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ABSTRACT

Standard Spanish grammar states that desideratives (querer que), directives (aconsejar que), purpose clauses (para que), causatives (hacer que), emotive-factives (alegrarse de que), negated epistemics (no creer que), dubitatives (dudar que), and modals (ser posible que) embed subjunctive complement clauses. However, in spite of these classifications, some predicates exhibit a certain degree of mood variation. For instance, emotive-factives can take indicative complements (Crespo del Río, 2014; Faulkner, 2021). Similar variability between the moods may also come about in negated epistemic (Bolinger, 1991), dubitative (Blake, 1981), and modal clauses (Deshors and Waltermire, 2019).

When both moods are acceptable, the choice between the two conveys a difference in meaning (Kanwit and Geeslin, 2014, 2017). Corroborating this hypothesis are findings from Faulkner (2021), which demonstrated that the mood variation occurring in emotive-factive clauses relates to the INFORMATIVENESS of the embedded proposition; i.e., propositions that are addressee-new versus addressee-old.

The objective of the current dissertation is to investigate the standardly subjunctive environments in which the use of the indicative may become acceptable. Two hundred and twenty-three native Spanish-speakers completed a 128-item Acceptability Judgment Task (AJT),
pertaining to the use of each mood in eight traditionally subjunctive complements (desiderative, purpose, directive, causative, modal, dubitative, negated epistemic, and emotive-factive clauses). Participants rated separate instances of subjunctive and indicative based on the (un)informativeness of the complement proposition.

Statistical analyses of the ratings revealed that subjunctive is always preferred over indicative in traditionally subjunctive environments. However, certain predicates were more receptive than others to taking indicative clauses. Whereas preference-based expressions (desideratives, directives, purpose clauses, causatives) require subjunctive complements, emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty (negated epistemics, dubitatives, modals) may accept indicative if the speaker intends to add the affirmative or negated proposition to the common ground. The likelihood that this occurs increases when the proposition (affirmative or negated) is informative. Since this was the case regardless of the participants’ countries of origin, said findings suggest that the Spanish mood system involves a split between two types of subjunctives, one that is required in preference-based contexts, and another that is default and can be replaced by the indicative.

INDEX WORDS: Spanish, Verbal Mood, Mood, Subjunctive, Indicative, Mood Variation
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The present dissertation could not have been completed without the help and guidance of multiple people. I first want to immensely thank my co-advisors Dr. Elena Herburger and Dr. Paul Portner for their consistent willingness to mentor me throughout my time at Georgetown. From Semantics 1 and 2, to my Qualifying Paper, various conferences, the Semantics Reading Group, and many other works, Elena and Paul have been unceasing sources of wisdom and mentorship throughout the years. Through their advising, my passion for semantics and pragmatics, and linguistics on whole, was further ignited. It is difficult to put into words how thankful I am to have had advisors who have not only enlightened me regarding my research interests, but who have also truly cared about my well-being as an individual, separate from being their student. I am forever grateful to them for the knowledge that they have bestowed upon me, as well as the humaneness that they showed me as a person. I am sincerely thankful to them both.

I would also like to thank my committee member, Dr. Francisco Ordóñez who has been a great help to me during the dissertation writing process. Throughout this process, Paco has provided commentary and advice that has helped me to think more critically and expansively about the subject matter that I am addressing. Not only did his comments allow me to think more profoundly, but they also guided me towards an understanding of how my research may be applicable to areas of study outside of semantics and pragmatics. Paco’s guidance was integral to my completion of this project. I am sincerely grateful for all of the help and motivation that he provided me with.

In addition to my committee members, I would also like to sincerely thank my family. Without the ceaseless support of my parents and husband, my career at Georgetown would not
have been possible. Although their fields of study do not relate to linguistics, all have been a consistent and pertinent part of this journey with me. From consulting with them regarding issues pertaining to Jamaican Creole, English, and even Spanish, to passionate conversations about various linguistic phenomena, my family has been there for me throughout it all. I am immensely grateful for their support, guidance, and love, and do not take any of their efforts and assistance for granted. I sincerely thank you all.

My friends have also been a consistent source of support for me throughout this process. From being sounding boards for research ideas, my support systems through good and bad times (especially during this pandemic), PowerPoint editors for important presentations, to helping to keep me accountable regarding any work that I had to complete, I could not have done this without my friends, near and far. I am sincerely grateful to you all, both those inside and outside of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese. Your guidance has been greatly appreciated.

Last but definitely not least, I want to thank God. Any successes made throughout these five years and more, I owe to you. I am sincerely grateful.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION ...........................................................................................................1

1.1 INTRODUCTION: THE TWO SPANISH SUBJUNCTIVES ..................................................1

1.2 MOOD VS. MODALITY ...........................................................................................................3

1.3 THE TWO VERBAL MOODS: INDICATIVE AND SUBJUNCTIVE .....................................4

1.3.1 Normative Variation between Subjunctive and Indicative .............................................5

1.3.1.1 Mood Variation According to the Royal Spanish Academy (RAE) (2011) .............9

1.3.2 Mood Variation in Subjunctive-normative Environments ...........................................15

1.3.2.1 Emotive-factives .......................................................................................................15

1.3.2.2 Negated Predicates of Knowledge and Belief ........................................................16

1.3.2.3 Dubitatives .............................................................................................................17

1.3.2.4 Modals ..................................................................................................................18

1.4 FORMAL SEMANTIC APPROACHES TO MOOD .................................................................20

1.4.1 The Comparison-based Approach to Mood Selection ................................................20

1.4.1.1 Giorgi and Pianesi (1997) ......................................................................................20

1.4.1.1.1 Comments on Giorgi and Pianesi (1997) ..........................................................25

1.4.1.2 Villalta (2008) ........................................................................................................27

1.4.1.2.1 Comments on Villalta (2008) ...........................................................................29

1.4.2 The Truth-based Approach to Mood Selection: Farkas (1992b) ...............................31

1.4.2.1 Comments on Farkas (1992b) ...............................................................................33

1.5 OTHER LINGUISTIC APPROACHES TO MOOD .................................................................34

1.5.1 Bolinger (1968) .............................................................................................................34

1.5.1.1 Comments on Bolinger (1968) .............................................................................36

1.5.2 Terrell and Hooper (1974) ..........................................................................................37

1.5.2.1 Comments on Terrell and Hooper (1974) ..............................................................41

1.5.3 Hooper (1975) .............................................................................................................42

1.5.3.1 Comments on Hooper (1975) ..............................................................................45

1.6 PEDAGOGICAL DESCRIPTIONS OF MOOD .......................................................................45

1.7 THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO VARIATION BETWEEN SUBJUNCTIVE
AND INDICATIVE ......................................................................................... 50

1.8 THE PREFERENCE-BASED AND DEFAULT SUBJUNCTIVES ...................... 51

CHAPTER 2: EXPERIMENTAL STUDY .................................................................... 62

2.1 OVERVIEW ........................................................................................................ 62

2.2 EXPERIMENTAL STUDY ................................................................................. 63

2.2.1 Study Design ............................................................................................... 63

2.2.2 Participants ................................................................................................... 65

2.2.3 Method .......................................................................................................... 65

2.2.3.1 Data Collection ......................................................................................... 66

2.2.3.1.1 Corpus Study and Creation of Acceptability Judgement Tasks .......... 66

2.2.3.1.1.1 Contextualized AJT ........................................................................ 66

2.2.3.1.1.2 Context-free AJT ............................................................................. 68

2.2.4 Statistical Analyses ....................................................................................... 69

2.2.4.1 The Subjunctive and Indicative Compared ............................................ 70

2.2.4.1.1 Subjunctive vs. Indicative in ‘Informative’ Complement Clauses ..... 70

2.2.4.1.2 Subjunctive vs. Indicative in ‘Uninformative’ Complement Clauses 73

2.2.4.1.3 Subjunctive vs. Indicative in ‘Context-free’ Complement Clauses... 75

2.2.4.2 The Subjunctive in (Un)Informative Complement Clauses .................... 77

2.2.4.2.1 Emotive-factive Clauses .................................................................... 79

2.2.4.2.2 Dubitative Clauses ............................................................................. 82

2.2.4.2.3 Purpose Clauses .................................................................................. 85

2.2.4.2.4 Negated Epistemic, Modal, and Volitional Clauses ......................... 87

2.2.4.3 The Indicative in (Un)Informative Complement Clauses ...................... 89

2.2.4.3.1 Emotive-factive Clauses .................................................................... 91

2.2.4.3.2 Negated Epistemic Clauses ................................................................. 94

2.2.4.3.3 Dubitative Clauses ............................................................................. 97

2.2.4.3.4 Causative Clauses ............................................................................. 100

2.2.4.3.5 Directive Clauses ............................................................................... 103

2.2.4.3.6 Modal, Purpose, and Desiderative Clauses ....................................... 105

2.2.4.4 Country Specific Results .......................................................................... 107
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Subjunctive vs. Indicative in ‘Informative’ Complement Clauses .......................... 72
Figure 2: Subjunctive vs. Indicative in ‘Uninformative’ Complement Clauses .......................... 75
Figure 3: Subjunctive vs. Indicative in ‘Context-free’ Complement Clauses .......................... 77
Figure 4: The Subjunctive in (Un)Informative Complement Clauses ........................................ 79
Figure 5: The Subjunctive in (Un)Informative Emotive-factive Clauses ................................. 80
Figure 6: The Subjunctive in (Un)Informative Dubitative Clauses ......................................... 83
Figure 7: The Subjunctive in (Un)Informative Purpose Clauses ............................................. 85
Figure 8: The Subjunctive in (Un)Informative Negated Epistemic, Modal, and Volitional
    Clauses .............................................................................................................................. 89
Figure 9: The Indicative in (Un)Informative Complement Clauses ......................................... 91
Figure 10: The Indicative (Un)Informative Emotive-factive Clauses ......................................... 92
Figure 11: The Indicative in (Un)Informative Negated Epistemic Clauses .............................. 95
Figure 12: The Indicative in (Un)Informative Dubitative Clauses ........................................... 98
Figure 13: The Indicative in (Un)Informative Causative Clauses ............................................. 101
Figure 14: The Indicative in (Un)Informative Directive Clauses ............................................. 103
Figure 15: The Indicative in (Un)Informative Modal, Purpose, and Desiderative Clauses ...... 106
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: The Two Spanish Subjunctives ........................................................................................................2
Table 2: Terrell and Hooper’s (1974) Semantically-based Analysis of Mood in Spanish ............. 38
Table 3: Hooper’s (Non)Assertive and Non-Factive Distinction .............................................................. 43
Table 4: Hooper’s (Non)Assertive and Factive Distinction ........................................................................ 44
Table 5: The Subjunctive with Wishes/Will and Requests ....................................................................... 46
Table 6: The Subjunctive with Emotive-factive and Impersonal Expressions ........................................... 47
Table 7: The Subjunctive with Certainty vs. Uncertainty/Doubt ................................................................. 48
Table 8: The Subjunctive with Adverbial Expressions such as Ojalá ....................................................... 49
Table 9: Subjunctive vs. Indicative in ‘Informative’ Complement Clauses ................................................... 71
Table 10: Subjunctive vs. Indicative in ‘Uninformative’ Complement Clauses ........................................... 74
Table 11: Subjunctive vs. Indicative in ‘Context-free’ Complement Clauses ............................................. 76
Table 12: The Subjunctive in (Un)Informative Complement Clauses ....................................................... 78
Table 13: The Subjunctive in (Un)Informative Negated Epistemic, Modal, and Volitional Clauses ............................................................................................................................................ 88
Table 14: The Indicative in Un(Informative) Complement Clauses ............................................................... 90
Table 15: The Indicative in (Un)Informative Modal, Purpose, and Desiderative Clauses ................. 106
Table 16: Results for Argentina .................................................................................................................. 107
Table 17: Results for Costa Rica ............................................................................................................... 110
Table 18: Results for the Dominican Republic .......................................................................................... 112
Table 19: Results for Mexico ....................................................................................................................... 114
Table 20: Results for Spain ......................................................................................................................... 116
Table 21: Results for All Countries Combined .......................................................................................... 118
Table 22: The Optative-Dubitative Distinction According to Lozano (1972) ............................................. 147
Table 23: The Subjunctive in (Un)Informative NON-MODAL Directive Complements .................. 167
Table 24: The Subjunctive in (Un)Informative MODAL Directive Complements .................................. 168
Table 25: The Indicative in (Un)Informative NON-MODAL Directive Complements ...................... 169
Table 26: The Indicative in (Un)Informative MODAL Directive Complements .................................... 169
Table 27: Indicative and Subjunctive Directive Clauses with Embedded Modals vs. Embedded
Non-modals.................................................................................................................................170
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction: The Two Spanish Subjunctives

In this dissertation, I argue that Spanish has not one, but instead two subjunctives. The idea that the Spanish mood system is characterized by two subjunctives is not a novel concept. As far back as 1847, Andrés Bello put forth that Spanish had both a COMMON and a HYPOTHETICAL subjunctive. Similarly, Gili Gaya (1980) suggested that there exist both a POTENTIAL and an OPTATIVE subjunctive in Spanish. That being said, the proposal that is most similar to that of the present dissertation is Lozano (1972), which states that Spanish has both an optative and a DUBITATIVE subjunctive. This will be discussed in greater depth in section 2.3 of Chapter 2.

In the current study, I argue that, whereas one of Spanish’s two subjunctives is preference-based and required in certain contexts, the other is default and can be overridden by the indicative. I will refer to the required, preference-based subjunctive as SUBJUNCTIVE 1, and the default, “overridable” subjunctive as SUBJUNCTIVE 2. As implied by their descriptions, the differences between the two stem from both the predicates with which they occur, as well as the (im)possibility of being substituted by the indicative. While subjunctive 1 is described as being triggered by the core subjunctive, preference-based predicates (desideratives, directives, and purpose clauses), subjunctive 2 is the default of emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty (dubitatives, negated epistemics, and modals). Unlike the complements in which subjunctive 1 is used, subjunctive 2 appears in clauses that may alternate with indicative if the speaker’s goal is to assert the embedded proposition or its negation. In this way, the affirmative or negated proposition gets added to the common ground (and, consequently, to the addressee’s mental model). I argue that this is most
likely to occur if the complement or its negation is thought to be INFORMATIVE (i.e., new or unknown to the hearer/reader in question, important, contrastive, and/or highly probable). As will be discussed in sections 1.8 and 2.3, the main distinction between the two proposed subjunctives is, thus, summarized as relating to the fact that the predicates that select subjunctive 1 compare $p$ or $\neg p$ (i.e., the proposition $p$ or its negation), but cannot assert $p$ or $\neg p$, while the predicates with which subjunctive 2 co-occurs can assert $p$ or $\neg p$, but cannot compare $p$ or $\neg p$. Emotive-factives are argued to be a unique hybrid between the two, in that they are able to do both; assert $p$ or $\neg p$ and compare $p$ or $\neg p$. However, like verbs of uncertainty, they are described as taking subjunctive 2 since their complements are at times accepting of the indicative. This distinction between the subjunctives is delineated in table 1 below:

Table 1: The Two Spanish Subjunctives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicate types</th>
<th>Subjunctive 1</th>
<th>Subjunctive 2</th>
<th>Subjunctive 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desideratives</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Default</td>
<td>Default</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose Clauses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubitatives</td>
<td>Default</td>
<td>Default</td>
<td>Default</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negated Epistemics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare $p$ or $\neg p$</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can assert $p$ or $\neg p$</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sections to follow seek to provide some background on the subjunctive-indicative contrast, in order to arrive at the main argument that Spanish has two subjunctives (see: section 1.8).
1.2 Mood vs. Modality

The term MODALITY is used to describe the linguistic phenomenon by which grammar allows us to discuss situations which may not be real. For instance, in the sentence below, the modal auxiliary *should* indicates that “situations in which Ben puts down the bird are in some respect better than, or preferable to, situations in which he does not” (Portner, 2018, p. 4).

(1) ‘Ben *should* put down the bird.’

(Mood, on the other hand, “is an aspect of linguistic form which indicates how a proposition is used in the expression of modal meaning” (Portner, 2018, p. 4). Linguists relate the concept of mood to at least two distinct grammatical phenomena: SENTENCE MOOD and VERBAL MOOD (Portner, 2018). Sentence mood refers to the various functions that root sentences carry out to fulfill specific communicative objectives.

(2) ‘Pick up the bird!’

(3) ‘Is Ben holding a bird?’

(4) ‘Ben is holding a bird.’

(2) the speaker’s goal is to make a command;

(3) the speaker’s goal is to ask a question; and

For instance, whereas sentence (2) is imperative, sentences (3) and (4) are respectively interrogative and declarative in nature. This means that in uttering sentence:

(2)
(4) the speaker’s goal is to make a declaration.

Verbal mood, on the other hand, refers to the various forms in which a subordinate clause can appear (Portner, 2018). For example, depending on the speaker or matrix subject’s cognitive state or the particular mental event being referred to, subordinate clauses may appear in either the subjunctive or indicative (p. 4).

1.3 The Two Verbal Moods: Indicative and Subjunctive

Spanish, being part of the Romance language family, distinguishes between two main categories of verbal mood: indicative and subjunctive. In accordance with standard Spanish grammar, predicates that embed indicative complement clauses include commissives (prometer ‘to promise’), verbs of communication (decir ‘to say’), verbs of certainty (estar seguro/a de que ‘to be certain/sure that’), verbs that indicate a happening or occurrence (ocurrir ‘to occur’), fiction verbs (soñar ‘to dream’), predicates of knowledge and belief (pensar ‘to think’, creer ‘to believe’), perception predicates (sentir ‘to sense’), neutral factive predicates (recordar ‘to remember’), and predicates of mental judgment (entender ‘to understand’). On the other hand, predicates that embed subjunctive complement clauses include desideratives (querer ‘to want’), directives (aconsejar ‘to advise’), causatives (hacer que ‘to make that’), emotive-factives (estar contento/a de que ‘to be happy that’), dubitatives (dudar ‘to doubt’), and modals (ser posible que ‘to be possible that’). The subjunctive is also said to be required in purpose clauses (para que ‘so that’), as well as with the negated counterparts of verbs of communication (no decir que ‘to not say that’) and negated predicates of knowledge and belief (no creer que ‘to not believe that’).

However, although the two moods tend to be in complementary distribution, there are certain environments in which their use will overlap. For instance, choice of mood varies in conditional
clauses (*Si tengo/tuviera tiempo… ‘If I have/had time…’*), relative clauses (*Compraré el vestido que me gusta/guste ‘I will buy the dress that I (already) like/(will) like [perhaps after looking at a few options]’*), as well as with certain adverbials (*Cuando me levanto, te llamo ‘When I wake up, I (always) call you’ vs. Cuando me levante, te llamo ‘When(ever) I wake up, I (will) call you’*). Thus, while there are contexts in which each mood is said to be ‘obligatory’, there also exist environments in which they are traditionally variable.

### 1.3.1 Normative Variation between Subjunctive and Indicative

Although the current dissertation centers on mood variation in prescriptively subjunctive-governing environments (e.g., emotive-factive, dubitative, negated epistemic, and modal complement clauses), the present subsection will describe contexts in which both moods are standardly acceptable.

Conditional clauses are one very well-known environment in which both subjunctive and indicative are appropriate. They are traditionally divided into two categories: those that are indicative and those that are subjunctive (Quer, 2009). Indicative conditionals have antecedents that are compatible with the speaker's assumptions. For instance, whereas example (5) suggests that the speaker thinks that it might rain, example (6) puts forth that s/he assumes that s/he may run into the individual in question.

(5) *Si llueve, las calles se mojan.*  
*If it rains, the streets get wet.*  
(Mejías-Bikandi, 2009, p. 165)
In contrast to (5) and (6), examples (7) and (8) are irrealis conditional expressions, since “subjunctive conditional antecedents quantify over worlds which are more distant from the actual one (present non-factual/counterfactual) or even disjoint from the actual one (past non-factual/counterfactual)” (Quer, 2009, p. 1780). Thus, with (7) and (8), at the time the utterances were made, the possibility of the subject having run into the specified individual was either slim or had already passed.

(7) Si lo viera, te avisaría.

If him see.PAST.SUBJ.1SG, you advise.COND.1SG

‘If I saw him, I would let you know.’

(Adapted from Quer, 2009)

(8) Si lo hubiera visto, te habría avisado.

If him have.PAST.SUBJ.1SG see.PP, you have.COND.1SG advise.PP

‘If I had seen him, I would have let you know.’

(Adapted from Quer, 2009)

It is interesting to note that in (irrealis) conditional statements like those of examples (7) and (8), the imperfect subjunctive is the form that is used to delineate counterfactuality. English also uses
the past tense (e.g., preterite ‘If I saw him’; pluperfect ‘If I had seen him’) as an identifier of irrealis conditionality.

Relative clauses are another environment in which subjunctive and indicative are standardly variable. Like conditional clauses, the interpretation of a relative clause changes as a result of a difference in mood.

(9) \textit{Busco unas tijeras que cortan alambre.}

Look-for.PRES.INDIC.1SG some scissors that cut.PRES.INDIC.3PL wire.

‘I’m looking for some scissors that cut wire.’

(Borgonovo et. al, 2015, p. 35)

(10) \textit{Busco unas tijeras que corten alambre.}

Look-for.PRES.INDIC.1SG some scissors that cut.PRES.SUBJ.3PL wire.

‘I’m looking for some scissors that cut wire.’

(Borgonovo et. al, 2015, p. 35)

In example (9), the use of the indicative \textit{cortan} ‘they cut’ signals that there is a specific pair of scissors being looked for. It would be logical for the speaker to add on to such a statement by saying that s/he believes that they are nearby: “I am looking for some scissors that cut wire. I think I left them around here [somewhere]” (Borgonovo et. al, 2015, p. 35). In contrast to this, is the use of the subjunctive \textit{corten}, in example (10). With the subjunctive, it is understood that any pair of scissors that can cut wire will do. In other words, the existence of a particular pair of scissors, capable of cutting wire is not presupposed (p. 35).

Choice of mood is also variable with certain adverbials. For instance, both subjunctive and indicative are acceptable, although with a change in the meaning of the clause, with adverbs such
as antes de que ‘before’, después de que ‘after’, siempre que ‘whenever’ or ‘as long as’, cuando ‘when’ or ‘whenever’, and en cuanto ‘as soon as’.

(11) Cuando viene Marta, cenamos

When come.PRES.INDIC.3SG Marta, eat-dinner.PRES.INDIC.1PL
en el centro.
in the center.
‘When Marta visits, we eat dinner in town.’

(Kanwit and Geeslin, 2014, p. 490)

(12) Cuando venga Marta, cenaremos

When come.PRES.SUBJ.3SG Marta, eat-dinner.FUT.1PL
en el centro.
in the center.
‘When Marta visits, we will eat dinner in town.’

(Kanwit and Geeslin, 2014, p. 490)

For instance, with the indicative viene following the adverb cuando, example (11) is understood as relaying that Marta’s visiting is habitual and likely to have happened on numerous occasions (p. 490). However, in example (12), with the subjunctive venga following cuando, the sentence is interpreted as signaling that Marta has not yet arrived; i.e., that the visiting event is tied to the future and has, thus, not yet occurred (p. 490).
1.3.1.1 Mood Variation According to the Royal Spanish Academy (RAE) (2011)

The Real Academia Española ‘Royal Spanish Academy’ (2011), henceforth RAE, discusses several other contexts in which alternations between subjunctive and indicative are acceptable. They state that these environments are especially interesting since they allow us to make detailed comparisons of the meanings attached to either mood (RAE, 2011, p. 178). They describe the following contrasts as being the most notable.

i. Communication vs. Influence: with verbs like decir ‘to say’, the indicative is used to communicate a fact, while the subjunctive is used to present orders, suggestions, and requests (p. 479).

(13)  
\[ \text{Le dijo que actuaba/actuara de buena fe.} \]

Indicative: ‘S/he told him/her that s/he acted in good faith.’

Subjunctive: ‘S/he told him/her to act with good faith.’

(RAE, 2011, p. 479)

ii. Thought vs. Intention: whereas with verbs like pensar ‘to think’, the indicative is used to manifest what the speaker or subject thinks or believes, the subjunctive relays the speaker or subject’s stance towards a particular event (p. 479).

(14)  
\[ \text{Inicialmente pensaba que} \]

Initially think.PAST.INDIC.1SG that
participaron los dos equipos sevillanos con un tercer rival.

‘I was initially thinking that the two Sevillian teams and a third rival participated.’

(Adapted from Razón, as cited in RAE, 2011, p. 479)

Initially estaba pensando que

‘I was initially thinking that the two Sevillian teams and a third rival should participate.’

(Razón, as cited in RAE, 2011, p. 479)

iii. **Understanding vs. Evaluation or Empathy**: whereas with verbs like *comprender* ‘to understand’, the indicative presents information that is either correct, perceived to be correct, or new to the discourse environment, the subjunctive is used to agree with or accept information that the other conversational participants already know (p. 479).

Comprendí que estaba equivocada.

‘I realized that I was wrong.’

(RAE, 2011, p. 479)
iv. Perception vs. Intention: with verbs like *ver* ‘to see’, the indicative reveals how the speaker or subject perceives or sees a particular event, while the subjunctive is used to relay his/her intent to make said event occur (p. 479).

(18) *Siempre veía que cada cosa estuviera en su lugar.*

Always see.PAST.INDIC.1SG that each thing be.PAST.INDIC.3SG

in its place.

‘I always saw that everything was always in its place.’

(RAE, 2011, p. 479)

v. Assertion vs. Justification: with the indicative, the verb *explicar* ‘to explain’ acts as a verb of saying (*verba dicendi*) and is, thus, used to communicate a particular happening
or event. With the subjunctive, on the other hand, it relays the cause of or reason for something (p. 479).

(20) *El maestro te ha explicado que las cosas no son como tú pensabas.*

The teacher you have explained.PP that the things not be.PRES.INDIC.3PL as you think.PAST.INDIC.2SG.

‘The teacher explained to you that things are not as you think.’

(RAE, 2011, p. 479)

(21) *Eso explica que las cosas no sean como tú piensas.*

That explain.PRES.INDIC.3SG that the things not be.PRES.SUBJ.3PL as you think.PRES.INDIC.2SG.

‘That explains why things are not as you think.’

(RAE, 2011, p. 479)

**vi. Affect vs. Assertion:** According to the RAE (2011), although emotive-factives generally take subjunctive clauses, variation with the indicative does also occur. They state that this happens more frequently in Latin American, as compared to European Spanish (p. 480).

With these expressions (e.g., *alegrarse de que* ‘to be happy that’; *preocuparse de que* ‘to be worried that’), the speaker’s use of the indicative is to point out or highlight the informativeness of the subordinate proposition. This idea directly ties in with the central point of the present dissertation, which is that, in certain normatively subjunctive environments, alternations with the indicative may occur if the complement or its negation
is informative (i.e., new/unknown to the addressee, important, contrastive, and/or highly probable). Conversely, when the complement appears in its default subjunctive mood, the RAE states that the proposition’s affectivity is the focus (p. 480).

(22) \textit{Se quejó de que el citado individuo había propalado infundios por la comarca.}  
\textit{REFL complain.PAST.INDIC.3SG of that the cite.PP individual have.PAST.INDIC.3SG divulge.PP lies through the region.}  
‘S/he complained that the cited individual had spread lies through the region.’  
(RAE, 2011, p. 480)

(23) \textit{Se queja de que la impiedad pretenda corromper el estudio de las ciencias naturales.}  
\textit{REFL complain.PRES.INDIC.3SG of that the impiety try.PRES.SUBJ.3SG corrupt.INF the study of the sciences natural.}  
‘S/he is complaining that impiety may corrupt the study of the natural sciences.’  
(RAE, 2011, p. 480)

vii. \textbf{Fear vs. Suspicion}: With the predicate \textit{temer} ‘to fear’, the indicative puts forth that the subject suspects that an event either will happen or has happened. However, with the subjunctive, it is understood that the subject is afraid that the particular event will/or has actually transpire(d).

(24) \textit{Me temo que va a haber dificultades.}  
\textit{REFL fear.PRES.INDIC.1SG that go.PRES.INDIC.3SG to have.INF difficulties.}
'I fear (suspect) that there are going to be some difficulties.'

