

TWO STRATEGIES FOR CONSTITUENT NEGATION (WITH DATA FROM SPANISH VARIETIES)¹

Ricardo ETXEPARE (CNRS, IKER, UMR 5478) & Myriam URIBE-ETXEBARRIA (UPV/EHU)
r.etxepare@iker.cnrs.fr myriam.uribe-etxebarria@ehu.eus

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.

[_{NEGP} NO [_{FocP} QP Foc⁰ [_{IP}... QP...]]]



- **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.

[[_{NEGP} NO [_{FocP} QP Foc⁰ (QP)]]_i Foc⁰ [...t_i...]]



- Fronting of the QP which does not involve contrastive focus (be it scrambling, focalization, etc.) to a position close to Neg (German, Russian, a. o.)

- The choice of one strategy or the other is dependent on (at least) **3 factors/properties of the languages**, which contribute to the different behavior exhibited by the so-called Constituent Negation (CN) across different structures and languages.

- (i) **The type of negation involved and its features** (Zanuttini 1997, Ramchand, 2004; Schapansky, 2002, 2010; De Clerq, 2013, 2016; Poletto, 2017, a.o.);
- (ii) **The relative position of negation in the structure;** and
- (iii) **The status of fronting operations and their articulation with economy considerations.**

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
 few.pl programs innate.pl neg raise issues concerning to the rights human.pl
 “(There are) Few innate programs (which) don’t 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.”
 [CREA, Sept. 2015]

- 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.).

¹This work has been funded by ANR, France (Basque in the Making, BIM, ANR-17-CE27-0011-01), the Basque Government (Consolidated Research Groups HiTT-IT769/13 & IT1396-19), the University of the Basque Country, UPV/EHU (Ikerketa Taldeak, HiTT, GIU18/22), the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities MICIU /Spanish Research Agency (AEI) & the European Regional Development Fund (FEDER, UE) (VASTRUD PGC2018-096870-B-I00)

■ **TRUE CASES OF CN.**

Several tests show that the scope of negation in cases like (1b) is not sentential, and that the *NEG+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 neg have 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 neg have 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
 neg many linguists have published at least 3 papers
 “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 almost 100 papers, like you
 “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 NEG+QP sequences involving true CN.**

- (4) a. * [No pocos] moverán un dedo por ti
 neg few.pl move.fut a finger for you
 “*Many (lit: not few) will lift a finger to help you.”
- b. Pocos no moverán un dedo por ti
 Few.pl neg move.fut a finger for you
 “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 Neg+POCOS_{FEW} (“many”)**, but the **impossibility of sequences involving Neg+MUCHOS_{MANY} (“few”)**, see Etxepare & Uribe-Etxebarria (2018).

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

■ **Our Proposal:**

Not all *Neg+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 [NEG+QP]

→ **A wide range of quantifiers** can be immediately preceded by Neg giving rise to *NEG+QP*:

- a) evaluative existential quantifiers like *muchos* (“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”,
- d) etc.

→ Given that sequences of *NEG+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.

- (5) *Direct Correspondence Approach*: A unified treatment of all Neg+QP sequences as involving *true Constituent Negation*. (cf. Sánchez López 1999, Kim & Sag 2002; Collins and Postal, 2014; Collins, 2016, 2017).

- a. [QP NO [QP ...Q...]]
- b. [NP/DP [NO Q] [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"
- c. **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."
- d. **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."
- e. **No a cualquiera** hubiera enviado el Superior a hablar con el joven
 neg to anyone 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."
- f. 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..."
- g. Hay casos extremos, **no a todo dios** le sienta igual todo
 there.are cases extreme, neg to all god CL.dat affects equally all
 "There are extreme cases, not everybody is equally affected by everything."
https://www.google.es/?gfe_rd=cr&ei=FqARVo_TheSs8wf_qZzoDQ&gws_rd=ssl#q=%22

- **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."
<http://blogdesuperheroes.es/cine-el-misterioso-personaje-de-escuadron-suicida-es-deadshot-ni-nadie-solo-un-espontaneo-que-se-colo-en-el-set>

(8) *Pocos* ("few")

- a. En realidad son varios los interrogantes que preocupan **a no pocos** trabajadores
 in reality are several the questions that concern to neg few.pl workers
 "To be honest, there are several issues that concern many (lit: not few) workers..."
<https://books.google.es/books?id=LtUiDWWyapgC>
- b. **En no pocas ocasiones**, Luis ha sido muy generoso
 In neg few.pl occasions.pl Luis has been very generous
 "On many occasions (lit: on not few occasions) Luis has been very generous."

