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This paper argues that there is a surface structure condition in Spanish which allows only one negative particle no to appear as a constituent of each simplex sentence in surface structure. As a result, the number of grammatical negations has no correlation with the number of S-nodes originally found in deep structure in those trees which have lost S-nodes in the course of their derivation. This hypothesis is supported by structures which have undergone Equi-NP Deletion, by sentences with quantifiers, with adjectives, and with certain adverbs, by certain comparative sentences, and by so-called simple sentences.¹

INTRODUCTION. It has recently been argued that elements which had traditionally been considered as constituents of simple sentences have more complex underlying structures and originate as predicates of higher or lower sentences than the element they modify. At least some adverbs must have their origin in higher sentences than the sentence or VP which they modify in surface structure (Lakoff 1965); quantifiers function as higher predicates as well (Lakoff 1965, Carden 1968, Rivero 1969), and adjectives are dominated by NP > S at some point in their derivation (Ross 1969a). In this paper I will present evidence that, in Spanish, quantifiers, adjectives, and adverbs must be treated as clausal in origin.

When quantifiers, adjectives, and adverbs appear in a surface string whose main verb or some other constituent is preceded by the particle no, they cannot be preceded by an additional no:

(1) a. *No muchos concejales no vinieron 'Not many councilmen didn’t come.'
   b. *Julio no parece no elegante 'Jules did not look inelegant.'
   c. *No siempre no canta 'He doesn’t always not sing.'

With the implicit assumption that to each clause there corresponds one possible negation in the underlying structure of a sentence, the ungrammatical examples in 1 seem to constitute counter-examples to the hypothesis that elements such as muchos, elegante, and siempre have their origin as predicates of sentences.² This paper will show, however, that such restrictions with respect to the number of negations do not constitute counter-evidence to the predicative nature of quantifiers, adverbs, and adjectives. Each generated sentence may optionally be negated up to surface structure, and it is only at this level that the sentences in 1 are marked as deviant. In other words, there is a surface structure constraint

¹ This is a revised and much extended version of a paper read at the 1969 LSA Summer Meeting under the title 'An output condition on double negatives in Spanish', and a revised version of Rivero 1969, ch. 4. I am grateful to Adrienne Lehrer, Donald G. Reiff, and Paul Schachter for their helpful comments.

² There are deep structure constraints on negation, but these will not be discussed in this article. For instance, some verbs do not allow negative complements, e.g. acabar 'to finish', cesar 'to cease', concluir 'to conclude', parar 'to stop'.
which limits the number of grammatical negations under certain conditions. In the following sections I will investigate the nature of this constraint.

1. Equi-NP Deletion. In trying to explain the ungrammaticality of the sentences in 1, we turn first to the study of additional cases where we would expect to find more negations than are actually grammatical in a given string. We will look for some common grounds which could account for the behavior of the relevant examples.

We will first discuss structures which have undergone Equi-NP Deletion. Consider the following sentences:

(2) a. No quiero comer pescado 'I do not want to eat fish.'
   b. Quiero no comer pescado 'I want not to eat fish.'
   c. *No quiero no comer pescado.

(3) a. No espero ir inmediatamente 'I don’t expect to go immediately.'
   b. Espero no ir inmediatamente 'I hope not to go immediately.'
   c. *No espero no ir inmediatamente.

The a–b pairs above are perfectly grammatical; the c sentences, although semantical, are deviant. We must conclude that the ungrammaticality of 2c and 3c is due to the presence of the particle no twice in each string.

If we allow one negation per clause, it is difficult to explain why we cannot have two negatives in 2c and 3c, since there are two sentences in their respective underlying structures (we are overlooking the structure of inmediatamente for the present). PM1 represents the underlying structure of 2c, and PM2 that of 3c.

(4) a. No quiero que el correo no pase por la oficina central 'I don’t want the mail not to go through the main office.'

*We will assume that the element NEG originates in a higher sentence than the clause which it negates. There are sentences in Spanish which indicate, as in English, that NEG cannot be a constituent of the negated clause in its underlying structure: Jorge no se casa a pesar de que la gitana lo habia predicho 'George isn’t getting married even though the gypsy woman had predicted it.'
b. No espero que las cartas no lleguen en el próximo tren 'I don’t expect the letters not to come on the next train.'

Since each underlying structure in 4 includes at least two sentences, there must be some difference in the derivational history of the strings under discussion which prevents 2c and 3c from having two negations in surface structure, but which does not affect the examples in 4.

Let us consider the derivational history of 2 and 3. There is a Spanish rule of Equi-NP Deletion which operates in the following manner. When the subject of an embedded sentence is identical with the subject of the matrix, the subject of the embedded sentence is deleted and its verb is changed to an Infinitive. The rule is optional for a small number of verbs, e.g. creer ‘to believe’; but it is obligatory for most verbs marked for it, e.g. desear ‘to wish’, querer ‘to want’, tratar de ‘to try’, intentar ‘to attempt’:

(5) a. Creo que hablo muy bien el francés 'I think I speak French very well.'
   b. *Creo hablar muy bien el francés

(6) a. *Quiero que yo esté lista a las tres.
   b. Quiero estar lista a las tres 'I want to be ready at three o’clock.'

Equi-NP Deletion has operated in 2 and 3, but not in 4.

When Equi-NP Deletion has not applied, the embedded sentence is preceded by the complementizer que and the verb is never in the Infinitive:

(7) Espero que las elecciones para concejales se efectúen de la manera prevista 'I hope that the election of councilmen will take place as expected.'

Some arguments supporting the assumption that the Infinitive arises by deleting the subject of the embedded sentence have been pointed out by Perlmutter 1968, ch. 4.

In the type of sentences we are discussing, the S-node which dominates the subordinate structure is subject to the S-pruning convention (Ross 1967:44), once Equi-NP Deletion has applied. An argument for this pruning is now presented.

Clitic pronouns in Spanish are moved to a pre-verbal position unless the verb is in the infinitive or in the gerund, in which case they may remain in post-verbal position:

(8) a. Compré un abrigo 'I bought a coat.'
   b. Lo compré 'I bought it.'

(9) a. Voy a comprar un abrigo 'I am going to buy a coat.'
   b. Voy a comprarlo 'I am going to buy it.'
   c. Lo voy a comprar

(10) a. Estoy comprando un abrigo 'I am buying a coat.'
   b. Estoy comprándolo 'I am buying it.'
   c. Lo estoy comprando

The clitics can only be moved to a pre-verbal position in the same clause. They cannot be moved across sentence boundaries:

(11) a. Quiero que estés haciéndomelo 'I want you to be doing it for me.'
   b. Quiero que me lo estés haciendo
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c. *Me lo quiero que estés haciendo.

(12) a. Creo que estoy cosiéndomelo muy bien 'I think that I am sewing
    b. Creo que me lo estoy cosiendo muy bien it very well (for myself).'
    c. *Me lo creo que estoy cosiendo muy bien.

As shown by the ungrammaticality of 11c and 12c, it is not possible to transport
the clitics from the embedded clause into the matrix, across an S-node.