(Caballero Bonald, as cited in RAE, 2011, p. 480)

(25) \textit{Temo que algún deslenguado lo sepa.}

Fear.PRES.INDIC.1SG that some foul-mouthed it know.PRES.SUBJ.3SG.

‘I fear (am afraid) that some foul-mouthed person knows about it.’

(RAE, 2011, p. 480)

Examples (13) through (25) show that, similar to conditional, relative, and adverbial clauses, variation between subjunctive and indicative occurs in the complements of several verbs and expressions. With these examples, the RAE (2011) provides very detailed intuitions regarding how the meaning of each mood differs depending on the predicate at hand. For instance, whereas after the expression \textit{alegrarse de que} ‘to be happy/pleased that’, the indicative’s role is to highlight the subordinate proposition’s informativeness, following the verb \textit{temer} ‘to fear’, its role is to relay suspicion. Similarly, whereas the subjunctive after the verb \textit{explicar} ‘to explain’ discloses the reason for or cause of the proposition, after the predicate \textit{ver} ‘to see’, its role is to reveal a particular intention. However, the fact that the meaning of each mood is defined differently based on the particular verb in question suggests that many of these expressions are polysemous. Thus, choice of mood with the matrix verbs in (13) to (25) appears to distinguish the specific meaning that is intended to be portrayed. In some cases, mood choice changes the lexical meaning of the verb in question (e.g., \textit{comprender} ‘to understand’, \textit{ver} ‘to see’), and in others, the compositional meaning of the entire sentence (e.g., \textit{pensar} ‘to think’, \textit{explicar} ‘to explain’).
1.3.2 Mood Variation in Subjunctive-normative Environments

In addition to the mood variation described in sections 1.3.1 and 1.3.1.1 above, are the alternations between subjunctive and indicative which occur with predicates that normatively take the subjunctive. For instance, as introduced in section 1.3.1.1, although generally inclined to taking subjunctive complements, emotive-factives (e.g., *ser bueno/malo que* ‘it is good/bad that’) do at times accept the indicative (Bolinger, 1991; Blake, 1981; Crespo del Río, 2014; Farkas, 1992a; Faulkner, 2021; García and Terrell, 1977; Gregory and Lunn, 2012; Kowal, 2007; Lipski, 1978; Lope Blanch, 1958; Quer, 1998, 2001; RAE, 2011; Silva-Corvalán, 1994; Terrell and Hooper, 1974). This is said to take place in all varieties of Spanish (Crespo del Río, 2014). Similar variability with indicative also comes about with negated epistemics (e.g., *no creer que* ‘to not believe that’) (Bolinger, 1991; Kowal, 2007; Quer, 1998, 2001, 2009; Waltermire, 2017), dubitatives (e.g., *dudar que* ‘to doubt that’) (Blake, 1981; Kowal, 2007; Waltermire, 2017), and modals (e.g., *ser posible que* ‘to be possible that’) (Deshors and Waltermire, 2019; Kowal, 2007). The following sections corroborate these points with examples.

1.3.2.1 Emotive-factives

Although regularly described as requiring the subjunctive (Alonso-Cortés, 1981; Giannakidou, 2015; Gili Gaya, 1960; Villalta, 2000), it is relatively widely known that Spanish emotive-factives may allow for the indicative (Blake, 1981; Crespo del Río, 2014; Farkas, 1992b; Faulkner, 2021; García and Terrell, 1977; Gregory and Lunn, 2012; Lipski, 1978; Quer, 1998, 2001; Silva-Corvalán, 1994; RAE, 2011; Studerus, 1995; Terrell and Hooper, 1974). Thus, while (26)

---

1 Emotive-factives are also referred to as ‘evaluative’ predicates.
embodies their default choice of mood, indicative complements, like that of (27), are not uncommon (Blake, 1982; Crespo del Río, 2014; Terrell and Hooper, 1974; RAE, 2011).

(26)  *Es triste que se vaya tan pronto.*  
Be.PRES.INDIC.3SG sad that REFL leave.SUBJ.3SG so soon.  
‘It is sad that s/he is leaving so soon.’  
(Terrell and García, 1977, p. 221)

(27)  *Me sorprendió que ustedes no pudieron ayudarnos con el plan.*  
Me surprise.PAST.INDIC.3SG that you-all not can.PAST.INDIC.3PL help.us-INF with the plan.  
‘It surprised me that you couldn’t help us with the plan.’  
(Terrell and García, 1977, p. 221)

1.3.2.2 Negated Predicates of Knowledge and Belief

A factor often claimed to trigger the subjunctive is negation (Farkas, 1992b; Giorgi and Pianesi, 1997; Portner, 2018). It is the commonly held view that certain indicative-normative predicates take the subjunctive when negated (Portner, 2018; Quer, 2001). However, although subjunctive may be the default after negation (Portner, 2018), the use of the indicative is not ruled out (Bolinger, 1991; Farkas, 1992b; García and Terrell, 1977; Giorgi and Pianesi, 1997; Quer, 2001, 2009; Studerus, 1995). Thus, either subjunctive or indicative may be admissible in examples (28) and (29) to follow.
(28) *Marta no cree* que Pedro *sea/es* culpable.

Marta not believe.PRES.INDIC.3SG that Pedro be.PRES.SUBJ/INDIC.3SG guilty.

‘Marta does not believe that Pedro is guilty.’

(Borgonovo and Prévost, 2003, p. 151)

(29) *La gente muchas veces no cree* que puede llegar a ese nuevo nivel que Dios tiene para ellos.

The people many times not believe.PRES.INDIC.3SG that can.PRES.INDIC.3SG arrive.INF to that new level that God have.PRES.INDIC.3SG for them.

‘People many times don’t believe that they can get to that new level that God has for them.’

(Davies’ Corpus del Español, 2016)

1.3.2.3 Dubitatives

Like negated epistemics, dubitatives are also regularly described as being subjunctive-governing predicates (Ramsey, 1956; Villalta, 2008).

(30) *Dudo* que sea culpable.

Doubt.PRES.INDIC.1SG that be.PRES.SUBJ.3SG guilty.

‘I doubt that s/he is guilty.’

(Ramsey, 1956, p. 419)
However, although this may be the normative pattern, they do at times accept indicative subordinate clauses (Kowal, 2007; Quer, 1998, 2001, 2009; Waltermire, 2017).

(31)  **Dudo** que **tiene** razón.

Doubt.PRES.INDIC.1SG that have.PRES.INDIC.3SG reason.

‘I doubt that s/he is right.’

(Fente as cited in Kowal, 2007, p. 58)

(32)  **Algunos dudan** que él **lo escribió**.

Some doubt.PRES.INDIC.3PL that he it write.PAST.INDIC.3SG.

‘Some doubt that he wrote it.’

(Davies’ Corpus del Español, 2016)

1.3.2.4 Modals

It is a common claim that Spanish requires that subjunctive be used after expressions of possibility and probability (Farkas, 1992b; Hooper, 1975; Ramsey, 1956; Villalta, 2008). Thus, if this rule were to be adhered to, only sentences such as (33) and (34) below should be considered grammatical.

(33)  **Es probable que lleguen** a tiempo.

Be.PRES.INDIC.3SG probable that arrive.PRES.SUBJ.3PL at time.

‘It is likely that they will arrive on time.’

(Laca, 2010, p. 203)
It is possible that they have already finished.

(Terrell and Hooper, 1974, p. 487)

However, in spite of these claims, native speakers will sometimes opt for indicative modal complements (e.g., Deshors and Waltermire, 2019; García and Terrell, 1977). Items (35) and (36) exemplify this further.

‘It is possible that she wants to point out that it is something that must be respected instead of being dumped in the basement.’

(Davies’ Corpus del Español, 2016)

‘It is probable/likely that the prices there will be lower.’

(García and Terrell, 1977, p. 220)
As introduced in section 1.1, both verbs of uncertainty (negated epistemics, dubitatives, and modals) and emotive-factives are described as co-occurring with the default, as opposed to the required subjunctive; i.e., subjunctive 2 as opposed to subjunctive 1. That is, the subjunctive that can at times be replaced by the indicative. In sections 1.8 and 2.3, I will propose that the replacement of the subjunctive with the indicative tends to occur when the complement is informative (new or unknown to the addressee, important, contrastive, and/or highly probable).

1.4 Formal Semantic Approaches to Mood

The present section will discuss the two main theories regarding the semantics of verbal mood; i.e., the comparison-based approach and the truth-based account of mood selection. The main idea characterizing ‘comparison’, tied to Giorgi and Pianesi (1997), is that the subjunctive is used in those grammatical contexts in which a comparison between alternatives is being expressed (Portner, 2018). On the other hand, the truth-based account of mood, exemplified by Farkas (1992b), suggests that the indicative is associated with contexts in which the clause is true as attached to certain possible worlds (Portner, 2018). In addition to describing the environments in which each mood is found, both theories discuss how they may also be applied to specific instances of cross- and intra-linguistic mood variation.

1.4.1 The Comparison-based Approach to Mood Selection

1.4.1.1 Giorgi and Pianesi (1997)

One of the two main theories regarding the semantics of verbal mood is the COMPARISON-based approach, described by Giorgi and Pianesi (1997). However, before delving into the
intricacies of this analysis, some important concepts mentioned by Giorgi and Pianesi need to be made clear. The first is that of the **EVALUATION CONTEXT**. The evaluation context is the semantic environment in which the truth of a complement is assessed. According to Giorgi and Pianesi, the distinction between subjunctive and indicative corresponds to the different properties characterizing these environments. The types of properties characterizing these environments are determined by the matrix predicate and the **CONVERSATIONAL BACKGROUND**. Conversational backgrounds are **MODAL BASES** and **ORDERING SOURCES** (see: Kratzer, 1991).

A modal base specifies the worlds in which the proposition in the scope of the modal is to be evaluated. Ordering sources, on the other hand, capture the observation that the understanding of a modalized sentence often implies the use of idealized states of affairs, describing the way the world should be – that is, *according to the law* or *according to what is the normal course of events*, and so on (p. 210)

Modal bases and ordering sources act together in ensuring that the evaluation of the modalized proposition takes place in the worlds (of the modal base) that better carry out the particular ideal (p. 210). Giorgi and Pianesi also discuss the importance of the **COMMON GROUND** and its **CONTEXT SET** (see: Stalnaker, 1973, 2002), both which relate to the global discourse environment. The common ground is the set of propositions that the speaker and hearer accept in the course of their conversation. A sentence with a presupposition *p* is pragmatically acceptable if *p* is consistent with the common ground. It is these presuppositions that “determine the context set of the conversation – that is, the set of all possible worlds which are compatible with every proposition in the common ground” (Giorgi and Pianesi, 1997, p. 206). Now that these concepts have been introduced, a discussion of the theory will follow.
Giorgi and Pianesi (1997) state that, across languages, the subjunctive is chosen when NON-NULL (i.e., non-empty) ordering sources co-occur with evaluation contexts that are NON-REALISTIC (p. 214). Non-realistic contexts of evaluation are those which are far away from the common ground; i.e., they do not match nor coincide with the common ground. This is the case for volitional predicates (e.g., desideratives and directives), which have ordering sources that are non-null (e.g., BOULETIC, TELEOLOGICAL, or DEONTIC) and contexts of evaluation that are non-realistic. As such, they are expected to (and do) select for the subjunctive. For instance, in sentence (37) to follow, *Mary paying attention to John* is evaluated with respect to the set of John’s desires. These desires “contribute the ordering source by establishing a bouletic conversational background” (Giorgi and Pianesi, 1997, p. 212). This is where the idea of comparison/preference comes into play. Desires are considered orderings or ranked sets of alternatives. In other words, in (37), John’s desire is that Mary pay attention to him, as opposed to, say, her not paying attention to him. Therefore, since the conversational background is bouletic (preference-based), we cannot assume that John’s desire will materialize in the actual world; i.e., the context of evaluation is non-realistic. The proposition in (37) is, thus, located ‘far away’ from the common ground (i.e., it does not match the common ground) since it refers to a desired/preferred future that is unpredictable. That is, a future that is not necessarily realistic.

(37) Juan quiere que María le haga caso.

John wants.PRES.INDIC.3SG that Mary him make.PRES.SUBJ.3SG case.

‘John wants Mary to pay attention to him.’

In the case of verbs like *saber* ‘to know’, *escribir* ‘to write’, or *informar* ‘to inform’, Giorgi and Pianesi (1997) state that their use with the indicative coincides with them having NULL
ordering sources (i.e., predicates with no ordering sources or empty ordering sources) and evaluation contexts that are close to the common ground. For instance, in example (38) below, no modal component with an ordering source is involved, which is why the subordinate mood is indicative (p. 219).

(38)      Juan sabe que María viene este fin de semana.

John knows that Mary is coming this weekend.’

In tackling the cross-linguistic variation that occurs with belief verbs (e.g., creer ‘to believe’), Giorgi and Pianesi (1997) state that the variation that exists between languages like French and Romanian, which take indicative complements, and languages like Italian and Icelandic which take subjunctive complements, relates to how each group of languages classifies the contexts of evaluation that they induce (p. 214). While French and Romanian “assimilate the derived contexts of belief predicates to common grounds” (p. 215), Italian and Icelandic have belief predicates with “modal bases that do not (necessarily) share anything with the common ground” (p. 215). Instead, they may depict private, internal realities (p. 214). Thus, unlike Romanian and French, Italian (and Icelandic) is “sensitive to a parameter constituted by the properties of the intersection between a modal base and the common ground. When such an intersection can be empty, Italian requires the subjunctive” (p. 215). These (dis)similarities in terms of what counts as close to or similar to the common ground are what cause some languages to take indicative complements, while others take subjunctive ones.
In the case of *verba dicendi*, such as *decir* ‘to say’, Giorgi and Pianesi (1997) argue that choice of mood relates to a change in the meaning of the predicate. As opposed to reporting someone else’s assertion (i.e., an indicative clause), a subjunctive ‘say’ clause reports a directive, a pattern that they state is predicted by their theory.

(39)  
*El texto dice* que viene con voz de archangel. O sea, viene como jefe de los ángeles.

‘The text says that he is coming with the voice of the archangel. In other words, he’s coming as the chief angel.’

(Davies’ Corpus del Español, 2016)

(40)  
*Esa voz que te dice* que venga, que por aquí. Esa ilusión serena que te impulsa hacia aquello que sientes te hará inmensamente feliz.

‘That voice that tells you to come, through here. That serene illusion that impulses you towards that which makes you extremely happy.’

(Davies’ Corpus del Español, 2016)
1.4.1.1 Comments on Giorgi and Pianesi (1997)

As seen in section 1.4.1.1, Giorgi and Pianesi’s (1997) comparison-based approach to mood discusses how the choice of the subjunctive is related to an ordering or set of preferences. However, although this may account for the subjunctive in the complements of preference-based subjunctive governors (e.g., desiderative and directive predicates), difficulties arise if less stringently subjunctive predicates are considered (i.e., emotive-factives, negated epistemics, dubitatives, and verbs of possibility). Unlike the former set of verbs and expressions, with the complements of the latter (as seen in section 1.3.2), the speaker may choose to present the proposition in the indicative.

In the case of emotive-factive clauses, Giorgi and Pianesi (1997) explain that the variation that they exhibit relates to the two components attached to their meaning. They argue that apart from a factive side to their meaning, emotive-factives also express causality.

(41) *Me sorprende que Juan haya/ha escrito esa carta a María.*

‘It surprises me that John wrote that letter to Mary.’

(Adapted from Giorgi and Pianesi, 1997, p. 219)

In terms of factivity, the complement proposition is presupposed to be true (i.e., in terms of example (41), it is assumed that John wrote a letter to Mary). With respect to causality, the proposition being described is understood as having caused the subject to feel the emotion expressed by the emotive-factive (e.g., astonishment or surprise) (p. 219). Thus, according to this
analysis, emotive-factives have a component of their meaning that requires “the complement clause to be true with respect to a modal environment – that is, a modal base and an ordering source” (p. 219). Giorgi and Pianesi state that languages that allow for both moods with emotive-factives are in an intermediate position on this causation-factivity continuum. For instance, since Spanish evaluative clauses may fluctuate between moods (Blake 1981; Crespo del Río 2014; Faulkner, 2021; Farkas 1992b; García and Terrell 1977; Gregory and Lunn 2012; Lipski 1978; Quer 1998; 2009; Silva-Corvalán 1994; Terrell and Hooper 1974), the use of subjunctive would result from the predicate’s causative side, while the presence of the indicative would relate to its factivity.

When it comes to negated epistemics, Giorgi and Pianesi (1997) state that “the effects of mood selection could be pursued on the basis of modifications negation induces on the interpretation context of the complement clause […] Negation makes the interpretation contexts more different than they normally are with respect to common grounds” (p. 226). If the subjunctive is licensed, the evaluation context is distant enough from the common ground. If not, the negation is understood as being “[…] in the scope of the assertive operator so that it does not change the context of evaluation” (p. 216). However, although Giorgi and Pianesi briefly discuss the subjunctive as co-occurring with negation, they do not discuss the link between subjunctive and verbs of doubting. Consequently, the fact that dubitatives sometimes take indicative complements, is not addressed. It is, thus, not clear how such variation would be explained. The same goes for weak modal expressions like ser posible/probable que ‘to be possible/probable that’. In spite of them being normatively subjunctive in Spanish (see: section 1.3.2.4), variation with the indicative does occur. However, because these expressions are not incorporated into Giorgi and Pianesi’s main analysis, it is not evident how their mood-taking patterns would be approached.
These points demonstrate that, although Giorgi and Pianesi’s (1997) comparative semantics may be applicable to mood use with the core subjunctive (querer ‘to want’, desear ‘to desire/wish’) and indicative predicates (e.g., saber ‘to know’, informar ‘to inform’), certain predicates with which intra-linguistic variation occurs, fall outside the scope of their theory (e.g., negated epistemics, dubitatives, and modals). Although a possible explanation would be to state that mood variation with these predicates stems from lexical ambiguity, the present dissertation intends to instead demonstrate how it relates to a division between subjunctives.

1.4.1.2 Villalta (2008)

Villalta (2008) is another work assuming a comparison-based semantics. Her analysis puts forth the idea that matrix predicates that have subjunctive complements introduce an ordering relation or scale (i.e., “desire predicates, emotive-factive predicates, modals, predicates expressing doubt, directives, and causatives” (p. 470)). This means that their semantics involves the embedded proposition being compared to different alternatives or possibilities. The ordering scale that is expressed by the predicate may relate to either likelihood or desirability. Moreover, since these predicates introduce a scale, they are to be understood as being GRADABLE. Thus, in a statement like that of (37), repeated below as (42), it is understood that John’s desire for Mary to pay attention to him is compared against some other alternative (e.g., Mary not paying attention to him).

\[(42) \quad \text{Juan quiere que María le haga caso.} \]

John wants.PRES.INDIC.3SG that Mary him make.PRES.SUBJ.3SG case.

‘John wants Mary to pay attention to him.’
However, different from Giorgi and Pianesi (1997), Villalta states that these contextual alternatives may be many. For example, although John wants Mary to pay attention to him, she may not do as he wishes and instead ignore him, or she may pay attention to someone else who isn’t John, or she may leave the situation in its entirety.

Villalta (2008) states that all predicates whose complements represent a comparison of alternatives require the subjunctive. Thus, in explaining why emotive-factives can sometimes have indicative complements, she suggests that a change in the meaning of the predicate has to take place. In this way, the matrix predicate changes verb classes and loses its emotivity; thereafter, the indicative becomes acceptable.

(43) Siento que te hayan hecho daño.

Sorry.PRES.INDIC.1SG that you have.PRES.SUBJ.3PL done.PP pain.

‘I am sorry that they have hurt you.’

(Villalta, 2008, p. 471)

(44) Siento que va a haber un problema.

Sense.PRES.INDIC.1SG that go.PRES.INDIC.3SG to-be a problem

‘I have the impression that there is going to be a problem.’

(Villalta, 2008, p. 471)

Thus, sentir, in the preceding examples, goes from being the emotive-factive ‘to be sorry’ with the subjunctive (43), to the perception predicate ‘to have the impression/sense’ with the indicative (44).
Villalta (2008) points out that unlike subjunctive-normative complements, indicative complements are not gradable. Thus, in example (38), repeated below as (45), which contains an indicative subordinate clause, no contextual alternatives are compared.

\[(45)\]

\[\text{Juan sabe que María viene este fin de semana.}\]

‘John knows that Mary is coming this weekend.’

1.4.1.2.1 Comments on Villalta (2008)

Although Villalta (2008) suggests that emotive-factives undergo a meaning change as a result of a change in the mood of the complement, the only emotive-factive example that she provides is sentir – a predicate whose lexical meaning inherently varies. For instance, according to the RAE (2020), the verb sentir denotes the following meanings: to sense, to feel, to pity, and to opine. Most importantly, when other emotive-factives are considered, no change in the meaning of the predicate comes about through a change in the mood of the complement. For example, in sentence (46) below, the emotive-factive ser bueno que ‘to be good that’ conserves its original denotation, regardless of the mood of the embedded context.

\[(46)\]

\[\text{Es bueno que usted llega/llegue a tiempo.}\]

‘It is good that you arrive on time.’
‘It’s good that you arrive on time.’

(Terrell and Hooper, 1974, p. 488)

For this reason, the meaning change that Villalta describes seems to be a property of certain emotive-factives, like sentir and temer, rather than the entire category of evaluative predicates. In the case of sentir and temer (see: section 1.3.1.1), choice of mood may relate to some ambiguity. For instance, while sentir with a subjunctive complement is understood to mean ‘to be sorry that’, with an indicative complement, it means ‘to have the impression that/sense that’. Similarly, with the indicative, temer may be understood to mean ‘to suspect’, whereas with a subjunctive complement, it denotes fear (i.e., to fear or to be afraid of). In terms of other emotive-factive expressions (e.g., ser bueno/malo que ‘to be good/bad that’; alegrarse de que ‘to be happy/pleased that’ etc.), what, instead, seems to be the case is that, unlike the core volitional predicates (e.g., desideratives and directives), they have a semantics that allows their embedded propositions to sometimes take the indicative. This directly relates to the central point of the present dissertation, which is that the Spanish mood system is characterized by a split between subjunctives; i.e., one subjunctive that is required (subjunctive 1) and another that is default and able to be replaced by the indicative (subjunctive 2). Going along with this idea is the previously mentioned point, which stated that variation with the indicative also occurs in the complements of negated epistemics, dubitatives, and verbs of possibility. Therefore, like Giorgi and Pianesi (1997), Villalta’s theory falls short in detailing how comparison can comprehensively explain the intermittent use of the indicative in certain normatively subjunctive environments.
1.4.2 The Truth-based Approach to Mood Selection: Farkas (1992b)

The other main intuition regarding the semantics of verbal mood has to do with the notion of TRUTH. Farkas (1992b) provides a theory of this type. The first point that Farkas puts forth is that the truth of a proposition has to be made relative to individuals. In this way, the proposition is understood as being true or false, only as it relates to a certain individual. She refers to this individual as the INDIVIDUAL ANCHOR of the proposition. As such, in example (47) below, the individual anchor (subject) is John. This means that the complement Mary is angry at him is only true as it relates to John’s reality, or as far as John is concerned.

(47)  **Juan cree que María está enojada**

John believe.PRES.INDIC.3SG that Mary be.PRES.INDIC.3SG angry con él.

with him.

‘John believes that Mary is angry at him.’

In addition to the term individual anchor, Farkas (1992b) introduces the concepts EXTENSIONAL ANCHORING and INTENSIONAL ANCHORING. She states that the two terms are useful in understanding why fiction verbs, which represent non-actual worlds (non-reality) and do not commit their subjects to the truth of their complements, take the indicative. Extensional anchoring refers to propositions that are interpreted as being attached to one particular world. Thus, according to Farkas, epistemics, commissives, declaratives, and fiction verbs are all extensional since their complements are anchored to a singular world. Epistemics introduce a world pertaining to the reality of the subject, commissives introduce a world pertaining to the future reality of the subject, declaratives introduce a world modeling the reality of a report, and fiction verbs present a
dream or fantasy world (p. 89). For instance, in example (48), the world in which the proposition
Mary was angry at him is interpreted, is a single, alternative dream world. It is, consequently, this
‘one-world’ association that causes these, and other similar predicates to govern the indicative.

(48) Juan soñó que María estaba enojada
  John dream.PAST.INDIC.3SG that Mary be.PAST.INDIC.3SG angry
  con él.
  with him.
  ‘John dreamed that Mary was angry at him.’

When it comes to the subjunctive, Farkas (1992b) brings in the term intensional anchoring. She states that, unlike the indicative, the use of the subjunctive co-occurs with predicates whose complements are anchored to multiple worlds; i.e., a set of worlds. Verbs with these properties are referred to as intensional predicates. They include modals, directives, and desideratives since each introduces a set of worlds that coincide with many possible futures (pp. 89-91).

In addressing the unique emotive-factive category of predicates, Farkas (1992b) suggests that they are hybrid, in that they have both an evaluative and a factive component. Whereas their evaluative or emotive side makes them compatible with the subjunctive, their factive character allows them compatibility with the indicative. Farkas states that in terms of their subjunctive side, they are similar to desideratives, directives, and modals since they classify situations according to the reaction or emotion that they produce, or as related to some implicit criteria (e.g., what one considers to be good/bad etc. (p. 101)). As to their indicative component, she states that unlike desideratives, directives, and modals, their complement propositions are factual and, thus, considered to be true of the actual world (p. 101).
Building on Farkas’ (1992b) truth-based tradition are Giannakidou (e.g., 2015) and Quer (e.g., 2001). For instance, Giannakidou (2015) and Giannakidou and Mari (2015) propose that, whereas the indicative is associated with VERIDICALITY, the subjunctive is tied to NON-VERIDICAL contexts. While “the indicative is the indicator of veridical epistemic states, and is selected by expressions that are at least subjectively veridical” (Giannakidou, 2015, p. 22), “the subjunctive is an indicator of a nonveridical epistemic state or modal base, and is selected by expressions that are at least subjectively nonveridical” (p. 26). Similar to Farkas, Giannakidou makes veridicality relative to individual anchors (p. 14).

Like Farkas (1992b) and Giannakidou (e.g., 2015), Quer (e.g., 2001) adopts the idea that truth should be made relative to individuals (p. 84). In his approach, Quer states that the subjunctive marks a model shift which relates to intensional predicates being divided into two distinct classes: i.e., weak and strong. Weak intensional predicates relate to those which represent epistemic, dream, and conversational models. That is, predicates which take us from the speaker’s epistemic model to the epistemic model of some other individual. With these predicates, we do not encounter a shift in the type of model, which means that no shift to the subjunctive is attested. Conversely, strong intensional predicates, which represent bouletic models (e.g., volitionals and directives), do induce a model shift since “they take us from the epistemic model of the speaker to the bouletic model of an individual” (p. 88).

1.4.2.1 Comments on Farkas (1992b)

One of the main problems with Farkas’ (1992b) truth-based approach is that it is difficult to understand how verbs of saying, believing, dreaming, and promising can be tied to a singular world. In terms of belief predicates, Portner (2018) points out that a subject’s beliefs “could never
be specific enough to pick out a particular world” (p. 95). The same goes for verbs of saying and promising. It is difficult to perceive that what a speaker or subject says or promises would be precise enough to be tied to a singular world, as opposed to a set of them. Also, in terms of verbs of dreaming, how could it ever be determined that a subject’s dream is tied to a specified dream world and not many? Another problem with the truth-based account is that, like comparison, it runs into problems where variation is concerned. It is not clear how the delineation between extensional and intensional anchoring can be extended towards contexts in which the use of the two moods overlaps. In terms of emotive-factives, Farkas explains the variation that they exhibit as stemming from their emotive and factive components; i.e., their hybridity. However, such an explanation does not seem to mesh well with her original theory – one world vs. multiple world anchoring. With negated epistemics, Farkas states that use of the indicative expresses negative epistemic commitment (i.e., the complement is false to the speaker or subject), while the use of the subjunctive exhibits an uncertain, graded epistemic attitude. However, in the case of modals and dubitatives, the fluctuations between moods that each of their complements may exhibit, is not discussed. Thus, although the division between predicates (extensional and intensional) may be useful for understanding the mood-taking patterns of certain verbs and expressions, it encounters difficulties if emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty are considered.

