



**HAL**  
open science

## Mood in Spanish

Brenda Laca

► **To cite this version:**

Brenda Laca. Mood in Spanish. B. Rothstein / R. Thieroff. Mood in the languages of Europe, John Benjamins, pp.198-220, 2010, Studies in Language Companion Series. halshs-00175675

**HAL Id: halshs-00175675**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00175675>**

Submitted on 29 Sep 2007

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## Mood in Spanish

### 1. Introduction

This paper is mainly concerned with the uses of the subjunctive in Modern Spanish (section 3).<sup>1</sup> Section 2 gives a brief sketch of those aspects of the temporal-aspectual system of Spanish that constitute a necessary background for the interpretation of subjunctive forms. Section 4 briefly describes the conditional, which exhibits very close links to some subjunctive forms. The imperative mood is discussed in the subsection devoted to the subjunctive in root contexts (3.3.4).

### 2. The temporal-aspectual system of Spanish

The neo-Reichenbachian system proposed by Demirdache & Uribe-Etxeberria (2007) proves particularly useful for representing the tense-aspect system of Spanish. In this system, tense is modelled as a relation between the time of evaluation (Ast-T, a direct descendant of the Reichenbachian R understood as an interval) and a highest anchor, which is normally the time of speech (Utt-T) in matrix contexts. Possible relations are anteriority (anchor after anchored), inclusion or coincidence, and posteriority (anchor before anchored). These relations are replicated for aspect, which expresses a relation between the time of the event (Ev-T) and Ast-T. The analysis I propose for Spanish is summarized in Table 1. Tenses are illustrated with the 1<sup>st</sup> Pers. Sing. of the verb *cantar* ‘sing’, aspects with aspectualized infinitival forms.

	AFTER	WITHIN	BEFORE
Tense	<i>canté</i> (PRETERITE) Utt-T >Ast-T + Ast-T $\supseteq$ EvT <i>cantaba</i> (IMPERFECT) Utt-T >Ast-T, ASP $\emptyset$	<i>canto</i> (PRESENT) Utt-T $\subseteq$ Ast-T, ASP $\emptyset$ <i>cantaba</i> (IMPERFECT) Tx $\subseteq$ Ast-T, ASP $\emptyset$	<i>cantaré</i> (FUTURE) Utt-T < Ast-T, ASP $\emptyset$ <i>cantaría</i> (CONDITIONAL) Tx < Ast-T, ASP $\emptyset$
Aspect	<i>haber cantado</i> (have+ V_PP) (PERFECT) Ast-T >Ev-T <i>acabar de cantar</i> (end + of + V_Inf.) (IMMED. ANTERIORITY) Ast-T >Ev-T	<i>estar cantando</i> (LOC-be + V_Ger.) (PROGRESSIVE) Ast-T $\subset$ Ev-T	<i>ir a cantar</i> (go + to + V_Inf.) (PROSPECTIVE) Ast-T < Ev-T

**Table 1 : Tense and grammatical aspect in Spanish**

I assume that aspect is not expressed by simple tenses in Spanish, with the notable exception of the preterite, which is a perfective tense requiring that Ast-T includes Ev-T (Laca 2005). All other simple forms leave the relation between Ast-T and Ev-T unspecified and are in this sense “aspectually neutral” (Smith 1991, Rossdeutscher, Reyle & Kamp 2005, Schaden 2007: Chap.3). “Aspectually neutral” forms are not totally unconstrained, but whatever preferences they exhibit result (a) from polarisation effects due to the existence of an aspectually marked competing form –thus, an imperfect will strongly prefer imperfective interpretations in the contexts in which it contrasts with the preterite, a simple future will prefer perfective interpretations by contrast with a progressive future (Laca 2005); (b) from

the temporal structure of the eventuality description, according to a very general pattern which essentially excludes imperfective interpretations of bona-fide telic descriptions (Demirdache & Uribe-Etxebarria 2007).

Deictic and anaphoric (or zero) tenses are distinguished by supposing that the latter do not have Utt-T, but an interval not identical with Utt-T, dubbed here Tx, as anchor. The notion of anaphoric tense used here is very restrictive, in that this anchor can only be provided by an embedding predicate of propositional attitude: in the sense used here, an anaphoric tense can only appear in reported speech or reported thought contexts. The introduction of Tx in the system<sup>2</sup> is designed to provide a unified interpretation of forms exhibiting imperfect morphology (the imperfect itself, as well as the pluperfect and the conditional) and to solve the well known problem posed by perfect conditional forms (*habría cantado* ‘would have sung’) without assuming a third layer of temporal relations next to Tense and Aspect. It can also prove useful in accounting for the fact that such forms consistently develop counterfactual uses. The splitting of the imperfect into two uses, a bona fide past tense and an anaphoric “present of the past”, is justified by the behavior of the imperfect with modal verbs –a point that cannot be developed here.

Aspect is explicitly expressed in Spanish by a set of periphrastic combinations exhibiting a characteristic behavior (Laca 2005). Periphrastic combinations formed with *haber* + PP are uniformly treated as compound or perfect tenses (perfect, pluperfect, future and conditional perfect) in the Spanish grammatical tradition, and carry the main bulk of the expression of secondary anteriority relations. The Spanish progressive shows a very similar distribution to that of the English progressive, and the prospective closely parallels the English *be-going-to*-construction.

### 3. The subjunctive

#### 3.1. Subjunctive morphology

In Modern Spanish, the subjunctive exhibits two simple forms, the present and the imperfect, as well as two compound forms, the perfect and the pluperfect. The present is built on the present stem of the verb by a change of the thematic vowel, *a* > *e* for verbs of the first conjugation class and *e/i* > *a* for verbs of the second and third classes. To the exception of a handful of irregular cases, the stem normally appears in the form it takes in the 1<sup>st</sup> pers. sing. present indicative. The imperfect is built on the preterite/perfect stem (the one of preterite indicative), and exhibits the peculiarity of having two distinct markers, *-ra-* and *-se-*, which are traditionally held to be in allomorphic variation. Person marking corresponds to the general pattern of the language, with  $\emptyset$  for 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. sing., *-s* for 2<sup>nd</sup> pers. sing., *-mos* for 1<sup>st</sup> pers. pl., *-is* for 2<sup>nd</sup> pers. pl., and *-n* for 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. pl (Boyé & Cabredo-Hofherr 2006).

INFINITIVE	1 <sup>ST</sup> SG PRES. IND.	PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE	3 <sup>RD</sup> SG PRET.IND.	IMPERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE
cantar 'sing'	canto	cante-	cantó	cantara- cantase-
correr 'run'	corro	corra-	corrió	corriera- corriese-
dormir 'sleep'	duermo	duerma-	durmió	durmiera- durmiese-
querer 'want, wish'	quiero	quiera-	quiso	quisiera- quisiese-

saber 'know'	sé	sepa-	supo	supiera- supiese-
salir 'exit'	salgo	salga-	salió	saliera- saliese-
tener 'have, own'	tengo	tenga-	tuvo	tuviera- tuviese-

**Table 2 : The morphology of the simple forms of the subjunctive**

Compound forms are built with the past participle and the auxiliary *haber*, which appears in the present subjunctive in the formation of the perfect (*haya cantado*), and in the imperfect subjunctive in the pluperfect (*hubiera/ hubiese cantado*).