Compare now the examples in 11 and 12 with sentences in which Equi-NP
Deletion has applied:

(13) a. Quiero estar haciéndomelo 'I want to be doing it for myself.'
    b. Quiero estarme haciendo
    c. Me lo quiero estar haciendo

(14) a. Creo estar cosiéndomelo muy bien 'I think that I am sewing
    b. Creo estarme cosiendo muy bien it very well (for myself).'
    c. Me lo creo estar cosiendo muy bien

Both 13c and 14c are grammatical. This implies that the clitics did not have to
cross an S-node to be placed before the matrix verb. Since the only difference
between 11c and 13c, and even more between 12c and 14c, is that 11c and 12c
have not undergone Equi-NP Deletion while 13c and 14c have, it follows that
the S-node of the embedded clause must be pruned once Equi-NP Deletion has
applied. When the rule does not apply to creer, as in 12, no S-nodes are deleted,
and the clitics cannot be moved out of the subordinate clause. In 14, a para-
phrase of 12 with the same underlying structure, the changes implied by Equi-
NP Deletion allow the clitics to move upward, out of the subordinate clause, to
the highest verb in the tree.

Let us now go back to 2c and 3c. Since Equi-NP Deletion reduces the number
of S-nodes in these structures, we could assume that the ungrammaticality of
these examples is due to the fact that, in their derived structure, the number
of negations exceeds the number of S-nodes. The examples share a common feature:
they have two negations with only one remaining S-node, even though the
underlying structure had more than one. The correctness of this assumption is
shown in the following example:

(15) a. No creo que yo no lo haga bien 'I don't think that I don’t do it well.'
    b. *No creo no hacerlo bien.

(15') a. No creo que lo hago bien 'I don't think that I do it well.'
    b. No creo hacerlo bien

(15") a. Creo que no lo hago bien 'I think that I don’t do it well.'
    b. Creo no hacerlo bien

Ex. 15b, although semantically coherent, is deviant, but 15a is not. This dif-
ference in grammaticality must be attributed to the reduction in structure
which the application of Equi-NP Deletion entails, given (a) that this is the
only rule which differentiates 15a from 15b and (b) that the negation can ap-
pear before the main verb, 15'b, or before the infinitive, 15"b.

If the derived structure of examples 16a and 16b is represented as PM3 and
PM4 respectively, we can see that the number of negations which is grammatical
correlates with the number of S-nodes in the tree:

\[(16)\]

a. *Creo que lo hago bien*

b. *Creo hacerlo bien*

'I think that I do it well.'

There are some Infinitives in Spanish which behave differently from those which are the result of Equi-NP Deletion. Consider the following sentences in which the nominalization, as well as the main verb, is negated:

\[(17)\]

a. *No contar tú lo ocurrido no demuestra mucha inteligencia* 'It is not very smart for you not to tell what happened.'

b. *El no hablar el paciente no nos sorprendió* 'That the patient didn't talk did not surprise us.'

\[No contar tú lo ocurrido and el no hablar el paciente in 17 are Factive Nominalizations. A tree which undergoes the set of processes which transform it into a Factive Nominalization never loses the S-node which dominated its underlying structure. A proof is that Factive Nominalizations are subject to the Sentential Subject Constraint (Ross 1967:243): ‘No element dominated by an S may be moved out of that S if that node is dominated by an NP which itself is immediately dominated by S.’ E.g.,

\[(18)\]

decir eso la niña ‘for the girl to say that’

a. *Eso que decir la niña es una impertinencia.

b. *La niña, que decir eso, es una impertinencia.

The derived structure of 17b is thus PM5. The number of negations in 17b correlates within the number of S-nodes in its derived structure.

When the subject of the Factive Nominalization is deleted, the structure does not lose its S-node. This is shown by the fact that a subjectless Factive Nominalization is still affected by the Sentential Subject Constraint:

\[(18')\]

a. *Contar lo ocurrido no demuestra mucha inteligencia* 'It is not very smart to tell what happened.'
b. *Lo ocurrido, que contar no demuestra mucha inteligencia, es sorprendente.

That lo ocurrido cannot be relativized indicates that the nominalization contar lo ocurrido is dominated by an S-node in 18'a.

2. QUANTIFIERS. With the results of the previous section in mind, let us go back to sentences with quantifiers to see if a reduction in structure is responsible for the constraint on the number of negations.

As was pointed out in the introduction to this paper, examples having a no preceding a quantifier and another no in the string are always ungrammatical in Spanish:

(19) a. Muchos aviones no se estrellan 'Many planes do not crash.'
   b. No muchos aviones se estrellan 'Not many planes crash.'
   c. *No muchos aviones no se estrellan.

This seems to constitute a counter-example to the assumption that quantifiers have their origin in higher predicates. If the underlying structure of 19c is roughly as in PM6, the two negations should not make the example ungrammatical, since each one is negating a different clause.

(19) so
     /   \
    NEG S1
   /   \  
  NP   VP
 /\     /
NP S2 muchos
/ \  / \  
aviones NEG S3
   \        /     \
  \ aviones se estrellan

However, let us consider the source of the deviance of 19c. First, quantifiers, like most verbal forms, can appear as predicates of a negated sentence, regardless of the number of negations in the rest of the tree. Although a quantifier cannot be negated if the main verb of the surface string or some other constituent is preceded by no, this does not depend on the underlying structure of the sentence. Consider the following:

(20) Muchos chicos no se preocupan de esos asuntos, pero no muchas chicas; ellas si que se preocupan 'While it is true that many boys do not care about those questions, the same is not true of many girls; they do care.'

To explain this sentence, we need an underlying structure in which both the quantifier and the lower predicate are negated. Ex. 20 shows that it is possible and necessary to have a negation for each of the underlying clauses in a sentence with a quantifier, in the same way that it was possible and necessary to have two underlying negated sentences in structures which had undergone Equi-NP Deletion.
A second argument for generating in the base those structures in which both the quantifier and the lower predicate are negated comes from sentences with the quantifier \textit{pocos} ‘few’. \textit{Pocos} must be analysed as having its origin in \textit{no muchos}, since it behaves semantically like \textit{no muchos}. Consider the following sentences:

(21) a. *\textit{No muchos elefantes murieron, pero muchos murieron} ‘Not many elephants died, but many died.’

b. \textit{Pocos elefantes murieron, pero muchos murieron} ‘Few elephants died, but many died.’

I have starred the above examples because they are contradictory sentences. If we replace \textit{no muchos} by \textit{pocos}, the truth value of the sentence is not altered. This shows that 21a and 21b are paraphrases and can be derived from the same underlying source.

Evidence for the negative element in \textit{pocos} comes from the fact that this quantifier can only be followed by restrictive relative clauses in the subjunctive, while non-negative quantifiers admit both subjunctive and indicative clauses. \textit{Ninguno} ‘none’, the negative quantifier, takes only subjunctive clauses:

(22) a. \textit{Pocos hombres que se consideren honrados lo harían} ‘Few men who consider (subj.) themselves honest would do it.’

b. \textit{*Pocos hombres que se consideran honrados lo harán}.

(22’) a. \textit{Ningún hombre que se considere honrado lo haría} ‘No man who considers (subj.) himself honest would do it.’

b. \textit{*Ningún hombre que se considera honrado lo hará}.