1.5 Other Linguistic Approaches to Verbal Mood

1.5.1 Bolinger (1968)

Bolinger (1968) puts forth that choice of mood in Romance can be paralleled to the (im)possibility of matrix verb postposition/postposing in English. He states that: “If in English it is possible to drop ‘that’ and move the main verb phrase away from its position in front of the
clause, then the verb in the corresponding Romance noun clause will be in indicative; if not, it will be in subjunctive” (Bolinger, 1968, p. 4). He provides the following examples in support of this claim:

(49) I believe they are ready.

(50) They are ready, I believe.

(51) Creo que están listos.

Believe.PRES.INDIC.1SG that be.PRES.INDIC.3PL ready.

‘I believe that they are ready.’

(Bolinger, 1968, p.4)

Since the main verb ‘believe’ in (49) can be postposed to yield example (50), the Spanish equivalent of either (i.e., 51) will take an indicative complement. Bolinger points out that in the case of the traditionally-defined ‘subjunctive-governing’ expressions, post-posing would not be acceptable.

Emotive-factive:

(52) It’s good that nobody else came.  *Nobody else came, it’s good.

(Bolinger, 1968, p. 5)

Negated Epistemic:

(53) I don’t believe that they are ready.  *They’re ready, I don’t believe.

(Bolinger, 1968, p. 5)

Dubitative:

(54) I doubt that it is relevant.  *It is relevant, I doubt.

(Bolinger, 1968, p. 5)
Modal:

(55) It’s probable that they know.                    *They know, it’s probable.

(Bolinger, 1991, p. 258)

Volitional:

(56) I insist that it stop immediately.                *It stop immediately, I insist

(57) I’ll see that the clerk calls you at six o’clock.   *The clerk calls you at six o’clock, I’ll see.

(Bolinger, 1968, p. 5)

Therefore, whereas the equivalents of indicative-taking Romance predicates (e.g., creer ‘to believe’) can postpone in English, those that are subjunctive cannot (e.g., ser bueno que ‘to be good that’). Bolinger characterizes this distinction as the difference between REPRESENTATIONAL (indicative) and NON-REPRESENTATIONAL (subjunctive) sentences. While representational statements characterize reality “in terms of a mental picture or a representation to the mind”, non-representational sentences “apply the polarity of two opposing attitudes […]” (e.g., acceptance and rejection) or “influence an outcome” (e.g., suasion or causation) (pp. 16-17). This contrast parallels that of postponing and non-postponing matrix predicates since representational verbs have their counterparts in Spanish taking the indicative, while those that are non-representational select the subjunctive (p. 17).

1.5.1.1 Comments on Bolinger (1968)

In an attempt to verify his claim regarding the impossibility of postponing and its tie to the subjunctive, Bolinger (1968) provides emotive-factive, negated epistemic, dubitative, and
volitional predicates as examples. However, although the link between postposing and volitional verbs may be accurate (see: examples 56 and 57), the idea cannot be extended to emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty (i.e., dubitatives, negated epistemics, and expressions of possibility see: examples 52, 53, 54, and 55). According to Bolinger, since postposing volitive predicates is not grammatical in English, their Spanish counterparts should take subjunctive complements. However, although postposing is described as being ungrammatical with emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty (negated epistemics, dubitatives, and modals), unlike what Bolinger (1968) would predict, they do not require subjunctive complements in Spanish. Instead, emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty can be argued to have the subjunctive as the default mood of their complements, which means that, in certain cases, it may be overridden by the indicative (as seen in sections 1.1, 1.3.2, 1.8, and 2.3.1.2). Additionally, in the case of emotive-factives, it can be argued that with certain matrix verbs, postposing is possible (e.g., ‘I’m afraid the vase broke’; ‘The vase broke, I’m afraid’, where postposing the evaluative predicate ‘to be afraid’ appears to be perfectly grammatical).

1.5.2 Terrell and Hooper (1974)

According to Terrell and Hooper (1974), the Spanish mood distribution is influenced by two semantic notions: ASSERTION and PRESUPPOSITION. As such, matrices and their complements are characterized into three distinct categories; assertion, presupposition, and neither. The following table provides details on the groups in which different predicate-types would fall.
Table 2: Terrell and Hooper’s (1974) Semantically-based Analysis of Mood in Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Notion</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Mood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASSERTION</td>
<td>(1) Assertion (e.g., saber ‘to know’)</td>
<td>Indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Report (e.g., decir ‘to say’)</td>
<td>Indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESUPPOSITION</td>
<td>(3) Mental judgment (e.g., entender ‘to understand’)</td>
<td>Indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Comment (e.g., ser bueno que ‘to be good that’)</td>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>(5) Doubt (e.g., no creer que ‘to not believe that’)</td>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Imperative (volition, suasion, influence) (e.g., querer que ‘to want that’)</td>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Terrell and Hooper, 1974, p. 488)

According to Terrell and Hooper (1974), assertive predicates include verbs of certainty (e.g., estar seguro/a de que ‘to be sure that’), predicates of knowledge/belief (e.g., saber ‘to know that’), and verbs of communication (e.g., decir ‘to say’). On the other hand, verbs whose complements are presupposed include predicates of mental judgment (e.g., darse cuenta de que ‘to realize’, entender ‘to understand’) and emotive-factives (e.g., ser bueno que ‘it is good that’, alegrarse de que ‘to be happy/pleased that’). Finally, predicates whose complements are neither asserted nor presupposed are either imperative (e.g., insistir en que ‘to insist that’) or dubitative (e.g., dudar ‘to doubt’, no estar seguro de que ‘to not be sure that’) in nature.

In terms of their mood-taking properties, assertive predicates (classes 1 and 2: e.g., estar seguro/a de que ‘to be sure that’, decir ‘to say’) are described as requiring the indicative, while those whose complements are neither asserted nor presupposed (classes 5 and 6: e.g., insistir ‘to insist’, dudar ‘to doubt’) take the subjunctive. However, Terrell and Hooper (1974) point out that,
whenever either of the two categories is negated, they switch verb classes. “Assertive predicates become dubitative matrices under negation, and dubitative matrices become assertive under negation” (p. 489). This change in the meaning of the matrix predicate is what leads to their “exchanging” of moods. In the examples below, whereas the assertive matrix verb creo ‘I believe’ (58) becomes dubitative (no creo ‘I don’t believe’) under negation (59), the dubitative matrix dudo ‘I doubt’ (60) becomes assertive (no dudo ‘I don’t doubt’) when negated (61). Although Terrell and Hooper do not explicitly discuss this, this switch is assumed to also occur when the matrix verb is presented in a form other than the first person.2

(58)  Creo que Martin ha leído
Believe.PRES.INDIC.1SG that Martin have.PRES.INDIC.3SG read.PP
ese libro.
that book.
‘I think Martin has read this book.’

Terrell and Hooper, 1974, p. 490

---

2 This switch between the verb classes may take place regardless of if the negated epistemic or dubitative complement is headed by a matrix predicate that is conjugated in the first-person.

Example: Muchos usuarios creen que Blackberry es sinónimo de Smartphone.
‘Many users believe that Blackberry is a synonym for Smartphone.’

(Davies’ Corpus del Español, 2016)

[…] Me dijeron que no creen que me lo devuelvan.
They told me that they don’t believe that they (will) return it to me.’

(Davies’ Corpus del Español, 2016)

No dudan que su punto de vista es el apropiado y cualquier otro diferente, la equivocada.
‘They don’t doubt that their point of view is the appropriate one and whichever other one, wrong.’

(Davies’ Corpus del Español, 2016)

Es tan sencillo que muchos dudan que sea real.
‘It is so simple that many doubt that it is real.’

(Davies’ Corpus del Español, 2016)
However, when it comes to the predicates falling under the label of presupposition, the division between moods is less clear cut. Although there is a sharply defined contrast between the mood-taking patterns characterizing classes 1 and 2 versus 5 and 6, the predicates in classes 3 and 4 are inconsistent. While predicates of mental judgement (class 3: e.g., entender ‘to understand’) require the use of the indicative, emotive-factives (class 4: e.g., alegrarse de que ‘to be happy that’) generally take subjunctive. Terrell and Hooper (1974) explain this inconsistency as resulting from an area of ‘instability’ in the Spanish mood system. In defending this point, they argue that it is common for speakers to also opt for indicative emotive-factive complements (p. 488). Thus,
if the mood system is to one day stabilize, they predict that the verbs in classes 3 and 4 will position themselves at the indicative end of the spectrum (p. 488). “Then the indicative would be consistently associated with assertion and presupposition, and the subjunctive with the lack of these attitudes” (p. 488).

### 1.5.2.1 Comments on Terrell and Hooper (1974)

Although a pioneering study, Terrell and Hooper (1974) has its shortcomings. One such issue relates to the predicates forming part of class 3; i.e., predicates of mental judgment (Tóth, 2008). Though they fall under the notion of presupposition, predicates of mental judgment select for the indicative (Tóth, 2008). This would, thus, make them “an exception to the [original] generalization that the indicative is the mood of assertion (Tóth, 2008)”.

Additionally, in spite of the complements of commissives (e.g., prometer ‘to promise’) and fiction verbs (e.g., soñar ‘to dream’) being neither asserted nor presupposed (a classification requiring the subjunctive according to Terrell and Hooper), both take the indicative (Tóth, 2008). However, more relevant to the present dissertation is the fact that the predicates that fall under Terrell and Hooper’s ‘doubt’ categorization (class 5: negated epistemics and verbs of uncertainty) are described as requiring the subjunctive. As mentioned in section 1.3.2, like emotive-factives (class 4), verbs and expressions of uncertainty are at times variable with the indicative. Therefore, in terms of their subjunctive-labeled categories of predicates (emotive-factive, doubt, imperative), only one of the three can be accurately described as requiring the subjunctive (i.e., imperative/volitional). It can, consequently, be put forth that Terrell and Hooper’s theory is limited in the sense that it is not very flexible with respect to mood variation.
1.5.3 Hooper (1975)

Whereas Terrell and Hooper (1974) describe mood choice as being solely related to (non)assertion, Hooper (1975) incorporates the concept of (NON)FACTIVITY. Hooper, therefore, distinguishes between four major classes of predicates: assertive, non-assertive, factive, and non-factive. Examples of the types of predicates forming part of each category are provided in the tables to follow (taken from Hooper, 1975).
### Table 3: Hooper’s (Non)Assertive and Non-Factive Distinction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak Assertive</th>
<th>Assertive</th>
<th>Non-assertive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>think</td>
<td>acknowledge</td>
<td>agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believe</td>
<td>admit</td>
<td>be likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suppose</td>
<td>affirm</td>
<td>be possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expect</td>
<td>allege</td>
<td>be probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imagine</td>
<td>answer</td>
<td>be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guess</td>
<td>argue</td>
<td>conceivable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seem</td>
<td>assert</td>
<td>be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appear</td>
<td>assure</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>figure</td>
<td>certify</td>
<td>be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>charge</td>
<td>impossible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>claim</td>
<td>be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contend</td>
<td>likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>declare</td>
<td>be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>divulge</td>
<td>possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emphasize</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>explain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>guarantee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hypothesize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indicate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>divulge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emphasize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>explain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>guarantee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hypothesize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indicate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>insist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intimate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maintain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>point out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>predict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prophesy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>postulate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>remark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suggest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>swear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>testify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>theorize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>verify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>write</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>insist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intimate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maintain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>point out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>predict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prophesy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>postulate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>remark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be afraid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be certain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be obvious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be evident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>calculate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deduce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>estimate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>presume</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>surmise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suspect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be afraid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be certain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be obvious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be evident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>calculate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deduce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>estimate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>presume</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>surmise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suspect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

be likely
be possible
be probable
be conceivable
be unlikely
be impossible
be improbable
be inconceivable
doubt
deny
Based on many of the ideas presented in Bolinger (1968) (see: section 1.5.1), Hooper (1975) states that the assertive/non-assertive distinction relates to complement preposing. She argues that complement preposing serves to make the complement proposition the main assertion of the sentence. In this way, the original main clause gets relegated to secondary status. Going back to the topic of non/assertion), she states that only assertive predicates allow for pre-posing. Thus, whereas ‘believe’, ‘agree’, and ‘discover’ are able to prepose their complements, ‘be possible’ and ‘regret’ cannot. Hooper affirms that the former group (assertive and able to prepose) takes the indicative, while the latter (non-assertive and unable to complement prepose) requires the subjunctive.
1.5.3.1 Comments on Hooper (1975)

Similarly to Farkas (1992b), Hooper (1975) integrates the concept of truth into her theory. According to Hooper, it is assertive predicates that commit the speaker to the truth of the complement. She states that this is another reason for why assertive predicates take the indicative, while non-assertive verbs and expressions select for the subjunctive. However, in spite of this delineation, emotive-factives do both. Although Hooper classifies them as non-assertive, emotive-factives commit the speaker or subject to the truth of the embedded complement and are able to take the indicative. Furthermore, although verbs of doubting and possibility are labeled as non-assertive, they too may at times accept indicative complements (see: section 1.3.2) (e.g., Deshors and Waltermire, 2019; Kowal, 2007; Quer, 1998, 2001, 2009; Waltermire, 2017). Finally, in addition to Hooper’s theory being difficult to apply to fluctuations between the moods, is the fact that it fails to account for volitional predicates (e.g., Tóth, 2008). As seen in tables 3 and 4 above, volitional predicates are not included in Hooper’s lists of expressions.

1.6 Pedagogical Descriptions of Mood

Unlike the previously discussed theories (sections 1.4 and 1.5), pedagogical accounts of mood tend not to focus on semantic concepts like preference, truth, and/or (non)assertion. Instead, a more syntax-based approach is implemented. Textbooks and other instructional materials tend to address the subjunctive-indicative distinction by means of lists of verbs and expressions which learners have to memorize in order to produce sentences with the appropriate form (Sessarego, 2016, p. 392). One such technique is the mnemonic device WEIRDO (wish-will/emotion/impersonal-expressions/request/doubt-denial/ojalá). As inferred by their name, mnemonic devices are meant
to help students to remember what they have learned (Gregory and Lunn, 2012). Examples of some of the lists of predicates that would be associated with mnemonic devices like *WEIRDO*, are provided as follows.

**Table 5: The Subjunctive with Wishes/Will and Requests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Es importante que</th>
<th>Aconsejar que</th>
<th>Pedir que</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Es (im)posible que</td>
<td>Decir que</td>
<td>Permitir que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es (in)admisible que</td>
<td>Dejar que</td>
<td>Preferir que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es necesario que</td>
<td>Desear que</td>
<td>Prohibir que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es obligatorio que</td>
<td>Escribir que</td>
<td>Querer que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es preferable que</td>
<td>Esperar que</td>
<td>Recomendar que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importa que</td>
<td>Insistir en que</td>
<td>Sugerir que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandar que</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Bretz et al., 2014, p. 119)
Table 6: The Subjunctive with Emotive-factive and Impersonal Expressions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Esperar que</th>
<th>Me encanta que</th>
<th>Es bueno que</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estar contento/a de que</td>
<td>Me enfada que</td>
<td>Es fantástico (increíble, interesante, malo, natural, sorprendente, tremendo, triste)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estar triste (de) que</td>
<td>Me enoja que</td>
<td>Es una lástima que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentir que</td>
<td>Me fascina que</td>
<td>¡Qué bueno (fantástico, malo, lástima, triste) que…!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tener miedo (de) que</td>
<td>Me gusta que</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es preferable que</td>
<td>Me pone contento/a que</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importa que</td>
<td>Me pone triste que</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Me preocupa que</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Bretz et al., 2014, p. 151)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creer que</th>
<th>No creer que</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No dudar que</td>
<td>Dudar que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estar seguro/a (de) que</td>
<td>No estar seguro/a (de) que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No negar que</td>
<td>Negar que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensar que</td>
<td>No pensar que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suponer que</td>
<td>No suponer que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es cierto que</td>
<td>No es cierto que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No es dudoso que</td>
<td>Es dudoso que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es evidente que</td>
<td>No es evidente que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es obvio que</td>
<td>No es obvio que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es que</td>
<td>No es que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es seguro que</td>
<td>No es seguro que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es verdad que</td>
<td>No es verdad que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cabe duda (de) que</td>
<td>(No) Es (im)posible que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No hay duda (de) que</td>
<td>(No) Es (im)probable que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parece que</td>
<td>(No) Puede (ser) que</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Bretz et al., 2014, p. 150)
Table 8: The Subjunctive with Adverbial Expressions such as *Ojalá*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A condición (de) que</th>
<th>En caso (de) que</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A fin de que</td>
<td>Para que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A menos que</td>
<td>Sin que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con tal (de) que</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Bretz et al., 2014, p. 226)

Through lists of verbs and expressions, such as the ones shown in the tables above, learners are taught “that the Spanish speaker’s task is one of mood selection. That is, for Spanish verbs, one must always select between one of two moods – [...] – for every verb, just as one must determine a verb’s tense, person, or number” (Collentine, 2010, p. 40). However, as already mentioned, what is missing from such an approach is an understanding of why a certain mood goes with a particular predicate. Pedagogical accounts of the mood contrast view subjunctive and indicative as mechanically and, thus, meaninglessly, triggered by specific expressions. Students taught these approaches will, therefore, find it difficult to understand and maneuver the alternations between moods that they are bound to come across in authentic speech. Put differently, such approaches fail to address mood variation. A final problem with the lists-of-expressions account of mood is that the verbs grouped with each category (e.g., will or emotion) may differ depending on the textbook or instructional materials being considered.
1.7 Theoretical Approaches to Variation Between Subjunctive and Indicative

Each of the theories discussed in the preceding sections puts forth various reasons behind the use of the subjunctive and indicative. Whereas some accounts focus on the semantics of mood choice, others take a more syntactic approach. Some theories associate the distinction with comparison (i.e., preference vs. a lack of preference) (e.g., Giorgi and Pianesi, 1997; Villalta, 2008) or individualized truths (i.e., pertaining to many or a singular world(s)) (e.g., Farkas, 1992b), while other accounts tie it to (non)assertion (Terrell and Hooper, 1974; Hooper, 1975) or complement preposing (Bolinger, 1968; Hooper, 1975). However, the common factor bringing together many of these approaches is their positioning towards variability. Few go into detail regarding how they may also apply to instances of mood variation. Thus, although they tackle mood-taking patterns that are expected, many do not address variability that is non-normative, except for emotive-factives in some cases (i.e., alternations between subjunctive and indicative in dubitative, negated epistemic, and possibility clauses). It is important to point out, however, that Giorgi and Pianesi’s (1997) (see: section 1.4.1.1) comparison-based approach and Farkas’ (1992b) (see: section 1.4.2) truth-based account of mood may be useful in understanding certain instances of cross- and intra-linguistic mood variation (e.g., French, Romanian, Italian, Icelandic). Nonetheless, with respect to the specific case of Spanish, it seems reasonable to suggest that there is a gap in the literature regarding mood use that is non-traditional. The section to follow discusses this further.
1.8 The Preference-based and Default Subjunctives

As discussed in section 1.3, variation between subjunctive and indicative occurs both in environments in which it is standardly allowed, as well as in contexts in which it is traditionally unexpected. We saw, for example, instances of standard variation between the moods in conditional, relative, and adverbial clauses (see: section 1.3.1), as well as with several normatively indicative-taking predicates (e.g., pensar ‘to think’, ver ‘to see’, explicar ‘to explain’, comprender ‘to understand’) (see: section and 1.3.1.1). However, we also saw examples of mood variation that is not traditionally considered to be grammatical (see: section 1.3.2). For instance, in spite of dubitatives, negated epistemics, and modals being described as requiring subjunctive embedded clauses (e.g., Real Academia, 2011; Romero, 2012), their complements do at times exhibit variability with the indicative (e.g., Blake, 1981; Crespo del Río, 2014; Farkas, 1992b; García and Terrell, 1977; Gregory and Lunn, 2012; Kowal, 2007; Lipski, 1978; Quer, 1998, 2001, 2009; Silva-Corvalán, 1994; Studerus, 1995; Terrell and Hooper, 1974; Waltermire, 2017). The same is the case for emotive-factives, although their receptivity to indicative complements is more widely recognized. In the present dissertation, I will argue that the alternations between subjunctive and indicative that occur in the complements of emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty (negated epistemics, dubitatives, and modals) relate to the speaker’s intent to assert his/her commitment to the subordinate proposition (or its negation). In this way, the proposition gets added to the current common ground. Thus, in examples (27), (28), (31), and (35) (repeated below as 62, 63, 64, and 65), the use of the indicative will be explained as signaling both speaker commitment to the embedded (affirmative or negated) complement, as well as its assertion.

(62) Me sorprendió que ustedes no pudieron
It surprised me that you couldn’t help us with the plan.’

(Terrell and García, 1977, p. 221)

(63) **Marta no cree** que Pedro **sea/es culpable.**

Marta does not believe that Pedro is guilty.’

(Borgonovo and Prévost, 2003, p. 151)

(64) **Dudo que tiene razón.**

‘I doubt that s/he is right.’

(Fente as cited in Kowal, 2007, p. 58)

(65) **Es posible que quiere destacar que es algo que debe ser respetado en vez de depositado en el sótano.**

‘It is possible that she wants to point out that it is something that must be
respected instead of being dumped in the basement.’

(Davies’ Corpus del Español, 2016)

My hypothesis puts forth that the contexts in which assertion is most appropriate, are those wherein the speaker assumes the proposition or its negation to be informative (e.g., new or unknown to the addressee, important, contrastive, and/or highly probable). It is, however, important to reiterate that this choice to use the indicative is only possible with certain subjunctive-governing predicates. In accordance with section 1.3.2, the examples above demonstrate that this option may be available to speakers using emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty (negated epistemics, dubitatives, modals). It is, however, unavailable to a speaker using a volitional predicate (e.g., desideratives, directives, and purpose clauses).

In order to better understand why this may be, a good first step would be to separate desideratives, directives, and purpose clauses from emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty. Let’s place the former into group 1 and the latter into group 2. If we examine the predicates in group 1 (i.e., desideratives, directives, and purpose clauses), we see that they are the core subjunctive-governing verbs, which put forth the speaker or subject’s (dis)preferences; i.e., propositions that are non-realistic. These predicates compare the complement proposition or its negation (i.e., \( p \) or \( \neg p \)). For instance, in examples (66) through (68), the speaker or subject’s dis(preferred) outcome is that Mary get the job.

(66) Desideratives (compare \( p \) or \( \neg p \))

a) I (don’t) want Mary to get the job.

b) We (don’t) want Mary to get the job.

c) S/he (doesn’t) want(s) Mary to get the job.
d) They (don’t) want Mary to get the job.

(67) Directive Clauses (compare \( p \) or \( \neg p \))

a) I (don’t) recommend that Mary get the job.

b) We (don’t) recommend that Mary get the job.

c) S/he (doesn’t) recommend(s) that Mary get the job.

d) They (don’t) recommend that Mary get the job.

(68) Purpose Clauses (compare \( p \) or \( \neg p \))

a) I’ve been practicing with Mary so that she (doesn’t) get(s) the job.

b) We’ve been practicing with Mary so that she (doesn’t) get(s) the job.

c) S/he’s been practicing with Mary so that she (doesn’t) get(s) the job.

d) They’ve been practicing with Mary so that she (doesn’t) get(s) the job.

Thus, regardless of if the complement reveals a desire (66), suggestion (67), or intention (68), the subject’s (dis)preferred end result (as compared to other alternative outcomes) is what is being relayed; that is, that Mary be (or not be) the individual selected for the job in question.

I propose that, different from the predicates in group 1, the predicates in group 2 (i.e., emotive-factives, negated epistemics, dubitatives, and modals) represent a particular truth (e.g., emotive-factives) or an experience (e.g., a doubted, disbelieved, or (im)possible proposition as assessed by the speaker or matrix subject, based on his/her experiences); i.e., propositions that are not preference-based and are potentially realistic – meaning that the speaker assumes that they could or have materialize(d) in the actual world. Thus, whereas in example (69), the subject’s truth is that Mary got (or did not get) the job, in sentences (70) through (72), the uncertainty regarding
Mary’s prospective offer (or rejection) results from the subject’s experiences; e.g., his/her experiences regarding Mary’s credentials, personality, application, potential as a worker, etc.

(69) Emotive-factives (can assert \( p \) or \( \overline{p} \); compares \( p \) or \( \overline{p} \))

a) I am (not) happy that Mary got the job.
b) We are (not) happy that Mary got the job.
c) S/he is (not) happy that Mary got the job.
d) They are (not) happy that Mary got the job.

(70) Dubitatives (can assert \( p \) or \( \overline{p} \))^3

a) I doubt that Mary got the job.
b) We doubt that Mary got the job.
c) S/he doubts that Mary got the job.
d) They doubt that Mary got the job.

(71) Negated Epistemics (can assert \( p \) or \( \overline{p} \))

a) I don’t believe that Mary got the job.
b) We don’t believe that Mary got the job.
c) S/he doesn’t believe that Mary got the job.
d) They don’t believe that Mary got the job.

(72) Modals (can assert \( p \) or \( \overline{p} \))

a) It is (not/im)possible that Mary got the job.

---

^3 As mentioned by Terrell and Hooper (1974), predicates of doubting and knowledge and belief change verb classes when negated. As such, if negated, examples (70) and (71) would be expected to take the indicative, since according to T&H, they become assertive predicates (e.g., ‘I don’t doubt…’ and ‘I believe…’).
b) It is (not/im)probable that Mary got the job.

c) It is (not/un)likely that Mary got the job.

Since we have now organized like predicates together (group 1 vs. group 2), we can now further explain how their grouping relates to their choice(s) of mood. My hypothesis is that the predicates in group 1, which include the core group of subjunctive selectors, compare $p$ or $\neg p$, but cannot assert $p$ or $\neg p$. I argue that this relates to their complements being non-realistic. As such, they require the subjunctive and have been deemed PREFERENCE- or PERSUASION-based predicates (see: section 2.3.1.1). Contrarily, since the verbs and expressions in group 2 (i.e., emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty) represent propositions that are not preference-based and close(r) to the actual world (i.e., propositions that are at least somewhat realistic), their complements (whether affirmative or negated) can appear in the indicative. The results of the experimental study discussed in section 2.2 demonstrate that emotive-factive and uncertainty clauses are most likely to be asserted when $p$ or $\neg p$ is informative. In this way, the hearer gets alerted to the proposition’s value (i.e., its informativeness, e.g., its newness, importance, contrastiveness, and/or high likelihood). We have, therefore, conferred this group of predicates the label of ASSERTION-inclined, since they can assert $p$ or $\neg p$, but cannot compare $p$ or $\neg p$ (see: section 2.3.1.2).

A question that may come up relates to why emotive-factives, which have been argued by some to have a comparison-based semantics ($p$ or $\neg p$ is compared), form part of group 2. Although their semantics involves comparison (see: example 69 above), unlike the predicates in group 1, their complements may be asserted with the indicative. Thus, emotive-factives are unique in the sense that, although assuming a preference-based semantics, they act similarly to verbs of uncertainty, in that their complements can take the indicative (see: section 2.3.1.2.1). Therefore, as related to examples (69) through (72), Spanish speakers may choose to assert any of the listed complements
with indicative, especially when informative. Consequently, whereas with preference-based predicates (66-69; 73-75), the use of the subjunctive is inflexible (i.e., the subjunctive is required), with the assertion-inclined predicates, indicative may at times be available (69-72).

(73) **Quiero** que **todo el mundo**
Want.PRES.INDIC.1SG that everyone

*se calle/*se calla.
be-quiet.PRES.SUBJ.3SG/PRES.INDIC.3SG.

‘I want everyone to be quiet.’

(Borrego et. al, 1989. p. 34)

(74) **Nos aconsejaron** que **no nos**
Us advise.PAST.INDIC.3PL that not us

*acercáramos/*acercamos.
advise.PAST.SUBJ.3PL/PAST.INDIC.3PL.

‘They advised us not to come close.’

(Borrego et. al, 1989. p. 34)

(75) **La vida nos presta** los años para que
The life us lend.PRES.INDIC.3SG the years for that

*la disfrutemos/*disfrutamos y luego
it enjoy.PRES.SUBJ.1PL/PRES.INDIC.1PL and later

*se acaba.*
REFL end.PRES.INDIC.3SG.