The set of forms of the subjunctive is radically reduced in comparison to that of the indicative on account of the lack of a perfective/imperfective (neutral) contrast in the past forms, on the one hand, and of the lack of a present/future contrast on the other. Medieval and Classical Spanish had a form for the future subjunctive. Built on the preterite/perfect stem with the marker *-re-* (*cantare/ quisiere/ saliere*), this simple form was flanked by a corresponding compound form with *haber* in the future subjunctive (*hubiere cantado*). Although surviving in some set expressions (*sea como fuere* 'be as it may'), in juridical language, and possibly in some reduced dialectal areas, future subjunctive forms seem to have disappeared from general usage as far back as the 18<sup>th</sup> century (Ridruejo 1990, Camus Bergareche 1990, Eberenz 1983/1990).

A comparison with the original Latin subjunctive paradigm shows that the main differences are directly or indirectly related to the loss of a conjugation system based on the contrast between *infectum* and *perfectum* and to the concomitant generalization of compound forms for perfects. The main reinterpretation processes are the following:

- (i) the Latin pluperfect subjunctive is reinterpreted as a general past (imperfect) subjunctive (*canta(vi)sse > cantase*).
- (ii) the Latin perfect subjunctive conflates with the Latin future perfect indicative to give the form of the future subjunctive (*canta(ve)rim/ canta(ve)ro > cantare*). The resulting form is indistinguishable from the Latin imperfect subjunctive for all verbs lacking a perfect stem form distinct from the present stem (*cantare(m)*), so that the latter can be held either to have been entirely given up or to have concurred in the formation of the future subjunctive (Ridruejo 1990).
- (iii) the Latin pluperfect indicative is reinterpreted as a subjunctive form (*canta(ve)ram > cantara*), and ends up being largely equivalent to the imperfect subjunctive arisen from the Latin perfect subjunctive. This process sets on in Medieval Spanish and stretches well into the contemporary language. The details of this semantic development are extremely complex, though clearly linked to a cross-linguistically widespread phenomenon which consists in exploiting past morphology for the expression of counterfactuality (Ridruejo 1990, Iatridou 2000). In contemporary language, the *-ra-* form preserves some of its etymological uses in contexts from which the *-se-* form is excluded, most notably as a pluperfect or preterite indicative in subordinate clauses, and with the modals *deber* 'must', *poder* 'can', and *querer* 'wish' in independent clauses. It tends to fully replace the *-se-* form for the expression of the imperfect subjunctive in a large number of regional, specially American varieties.

Although lacking any direct impact on the stock of subjunctive forms, the emergence of a conditional in Romance – together with changes in the uses of the imperfect indicative – has profoundly affected the distribution and interpretation of the subjunctive.

### 3.2. Temporal and aspectual relations

The comparatively poor stock of subjunctive forms and the fact that the subjunctive is a dependent mood appearing mainly in sequence-of-tense contexts have given rise to a debate as to the temporal interpretation of subjunctive forms. This debate concentrates on the contrast between the present and the imperfect subjunctive and is formulated in the generative tradition as a question concerning the existence of an independent Tense feature in subjunctive clauses. The issue carries over to the contrast between the compound forms of the subjunctive: although both convey a secondary anteriority relation, they contrast as to the possible highest anchors for this relation. On the basis of the distribution in (1a-b), Picallo (1984/1990) has argued that subjunctive clauses lack independent Tense, and that subjunctive forms are selected via a necessary anaphoric link with the temporal features of the matrix sentence, in such a way that a PAST in the matrix determines an imperfect/pluperfect subjunctive, whereas a NON-PAST in the matrix determines a present/perfect subjunctive:

- 1      a. *Desea*                      *que vengan/*                      *\*vinieran.*  
           wish.PRS.IND.3SG that come.PRS.SBJ.3PL/ come.IMPF.SBJ.3PL  
           ‘S/he wants them to come’  
       b. *Deseaba*                      *que \*vengan/*                      *vinieran.*  
           wish.PRS.IND.1/3SG that come PRS.SBJ.3PL/ come.IMPF.SBJ.3PL  
           ‘I/S/he wanted them to come’

This claim has been challenged on a number of grounds. Strict temporal selection holds only in a restricted type of contexts, particularly those involving subjunctive selection by a forward-shifting predicate<sup>3</sup> or in causative constructions, and subjunctive licensing in subject clauses of copular sentences. Even in these contexts, it often takes the form of a constraint banning certain crossed combinations, but not others. Thus, forward-shifting predicates exclude an imperfect subjunctive under a matrix NON-PAST (2c), but allow a present subjunctive under a matrix PAST (2b), whereas copular sentences allow an imperfect subjunctive under a matrix NON-PAST (3b), but exclude a present subjunctive under a matrix PAST (3c) (for further details, see Suñer & Padilla Rivera 1987/1990, Kempchinsky 1990, Quer 1998):

- 2      a. *Les pidió*                      *que llegaran*                      *a tiempo.*  
           them ask.PRT.IND.3SG that arrive.IMPF.SBJ.3PL to time  
           ‘S/he asked them to arrive on time’  
       b. *Les pidió*                      *que lleguen*                      *a tiempo.*  
           them ask.PRT.IND.3SG that arrive.PRS.SBJ.3PL to time  
           ‘S/he asked them to arrive on time’  
       c. *Les pide*                      *que lleguen/*                      *\*llegaran a tiempo.*  
           them ask.PRS.IND.3SG that arrive.PRS.SBJ.3PL /arrive.IMPF.SBJ.3PL to time  
           ‘S/he asks them to arrive on time’
- 3      a. *Es*                      *probable que lleguen*                      *a tiempo.*  
           be. PRS.IND.3SG likely      that arrive PRS.SBJ.3PL to time  
           ‘It’s likely that they will arrive on time’  
       b. *Es*                      *probable que llegaran*                      *a tiempo.*  
           be. PRS.IND.3SG likely      that arrive.IMPF.SBJ.3PL to time  
           ‘It is likely that they arrived on time’  
       c. *Era*                      *probable que \*lleguen/*                      *llegaran*                      *a tiempo.*  
           be. IMPF.IND.3SG likely      that arrive.PRS.SBJ.3PL / arrive.IMPF.SBJ.3PL to time  
           ‘It was likely that they would arrive on time’

The conclusion seems thus inescapable that subjunctive forms make a temporal contribution of their own: what appears as strict temporal selection is a result of the interaction between the semantic properties of the context and this temporal contribution.

The interpretation of the PAST / NON-PAST combinations in (2b) and (3b) offers an immediate clue as to what this contribution is. (2b) is an instance of a double access configuration, in which the time of the subordinate clause is calculated with Utt-Time as anchor (Kempchinsky 1990): the requested arrival must follow Utt-Time. On the other hand, (3b) contrasts with (3c): the arrival must precede the time of epistemic evaluation in (3b), which reports present epistemic uncertainty about an already settled matter, whereas it follows the time of evaluation in (3c), which reports past metaphysical uncertainty about a matter not yet settled at that time.

I would like to suggest that the contrast between the present and the imperfect subjunctive parallels that between the corresponding indicative tenses. The present is a deictic tense, always anchored with regard to Utt-Time. The imperfect can be an anaphoric tense, taking Tx as anchor (“present of the past”), but it can also have a deictic interpretation, in which case it signals anteriority with regard to Utt-Time. This latter interpretation becomes prominent whenever the matrix context does not provide a past temporal anchor, i.e. a suitable Tx.