(22”) a. \textit{Muchos hombres que se consideren honrados lo haríen} ‘Many men who consider (subj.) themselves honest would do it.’

b. \textit{Muchos hombres que se consideran honrados lo harian} ‘Many men who consider (ind.) themselves honest would do it.’

Exx. 22”a–b are not paraphrases: In 22”a the speaker does not commit himself about the existence of the men; in 22”b it is assumed that there is a group of men who think that they are honest.

If we consider 23, a perfectly well-formed sentence, it becomes clear that we need an underlying structure where both \textit{muchos} and the lower S are negated:

(23) \textit{Pocos aviones no se estrellan} ‘Few planes do not crash.’

That is exactly the same underlying structure as the one diagramed in PM6, which resulted in the ungrammatical sentence 19c, where the process which incorporates the \textit{neg} into the quantifier did not apply. We will return to the ungrammaticality of 19c in §6 below.

If underlying structures like PM6 are needed, then we have shown that clauses with quantifiers as predicates behave like most clauses: they can be negated in their underlying structure regardless of the number of \textit{neg}‘s in the rest of the tree. And when we consider sentences with several quantifiers, we see that any given quantifier can be negated, as shown by the different ways in which the following can be interpreted:

(24) \textit{Muchos catedráticos no dieron matrículas a todos los alumnos} ‘Many professors did not give summa cum laude to all the students,’
a. pero algunos si las dieron 'but some did.'
   b. sólo a algunos 'only to some.'

If followed by a, 24 receives an interpretation where muchos is negated; if followed by b, it receives an interpretation in which todos is negated. But if we try to get a sentence where both quantifiers are negated, as well as the main verb, or where a single quantifier and the main verb are negated, the sentence is always ungrammatical:

(25) a. *No muchos catedráticos no dieron matrículas a todos los alumnos.
   b. *Muchos catedráticos no dieron matrículas \( \{ a \ no \} \) todos los alumnos.
   c. *No muchos catedráticos dieron matrículas \( \{ a \ no \} \) todos los alumnos.

(26) a. *No muchos catedráticos no dieron matrículas a no todos los alumnos.
   b. *No muchos catedráticos no dieron matrículas a todos los alumnos.
   c. *Muchos catedráticos no no dieron matrículas a todos los alumnos.
   d. *Muchos catedráticos no no dieron matrículas a todos los alumnos.

Although little is known about the derivational history of the quantifiers, motivation to consider them as predicates of higher sentences comes from the fact that they block Neg-transportation when they modify a nominal in the embedded sentence. Neg-transportation moves a \textit{NEG} in an embedded clause to the matrix when the matrix verb is marked for the rule. Spanish verbs which are favorable environments for Neg-transportation are creer 'to believe, to think', desear 'to wish', opinar 'to be of the opinion that', pensar 'to think', querer 'to want', recomendar 'to recommend'. We may state the rule thus:

\textbf{NEGATIVE-TRANSPORTATION}

\[ X \rightarrow [NP \ V \ NP[NEG \ S]_{NP}] \rightarrow Y \]

Condition: If \( X \) is of the form \( Z \ NEG \), the rule is blocked.

In the following pairs, the \( b \) sentences are the result of Neg-transportation, but have the same underlying structure as the \( a \) sentences:

(27) a. Creo que no mencionó palabra del asunto 'I don't think he said a word about the matter.'
   b. No creo que mencionara palabra del asunto 'I don't think he said a word about the matter.'

(28) a. Quiero que no pruebes gota de vino 'I don't want you to touch a drop of wine.'
   b. No quiero que pruebes gota de vino 'I don't want you to touch a drop of wine.'

\[ ^4 \text{Some dialects of Spanish admit both the no + PREP order and the PREP + no order, with the same degree of grammaticality and no semantic implications.} \]

\[ ^5 \text{There are dialects in which a quantifier cannot be preceded by no if it is in post-verbal position. In these dialects, 25b–c and 26a would be ungrammatical on two counts: the position of the no's and their number.} \]

\[ ^6 \text{We are assuming that there is a rule which optionally transports a NEG which negates the quantifier to a pre-verbal position.} \]

\[ ^7 \text{See §6 for the possibility of eliminating this condition in favor of a more general one.} \]

\[ ^8 \text{The idiomatic expressions gota de ... , palabra de ... are grammatical only when they are constituents of a negated clause in deep structure. For motivation of Neg-transportations as a syntactic process in Spanish, see Rivero, ch. 2.} \]
Now consider the following:

(29) a. *No quiero que los niños prueben gota de vino ‘I don’t want the children to touch a drop of wine.’
b. *No creo que los niños entiendan palabra de francés ‘I don’t think the children understand a word of French.’

(30) a. *No quiero que todos los niños prueben gota de vino.
b. *No creo que muchos niños entiendan palabra de francés.

The ungrammaticality in 30 shows that the negation which appears in the matrix could not have been transported from the lowest embedded sentence, that in which gota de vino and palabra de francés are constituents. That the ungrammaticality of these sentences is due to the presence of the quantifiers is seen when we look at 29: there, with the quantifier omitted, the negative can be transported to the matrix.

If Neg-transportation applies when the quantifier is still dominated by an S-node and functions as a verbal form, the ungrammaticality of the examples in 30 is easily explained. Consider 31, with the underlying structure of PM7:

(31) Creo que muchos niños no hablan palabra de ruso ‘I think that many children don’t speak a word of Russian.’

Neg-transportation must apply between two adjacent sentences, but this condition is not met by PM7 if the quantifier is treated as a verbal form which is not a favorable environment for Neg-transportation. Between the clause which is negated and the clause whose verb is marked for the rule, there is an intervening clause with muchos as predicate. If Neg-transportation applies to PM7, the result is an ungrammatical sentence. This argument indicates that, at the moment at which Neg-transportation applies, the quantifier has not lost its S-node.

Note that the presence of a quantifier in an embedded sentence does not block the movement of the clitic pronouns after Equi-NP Deletion has applied:

(32) a. Quise hablarles a muchos niños ‘I wanted to talk (to them) to many children.’
b. Les quise hablar a muchos niños ‘I wanted to talk (to them) to many children.’

(33) a. Quise dárselo a todos mis amigos ‘I wanted to give it (to them) to all my friends.’
b. Se lo quise dar a todos mis amigos ‘I wanted to give it (to them) to all my friends.’
This implies that, at the time when the rule which moves the clitics applies, the quantifier is no longer dominated by an S-node; if it were, the clitics would have to cross a sentence boundary to be collocated in pre-verbal position. This would result in an ungrammatical string, as demonstrated in §1. The grammaticality of 32b and 33b indicates that the clitics did not cross an S-node.

A sentence like 34 comes to acquire the derived structure of PM9 from the underlying structure of PM8:

(34) *Muchos barcos se hundieron ‘Many ships sank.’

Pruning conventions apply to PM9 to give PM10. Considering PM10, we can see that there is a common factor between structures involving quantifiers and structures which have undergone Equi-NP Deletion: they have lost S-nodes in the course of the derivation. The same constraint which explained the deviance of the examples in the first section of this paper accounts for the deviance of 19c, 25, and 26: the number of no’s must not exceed the number of S-nodes in the derived structure of a given sentence. No matter how many quantifiers appear in a sentence, all the corresponding S-nodes have been deleted in the course of the derivation, and therefore the number of negations may not correlate with the number of quantifiers.