‘Life lends us years so that we can enjoy it and later it ends.’

(Davies’ Corpus del Español, 2016)
We can now argue that the differing behaviors of the preference-based predicates versus the assertion-inclined verbs and expressions relate to a split between subjunctives. Whereas the subjunctive used with the core subjunctive, preference-based predicates is required, the subjunctive used in the complements of the assertion-inclined verbs and expressions is default and can be overridden by the indicative (especially when informative). Table 1 is repeated below for convenience.

**Table 1. The Two Spanish Subjunctives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicate types</th>
<th>Subjunctive 1</th>
<th>Subjunctive 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desideratives</td>
<td>Dubitatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Negated Epistemics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose Clauses</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use</strong></td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Default</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compare p or ¬p</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Can assert p or ¬p</strong></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As will be discussed in the following chapters, the argument that there is a split between subjunctives finds support in the experimental investigation that I conducted. My investigation is centered on understanding which subjunctive predicates allow for variation with the indicative, and why. The research questions that guided the study are provided below:
1. **Research Question 1:** Which verbs generally thought to require the subjunctive in their complements can also have indicative complements? Is this variation found only in certain dialectal varieties of Spanish or is it common to all varieties?

2. **Research Question 2:** Does the informativeness of the complement influence the speaker’s choice to use the subjunctive or indicative? If so, with which cases of mood variation does this occur?

The remainder of the present dissertation is, therefore, organized as follows:

i. **Chapter 2:** Chapter 2 begins with a discussion of the experimental study that I carried out, which led to the hypothesis that Spanish has two subjunctives. In section 2.2., I provide an introduction to the study, after which I discuss the study’s design, including the five participant groups (Argentina, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, and Spain), the methodology and materials used to carry out the data collection (Davies’ *Corpus del Español* ‘Corpus of Spanish’ and Acceptability Judgment Tasks), as well as the statistical analyses that were run. Following this introduction, I detail the results that were collected. I begin with a comparison of the ratings assigned to the subjunctive versus those that were assigned to the indicative. Later, I examine how the two moods were individually rated, so as to determine any patterns regarding the participants’ contextual (dis)preferences. I end section 2.2 with analyses of country-specific results, as well as a summary of the section’s main points.

Section 2.3 brings together the main points discussed in Chapter 1 and sections 2.1-2.2 regarding the Spanish mood system being characterized by two subjunctives. Here, I start off by discussing preference-based predicates (desideratives, directives, and purpose clauses) and their requirement of the subjunctive. I put forth that the
comparative nature of their semantics is what triggers the obligatoriness of subjunctive; i.e., their selection of subjunctive 1. I, then, discuss the assertion-inclined, subjunctive 2-taking predicates (emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty) by examining how their connection with more realistic propositions, influences their co-occurrence with the default, as opposed to the required subjunctive form. I also mention in this chapter, Lozano’s (1972) two Spanish subjunctives, and how they differ from the approach taken in the present dissertation. The chapter closes by summarizing that, while preference-based predicates compare \( p \) or \( \neg p \), but cannot assert \( p \) or \( \neg p \), assertion-inclined predicates can assert \( p \) or \( \neg p \), but cannot compare \( p \) or \( \neg p \). An exception is made concerning the emotive-factive predicates, which are able to do both; i.e., assert \( p \) or \( \neg p \) and compare \( p \) or \( \neg p \). However, because, like verbs of uncertainty, emotive-factives have subordinate clauses whose mood may fluctuate, they are described as taking subjunctive 2 (i.e., that which is overridable by the indicative), as opposed to the required subjunctive 1.

**ii. Chapter 3:** Different from the preceding chapters (Chapters 1 and 2), Chapter 3 focuses solely on the directive category of predicates. Following up on the unexpectedly high ratings associated with the indicative directive clauses discussed in Chapter 2, Chapter 3 discusses the role that modal concord plays in the mood of directive complements. The chapter starts off by introducing the general mood selection patterns of Spanish directive verbs, which entails a requirement of the subjunctive. The discussion then introduces how modal concord between a matrix directive and an embedded modal predicate causes the indicative to be the only mood suitable in the complement. Following a discussion of the surprising findings of
Chapter 2, I then go on to talk about the follow-up investigation which led to the current findings regarding modal concord. After a presentation of the follow-up study’s results, as well as commentary on modal concord as witnessed in 13th century Spanish, I end the chapter with a summary of its principal findings.

iii. **Chapter 4:** In Chapter 4, I conclude the main findings made as related to Chapters 1 and 2. I also discuss the conclusions drawn from Chapter 3 regarding modal concord. I end this chapter by discussing some of the puzzles that are left to be answered, as well as how future studies may be able to benefit from the results of the present study.
CHAPTER 2
EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

2.1 Overview

The focus of the present dissertation are embedded clauses that are generally described as taking subjunctive complements. However, as discussed in section 1.3.2, although regularly described as requiring the subjunctive (e.g., Romero, 2012; Villalta, 2008), the complements of emotive-factives, negated epistemicals, dubitatives, and modals, do at times appear in the indicative (e.g., Blake, 1981; Crespo del Río, 2014; Farkas, 1992b; Faulkner, 2021; García and Terrell, 1977; Gregory and Lunn, 2012; Kowal, 2007; Lipski, 1978; Quer, 1998, 2001, 2009; RAE, 2011; Silva-Corvalán, 1994; Studerus, 1995; Terrell and Hooper, 1974; Waltermire, 2017). One of the main objectives of the current study is, thus, to investigate if this pattern extends to most traditionally subjunctive environments, or only to some.

According to various linguists, the contrast between subjunctive and indicative in Spanish is influenced by pragmatic factors (e.g., Gregory and Lunn, 2012; Lunn, 1989; Sessarego, 2016). For instance, it has been stated that, whereas the indicative is used to assert information that a speaker believes to be high in its value, the subjunctive is used to background information whose value is assumed to be low (Gregory and Lunn, 2012). However, this description is tied to the use of the subjunctive and indicative in contexts in which they are normatively expected. In the present study, I will argue that, in considering what the addressee(s) already knows or has already stated, speakers may choose to assert certain normatively subjunctive complements with the indicative. I argue that this is most likely to occur if the embedded proposition is informative (i.e., new/unknown,
important, contrastive, and/or highly probable or likely vs. old/known, unimportant, non-
contrastive, and/or highly improbable or unlikely).

The focus of the present chapter is to discuss the results of the experimental study which led to the idea that not all of Spanish’s subjunctive-normative predicates behave the same as related to their requirement of the subjunctive. With these points in mind, the investigation’s primary goal was to respond to the following research questions:

1. **Research Question 1:** Which verbs generally thought to require the subjunctive in their complements can also have indicative complements? Is this variation found only in certain dialectal varieties of Spanish or is it common to all varieties?

2. **Research Question 2:** Does the informativeness of the complement influence the speaker’s choice to use the subjunctive or indicative? If so, with which cases of mood variation does this occur?

### 2.2 Experimental Study

#### 2.2.1 Study Design

In the sections to follow, I discuss the results of the experimental study that I conducted, which led to the hypothesis that Spanish has two subjunctives; i.e., one that is preference-based and required, and another that is default and able to be overridden by the indicative. As mentioned in the research questions, the goal of the experimental study was to investigate which verbs, generally described as requiring subjunctive complements, can also accept indicative embedded clauses.

In order to do this, I searched Davies’ *Corpus del Español* ‘Corpus of Spanish’ (2016) to find naturally-occurring examples of mood use in eight normatively subjunctive environments (i.e.,
emotive-factive, negated epistemic, dubitative, modal, causative, directive, purpose, and desiderative clauses). At the end of the search, 16 sentences per verb class were selected (i.e., 16 negated epistemic, 16 emotive-factive, 16 dubitative, 16 modal, 16 causative, 16 directive, 16 purpose, and 16 desiderative clauses – 128 items in total). Each item, after being revised for length and mood if necessary, was then used in the creation of an Acceptability Judgement Task (AJT). The AJT, which contained equal parts subjunctive and indicative items, was divided into two parts; 64 contextualized and 64 uncontextualized (context-free) items. For the contextualized section, which involved eight sentences per complement type (four subjunctive and four indicative), I created contexts to precede all items. The contexts related to what the addressee(s) already knew or did not know and, thus, what would have already or not already been a part of the common ground; i.e., the (un)informativeness of the propositions in question. For each complement type, two subjunctive items involved informative contexts (i.e., new/unknown to the addressee), and two uninformative contexts (i.e., old/known to the addressee). The same was the case for the indicative; i.e., two informative and two uninformative indicative items per complement type. Thus, with eight contextualized items per eight verb classes, 64 items were preceded by (un)informative contexts. However, in addition to the (un)informative items, were those that were not attached to a particular informational context; i.e., context-free items. Therefore, with eight context-free items per eight verb classes, 64 items were uncontextualized. Participants were subsequently asked to rate each proposition, based on the presence or absence of the mentioned contexts. A point to note is that, with respect to the experimental study, the terms informative and uninformative are respectively used to refer to propositions that the addressee(s) would not have already known (new) versus those that s/he would have already known (old). However, in section 2.3 of Chapter 2, which conducts a more detailed analysis of the data being considered, the two
concepts are expanded upon to refer to the newness/oldness, (un)importance, (non)contrastiveness, and/or high or low likelihood of the proposition in question. With the exception of the current section (i.e., section 2.2) and the follow-up experiment discussed in Chapter 3, the terms informative and uninformative are to be understood in their broader senses and, thus, as reflective of the latter definition; i.e., the newness/oldness, (un)importance, (non)contrastiveness, and/or high or low likelihood of the proposition at hand.

2.2.2 Participants

Two hundred and twenty-three native Spanish-speaking university students \((N = 223)\) formed part of the current investigation. The participants were recruited from several Spanish-speaking countries in order to have the representation of various Spanish dialects (South America, Central America, the Caribbean, North America, and Europe). Participants came from Argentina \((n = 45)\), Costa Rica \((n = 37)\), the Dominican Republic \((n = 37)\), Mexico \((n = 51)\), and Spain \((n = 53)\).

2.2.3 Method

All 223 participants were asked to sign an electronic informed consent form that stated that they were to be 18 years or older in order to participate. After consenting to the experiment, they were subsequently administered the 128-item Acceptability Judgment Task (‘AJT’) that contained both contextualized and context-free items. Each participant was instructed to rate separate instances of subjunctive and indicative, in eight traditionally subjunctive complements: emotive-factive, negated epistemic, dubitative, modal, causative, directive, purpose and desiderative clauses. Using a 4-point scale (Highly Acceptable - 4, Acceptable - 3, Highly Unacceptable - 2,
Unacceptable - 1), they ranked the highlighted verb form based on how natural or unnatural they perceived its use to be. On completion of the tasks, all participants had rated a total of 128 contextualized and context-free subjunctive and indicative items.

As compensation for their participation, each subject was provided an electronic Amazon gift card valued at $20.

2.2.3.1 Data Collection

2.2.3.1.1 Corpus Study and Creation of Acceptability Judgment Tasks

As mentioned in section 2.2.1, I conducted a search of the Davies’ Corpus del Español (2016) ‘Corpus of Spanish’ in order to obtain authentic examples of the forms that were to be used in the AJT. The objective was to find naturally-occurring examples of mood use in the eight normatively subjunctive clauses that were mentioned; i.e., emotive-factive, negated epistemic, dubitative, modal, desiderative, directive, causative, and purpose clauses. At the end of the search, 16 sentences, related to each of the eight categories, were selected; i.e., 128 sentences in total.

After all samples were revised (for both length and mood if necessary), they were used to create the AJT. The AJT was created using Qualtrics™ and divided into two parts, contextualized and uncontextualized items. The two sections contained 64 items each. More about these tasks is discussed in the sections to follow.

2.2.3.1.1.1 Contextualized AJT

The contextualized section of the AJT contained 64 sentences which were equally divided amongst the eight traditionally subjunctive environments; i.e., eight sentences per complement
type, for example, eight desiderative items. Since this portion of the AJT was contextualized, each sentence was preceded by a context which revealed if the information that was contained in the complement clause was (un)informative to the addressee at which it was directed. As mentioned previously (see: section 2.2.1), as related to present sub-section (i.e., section 2.2), the term (un)informativeness relates to how new or old the proposition was to the addressee(s) at which it was directed; i.e., if the proposition did or did not already form part of the common ground..

Each of the eight normatively subjunctive environments had two items with the indicative as used in propositions that were addressee-informative, as well as two with it tied to complements that were uninformative to the addressee(s) in question; i.e., four contextualized indicative sentences per normatively subjunctive environment. The same was the case for items involving the use of the subjunctive. Each clausal environment contained two items with the subjunctive as used in complements that were informative, as well as two with it attached to propositions that were addressee-uninformative; i.e., four contextualized subjunctive sentences per complement type. There were, therefore, a total of four indicative (two informative, two uninformative) and four subjunctive (two informative, two uninformative) contextualized sentences per complement category. Below is an example of how a contextualized AJT item would have been appeared.

(76) **Example of an ‘Informative’ Emotive-factive Complement**

Comment extracted from an internet forum titled: *Daily menu for babies from 6 to 9 months*. This mother is speaking about the eating habits of her child. The information she is sharing is new to the readers at which it is directed.

*Hola, mi bebe tiene 7 meses, está bien en el peso y*

Hello, my baby has.PRES.INDIC.3SG 7 months, be.PRES.INDIC.3SG well in the weight and
el tamaño para su edad, pero me preocupa que no le
the size for his age, but me worry. PRES. INDIC. 3SG that not him

agrada mucho la comida. Todavía toma leche materna.
please. PRES. INDIC. 3SG much the food. Still take. PRES. INDIC. 3SG milk maternal.

‘Hello, my baby has 7 months, he is good in weight and size for his age, but it worries me that food doesn’t please him much. He still drinks breast milk.’

Highly Acceptable  Acceptable  Unacceptable  Highly Unacceptable

2.2.3.1.1.2 Context-free AJT

No details regarding the (un)informativeness of the propositions being considered were included alongside the 64 context-free AJT items. Each traditionally subjunctive environment involved eight uncontextualized sentences; i.e., four with indicative complements and four with subjunctive embedded clauses. An example of how a context-free item would have appeared is provided as follows.

(77) Example of a Context-free Desiderative Complement

Quiero que este asunto se resuelva lo antes posible
Want. PRES. INDIC. 1SG that this issue REFL resolve. PRES. SUBJ. 3SG as soon as possible
para salvar a esos niños vulnerables.
for save. INF to those children vulnerable.

‘I want this issue to be resolved as soon as possible in order to save vulnerable children.’
2.2.4 Statistical Analyses

After all five of the participant groups’ results were collected and tallied, Mann-Whitney U tests were carried out in order to test for differences between the data (rankings); i.e., the ratings provided by the Argentine, Costa Rican, Dominican, Mexican, and Spanish participant groups. As already mentioned, all eight traditionally subjunctive environments that were examined had the mood contained in their complements being rated in terms of its use with propositions that were addressee-informative, addressee-uninformative, and context-free. Thus, ratings were assigned to both subjunctive and indicative as used in embedded clauses that were informative, uninformative, and uncontextualized. Five batches of statistical analyses were, therefore, performed on the ratings provided for each type of complement. For example, in terms of the desiderative category of predicates, statistics were run on ratings assigned to: 1) indicative in informative complements vs. indicative in uninformative complements; 2) subjunctive in informative complements vs. subjunctive in uninformative complements; 3) indicative in informative complements vs. subjunctive in informative complements; 4) indicative in uninformative complements vs. subjunctive in uninformative complements; and 5) indicative vs. subjunctive with context-free propositions. These analyses were carried out for all five countries as a singular group, as well as individually. The sections to follow discuss the results.
2.2.4.1 The Subjunctive and Indicative Compared

Ratings obtained for the subjunctive and indicative were compared in terms of their use in 128 normatively subjunctive clauses. Sixty-four complements were assigned conversational contexts that were either informative or uninformative, while the remaining 64 were context-free. The traditionally subjunctive clauses that were of focus included emotive-factive, negated epistemic, dubitative, modal, desiderative, directive, causative, and purpose clauses.

2.2.4.1.1 Subjunctive vs. Indicative in ‘Informative’ Complement Clauses

The first comparisons that were made involved the use of the subjunctive and indicative in informative embedded complements. Section 1 of Appendix A provides all ‘informative’ items used in the investigation.

Comparisons of the ratings assigned to the two moods as used with informative embedded propositions, demonstrated that the subjunctive was rated significantly more favorably than the indicative, with all eight complement types: i.e., emotive-factive, negated epistemic, dubitative, possibility, causative, desiderative, directive, and purpose clauses. Thus, the informativeness of the proposition did not increase the acceptability of the indicative to the extent that it became more appropriate than the subjunctive.
### Table 9: Subjunctive vs. Indicative in ‘Informative’ Complement Clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Type</th>
<th>Subjunctive</th>
<th>Indicative</th>
<th>Subjunctive</th>
<th>Indicative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Emotive-factive</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Negated Epistemic</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Doubt</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Possibility</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Causative</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Desiderative</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistically Preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistically Less Preferred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 9 and Figure 1 above, it is observed that informative, indicative directive complements were surprisingly very well-rated. However, as will be discussed in Chapter 3, this is not the typical case for indicative directive complements. The high ratings that the indicative was assigned relate to modal concord (see: Chapter 3).
2.2.4.1.2 Subjunctive vs. Indicative in ‘Uninformative’ Complement Clauses

Comparisons between the ratings for the subjunctive and indicative in uninformative complements were made next. Section 1 of Appendix A provides all ‘uninformative’ items that were included in the AJT.

Similar to informative complements, uninformative embedded clauses (e.g., old/known to the addressee) had the subjunctive as the more positively rated mood. The indicative was again ranked less favorably than subjunctive as related to all eight complement types; i.e., emotive-factive, negated epistemic, dubitative, possibility, causative, desiderative, directive, and purpose clauses. There were, therefore, no contexts in which the ‘un-informativeness’ of the proposition in question caused the indicative to become the preferred of the two moods. However, it was noticed that uninformative, indicative directive clauses received ratings that were unexpectedly quite similar to those assigned to the subjunctive. As mentioned in section 2.2.4.1.1, this is not the typical pattern of directive complements and, instead, relates to modal concord. Chapter 3 is focused on discussing these very surprising findings.
### Table 10: Subjunctive vs. Indicative in ‘Uninformative’ Complement Clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Type</th>
<th>Subjunctive</th>
<th>Indicative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Emotive-factive</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Negated Epistemic</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Doubt</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Possibility</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Causative</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Directive</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Purpose</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Desiderative</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

- Statistically Preferred
- Statistically Less Preferred
2.2.4.1.3 Subjunctive vs. Indicative in ‘Context-free’ Complement Clauses

The next set of comparisons made were those between the subjunctive and indicative in context-free embedded clauses. With these items, participants rated the use of each mood in complements that had no additional details regarding their (un)informativeness. Section 2 of Appendix A provides a list of all context-free items that were included in the investigation.

Like the previously discussed environments (i.e., informative and uninformative complements), the subjunctive was again the mood that was assigned the more favorable scores. The subjunctive was ranked higher than the indicative in all 64 context-free sentences, with respect
to all eight traditionally subjunctive environments: i.e., emotive-factive, negated epistemic, dubitative, possibility, causative, desiderative, directive, and purpose clauses.

Table 11: Subjunctive vs. Indicative in ‘Context-free’ Complement Clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Uncontextualized’ Complement Clauses</th>
<th>Subjunctive</th>
<th>Indicative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clause Type</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Emotive-factive</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Negated Epistemic</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Doubt</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Possibility</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Causative</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Directive</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Purpose</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Desiderative</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistically Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistically Less Preferred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.4.2 The Subjunctive in (Un)Informative Complement Clauses

Since the subjunctive is the default in the complements relevant to the present study (e.g., Portner, 2018; Real Academia Española, 2011; Romero, 2012), it was expected that it be rated favorably with propositions attached to either of the two levels of informativeness (i.e., informative vs. uninformative complements). However, in accordance with its tie to complements of ‘low information quality’⁴ (Gregory and Lunn, 2012), it was expected that it be preferred with uninformative propositions (i.e., old/known information).

---

⁴ According to Gregory and Lunn (2012), information that is of low quality or value may either be unreliable (doubtful, untrue, future etc.), or uninformative (already known), and tends not to be asserted (p. 334). They state that these are the contexts in which the subjunctive tends to be found.
Although it was the case that the subjunctive was rated favorably across all eight complement environments, there were significant differences in how it was ranked, with respect to three in particular: emotive-factual, dubitative, and purpose clauses. The overall pattern was that it was preferred with uninformative propositions, with emotive-factuals, and in informative complements in the case of dubitative and purpose clauses. The remaining five complement types (desiderative, directive, possibility, negated epistemic, and causative clauses) had the subjunctive being rated equivalently favorably in both of the informational contexts (i.e., with informative and uninformative propositions). The sections to follow discuss these findings further.

Table 12: The Subjunctive in (Un)Informative Complement Clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjunctive</th>
<th>‘Informative’</th>
<th>‘Uninformative’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clause Type</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Emotive-factual</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Negated Epistemic</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Doubt</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Modal</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Causative</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Desiderative</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.4.2.1 Emotive-factive Clauses

In emotive-factive clauses, the subjunctive was rated significantly more favorably when the evaluative clause in question was uninformative; (informative (addressee-new) emotive-factive clauses ($Mdn = 3; M = 3.34$) vs. uninformative (addressee-old) emotive-factive clauses ($Mdn = 4;$
With informative propositions, the ratings assigned to the subjunctive were statistically significantly lower. Below are examples of the contextualized, subjunctive emotive-factive items that were included in the AJT.

![Figure 5: The Subjunctive in (Un)Informative Emotive-factive Clauses](image)

(78) ‘Informative’ Emotive-factive Complements

Comment taken from a blog about being a mother. The mother in question is revealing a personal story to readers who know neither her nor her daughter.

_Hola a todos. Les quiero contar lo que pasó_

Hello to everyone. You want to tell what happened.

_Es absolutamente horrible que los niños en con mi hija._

It is absolutely horrible that the children in with my daughter.
su colegio le traten mal. Cada día sufre acoso

her school her treat.PRES.SUBJ.3PL bad. Each day suffer.PRES.INDIC.3SG bullying escolar.
school.

‘Hello everyone. I Want to tell you what happened with my daughter. It’s absolutely horrible that the kids at her school treat her badly. She’s bullied every day.’

In example (78), the emotive-factive expression es horrible que ‘it is horrible that’ introduces information that is new to addressee(s) in question; i.e., that the child being discussed is being bullied at school every day.

(79) ‘Uninformative’ Emotive-factive Complements

Comment extracted from a blog titled: Visiting Julio Cortazar’s house. The author of the comment is responding to someone who already interested in Cortazar’s work.

Me encanta que te guste Cortázar. Me
Me love.PRES.INDIC.3SG that you like.PRES.SUBJ.3SG Cortazar. Me
pone muy feliz eso ya que era un excelente
put.PRES.INDIC.3SG very happy that since be.PAST.INDIC.3SG an excellent escritor.
writer.

‘I love that you like Cortazar. That makes me very happy since he was an excellent writer.’
In example (79), the emotive-factive expression *me encanta que* ‘it pleases me that/I love that’ relays information that is uninformative (already known) to the addressee(s) in question. That is, the addressee already knows of Cortazar’s work.

Whereas example (78) (new information) had the subjunctive being assigned ratings that were 89.2% positive, example (79) (old information) had it receiving rankings that were at 98.2% positivity. This was reflective of the general pattern throughout all subjunctive emotive-factive items. This is to say that subjunctive emotive-factive clauses containing information that was already known to the addressee(s) in question were more highly ranked than complements containing information that was addressee-new.

2.2.4.2.2 Dubitative Clauses

An analysis of the participants’ combined ratings showed that, in the case of dubitative clauses, there was an overall preference for the use of the subjunctive when it appeared in complements that were informative; (informative dubitative clauses \(Mdn = 4; M = 3.47\)) vs. uninformative dubitative clauses \(Mdn = 3; M = 3.35\): \(U = 89930.5, p = 0.01, r = -0.09\). Below are examples of some of the contextualized, subjunctive dubitative items that were included in the AJT.
‘Informative’ Dubitative Complements

Opinion taken from a forum about work. The man in question is sharing for the first time that he's suffered discrimination because of the work that he does.

Desafortunadamente, hay muchos que dudan que mi trabajo sea tan serio como el de un abogado o un doctor.

Unfortunately, have many that doubt that my work is as serious as the of a lawyer or a doctor.
‘Unfortunately, there are many that doubt that my job is as serious as that of lawyer or doctor.’

In sentence (80), the dubitative clause dudan que ‘they doubt that’ presents new information (the fact that the subject in question has faced discrimination regarding his line of work) that appears to contradict a previously mentioned statement (as noted through the inclusion of ‘unfortunately’).

(81) ‘Uninformative’ Dubitative Complements

Opinion extracted from a website about Christianity. The author of the message had already mentioned that people aren’t in the habit of reading the Bible.

Si alguien les preguntara cuál ha sido la mejor experiencia de su vida, es dudoso que muchos vayan a decir que es leer la Biblia.

‘If someone asked you what the best experience of your life has been, it is doubtful that many are going to say that it is reading the Bible.’

In example (81), the dubitative expression es dudoso que ‘it is doubtful that’ relays information that is not very informative to the readers. The individuals being addressed had already been made aware that not many people tend to read the Bible.

Whereas item (81), an uninformative dubitative proposition, had 87.84% of its ratings as being positive (i.e., acceptable or highly acceptable), item (80), the informative dubitative
complement, had 96.85% of its ratings as being favorable. This preference for the subjunctive in informative dubitative clauses was consistent throughout the experiment.

2.2.4.2.3 Purpose Clauses

Participants rated the subjunctive, as used in purpose clauses, significantly more positively when the purpose clause in question was informative; (informative purpose clauses \((Mdn = 4; M = 3.61)\) vs. uninformative purpose clauses \((Mdn = 4; M = 3.46)\): \(U = 88364.5, p = 0.001, r = -0.11\)). This preference for subjunctive in informative purpose clauses is detailed in the examples to follow.

Figure 7: The Subjunctive in (Un)Informative Purpose Clauses
‘Informative’ Purpose Clauses

Comment taken from a blog about a new independent documentary. The author of the comment is telling the director of the film that she really liked it. The director didn’t know that his work would be so well received.

Estimado Andrés,

Dear Andres,

Muchas felicitaciones por tus trabajos documentales. Me gustaría poder compartir este documental con otras personas para que puedan conocer y entender un poco mejor la situación actual sobre este tema.

‘Dear Andres, Many congratulations on your documentaries. I would like to be able to share this documentary with other people so that they can get to know and better understand the current situation regarding this topic.’

Example (82) above has the purpose clause para que ‘so that/in order that’ introducing information that is informative to the readers in question; i.e., the fact that the subject wants others to know and understand the situation a lot better.
‘Uninformative’ Purpose Clauses

Extract taken from a story about the dissolution of a marriage. The housekeeper recently discovered that the man of the house is having an affair. He has begged her to not say anything about this to his wife.

\[\text{María, favor de deshacer mi cama para que mi esposa crea que dormí en casa.} \]

‘Maria, favor of un-make.INF my bed for that my wife believe.PRES.SBJ.3SG que dormí en casa.’

In example (83), the complement of para que ‘so that/in order that’ introduces an uninformative proposition; i.e., information that the maid already knows. It is clear from the context that the housekeeper is aware of the owner’s affair and that he did not sleep at home.

Whereas in the informative purpose clause of (82), the subjunctive was assigned 97.75% positive ratings, in its uninformative counterpart (83), it was assigned significantly less positive ratings, at 91.44% positivity. It was observed throughout the rest of the experiment that the subjunctive was preferred in purpose clauses containing propositions that were informative.

2.2.4.2.4 Negated Epistemic, Modal, and Volitional Clauses

Similar to the three previously discussed environments (emotive-factive, dubitative, and purpose clauses), the subjunctive was rated positively with the remaining five verb classes: negated epistemic, possibility, and volitional (causative, directive, directive) clauses. However, unlike the
previous complement categories, the (un)informativeness of the proposition played no significant role in the ratings that the subjunctive was assigned with respect to the latter. Thus, the subjunctive, as used in either of the five abovementioned complements, showed no preference with respect to propositions of high vs. low informativeness; i.e., no statistically significant differences were found.

