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0. THE PROPOSAL

→ Languages may use different means to delimit the relative scope of Negation and QPs.

→ There are several different underlying structures in sequences involving adjacent instances of NEG and a QP. Some of them involve Direct Merge of Neg and the QP (these are true instances of Constituent Negation), while in other cases the adjacency between Neg and the QP is derived along the derivation (illusory cases of Constituent Negation).

(i) Direct Merge: [QP NO […]Q…]].
   - This option is limited to a subset of QPs.
   - This strategy is unattested in many languages.

(ii) Association with Focus:
   - Generally available in all languages (which allow this type of fronting). It involves focus fronting a high negation and the projection of the structure corresponding to the Speech Act and an assertive operator.
   - Negation is an adverb that directly merges to the Focal Phrase, this is the proposal of Gutiérrez-Bravo, Sobrino & Uth (2019)
   - Mixed strategy: Portuguese. It combines the other 2 strategies (Direct Merge and Focus Fronting). Neg and QP merge and form a complex QP/NegP which then undergoes focus fronting.

(iii) The status of fronting operations and their articulation with economy considerations.
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1. CONSTITUENT NEGATION (CN)

The examples in (1a-b) illustrate two of the syntactic configurations where negation can be found in Spanish in sentences involving a quantifier phrase (QP).

(1) a. Sentential Negation (SN).
   Pocos programas innatos no implican cuestiones relativas a los derechos humanos.
   Many (lit: “not few”) innate programs raise issues related to human rights.
   → Neg surfaces separated from the QP "pocos programas" ("few programs"), and serves to negate the proposition (see Acquaviva 1997, Herburger 2000, a.o.).

(1) b. Constituent Negation (CN)
   No pocos programas innatos implican cuestiones relativas a los derechos humanos.
   Not few.pl programs innate.pl raise issues concerning to the rights human.pl
   “Many (lit: “not few”) innate programs raise issues related to human rights.”
   → Neg surfaces immediately preceding the QP, and it does not negate the proposition; rather, it only affects the quantificational expression it is adjacent to. This would be a case of Constituent Negation (CN) (Klima 1964; Lasnik, 1972; Horn 1989, Sánchez López 1999; Collins and Postal, 2014; Collins, 2016, 2017, a. o. ).
TRUE CASES OF CN.

Several tests show that the scope of negation in cases like (1b) is not sentential, and that the \( \text{NEG}+\text{QP} \) sequence involves true Constituent Negation.

(i) Compatibility of Neg+QP sequences with positive polarity items

- (2a) and (2b) involve SN and a pseudo-focal quantifier and an approximative quantifier, respectively, which are positive polarity items. The sentences sound odd because these quantifiers are positive polarity items and they cannot occur in the scope of Neg (see González 2008 for Spanish).

(2) a. * Muchos lingüistas no han publicado al menos tres artículos SN
     “Many linguists have not published at least three papers.”
     “Many linguists haven’t published at least 3 papers.”

b. * Muchos lingüistas no han publicado casi 100 artículos SN
     “Many linguists haven’t published almost 100 papers.”
     “Many linguists haven’t published almost 100 papers.”

However, as illustrated in (3a-b), their constituent negation (CN) counterparts are good; this is precisely what we expect if the scope of negation in structures involving CN is not sentential, and only affects the QP it precedes.

(3) a. [No muchos lingüistas] han publicado al menos 3 artículos CN
     “Not many linguists have published at least 3 papers.”

b. [No muchos lingüistas] han publicado casi 100 papers, como tú CN
     “Not many linguists have published nearly 100 papers, like you.”

- The reverse pattern arises if we insert strong polarity items of the minimizer sort: they are licensed by Sentential Negation, but not by \( \text{NEG}+\text{QP} \) sequences involving true CN.

(4) a. * [No pocos] moverán un dedo por ti
     “Few people will not lift a finger to help you.”

b. Pocos no moverán un dedo por ti
     “Few people will not lift a finger to help you.”