As a last point, which should not be considered as an argument in itself, it should be noted that structures which have undergone Equi-NP Deletion and sentences with quantifiers, when both types violate the above constraint, are intuitively very similar in their deviance:

(35) a. *Los mozos no quieren no ir al baile.
    b. *No muchos mozos no van al baile.

These examples are not semantically deviant, since they have unique, natural, and literal interpretations in which the two negations cancel each other out.

3. Adverbs. It appears that at least some Spanish adverbs must be derived from predicates in higher sentences than the VP or S they modify. A first argument for this assumption is basically the same one we used to prove that quantifiers are dominated by an S-node and function as predicates in their underlying structure. Certain adverbs block Neg-transportation when they modify an
embedded clause or one of its constituents. By the traditional analysis for adverbs, this phenomenon is found in structures which meet the structural index of the rule. Consider the following sentences, which are paraphrases:

(36) a. Yo creo que Ernesto probablemente no dijo una palabra de sus estudios
   b. Yo creo que probablemente Ernesto no dijo una palabra de sus estudios

'I think that probably Ernest didn't say a word about his studies.'

Here the location of probablemente is optional; the adverb may appear in pre-subject or post-subject position. Note that it must appear after the complementizer que if it is to be interpreted as modifying the embedded clause. By an analysis in which adverbs are constituents of the same sentence they modify, the examples in 36 would roughly have the underlying structure of PM11. In this P-Marker NEG is presented in its traditional position, but this has no bearing on the point under discussion.

(PM11)

Under the conditions given for Neg-transportation, there is nothing in PM11 to prevent the rule from transporting the NEG to the matrix. This type of analysis predicts that the resulting structures should be grammatical; but such is not the case. Consider the following:

(37) a. *Yo no creo que Ernesto probablemente dijera una palabra de sus estudios.
   b. *Yo no creo que probablemente Ernesto dijera una palabra de sus estudios.

That probablemente is the element responsible for the ungrammaticality of 37 is seen in

(38) Yo no creo que Ernesto dijera una palabra de sus estudios 'I don't think that Ernest said a word about his studies.'

If probablemente is treated as a predicate of a higher sentence than the one it modifies, there is a natural explanation of the blocking of Neg-transportation. If the NEG is transported to the matrix, the resulting string should be ungrammatical. Consider the underlying structure of 36 under this analysis, that is PM12. There is an intervening sentence between the matrix and the negated embedded clause; thus Neg-transportation cannot apply. The ungrammaticality of 37 implies that probablemente must be assigned an underlying structure as in
PM12, and that the more traditional analysis, PM11, must be rejected because it makes the wrong predictions. Further support for this proposal comes from the fact that some adverbs may be followed by the *que* complementizer, in the same way as matrices whose sentential origin is still overt in surface structure:

(39) a. *Indudablemente* que se quiere ir 'Undoubtedly, he wants to go.'
    b. *Posiblemente* que lo decida esta tarde 'Possibly I will decide it this afternoon.'

(40) a. *Es indudable* que se quiere ir 'There is no doubt that he wants to go.'
    b. *Es posible* que lo decida esta tarde 'It is possible that I will decide it this afternoon.'

Still another argument is that, if adverbs are considered as predicates of higher clauses, some sentences whose verb is in the subjunctive can easily be explained. Although the subjunctive does not appear in simple sentences in Spanish, there are some apparent exceptions to this statement (we will overlook negative imperatives):

(41) a. *Quizás* venga José 'Perhaps Joseph will come.'
    b. *Ojalá* me salga bien todo 'I wish everything would turn out all right for me.'

If *quizás* and *ojalá* are considered as predicates of higher sentences, they only have to be specified as taking a subjunctive complementizer. The sentences in 41 are then no different from those in

(42) a. *Es posible* que venga José 'It is possible that Joseph will come.'
    b. *Deseo* que me salga todo bien 'I wish everything would turn out all right for me.'

Supporting this claim is the fact that both *quizás* and *ojalá* may take a *que* complementizer:

(43) a. *Quizás* que venga José.
    b. *Ojalá* que me salga todo bien.

Having motivated the assumption that at least some Spanish adverbs should

*Ojalá* is historically derived from a sentence, the Arabic equivalent of 'May God will it!'
be derived from predicates in higher sentences, we turn our attention to the adverb *siempre* 'always', which must be considered a higher predicate because of the way it behaves with respect to Neg-transportation. In a sentence such as the following, the neg applies to *siempre*, never to the lowest embedded sentence:

(44) *No creo que venga siempre* 'I do not think that he comes always.'

Here it is impossible to obtain a reading in which *venga* is negated. If *siempre* is considered a higher predicate, this is automatically explained. The neg in the underlying structure applies to the adverb *siempre*, and is moved to the matrix by Neg-transportation. In other words, 44 is a paraphrase of the following:

(45) *Creo que no siempre viene.*

*Siempre* is an adverb which can be preceded by the particle *no*, and it is then the only element which is negated in a sentence where that surface order is found:

(46) *No siempre viene* 'He doesn't come always.'

If *siempre* is clausal in origin and can be negated, we should expect to find sentences of the following type perfectly grammatical, but they are not:

(47) *No siempren o viene.

Sentences like this are always deviant, although their semantic content is easily captured in very similar strings:

(48) *No es siempre que no viene* 'It is not always that he does not come.'

Since we find sentences such as 48 which are not ungrammatical and which are paraphrases of 47, it follows that there is no semantic anomaly in 47, and that its ungrammaticality must come from a different source.

Let us assume that the deviance of 47 can be explained in the same way as in §§1-2. The ungrammaticality of 47 would then be due to the fact that, in the
derived structure of the string, there are more no's than S-nodes. Since we have already motivated the existence of an S-node over siempre at the time when Neg-transportation applies, we need only show that this node is lost in the course of the derivation. Consider these examples:

(49) a. Quiero hacerlo siempre I want to always do it.
    b. Lo quiero hacer siempre ‘I want to always do it.’

At the point where the clitics move up to the matrix, after Equi-NP Deletion has applied, siempre has also lost its S-node, and does not block the movement of the pronouns. (The only reading we are considering is that in which siempre modifies hacer.)

Having demonstrated that siempre is dominated by an S-node in its underlying structure and that it loses that node, we conclude this section by remarking that the anomaly of 47 is just one more example of the violation of a constraint which applies widely to Spanish: it is not a peculiarity of adverbs.

4. ADJECTIVES. Ross 1969a proposes an underlying structure like PM13 for sentences with predicate adjectives such as

(50) Julio es educado ‘Jules is polite.’

In PM13, Equi-NP Deletion, which applies obligatorily, deletes the subject of the embedded sentence. Then, by the S-pruning convention, the S1-node and the NP which exhaustively dominates educado should perhaps be deleted as well, giving the derived structure in PM14.

There are many similarities of the type discussed by Ross 1969a and by Lakoff 1965 between Spanish adjectives and verbs, but we will not present them here.