The sequence *CM/P+NEG+QP* is also possible for some speakers when the quantifier involved is *todos/-as* ("all").

(9) *Todos/-as* ("all")

- a. Es un evento que **a no todos** les parece claro
 is an event that to neg all CL.dat.pl seems clear
 "It is an event that not everyone considers (to be) clear." [From CREA, IX/2015]
- b. **En no todos los niños** surge efecto
 In neg all the children have effect
 "It doesn't work with all children."

For many speakers, **todo el mundo** (lit: "all the world" = "everyone") cannot be immediately preceded by negation, although a few examples can be found in the internet :

(10) *Todo el mundo* (lit: "all the world" = "everyone")

Sin embargo, **a no todo el mundo** le gusta un medio tan abierto.
 However to neg all the world CL.dat likes a media so open
 "However, not everyone likes such open(-minded) media."
<es.bab.la> › <Diccionario bab.la> › <Español-Alemán>

Finally, this combination seems to be more restricted for quantifiers like *cualquiera* "anyone". We did not find a single example in monitored corpora, but we did find a few on the internet:

(11) *Cualquiera* ("anyone")

Con el tiempo aprendí que **a no cualquiera** se le llama amigo
 With the time, learnt.I that to neg anyone cl.IMP cl.dat calls friend
 "As time went by, I learnt that you cannot call just anybody a friend."
<https://twitter.com/.../status/309346974564495360>

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 friends with wine ”

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

- (14) a. *[CM/P a [NEG_P NO [QP]]]
b. [NEG_P 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) [NEG_P Neg [FOCP QP Foc^o [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**
they.have come all.pl
“All have come”
- b. *Han venido **no todos**
they.have come not all.pl
“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**
they.have come few.pl
“Few have come ”
- b. Han venido **no pocos**
they.have come neg few
“Not few have come ”
- c. **No pocos** han venido
neg few they.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**
CL like CM not few
“Not few of them like it ”
- b. **A no pocos** les gusta
CM not few CL.dat.pl like
“Not few of them like it ”
- (20) a. **No a pocos** les gusta
Neg CM few CL.dat.pl like
“Not few of them like it ”
- b. *Les gusta **no a pocos**
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.

$$(22) [_{QP} NO [_{Q'} \dots Q \dots]]$$

- 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).

$$(23) [_{NEGP} Neg [_{FOCP} QP Foc^0 [_{IP} \dots QP \dots]]]$$

- 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**

$$[_{IP} Les gusta [_{VP} \dots [_{a_{P/CM}} [_{NEGP} no [_{QP} pocos]]]]]$$

b. **Illusory CN**

$$[_{NEGP} No [_{FOCP} [_{QP} a pocos] Foc^0 [_{IP} \dots [_{VP} \dots [_{QP} a pocos] \dots]]]]$$

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).

$$(24) a. [_{QP} NO_{NEG} [_{QP} \dots Q \dots]]$$

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

$$(24) b. [_{NEGP} NO_{NEG} [_{FOCP} QP Foc^0 [_{IP} \dots QP \dots]]]]$$

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 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 gusta _{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 quizás a todos les gustó*
things that wanted(I) share.inf of a way that neg perhaps to all.pl CL.dat liked
“Things that I wanted to share in a way that perhaps not everyone liked.”
(forums.lan.leagueoflegends.com/board/showthread.php?t=71433)

c. *...no afortunadamente a todos los que fueron mis subalternos en la Nacional,*
neg fortunately to all.pl the that were my subordinates in the National,

sino a algunos que...

but to some that

“Fortunately not to all those who were my subordinates on the Nacional but to some that...”

<https://books.google.es/books?isbn=9703222528>

→ That the subjunctive in (25a) is licensed by the modal adverb and not by negation is shown by the fact that, without the adverb, the subjunctive is not licensed:

(26) * *No a todos les gusta _{SUBJUNCTIVE} eso*
not to all CL-dat.pl like.3.psg. _{SUBJUNCT} that
“Not everybody likes that.”

→ If in order to license subjunctive mood inflection in the finite form the modal adverb must be able to c-command it, it then follows that the adverb *tal vez* is not embedded in a purported constituent headed by negation or the quantifier.

