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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]]
   “Few did not come to the party”
   b. [[no pocos] han venido a la fiesta]
   “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 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
   “Not all have come
   b. Han venido no todos *(sino solo algunos)
   “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
   “To not many like the wine
   b. *A no todos/cualquiera le(s) gusta el vino
   “To not all/anyone like the wine
   c. No a todos/cualquiera le(s) gusta el vino
   “Not all/anyone like the wine

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

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

(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]
   “Has eaten where not many/few
   b. Ha comido donde todos [IP]
   “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 muchos and todos can occupy the Spec of SP (10), no todos corresponds to no single constituent:

(9) [SigmaP [no muchos] S […]]
This structure also provides an immediate 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 offended 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)  

\[[Neg P no [FocP todos, F [ han venido t]]]]

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 [F todos, F [ parece [que hayan llegado t, tarde]]]]

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  
"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  
arrived untidy not all, but that some “Not all, but some arrived untidy”

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.