some one such that I want you to send him.
- b. *kæs-i rā næ-didæm
 person-IND ACC NEG-saw.3.SG
 Intended meaning: There is a certain person such that I didn’t see him.

Roughly speaking, it is extremely hard to admit that for indefinite NPs which

4. Approximation, indefiniteness and Specificity

do not have the value of exact, the specificity be marked by $r\bar{a}$, but for those which have the value of exact (i.e. generics, numerals and plurals), $r\bar{a}$ can indicate specificity.

- (107) a. sib $r\bar{a}$ bo-xor
apple ACC IMP-eat
“Eat the apple”
- b. sæg $r\bar{a}$ næ-didæm
dog ACC NEG-SAW.1.SG
“I didn’t saw the dog”

The fact that $r\bar{a}$ can occur with time adverbials, follows some relative clause, be a dative case marker etc, (Windfuhr 1979) suggests that $r\bar{a}$ is more than specific marker which is yet undiscussed. Due to the topical constraints, studying the behavior of $r\bar{a}$ is beyond the scope of the present study and calls for further scholarly attention. As I showed in this section and chapter 3, the specificity of the indefinites is either ambiguous e.g. plural indefinites or is marks by an emphatic form.

5. Conclusion

In this thesis, I have reviewed the indefinite pronouns and nouns in Persian and pointed out major difference between the indefinite markers *-i* and *yek*.

The central point of this thesis is that *yek* series indefinite pronouns and singular *yek* indefinite NPs can have emphatic form which facilitates the wide scope reading and specificity (epistemically or scopally).

Additionally I discussed that *yek* series and *yek* indefinite NPs also can be used as minimizers with an accentuation different from the emphatic form. I also showed licensing environments for minimizing *yek* series. For *-i* series indefinite pronouns and NPs the property of being emphatic is limited to some positive contexts and within the environments in which the speaker can epistemically identify the entity. I also showed that the *yek* series and the *yek* indefinite NPs have polarity sensitivity (PPI and minimizer) while the *-i* series indefinite pronouns and NPs are inherently indefinite existentials. But as I mentioned, it might be an issue whether the *-i* series are indefinite pronouns at all or if they are fully grown in series.

The exceptional behavior of some elements in the two series also must be explained. For example some *-i* series elements like time related *gāh-i* cannot give a meaning equivalent to *never* while *væqt-i* or *zæmān-i* (also time related) can within a limited contexts. Also, some *-i* indefinite NPs are grammaticallized as minimizers and are presuppositional like *zærre-i* ‘a bit’.

I have explained that the behavior of the enclitic indefinite marker *-i* is sensitive to the notion of approximation. I documented that specificity, if available, is marked by emphatic reading. Those which do have the exact value can show a specific reading by *rā*. But the specificity for those which do not have the value of exact is either ambiguous or marked by the emphatic form.

Ultimately, so many questions remain open for further studies but I hope the

5. Conclusion

present study provides the first step toward a better understanding of indefinite NPs in Persian and the role of prosody in their interpretation.

References

- Abbott B. (1976). *A study of referential opacity*. Doctoral dissertation: University of California at Berkeley.
- Asarina Alya. (2011). Presuppositional Indefinites are Positive Polarity Items. *In the proceedings of WCCFL 29*.
- Baker, L.C (1970). Double negatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 1, 169–186.
- Baker, L.C. (1966). *Definiteness and indefiniteness in English*. Unpublished MA thesis: University of Illinois.
- Cohen, A. (2001). On the generic use of indefinite singulars. *Journal of Semantics*, 18:3, 183-209.
- Dayal.V. (2004). The Universal Force of Free Choice Any. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 4, 5-40.
- Enç M. (1991). The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 1-25.
- Ernst Thomas. (2011). Speaker oriented adverbs. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 27, 497– 544.
- Ghomeshi Jila. (2003). Plural marking, indefiniteness and the noun phrase. *Studia Linguistica* 57, 47-74.
- Giannakidou Anastasia.(1998). *Polarity Sensitivity as (Non)veridical Dependency*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Giannakidou Anastasia. (1999). Affective Dependencies. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 22, 367-421.
- Giannakidou Anastasia. (2001). Varieties of Polarity Items and the (Non)veridicality Hypothesis. *Perspectives on Negation and Polarity Items*, 99-127 John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Giannakidou Anastasia. (2011). Negative and Positive Polarity Items:

- Licensing, Compositionally and Variation. Berlin/ New York:
Mouton de Gruyeter. Horn, Laurence R. : To appear In *Semantics: an international handbook of natural language, Meaning*. Maienborn, Claudia, Klaus Von Heusinger, and Paul Portner (eds).
- Haspelmath Martin. (1997). *Indefinite Pronouns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hedberg. N.E., & Mamen. MGörgül. (2011). On definiteness and specificity in Turkish and Persian. *Proceedings of the 2011 annual conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association*.
- Horn R. Laurence. (1989). *A Natural History of Negation*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hsieh, I.-T. C. (2011). On NPI-Licensing and the Semantics of Because Sentences. Paper presented in *the 10th Symposium on Logic and Language*, Balatonszemes , Hungary.
- Jennings R. E. (1994). *The Genealogy of Disjunction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Karimi Simin. (1996). Case and specificity: Persian râ revisited. *Linguistic Analysis* 26, 174-194.
- Krifka, M. (1987). *An Outline of Genericity*, partly in collaboration with Claudia Gerstner. SNS-Bericht 87-23, University of Tübingen.
- Ladusaw A. William. (1979). *Polarity Sensitivity as Inherent Scope Relations*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin. [Distributed by Garland Pub., New York and London, 1980].
- Lee. C , Chung. D, Nam. S. (2000). The Semantics of amwu N-to/-irato/-ina in Korean*—Arbitrary Choice and Concession. *Language & Information* vol. 4.2.
- Linebarger C. Marcia. (1980). *The Grammar of Negative Polarity*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT. [Reproduced by the Indiana University Linguistics

The Semantics of Indefinites in Persian

Club, Indiana, 1981].

Nilsen.Oystein. (2003). *Eliminating Positions*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Utrecht.

Progovac Ljiljana. (1994). *Negative and Positive Polarity: A Binding Approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Progovac Ljiljana. (1998). *A Binding Approach to Polarity Sensitivity*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Progovac Ljiljana. (1992). Negative Polarity: A Semantico-Syntactic Approach. *Lingua* , 86, 271-299.

Sells & Kim (2006). Korean NPIs Scope Over Negation. *Language Research* 42.2, 275–297, 2006.

Shimoyama J. (2008). Indeterminate NPIs and scope. In Tova Friedman and Satoshi Ito, eds. *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory XVIII (SALT18)*, CLC Publications, Cornell University, Ithaca.

Szabolcsi Anna. (2004). Positive polarity–negative polarity. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 22, 409–452.

Taleghani A. (2008). *Modality, aspect and negation in Persian*. John Benjamins Publishing

Windfuhr, Gernot L. (1979). *Persian Grammar, History and State of its Study*. Trends in Linguistics, State-of-the-Art Reports, 12. 12. The Hague: Mouton

Van der Wouden Ton. (1997). *Negative Contexts: Collocation, Polarity and Multiple Negation*. Routledge, London.

Von Stechow Kai. (1999). NPI Licensing, Strawson Entailment, and Context Dependency. *Journal of Semantics* 16, 97-148.

- Von Heusinger K. (2011). Specificity. *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning. Vol. 2. Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science / [HSK]*, vol. 33/2. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter: In K. von Heusinger C. Maienborn, P. Portner (eds.).
- Yoshimura Akiko. (1992). The Cognitive Structure of Negation as an NPI-Licensing Condition. *English Linguistics* , 9, 244-264.
- Yun Jiwon (2012). The deterministic prosody of indeterminates. Proceeding of the 29th west coast conference on formal linguistics.258-293
- Zwarts Frans. (1993). *Three Types of Polarity*. unpublished ins., University of Groningen.