The temporal contrast between the present and the imperfect subjunctive is somewhat obscured by the fact that the latter gives rise to interpretations in which the event time is simultaneous or forward-shifted with regard to Utt-T. The imperfect subjunctive cannot be understood either as a deictic past or as an anaphoric “present of the past” in main clauses expressing wishes (with *ojalá* as a licensing adverb), nor in the antecedent of conditionals. It does not contrast in temporal location with the present subjunctive or with the present indicative, respectively:

- 5     a. *Ojalá       estuvieran/       estén        en casa.*  
           hopefully be.IMPF.SBJ.3PL /be.PRS.SBJ.3PL in house  
           ‘I wish they were/ I hope they are at home’  
        b. *Si estuvieran/       están        en casa...*  
           if be.IMPF.SBJ.3PL /be.PRS.IND.3PL in house  
           ‘If they were/ are at home...

Such cases can be assimilated to the numerous instances of past tenses being used for signaling counterfactuality or non-realistic modal bases (see Iatridou 2000).<sup>4</sup> By contrast with the present subjunctive resp. indicative versions, which only indicate epistemic uncertainty, in the imperfect subjunctive versions the world of evaluation w0 is assumed not to be a world in which they are at home in (5a-b). In fact, counterfactual uses of the imperfect subjunctive rather reinforce the analogy with the imperfect indicative, which in some so-called modal uses locates event-time simultaneously or subsequently to Utt-T, but does not locate it in the world of evaluation:

- 6     *Yo que tú   no se        lo contaba.*  
        I   that you not him/her it tell IMPF.IND.1SG  
        ‘If I were you, I wouldn’t tell him/her’

The simple forms of the subjunctive are aspectually neutral. The compound forms convey an anteriority relationship whose highest anchor can be Utt-T in the case of the perfect subjunctive, and is normally a Tx preceding Utt-T in the case of the pluperfect:

- 7 a. *Me sorprende que lo hayan/ \*hubieran visto.*  
 me surprise PRS.IND.1SG that it have PRS.SBJ.3PL/ have IMPF.SBJ.3PL seePP  
 ‘I’m surprised that they (should) have seen it’
- b. *Me sorprendió que lo hayan/ hubieran visto.*  
 me surprise PRT.IND.1SG that it have PRS.SBJ.3PL/ have IMPF.SBJ.3PL seePP  
 ‘I was surprised that they had/ should have seen it’

However, just like the imperfect subjunctive can locate event-time simultaneously with Utt-T in counterfactually interpreted contexts, the pluperfect subjunctive can express a single anteriority relation, locating the eventuality before Utt-T in such contexts. Pluperfect and perfect do not contrast in temporal location in (8a-b), but the pluperfect versions indicate that w0 is not assumed to be a world in which they arrived on time, whereas the perfect versions merely express epistemic uncertainty as to w0 being or not such a world

- 8 a. *Ojalá hubieran / hayan llegado a tiempo.*  
 hopefully have.IMPF.SBJ.3PL / have.PRS.SBJ.3PL arrive.PP to time  
 ‘I wish they had / I hope they have arrived on time’
- b. *Si hubieran / han llegado a tiempo...*  
 if have.IMPF.SBJ.3PL / have.PRS.IND.3PL arrive.PP to time  
 ‘If they had / have arrived on time...

The subjunctive is compatible with the periphrastic expression of prospective aspect, but prospective subjunctives are excluded in forward-shifting matrix contexts such as volitionals and directives.

To sum up, the temporal-aspectual organization of the subjunctive does not differ radically from that of the indicative. It has a deictic form indicating coincidence with Utt-T, the present, and a form that can function anaphorically, indicating coincidence with Tx, or deictically, indicating precedence with regard to Utt-T, the imperfect. This latter form is exploited for counterfactual uses, signaling coincidence with Utt-T in a “world history” different from w0. Forms indicating coincidence regularly give rise to forward-shifted readings, sometimes as a function of the forward-shifting properties of the matrix context, but often simply as a result of the type of eventuality described in the clause. Compound forms indicate a secondary anteriority relation. When the highest anchor for this secondary anteriority relationship is Utt-T, the perfect subjunctive is very close to a deictically functioning imperfect subjunctive.

### 3.3. The meaning and uses of the subjunctive

General semantic characterizations of mood are notoriously difficult. The subjunctive is clearly an expression of modality, in as far as all its uses involve consideration of sets of alternative possible worlds, i.e. non totally realistic modal bases. However, this characterization captures a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for subjunctive use. Whereas the indicative corresponds to the default mood, appearing in main assertions, but also in questions and in a number of dependent clauses, the subjunctive is a dependent mood, which is subject to specific licensing conditions. This does not mean that the subjunctive is restricted to subordinate clauses, although the widest array of its uses does involve syntactic subordination. We will first discuss the subjunctive in dependent clauses and then the subjunctive in root contexts.

#### 3.3.1. Argument clauses

Two distinctions have proven particularly useful when describing uses of the subjunctive. The first opposes intensional contexts to polarity contexts (Quer 1998) as subjunctive licensors. In intensional contexts, the subjunctive is triggered by the lexical properties of a predicate, which can be a verb, but also an adjective or a noun:

- 9      *Quiere                    que hablen                    de él.*  
           want.PRS.IND.3SG that talk.PRS.SBJ.3PL of him  
           ‘He wants people to talk about him’

In polarity contexts, it is essentially a negation in the matrix context that licenses a subjunctive which would be otherwise excluded.

- 10     *Nunca dijo                    que estuviera                    enfermo.*  
           never say PRT.IND.3SG that be IMPF.SBJ.3SG ill  
           ‘S/he never said that he was ill’

The second, more traditional distinction, opposes contexts of rigid subjunctive selection to contexts in which mood alternation is possible. Thus, the subjunctive is the only possible option in (9) whereas (10) also admits the indicative. However, the two distinctions do not overlap: (11a-c) show cases of mood alternation for “intensional” subjunctives.

- 11     a. *Insiste                    en que lleguen/                    llegan a las tres.*  
           insist PRS.IND.3SG in that arrive.PRS.SBJ.3PL/ arrive.PRS.IND.3PL at three  
           ‘S/he insists on their arriving/ that they arrive at 3 o’clock’  
        b. *Se    aseguró                    de que la puerta estuviera/*  
           REFL make-sure. PRT.IND.3SG of that the door be. IMPF.SBJ.3SG/  
           *estaba                    cerrada.*  
           be. IMPF.IND.3SG closed  
           ‘S/he saw to it/ checked that the door was closed’  
        c. *Admitió                    que no le                    pagaran/                    pagaban.*  
           admit. PRT.IND.3SG that not him/her pay IMPF.SBJ.3PL/ pay IMPF.IND.3PL  
           ‘S/he consented not to be paid/ admitted that s/he was not being paid’