→ The existence of sequences like those in (25a-c), where the linear adjacency between negation and the QP is interrupted by sentential adverbs, provides direct evidence against a direct merge analysis of these *NEG-QP* sequences, where Neg would be merged or adjoined in the extended projection of the QP.

→ Furthermore, 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.

• Further Evidence:

→ Further evidence that **the position Neg occupies in Illusory CN (Neg₁ in (27=24b)) must be different from the one occupied by regular sentential negation (Neg₂ in (27))**, comes from the fact that the latter (Neg₂) follows (instead of preceding) evaluative and modal adverbs, as shown in (28):

(27=24b) [NEG_{P1} NEG₁ [FOCP QP Foc^o [NEG_{P2} NEG₂ ...[...QP...]]]]

(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

→ If the negation involved in illusory CN is not standard sentential negation, **we predict the possible existence of cases involving double negation.**

→ **This prediction is borne out.** Although it has been claimed that this type of structure does not exist (Rivero 1970), examples of these sort are easily found under the appropriate discourse conditions.

→ **These structures typically involve objections to a previously uttered negative proposition**, as in (29), gathered from a discussion website. The heading subject is the proposition “animals that do not smell” (29a). Following discussion about the heading subject (the idea being that they don’t smell), someone has been led to say that “not all animals do not smell” (29b):

(29) a. *¿Animales que no huelan?*
animals that neg smell?
“Animals that don’t smell?”

b. *Pues no todos no huelen*
the.truth.is neg all neg smell
“The truth is that not all of them don’t smell” (www.faunaexotica.net)

The following pair provides another instance of this type of structure: the news heading says that “the 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 don't wish to work the land” (30b):

- (30) a. Los parados españoles no quieren trabajar en el campo
 the jobless Spanish neg want work.inf in the land
 “The spanish 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) [$_{NEG1} No$ [$_{XP^*}$ (high adverbs) X^0 [$_{FOCUSP} QP Foc^0$ [$_{NEG2} No$ [$_{IP} \dots (QP) \dots$]]]]]

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 Wiltschko, this could correspond to a head in the ResponseP see Wiltschko & 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) 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 I 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 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 (Gutiérrez-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** llovió, 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
Today neg they.have come many customers in fact neg has come anyone
“It is not the case that many customers have come ”
- b. **No** MUCHOS CLIENTES han venido hoy. # De hecho no ha venido ninguno
Neg many customers have come today. In fact neg has come any
“Not many customers came today. #In fact noone 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...]]