페르시아어 부정명사구의 의미론

본 논문은 페르시아어의 부정대명사와 부정명사구의 의미 및 분포를 다양한 맥락에서 밝히는 것을 목표로 한다. 페르시아어의 부정대명사를 총칭적 명사 기반 부정표현(*generic-noun-based indefinite*)으로 분석한 Haspelmath(1997)의 분석을 비판하고, 부정대명사의 의미 특질을 밝히기 위해서는 다음 두 부류의 부정표현을 구분할 필요가 있음을 보인다. 하나는 ‘총칭명사 *-i*’ 형식의 부정대명사이고 다른 하나는 수사 *one*을 동반하는 형식의 부정대명사이다. 본 논문에서는 전자를 *i* 계열 (*i* series) 부정대명사라고 부르고 후자를 *yek* 계열(*yek* series) 부정대명사라고 부른다.

선행 연구에서와 달리, 이 두 시리즈는 그 분포와 의미에 다양한 차이를 보인다. 그 차이를 부정대명사의 쓰임에서 확인할 수 있으며, 이런 차이는 일반 부정명사구에서도 확인된다. *yek* 시리즈는 긍정문과 부정문 모두에서 강조형과 비강조형 사이에 대조를 보여 주며, 강조형은 특정 해석(*specific reading*)을 가지면서 넓은 영향권 해석(*wide scope reading*)을 선호한다. 따라서 강조형은 부정적 맥락(*negative contexts*)에서도 긍정 극어와 같은 해석을 나타내기도 한다.

yek 계열 부정대명사는 일부 부정극어와 같이 극소(*minimizer*)로 사용되기도 한다. 극소사로서의 *yek* 시리즈는 강조형과 다른 운율 특징을 가지면서 척도 함축(*scalar implicature*)을 불러온다. *yek* 시리즈의 이러한 성질은 단수 부정 명사구에 적용 시킬 수 있지만, 복수 부정명사구는 강조형과 비

강조형의 대조를 나타내지 못하고 극소사로도 사용될 수 없다. 그렇지만 복수 부정명사구는 전제적(presuppositional) 해석을 가지므로, 부정 맥락에서도 부정 요소보다 넓은 영향권으로 갖는 것으로 해석된다.

yek 계열 부정대명사와 달리, *-i* 계열의 부정대명사는 특정한 긍정문에서 강조형과 비강조형 사이에 의미적 대조를 나타내며, 존재적 부정어이기 때문에 언제나 부정표현 안에서 해석된다. 그렇지만, *-i* 계열의 부정대명사는 부정 극어로 분석될 수 없다. *-i* 계열의 부정대명사는 긍정문과 부정문에서도 존재 부정어로 나타나며 일반적인 부정 극어와 달리 자유 선택 해석 (free choice reading)을 나타낼 수 없다. 이러한 *-i* 계열의 부정대명사의 특성은 단수 부정대명사에서 확인되지만, 복수 부정대명사는 강조형을 가지지 않으며 그 의미가 전제적이어서 부정문에서도 넓은 영향권 해석을 가진다. 접미사 *-i*가 *yek* 부정대명사와도 함께 출현할 수 있지만, 부정 명사의 의미에 따라 선택적으로 허용된다. 부정대명사와 부정명사의 분포에 대한 연구는 부정 접미사 *-i*의 특성을 잘 설명해 준다. *-i*의 쓰임은 화자가 절대값을 전달하고 싶은지 아니면 근사값을 전달하고 싶은지에 따라 정해진다. 이 논문에서는 이 차이를 ‘근사값 지시’(approximation) 효과라고 부르고 그것이 페르시아어의 특정성 해석과 어떤 관계를 맺고 있는지를 설명한다.

주요어 : 페르시아어 부정명사구, 부정 대명사, 부정 극어, 긍정 극어,
특정성

학 번 : 2011-24256

Acknowledgments

I acknowledge, with gratitude, my debt of thanks to my supervisor, Prof. Seungho Nam for his valuable guidance. I would also like to extend my gratitude to Prof. Elena Guerzoni and the thesis committee members Prof. Heejeong Ko and Dr. Saera Kwak for their valuable comments.

In addition, I would like to appreciate the ceaseless supports and encouragements of my mother R. Alidust, my brother Valiallah and my sister Fatemeh.