The clear meaning differences between the subjunctive and the indicative versions in (11a-c) give precious clues as to the semantic contribution of the subjunctive. In (11a), the subjunctive version reports a directive speech act, whereas the indicative version reports a statement of fact. This sort of contrast extends to a large class of verbs of communication. In (11b), the indicative version asserts that the subject of the main verb checked a fact. The subjunctive version signals that the subject has a vested interest in this fact, and has possibly contributed to its coming about, for instance by closing the door herself. Finally, in (11c), the indicative version conveys acknowledgement of the truth of the propositional content of the object clause, whereas the subjunctive version indicates acquiescence or agreement with a suggestion. What is common to all the subjunctive versions is (a) an “element of will” on the side of the subject of the propositional attitude verb as to the coming about of the state of affairs described in the subordinate clause, and (b) the fact that the subject is involved as a causal factor that can possibly favor or prevent this coming about. Bouletic modality and causation are involved in most cases of rigid subjunctive selection,<sup>5</sup> namely with volitionals, as in (9), and with directives, implicatives, and causatives (12). Note that the latter two cases assert the truth of the propositional content of the subjunctive clause, thus infirming the widely held view that the subjunctive signals lack of assertion:



- 12 *Exigió/ Consiguió/ Hizo.*  
 demand. PRT.IND.3SG/ obtain. PRT.IND.3SG/ make PRT.IND.3SG  
*que le pagaran.*  
 that him/her pay IMPF.SBJ.3PL  
 ‘S/he demanded/ managed to be paid’/ ‘S/he made them pay him/her’

In some cases, causation alone triggers rigid subjunctive selection. This is the case when a causal relation between two eventualities is established by means of a verbal predicate (13a-b), but also in the complement clauses of nouns and adjectives denoting causal relations:

- 13 a. *El mal tiempo explica que llegara tarde.*  
 The bad weather explains that arrive.IMPF.SBJ.3SG late  
 ‘The bad weather explains his/her late arrival’  
 b. *Que se negaran a pagarle dio lugar a una disputa.*  
 That REFL refuse IMPF.SBJ.3PL to pay- him/her gave place to a quarrel  
 Their refusal to pay him/her caused a quarrel’

Emotive-factive predicates express a relationship between an Experiencer and a Stimulus, such that the Stimulus causes a psychological reaction in the Experiencer. They consistently select the subjunctive in their argument clauses:

- 14 *Le sorprende que haya llegado tarde.*  
 Him/her surprise PRS.IND.3SG that have- PRS.SBJ.3SG arrive.PP late  
 ‘S/he is surprised that s/he should have arrived late’

However, some emotive-factive predicates exhibit uses as verbs of communication. They report speech acts which convey at the same time the assertion of a fact and an evaluation of this fact by the subject of the propositional attitude. In such uses, they lose their factive status, in as far as they do not presuppose the truth of their complement, and they occasionally give rise to mood alternation:

- 15 *Se lamenta – injustificadamente- de que nadie lo comprende/ comprenda.*  
 REFL complain PRS.IND.3SG unjustifiedly of that nobody  
 him understand.PRS.IND.3SG/ understand.PRS.SBJ.3SG  
 ‘He unjustifiedly complains about not being understood by anybody’

Mood alternation is sensitive, in such contexts, to the foregrounding of the propositional content of the subjunctive clause (indicative) or of the emotive-factive predicate (subjunctive), as shown by the fact that the focus of pseudo-cleft structures allows the indicative even in the absence of reported-speech readings (Quer 1998, GRAE 2008):

- 16 *Lo que le sorprende es que haya llegado/ llegó tarde.*  
 That.N.SG that him/her surprise PRS.IND.3SG be.PRS.IND.3SG that  
 have- PRS.SBJ.3SG arrive.PP/ arrive.PRT.IND.3SG late  
 ‘What surprises him/her is that s/he (should have) arrived late’

As argued by Quer (1998), the causation component in the semantics of emotive-factive predicates is a decisive factor in mood selection. At the same time, these predicates convey the (positive or negative) evaluation of a fact on the side of the Experiencer. Evaluative predicates constitute another major class of subjunctive selectors. They include a couple of verbs such as *bastar* 'suffice', *convenir* 'be advisable', *urgir* 'be urgent', and a large class of adjectives and nouns, as well as the adverbs *bien* 'well, right, proper' and *mal* 'bad, unfair, inappropriate' (GRAE 2008).

- 17 a. *Basta con que lleguen a tiempo.*  
 suffice.PRS.IND.3SG with that arrive.PRS.SBJ.3PL to time  
 'It's enough that they should arrive on time'  
 b. *Me parece mal que no le hayan pagado.*  
 me seem.PRS.IND.3SG bad that not him/her have.PRS.SBJ.3PL pay.PP  
 'I disapprove his/her not having been paid'

The subjunctive is triggered whenever the propositional content of the argument clause is not merely asserted, but located in a space of possibilities. This is the case with modal predicates expressing epistemic or metaphysical possibility or necessity, but also with predicates expressing frequency and with those expressing falsity:

- 18 *Es probable/ usual/ erróneo.*  
 be.PRS.IND.3SG likely/ usual/ mistaken  
*que surjan conflictos.*  
 that arise.PRS.SBJ.3PL conflicts  
 'It is likely/ usual/ false that conflicts (should) ensue'

Among predicates of propositions, only those that are equivalent to the assertion of the proposition, as for example *es verdad/ cierto/ exacto/ seguro* 'it is true/ correct/ exact/ sure', consistently select the indicative mood. Note that with modal predicates, the truth of the subjunctive proposition may be entailed in some cases. Together with the implicative subjunctive triggers mentioned above (12), this fact casts some doubt on the role of non-veridicality (Giannakidou 1997) in the distribution of the subjunctive.

To sum up, subjunctive triggering in intensional contexts is intimately related to the notions of causation and evaluation. Mood selection is usually rigid in such contexts, which is probably an indication of the fact that argument clauses in such configurations cannot escape the scope of the selecting predicate. Note that the more complex scope configurations involved in pseudo-clefts, possibly disrupting subordination, permit the indicative, as in (16) above, and that when causal relations do not involve the embedding of an argument clause, no subjunctive is licensed (19a-b):

- 19 a. *¿Le molesta si fumo?*  
 you/him/her bother.PRS.IND.3SG if smoke PRS.IND.1SG  
 'Do you/ Does s/he mind if I smoke?'  
 b. *Se aburrió porque siempre lo criticaban.*  
 REFL annoy.PRT.IND.3SG because always him criticize.IMPF.IND.3PL  
 'S/he got fed up because he was always being criticized'

Subjunctive selection in argument clauses is much less rigid in polarity contexts. Possible subjunctive licensors include first and foremost sentential negation, but also non-upward entailing environments, such as contexts containing downward-entailing elements,

questions and conditional antecedents (Ridruejo 1999, GRAE 2008). Thus, the indicative is the only possible choice in (20a), but the subjunctive is allowed in (20b):

- 20 a. *Creían/ Afirmaban que Juan*  
 believe. IMPF.IND.3PL/ claim. IMPF.IND.3PL that Juan  
*\*estuviera/ estaba enfermo.*  
 be. IMPF.SBJ.3SG/ be. IMPF.IND.3SG ill  
 ‘They believed/ claimed that Juan was ill’
- b. *No creían/ afirmaban que Juan*  
 not believe. IMPF.IND.3PL/ claim. IMPF.IND.3PL that Juan  
*estuviera /estaba enfermo.*  
 be. IMPF.SBJ.3SG/ be. IMPF.IND.3SG ill  
 ‘They didn’t believe/ claim that Juan was ill’

Mood alternation in polarity contexts produces extremely subtle effects which involve the attitude of the speaker towards the propositional content of the argument clause. Note that first person present negated belief reports select the subjunctive (Quer 1998):

- 21 *No creo que*  
 not believe. PRS.IND.1SG that  
*estuviera/ \*estaba enfermo.*  
 be. IMPF.SBJ.3SG/ be. IMPF.IND.3SG ill  
 ‘I don’t believe s/he was ill’

This can be taken to mean that indicative clauses in polarity contexts convey the speaker’s endorsement of the truth of the complement. The indicative version of (21), in which subject of belief and speaker coincide, seems to report contradictory beliefs. By contrast, the subjunctive in polarity contexts does not convey any attitude of the speaker as to the truth of the complement clause: it indicates that the complement clause is under the scope of the propositional attitude verb and the operator affecting it.