That ser and estar take an abstract NP as their object is motivated by three of the arguments given by Ross, which apply to Spanish as well. First, pro-forms which replace adjectives are morphologically identical to proforms which replace abstract NP’s. Second, in pseudo-cleft sentences, adjectives function as NP’s. Third, the same is true in equative sentences. Note the following examples:

(51) a. María sabía que venías y yo sabía que venías también ‘Mary knew that you were coming and I knew that you were coming too.’
b. *Marta sabía que venías y yo lo sabía también* 'Mary knew that you were coming and I knew it too.'

(52) a. *Marta es ingenua y Lola es ingenua también* 'Mary is naïve and Lola is naïve too.'

b. *Marta es ingenua y Lola lo es también* 'Mary is naïve and Lola is (it) too.'

(53) a. *Lo que encontré fue tu libro de física* 'What I found was your physics book.'

b. *Lo que tu hermana parece es idiota* 'What your sister looks is stupid.'

(54) a. *Encontré algo que no esperaba: tu libro de física* 'I found something which I didn't expect: your physics book.'

b. *Tu hermana parece algo que tú no pareces: idiota* 'Your sister seems to be something which you do not: stupid.'

To motivate the treatment of *ser* and *estar* as true verbs is quite a complex problem and beyond the scope of this paper.12 We would simply like to indicate that, as Ross 1969b has pointed out, the rule of Gapping functions in the same way for true verbs as for *ser* and *estar*:

(55) a. *Tengo cinco libros y Elena tiene seis cuadernos* 'I have five books and Ellen has six notebooks.'

b. *Tengo cinco libros y Elena seis cuadernos* 'I have six books and Ellen six notebooks.'

(56) a. *Soy estudiante y mi padre es mecánico* 'I am a student and my father is a mechanic.'

b. *Soy estudiante y mi padre mecánico* 'I am a student and my father a mechanic.'

(57) a. *Estoy enfermo y tú estás demasiado débil* 'I am sick and you are too weak.'

b. *Estoy enfermo y tú demasiado débil* 'I am sick and you too weak.'

Also, the *S* {estar/ser} O order of Spanish copular sentences correlates with the SVO order which is basic to Spanish. Finally, the fact that *estar* precedes the gerund in the *estar* + -ndo construction can be explained as an instance of a verb's preceding its object. This is motivated by the fact that the gerund may be replaced by the same pro-form as an abstract NP:

(58) *¿Está cantando? Lo está* 'Is he singing? He is (it).'

Now that we have shown that several of the arguments presented by Ross apply readily to Spanish, we return to the discussion of the constraint on the number of negations.

If the origin of the adjectives is clausal, we should expect to find strings of the following type:

(59) *Julio no es no educado.*

Strings with a negation in both matrix and embedded sentence are always deviant. That both *ser* and the adjective may be negated independently of each other is shown by the two ways in which the following can be disambiguated:

(60) *Julio no es educado* 'Jules is not polite,'

12 See Rivero, ch. 4, for a discussion of this problem.
a. pero lo parece a primera vista ‘but he seems so at first sight.’
b. es muy bruto ‘he is very rough.’

In the reading which a disambiguates, it is ser which is negated; in b, it is the adjective which is negated.

Equi-NP Deletion applies to PM13 to reduce the tree to its surface form. The application of this rule provides the explanation of the ungrammaticality of 59. As demonstrated in §1, Equi-NP Deletion implies the pruning of the S-node which dominates the embedded clause. Ex. 59 has more no’s in its derived structure than S-nodes; it can be marked as deviant by the same constraint which applies to structures which have undergone Equi-NP Deletion, to sentences with quantifiers, and to those with adverbs. The ungrammaticality of 59 is not, then, a counter-example to the assumption that adjectives originate in lower clauses.

5. COMPARATIVES. Another example of a structure which involves restrictions on the number of grammatical negations is the comparative construction in some of its manifestations. Although no analysis is proposed here for this construction in Spanish, I will try to show that, in the course of their derivation, some of the structures which are classified as comparative sentences are subject to the same type of constraint as the four constructions we have already discussed.

It is plausible to assume that some comparative constructions should be derived from an underlying structure with at least two sentences. A sentence like the following should be derived from a P-Marker like PM15:

(61) Tu amigo está más tonto que el año pasado ‘Your friend is sillier than last year.’

There are two facts which indicate that the embedded sentence in this type of comparative construction is negative. First, the negative particle no may optionally appear in the second term of the comparison:

(62) Mi hermana era más rubia de niña que (no) ahora ‘My sister was blonder as a child than now.’

(63) Alicia come más que (no) ayer ‘Alice is eating more than yesterday.’
The sentences with and without no are paraphrases. To account for the presence of no, we need to posit a second sentence with a negation.

Second, negative lexical items such as nada, nadie, nunca etc. appear in the second term of the comparison, with no traces of a negation in the first term:

13 A recent paper by Campbell & Wales (1969) questions the assumption that all comparative sentences derive from two base strings. The sentences which are basic to our argument, namely those which compare two degrees of a property, are not discussed there; but because of semantic considerations of the kind mentioned by Campbell & Wales, it seems that the assumption that they are derived from two underlying strings can be maintained.
a. Mi padre duerme más que nadie ‘My father sleeps more than anybody else.’
b. Estás más elegante que nunca ‘You are more elegant than ever.’

The first term or sentence of the comparison can, naturally, be negated:

a. Mi hermana no era más rubia de niña que ahora ‘My sister wasn’t blonder as a child than now.’
b. Alicia no come más que ayer ‘Alice isn’t eating more than yesterday.’

It seems highly probable that, at a certain stage of the derivation of these comparative sentences, the S-node which dominated the second term of the comparison was pruned. Elements such as que ahora, que ayer, and que el año pasado in the above examples will not be dominated by an S-node in their derived structure. But we lack motivation for such a pruning, as well as for many aspects of our analysis at the present moment; so the conclusions of this section can only be considered tentative.

Although the presence of a no in the second term of the comparison in 62 and 63 is always optional and does not change the interpretation of the sentence in any way, if the first term or first sentence of the comparison is negated, then the appearance of a no in the second term makes the string deviant:

a. Mi amigo se encuentra mejor ahora que esta mañana ‘My friend feels better now than this morning.’
b. Mi amigo se encuentra mejor ahora que no esta mañana.

(66) a. Mi amigo no se encuentra mejor ahora que esta mañana ‘My friend doesn’t feel better now than this morning.’
b. *Mi amigo no se encuentra mejor ahora que no esta mañana.

Assuming that the type of comparative construction we are discussing has only one remaining S-node in its derived structure, it is easy to explain the ungrammaticality of 67b. It violates the constraint that there should be no more no’s in a derived tree than there are S-nodes. Sentence 67a, a paraphrase of 67b which shares its underlying structure, does not violate the constraint and is therefore grammatical.

6. LEVEL OF THE CONSTRAINT. We have discussed five different structures which involve the deletion of some S-node in their derivational history, and have shown that the same constraint is able to explain the deviance of sentences with more no’s than S-nodes. Although at this point the constraint on the number of negations is clearly connected with the S-pruning convention, we have not discussed what type of condition it is, and have not tried to find out which level of the grammar of Spanish should contain it. This section will deal with that question.