Table 13: The Subjunctive in (Un)Informative Negated Epistemic, Modal, and Volitional Clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Type</th>
<th>‘Informative’</th>
<th>‘Uninformative’</th>
<th>Statistical Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negated Epistemic</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiderative</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

No Statistical Preference
2.2.4.3 The Indicative in (Un)Informative Complement Clauses

Since the eight complement types being examined are regularly described as governing the subjunctive (e.g., Real Academia Española, 2011; Romero, 2012), it should be expected that the indicative be rated negatively across the verb classes. However, despite being rated lower than subjunctive overall, the acceptability of the indicative was still evidently influenced by the (un)informativeness of the context in which it was found. For instance, the ratings demonstrated that there were significant differences in how the indicative was ranked as used in five out of the eight complement types: emotive-factive, negated epistemic, dubitative, causative, and directive.
clauses. The overall pattern was that the indicative was preferred in informative emotive-factive, negated epistemic, dubitative, and causative complements, and in uninformative directive clauses. The sections to follow discuss these findings further.

Table 14: The Indicative in Un(Informative) Complement Clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Type</th>
<th>‘Informative’</th>
<th>‘Uninformative’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Emotive-factive</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Negated Epistemic</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Doubt</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Possibility</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Causative</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Directive</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Purpose</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Desiderative</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Statistical Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistically Preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistically Less Preferred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.4.3.1 Emotive-factive Clauses

It was noted that in emotive-factive clauses, the indicative was rated significantly more favorably when the evaluative clause at hand was informative (i.e., addressee-new or unknown); (informative emotive-factive clauses ($Mdn = 3; M = 2.76$) vs. uninformative emotive-factive clauses ($Mdn = 2; M = 1.95$): $U = 51242.00, p = 0.00, r = -0.44$). With uninformative evaluative propositions (i.e., addressee-old or known), the ratings assigned to the indicative were significantly more negative. Following Figure 10 are examples of some of the contextualized, indicative emotive-factive items used in the experiment.
Figure 10: The Indicative (Un)Informative Emotive-factive Clauses

(84) ‘Informative’ Emotive-factive Complements

Comment taken from an internet forum titled: “Daily menu for babies 6 to 9 months old.” The mother in question is speaking about her son’s eating habits.

_Hola, mi bebé tiene_ 7 meses, está bien en el peso
Hello, my baby have.PRES.INDIC.3SG 7 months, be.PRES.INDIC.3SG well in the size
_y el tamaño para su edad, pero me preocupa que no le_ and the size for his age, but me worry.PRES.INDIC.3SG that not him
_agrada mucho la comida. Todavía toma leche_ please.PRES.INDIC.3SG much the food. Still take.PRES.INDIC.3SG milk
_maternal._

maternal

1.5
2
2.5
3
3.5
4
Mean Ratings

Informative
Uninformative

Informational Context

Informative
Uninformative
‘Hello, my baby is 7 months old, he’s good in terms of weight and size for his age, but it worries me that food doesn’t please him much. He still drinks breast milk.’

In example (84), the context makes explicitly clear that the addressees are not informed about the baby’s eating habits. Thus, the emotive-factive _me preocupa que_ ‘it worries me that’ introduces an informative proposition since the reader(s) would not have already known that the baby does not like to eat.

(85) ‘Uninformative’ Emotive-factive Complements

Comment extracted from a blog about religion. The man in question is asking his pastor a question after having spoken to him many times about his relationship with his girlfriend.

_Tengo_ ahora más de 3 años saliendo con mi novia y como ya

_Have.PRES.INDIC.1SG now more of 3 years date.GER with my girlfriend and as already_

_sabes,_ es _atea._ ¿Es _malo que_

_know.PRES.INDIC.2SG PRES.INDIC.3SG atheist. Be.PRES.INDIC.3SG bad that_

_salgo_ _con ella?_

_date.PRES.INDIC.1SG with her?_

‘I’ve been with my girlfriend for 3 years now and as you know, she’s atheist. Is it bad that I’m dating her?’
As related to example (85), the evaluative expression *es malo que* ‘is it bad that’ introduces information that had already been discussed with the pastor in question. The proposition is, thus, uninformative since it would have already been a part of the hearer’s mental model.

In the case of example (84), which had the indicative in an emotive clause containing an informative proposition (i.e., new information), ratings were primarily favorable, at 68.02% positivity. However, when it came to item (85), which had the indicative being used in an uninformative emotive-factive complement (i.e., addressee-old or known), ratings were predominantly negative, at only 9% positivity. This preference for informative, indicative emotive-factive complements (as compared to uninformative, indicative evaluative complements) was consistent throughout the experimental results.

2.2.4.3.2 Negated Epistemic Clauses

In negated epistemic clauses, the indicative was once again preferred with propositions that were informative; (informative negated epistemic clauses \(Mdn = 3; M = 2.54\)) vs. uninformative negated epistemic clauses \(Mdn = 2; M = 2\): \(U = 76465.5, p = 0.00, r = -0.21\). Following Figure 11, which illustrates these findings, are examples of some of the indicative, negated epistemic items that were used in the contextualized AJT.
Figure 11: The Indicative in (Un)Informative Negated Epistemic Clauses

(86) ‘Informative’ Negated Epistemic Complements

Comment extracted from a blog titled: “I like being a woman.” The blogger in question is informing her readers about something she read regarding how men treat women nowadays. What she is sharing is new to the readers in question.

Yo no pienso que los hombres son todos iguales.

Hay hombres que quieren casarse y que que quieren abrirnos puertas.
‘I don’t think that all men are the same. There are men who want to get married and who want to open doors for us.’

In example (86), the indicative appears in a negated epistemic clause that is informative to the addressees at which it is directed. The proposition is informative in that it involves information that is new (i.e., the addressees do not already know the speaker’s beliefs about men and relationships) and presumed to be important to the speaker, since it contradicts a previously discussed statement. The contrasting nature of the statement is observed through the subject’s use of the contrastive yo ‘I’ at the beginning of the sentence.

(87) ‘Uninformative’ Negated Epistemic Complements

Comment taken from a forum involving a discussion about planning a trip. Everyone has decided that they’ll buy the tickets once they receive their salary. However, someone is suggesting that they don’t wait, and that they buy them now. The author of the comment below is repeating to this individual that waiting a week won’t complicate their plans.

…Pero ya hemos dicho que no estamos seguros
But already have.PRES.INDIC.1PL say.PP that not be.PRES.INDIC.1PL sure de que es necesario hacerlo hoy. Podemos hacerlo la semana que viene.
of that be.PRES.INDIC.3SG necessary do.it-INF today. Can.PRES.INDIC.1PL do.it-INF the semana que viene.
week that come.PRES.INDIC.3SG.

‘But we’ve already said that we aren’t sure that it’s necessary to do it today. We can do it next week.’
In example (87), it is expressly put forth that the speaker is repeating a point that had already been added to the common ground; i.e., the idea that it may not be necessary to purchase the tickets immediately. Thus, the expression *no creo que* ‘I don’t believe that’ introduces a point of view that is uninformative, since it is addressee-old.

In the case of (86), which had the indicative being used with an informative negated epistemic proposition, ratings were primarily positive, at 58% positivity. Conversely, in the case of example (87), which had the indicative being tied to an uninformative negated epistemic complement, ratings were only relatively positive, at 34% positivity. The overall pattern of ratings followed this trend, in that the indicative was assigned significantly more positive ratings when present in negated epistemic complements containing propositions that were informative.

### 2.2.4.3.3 Dubitative Clauses

In the case of dubitative clauses, it was observed that the acceptability of the indicative significantly increased when the complement was informative; (informative dubitative clauses \((Mdn = 2; M = 2.44)\) vs. uninformative dubitative clauses \((Mdn = 2; M = 1.79)\): \(U = 60027.5, p = 0.00, r = -0.4\)). That is, the ratings for the indicative in informative dubitative clauses were significantly higher than those assigned to its use in dubitative complements that were uninformative. Figure 12 below demonstrates these findings.
The examples below demonstrate what contextualized, indicative dubitative items would have entailed.

(88) ‘Informative’ Dubitative Complements

**Opinion taken from an internet forum that has to do with marketing.** The computer specialist that wrote this comment is informing the readers of the weak aspects of email marketing.

La verdad es que muchos dudan que el email

The truth be.PRES.INDIC.3SG that many doubt.PRES.INDIC.3PL that the email
marketing va a seguir vivo. Sin embargo, yo no marketing go.PRES.INDIC.3SG to continue.INF alive. However, I not estoy de acuerdo con este punto. be.PRES.INDIC.1SG of agreement with this point.

‘The truth is that many doubt that email marketing is going to stay alive. However, I do not agree with this point.’

In example (88) above, the dubitative expression dudan que ‘they doubt that’ sets up a proposition that the addressee(s) did not already know; i.e., the fact that there are many people who doubt the longevity of online marketing. The expression is, thus, informative since it informs the hearer of a new and contrastive opinion (contrastive as noted through the use of the phrase la verdad es que ‘the truth is that’, sin embargo ‘however’, yo ‘I’, and no estoy de acuerdo ‘I am not in agreement’, see: section 2.3).

(89) ‘Uninformative’ Dubitative Complements

Extract from an email about the changes that should be implemented in order to increase the number of readers of an online magazine. The author is directing this message to the creators of the magazine, so everyone (the addressees) already knows that there had been little interest in a certain recently published interview.

Dudo que muchos lectores tenían interés en la Doubt.PRES.INDIC.1SG that many readers have.PAST.INDIC.3PL interest in the entrevista con ese artista. interview with that artista.
‘I doubt that many readers had interest in the interview with that artist.’

In (89), the preceding context expressly puts forth that the addressees in question are knowledgeable about the proposition included in the dubitative complement; i.e., the fact that there was a lack of reader interest in the interview with said artist. Thus, *dudo* ‘I doubt’ can be said to introduce an uninformative proposition (i.e., uninformative), in the sense that it is already known, it is repetitive, and it is non-contradictory.

In the case of example (88), the dubitative complement containing an informative proposition, the indicative was assigned relatively positive scores, at 37% positivity (i.e., acceptable or highly acceptable). However, it was noted that this particular category of predicate showed some dialectal variation, as with the Spanish group of participants omitted, the positivity score of the present item increased to 44%. On the other hand, in the case of the dubitative clause of example (89), which involved an uninformative proposition, the same mood was assigned ratings that were largely negative, at only 14.86% positivity. This preference for the indicative in informative (as opposed to uninformative) uncertainty clauses was consistent throughout the rest of the experiment.

2.2.4.3.4 Causative Clauses

Participants rated the indicative as used in causative clauses as being significantly more acceptable when the complement was informative; (informative causative clauses ($Mdn = 2; M = 1.72$) vs. uninformative causative clauses ($Mdn = 1; M = 1.54$): $U = 84451.00, p = -0.00, r = -0.145$). The overall pattern relating to these findings is detailed in the figure and examples to follow.
Figure 13: The Indicative in (Un)Informative Causative Clauses

(90) ‘Informative’ Causative Complements

Comment taken from an article about violence in Mexico. Those who are going to read the article didn’t know that Rafael’s brother is dead.

Las diferencias surgidas causaron que el propio hermano de Rafael fue asesinado por los miembros de la pandilla.

The differences arise.PP cause.PAST.INDIC.3PL that the own brother of Rafael Be.PAST.INDIC.3SG assassinate.INF by the members of the gang.

‘The differences that arose caused that Rafael’s own brother was assassinated by the members of the gang.’
In (90), the causative expression *causaron que* ‘caused that’ introduces an embedded complement that is informative. Not only was the proposition unfamiliar to the addressee(s) in question, but it was also probably fairly alarming.

(91) ‘Uninformative’ Causative Complements

Comment from a blog focused on health. The person who wrote this post is repeating a story that s/he has shared many times in the blog.

Así que, tenía 2 hemorragias que provocaron que

So, have.PAST.INDIC.1SG 2 hemorrhages that provoke.PAST.INDIC.3PL that

fui al hospital en noviembre del año pasado.

go.PAST.INDIC.1SG to-the hospital in November of-the year past.

‘So, I had two hemorrhages which caused me to go the hospital in November of the last year.’

In (91), the causative clause *provocaron que* ‘provoked/caused that’ introduces information that the intended addressees(s) were to have already known; i.e., the fact that the subject had to make a trip to the hospital in November of the year in question. The complement was, thus, uninformative since it contained old information.

Whereas the informative causative complement had the indicative receiving ratings that were predominantly negative (15% positivity), its uninformative counterpart saw its acceptability falling even lower, to only 6% positivity. It was seen throughout the analyses of results that, although the indicative was dispreferred in both informative and uninformative causative complements, its use with informative propositions showed a statistically significant preference. This is discussed further in Chapter 4, which treats these findings as a puzzle.
2.2.4.3.5 Directive Clauses

Going against the preceding trend (i.e., a preference for the indicative in informative complement clauses) were the ratings attached to the directive category of predicates. There was an overall preference for the indicative’s use in directive clauses containing uninformative propositions; (informative directive clauses ($Mdn = 2; M = 2.23$) vs. uninformative directive clauses ($Mdn = 3; Mdn = 3.25$): $U = 48696.5, p = 0.00, r = -0.5$). Figure 14 below illustrates this pattern of findings.

![Figure 14: The Indicative in (Un)Informative Directive Clauses](image)

The sentences to follow provide examples of some of the indicative directive items that were used in the contextualized AJT.
‘Informative’ Directive Complements

Extract from a medical website. A doctor is informing readers that they should not use homemade medicines. The readers do not know how dangerous it is to use homemade medication.

Aconsejamos que no hacen nada casero.

Advise.PRES.INDIC.1PL that not make.PRES.INDIC.3PL nothing homemade.

Es mejor consultar a su centro de salud en caso cualquier enfermedad.

Be.PRES.INDIC.3SG better consult.INF to your center of health in case any illness.

‘We advise that you do not make anything homemade. It’s better to consult with (someone from) your medical center in the case of any illness.’

Example (92) has the indicative being used in an informative directive clause. The addressees are being informed about a danger that they were not previously aware of.

‘Uninformative’ Directive Complements

Comment extracted from an article about raising kids. The readers already know that it is good to have frequent conversation with their children.

Asimismo, recomiendan que los padres deben

Also, recommend.PRES.INDIC.3PL that the parents should.PRES.INDIC.3PL mantener un diálogo constante con los menores para detectar cambios de

104
maintain.INF a dialogue constant with the minors for detect.INF changes of comportamiento.

behavior.

‘At the same time, they recommend that parents must maintain constant dialogue with their children in order to be able to detect changes in their behavior.’

In example (93) above, the directive phrase recomiendan que ‘they recommend that’ introduces a point of view that the reader(s) in question already know; i.e., the fact that having consistent dialogue with your children is a good way of detecting if something is wrong. The complement is, thus, uninformative.

When it came to example (92), the informative directive clause, the participants assigned the indicative mostly negative ratings, at only 6.75% positivity. However, in the case of example (93), the uninformative directive complement, ratings were predominantly favorable, at 82% positivity. This preference for uninformative, indicative directive complements (as opposed to informative, indicative directive clauses) was consistent with all directive items forming part of the original experimental study. Chapter 3 to come will explain why these very unexpected findings are a special case, as was determined through a follow-up study.

2.2.4.3.6 Modal, Purpose, and Desiderative Clauses

In the case of possibility, purpose, and clauses, ratings for the indicative did not significantly differ with respect to the complements’ (un)informativeness (i.e., how new or old the proposition was to the addressee(s) in question). However, it was observed that, whereas the indicative received predominantly negative ratings in desiderative and purpose clauses, its rankings were
conspicuously more positive in modal complements. Table 15 and Figure 15 below summarize these results.

Table 15: The Indicative in (Un)Informative Modal, Purpose, and Desiderative Clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Type</th>
<th>‘Informative’</th>
<th>‘Uninformative’</th>
<th>Statistical Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiderative</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15: The Indicative in (Un)Informative Modal, Purpose, and Desiderative Clauses
2.2.4.4 Country Specific Results

Whereas the previous sections discuss the overall picture of findings, the present section provides a breakdown of these results as related to each individual country.

2.2.4.4.1 Argentina

Table 16: Results for Argentina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Type</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotive-factive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negated Epistemic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose Clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiderative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 above displays the results of the Mann-Whitney U tests performed on the ratings provided for the subjunctive and indicative by the 45 Argentine participants. Column 1 contains the eight classes of subjunctive clauses, with their results being distributed across rows 1 through 8. Columns 2-3 compare new versus old within the results for a singular mood, while columns 4-9 compare subjunctive versus indicative within a particular informational context (or lack thereof). Thus, whereas column 2 row 1 compares results for the indicative in dubitative clauses attached to informative (i.e., new information) versus uninformative propositions (i.e., old information), column 3 row 1 shows those related to the subjunctive.

When it came to the use of the subjunctive, there were significant differences between its use with informative versus uninformative propositions in three out of the eight clausal environments. In both emotive-factive and desiderative clauses, Argentine participants preferred the use of the subjunctive in complements that were addressee-uninformative. However, in purpose clauses, it was significantly more positively rated in complements that were addressee-informative. The remaining five contexts (negated epistemic, dubitative, possibility, causative, and directive clauses), on the other hand, involved no significant differences between its use in either context.

With respect to the use of the indicative in informative versus uninformative complements, there were significant differences between the ratings it was assigned as related to five out of the
eight clausal environments. Argentine participants rated the indicative significantly more positively with informative propositions, in emotive-factive, negated epistemic, dubitative, and causative clauses. In the case of directives, it was rated significantly more positively in the case of propositions that were uninformative. However, in terms of possibility, purpose, and desiderative clauses, there were no significant differences between the ratings that it was assigned.

Following the analyses of each mood in informative versus uninformative complements, came their comparisons to one another. With informative propositions, the subjunctive was rated significantly more positively than the indicative in all eight of the clausal environments that were considered (emotive-factive, negated epistemic, dubitative, modal, causative, directive, purpose, and desiderative clauses). This was the same with respect to uninformative propositions, as subjunctive was again rated significantly more favorably than indicative in all eight instances.

The final comparisons made were related to the use of each mood in sentences that were attached to no contextual information. Results showed that the subjunctive was once again more favorably received than was the indicative.
2.2.4.4.2 Costa Rica

Table 17: Results for Costa Rica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Type</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicative (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjunctive (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative (New Information)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninformative (Old Information)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context-free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Statistical Preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistically Preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistically Less Preferred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17 above displays the results of the Mann-Whitney U tests performed on the ratings provided for subjunctive and indicative by the 37 Costa Rican participants.

In terms of the subjunctive mood, the only significant differences that were observed related to the dubitative category of predicates. With dubitatives, the subjunctive was ranked significantly more positively in informative complements. However, in the case of the remaining seven categories of complements, no significant differences were observed.

The indicative in informative versus uninformative complements produced five instances of statistically significant differences. In emotive-factive, negated epistemic, dubitative, and causative sentences, it was received significantly more favorably with propositions that were reader-informative. Conversely, when it came to directives, its ratings were significantly more positive with propositions that were reader-uninformative. However, with possibility, purpose, and desiderative clauses, there were no significant differences between the ratings that it was assigned.

We also compared the subjunctive and indicative in informative complements. Significant differences were observed between the ratings assigned to each mood with respect to all eight of the clausal types that were examined. All eight environments had subjunctive being rated significantly more favorably than indicative. However, with respect to uninformative propositions, the subjunctive was assigned significantly more positive ratings in only seven out of the eight clausal contexts (emotive-factive, negated epistemic, dubitative, modal, causative, purpose, and desiderative clauses). In the case of directive predicates, there were no significant differences between the rankings that each mood was assigned.

When it came to the context-free environments, the subjunctive received higher ratings than the indicative as related to all eight complement types in question.
2.2.4.4.3 The Dominican Republic

Table 18: Results for the Dominican Republic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indicative (I)</td>
<td>Subjunctive (S)</td>
<td>Informative (New Information)</td>
<td>Uninformative (Old Information)</td>
<td>Context-free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb Class</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Emotive-factive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Negated Epistemic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Doubt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Modal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Causative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose Clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Desiderative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Statistical Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistically Preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistically Less Preferred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18 above shows the results of the Mann-Whitney U tests performed on the ratings provided for the subjunctive and indicative by the 37 Dominican participants.

The first analyses that were carried out related to the use of the subjunctive in complements that were both informative and uninformative. Only one significant difference was observed. In purpose clauses, Dominican participants assigned more positive ratings to its use with informative, as opposed to uninformative propositions. However, in terms of the remaining seven clausal environments, ratings assigned to the subjunctive were not significantly different.

In terms of the indicative, significant differences were observed in four out of the eight embedded environments. With informative propositions, the indicative was rated significantly more positively with respect to emotive-factive, dubitative, and causative clauses. However, with directives, it was assigned significantly more favorable rankings with information that was reader-uninformative. In contrast to these findings, were the ratings associated with negated epistemic, modal, purpose, and desiderative clauses, where no significant differences between the two environments (new vs. old information) were observed.

As for the rankings provided for subjunctive versus indicative in informative complement clauses, the subjunctive was assigned significantly more favorable ratings in terms of all eight conditions. However, in the case of uninformative propositions, subjunctive was ranked significantly more positively than indicative in only seven out of the eight clausal types (emotive-factive, negated epistemic, dubitative, modal, causative, purpose, and desiderative clauses). In terms of the directive category of predicates, ratings for indicative versus subjunctive did not significantly differ.

In context-free environments, the subjunctive was again the more favorably-rated mood. All eight clausal environments had the subjunctive as the more highly-rated option.
### 2.2.4.4.4 Mexico

**Table 19: Results for Mexico**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Class</th>
<th>Indicative (I)</th>
<th>Subjunctive (S)</th>
<th>Informative (New Information)</th>
<th>Uninformative (Old Information)</th>
<th>Context-free</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Emotive-factive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Negated Epistemic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Doubt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Modal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Causative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose Clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Desiderative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

- No Statistical Preference
- Statistically Preferred
- Statistically Less Preferred
The preceding table (Table 19) displays results from the Mann-Whitney U tests performed on the ratings provided for the subjunctive and indicative by the 51 Mexican participants forming part of the present study.

The subjunctive as used in informative versus uninformative complements produced only one statistically significant difference. With directives, the Mexican participants rated it as being more preferable with propositions that were addressee-uninformative. There were, however, no significant differences between the ratings it was assigned as related to the remaining seven clausal environments.

The indicative in informative and uninformative complements showed significantly different ratings with four out of the eight complement categories. When present in emotive-factive, negated epistemic, and dubitative clauses, it was rated considerably more favorably with informative, as opposed to uninformative complements. With directives, on the other hand, it received significantly more positive ratings with propositions that were addressee-old. However, in the case of the remaining four clausal types (modal, causative, purpose, and desiderative clauses), no significant differences between the pairs of rankings were observed.

With both informative and uninformative propositions, the subjunctive was the favored mood. This was the case with respect to all eight types of complements. This was also the case in the context-free environments, which had subjunctive being ranked more highly than indicative in all eight complements that were compared.
### 2.2.4.4.5 Spain

Table 20: Results for Spain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Class</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Emotive-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Negated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Doubt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Modal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Causative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Directive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Desiderative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

- No Statistical Preference
- Statistically Preferred
- Statistically Less Preferred
The preceding table (Table 20) displays results from the Mann-Whitney U tests performed on the ratings provided for the subjunctive and indicative by the 53 Spanish participants who formed part the current investigation.

Spanish participants rated the subjunctive as used in informative versus uninformative propositions differently as related to only one clausal environment; that of the emotive-factives. In emotive-factive complements, the subjunctive was ranked significantly more positively with addressee-old, as opposed to new information. The remaining seven contexts, however, demonstrated no significant differences in terms of the rankings that were compared.

In terms of the use of the indicative in informative and uninformative complements, significant differences were noted with regard to four of the examined clausal types. When it came to emotive-factives, negated epistemics, and dubitatives it was rated significantly more positively with information that was addressee-informative. With respect to directives, however, its ratings with old information were significantly higher. Contrarily, there were no significant differences between the ratings it was assigned when used in possibility, causative, purpose, or desiderative clauses, regardless of the informational context being considered.

When the subjunctive and indicative were compared to each other, it was observed that there were significant differences in how each mood was rated in terms of all three conditions that were examined (i.e., informative, uninformative, and context-free propositions). It was the case that the subjunctive was assigned considerably more positive rankings than the indicative with respect to all three environments, regardless of the clausal type in consideration.
2.2.4.4.6 Combined Results

The present sub-section provides a concise summary of the overall results discussed in sections 2.2.4.1-2.2.4.3.6.

Table 21: Results for All Countries Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Class</th>
<th>Indicative (I)</th>
<th>Subjunctive (S)</th>
<th>Informative (New Information)</th>
<th>Uninformative (Old Information)</th>
<th>Context-free</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotive-factiv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negated Epistemic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose Clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiderative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Statistical Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistically Preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistically Less Preferred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The preceding table (Table 21) displays results from the Mann-Whitney U tests performed on the ratings provided for the subjunctive and indicative by all 223 participants who formed part of the present investigation; i.e., a combined analysis of the ratings provided by the participants from each of the five countries; i.e., Argentina, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, and Spain.

In the case of the subjunctive in informative and uninformative complements, significant differences were identified in three out of the eight clausal environments. With respect to dubitatives and purpose clauses, participants had an overall preference for its use with propositions that were addressee-informative. However, with emotive-factives, it was more highly ranked overall with propositions that were addressee-old. The remaining five clausal types (negated epistemics, possibility, causative, directive, and desiderative clauses) showed no significant differences between its use with informative versus uninformative propositions.

Ratings for the indicative in informative and uninformative complements revealed significant differences in five out of the eight traditionally subjunctive environments. With emotive-factives, negated epistemics, dubitatives, and causatives, it was assigned significantly more positive ratings overall with information that was addressee-informative. However, going along with the individual country trends, it was rated significantly higher with uninformative directive clauses. Conversely, in the case of possibility, purpose, and desiderative clauses, there were no significant differences between the ratings that it was ascribed.

Comparisons of the ratings that the subjunctive and indicative were individually assigned revealed significant differences with respect to all three clausal environments: informative, uninformative, and no contextual information. With new information, the subjunctive was rated significantly more positively than the indicative in all eight of types of complements (emotive-
factive, negated epistemic, dubitative, modal, causative, directive, purpose, and desiderative clauses). This was likewise the case with the ratings assigned to the subjunctive with information that was addressee-old. With old information, it was again significantly more highly rated than indicative, with respect to all eight categories of clauses. The same occurred in the context-free environments, with subjunctive once again being more preferable than indicative, regardless of the complement in question.

2.2.5 Summary of Sections 2.1 to 2.2.4

In the above sections, we saw that the subjunctive is always preferred over indicative in normatively subjunctive environments. This was the case regardless of the subordinate proposition’s (un)informativeness (i.e., how new or old the proposition was to the addressee at which it was directed). We also saw that, although the contexts that were examined are traditionally subjunctive, the (un)informativeness of the clause played a role in how it was rated in certain environments. Although rated highly across the board (i.e., regardless of both the presence or absence of a particular context and the type of complement in question), the subjunctive was preferred in uninformative emotive-factive clauses, and informative purpose and dubitative clauses.

In terms of the indicative, in spite of being assigned lower overall ratings than the subjunctive, there was a noticeable split between the verb classes with which it was more positively or negatively received. It was noticed that with emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty (negated epistemics, dubitatives, and modals), the ratings assigned to the indicative were in a similar range of acceptability. However, with the volitional or preference-based predicates (desiderative, directive, purpose, and causative clauses), its ratings were relatively low. With emotive-factives,
negated epistemics, and dubitatives, the newness or unfamiliarity of the proposition played a significant role in its acceptability. Surprisingly, in terms of the directive category of predicates, it was noticed that indicative was rated very highly with respect to propositions that were uninformative. This was very unexpected, as directives form part of the core subjunctive-selecting group of predicates. However, a follow-up investigation showed that these high ratings relate to modal concord, as opposed to the general use of the indicative in directive complements. The follow-up investigation will be discussed in Chapter 3. Lastly, we observed that, in addition to how new or old the proposition is to the addressee(s), (un)informativeness may also relate to (non)contrastiveness. In the section to come, we will expand this concept (i.e., (un)informativeness) even further to incorporate the proposition’s perceived likelihood and (un)importance, where (un)importance may take into consideration all three of the mentioned characteristics; i.e., the proposition’s familiarity or unfamiliarity to the hearer, its (non)contrastiveness, and/or its likelihood.