For further evidence of true cases of CN involving the availability of CLLD with sequences involving \( \text{NEG}+\text{POCO} \text{S} \text{MW} \) (“many”), but the impossibility of sequences involving \( \text{NEG}+\text{MUCHOS} \text{MANY} \) (“few”), see Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria (2018).

2. DISENTANGLING THE DIFFERENT STRUCTURES UNDERLYING NEG+QP SEQUENCES.

- Our Proposal:

Not all \( \text{NEG}+\text{QP} \) sequences correspond to true CN cases, where Neg forms a unit with QP. We need to distinguish true CN from illusory CN.

2.1. THE DIRECT CORRESPONDENCE APPROACH: DIRECT MERGE \( \{ \text{NEG}+\text{QP} \} \)

→ A wide range of quantifiers can be immediately preceded by Neg giving rise to \( \text{NEG}+\text{QP} \):

a) evaluative existential quantifiers like mucho (“many”) and pocos (“few”).

b) degree quantifiers such as demasiado “too many/much”, and comparatives of degree such as más/menos de “not more than/not less than”.

c) universal quantifiers, such as todos “all”, or todo el mundo “all the world/everyone”,

etc.

→ Given that sequences of \( \text{NEG}+\text{QP} \) seem to be widely available, it would then be tempting to assume that a “constituent negation/CN” analysis may be unproblematically extended to all the attested cases, as stated by the Direct Correspondence Approach in (5) below.


a. \( [\text{QP} \text{NO} \text{[QP ... Q]]} \)

b. \( [\text{NEG} \text{NO} \text{[NP/DP]} \) (Collins’ Inner Negation, 2017)

→ However, as we will show next in Sect. 2.2., if we (minimally) complexify the relevant sequences of negation and QP by adding a Case Marker (CM) or a preposition (P), the Direct Correspondence Approach gives rise to a number of structural paradoxes.
2.2. A SYNTACTIC PARADOX: WORD ORDER ASYMMETRIES AFFECTING THE NEG+QP SEQUENCE.

When we add a Case Marker (CM) or a Preposition to sequences involving Negation and a QP, there are two possible relative orders between Neg and the CM/P available.

- **NEG + P/CM + QP**

The relative order in which negation precedes the CM/P seems to be available to all the quantifiers that can combine with negation (all the examples are taken from CREA (Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual), except for (6f,g), borrowed from Google, and (6h)): 

(6) a. ... este tipo de deporte que no a mucha gente le gusta jugar 
this type of sport that neg to many people CL.dat likes play.inf 
“...this type of sport, which not many people like playing”

b. No a todo el mundo le sientan igual las bromas 
neg to all.sg. the.sg. world.masc.sg. CL.dat affect equally the jokes 
“Not everyone is equally affected by jokes.”

c. No a todos les interesa llegar tan lejos 
neg to all.pl CL.dat interests get.inf that far 
“Not all are interested in getting that far.”

d. No a cualquiera hubiera enviado el Superior a hablar con el joven 
neg to any.pl the young one would have sent the superior to speak.inf with the young 
“The headmaster wouldn’t have sent just anyone to speak to the young man.”

e. Si bien no a cada uno le resulta fácil establecerse... 
if well neg to each one CL-DAT turns.out easy establish.inf refl to 
“Even if not everyone finds it easy to set out...”

f. Hay casos extremos, no a todo díos le sienta igual todo 
there are extreme cases, neg to all god CL.dat affects equally all 
“These are extreme cases, not nobody is equally affected by everything.”

- **P/CM + NEG+QP**

In contrast, the word order where NEG follows the CM/P does not seem to be available to all quantifiers. **This word order is possible for the following quantifiers**

(7) **Muchos (“many”):**

... recuerdo que a no muchos les gustó ese traje ... remember-I that to neg many.pl CL.dat.pl liked that suit 
“I remember that not many liked that suit.”