A priori, a condition could be stated at three different points of a grammar: (a) It could be a deep structure constraint before any transformation has applied. (b) It could be a transformational constraint to be included in the transformational component, either as a condition to be attached to certain specific transformations, or as a condition independent of any given transformation but stated
in the transformational component as a meta-constraint. (e) Finally, it could be a surface structure constraint outside the transformational component, possibly applying after all transformations have applied. Let us discuss these three possibilities in connection with the constraint on the number of negations.

6.1. It should be obvious at this point that the constraint on the number of negations cannot be a deep structure constraint. To begin with, those structures which undergo only optional Equi-NP Deletion are ungrammatical with two no's when they have undergone the rule, but perfectly grammatical if the rule has not applied:

(68) a. No creo que (yo) no lo haya hecho bien, este último examen 'I don't think I didn't do it well, this last exam.'
    b. *No creo no haberlo hecho bien, este último examen.

Since these two sentences have the same underlying structure, and 68a is grammatical, there can be no constraint in deep structure which prevents 68b from being generated.

Furthermore, the transformational component needs to refer also to those strings which undergo Equi-NP Deletion obligatorily:

(69) a. Mi marido no quiere que (yo) no coma ni yo tampoco, así que no sigo ningún régimen 'My husband doesn't want me not to eat and I don't either, so I am not on a diet.'
    b. Mi marido no quiere que (yo) no coma y yo no quiero tampoco, así que no sigo ningún régimen 'My husband doesn't want me not to eat and I do not want to either, so I am not on a diet.'
    c. *Mi marido no quiere que (yo) no coma y yo no quiero no comer tampoco, así que no sigo ningún régimen.

Ex. 69c, with no deletions in the string *yo no quiero no comer tampoco, is deviant; but it is clear that the underlying structure must be generated by the base, so that the deletions which account for 69a-b can be performed.

A second reason why the constraint cannot be in the deep structure is found in sentences with quantifiers:

(70) a. Muchas estudiantes no están politizadas, pero no muchos estudiantes; ellos sí que lo están 'Many women students are not politicized, but this is not true of many male students; they ARE (it).'</n
    b. *Muchas estudiantes no están politizadas, pero no muchos estudiantes no están politizados; ellos sí que lo están.

Ex. 70a is a perfectly well-formed sentence in which no están politizados has been deleted under identity conditions with a previous string. When we try to have a surface structure with no deletions, we get a deviant sentence, 70b. To explain 70a, we need a deep structure in which both the quantifier sentence and the lower sentence are negated. Although such an underlying structure is ungrammatical, the deletions which it will undergo convert it into a perfectly grammatical sentence.

If pocos is to be considered as derived from neg + muchos, the base must generate structures in which both the quantifier sentence and the lower sentence
are negated, to account for perfectly grammatical surface structures of the following type:

(71) *Pocos marineros no te contardn esa historia 'Few sailors will not tell you that story.'

Third, further evidence that the constraint cannot be in deep structure comes from the fact that pseudo-cleft sentences allow two negations, while their non-cleft counterparts allow only one. It was a cleft-type construction which permitted the semantic content of deviant strings like 72a to be captured by a grammatical construction 72b:

(72) a. *No siempre no nos comemos el tocino.
   b. No es siempre que no nos comemos el tocino 'It is not always that we do not eat the bacon.'

Although no analysis of the Spanish pseudo-cleft construction is proposed here, it is to be expected that the most valuable analysis should capture the relationship between non-cleft and cleft sentences. Suppose we try to establish a relationship between the pair of sentences in 72. It is quite clear that we must allow two negations in 72a; otherwise there is no way to relate the two sentences. In other words, if there were a deep structure constraint which prevented 72a from being generated, many cleft constructions would lack non-cleft counterparts. Ex. 72a violates the constraint which has been the topic of this paper: it has two negations and only one remaining S-node. But the underlying structure of 72a is needed if we are to maintain the assumption that each pseudo-cleft sentence has a non-cleft counterpart.

Finally we may note that all the sentences which violate the condition have in common the fact that they are not semantically deviant—which implies that their anomaly must be attributed to their syntax.

To pretend that our constraint should be stated as a deep structure constraint would imply that we would have to foresee all the processes which are going to result in deletions of S-nodes, and constrain those structures accordingly which have to undergo those processes. Since some of the processes which those sentences undergo are optional (e.g. Equi-NP Deletion with creer), we would have to prevent some transformations from applying to strings which we could not possibly constrain. Still we would find ourselves without input to those deletion transformations which make grammatical strings out of deviant ones—clearly an impossible situation.

6.2. We will discuss now the possibility of locating our constraint in the transformational component. Here it could be stated as a requisite attached to a number of specific transformations, indicating that they should be blocked when certain conditions are met. The constraint could also be stated as a meta-condition, independent of any particular transformation.

The fact that the constraint on the negations depends on the effect of the S-pruning convention would seem to indicate that it must be an independent condition, i.e. one which is not attached to a specific transformation. Furthermore, if

11 The S-pruning convention must operate in the transformational component in Spanish, as is seen when we consider that an S-node must be pruned before the clitics can be moved
it were to be considered a condition on a given transformation, the common factor of the different cases we have discussed would be purely coincidental. To insure that the number of no's do not exceed the number of S's, we would have to place independent constraints on Equi-NP Deletion, Quantifier Reduction, Adverb Reduction, and some of the transformations involved in the comparative construction.

Whichever possibility is chosen, we can reject it by showing that the specific transformations which are involved in our discussion cannot be constrained; hence it is irrelevant if the constraint is better captured by a meta-condition or by a very specific condition attached to a particular transformation.

That Equi-NP Deletion cannot be blocked is easily seen when we consider that structures which undergo both Equi-NP Deletion and certain deletion transformations are perfectly grammatical, once these two kinds of processes have altered their form. The deletions have the effect of transforming an ungrammatical sentence into a grammatical one. The examples in 69 show that very clearly. If Equi-NP Deletion is blocked when there are two negations in the tree, then 69c, a perfectly well-formed sentence, cannot be explained. Furthermore, the deletion transformations which apply to 69c are all optional, as seen in the following example which does not violate the constraint:

(73) Mi marido no quiere que (yo) coma y yo no quiero comer tampoco, así que sigo un régimen severo 'My husband doesn't want me to eat and I don't want to eat either, so I am on a strict diet.'

Thus 69c could pass through the transformational component undetected, and be found as a surface structure with the same status as 73. In other words, the constraint cannot be transformational because the relevant obligatory transformations cannot be blocked; the deletion transformations which make the strings grammatical are optional.

The same problem arises when we deal with quantifiers. Structures in which both the quantifier sentence and the lower sentence are negated become grammatical if they undergo certain deletions—or, in the case of muchos, if NEG is incorporated into the quantifier. If the transformations involved in the reduction of the quantifiers could be blocked, we could not possibly explain 70a. With pronominalization processes the same is true. Consider the following example, which involves a kind of VP-pronominalization:

(74) a. Muchos delegados de curso no asistieron a la asamblea, pero no muchos estudiantes hicieron lo mismo; estos sí que asistieron 'Many student representatives did not attend the meeting, but not many students did the same; these last did attend the meeting.'

b. *Muchos delegados de curso no asistieron a la asamblea, pero no muchos estudiantes no asistieron a la asamblea; estos sí que asistieron.