This scopal dependency of the subjunctive –contrasting with the outscoping effects of the indicative- is further confirmed by the fact that polarity contexts license negative polarity items in subjunctive, but not in indicative complement clauses (Bosque 1990):

- 22 *Pocos afirman que*  
 few.M.PL claim. PRS.IND.3PL that  
*haya sido/ \*fue de utilidad alguna.*  
 have.PRS.SBJ.3PL be.PP/ be.PRT.IND.3SG of use any  
 ‘Few claim that it was of any use’

### 3.3.2. Relative clauses

As stated above, in polarity contexts the subjunctive indicates that the clause containing it is in the scope of the licensing context. Mood alternation in relative clauses follows an analogous interpretive pattern. The descriptive content of an indicative relative is evaluated in w0 (the world in which non-modalized assertions are evaluated). By contrast, the descriptive content of a subjunctive relative is evaluated in a non-totally realistic modal base contributed by an intensional environment. This explains the well known fact that noun phrases containing subjunctive relatives are typically interpreted non-specifically (23a) or attributively (23b):

- 23 a. *Pidieron un libro que fuera fácil de leer.*  
 ask. PRT.IND.3PL a book that be.IMPF.SBJ.3SG easy of read.INF  
 ‘They asked for a book that was easy to read’
- b. *Le dieron un libro a cada cliente que hubiera gastado más de 10 euros.*  
 him give.PRT.IND.3PL a book to every customer that  
 have. IMPF.SBJ.3SG spend.PP more of 10 euros  
 ‘They gave a book to any customer having spent over 10 euros’

Non-specific relatives do not entail the existence in w0 of an object verifying the description. Attributive relatives are characterized by the fact that the link between the content of the nominal description and the property denoted by the rest of the sentence is a law-like one, grounded in generalizations that extend to counterfactual cases and usually involve causality.

Mood alternation is excluded in appositive relatives. Since these constitute independent subsidiary assertions, they only take the indicative (Ridruejo 1999).<sup>6</sup>

The licensing environments for subjunctive relatives share, to a certain extent, the properties of the environments licensing subjunctive argument clauses. As a matter of fact, restrictive relatives contained in subjunctive argument clauses admit themselves the subjunctive (GRAE 2008):

- 24 a. *Insiste en que le traigan un libro.*  
 insist PRS.IND.3SG in that him/her bring. PRS.SBJ.3PL a book  
*que sea fácil de leer*  
 that be.PRS.SBJ.3SG easy of read.INF  
 ‘S/he insists on being brought a book that is easy to read’
- b. *Me sorprende que le hayan traído un libro*  
 me surprise PRS.IND.3SG that him/her have PRS.SBJ.3PL bring.PP a book  
*que fuera fácil de leer.*
- c. *Sólo Juan dijo que le hubieran traído un libro*  
 only Juan say. PRT.IND.3SG that him have IMPF.SBJ.3PL bring.PP a book  
*que fuera fácil de leer.*  
 that be.IMPF.SBJ.3SG easy of read.INF  
 ‘Only Juan said that they brought him a book that was easy to read’

As for subjunctive relatives not contained in subjunctive clausal environments, they are excluded in contexts involving totally realistic modal bases (25a), and they are licensed in modal environments such as those involving bouletic modality (25b), but also in those containing modal verbs (25c), future tense or prospective aspect, or exhibiting a habitual/generic interpretation (Quer 1998, GRAE 2008):

- 25 a. *Vendió un libro*  
 sell PRT.IND.3SG a book  
*que contenía/ \*contuviera ilustraciones.*  
 that contain.IMPF.IND.3SG/ contain IMPF.SBJ.3SG illustrations  
 ‘He sold a book that contained illustrations’
- b. *Necesitaban/ Querían/ Consiguió un libro*  
 need.IMPF.IND.3PL/ want.IMPF.IND.3PL/ obtain.PRT.IND.3SG a book  
*que contuviera ilustraciones.*  
 that contain IMPF.SBJ.3SG illustrations  
 ‘They needed/ wanted/ S/he got a book that contained illustrations’

c. *Puedes comprar un libro*  
 can.PRS.IND.2SG buy.INF a book  
*que contenga ilustraciones.*  
 that contain PRS.SBJ.3SG illustrations  
 ‘You can buy a book containing illustrations’

The problem is that, in relative clauses, the subjunctive itself can be the only overt element triggering a non-totally realistic interpretation of the environment. Usually, unexpected subjunctives are linked to the possibility of establishing an intentional link between the will of an agent and the descriptive content of the noun phrase, and are thus assimilable to bouletic modality. This is particularly clear in the case of so-called “purpose relatives” exemplified in (26) (Ridruejo 1999), but also extends to subtler cases:

26 *Hicieron un cobertizo*  
 build PRT.IND.3PL a shed  
*que los protegiera de la lluvia.*  
 that them protect IMPF.SBJ.3SG of the rain  
 ‘They built a shed as a protection against the rain’

Note that such cases are analogous to subjunctive-triggering with implicative verbs, in as far as entailments of existence are not suspended by the subjunctive, which only adds a forward-shifting element of will.

Although we have exemplified subjunctive relatives mainly in indefinite noun-phrases, all determiners, to the notable exception of demonstratives, are compatible with subjunctive relatives (Quer 1998). Occasional difficulties with the definite article should probably be attributed to a mismatch between the presuppositions of the article and the descriptive content of the noun phrase. Semantic definites –those in which the unicity presupposition is guaranteed by the descriptive content of the noun phrase, such as superlatives or descriptions containing ordinals- pose no problem for the subjunctive (Ridruejo 1999):

27 *Iban a comprar el libro*  
 go.IMPF.IND.3PL to buy.INF the book  
*que contuviera #(más) ilustraciones.*  
 that contain IMPF.SBJ.3SG more illustrations  
 ‘ They were going to buy the book with the greatest number of illustrations’

Bare plurals (28), but also count singular *algún* ‘some’, free choice items, and negative indefinites strongly favor subjunctive relatives (Quer 1998). In the first case, this is a consequence of the scopal dependency of bare plurals; in the other cases, scopal dependency is reinforced by the fact that the items in question require licensors roughly corresponding to those required by the subjunctive:

28 *Buscan libros que*  
 search.PRS.IND.3PL books that  
*??contienen/ contengan ilustraciones.*  
 contain.PRS.IND.3PL /contain PRS.SBJ.3PL illustrations  
 ‘They are looking for books containing illustrations’

Free relatives also clearly favor the subjunctive, possibly as a consequence of the tendency to interpret them attributively and of their proximity to free-choice items (Giannakidou 1997, Quer 1998):

- 29 *Buscaba quien lo \*ayudaba /ayudara*  
 search.IMPf.IND.3SG who him help. IMPf.IND.3SG/ help.IMPf.SBJ.3SG  
 ‘He was looking for someone to help him out’

To sum up, relatives clauses exhibit mood alternation. The subjunctive requires that the descriptive content of the clause be evaluated in a non-totally realistic modal base, which is more often than not guaranteed by its dependence from an intensional context and gives rise to non-specific or attributive readings for the NP containing it.