But there are two quantifiers that do not admit such a configuration. We have not found a single instance either in internet or elsewhere of sequences like a no cada uno (“to not each one”), or a no todo dios (“to not everyone”). The examples would have looked as follows:

(12) a. *A no todo dios le gusta eso
to not all god cl.dat likes that
“Not everyone likes that.”

b. *A no cada estudiante le gusta eso
to neg each student cl.dat likes that
“Not each student likes that.”

→ Note that this already raises a question about the syntax of sequences like (13):

(13) No todo dios es amigo del vino
Neg all god is friend of the wine
“Not everyone is friend with wine”

→ That is, if the structure [NegP NO [QP]] is not available as part of the structure of [CM/P a [NegP NO [QP]]] in (14a), why is it available in examples like (13)?

(14) a. *[CM/P a [NegP NO [QP]]]

b. [NegP NO [QP]]

→ Conclusion: we need an alternative underlying structure for some of the sequences involving Neg + QP: this leads us to the Indirect Correspondence Approach.

3. THE INDIRECT CORRESPONDENCE APPROACH: EXTERNAL NEG + FOCUS MOV. OF QP.

Our proposal:

i. Some Neg + QP sequences are not derived by direct merge; rather, they follow from a focus fronting movement operation of the QP to a position adjacent to a “clause-external” negation.

(15) [NegP Neg [FOCP QP Foc° [IP… QP…]]]

ii. This operation is available to all QPs that may undergo fronting.

In the following subsections we present evidence in favor of this proposal.

3.1. WORD ORDER WITHIN THE NEG+QP SEQUENCE AND AT THE SENTENTIAL LEVEL

→ Lasnik (1972) and Postal (1974) observed that so-called constituent negation (CN) triggers changes in word order.

→ As shown in (16), in Spanish some QPs that are licensed in postverbal position, like the universal quantifier todos (“all”) in (16), are not licensed in that position when they form a sequence with Neg (16b), while the same sequence is licensed when it appears in sentence initial position (16c).

(16) a. Han venido todos
b. *Han venido no todos
they have come all.pl they have come not all.pl
“All have come” “Not all have come”

  c. No todos han venido
  Neg all they have come
  “Not all have come”

In contrast, weak quantifiers like pocos (“few”) do not seem to be affected by this constraint.

(17) a. Han venido pocos
b. Han venido no pocos
they have come few.pl they have come neg few
“Few have come” “Not few have come”

At first sight, this seems to fit into Collins’ (2017) generalization, in (18)

(18) A generalization (Collins, 2017):
Negated Universal Quantifiers can only occur in preverbal position

→ But, as we show next, the Spanish facts under analysis are more complex and cannot be accounted for under the formulation of the fronting restriction in (18).

Consider what happens in Neg + CM/P + QP sequences involving weak quantifiers, when Negation precedes the Case Marker/Preposition.

(19) a. Les gusta a no pocos
b. a no pocos les gusta
CL like CM not few
“Not few of them like it”

CL not few CL.dat.pl like

(20) a. No a pocos les gusta
b. *Les gusta no a pocos
Neg CM few CL.dat.pl like
“Not few of them like it”

CL.dat.pl like not CM few


→ Conclusion:

(i) In sequences with weak quantifiers involving a Prep/CM, whenever Negation is external to the CM/P + QP sequence, Weak Quantifiers like few behave as universals quantifiers like todos “all” regarding the impossibility of surfacing in postverbal position and their availability in preverbal position.

(ii) We argue that this asymmetry follows from the fact that Neg does not merge directly with the CM/P + QP unit. Rather, the sequence Neg + CM/P + QP follows from the fronting of CM/P+QP to the specifier of a high FocP close to a high clausal negation.

(iii) The correct generalization is not (18), but (21).

(21) Generalization: Case/Preposition-external negation is related to QP fronting.

→ What does this follow from? How can we account for this? There are two possible approaches in the literature to consider. (Sect. 3.1.1. & Sect. 3.1.2.)