Chapter 4 will address the following questions that came about:

1) why causatives, which dislike indicative complements, showed an effect for the informativeness of the embedded proposition;

2) why the subjunctive was preferred in informative dubitative and purpose clauses. With emotive-factives, it was preferred in uninformative complements, which was expected. Emotive-factive complements (which have the subjunctive as their default in Spanish) are inherently tied to old information, a context in which the subjunctive tends to be found. The subjunctive’s higher rankings with informative (versus uninformative) dubitative and purpose clauses is, thus, somewhat puzzling.
2.3 Analysis: Two Subjunctives

2.3.1 Introduction

In Chapter 1, I introduced the idea that Spanish has not one, but instead two subjunctives. I describe the required subjunctive as being triggered by the core subjunctive governors (desideratives, directives, and purpose clauses), and the default subjunctive as co-occurring with emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty (negated epistemics, dubitatives, and modals). We proposed that the required subjunctive, subjunctive 1, distinguishes itself by being used with predicates which compare $p$ or $\neg p$, but which cannot assert $p$ or $\neg p$. We, thus, conferred this group of verbs and expressions the title of preference- or persuasion-based predicates. On the other hand, we put forth that the default subjunctive, subjunctive 2, differs from subjunctive 1 in that it can be replaced by the indicative. We stated that, unlike the preference-based verbs, predicates that take subjunctive 2 can assert $p$ or $\neg p$, but cannot compare $p$ or $\neg p$. We, therefore, conferred this group of verbs and expressions the label of assertion-inclined predicates. Emotive-factives are, however, a special case of assertion-inclined predicate, in that their hybridity (emotivity vs. factivity) allows them to both assert or compare the affirmative or negated embedded proposition.

These observations were made by means of the experimental study discussed in section 2.2. In examining the results, it was apparent that the indicative was most likely to be used by a speaker who intends to assert the complement proposition. As discussed by Stalnaker (2002), assertion may be appropriate not only to add content to the communicative context, but also to influence the direction of subsequent conversation (p. 710). This may occur, for instance, when the proposition “is a noteworthy piece of information that the addressee might be expected to comment on. [In such cases] it might be inappropriate to convey the information in a way that keeps it in the background” (p. 710). In accordance with Stalnaker’s theory, the results of the investigation
suggested that speakers are more likely to alert their addressees to informative propositions (whether affirmative or negated). In order to do this, s/he may choose to assert the complement clause with the indicative. In this way, the negated or affirmative proposition is brought to the hearer’s attention through its addition to the common ground. This pattern was, however, only seen to be the case with emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty.

As per the above discussion, the main points to be extracted from Chapter 1 and sections 2.1-2.2 are that native speakers consider indicative emotive-factive and uncertainty clauses (negated epistemic, dubitative, and modal complements) to be significantly more acceptable than indicative preference-based complements (desiderative, directive, and purpose clauses). Another important point to be extracted is that, in the case of emotive-factives, negated epistemics, and dubitatives, the increased acceptability of the indicative is influenced by the informativeness of the affirmative or negated complement (i.e., how new/unknown and/or contrastive the proposition is considered to be). By the end of this section, we will see that in the case of modal clauses, (un)informativeness may relate to the proposition’s likelihood. We will also add to the definition of (un)informativeness, the concept of (un)importance, which as stated in section 2.2, may relate to a combination of the three already discussed factors; i.e., the proposition’s (un)familiarity, (non)contrastiveness, and/or likelihood. A final point to be extracted from these sections is that, with the core subjunctive, preference-based predicates, indicative complements are largely unacceptable. Thus, as discussed in Chapter 1, whereas certain normatively subjunctive matrices require subjunctive complements (predicates that select subjunctive 1), others have the subjunctive as the default, which means that they may at times take indicative embedded clauses (predicates that take subjunctive 2).
Section 2.3 aims to bring together the above-mentioned points by demonstrating how the preference-based, subjunctive 1-selecting predicates differ from the assertion-inclined, subjunctive 2-taking verbs and expressions. The present sub-section will, thus, focus on discussing the idea that the Spanish mood system is characterized by a split between subjunctives. Table 1 from Chapter 1 is repeated as follows.

Table 1: The Two Spanish Subjunctives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicate types</th>
<th>Subjunctive 1</th>
<th>Subjunctive 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desideratives</td>
<td>Dubitatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directives</td>
<td>Negated Epistemics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose Clauses</td>
<td>Modals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Default</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare ( p ) or ( \neg p )</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can assert ( p ) or ( \neg p )</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.1.1 Preference-based Predicates and Subjunctive 1

As mentioned in sections 1.1 and 1.8, preference-based predicates require the use of the subjunctive and, thus, have complements that take subjunctive 1. Following many of the ideas discussed by Giorgi and Pianesi (1997) and Villalta (2008), I assume that predicates which select for subjunctive 1 (desideratives, directives, and purpose clauses) have a comparison- or preference-based semantics. This means that the matrix predicate introduces a complement which denotes an ordering of possibilities or a comparison of alternatives. Whether or not this
comparativeness is one to one (e.g., the subject’s desire for Mary to get the job versus not getting the job) or related to various contextual alternatives (e.g., Mary getting this particular job vs. getting another position elsewhere vs. getting another position at the same location), the purpose of the complement is to express the subject’s (dis)preferred end result. In other words, preference-based predicates compare $p$ or $\neg p$. This is the case regardless of the tense that is elected. Whether the proposition is located in the present or the past, the complement expresses the speaker or subject’s (dis)favored outcome. Thus, in the case of examples (94), (95), and (96) to follow, each volitional complement discloses the subject’s desire for Mary to have gotten the job.

(94) Desiderative Clauses

e) I want(ed) Mary to get the job.

f) We want(ed) Mary to get the job.

g) S/he wants(ed) Mary to get the job.

h) They want(ed) Mary to get the job.

(95) Directive Clauses

e) I recommend(ed) that Mary get the job.

f) We recommend(ed) that Mary get the job.

g) S/he recommends(ed) that Mary get the job.

h) They recommend(ed) that Mary get the job.

(96) Purpose Clauses

e) I practiced with Mary so that she get/got the job.

f) We practiced with Mary so that she get/got the job.

g) S/he practiced with Mary so that she get/got the job.
h) They practiced with Mary so that she get/got the job.

According to Portner and Rubinstein (2020), ‘wanting’ is not understood to implicate desires that the experiencer is committed to and prepared to defend (p. 14). They state that:

Being committed to a priority entails that the priority has a chance of materializing both circumstantially, given relevant facts, and preferentially, given other priorities. In other words, one cannot be committed to inconsistent priorities, and one cannot be committed to priorities that are circumstantially unrealistic (p. 15)

Related to this point is what Giorgi and Pianesi (1997) say about desires and wanting. They argue that bouletic backgrounds are non-realistic, since we cannot assume that anyone’s desires are realized in the actual world (p. 212).

With the previous points in mind, let us now assume that all preference-based predicates have complements that report a (dis)preference, desire, requirement, command, instruction, suggestion, dissuasion, disapproval, prohibition, or intention. Thus, regardless of whether the matrix subject wants/recommends/requires/prohibits/or does something so that \( p \) or \( \neg p \) (or wanted/recommended/required/prohibited/or did something so that \( p \) or \( \neg p \)), the complement proposition is non-realistic since it cannot be assumed that his/her desires will materialize in the actual world. This explains why indicative preference-based complements are ungrammatical. Similar to what Quer (2009)\(^5\) states about conditional statements, I argue that the indicative can

\[\text{Quer (2009) states that, “indicative appears in protases that are realistic in the sense that they quantify over worlds close enough to the actual one […] By contrast, subjunctive conditional antecedents quantify over worlds which are more distant from the actual one (present non/factual/counterfactual) […] or even disjoint from the actual one (past non-factual/counterfactual) […]” (p. 1780).}\]
only appear in complements that represent propositions that are close enough to the actual world. Conversely, complements which represent propositions that are distant or disjoint from the current world (non-realistic), require the subjunctive. Therefore, preference-based complements cannot be asserted with indicative since the matrix subject cannot commit him/herself to situations that are far away from the common ground; i.e., desires or (dis)preferences, which cannot be assumed to be realistic.

In accordance with the prior arguments, my hypothesis puts forth that assertion is most likely with complements which denote propositions that are least somewhat realistic; i.e., those assumed by the speaker to be able to materialize in the current world. In these cases, the complement will report a particular truth (factivity) or experience (uncertainty, doubt, possibility), as related to the speaker or matrix subject. Unlike comparisons of alternatives, such propositions may be close to the actual world and can, thus, be asserted so that they get added to the common ground. As will be discussed further in section 2.3.1.2, this is most likely to occur when the proposition is informative (new, important, contrastive, and/or highly likely). This appears to be why examples (97), (98), and (99) to follow have been deemed unacceptable. Desires are too far away from the common ground and, thus, too different from the hearer’s mental model to be asserted with the indicative.

(97)    Desiderative

Comment extracted from a blog focused on the differences between men and women. The blogger in question is sharing information about his life as a newlywed. This is new blog, so the readers don’t know anything about his relationship, neither do they know the woman.
*Mi mujer prefiere que el mensaje es comunicado de tantas maneras creativas como sea posible.

‘My wife prefers that the message be communicated in as many creative ways as possible. For this reason flower shops and card businesses exist.’

(98) Directive

Extract from a medical website. A doctor is informing readers that they shouldn’t use homemade medicines. The readers don’t know how dangerous it is to use homemade treatments.

*Aconsejamos que no hacen nada casero.

‘We advise that you don’t make anything homemade. It is better to consult with your health center in the case of any illness.’
Comment taken from a blog titled: “Plants that help us cure cancer.” The blogger in question is presenting her new blog to readers who had never visited it. She’s sharing for the first time the reason for which she created it.

*Hola a todos, acabo de crear este blog por casualidad.*

Hello to everyone, finish.PRES.INDIC.1SG of create.INF this blog by chance

*Mi intención es hacer difusión de todo lo increíble de las plantas para que puede llegar esta información a mucha gente.*

My intention be.PRES.INDIC.3SG make.INF diffusion of all what incredible of the plantas for that can.PRES.INDIC.3SG arrive.INF this information to many people.

‘Hello everyone, I just finished creating this blog by chance. My intention is to let everyone know how incredible plants are so that this information can get to many people.’

Since preference-based complements are assumed to be non-realistic, no matter how informative they may be, variation with the indicative (the assertion of the complement proposition) is never possible. The complements of preference-based predicates are, therefore, required to take the subjunctive, so as to signal their distance from the common ground. That is, their comparativeness automatically triggers the selection of subjunctive 1. It may, nonetheless, be argued that there are circumstances in which the assertion of a preference-based statement is possible. For instance, in example (100) below, y lo hará ‘and she will’ is an assertion. However, different from venga ‘come’, which forms part of the desiderative complement, y lo hará can stand on its own. In other words, ‘John wants Mary to come and she will’ is a compound sentence, made up of two independent clauses; i.e., ‘John wants Mary to come’ and ‘She will’. In terms of the
present dissertation, my claim is that it is the complement of the desiderative verb that cannot be asserted, as opposed to a following conjunctive sentence.

(100)  

\[ \text{Juan quiere que María venga y lo hará.} \]

‘John wants Mary to come and she will.’

2.3.1.2 Assertion-inclined Predicates and Subjunctive 2

As mentioned in section 2.3.1.1, assertion is most likely with complements that represent events that are close enough to the actual world. Events that are close to or coincide with the common ground include those that:

i. are presupposed to be true (factive),

ii. are negated or doubted (as assessed by the speaker or subject, based on his/her experiences), or

iii. are (im)possible (as assessed by the speaker or subject, based on his/her experiences).

This is why Spanish has emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty (negated epistemics, dubitatives, and modals) sometimes taking the indicative. With these verbs, the speaker is able to assert his/her commitment to the complement or its negation, since it may denote a proposition that is realistic (i.e., close to the actual world and, thus, close to or coinciding with the common ground). In asserting the subordinate clause, \( p \) or \( \neg p \) gets incorporated into the set of propositions that the speaker and hearer have accepted during the course of the conversation. Thus, the
proposition’s content is added to the communicative context, with the possible effect that it influences the direction of subsequent conversation (see Stalnaker (2002)).

Since emotive-factives and expressions of uncertainty have subjunctive as their default, in asserting and, consequently, adding the proposition to the common ground, the hearer’s attention gets called to it newness, importance, contrastiveness, and/or high likelihood. Put differently, the use of the indicative can signal the embedded proposition’s informativeness. Whereas with emotive-factives, this is the case when the complement is assumed to be new to the hearer or reader, with negated epistemics and dubitatives, both the addressee’s presumed unfamiliarity with the negated proposition, as well as its contrastiveness (and/or importance), may cause the speaker to opt for assertion with the indicative. In the case of modal predicates, we will see that informativeness relates to the proposition’s likelihood. The sections to follow detail this further.

2.3.1.2.1 Emotive-factive Clauses

Emotive-factive or evaluative predicates introduce the attitude of the speaker or matrix subject towards a particular event (Becker, 2010; Portner, 2018). Evaluative predicates fall under the factive classification since the truth of their complements is presupposed (e.g., Farkas, 1992b; Portner, 2018). Thus, in the example (101) below, Mary is assumed to have gotten the job.

(101)  
\[ \text{Me alegra que María haya conseguido el trabajo.} \]

‘I am happy that Mary got the job.’
In addition to their factivity, emotive-factives have also been analyzed as having a comparative (preference-based) semantics. For instance, if we look again at example (101), we can infer that the matrix subject’s happiness stems from his/her evaluation of possible alternatives; e.g., The fact that Mary got the job is better than or preferred to the possibility of her not having been offered the job.

As a result of their factivity, emotive-factives tend to be used to communicate old or known information (e.g., Gregory and Lunn 2012; Lunn 1989; Quer 2001; Sessarego 2016). This means that in using an emotive-factive, the speaker assumes that his/her addressee is already in the know about what the complement affair entails. As Faulkner (2021) puts it:

It would be unusual […] for John to tell Tim that he’s happy that Mary got married, if Tim did not share in the knowledge that Mary had ever been engaged, or that she had ever been in a relationship (or even worse, if Tim did not know who Mary was) (pp. 9-10)

The fact that they usually relay old information directly relates to their default use of the subjunctive. One of the uses of the subjunctive is to communicate information that is of low value (e.g., old or known information) (e.g., Gregory and Lunn 2012; Lunn 1989; Mejías-Bikandi, 1998; Quer 2001; Sessarego 2016). However, although this is normatively the case, there are some situations in which the conversational participant(s) will be unfamiliar with the topic of the emotive-factive complement. In these cases, the speaker may consider the embedded proposition to be informative since it involves information that is new to the addressee(s) at which it is directed. In such instances, the speaker may opt for the indicative in order to assert and, consequently, add the content of the factive complement to the common ground. In this way, the hearer is able to incorporate the new proposition into his/her mental model. Therefore, whereas the indicative may be acceptable in a context like that of (102) (originally 84), where the information being discussed
is new to the addressee(s) in question, it is unlikely to be acceptable in (103) (originally 85), a proposition that is described as already being known to the hearer or reader (i.e., old information).

(102)  ‘Informative’ Emotive-factive Complements

Comment extracted from an internet forum titled: Daily menu for babies from 6 to 9 months. This mother is speaking about the eating habits of her child. The information she is sharing is new to the readers.

Hola, mi bebe tiene 7 meses, está bien en el peso y el tamaño para su edad, pero me preocupa que no le agrada mucho la comida. Todavía toma leche materna.

‘Hello, my baby has 7 months, he is good in weight and size for his age, but it worries me that food doesn’t please him much. He still drinks breast milk.’

(103)  ‘Uninformative’ Emotive-factive Complements

Comment extracted from a blog about religion. The man in question is asking his pastor a question after having spoken to him many times about his relationship with his girlfriend.

Tengo ahora más de 3 años saliendo con mi novia y como ya

Have.PRES.INDIC.1SG now more of 3 years date.GER with my girlfriend and as already
‘I’ve been with my girlfriend for 3 years now and as you know, she’s atheist. Is it bad that I’m dating her?’

It is clear that the proposition in example (102) is informative (i.e., new to the addressee), both through the contextual details, as well as through the subject’s use of the greeting *Hola* ‘Hello’. In contrast to this, the proposition of example (103) is explicitly described as being known to the addressee(s) at which it is directed; i.e., uninformative → old. It is in situations (like that of 102), in which the speaker is sharing a factive proposition that is not assumed to already be known to the hearer or reader, that assertion with the indicative may be appropriate. In contexts like that of (103), where the speaker is discussing information that is familiar to the conversational participants, variability with the indicative is unlikely. In uninformative contexts (103), the use of the subjunctive is the default since the complement is assumed to contain information that need not be added to the common ground; i.e., information that is presumed to already be shared amongst the members of the conversational environment. For this reason, the results discussed in section 2.2 showed that, if separately considered, the subjunctive is preferred in uninformative emotive-factive complements (as opposed to informative evaluative complements), while indicative is preferred in those that are informative (rather than uninformative) (i.e., propositions that contain new information).
2.3.1.2.2 Negated Epistemic Clauses

Negated epistemic complements relay the speaker or matrix subject’s doubts regarding a particular situation or happening. Thus, in example (104) below, the matrix subject John is negating the possibility that Mary was offered the position. Based on John’s experiences (e.g., through knowing Mary, how the job market functions, or about the particular establishment that Mary applied to etc.), the likelihood that Mary got the job is low. In other words, to John, it is unlikely that Mary got the job.

\[(104) \quad \text{Juan no cree que María haya conseguido el trabajo.}\]

‘John doesn’t believe that Mary got the job.’

As has been frequently stated, in many cases, negation is considered a trigger for the subjunctive (Farkas, 1992b; Giorgi and Pianesi, 1997; Portner, 2018; Quer, 1998, 2009). The general pattern is, therefore, that negated epistemics take subjunctive complement clauses. However, as seen below (and in previous sections e.g., section 1.3.2.2), they may allow for the indicative, especially if the speaker’s goal is to assert a rejected or refuted, previously mentioned statement. In this way, the negated proposition gets incorporated into the common ground. For instance, in example (105) to follow, the presence of an indicative negated epistemic complement serves to assert a contrasting opinion; i.e., the speaker rejects the idea that the matter relates to the exploitation of petroleum. In example (106), (originally 86), the contrastiveness of the negated proposition is also made explicitly clear via assertion with the indicative. In rejecting the idea that
all men are equal, the speaker uses the contrastive *yo* ‘I’ in order to point out that her opinion differs from a previously mentioned statement. The assertion of the negated complement with the indicative, thus, ensures that the new and contrastive idea gets added to the current common ground.

(105)  ‘Informative’ Negated Epistemic Complements

Comment taken from a blog about the exploitation of gas. The readers are seeing for the first time the president’s response regarding the issue.

*Hay gente que trata de politicar este asunto.*

Have.PRES.INDIC.3SG people that try.PRES.INDIC.3SG politicize.INF this issue.

*No es verdad que tiene que ver con explotación petrolera, sostuvo el presidente.*

Not be.PRES.INDIC.3SG truth that have.PRES.INDIC.3SG-to-do with exploitation gas, maintain.PAST.INDIC.3SG the president.

‘There are people who try to politicize this issue. It is not true that it has to do with gas exploitation, maintained the president.’

(106)  ‘Informative’ Negated Epistemic Complements

Comment extracted from a blog titled: I like being a woman. The blogger in question is informing readers about something she read regarding how men treat women nowadays. The readers don’t know anything about the issue.
Yo no pienso que los hombres son todos iguales. Hay hombres que quieren casarse y que quieren abrirnos puertas.

‘I don’t think that all men are equal. There are men who want to get married and who want to open doors for us.’

This is why examples such as (107) to follow were dispreferred (rated poorly) by the participants who took part in the experimental study. Since (107) involved a negated epistemic proposition that already formed part of the common ground (i.e., the fact that it may be unnecessary to carry out the particular spending ‘today’), assertion with the indicative was likely to have been deemed unnecessary or redundant. Indicative, negated epistemic complements are most likely to be acceptable when the speaker intends to add a new, contrastive perspective to the discourse environment.

(107) ‘Uninformative’ Negated Epistemic Complements

Comment taken from a forum involving a discussion about planning a trip. Everyone has decided that they’ll buy the tickets once they receive their salary. However, someone is suggesting that they don’t wait, and that they buy them now. The author of the comment below is repeating to this individual that waiting a week won’t complicate their plans.
...Pero ya hemos dicho que no estamos seguros

But already have say PP that not be sure
de que es necesario hacerlo hoy. Podemos hacerlo la
do it INF today. Can do it INF the
of that be necessary do it INF today. Can do it INF the
semana que viene.

week that come.

‘But we’ve already said that we aren’t sure that it’s necessary to do it today. We can do it next week.’

2.3.1.2.3 Dubitative Clauses

Like negated epistemic clauses, dubitative complements present a speaker or matrix subject’s doubts regarding a particular situation or happening. Put differently, they reveal the belief that s/he holds concerning the likelihood of the proposition being discussed. For instance, in example (108) below, the matrix subject John is negating the possibility of Mary having been offered the position. Thus, according to John’s experiences (e.g., having seen Mary’s application or applied to the same job himself etc.), Mary likely did not get the job.

(108) Juan duda que María haya conseguido el

John doubt that Mary have gotten the
trabajo.

job.

‘John doubts that Mary got the job.’
Although Spanish dubitatives have the subjunctive as their default, the findings detailed in section 2.2 (see: section 2.2.4.3.3) suggest that speakers may opt for the indicative in order to call the hearer’s attention to the negated proposition (i.e., by adding it to the common ground). For instance, in example (109) below, the indicative is considered acceptable if the speaker intends to make known his/her disagreement with a previously mentioned statement (e.g., Smead, 1994). Thus, the use of the indicative signals the contrastive effect of the doubted proposition.

(109)  Dudo     que el profeta vuelve.

Doubt.PRES.INDIC.1SG  that the prophet return.PRES.INDIC.3SG

(implies.PRES.INDIC.3SG  that someone have.PRES.INDIC.3SG

afirmado previamente: “el profeta vuelve.”)

affirm.PP previously: “the prophet return.PRES.INDIC.3SG.”)

‘I doubt that the prophet is returning: implies that someone had previously mentioned that the prophet was returning.’

(Bell, 1990, p. 92 as cited in Smead, 1994)

In using an indicative dubitative complement, the speaker does not take for granted that his/her disagreement is background information that the hearer already knows. Alternatively, his/her intent is to assert the negated proposition so that it gets added to the hearer’s mental model. If the subjunctive were instead to be used (110), it would not necessarily be inferred that it had previously been affirmed that the prophet was returning. Contrastiveness would, therefore, not inevitably be manifested.
Dudo que el profeta vuelva.

‘I doubt that the prophet is returning.’

(Adapted from Bell, 1990, p. 92 as cited in Smead, 1994)

The proposition in (109) can, thus, be considered informative in that its contrastiveness foregrounds its newness (i.e., it brings a new perspective to the discourse context – the negation or refutation of a previously mentioned belief) and assumed importance to the speaker. This is also why the indicative may appear in a sentence like (111) (originally 88) to follow. In this particular example, the speaker indicates in two ways that the dubitative statement is contrastive. The first means by which s/he does this is through the use of La verdad es que ‘The truth is that’, which naturally implies some contradiction. The second is through the addition of the follow-up statement: Sin embargo, yo no estoy de acuerdo con este punto ‘However, I am not in agreement with this point’. In the follow-up statement, the speaker expresses his/her disagreement with the previous answer he provided by means of the contrastive yo ‘I’, the use of sin embargo ‘however’, as well as through the explicit mentioning of his/her disagreement with the point – yo no estoy de acuerdo… ‘I am not in agreement’. What is inferred from this statement is, thus, that a previous point was made regarding the presumed longevity of email marketing. Said statement was then followed by the contrastive dubitative proposition which refuted the claim that said modality would be long-lasting. Finally, in order to show his/her agreement with the implied previous statement (that email marketing would have a lengthy life), the speaker follows up by affirming his/her disagreement with the negated proposition. Thus, like example (109), the dubitative proposition of (111) is informative, in that it is contrastive and, thus, brings something new to the addressee’s mental model.
‘Informative’ Dubitative Complements

Opinion taken from an internet forum that has to do with marketing. The computer specialist that wrote this comment is informing the readers of the weak aspects of email marketing.

La verdad es que muchos dudan que el email va a seguir vivo. Sin embargo, yo no estoy de acuerdo con este punto.

‘The truth is that many doubt that email marketing is going to stay alive. However, I do not agree with this point.’

Both (109) and (111) demonstrate that the speaker’s choice to use an indicative dubitative complement can result from the intent to bring the contradicted proposition into the common ground.

If we look back at section 2.2.4.3.3, we see that, in accordance with the above, informative, indicative dubitative complements were deemed more acceptable than those that were uninformative. When the dubitative complement contained a negated proposition that had likely already formed part of the common ground (i.e., old and/or non-contrastive), ratings for the indicative significantly decreased. Thus, in a context like that of (112) to follow, (originally 89), we can infer that the indicative would be redundant since assertion is unnecessary. It is only when
the negated complement contrasts an implied or explicit previous assertion, that the speaker is likely to opt for the indicative.

(112) ‘Uninformative’ Dubitative Complements

Extract from an email about the changes that should be implemented in order to increase the number of readers of an online magazine. The author is directing this message to the creators of the magazine, so everyone (the addressees) already knows that there had been little interest in a certain recently published interview.

Dudo que muchos lectores tenían interés en la entrevista con ese artista.

‘I doubt that many readers had interest in the interview with that artist.’

2.3.1.2.4 Modal Clauses

Modal meanings differ based on their STRENGTH (Portner, 2018). For instance, whereas must and it is necessary that are strong modals, may and it is possible that would be characterized as weak (Portner, 2018). Strong modals tend to be called NECESSITY modals, while weak ones are deemed POSSIBILITY modals (p. 12). Possibility modals such as ser posible que ‘to be possible that’ reflect the speaker or subject’s uncertainty towards the subordinate proposition. Because they express uncertainty, they tend to be described as requiring subjunctive complement clauses (e.g., Romero, 2012).
Es posible que María haya conseguido el trabajo.

‘It is possible that Mary got the job.’

However, Spanish speakers may opt for indicative modal clauses if the aim is to assert their commitment to the embedded complement. Unlike the emotive-factives and the other verbs of uncertainty (negated epistemics and dubitatives), the use of the indicative in a possibility clause primarily serves to add a proposition that the speaker or subject is confident about (more likely or realistic) to the common ground. For instance, in the three uses of es posible que ‘it is possible that’ to follow, all taken from the same source, only one clause appears in the indicative.

Cualquier persona que está presionando demasiado es posible que tiene otras intenciones diferentes a los sentimientos que tú tienes o

‘Whoever is too pressuring, it is possible that s/he has different intentions from the
feelings that you have or it’s possible that s/he is thinking about carrying out a scam that will end with you losing your money.’

(Davies’ Corpus del Español, 2016)

c. *Es posible que la persona trabaje*

It is possible that the person works by phone in a foreign country, trying to find ways to obtain a green card or access your bank account or a flight to your country, or the money for a flight that s/he is never going to use.’

(Davies’ Corpus del Español, 2016)

What is observed is that, whereas uses b and c describe more inconsistent, less probable situations, use a relays a proposition that is highly likely. Use b discusses the possibility that an online individual who messages frequently may be trying to swindle the addressee out of his/her money. Use c talks about the likelihood that s/he works by phone in a foreign country, with the intention of scamming the addressee out of a green card, his/her bank account information, or money for a
flight. The modal expression in use a, however, states that it is possible that the individual doing the pressuring has intentions that differ from or do not coincide with those of the addressee; i.e., the addressee’s intention to seek out a romantic relationship. Therefore, in comparison to uses b and c, the likelihood that the proposition of use a will materialize is higher, which, consequently, makes it more realistic. In other words, the complement of the first modal clause depicts an event that has a higher likelihood of being true or transpiring. This makes the proposition a more suitable candidate for the speaker to commit to and assert. Another interesting example is that of (115) below. In this case, the use of the indicative seems to relate to the announcing of a new possibility.