### 3.3.3. Adverbial and/or adjunct clauses

Due to space limitations, only information concerning some prominent types of subjunctive adverbial/adjunct clauses and some limited types of mood alternation will be given in this section. Subjunctive use in these contexts is sensitive to roughly the same type of semantic factors we have been discussing. Thus, for instance, purpose clauses (30a), which involve bouletic modality, and clauses negating concomitance (30b), in which the proposition expressed is necessarily under the scope of the negative *sin* ‘without’, take the subjunctive. Both types of interclausal relations are expressed by a preposition governing a complement clause (GRAE 2008):<sup>7</sup>

- 30 a. *Lo hice para que se enterara.*  
 it do.PRT.IND.1SG for that REFL inform.IMPf.SBJ.3SG  
 ‘I did it so that he would notice it’  
 b. *Lo hice sin que se enterara.*  
 it do.PRT.IND.1SG without that REFL inform.IMPf.SBJ.3SG  
 ‘I did it without his noticing it’

Modern Spanish exhibits the peculiarity that all forward shifted temporal clauses – whose time of evaluation is ordered after the highest anchor Utt-T or Tx - take the subjunctive. This holds of temporal clauses introduced by any syntactic type of subordinating expression, and expressing simultaneity, posteriority or anteriority:

- 31 *Cuando llegue, se lo decimos.*  
 when arrive. PRS.SBJ.3SG him/her it tell.PRS.IND.1PL  
 ‘When s/he arrives, we’ll tell him/her’

Some authors classify these uses of the subjunctive as “suppletive” future tenses, but the assumption of a “different” subjunctive seems unwarranted. Furthermore, *before*-temporal clauses always take the subjunctive (i.e., not only when they are forward-shifted), whereas *after*-temporal clauses only take it in European Spanish (GRAE 2008).

Conditional antecedents and subjunctive concessive clauses figure prominently among the contexts in which the temporal contrast between present and imperfect subjunctive forms is reinterpreted, with imperfect subjunctive forms being used for the expression of non-realistic modal bases. Thus, both (32a-b) and (33a-b) locate the time of the subordinate after resp. before Utt-T. But (32b) and (33b) signal that the speaker views Pedro’s confession as improbable resp. as contrary to fact:

- 32 a. *Aunque Pedro confiese,*  
 even-that Pedro confess. PRS.SBJ.3SG  
*yo seguiré negando.*  
 I follow.FUT.IND.1SG deny.GER  
 ‘Even if Pedro confesses, I’ll go on denying it.’  
 b. *Aunque Pedro confesara,*  
 even-that Pedro confess. IMPF.SBJ.3SG  
*yo seguiría.COND.1SG negando.*  
 I follow deny.GER  
 ‘Even if Pedro confessed, I would go on denying it’
- 33 a. *Aunque Pedro haya confesado,*  
 even-that Pedro have. PRS.SBJ.3SG confess. PP  
*yo seguiré FUT.IND.1SG negando.*  
 I follow deny.GER  
 ‘Even if Pedro has confessed, I’ll go on denying it’  
 b. *Aunque Pedro hubiera confesado,*  
 even-that Pedro have. IMPF.SBJ.3SG confess. PP  
*yo seguiría negando.*  
 I follow COND.1SG deny.GER  
 ‘Even if Pedro had confessed, I would go on denying it’

Conditionals and subjunctive concessives show parallel patterns in tense-mood distribution (Quer 1998), with one important exception: conditionals introduced by the conjunction *si* ‘if’ never accept present/perfect subjunctive forms (34a). This restriction does not hold of other expressions, as shown by (34b):

- 34 a. *Si Pedro confiesa/ \*confiese,*  
 if Pedro confess. PRS.IND.3SG / confess. PRS.SBJ.3SG  
*yo también confesaré.*  
 I also confess. FUT.IND.1SG  
 ‘If Pedro confesses, I will confess too’  
 b. *En caso de que Pedro \*confiesa/ confiese,*  
 in case of that Pedro confess. PRS.IND.3SG / confess. PRS.SBJ.3SG  
*yo también confesaré.*  
 I also confess. FUT.IND.1SG  
 ‘If Pedro confesses, I will confess too’

Counterfactual conditionals and subjunctive concessives with an imperfect or a pluperfect subjunctive normally have conditional forms in the main clause. However, there is a marked tendency to replicate a pluperfect subjunctive in the main clause:

- 35 *Si/Aunque hubiera confesado,*  
 if even-that have IMPF.SBJ.3SG confess. PP  
*lo habrían/ %hubieran condenado.*  
 him have. COND.3PL/ have. IMPF.SBJ.3PL condemn. PP  
 ‘If / Even if he had confessed, he would have gotten a sentence’

Causal subordinates do not of themselves license the subjunctive (36a). However, under negation, as well as under emotive-factive or evaluative predicates, the subjunctive is

used to indicate that the higher operator or predicate affects the causal relationship itself (GRAE 2008):

- 36 a. *Vino porque se lo pidieron/ \*pidieran.*  
 come.PRT.IND.3SG because him/her it ask PRT.IND.3PL/ ask IMPF.SBJ.3PL  
 ‘S/he came because s/he was asked to’  
 b. *No vino porque se lo pidieran,*  
 not come.PRT.IND.3SG because him/her it ask IMPF.SBJ.3PL  
*sino por su propia iniciativa.*  
 but by his/her own initiative.  
 ‘S/he didn’t come because s/he was asked to, but of her own accord’

### 3.3.4 Root contexts

In main clauses, the subjunctive invariably signals that the propositional content is not being asserted. This is the case in directive (37a) and desiderative sentences (37b), but also in sentences expressing some forms of epistemic modality (37c).