3.1.3. OUR PROPOSAL

In order to account for all the Spanish facts under consideration, we need to allow (at least) two different structural options underlying the Neg + QP sequences.

- **Direct Correspondence (True Constituent Negation, TCN)**
  - TCN can be structurally described as in (22), with direct merge of Neg and the QP.
    
    (22) \[ \text{QP NO} \{ \text{Q...Q...} \} \]
  
  - TCN is available to a variable set of quantifiers. The set of quantifiers seems to vary cross-linguistically. For Spanish, it would seem that direct Merge of Negation and QP is possible for Existential Quantifiers, Degree and Comparative Quantifiers.

- **Indirect Correspondence (Illusory Constituent Negation, ICN)**
  - No direct merge of Neg + QP.
  - The adjacency between Negation and the QP results from focus fronting of the QP to a position adjacent to a “clause-external” negation, as in (23).
    
    (23) \[ \text{NEG} \text{ QP Foc}^0 \{ \text{IP...Q...Q...} \} \]
  
  - This option is open to all QPs that may undergo fronting.

→ The word order asymmetry arising between CM/P+Neg+QP and Neg+CM/P+QP sequences follows from two different syntactic structures and derivations:

(24) a. True CN

\[ \text{IP} \text{ Les gusta} \{ \text{IP...[IP\text{FCM NEG}\{\text{QP pocos}\}]} \} \]

b. Illusory CN

\[ \text{NEG} \text{ No [FOCP QP a pocos] Foc}^0 \{ \text{IP...[IP...[FOCP a pocos]} \} ] ] ]

SUMMARIZING: Sequences of Neg + QP correspond to (at least) one of these options:

- **True Constituent Negation (TCN)**. Direct merge Neg+QP. Available to a restricted set of quantifiers (like Existential Quantifiers, Degree Quantifiers or Comparative Quantifiers).

(24) a. \[ \text{QP NO} \{ \text{Q...Q...} \} \]

- **Illusory Constituent Negation (ICN)**. Available to all quantifiers which can front.

(24) b. \[ \text{NEG} \text{ NO} \{ \text{FOCP QP Foc}^0 \{ \text{IP...Q...Q...} \} \} \]

4. Where is Negation in cases involving Illusory CN?

→ Under our approach, in illusory CN the adjacency between negation and the QP is an illusion produced by fronting of the QP into the specifier of a functional head which is in a very local relation with a very high negation.

→ We now present two additional pieces of evidence in favour of our analysis of some Neg+QP sequences as involving Illusory CN (indirect approach):

i) Cases in which the sequence NEG+QP is interrupted by high clausal adverbs (Sect. 4.1.)

ii) The existence of clauses with double negation (Sect. 4.2.)
4.1. CLAUSAL ADVERBS

→ In cases of illusory CN, where negation is external, Neg and the (Prep) QP do not need to be immediately adjacent to each other and can be separated by an adverb taking clausal scope.

→ This adverb can be a modal adverb (25a,b), or an evaluative one (25c), both with clausal clausal scope.

Direct morphosyntactic evidence for the clausal scope of the adverb in (25a) comes from the fact that it licenses the occurrence of subjunctive inflection, as one expects from modal adverbs with sentential scope:

(25) a. No tal vez a todos les guste subjunct eso
   neg perhaps to all.pl CL.dat like subjunct that
   “Perhaps not everybody likes that.”

b. Cosas…que quise compartir de una forma que no quisís a todos les gustó cosas que quise compartir de una forma que Neg2 would be immediately adjacent to each other and can be separated by an adverb taking clausal scope.