SELECTED REFERENCES

- Acquaviva, P. 1997. *The Logical Form Of Negation*, Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics. Revised Edition, New York: Garland Science.
- Albader, M.H. 2018. *La sintaxis de la coordinación distributiva*. Doctoral dissertation, Universidad Complutense, Madrid.
- Al-Horais, N. 2017. "On Negation and Focus in Standard Arabic" *Journal of Universal Language* 18-1: 1-34.
- Aoun, J. et al. 2010. *The Syntax of Arabic*. Cambridge University Press.
- Baunaz, L. 2011. *The Grammar of French Quantification*. Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 83, Dordrecht: Springer.
- Beghelli, F. & T. Stowell, 1997. "Distributivity and negation: The syntax of *each* and *every*", in A. Szabolcsi (ed.), *Ways of Scope Taking*, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 71-107.
- Bosque, I. 1984. "Negación y elipsis" *E.L.U.A.* 2: 171-199.
- Cavalcante, R. (2012) *Negação anafórica no Português brasileiro: Negação sentencial, negação enfática e negação do constituinte*. Universidade de São Paulo dissertation.
- Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cinque, G. 1990. *Types of A-bar Dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Collins, C. and P. Postal. 2014. *Classical Neg-Raising*. MIT Press.
- Collins, C. 2017. "The Distribution of Negated Quantifier Phrases in English" Ms., NYU
- Collins, C. 2018. " *NEG NEG " *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics*, 3-1.
- Cruschina, S. 2011. *Discourse-Related Features and Functional Projections*. Oxford University Press.
- Corver, N. 1997. "The Internal Syntax of the Dutch Extended Adjectival Projection", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15, 289-368.
- De Clercq, K. 2013. *A Unified Syntax of Negation*. Doctoral dissertation, Universiteit Gent.
- Depiante, M. 2000. *The syntax of Deep and Surface Anaphora*. Doctoral diss., University of Connecticut.
- Elordieta, G. and A. Irurtzun. 2009. "The Prosody and INterpretation of Non-Exhaustive Answers" *ASJU* 43 : 205-230.
- Etxepare, R. 1997. *On the grammatical representation of speech events*, Ph.D. Dissertation, U. Maryland.
- Etxepare, R. and M. Uribe-Etxebarria. 2005. "Wh-phrases in-situ in Spanish: scope and locality" *Recherches Linguistiques de Vincennes* 33, 9-34.
- Etxepare, R. and M. Uribe-Etxebarria. 2008. "On Negation and Focus in Spanish and Basque", in X. Artiagoitia & J. Lakarra (eds.), *Gramatika jaietan: Patxi Goenaga irakaslearen omenaldiz*. Special issue of *International Journal of Basque Linguistics and Philology*, UPV/EHU, Bilbao. 287-309.
- Etxepare, R. and M. Uribe-Etxebarria. 2011. "Foco y Negación de Constituyentes" In Escandell, M. et al (eds) *60 problemas de gramática*. Madrid: Akal. 235-241.
- Etxepare, R. and M. Uribe-Etxebarria. 2012. "Las preguntas de Qu-in situ en español: un análisis derivacional", in J.M. Brucart & Á. Gallego (eds.), *El movimiento de constituyentes*, Visor: Madrid, 247-268.
- Etxepare, R. and M. Uribe-Etxebarria. 2018. "Context Sensitive Aspects of Constituent Negation" In A. Gallego et al (eds). *Language, Syntax and the Natural Sciences*. Cambridge University Press. 77-98.
- Etxepare, R. and M. Uribe-Etxebarria. 2020. "The structure of the Speech Act, Negation and Focus", ms. Iker-lab (CNRS) & UPV/EHU.
- Fox, D. 2000. *Economy and Semantic Interpretation*. MIT Press.
- González, R. 2008. *La polaridad positiva en español*. Doctoral Dissertation Universidad Complutense and Instituto Universitario Ortega y Gasset, Madrid.
- Gutierrez-Bravo, R., C.M. Sobrino and M. Uth. 2019. "Contrastive Focus in Yucatecan Spanish" In A. Gallego (ed) *The Syntactic Variation in Spanish Dialects*. Oxford University Press.
- Herburger, E. 2000. *What Counts: Focus and Quantification*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Herrera Morera, G. 2012. "El operador *no* en el español de Centroamérica: análisis tipológico". *Letras* 51 : 147-162.
- Holmberg, A. 2016. *The Syntax of Yes and No*. Oxford University Press.
- Horn, L. 1989. *A Natural History of Negation*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Israel, M. 2011. *The Grammar of Polarity: Pragmatics, Sensitivity, and the Logic of Scales*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jackendoff, R. 1972. *Semantic interpretation in generative grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kaiser, E. 2006. "Noncanonical negation and information structure in Finnish" In V. Molnar and S. Winkler (eds) *The Architecture of Focus*. Berlin : Mouton De Gruyter. 265-290.
- Kim J.B. & I. Sag. 2002. "Negation without head movement". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20, 339-412.
- Kiss, K. E. 2002. *A Grammar of Hungarian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Klima, E.S. 1964. "Negation in English", in J. Fodor and J. Katz (eds.), *The Structure of Language*, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 246-323.
- Köhler, E. 1985. "*Nicht-Não*: uma equivalencia problematica" In A.C. Franco (ed) *Duas Linguas in Contraste: Portugues et Alemão. Actas do I Coloquio Internacional de Linguística Contrastiva Portugues-Alemão*. Porto: Universidade do Porto. 29-42.
- Krifka, M. 2001. "Quantifying into question acts" *Natural Language Semantics* 9-1: 1-40.
- Lasnik, H. 1972. *Analyses of Negation in English*. MIT doctoral dissertation.
- Lee, C. 2017. "Contrastive Topic, Contrastive Focus, Alternatives, and Scalar Implicatures" In C. Lee et al (eds) *Contrastiveness in Information Structure, Alternatives and Scalar Implicatures*. Springer. 3-21.
- Neeleman, A. and R. Vermeulen. 2012. "Types of focus and their interaction with negation" In A. Neeleman and R. Vermeulen (eds) *The Syntax of Topic, Focus and Contrast. An Interface Approach*. Berlin: Mouton. 227-264.
- Manzotti, E. and A. Rigamonti. 1991. "La negazione" In L.Renzi and G. Salvi (eds) *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*. Volume II. Bologna: Il Mulino. 245-320.
- McCawley, J. 1991. "Contrastive Negation and Metalinguistic Negation" *Chicago Linguistic Society* 27: 189-206.
- Merchant, J. 2001. *The Syntax of Silence*. Oxford University Press.
- Neeleman, A. and R. Vermeulen (eds). 2012. *The Syntax of Topic, Focus and Contrast. An Interface Based Approach*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Payne, J.R. 1985. "Negation" In T. Shopen (ed) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Vol I*. Cambridge University Press. 197-242.
- Penka, Doris. 2011. *Negative Indefinites*. Oxford University Press.
- Peres, J. A. 2013. "Negação" In E.B.P. Raposo et al (eds) *Gramática do Português. Vol I*. Fundação Kalouste Gulbenkian. 461-498.
- Poletto, C. 2017. "Negative Doubling: in favor of a Big-NegP analysis" In S. Cruschina et al (eds) *Studies on Negation. Syntax Semantics and Variation*. Vienna University Press. 81-104.