- 37 a. *No salgas.*  
 not go-out. PRS.SBJ.2SG  
 Don’t go out !  
 b. *Que/ Ojalá (que) salga.*  
 that/ hopefully that go-out.PRS.SBJ.3SG  
 ‘S/he should go out / I hope s/he’ll go out’  
 c. *Quizás/ Probablemente salga PRS.SBJ.3SG.*  
 perhaps/ probably go-out.PRS.SBJ.3SG  
 ‘Maybe/ Probably s/he’ll go out’

Note that in all cases, the subjunctive requires a licenser that precedes it: negation in (37a), the complementizer *que* or the particle *ojalá* (37b), and an adverb in ((37c).<sup>8</sup>

The subjunctive alternates with the imperative in directives. Negative directives cannot be expressed in the imperative, and 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. imperatives are indistinguishable from subjunctive forms.<sup>9</sup> Since the politeness form of address is a 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. form, and the only form for plural addressees in American Spanish is the politeness form, this leads to considerable overlap between imperative and subjunctive. Table 3 shows that there are only two distinct forms for the imperative in European Spanish, and only one in American Spanish :

	SINGULAR	PLURAL
1 <sup>st</sup> person		tengamos
1 <sup>st</sup> person+Neg		no tengamos
2 <sup>nd</sup> person	<b>ten</b>	<b>tened</b> (Eur. Span.)/ <b>tengan</b> (Amer.Span.)
2 <sup>nd</sup> person+Neg	no tengas	no tengáis / no tengan
2 <sup>nd</sup> person+polite	tenga	tengan
2 <sup>nd</sup> person+polite+Neg	no tenga	no tengan
3 <sup>rd</sup> person	que tenga	que tengan
3 <sup>rd</sup> person+Neg	que no tenga	que no tengan

**Table 3 : Imperative and subjunctive forms in directives**

Although the wisdom of maintaining a separate mood for two, resp. one distinct inflection may be questioned, imperative sentences not introduced by negation or by a complementizer share with infinitives and gerunds the peculiarity of not allowing proclitics:



- 38 a. *tenme / tenedme / téngame*  
 hold-IMP.2SG-me/ hold-IMP.2PL-me/ hold-IMP.3SG-me  
*ténganme/ tengámosle la mano*  
 hold-IMP.3PL-me/ hold-IMP.1PL-him/her the hand  
 ‘Hold my hand / Let’s hold his/her hand’  
 b. *me tienes/ me tenéis / me tenga*  
 me hold-IND.2SG-me/ me hold-IND.2PL-me/ me hold-SBJ.1/3SG  
*me tengan/ le tengamos la mano*  
 me hold-SBJ.3PL/ him/her hold.SBJ.1PL the hand  
 ‘You/ I/ S/he/ They hold my hand// We hold his/her hand’

Thus, clitic position is held to discriminate between subjunctive and imperative in cases such as *le tenga/ téngale*, etc. (GRAE 2008).

Apart from certain set expressions and set patterns expressing wishes (39), desiderative sentences require a licensing element preceding the subjunctive. The most usual are the complementizer *que* and the particle *ojalá* ‘hopefully’ illustrated above.

- 39 a. *Dios te ayude.*  
 God you help PRS.SBJ.3SG  
 ‘(May) God help you’

Adverbs expressing uncertainty license the subjunctive in main clauses when they precede the verb, but never when they follow it, as shown by the following contrast:

- 40 a. *Quizás/ Probablemente esté/ está enfermo.*  
 perhaps/ probably be.PRS.SBJ.3SG be.PRS.IND.3SG ill  
 ‘Maybe/ Probably s/he is ill’  
 b. *\*Esté/ Está enfermo, quizás/ probablemente.*  
 be.PRS.SBJ.3SG be.PRS.IND.3SG ill maybe/ probably  
 ‘S/he is ill, maybe/probably’

The factors linked to the presence of the subjunctive in main clauses parallel those we find in dependent clauses, in as far as they involve evaluation with regard to non-totally realistic modal bases.

#### 4. The conditional

The verbal form built on the infinitive/future stem by adding to it the desinences of the imperfect (*cantar-ía/ haber-ía cantado*) is predominantly classified as a temporal form of the indicative mood. It is not surprising that it should have modal uses: the future and imperfect indicative are known to exhibit a number of modal uses, which clearly predominate over temporal uses in the case of the former, so that it is only to be expected that a form combining the morphology of both tenses will have a still more pronounced modal profile. I would like to suggest, however, that there are good reasons for assuming a split in uses of this form, with some of them corresponding to a tense (“future of the past” and, more interestingly, “past of the future”), and others constituting the mood of choice when non-realistic modal bases are involved, i.e. when  $w_0$  is excluded from the domain of quantification in a modal environment.

In “future of the past” uses, the conditional behaves as a strictly anaphoric tense: it requires a past anchor contributed by a verb of thinking or speaking (41a), which may be implicit in free indirect speech contexts and in so called quotative or evidential uses of the conditional (Squartini 2001). It thus contrasts with prospective aspect, whose past anchor can be contributed by an adverbial (41b) or by the tense of an independent previous sentence (41c):

- 41 a. *Pensó/ Afirmó que llovería / iba a llover.*  
 think.PRT.IND.3SG/claim PRT..3SG that rain.COND.3SG/ go.IMP.IND.3SG to rain  
 ‘S/he thought/claimed that it would rain/ it was going to rain’  
 b. *Ayer \*llovería / iba a llover.*  
 yesterday rain. COND.3SG / go IMPF.IND.3SG to rain  
 ‘Yesterday it would rain/ was going to rain’  
 c. *No salimos porque \*llovería / iba a llover.*  
 not go-out PRT.IND.1PL because rain COND.3SG / go IMPF.IND.3SG to rain  
 ‘We didn’t go out because it would rain/ was going to rain’

What I’d like to label “past of the future” readings are practically equivalent to future perfects in contexts expressing a conjecture (Squartini 2001). Spanish makes abundant use of future morphology for indicating that the propositional content is advanced as a possibility, and not as an unqualified assertion. If the propositional content concerns a time preceding UtT, anteriority can be expressed by the future perfect, but also by the conditional:

- 42 *No vino a la fiesta.*  
 not come PRT.IND.3SG to the party  
*Estaría/ Habrá estado enfermo.*  
 be.COND.3SG/ have.FUT.IND.3SG be.PP ill  
 ‘He didn’t come to the party. He might have been ill’

Modal uses of the conditional, on the other hand, are only licensed in a particular subset of modal environments, comprising (a) modal verbs; (b) verbs expressing wishes or preferences; (c) the consequent of counterfactual or hypothetical conditional sentences (Laca 2006).

- 43 a. *Podrías/ Tendrías que prestar atención.*  
 can.COND.2SG/ have. COND.2SG that lend.INF attention  
 ‘You could/ should pay attention’  
 b. *Querría/ Preferiría/ Me gustaría*  
 want. COND.1SG/ prefer.COND.1SG/ me like.COND.3SG  
*que prestaras atención.*  
 that lend.IMP.3SG attention  
 ‘I wish/ I’d prefer you would pay attention/ I’d like it for you to pay attention’  
 c. *Si te importara, prestarías atención.*  
 if you.DAT mind. IMPF.SBJ.3SG lend.COND..2SG attention  
 ‘If you minded, you would pay attention’

What the semantics of conditionals, *want*-verbs, and modals have in common is the fact that they require consideration of non-totally realistic modal bases. It is thus natural to assume that “conditional mood” requires sets of alternative worlds to operate on. To judge from its effects in conditional sentences, what it does in such contexts is to exclude the world of evaluation

from the domain of quantification, signaling that  $w_0$  does not belong to the modal base. The non-totally realistic modal base contributed by the modal element on which the conditional is grafted becomes a non-realistic modal base. When talking about the past –by means of perfect morphology on the conditional or on an embedded infinitive- non-realistic modal bases result in clearly counterfactual interpretations involving non-realized possibilities or unfulfilled wishes:

- 43 a. *Habrías podido/ tenido que prestar atención.*  
have COND..2SG can.PP/ have PP that lend.INF attention  
'You could/ should have paid attention'
- b. *Preferiría haberme enterado inmediatamente.*  
prefer. COND.1SG have.INF-me inform immediately  
'I'd have rather learnt about it right away'

“Conditional mood” –by contrast with the temporal conditional- is a counterfactual form. As such, it interferes in a number of contexts with imperfect and pluperfect subjunctives, which have been shown to exhibit counterfactual interpretations. As stated above, pluperfect subjunctives compete with perfect conditionals in the consequent of past counterfactuals. The same competition exists with modals and with verbs of wish. This connection is reinforced by the use of the imperfect subjunctive in root clauses containing the modals *poder*, *querer* and *deber*.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> I am greatly indebted to Ignacio Bosque (GRAE, Madrid). The materials and analyses proposed in GRAE (2008/ to appear) have profoundly influenced my views on the Spanish subjunctive. I gratefully acknowledge the support by the Fédération Typologie et Universaux CNRS for the program *Temporalité: typologie et acquisition*.