(27a=28)

Further evidence that the position Neg occupies in Illusory CN (Neg1 in (27=28)) must be different from the one occupied by regular sentential negation (Neg2 in (28)), comes from the fact that the latter (Neg2) follows (instead of preceding) evaluative and modal adverbs, as shown in (28):

(27=28) [NEG1 Neg2 [FOCP QP Foc” [NEG2 Neg1 …[…Q?…]]]]

(28) a. Afortunadamente/tal vez no han venido
   fortunately /perhaps, neg have(they) come
   “Fortunately/perhaps, they didn’t come.”

b. *No afortunadamente/probablemente han venido
   neg fortunately/probably have(they) come

→ The Neg we find in Illusory CN corresponds to Neg1 in (27), and sentential negation corresponds to Neg2.

4.2. SENTENCES WITH DOUBLE NEGATION

Further evidence, the fact that in cartographic terms the element that interrupts the sequence is a very high adverb provides strong evidence that negation in those cases belongs in the high CP-domain.
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The following pair provides another instance of this type of structure: the news heading says that “not all Spanish jobless do not wish to work the land” (30a); a reply to this statement in the comment section of the news counterargues saying that “not all Spanish jobless dont wish to work the land” (30b):

30 a. Los parados españoles no quieren trabajar en el campo

b. Que ponga en el titular “algunos parados”...

(30) Los parados españoles no quieren trabajar en el campo

“The西班牙 jobless do not want to work the land.”

b. Que ponga en el titular “algunos parados”...

That says subjunct in the headline some jobless

que no todos no quieren trabajar en el campo

because neg all neg want work.inf in the land

“The headline should say “some jobless”, because not all of them don't want to work the land.”

**CONCLUSION:** Over and above standard sentential Neg in Spanish (NO_neg2), there is the possibility of projecting a higher Neg (NO_neg1), whose function is to object to an (implicit or explicit) previous assertion, and which can be combined with sentential negation (NO_neg2).

31 [NEGP2 NO [XP (high adverbs) X^0 [FOCUSP QP FOC^0 [NEGP1 NO [p ...(QP)... ]]]]]

Although we will not have time to discuss this in detail here, we defend that this high Neg occupies a position within the structure of the Speech Act (Under the neoperformative model defended by Wilschko, this could correspond to a head in the ResponseP see Wilschko & Heim 2016 and Uribe-Etxebarria 2018, and Etxepare & Uribe-Etxebarria 2020 ms. for related discussion)

5. AN OPEN ISSUE: WHY *NEG + DP

→ Collins (2017) notes that DPs cannot be the object of CN in English. The same is true in Spanish.

32 a. *Not RICARDO has come

b. *No RICARDO ha venido

→ He claims that the reason for this is that Neg must operate over types that include < t >, a propositional type, like Generalized Quantifiers < <e,t>, <e,t>, t >, and cannot apply to categories of type <e>, individuals.

→ In the broader context that we have set, in which many instances of CN are instances of association with a fronted element, possibly a focus, it is not clear why NEG + DP should be an impossible sequence, given that it is possible to associate negation to a focused DP:

33 a. No ha venido RICARDO (sino MYRIAM).

Neg has come Ricardo, but Myriam

→ Further, (95) is attested in many languages (a.o. Standard Arabic, Aoun et al., 2010; Al-Horais, 2017; Hungarian, Kiss, 2002; Russian, Dahl 2006; German, Payne 1985; Indo-Aryan languages, e.g. Marathi, Pandharipande, 1997; Turkish, Cavalcante 2012).

5.1. YUCATECAN SPANISH: NEG + DP

→ Constituent negation of DPs is possible also in at least one variety of Spanish, Yucatecan Spanish, as studied by Uth (2018) and Gutierrez Bravo, Sobrino and Uth (2019):

34 a. No YO se lo compré. ALEXIS se lo compró (Gutiérrez-Bravo, Sobrino & Uth 2019)

Neg 1 cl cl bought Alexis cl cl bought

“It is not ME who bought it, ALEXIS did it”

b. No JUGO dijo Abu que vamos a tomar, agua (Uth, 2018 : 33)

Neg 1 juice said Abu that we.were.going to have, water

“It is not JUICE that Abu said we were having, (but) WATER ”

c. No ESO la mancha, TÚ la manchas (Gutiérrrez-Bravo, Sobrino and Uth, 2019)

Neg that cl stains, you cl stain

“It is not THAT that is staining it, but you are ”

d. No DOMINGO DE RAMOS lllovió, el otro (Gutiérrez-Bravo, Sobrino & Uth 2019)

neg Sunday of Palms rained, the other

“It didn’t rain on Palm day, but another Sunday”

5.2. FRONTING

→ Most of the quantifiers are good when fronted to a preverbal position.