(115)  
\begin{verbatim}
Es posible que va a decir que usted es una persona mala persona…
\end{verbatim}

‘It is possible that s/he is going to say that you’re a bad person.’  
(Davies’ Corpus del Español, 2016)

Thus, with respect to modal clauses, it seems as if the use of the indicative primarily has to do with the commitment or confidence that the speaker has regarding the truth of the complement. The more likely the proposition is to happen (the closer it is to the actual world), the more possible assertion with the indicative becomes. Accordingly, in these cases, the informativeness of the proposition pertains to its higher likelihood.
2.3.2 Lozano’s (1972) Two Spanish Subjunctives

In the previous sections, we proposed that Spanish has a required, preference-based subjunctive, as well as a default, overridable subjunctive. However, as mentioned in Chapter 1 (see: section 1.1), the idea that Spanish has a division between subjunctives is not a novel concept (e.g., Bello, 1847; Gili Gaya, 1960; Lozano, 1972; Quer, 1998, 2010). The theory most related to the present approach is that of Lozano (1972). Lozano explains that there are two main features of the Spanish subjunctive, [+optative] and [±dubitative], each of which can later be split into several other sub-categorizations (p. 76).

According to Lozano (1972), the category [+optative] “obligates subjunctives and is related to the semantic characteristics of volition, intent, persuasion, or obligation” (p. 76). The subcategories that fall under [+optative] include optative-imperative (e.g., pedir que ‘to request that’; ordenar que ‘to order that’), optative-impersonal (e.g., es importante que ‘it is important that’; es mejor que ‘it is better that’), and optative-emotional (e.g., me alegra que ‘it pleases me that’; querer que ‘to want that’). When it comes to the feature [±dubitative], Lozano states that it “may or may not obligate subjunctives and is related to [the] semantic characteristics of doubt, unreality, and probability” (p. 76). Under the [±dubitative] main umbrella are dubitative-personal (e.g., dudar que ‘to doubt; negar que ‘to deny that’) and dubitative-impersonal predicates (e.g., es posible que ‘it is possible that’; es dudoso que ‘it is doubtful that’). In terms of the differences between the two categories, Lozano affirms that they behave dissimilarly under negation (p. 77). While the feature [+optative] ‘always’ requires subjunctives, “the feature [±dubitative] may or may not obligate subjunctives if the matrix verb in the main clause is preceded by the preverb no” (p. 77). He provides the following sentences as examples of this distinction.
### Table 22: The Optative-Dubitative Distinction According to Lozano (1972)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE FEATURE [+OPTATIVE]</th>
<th>THE FEATURE [±DUBITATIVE]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(116) <em>Quiero que lo hagases.</em></td>
<td><em>Dudo que lo hagases.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want.1SG that it do.SUBJ.2SG</td>
<td>Doubt.1SG that it do.SUBJ.2SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I want you to do it.’</td>
<td>‘I doubt that you’ll do it.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(117) <em>No quiero que lo hagas.</em></td>
<td><em>No dudo que lo hagases.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not want.1SG that it do.SUBJ.2SG</td>
<td>Not doubt.1SG that it do.SUBJ.2SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I don’t want you to do it.’</td>
<td>‘I don’t doubt that you’ll do it.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(118) <em>No quiero que lo haces.</em></td>
<td><em>No dudo que lo haces.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not want.1SG that it do.INDIC.2SG</td>
<td>Not doubt.1SG that it do.INDIC.2SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I don’t want you to do it.’</td>
<td>‘I don’t doubt that you’ll do it.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(119) <em>Quiero que lo haces.</em></td>
<td><em>Dudo que lo haces.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want.1SG that it do.INDIC.2SG</td>
<td>Doubt.1SG that it do.INDIC.2SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I want you to do it.’</td>
<td>‘I doubt that you’ll do it.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to the present dissertation, Lozano’s (1972) two subjunctives include one that is volitional and required (‘optative’ – desideratives and directives), and another that is somewhat...
variable (‘dubitative’ – dubitatives, negated epistemics, verbs of possibility). Whereas optative predicates reject any variability with indicative, dubitative expressions may allow for the indicative when negated. Thus, while Lozano’s optative subjunctive is obligatory, his dubitative subjunctive is default. However, different from the present study, Lozano’s variably subjunctive predicates (‘dubitatives’) do not incorporate emotive-factives. Instead, he positions evaluative and impersonal expressions under the optative group of predicates, with which alternations with indicative do not occur. Additionally, although Lozano mentions that mood variation occurs with negated dubitatives (e.g., no dudar que ‘to not doubt that’, no pensar que ‘to not think that’), he claims that it is disallowed with affirmative verbs of doubting (e.g., dudar ‘to doubt’). Thus, the complements of both affirmative dubitatives and emotive-factives are described as prohibiting the use of the indicative.

Contradicting Lozano’s (1972) claims are, however, the findings made in section 2.2. As discussed in section 2.14, both emotive-factives (2.2.4.3.1) and (affirmative) dubitative complements (2.2.4.3.3) may accept the indicative. Whereas with emotive-factives, this is most likely to occur if the speaker intends to assert a proposition that is addressee-new, with dubitatives, it may occur if the speaker intends to assert a negated complement that is new and/or contrastive. Thus, in both cases, the informativeness of the proposition increases the likelihood that the speaker will opt for assertion. Accordingly, unlike Lozano, who describes variation between moods as stemming solely from the relationship between predicate type (optative vs. dubitative) and negation, the current theory proposes that it results from the interaction between predicate type (group 1, subjunctive-1-selecting predicates vs. group 2, subjunctive-2-taking predicates), assertion, and (un)informativeness. In this way, all subjunctive predicates with which variation may occur are accounted for and grouped together, whether affirmative or not; i.e., group 1 –
desideratives, directives, and purpose clauses; group 2 – emotive-factives, negated epistemics, dubitatives, and expressions of possibility.

2.3.3 Summary of Section 2.3

In section 2.3, we argued that Spanish has two subjunctives; subjunctive 1 and subjunctive 2. We stated that subjunctive 1 is selected by the core subjunctive, preference-based predicates (desideratives, directives, purpose clauses), while subjunctive 2 is found in the complements of emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty (negated epistemics, dubitatives, and modals). In the case of subjunctive 1, this means that it is licensed by predicates which compare \( p \) or \( \neg p \), but which cannot assert \( p \) or \( \neg p \). It is, thus, required since it is used in complements that are non-realistic. That is, propositions which cannot be assumed to materialize in the actual world. Subjunctive 2, on the other hand, co-occurs with predicates whose complements can depict statements that are at least somewhat realistic. Propositions that are somewhat realistic are those which are not far from the common ground. I hypothesize that these include situations that are tied to truth or experience (as related to the speaker or matrix subject). Whereas emotive-factives are tied to truth, since their complements are presupposed (e.g., ‘She is happy that Mary got the job’ presupposes the truth of Mary getting the job), verbs of uncertainty are used to depict the likelihood of the proposition, as assessed by the speaker or matrix subject’s experiences (e.g., ‘I doubt that/I don’t believe that/It is (im)possible that Mary got the job’, given what I know about Mary or the person with whom she interviewed). With these types of complements, assertion with the indicative is possible. We, thus, described subjunctive 2 as the default of predicates which can assert \( p \) or \( \neg p \), but which cannot compare \( p \) or \( \neg p \). As we have already pointed out, emotive-factives are a hybrid case, in that they can both assert \( p \) or \( \neg p \) and compare \( p \) or \( \neg p \). However, in spite of their hybridity, we placed them
in group 2 (subjunctive 2 taking predicates), since, like verbs of uncertainty, the subjunctive they take may be replaced by the indicative. Finally, we saw that in many cases, assertion with the indicative is influenced by the informativeness of the complement (how new, important, contrastive, and/or how likely the proposition is), although this is not always the case. The end result of the affirmative or negated complement’s assertion is that it gets added to the common ground and, consequently, to the hearer’s mental model.

The chapter to follow, Chapter 3, discusses some unexpected, but very interesting findings regarding the directive category of verbs and expressions. Although forming part of the core group of subjunctive governors (group 1), directives prefer indicative, whenever there is modal concord between matrix and embedded predicates; i.e., when both verbs are of the same strength and modality type.
CHAPTER 3
MODAL CONCORD IN DIRECTIVE COMPLEMENTS

3.1 Introduction

As mentioned in section 2.2.4.3.5, directive clauses were surprisingly accepting of the indicative. It was noticed that, whereas informative, indicative directive clauses appeared to only be relatively acceptable, those that were uninformative were almost as statistically acceptable as the subjunctive. This was highly unexpected, as directives, being core subjunctive governors, are expected to be disapproving of indicative complements. In the initial experiment, it was observed that the indicative directive complements that were rated highly exhibited modal concord (i.e., three out of the four items). This was the case for all uninformative items, and one informative item (i.e., two uninformative items and only one of the two informative propositions). The only indicative directive proposition that was rated poorly was the informative item whose complement did not exhibit modal concord with the matrix predicate. Thus, a follow-up investigation was carried out to determine whether modal concord plays a role in the acceptability of indicative directive complements. The present chapter will deviate from the main investigation, in that its focus is solely on directives. In section 3.2 to follow, I will begin the discussion by providing some background on directive predicates.

3.2 Directives and the Subjunctive

Directive predicates are words with meanings that are similar to ‘order’, ‘require’, ‘recommend’, and ‘advise’. They “report directive speech acts of the kind which would be
performed with imperative clauses” (Portner, 2018, p. 72). Being volitional in their nature, directives are said to form part of the core group of subjunctive predicates (e.g., Portner, 2018). As such, like desiderative and purpose clauses, they are expected to, and generally do, take the subjunctive (e.g., Borrego et. al, 1989; Portner, 2018; Romero, 2012; Villalta, 2008).

(120)  
\[ \text{Le aconsejó/recomendó que lo} \]
\[ \text{S/he/you advise/recommend.PAST.INDIC.3SG that him} \]
\[ \text{perdonara.} \]
\[ \text{forgive.PAST.SUBJ.3SG} \]
\[ \text{‘S/he advised/recommended that s/he/you forgive him.’} \]
\[ \text{(Adapted from Borrego et. al, 1989)} \]

(121)  
\[ \text{Le invitó/permitió que lo} \]
\[ \text{S/he/you invite/permit.PAST.INDIC.3SG that him} \]
\[ \text{perdonara.} \]
\[ \text{forgive.PAST.SUBJ.3SG} \]
\[ \text{‘S/he invited/permitted that s/he/you forgive him.’} \]
\[ \text{(Adapted from Borrego et. al, 1989)} \]

(122)  
\[ \text{Le ordenó/mandó que lo} \]
\[ \text{S/he/you advise/recommend.PAST.INDIC.3SG that him} \]
\[ \text{perdonara.} \]
\[ \text{forgive.PAST.SUBJ.3SG} \]
\[ \text{‘S/he ordered that s/he/you forgive him.’} \]
\[ \text{(Adapted from Borrego et. al, 1989)} \]
Although there is no standard analysis, directives tend to be analyzed as involving a comparison-based semantics (e.g., Portner, 2018; Villalta, 2008). This means that their use of the subjunctive is understood as being triggered by a comparison of alternatives or an ordering of preferences (e.g., Portner, 2018). The particular ordering (i.e., preference) relation contributed by the directive may, however, vary (Villalta, 2008, p. 484). For instance, if the directive expresses a command, it has a DEONTIC ordering source (e.g., mandar ‘to order’, ordenar ‘to order’), if it expresses an invitation, its ordering source is BOULETIC (e.g., invitar ‘to invite’, permitir ‘to permit’), and if it puts forth a suggestion, its ordering source is TELEOLOGICAL in its nature (e.g., sugerir ‘to suggest’, recomendar ‘to recommend’). Thus, whereas example (120) is a teleological directive statement, (121) and (122) are respectively bouletic and deontic. However, despite these differences in classification, the common factor between the three is that each requires the subjunctive.

3.3 Modal Concord

In examining items (123) and (124) below, we can observe that, whereas (123) has only one modal operator, recomiendan ‘they recommend’, (124) has two, recomiendan ‘they recommend’ and sea obligatorio ‘it be obligatory’. With both examples, the subjunctive is required.

(123)  Recomiendan que se usen en la fase temprana.

Recomend.PRES.INDIC.3PL that REFL use.PRES.SUBJ.3SG in the phase temprana.

‘They recommend that it be used in the early phase.’

(Adapted from Davies’ Corpus del Español, 2016)
In cases like that of (124), where there are two modal elements of different strengths (recomendar → weak necessity, sea obligatorio → strong necessity) and modality types (recomendar → teleological, sea obligatorio → deontic), a compositional reading is manifested (e.g., Zeijlstra, 2007). This is to say that the matrix and embedded predicates are understood as two distinct modal operators. In other words, the matrix directive recomiendan que ‘they recommend that’ introduces a second instruction que sea obligatorio ‘that it be made obligatory’.

In addition to propositions such as that of example (124) (i.e., containing two modal elements of different strengths and modalities), we find environments in which the two modal elements share in both modality type (e.g., teleological, deontic, and bouletic) and strength (e.g., weak, weak necessity, strong necessity). Unlike the compositional reading yielded in (124), in these contexts, a concord reading is manifested (e.g., Zeijlstra, 2007). In other words, the statement is understood as if only a single modal element were present (e.g., Portner, 2018; Zeijlstra, 2007). Examples (125) and (126) to follow provide evidence of this phenomenon.

(125)  You may possibly have read my little monograph upon the subject.

‘It is possible that it is possible that you read his little monograph.’

‘It is possible that you read his little monograph.’

(Zeijlstra, 2007, p. 317)
Power carts must mandatorily be used on cart paths where provided.

'It is obligatory that it is obligatory that power carts are used on cart paths where provided.'

'It is obligatory that power carts be used on cart paths where provided.'

(126) (Zeijlstra, 2007, p. 317)

Example (125) has two modal elements; may and possibly. The two have a similar type of modality (epistemic) and are of similar strength (weak). Thus, since both are of like status (i.e., weak and epistemic), the sentence gets interpreted as if only one of the two were present: 'It may be possible that you read his little monograph.' The same goes for a sentence like (126). There are again two modal operators in this example; must and mandatorily. Since both are of similar modality type (i.e., deontic) and strength (i.e., strong necessity), the reading they yield is, therefore, concord as opposed to compositional: 'It is obligatory that power carts are used on cart paths where provided'

Apart from concord between auxiliaries and adverbs, modal concord can also take place between matrix directives (aconsejar ‘to advise’, recomendar ‘to recommend’) and embedded modal predicates (e.g., tener que ‘to have to’, deber ‘should’). For instance, in Spanish, if a directive matrix embeds another similarly directive verb or expression, the reading yielded is concord as opposed to compositional. Thus, if example (124) had an embedded predicate that was of similar modality type (teleological) and strength (weak necessity) to recomendar, a concord reading would instead be manifested. As I will show, this also decides if the complement will appear in indicative or subjunctive.

Although described as core subjunctive selectors (Portner, 2018), native speaker judgments suggest that indicative directive complements are strongly preferred whenever there is modal
concord between the matrix directive and the verb of the embedded complement. For example, in item (127) below, because the subordinate predicate *deber* ‘should’ parallels *recomendar* in strength and type of modality, the indicative is the only mood that is appropriate.

(127) Aquellos que defienden su utilización

Those who defend.PRES.INDIC.3PL its utilization

recomiendan que deben usarse

recommend.PRES.INDIC.3PL that should.PRES.INDIC.3PL use.INF

en la fase temprana (primeras 24 horas)...

in the phase early (first 24 hours)…

Those who defend its use **recommend that they (should)** be used in the early phase (during the first 24 hours)

?‘Those who defend its use **recommend that it be recommended that** they are used in the early phase (during the first 24 hours).’

‘**Those who defend its use recommend that they be used during the first 24 hours.**’

(Davies’ Corpus del Español, 2016)

Both *recomendar* and *deber* are weak necessity, teleological modal predicates, whose meanings suggest that a particular course of action be taken. Thus, as a result of their corresponding composition, the sentence gets interpreted as if only one of the two were present: i.e., ‘Those who defend its use **recommend that it be recommended that** they be used during the first 24 hours.’ It appears that this concord between the matrix and embedded predicates is what triggers the use of the indicative. Example (128) below also exhibits modal concord, since both *aconsejar* ‘to advise’
and *deber* ‘should’ are weak necessity, teleological modal predicates. The indicative is, thus, the only suitable mood of the subordinate environment.

(128)  
*Como ya se ha mencionado*  
As already have.PRES.INDIC.3SG mention.PP anteriormente, su entrenadora le aconseja al grupo de jóvenes que primero deben enfocarse en sus estudios y luego hacer deportes.  
previously, their trainer them advise.PRES.INDIC.3SG to-the group of youths that first should.PRES.INDIC.3PL focus-REFL.INF on their studies and later do sports.  

‘As has already been mentioned previously, their trainer advises the group of youths that they (should) first focus on their studies and later do sports.’  

‘As has already been mentioned previously, their trainer advises the group of youths that it be recommended that they first focus on their studies and later do sports.’  

‘As has already been mentioned previously, their trainer advises that the group of youths focus first on their studies and later on sports.’

(Davies’ Corpus del Español, 2016)

When it comes to the subjunctive, although unacceptable in contexts like that of (127) and (128), its use is required in non-concord environments. This is why the subjunctive is the mood in the subordinate clauses of examples (123) and (124). In example (123), repeated below as (129),
since the embedded verb *usar* ‘to use’ is non-modal, the relationship between the matrix and embedded predicates is automatically non-concord.

(129)  

\[
\text{Recomiendan}\quad que\quad se\quad \text{usen}\quad en\quad la\quad fase
\]

Recommend.PRES.INDIC.3PL that REFL use.PRES.SUBJ.3PL in the phase 

*temprana.*

early.

‘They recommend that it be used in the early phase.’

(Davies’ Corpus del Español, 2016)

In example (124), repeated below as (130), even though two modal elements are present (*recomendar* and *ser obligatorio*), their difference in strength (weak necessity vs. strong necessity) and modality (teleological vs. deontic) prevents them from being interpreted as a unit; i.e., as if only one of the two were present. Thus, a modal concord reading is not manifested. Instead, the embedded expression *ser obligatorio que* gets interpreted as if it were a distinct sub-part of the main directive statement.

(130)

\[
\text{a. Recomiendan}\quad que\quad \text{sea}\quad \text{obligatorio}
\]

Recommend.PRES.INDIC.3PL that be.PRES.SUBJ.3SG mandatory 

*usarse\quad en\quad la\quad fase\quad temprana.*

use-REFL.INF in the phase early.

‘They recommend that it be obligatory to use them in the early phase.’

(Adapted from Davies’ Corpus del Español, 2016)
b. *Recomiendan que es obligatorio

Recommend.PRES.INDIC.3PL that be.PRES.INDIC.3SG mandatory

usarse en la fase temprana.

use-REFL.INF in the phase early.

‘They recommend that it be obligatory to use them in the early phase.’

(Adapted from Davies’ Corpus del Español, 2016)

It is in these contexts that the subjunctive is the required form. This is why the indicative would be unacceptable in the embedded clauses of (130) above and (131) to follow. The indicative is disallowed in directive clauses whose embedded predicates are not in modal concord with the matrix directive.

(131)

a. Aconsejamos que no hagan nada casero.

Advise.PRES.INDIC.1PL that not make.PRES.SUBJ.3PL anything homemade

‘We advise that you do not make anything homemade.’

b. *Aconsejamos que no hacen nada casero.

Advise.PRES.INDIC.1PL that not make.PRES.INDIC.3PL anything homemade

‘We advise that you do not make anything homemade.’

Example (132) below is an interesting case, as native speakers may find both indicative and subjunctive appropriate. What seems to be the case with this particular item is that, both a concord and non-concord reading are possible, depending on the mood that is selected.
a. Recomiendan que es imprescindible

Recommend.PRES.INDIC.3PL that be.PRES.INDIC.3SG essential

usarse en la fase temprana.

use-REFL.INF in the phase early.

‘They recommend that (it be essential) to use them in the early phase.’

‘They recommend that it be valued/important that they are used in the early phase.’

‘They recommend that they be used in the early phase.’

b. Recomiendan que sea imprescindible

Recommend.PRES.INDIC.3PL that be.PRES.SUBJ.3SG essential

usarse en la fase temprana.

use-REFL.INF in the phase early.

‘They recommend that it be essential to use them in the early phase.

This would make sense if ser imprescindible que could be interpreted as meaning both ‘it is important that’, in that a certain course of action is valued, as well as ‘it is essential that’, in that a certain course of action is necessary. With the indicative in the directive complement, the meaning of ser imprescindible que parallels that of recomendar and is, thus, of similar strength and modality; i.e., the ‘it is valued that’ meaning is evoked. Conversely, with the subjunctive in the directive clause, the same expression seems to be interpreted as ‘it is essential that’ or ‘it is absolutely necessary that’, none of which has the same strength as recomendar. Therefore, the
hybridity of this expression, brought out by the particular mood in the complement, seems to be what causes some speakers to be accepting of both subjunctive and indicative.

3.4 Follow-up Investigation

3.4.1 Previous Results

The above-mentioned claims stem from a follow-up investigation that was carried out after the very unexpected findings that were discussed in section 2.2. As discussed in section 2.2.4.3.5, at first look, it had appeared as if the un-informativeness of the directive complement positively increased the acceptability of the indicative. Whereas with propositions that were informative, it was deemed only relatively acceptable, with complements that were of low informativeness, its ratings were predominantly favorable. As previously discussed (see: section 2.2.4.3.5), this was unanticipated for two reasons. The first being that, in this case, it was the un-informativeness of the proposition that seemed to work better with the indicative. This went against the pattern of findings that suggested that the indicative was preferred in informative complement clauses. The second reason was that directive clauses are preference-based. Being preference-based, the informativeness of the proposition should play no role in making the indicative more acceptable. Assertion is not possible in preference-based complements. However, after examining the data at hand, it was observed that all indicative directive items that were uninformative exhibited modal concord. This was only the case for one of the indicative items that was informative. Additionally, the singular informative item that exhibited modal concord, also had the indicative being assigned very high rankings. The examples below demonstrate this further.
(133) ‘Informative’ Directive Complements

Book review that discusses the history of Latin America. The readers don’t know what the book is about. They haven’t read it.

*El libro nos recomienda que conviene*

The book us recommend.PRES.INDIC.3SG that be-advisable.PRES.INDIC.3SG entender el proceso emancipatorio del siglo XIX para mejor entender understand.INF the process emancipatory of-the century 19 for better understand.INF el presente.

the present.

‘The book recommends that it be advisable to understand the emancipatory process of the 19th century in order to better understand the present.’

?‘The book recommends that it be recommended that the emancipatory process is understood in order to better understand the present.’

‘The book recommends that the emancipatory process be understood in order to better understand the present.’

(134) ‘Informative’ Directive Complements

Extract from a medical website. A doctor is informing readers that they should not use homemade medicines. The readers do not know how dangerous it is to use homemade treatments.

*Aconsejamos que no hacen nada casero.*

Advise.PRES.INDIC.1PL that not make.PRES.INDIC.3PL anything homemade.

‘We advise that you do not make anything homemade.’
Whereas (133) exhibits modal concord *(recomienda que conviene* ‘recommends that it is advisable’), item (134) does not *(aconsejamos que no hacen* ‘we advise that you do not make’). This correlated with the observation that (133) had the indicative receiving primarily positive ratings (78.4% positivity), while the ratings ascribed to its use in (134) were predominantly negative, at only 6.75% positivity.

(135) ‘Uninformative’ Directive Complements

Comment extracted from an article about raising kids. The readers already know that it is good to have frequent conversation with their children.

*Asimismo, recomiendan que los padres deben*  
Also, recommend.PRES.INDIC.3PL that the parents should.PRES.INDIC.3PL *mantener un diálogo constante con los menores para detectar cambios de comportamiento.*  
*Asimismo, recomiendan que los padres deben*  
Also, recommend.PRES.INDIC.3PL that the parents should.PRES.INDIC.3PL *mantener un diálogo constante con los menores para detectar cambios de comportamiento.*

‘Also, they *recommend that* parents *(should)* maintain constant dialogue with their children in order to be able to detect changes in their behavior.’

‘Also, they **recommend that it be recommended that** parents maintain constant dialogue with their children in order to be able to detect changes in their behavior.’

‘Also, they **recommend that parents maintain constant dialogue with their children in order to be able to detect changes in their behavior.’**
‘Uninformative’ Directive Complements

Comment extracted from an article about a baseball game. It has been mentioned on many occasions that the team’s coach believes that their studies are very important.

Como ya se ha mencionado
As already have.PRES.INDIC.3SG mention.PP
anteriormente, su entrenadora le aconseja al grupo
previously, their trainer them advise.PRES.INDIC.3SG to-the group
de jóvenes que primero deben enfocarse en sus
of youths that first should.PRES.INDIC.3PL focus-REFL.INF on their
estudios y luego hacer deportes.

studies and later do.INF sports.

‘As has already been mentioned previously, their trainer advises the group of youths that they
(should) first focus on their studies and later do sports.’

?‘As has already been mentioned previously, their trainer advises the group of youths that it
be recommended that they first focus on their studies and later do sports.’

‘As has already been mentioned previously, their trainer advises that the group of youths
focus first on their studies and later on sports.’

Examples (135) and (136) above, where directive complements were attached to uninformative propositions, both exhibit modal concord (recomiendan que ... deben ‘recommend that… they should’ and aconseja que... deben ‘advise that… they should’). With both, the indicative was rated very favorably. Item (136) had the indicative being ascribed 82% of its ratings as positive, while example (137) had it receiving ratings that were at 91.4% positivity. Thus, if all 4 items
(134, 135, 136, 137) are analyzed as a unit, item (135) would be the only clear outlier. This was the only example that was ascribed predominantly negative ratings (93.25 % negativity or 6.75% positivity). It was also the only example that did not exhibit modal concord. Therefore, in order to verify that modal concord was the common factor, a second, follow-up investigation was carried out. This second study had as its primary goal to test if indicative complements were acceptable when the embedded modal is of similar strength and modality to the matrix directive.

3.4.2 Methodology: Follow-up Investigation

3.4.2.1 Creation of the Follow-up Investigation’s Contextualized AJT

A search of the Davies’ Corpus del Español (2016) ‘Corpus of Spanish’ was again carried out in order to obtain naturally-occurring examples of mood use in directive clauses. The objective was to find directive expressions that had both modal and non-modal predicates embedded in their subordinate complements. At the end of the search, 32 directive items were selected. Sixteen had an embedded predicate of the same modality and strength as the matrix, while the remaining 16 had an embedded predicate that was a non-modal. It is important to point out that, in the case of the modal directive complements, all items were originally in the indicative; i.e., no authentic subjunctive embedded modal items were found. Appendix B has all of the items used in the follow-up investigation.

After each item was assigned a particular pragmatic context (informative or new and uninformative or old), the samples were revised for both length and mood if necessary. Of the 16 modal directive items, half were attached to contexts of new information, while the other half were associated with information that was reader-old. There were, thus, eight indicative (four new, four old) and eight subjunctive (four new, four old) embedded modal items. In the case of the non-
modal directive complements, there were again eight indicative (four new, four old) and eight subjunctive items (four new, four old); i.e., 32 items in total.

3.4.2.2 Participants

One hundred and two participants \((N = 102)\) formed part of the follow-up experiment. Participants came from Costa Rica \((n = 60)\) and the Dominican Republic \((n = 42)\) since these were the two groups whose original ratings were most noticeably affected by modal concord and/or the (un)informativeness of the directive proposition. The two groups consisted of native speaker participants who were recruited from various universities in their countries of origin.

3.4.2.3 Procedure

All 102 participants were asked to sign an electronic informed consent form that stated that they were to be 18 years or older in order to participate. After consenting to the experiment, they were subsequently administered the AJT. Each participant was instructed to rate the use of the subjunctive and indicative in directive clauses. Using a 4-point scale (Highly Acceptable - 4, Acceptable - 3, Highly Unacceptable - 2, Unacceptable - 1), they ranked the highlighted verb based on how natural or unnatural they perceived the form to be. On completion of the tasks, all participants had rated 32 contextualized subjunctive and indicative items.

