Reviewing constituent negation in Spanish

Ricardo Etxepare (CNRS, UMR5478) and Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria (EHU-UPV)

Negation in Spanish can head a finite clause (1a) (Laka, 90) or be merged to a constituent of that clause (1b), a case of Constituent Negation (CN) (Klima, 64; Horn, 89; Sanchez López, 99). CN applies to a wide range of quantifiers in Spanish (2a-b):

(1)   a. [Pocos [no   han venido a la fiesta]]   b.[[no pocos] han venido a la fiesta]]
             few   neg have come to the party   neg few   have come to the party
        "Few did not come to the party"   "Not few came to the party"

(2)   a. No muchos/pocos/más de tres   han venido tarde
            not many /few/more than three have arrived late
        b. No todos/todo dios/cualquiera/cada uno de ellos ha(n) venido tarde
             not all /everyone /anyone   /each of them has/have arrived late

The standard view of the syntactic structures in (2a-b) is that negation directly merges to the QP (Sanchez Lopez, 99; Kim&Sag, 02). *Neg-QP* sequences, however, do not behave uniformly when we consider other syntactic environments. Among the set of quantifiers, the universal ones (typically group *todos*, but also restricted *cada* and free-choice *cualquiera*) show an intriguing asymmetry: whereas in preverbal position they are not required to be contrastive (3a), they are bound to be so in postverbal position (3b). This is not the usual behaviour of universal quantifiers otherwise (3c):

(3)   a. No todos han venido   b. Han venido no todos *(sino solo algunos)
            not all   have come   have come not all,   but only some
        c. Han venido todos
            have come   all

This difference goes together with some others (see Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria, 2011):
(i) Unlike in the case of *no pocos/muchos/más de Q*, *no* cannot directly merge to *todos*, as witnessed by case-marked phrases (4a vs.4b):

(4)   a. A no pocos les gusta el vino   b. *A no todos/cualquiera le(s) gusta el vino
             to not many cl like   the wine   to not all/anyone   cl   like   the wine
        c. No a todos/cualquiera le(s) gusta el vino

(ii) Negation, in the sequences *no todos/todo dios/cualquiera* licenses negative polarity   ítems, unlike in the case of *no pocos/muchos*:

(5)   a. *Han invitado a no pocos/muchos dirigentes ni simpatizantes
              have invited P not few/many   leaders   nor followers
        b. Ha(n) invitado no a todos los dirigente(s) ni simpatizante(s), sino…
            have invited   not P all   the leaders nor follower(s), but...

(6)   a. *No muchas manchas en la   piel son síntoma   de nada
             not many   spots   in the skin are symptom of anything
        b. No todas las manchas   en la piel son síntoma de nada
             neg all   the symptoms in the skin are symptom of anything

(iii) Coordination can break the purported negated constituent, as in the following conjoined (gapped) structure, with a downward intonation in the second term:

(7)   No [a todo el mundo le gusta el vino] y/o [a cualquiera [e] el café]

In (7), *cualquiera* is interpreted under the scope of negation (*not>just anyone*). This is only possible if negation c-commands the whole clause. The contrasts above suggest that sequences such as *no todos*, as opposed to sequences like *no pocos/muchos*, do not correspond to any constituent (see also Vicente, 2007, for evidence from fragment answers). The idea is further confirmed by the following contrasts in IP-ellipsis:

(8)   a. Ha comido donde no muchos/pocos [IP]   b. Ha comido donde todos [IP]
            has eaten   where not many/few   has eaten where all
        c. *Ha comido donde no todos [IP]
             has eaten   where not all

Assuming that IP ellipsis is licensed under a Sigma Phrase (Laka, 1990) and that *no* is one of its overt manifestations, (9a-c) suggest that whereas *no mucho*s and *todo*s can occupy the Spec of SP (10), *no todos* corresponds to no single constituent:

(9)   [$_{SigmaP}$ [no muchos] S [...]]

This structure also provides an inmediate answer to the other properties we found in *no todos/cualquiera* sequences: (i) *no* takes clausal scope, so it can license NPIs both inside the QP and at the clausal level; (ii) *no* will always precede whatever projection the quantifier is embedded in, such as PPs; and (iii) since *no todos* corresponds to no constituent, the two elements can be separated in coordination.

Preverbal and postverbal sequences of *neg-Strong Q* give rise to the contrasts in (10):

(10)　　a. *Se han ofendido porque   han venido no todos, sino algunos
　　　　　　 cl have offended because have come   not all,   but   some
　　　　　b. Se han ofendido porque   no todos han venido
　　　　　　 cl have ofended because not all   have come

We should compare the (a) cases to the following one, which is grammatical:

(11)　　Dice Pedro que han venido no todos, sino algunos
　　　　　says Pedro that have come not all   but some

Postverbal neg-QP sequences are sensitive to islands, preverbal ones are not. For preverbal cases we propose a syntactic representation where the position after negation hosts (non-contrastive) focus:

(12)　　[$_{NegP}$ no [$_{FocP}$ todos$_i$ F [han venido t$_i$]]]]

Focused quantifiers can move successive cyclically, as in (13) (note that negation here licenses subjunctive, unlike constituent negation of the *no muchos* sort):

(13)　　[No [$_{FP}$ todos$_i$ F [parece [que hayan llegado t$_i$ tarde]]]
　　　　　 Neg   all   seems that have-subj come late

The postverbal cases involve an extra step: remnant movement of the non-focal part to a Topic position, which provides the background for contrastive interpretation. This means that the only way to get postverbal instances of *neg-Qs* in the preceding cases is by extracting the focus first, then moving the remnant. If extraction is barred, then remnant movement does not apply, and no postverbal *neg-Q* sequence is possible (Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria (2005, 2008) for related cases). The facts show that there is no constituent negation with strong quantifiers, but rather that "constituent negation" of strong Qs is a subcase of association with focus (Jackendoff, 1972; Rooth, 1985, 1992, 1997). One obvious issue raised by this analysis is the presence of two negations as in (14):

(14)　　No todos no han llegado a tiempo
　　　　　neg all   neg have come in time "Not everyone did not come in time"

But double negation interacts in an intriguing way with the size of the contrasting *but* phrase. *But* phrases can include an overt complementizer in preverbal position, but must be bare in the postverbal one: (16)　　　a. No algunos, sino (que) todos, llegaron sucios
　　　　　　　　　b. Llegaron sucios no todos, sino (*que) algunos
　　　　　　　　　　 arrived untidy not all, but that some "Not all, but some arrived untidy"

Overt complementizers are impossible with double negation:

(17)　　No todos, sino (*que) algunos no llegaron sucios

This asymmetry suggests the following analysis, assuming the presence of *que* signals that negation takes overt scope over a clause: "constituent negation" results from (i) the association of ordinary sentential negation with a focused strong Q, or (ii) from adjunction of negation to the edge of the strong Q. In this case, the scope of negation is just the QP, and no *que* is expected in the *but* phrase. The presence of two negations means that both strategies, the adjoining one and the sentential one co-occur, with the corollary that in that case, the *but* phrase in "constituent negation" cannot license *que*, since it must necessarily correspond to the narrow adjunction strategy.