In 74a, hicieron lo mismo has as its antecedent no asistieron a la asamblea, a clear

out of their original clause in a process which is cyclic:

a. Pienso poder dártelo a ti
b. Pienso poder dar a ti 'I think I will be able to give it to you.'
c. Te lo pienso poder dar a ti
proof that there is nothing semantically deviant in 74b; but if we try to insert the nonpronominalized string, the result is a deviant sentence. The pronominalization which is involved in 74a is optional, as shown by

(75) a. Muchos delegados de curso asistieron a la asamblea, pero no muchos estudiantes hicieron lo mismo 'Many student representatives attended the meeting, but not many students did the same.'
b. Muchos delegados de curso asistieron a la asamblea, pero no muchos estudiantes asistieron a la asamblea 'Many student representatives attended the meeting, but not many students attended the meeting.'

It is easy to construct sentences to show that the processes which reduce the structure of adverbs cannot be blocked since, if certain deletions occur, the resulting structure will be grammatical. E.g.,

(76) a. María no miente en general, pero hay que decir que no siempre lo hace, el no mentir 'Generally, Mary doesn't lie, but it must be said that she doesn't do it always, not to lie.'
b. *María no miente en general, pero hay que decir que no siempre no miente.

Since no obligatory transformation can be blocked, and there are no optional transformations which can be stopped, we could turn to a third possibility: to make obligatory those optional transformations which make ungrammatical strings into grammatical ones. If all deletion transformations and the various types of VP-pronominalization were made obligatory, strings such as 69c, 70b, 74b, and 76b could never be found in surface structure; or, if they were found, the fact that they had not undergone an obligatory transformation would mark them as deviant. But this last solution, to make some optional transformations obligatory, is not viable either. Let us see why. VP-pronominalization is an early rule in Spanish, one which must precede Neg-transportation. Consider the following sentence:

(76') Juan no cree que María estudie y además cree que Pedro hace lo mismo 'John thinks that Mary doesn't study and he also thinks that the same is true of Peter.'

This can be paraphrased by 76"a, but never by 76"b:

(76") a. Juan no cree que María estudie y además cree que Pedro no estudia 'John thinks that Mary doesn't study and he also thinks that Peter doesn't study.'
b. Juan no cree que María estudie y además cree que Pedro estudia 'John thinks that Mary doesn't study and he also thinks that Peter studies.'

If we allow VP-pronominalization to apply to the underlying structure of 76' before Neg-transportation has applied to the first conjunct, we have explained why 76' and 76"a are paraphrases. VP-pronominalization applies to a subordinate structure which is negative, and it is only afterwards that the negative of the first conjunct is transported to its derived position in the matrix sentence.

The rules which reduce the structure of the adverb and that of the quantifier
cannot apply before Neg-transportation. If Quantifier Reduction and Adverb Reduction had already operated when Neg-transportation is applied, the quantifier and the adverb would have already lost their S-nodes, and they could not block the rule under the conditions discussed in §§2–3. It follows that VP-pronominalization is an earlier rule than Quantifier Reduction and Adverb Reduction.

If we tried to make VP-pronominalization obligatory in 74a, this would imply that, at the moment in which it operated, we could foresee the reduction in structure which later transformations and the pruning convention entail—and this is not possible. This is the type of argument used by Perlmutter 1969 to prove that the order of clitics in Spanish must be constrained by a surface structure constraint.

Another optional transformation which could be made obligatory is the incorporation of NEG into muchos, to give pocos. But this could explain only the deviance of strings of the form *no muchos no ..., not those with quantifiers which fail to undergo rules incorporating negative elements into them (e.g. bastantes, suficientes ‘enough’). All the other cases discussed in this paper would need to be explained independently of this specific transformation.

6.3. If the constraint on the number of no’s is not in deep structure, and is not transformational, then it must be a surface structure constraint, a condition which applies after the transformations and which affects the surface form of the string.

Consider 74 again. After all obligatory transformations have applied to the underlying structure of this example, VP-pronominalization may or may not have taken place. If it has, then our constraint at the level of surface structure, where all the necessary prunings and reductions of structure have already occurred, checks the number of no’s against the number of S-node; since the constraint is not violated, the sentence is not marked as deviant. If pronominalization has not applied, then our constraint will mark the sentence as deviant, because the number of negations exceeds the number of S-nodes.

An argument in favor of applying the constraint to surface structure is the fact that this condition does not deal with the number of NEG elements in deep structure or in the derived structure, nor with the number of constituents which have in some way acquired the feature [+NEG], but rather with the specific lexical item no. As we have already indicated, strings of the form of Pocos no vinieron ‘Few didn’t come’ have two NEG’s in deep structure; but they do not violate the constraint. Sentences of the type of No vino nadie nunca ‘No one ever came’, although having only one NEG in deep structure, have several negative lexical items in surface structure; but the constraint is not relevant to them. Strings such as No bebe vino, ni cerveza, ni licores ‘He doesn’t drink wine, beer, or liqueur’, in which there are several ni’s under one common S-node, are not affected by the constraint. It is only when the specific item no is involved that the constraint becomes relevant.

All the cases we have been discussing indicate that A STRING IS UNGRAMMATICAL IF THE NUMBER OF no PARTICLES EXCEEDS THE NUMBER OF S-NODES IN ITS SURFACE STRUCTURE. But if we were to state the constraint in this way, the following
sentences and many others would not be ruled out as ungrammatical:

(77) a. *Me dijeron que no muchos invitados no vinieron.
    b. *Olvidé que no siempre no lo repitié.

To avoid this problem, the condition must be stated in a somewhat different way, reflecting the fact that it is one given S-node which cannot have more than one no assigned to it in surface structure: **IN SURFACE STRUCTURE EACH S-NODE CAN HAVE ONLY ONE no PARTICLE AS CONSTITUENT.** The above condition automatically predicts that those strings in which the number of no's exceeds the number of S's will be ungrammatical.

If we incorporate this surface structure constraint into the grammar of Spanish, some conditions on specific transformations can easily be removed. For example, consider Neg-transportation as stated in §2. It has been traditionally said that this rule is blocked if the matrix is negated. This would prevent sentences of the following type from being generated:

(78) *No no creo que venga.

But since a surface structure constraint indicates that 78 is deviant, we can let Neg-transportation apply freely and generate 78. In this way, what looked like a very specific condition of a specific transformation can be eliminated in favor of a general condition which explains a wide-spread phenomenon in Spanish.

The surface structure constraint on the number of no's also explains the ungrammaticality of other types of sentences which we have not yet specifically discussed. E.g., there is an optional rule which attaches a **NEG** to y 'and' when that y precedes the **NEG**, yielding ni ‘nor’.

(79) a. Yo no canto y María no canta
    b. Yo no canto, ni María canta

(80) a. Yo no tengo frio, y no tengo calor
    b. Yo no tengo frio, ni tengo calor

But consider what happens in the following sentences:

(81) a. *Yo no canto, y María no.
    b. Yo no canto, ni María ‘I do not sing, nor (does) Mary.’

(82) a. *Yo no tengo frío y no calor.
    b. Yo no tengo frío ni calor ‘I am not cold and I am not hot.’