<sup>2</sup> A temporal anchor different from Utt-T, labelled Tx, is introduced, albeit with different characterizations, by Giorgi & Pianesi (1997) and by Iatridou (2000). Adoption of Tx could lead to a more precise formulation of the intuition regarding “inactual” tenses on which Coseriu (1976) based his analysis of the Romance verbal system.

<sup>3</sup> Forward-shifting predicates are characterized by the fact that the clauses they introduce are evaluated at a time that cannot precede the matrix time. Volitionals, directives, and verbs of planning belong to his class. For a discussion, see Abusch (2004), for an analysis of modal verbs as forward-shifting, see Condoravdi (2001).

<sup>4</sup> **Non-realistic** modal bases are domains excluding the world of evaluation (w0). They are contrasted in the text to **non-totally realistic** modal bases, which contain w0 but are non-singleton sets of worlds, and to **totally realistic** modal bases, which are singleton sets whose only member is w0. The latter form the background for factual, non-modalized statements. For a discussion, see Kaufmann, Condoravdi & Harizanov (2006), as well as Giorgi & Pianesi (1997: 205-217).

<sup>5</sup> Assertions as to rigid subjunctive selection or exclusion should be taken with a pinch of salt whenever the verb involved is a modal (GRAE 2008), since modals can appear in the indicative in subjunctive-selecting contexts, and in the subjunctive in indicative-selecting contexts.

<sup>6</sup> This means that the *-ra*-forms appearing in appositive relatives in certain registers should be analysed as indicative forms. As for their role in restrictive relatives, it is subject to debate (see Rivero 1977/1990).

<sup>7</sup> Mood alternation distinguishes purpose (subjunctive) from result clauses (indicative) with prepositional expressions such as *de manera/modo/forma tal (que)* ‘so as/ so that’.

<sup>8</sup> A possible exception is that of counterfactual suggestions or wishes, for instance:

(i) *Me lo hubieras dicho antes.*  
me it have IMPF.SBJ.2SG say.PP before  
‘You should have told me before’

<sup>9</sup> 3<sup>rd</sup> person imperatives are not usually acknowledged as such in the Spanish descriptive tradition, which assimilates the sentences containing them to desideratives (GRAE 2008). However, some of their uses cannot be semantically assimilated to desideratives:

(i) *Que hagan el menor error, y los denuncio.*  
that make.PRS.SBJ.3SG the least mistake and them report..PRS.IND.1SG  
‘Let them commit the slightest mistake, and I’ll report them’

---

## References

- Abusch, D. 2004. On the temporal composition of infinitives. In *The Syntax of Time*, 27-53  
J. Lecarme & J. Guéron (eds). Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Bosque, I. 1990 Las bases gramaticales de la alternancia modal. In Bosque, I. (ed.), 13-65.
- Bosque, I. (ed.) 1990. *Indicativo y subjuntivo*. Madrid: Taurus
- Boyé, G. & Cabredo-Hofherr, P. 2006 .The structure of allomorphy in Spanish verbal inflection. *Cuadernos de Lingüística, Instituto Universitario Ortega y Gasset XIII*, 9-24.
- Camus Bergareche, B. 1990. El futuro de subjuntivo en español. In Bosque, I. (ed.), 410-427.
- Condoravdi, C. 2001. Temporal interpretations of modals. Modals for the present and for the past. In *Stanford Papers on Semantics*, D. Beaver & al. (eds), 59-87 . Stanford: CSLI Publications
- Coseriu, E. 1976. *Das romanische Verbalsystem*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Demirdache, H. & Uribe- Etxebarria, M. 2007. The syntax of time arguments. In *Lingua* 117, 2. 330-366.
- Eberenz, R. 1983/1990. *Sea como fuere*. En torno a la historia del futuro de subjuntivo español. In Bosque, I. (ed.), 383-409..
- Giannakidou, A. 1997. *The Landscape of Polarity Items*. Groningen Dissertations in Linguistics (GRODIL) 18.
- Giorgi, A. & Pianesi, F. 1997. *Tense and aspect. From semantics to morphosyntax*. New-York/Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- GRAE 2008/to appear. *Nueva gramática de la lengua española*. Real Academia Española y Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española. Madrid: Espasa
- Iatridou, S. 2000. The grammatical ingredients of counterfactuality. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31, 2: 231-270.
- Kaufmann, S., Condoravdi, C., & Harizanov, V. 2006. Formal approaches to modality. In *The Expression of Modality*, 72-106. W. Frawley (ed.). Berlin: Mouton/de Gruyter
- Kempchinsky, P. 1990. Más sobre el efecto de referencia disjunta del subjuntivo. In Bosque, I. (ed.), 234-258.
- Laca, B. 2005. Périphrases aspectuelles et temps grammatical dans les langues romanes.'In *Les périphrases verbales*, H. Bat-Zeev Schyldkrot & N. Le Querler (eds ), 47-66. Amsterdam : J. Benjamins.
- Laca, B., 2006. Tiempo, aspecto y la interpretación de los verbos modales en español. *Lingüística* 17 (ALFAL): 9-43.
- Picallo, C. 1984/1990. El nudo FLEX y el parámetro de sujeto nulo. In Bosque, I. (ed.), 202-233.
- Quer, J. 1998. Mood at the interface. PhD Dissertation, University of Utrecht.
- Reyle, U., Rossdeutscher, A. & Kamp, H. 2005. Ups and downs in the theory of temporal reference , submitted to *Linguistics & Philosophy*.
- Ridruejo, E. 1990. ¿Cambios iterados en el subjuntivo español?. In Bosque, I. (ed.), 361-382.
- Ridruejo, E. 1999. Modo y modalidad. El modo en las subordinadas sustantivas. In *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española*, I. Bosque & V. Demonte, (eds) 3209-3251. Madrid: Espasa.
- Rivero, M.-L. 1977/1990. Especificidad y existencia. In Bosque, I. (ed.), 261-279.
- Schaden, G. 2007. La sémantique du Parfait : étude des “temps composés” dans un choix de langues germaniques et romanes. PhD Dissertation. University Paris 8.

- 
- Smith, C. 1991. *The parameter of aspect*. Dordrecht : Kluwer Academic Press.
- Squartini, M. 2001. The internal structure of evidentiality in Romance. *Studies in Language* 25:2, 297–334.
- Suñer, M. & Padilla Rivera, J. 1987/1990. Concordancia temporal y subjuntivo. In Bosque, I. (ed.), 185-201.