→ This fronting seems to have an effect in the interpretation of the sentence (Uribe-Etxebarria, 1992). Consider the following contrasts:

35 a. No han venido TODOS. De hecho no ha venido ninguno

Neg they.have come all. In fact neg has come anyone

“It is not the case that everyone came, in fact noone did ”

b. No TODOS han venido. #De hecho no ha venido ninguno.

Neg all they.have come. In fact neg has come anyone

“Not everyone came. #In fact noone did ”
(36) a. Hoy no han venido MUCHOS CLIENTES. De hecho no ha venido ninguno “It is not the case that many customers have come”
b. No MUCHOS CLIENTES han venido hoy. # De hecho no ha venido ninguno “Not many customers have come today. #In fact none did”

→ But what scope or referential semantic effect can be induced by fronting a DP like Ricardo?

→ Let us say with Cruschina (2011) and Remberger (2014) that focus fronting in Spanish is related to contrastive focus.

Tomioka (2010) argues that contrastive topics require the presence in the semantic structure of a Speech Act operator. We will extend that idea to contrastive foci. Let us call the Speech Act operator ASSERT.

→ Krifka (2001, 2003) shows that certain logical operations, such as disjunction or negation, are not applicable to speech acts.

→ This is so because according to him the (denotation) domain of speech acts does not constitute a boolean algebra, but at most a semi-lattice. In that domain, certain operations such as conjunction are well defined, whereas disjunction and negation are not. Consider for instance the following assertion (from Krifka 2001: 16):

(37) Al made the pasta and Bill made the salad
    a. I assert: Al made the pasta and Bill made the salad
    b. I assert: Al made the pasta, and I assert: Bill made the salad

→ The conjunction operator, as shown in (38a,b), can be interpreted either as conjoining the asserted propositions or as conjoining two acts of assertion. Unlike conjunction, disjunction is only interpreted at the propositional level:

(38) Al made the pasta or Bill made the salad
    a. I assert: Al made the pasta or Bill made the salad
    b. # I assert: Al made the pasta, or I assert: Bill made the salad

→ Disjunction at the speech act level amounts to canceling the illocutionary force of the sentence.

→ Speech acts also lack negation as a general operation (39). As Krifka notes, it is not clear what the complement of a speech act could possibly be.

(39) a. # I don’t assert: Al made the pasta
    b. # Noone asserts: Al made the pasta

If Tomioka and Krifka are right, Contrastive Focus is introduced by a Speech Act operator, which we represent roughly as in (40):

(40) ASSERT QP_focus

→ But then this configuration is not possible in Illusory CN, if our high negation takes scope over the contrastive focus, as it does:

(41) *NEG ASSERT QP_focus

→ How do we get out of the assertion trap?

i. One possibility is that fronting in a given language does not trigger the introduction of an assertive operator. Fronting of QPs to the preverbal position, for instance, may be motivated by things other than contrastive effects. Languages in which information structure is managed by operations like scrambling, may front constituents without introducing a speech act operator too (German, Russian).

ii. The other possibility is that negation can be inserted in a position lower than the assertive operator, as an adverb. This is the suggestion for the position of negation in Yucatec Maya by Aissen (1992).

iii. Another possibility is that negation is an adverb that directly merges to the Focal Phrase, this is the proposal of Gutiérrez-Bravo, Sobrino & Uth, 2019) for negation in Yucatec Spanish, that they take to be a result of contact with Yucatec Maya:

(42) ASSERT [FocP NEG [FocP FocP…]]