In 81a and 82a, the surface structure constraint we have been discussing is violated as a consequence of the reduction of structure which has occurred. Although 81b and 82b have undergone the same type of reduction, they do not violate the constraint, which applies only to no, not to any other form of negation. To prevent 81a and 82a from being generated, we would have to apply the deletion transformation first, and then make Neg-incorporation into y obligatory if the deletion transformation has applied, optional if it has not. Without getting involved with the ordering of the rules, it should be evident that the surface structure constraint we have stated, which is independently needed in the grammar of Spanish, can do the same job.

**NEG** can also be incorporated into the preposition con ‘with’ in an optional process. The following are paraphrases:
Now consider the following sentences:

(84) a. *No lo hizo sin interés. 'He didn’t do it without interest.'
   b. *No lo hizo no con interés.

Ex. 84a does not violate the surface structure constraint, but 84b does. To avoid the generation of 84b, we would have to make the incorporation of neg into con obligatory just in those cases in which there is going to be a no in the surface structure of the string, overlooking those NEG’s which will not be spelled as no:

(85) No lo hizo sin negarlo 'He didn’t do it without denying it.'

(86) a. No lo hizo sin pocas fuerzas 'He didn’t do it without little strength.'
   b. *No lo hizo no con no muchas fuerzas.

Our constraint captures these facts easily, and with much more generality.

7. ‘SIMPLE SENTENCES’. In discussing the general principle restricting the number of no’s in certain structures, we have dealt only with complex sentences, those involving more than one S-node in deep structure. Let us now turn to what might be considered a simple sentence, with only one S-node in its underlying structure, and see how our constraint affects that type of structure.

If the constraint on the number of no’s predicts that any sentence with more no’s than S-nodes should be deviant, then what has been traditionally considered a simple sentence should be ungrammatical if assigned more than one no. This is indeed the case:

(87) a. *No María no viene.15
   b. *María no no viene.

The theoretical implications of the principle, as applied in 87, are of a different nature than those we draw from the cases discussed in the previous sections. With the underlying structure which has here been assumed for negation, it is clear that we can no longer consider an example like the following as a simple sentence (disregarding in the present discussion the structure of nouns):

(88) Mario no reacciona 'Mario is not reacting.'

In the underlying structure of 88 there are at least two S-nodes. When we ask if the same constraint which explained the ungrammaticality of sentences involving Equi-NP Deletion, Quantifier Reduction, etc., could explain the ungrammaticality of 87, we are not focusing on the difference SIMPLE vs. COMPLEX, because any negated sentence implies a complex sentence in deep structure. If our constraint rules out 87 in the same way as it rules out all the other cases we have studied, it means that the impossibility of having doubly negated simple sentences in surface structure has nothing to do with the deep structural properties of negation, nor with its transformational properties. If 87 is marked deviant by a surface structure constraint, the underlying structure presented in

15 Ex. 87a should not be confused with No, María no viene ‘No, Mary isn’t coming’, an answer to a yes-or-no question. This type of sentence, because of its intonation and the heavy pause after the first no, should be considered as formed by two independent strings which do not blend in surface structure.
PM16 must be generated by the base and must pass through the transformational component. This automatically implies that negation can be self-embedding in Spanish.\textsuperscript{16}

In those languages in which there is a constraint preventing doubly negated simple sentences from being grammatical, the assumption has been that the constraint was deep-structural: negation could not be self-embedding, and the structure presented in PM16 could not be generated by the base. If it were held that negation is not self-embedding because the condition which prevents doubly negated sentences is to be stated as a deep structure constraint, we would be dealing with two totally unrelated phenomena: a surface structure constraint independently needed for other cases, and a deep structure constraint affecting only the element \textit{NEG}.

We will now see that Spanish has no deep structure constraint which prevents \textit{NEG} from being self-embedding. The constraint which marks 87 as deviant is the same surface structure constraint which prevents more than one \textit{no} from being immediately dominated by the same S-node in surface structure (that is, with no intervening S-nodes). Note the following examples:

(89) a. \textit{Ernesto no llora, pero no Carmen; ella si que llora} ‘Ernest doesn’t cry, but the same is not true of Carmen; she does cry.’

b. *\textit{Ernesto no llora, pero no Carmen no llora}.

(90) a. \textit{El mayor no se aburre, pero no el pequeno; este si que se aburre} ‘The older one is not bored, but the same is not true of the younger one; he is bored.’

b. *\textit{El mayor no se aburre, pero no el pequeno no se aburre}.

The condition which marks 89b and 90b as deviant is not transformational, since the only obligatory transformation which could be blocked would concern the reduction in structure which \textit{NEG} undergoes, and we would be left with no explanation for the perfectly well-formed 89a and 90a. The deletions in 89a and 90a are optional, and all VP-pronominalizations are optional as well:

(91) a. \textit{Yo no me fui, pero Ignacio no hizo lo mismo} ‘I didn’t go, but Ignatius didn’t do the same.’

b. *\textit{Yo no me fui, pero Ignacio no no se fue}.

\textsuperscript{16} Even if an analysis in which \textit{NEG} is a higher predicate is rejected, sentences of the type of 89a and 90a need an explanation, so the constraint is needed independently of the analysis given to \textit{neg}. Nor is the constraint dependent on the analysis we have presented for the quantifiers and for some adverbs, since sentences of the type of 20 and of the type of 76a need to be explained, regardless of how quantifiers and adverbs are treated.
Since the type of constraint which applies to sentences with a deep structure in which the neg's are self-embedded cannot be deep-structural or transformational, we must be dealing with a surface structure constraint. It is clear that the surface structure constraint which we stated at the end of §6 can explain the ungrammaticality of 89b, 90b, and 91b. We must conclude that only that constraint is needed in the grammar of Spanish. This is not surprising, since surface structure simple sentences which are doubly negated have undergone a process of reduction which is very similar in one respect to all the other cases: the S-node which dominated the neg element has been lost. From an underlying structure as in PM16, ex. 87a comes to have a derived structure like PM17, which violates the surface structure constraint on the number of no's.

(PM17) So

8. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS. This paper has demonstrated that a surface structure constraint exists in the grammar of Spanish which states that each S-node can dominate only one particle no. This implies that the number of no's can never exceed the number of S-nodes in surface structure. It is this constraint which explains the ungrammaticality of many sentences which have undergone processes of reduction, and in which we find that the number of no's cannot be correlated with the number of basic nodes.

Although the constraint on the number of no's has been studied in isolation, the possibility remains open that this condition may be a part of a much more general constraint, perhaps a meta-constraint, not necessarily connected with negation. In studies of the ordering of clitics, Perlmutter (1968, 1969) postulates an output condition for clitics which predicts that certain clitics are incompatible when they appear in the same sentence, regardless of their relative ordering. There are some cases in which the particle no might be considered a clitic, but it is much freer in its positional variations than the clitics. Still, the two phenomena could easily be related, in that our condition states that two or more no's are incompatible in the same sentence regardless of their relative positions. The similarity between the two constraints might be due to their sharing some aspects of a more general constraint on the incompatibility of certain elements in surface structure: there can be only one element of the type x in the surface structure of a given sentence. If this were the case, a condition of greater generality would replace the surface structure constraint in §6.
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