- Sánchez-López, C. 1999. "La negación", in I. Bosque y V. Demonte (eds.), *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española, Volumen 2*. Madrid: Espasa, 2561-2634.
- Ramchand, G. 2004. "Two types of negation in Bengali" In V. Dayal et al. (eds) *Clause Structure in South Asian Languages*. Kluwer. 39-66.
- REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA: Banco de datos (CREA) [en línea]. *Corpus de referencia del español actual* ("Reference Corpus of Contemporary Spanish"). <http://www.rae.es>
- Remberger E.M. 2014. "A Comparative Look at Focus Fronting in Romance" In A. Duffer and A.S. Octavio de Toledo (eds) *Left Sentence Peripheries in Spanish. Diachronic, Variationist and Comparative Perspectives*. Amsterdam : John Benjamins. 383-418.
- Rivero, M.L. 1970. "A Surface Structure Constraint on Negation in Spanish", *Language* 46 (3), 640-666.
- Rizzi 1997. "The fine structure of the left periphery", in Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar. A Handbook of Generative Syntax*, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 281-337.
- Rooth, M. 1992. "A theory of focus interpretation", *Natural Language Semantics* 1, 75-116.
- Schapansky, N. 2010. "Further aspects of negation in French" *Lingua* 120: 103-131.
- Temmerman, T. 2012. *Multidominance, ellipsis, and quantifier scope*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Leiden University.
- Tomioka, S. 2010. "Contrastive topics operate on speech acts". In M. Zimmermann a,d C. Féry (eds) *Information Structure: Theoretical, Typological and Experimental Perspectives*. Oxford University Press. 115-138.
- Uriagereka, J. 2008. *Syntactic Anchors*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Uribe-Etxebarria, M. 1992. "On the structural position of the subject in Spanish, their nature and their consequences for quantification" In J.A. Lakarra and J. Ortiz de Urbina (eds) *Syntactic Theory and Basque Syntax*. Donostia : Gipuzkoako Foru Aldundia. 447-492.
- Uribe-Etxebarria, M. 2002. "In situ questions and masked movement", *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 2, 259-303.
- Uribe-Etxebarria, M. 2018, "The Left Periphery and the Syntax- Pragmatics Interface of (Negative) Polar Questions", 2018 SNU International Conference on Linguistics. June 2018, Seoul.
- Uth, M. 2018. *Language Contact as a Developmental Co-Determinant Between Systems and Exemplars*. Habilitation thesis. University of Cologne.
- Vicente, L. 2006. "Short negative replies in Spanish" In J. Van der Weijer and L. Bettelou (eds) *Linguistics in the Netherlands*. Amsterdam :John Benjamins. 199-211.
- Wiltschko, M. & J. Heim. 2016. The syntax of conformationals. In Gunther Kaltenböck, Evelien Keizer and Arne Lohmann (eds.), *Outside the Clause: Form and function of extra-clausal constituents* [Studies in Language Companion Series 178].
- Zanutini, R. 1997. *Negation and clausal structure : a comparative study of Romance Languages*. Oxford University Press.
- Zeljstra, H. 2013. "Not in the first place". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 31, 865-900.