As compensation for their participation, each subject was provided with an electronic Amazon gift card valued at $10.
3.5 Results

Mann-Whitney U tests were carried out in order to test for differences between the ratings obtained for the two participant groups in question (Costa Rica and the Dominican Republic).

3.5.1 The Subjunctive in (Un)Informative Non-modal and Modal Directive Complements

The Mann-Whitney tests that were carried out showed that there was a significant preference for the subjunctive in uninformative, non-modal directive complements, but only as related to Costa Rica. In terms of its use in modal directive complements, there was an overall preference for its use in clauses that were informative.

Table 23: The Subjunctive in (Un)Informative NON-MODAL Directive Complements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>Uninformative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>Uninformative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Statistical Preference</th>
<th>Statistically Preferred</th>
<th>Statistically Less Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Table 24: The Subjunctive in (Un)Informative MODAL Directive Complements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uninformative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistically Preferred</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistically Less Preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.2 The Indicative in (Un)Informative Non-modal and Modal Directive Complements

There were no significant differences between the ratings the indicative was assigned in informative versus uninformative non-modal directive complements. However, in terms of modal directive complements, there was a significant preference for its use with propositions that were uninformative.
Table 25: The Indicative in (Un)Informative NON-MODAL Directive Complements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Uninformative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Statistical Preference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26: The Indicative in (Un)Informative MODAL Directive Complements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Uninformative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistically Preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistically Less Preferred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5.3 Subjunctive vs. Indicative in Non-modal and Modal Directive Complements

An examination of the preceding tables (i.e., tables 22-25) demonstrates that, in addition to the effect of (un)informativeness on the ratings assigned to each mood, was the greater effect of (non)modality. The table to follow illustrates the overall contrast between subjunctive and indicative, as used in non-modal and modal directive complements. This has been the focal point of the current chapter since, as mentioned above, the presence or absence of modal concord, as opposed to the complement’s (un)informativeness, was seen to be the most important factor in terms of how each of the two moods was scored.

Table 27: Indicative and Subjunctive Directive Clauses with Embedded Modals vs. Embedded Non-modals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Indicative Modal</th>
<th>Indicative Non-Modal</th>
<th>Subjunctive Modal</th>
<th>Subjunctive Non-Modal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistically Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistically Less Preferred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results contained in table 27 demonstrate the following points:
1. Indicative complements are strongly preferable to subjunctive complements when the embedded verb is of the same modality type (teleological) and strength (weak necessity) as the matrix directive; i.e., when there is modal concord.

2. Subjunctive complements are strongly preferable to indicative complements when there is no modal concord between the embedded predicate and the directive matrix.

The above results, thus, support the very interesting finding that the indicative is the appropriate mood of embedded complements that are in modal concord with the main directive predicate. These are the only cases in which an indicative directive complement is acceptable, otherwise, the subjunctive is the mood that is required.

3.6 Modal Concord in Old Spanish

These findings do not seem to be characteristic of modern Spanish alone. This phenomenon can be traced as far back as to the Spanish of the 13th century. The following examples from Fuero de Teruel appear to support this point further.

\[(137) \] *es assaber que los iurados de las aldeas deuen pechar la meytat.*

[...] It is to advise that the judges of the villages should.INDIC shoulder the half. ‘It is to advise that it be recommended that the judges of the villages shoulder half.’ ‘It is recommended that the village judges shoulder half.’

(Adapted from Jensen and Lathrop, 1973, p. 19)
In examples (137) and (138), the directive predicate *assaber* ‘to advise’ is understood as introducing the recommendation *deuer* ‘deber’. However, since *assaber* and *deber* are of similar modality type (teleological) and strength (weak necessity), a concord reading is elicited. Thus, both matrices take indicative complements. As already mentioned, it seems that the subjunctive here would be unacceptable since only one direction or instruction is being relayed; i.e., a concord, as opposed to a compositional reading, is to be manifested.

### 3.7 Summary of Chapter 3

The present chapter has demonstrated that, although directive complements are expected to take the subjunctive, when there is modal concord between the matrix predicate and the verb of its complement, the indicative is considered the appropriate mood. This finding, although very unexpected, reiterates the points made in previous chapters regarding choice of mood being meaningful. The use of the indicative to indicate modal concord between an embedded and a matrix predicate would make sense if it were understood to be the mood of assertion and/or informativeness. In such cases, the concord reading between the matrix and embedded predicates could be said to relate to the fact that their similar strengths and modalities (e.g., *recomendar* ‘to recommend’ and *deber* ‘should’) call for a harmonic assertiveness to be manifested. In other
words, a singular assertion of the instruction, as opposed to two separate commands. Conversely, the use of the subjunctive in complements that do not exhibit modal concord with the main directive predicate would make sense if it were understood to be the more dependent or subordinate mood, as well as representative of (dis)preferences; i.e., non-assertive and preference-based. In those contexts in which the directive verb and the embedded predicate are of differing modalities and strengths, the complement is understood as being a sub-part of the main directive instruction. In other words, the complement is to yield a compositional, comparative reading. Therefore, whereas the indicative appears in directive complements that are to be understood in concord with a main assertion, the subjunctive appears in non-concord directive environments in which a preference-based sub-part (i.e., the complement) is to be identified. Chapter 4 to follow summarizes the impact of the present results, as well as it combines the previous chapters’ points regarding the two Spanish subjunctives.
CHAPTER 4
CONCLUSION

4.1 Introduction: Preference-based and Assertion-inclined Predicates

The present chapter will center on discussing the most important points to be taken from the previous three chapters. In addition to discussing Spanish’s two subjunctives (see: Chapters 1 and 2), Chapter 4 will also address modal concord as related to directives (see: Chapter 3), some of the puzzles detailed in section 2.2, as well as how this investigation may apply to future studies.

In Chapters 1 and 2, we argued that, although certain complement clauses are described as requiring the subjunctive in Spanish, the indicative may become acceptable if the speaker’s goal is to assert the embedded proposition. Speakers choose to assert propositions that they intend to add to the common ground; i.e., propositions which do not necessarily form part of the hearer’s mental model. We discussed that the predicates with which this is possible include emotive-factives, negated epistemics, dubitatives, and modals (we refer to the latter three as verbs of uncertainty). Emotive-factives and expressions of uncertainty were, thus, described as taking subjunctive 2, since it is the default as opposed to the required subjunctive and, thus, may be replaced by the indicative. This group of predicates can be used to assert \( p \) or \( \neg p \) since their complements are able to depict propositions that are somewhat realistic (i.e., assertion-inclined predicates). Realistic propositions are those which the speaker or matrix subject are able to commit to because of their close distance to or overlapping with the common ground. They include factive propositions (emotive-factives), as well as propositions that relate to the speaker or subject’s experiences (i.e., the experiences that drive the particular doubting, not believing, or perceived likelihood of the event); both which the speaker may assume are able to materialize in the actual
world. Unlike assertion-inclined verbs and expressions, we stated that preference-based predicates (e.g., desideratives, directives, and purpose clauses) have a comparative semantics. Thus, similar to what Giorgi and Pianesi (1997) and Villalta (2008) suggest, I argued that preference-based predicates compare $p$ or $\neg p$. This means that in (dis)preferring, requiring, commanding, instructing, suggesting, dissuading, disapproving, prohibiting, or carrying out a certain action so that $p$ (or $\neg p$), the proposition $p$ (or $\neg p$) is interpreted as being compared to an ordering or set of alternatives. Preference-based predicates were, therefore, described as having complements that denote propositions that are non-realistic since they cannot be assumed to materialize in the actual world. Put differently, they denote propositions that the speaker or subject cannot commit to and, consequently, cannot assert; i.e., non-realistic propositions. Accordingly, preference-based predicates take subjunctive 1, which is the required subjunctive form. In the case of emotive-factive expressions, we mentioned that, although described in this paper as forming part of the assertion-inclined group of predicates, they may also be interpreted as having a semantics that is comparative (i.e., Mary is glad that $p$ implies that $p$ is compared to some other possibility). However, in spite of their hybridity, we placed emotive-factives with the default, subjunctive 2-taking predicates, since their complements can be asserted with indicative. The main features defining the two groups of predicates were, therefore, summarized as follows:
Table 1: The Two Spanish Subjunctives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicate types</th>
<th>Subjunctive 1</th>
<th>Subjunctive 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desideratives</td>
<td>Dubitatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directives</td>
<td>Negated Epistemics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose Clauses</td>
<td>Modals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Default</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare $p$ or $\neg p$</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can assert $p$ or $\neg p$</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The central point of my analysis is, thus, that Spanish has not one, but instead two subjunctives.

This analysis is important for various reasons. The first is that, understanding that the use of the subjunctive (in Spanish) is not homogenous, helps to explain the varying degrees of obligatoriness that it exhibits. Interpreting these differences as being the result of a division between subjunctives offers a reason for why preference-based complements differ from assertion-inclined embedded clauses. In other words, such a split helps to explain why assertion-inclined complements may vary with the indicative. For instance, we saw that the informativeness of the subordinate proposition (i.e., how new/unknown the proposition is to the reader in question, how important the speaker perceives it to be in terms of local conversational context, how contrastive the proposition is to previously made statements, and/or how likely the proposition is to materialize) plays a role in the speaker’s choice to assert the complements of the predicates which take subjunctive 2; i.e., emotive-factives, negated epistemics, dubitatives, and modals. With emotive-factives, we observed that the newness of the proposition (as related to what the
conversational participants already know) increased the probability that the speaker would opt for assertion. With negated epistemics and dubitatives, we noticed that, both how new the proposition was to the addressee(s), as well as its contrastiveness (and/or importance), played a role in the speaker’s choice to assert it with the indicative. With respect to modals, we saw that their complements are more likely appear in the indicative when the likelihood that the proposition takes place is high(er).

Another reason for which knowledge of the subjunctive split may be valuable is that second-language Spanish learners can benefit. Through an understanding of this division, Spanish students may be able to come to the realization that pedagogical grammars are contained and, thus, idealistic. In this way, they will be better able to receive (and maneuver) the variation that they may encounter in authentic speech. Finally, through the labeling of a preference-based and assertion-inclined subjunctive, we can argue that mood is not mechanically triggered by the expression at hand. We instead understand that mood choice is influenced by the interaction between the speaker(s), the type of predicate that s/he chooses (e.g., (non)comparative or (non)preference-based verbs versus predicates that express a truth and/or an experience), and the pragmatic context (the discourse environment, the hearer(s), and the common ground).

4.2 The Link Between Indicative Directive Clauses and Modal Concord

In Chapter 3, we saw that the indicative is the appropriate mood for directive complements that exhibit modal concord with the matrix predicate. When the matrix directive and the verb of the embedded complement are of the same modality type and strength, the indicative is the mood of the subordinate clause. In these cases, a concord reading is yielded, in that the sentence is interpreted as if only one modal element were present. However, in contexts in which the two
modal elements are of different modality types and strength, the subjunctive is used, and a compositional modal reading is found; i.e., the matrix directive and the embedded verb are interpreted separately. Additionally, if the verb of the directive complement is non-modal, the subjunctive is again the appropriate mood.

The most significant of these findings is that the use of the indicative can be appropriate in directive complements. This is not only surprising because directives are regularly described as requiring the subjunctive, but also because no previous link between mood choice and modal concord has been made (to my knowledge). In future studies, it would be very interesting to investigate, in a more detailed manner, with which types of matrix and embedded predicates modal concord can occur. In the current experiment, examples of the pairs of matrix and embedded verbs that exhibited modal concord included: recomendar que + deber ‘to recommend that + should’, recomendar que + convenir ‘to recommend that + to be advisable that’, aconsejar que + tener que ‘to advise that + to have to’, and aconsejar que + deber ‘to advise that + should’. Thus, all of the matrix directive – embedded modal combinations that were examined were of weak strength and teleological in their type of modality. A question to be asked would, thus, be if indicative directive complements would still be appropriate if the strengths and modality types of each were not weak and teleological (e.g., strong necessity and bouletic – ordenar + ser obligatorio que ‘to order’ + ‘to be obligatory that’)? These results are, however, a useful first step in determining both the relationship between mood and modal concord, as well as the global role that verbal mood plays in the use of language.
4.3 Puzzles to be Addressed

In section 2.2, we discussed several puzzles which did not fit neatly into the main analysis; i.e., that the informativeness of the complement proposition increases the acceptability of the indicative only with the assertion-inclined predicates. For instance, in section 2.2.4.3.3, we saw that the informativeness of the proposition played a role in how indicative causative clauses were rated. Although indicative causative complements were rated predominantly negatively overall, the clauses that were attached to new information were significantly more highly rated than those attached to information that was known or uninformative. However, although this was unexpected, because the ratings attached to the indicative, in either context, were very low, any role of informativeness in the ratings cannot be very significant. We can, thus, conclude that with causatives, the use of indicative complements is unacceptable. With that said, causatives can be classified more along the line of the preference-based, subjunctive-1-requiring predicates that were discussed in the preceding chapters (i.e., desideratives, non-modal directive complements, purpose clauses). This makes sense since causatives are also comparative. For instance, in example (139) below, it is understood that the matrix subject may have influenced (or not) the outcome of Mary’s job hunt. The proposition is, therefore, preference-based, in that the subject’s volition or will is assumed to have affected (or not) the realization of a certain possibility.

(139) S/he caused (did not cause) Mary to not get the job.

That being said, table 1 from Chapter 1 has been updated in order to account for this point.
Another puzzle that was encountered dealt with the fact that the subjunctive was preferred in dubitative and purpose clauses that were informative (as opposed to its use in uninformative dubitative and purpose clauses). This was puzzling, in that the indicative is assumed to be the mood of informativeness. Why this would be the case is, therefore, unclear. With emotive-factives, it was expected that the subjunctive be preferred with uninformative complements since clauses containing old information need not be added to the common ground; i.e., need not be asserted. The default use of the subjunctive in emotive-factive clauses is, thus, understood since said complements tend to contain information that is presumed to already be shared amongst the conversational participants. However, in spite of the unexpected preference for the subjunctive in

---

6 As already mentioned (see: section 2.3.1.2.1), the subjunctive is considered to be the mood of information that is of low value; e.g., information that is old or known (see: Gregory and Lunn, 2012). This is why its use in complements like those of emotive-factives, is expected.
dubitative and purpose clauses that were informative, it is important to point out that it was still rated very positively in both informational contexts (i.e., informative and uninformative). This liking for its use in informative dubitative and purpose clauses may, therefore, be either ‘noise’ or related to factors that have not yet been determined. No consistent pattern was detected.

The final puzzle to be examined is how and why directive clauses are affected by (un)informativeness. In section 3.5.1 of Chapter 3, we saw that the Costa Rican participants preferred the use of the subjunctive in uninformative, non-modal directive complements. However, both groups preferred its use in informative, modal directive clauses. In terms of the indicative, with modal directive complements, we saw that it was preferred with uninformative propositions. Whereas the subjunctive’s tie to un-informativeness may explain certain aspects related to the former pattern, the liking for uninformative indicative complements goes against the premise of the current investigation. Again, this may relate to noise, the dialects that were examined, the type of predicate being examined, the AJT items themselves, and/or extra-linguistic factors. In future studies, I aim to investigate this further.

4.4 Research Questions Answered

With the previous discussion in mind, we can, thus, respond to the research questions that guided the original experimental study:

---

7 That is, the Costa Rican participants’ preference for uninformative, non-modal subjunctive directive complements. However, why both groups preferred the use of the subjunctive in informative, modal directive clauses is not clearly understood.
1. **Research Question 1:** Which verbs generally thought to require the subjunctive in their complements can also have indicative complements? Is this variation found only in certain dialectal varieties of Spanish or is it common to all varieties?

   **In response to Research Question 1 (RQ1):** The verbs regularly described as requiring the subjunctive in their complements which may also have indicative complements, include the assertion-inclined predicates: emotive-factives, negated epistemics, dubitatives, and modals. This variation is found across different Spanish dialects, although varieties from Spain may at times be less inclined to accepting the indicative than Latin American and Caribbean dialects (see: section 2.2.4.3.3).

2. **Research Question 2:** Does the informativeness of the complement influence the speaker’s choice to use the subjunctive or indicative? If so, with which cases of mood variation does this occur?

   **In response to RQ2:** We can affirm that the informativeness of the proposition may increase the acceptability of the indicative in the complements of the assertion-inclined, subjunctive 1-taking predicates. However, in terms of the subjunctive, although described as preferring complements representing old information (Gregory and Lunn, 2012; Mejías-Bikandi, 1998), the only case in which this is relevant is with emotive-factives. This is to say that, (un)informative or not, the subjunctive is always the preferred mood in the clauses that are traditionally described as requiring its use. The only exception, of course, being directive complements that exhibit modal concord with the matrix directive. In these contexts, indicative is strongly preferred over subjunctive.
4.5 Future Studies

Future studies could investigate if a split between subjunctives may explain the non-normative mood variation that occurs in other languages, as well if such a division relates to the difference between predicates that are preference-based versus those that are assertion-inclined. If this is found to be the case, it would also be interesting to investigate if the variability between moods occurring with the assertion-inclined predicates is influenced by the informativeness of the complement or its negation (how new/unknown, important, contrastive, and/or highly likely the proposition is perceived to be). Finally, it may also be useful to examine if the link found to exist between modal concord and indicative directive complements (in Spanish) extends to other languages and language families.
APPENDIX A: CONTEXTUALIZED AND CONTEXT-FREE SECTIONS OF THE ACCEPTABILITY JUDGMENT TASK (AJT)

A.1 Contextualized Section of the Acceptability Judgment Task (AJT)

P^1

Comentario extraído de una carta escrita por un presidente estadounidense.

El comentario está dirigido a políticos estadounidenses que ya estaban enterados de la perspectiva estadounidense en cuanto al futuro económico de Cuba y Puerto Rico.

“Estados Unidos prefiere que Cuba y Puerto Rico continúen dependiendo de España”.

Muy Aceptable Aceptable Inaceptable Muy Inaceptable

P2

Comentario extraído de un blog sobre las diferencias entre los hombres y las mujeres.

El bloguero está contando de su nueva vida como recién casado. Es un blog nuevo así que los lectores no saben nada sobre su relación, ni conocen a la mujer.

“Mi mujer prefiere que el mensaje es comunicado de tantas maneras creativas como sea posible. Por eso existen las florerías y negocios de tarjetas”.

Muy Aceptable Aceptable Inaceptable Muy Inaceptable

P3

Opinión extraída de un foro de internet dedicado a conversaciones sobre el amor.

Esta mujer está hablando de su experiencia con el amor. El comentario se dirige a lectores que no saben nada sobre su vida amorosa.

“Si mi pareja decide contarme algo es porque de verdad confía en mi y quiere que se que algo le ha pasado”.

Muy Aceptable Aceptable Inaceptable Muy Inaceptable

8 Pregunta – ‘Question’
P4

**Comentario extraído de un blog sobre la salud.**

La persona que escribió este comentario se dirige a lectores que saben que su papá está enfermo.

“Extraño mucho a mi padre. Quiero que se **cura** rápido para poder volver a casa”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

**P5**

**Mensaje extraído de un blog sobre la poesía.**

Un poeta nuevo está dirigiendo este mensaje a lectores que no lo conocen ni conocen su poesía.

“El día que yo me vaya, quiero que mis seguidores **recuerden** los buenos textos que escribí más que a mí como persona”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

**P6**

**Mensaje sacado de un artículo periodístico que trata de unos comentarios que hizo el ex presidente de Colombia, Álvaro Uribe sobre las FARC.**

El artículo se dirige a lectores que no saben de lo que piensa Uribe en cuanto a las FARC.

“Deseamos que el gobierno actual **suspenda** el diálogo con la terrorista FARC para profundizar el diálogo con los sectores productivos del país”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

**P7**

**Comentario extraído de un foro sobre el viaje.**

El creador del foro les ha mencionado muchas veces a los lectores que iba a cambiar el diseño del sitio web para mejorar cómo se interactúan.

“Deseamos que este nuevo diseño nos **permita** interactuar más fácilmente con ustedes”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable
P8

Noticia sacada de un artículo periodístico sobre el sobrepeso.

Los lectores ya han notado que muchas mujeres prefieren salir con hombres delgados.

“Más de la mitad de las mujeres casadas de este país desean que sus esposos son más delgados”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

P9

Noticia extraída de un artículo titulado: “Seis meses sin Chávez: ¿se desvanece su legado?”

El autor está informándoles a lectores no venezolanos de que hay muchos venezolanos que piensan que Chávez sigue con vida.

“Muchos venezolanos dudan que Hugo Chávez murió realmente por el secretismo que hubo en torno a su enfermedad en sus últimos días”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

P10

Opinión sacada de un foro de internet que tiene que ver con el marketing.

El informático que escribió este comentario está informándoles a los lectores de los puntos débiles del email marketing.

“La verdad es que muchos dudan que el email marketing va a seguir vivo. Sin embargo, yo no estoy de acuerdo con este punto”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

P11

Extracto de un email sobre los cambios que hay que implementar para aumentar el número de lectores de una revista en línea.

El autor del mensaje lo dirige a los creadores de la revista, así que todos saben que hubo poco interés en una entrevista que fue recién publicada.

“Dudo que muchos lectores tenían interés en la entrevista con ese artista”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable
P12

**Opinión sacada de un artículo sobre el urbanismo.**

*El autor ya ha mencionado muchas veces que nunca habrá paz entre coches y ciudades.

“Pero, como he dicho, es dudoso que podamos tener éxito y establecer una verdadera paz en la guerra declarada entre coches y ciudades”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

P13

**Artículo de blog sobre la ciencia.**

*El autor cuenta que algunas revistas dicen que el feto no es una persona. Los lectores no sabían que existiera gente que diría eso.

“Algunas revistas dicen que es dudoso que se considere un ser vivo, puesto que no puede respirar autónomamente”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

P14

**Opinión extraída de un blog sobre los dinosaurios.**

*El autor del comentario ya mencionó que no se puede clonar un dinosaurio.

“Dudamos que esas bestias pueden volver a la vida”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

P15

**Comentario sacado de un sitio de web sobre el cristianismo.**

*El autor del mensaje ya ha revelado que la gente no suele leer la Biblia.

“Si alguien les preguntara cuál ha sido la mejor experiencia de su vida? Es dudoso que muchos vayan a decir que es leer la Biblia”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

P16

**Opinión extraída de un foro sobre el trabajo.**
Este hombre está compartiendo por primera vez que ha sufrido discriminación por el trabajo que hace.

“Desafortunadamente, hay muchos que dudan que mi trabajo sea tan serio como el de un abogado o un doctor”.

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable

P17

Opinión sacada de un blog sobre un libro recién publicado.

La autora de este comentario está compartiendo su punto de vista con personas que ya han leído el libro.

“Por eso, es posible que el protagonista está luchando contra la discriminación que experimentan los indios de Latinoamérica”.

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable

P18

Opinión sacada de un blog sobre la crianza de los hijos.

Una mamá estaba quejándose de su hijo adolescente que dijo que ella no debería haber dejado su guitarra en el sótano. Otro lector le responde a la mamá para explicar su entendimiento de lo que quería decir el hijo. La perspectiva que tiene ese hombre es nueva para esta mujer.

“Es posible que tu hijo quiere destacar que es algo que debe ser respetado en vez de depositado en el sótano”.

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable

P19

Comentario extraído de un foro médico.

Un doctor está respondiéndole a un paciente que no sabía que no comer verduras o cereales causaría una insuficiencia de magnesio.

“Ya que tu hijo no come muchas verduras de hoja verde, cereales integrales, o frutos secos, es probable que no está recibiendo suficiente magnesio en su dieta”.

Aceptarable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable
**P20**

**Extracto de un artículo sobre cómo elegir un colegio para tu hijo.**

La directora de una escuela argentina revela que los colegios que tienen buenos directores tienen estudiantes más motivados. Se asume que los lectores no sabían de la relación que hay entre tener un buen director y tener estudiantes más decididos.

“Con una escuela de este tipo, es posible que los chicos aprendan”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

**P21**

**Extracto de un artículo sobre la salud mental.**

Un psicólogo está informando de que la gente no entiende el concepto de “sentirse bien”.

“No es una obligación sentirse bien, pero es una opción. Hay la posibilidad de que, a pesar de lo que ha pasado, uno pueda estar mejor”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

**P22**

**Extracto de un foro sobre la policía estadounidense.**

Los lectores de este foro ya saben que la policía estadounidense chequea la ropa de algunos ciudadanos.

“Sí, y es una pena. Pero en EE.UU hay la posibilidad de que las autoridades locales regulen temas como la vestimenta”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

**P23**

**Extracto de un artículo sobre la remodelación de un hospital.**

Todos los que han leído el artículo saben que la construcción debe durarse unos dos años.

“Tampoco es posible que lo hagan en el corto plazo”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable
P24

**Comentario sacado de un foro sobre el embarazo.**

Esta mujer ha escrito este comentario para lectores que ya saben de qué tan difícil es perder peso después de embarazarse.

“Ya saben que cabe la posibilidad de que no **pierdes** todo el peso que has ganado en un año”.

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable

P25

**Extracto de un blog sobre las distintas monedas del mundo.**

Los lectores del blog ya saben que muchos dudan el poder económico del euro.

“Así que, la primera amenaza es que no estamos seguros de que el euro **vaya** a resistir”.

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable

P26

**Comentario extraído de un artículo sobre la explotación petrolera.**

Los lectores están leyendo por primera vez la respuesta que ha dado el presidente sobre el asunto.

“Hay gente que trata de politizar este asunto. No es verdad que **tiene** que ver con explotación petrolera”, sostuvo el presidente.

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable

P27

**Comentario extraído de un blog titulado “Me gusta ser mujer”.**

La bloguera está informando de algo que leyó sobre cómo tratan a las mujeres los hombres de hoy en día. Los lectores no están al tanto del asunto.

“Yo no pienso que los hombres **son** todos iguales. Hay hombres que quieren casarse y que quieren abrirnos puertas”.

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable
P28

**Comentario extraído de un blog para mamás.**

Un lector está comentando sobre un mito muy común sobre el embarazo. Ya saben todos que el mito es falso.

“Como todos hemos mencionado, no es verdad que se **deba** comer por dos”.

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable

P29

**Comentario extraído de un sitio web sobre el cáncer.**

Los lectores no saben nada sobre su curación.

“Por tanto, no es cierto que la reducción de un tumor **implique** la curación”.

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable

P30

**Comentario sacado del sitio web de una heladería.**

El dueño está informándoles a los clientes de los cambios que se van a implementar durante el año nuevo.

“Estimados clientes: Este año será un poco diferente ya que no estoy seguro de que **vayan** a aparecer nuevos sabores.”

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable

P31

**Comentario extraído de un blog sobre la religión.**

El autor del comentario está reiterando el hecho de que todos los miembros del blog son amigos aunque tengan distintos puntos de vista. Ya saben esto todos.

“No creo que los que estamos en protesta **somos** enemigos de los que están de acuerdo. ¿Cierto?”

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable
P32
Comentario de un foro de internet sobre la planificación de un viaje.

Todos han decidido que no comprarán los boletos hasta que reciban el sueldo. Sin embargo, alguien sugiere que no esperen y que los compren hoy. El autor del comentario de más abajo le repite que esperar una semana no complicará la planificación.

“... Pero ya hemos dicho que no estamos seguros de que es necesario hacerlo hoy. Podemos hacerlo la semana que viene”.

Muy Aceptable Aceptable Inaceptable Muy Inaceptable

P33
Reseña de un libro que habla de la historia de América Latina.

Los lectores no saben de qué se trata el libro. No lo han leído.

“El libro nos recomienda que conviene entender el proceso emancipatorio del siglo XIX para mejor entender el presente”.

Muy Aceptable Aceptable Inaceptable Muy Inaceptable

P34
Extracto de un sitio de web sobre el catolicismo.

Los lectores ya saben de lo que el Papa Francisco ha dicho sobre la Virgen María.

“El Papa Francisco nos recomienda que cuidemos nuestras relaciones con la Virgen María, pues si no lo hacemos podemos correr el peligro de quedarnos huérfanos”.

Muy Aceptable Aceptable Inaceptable Muy Inaceptable

P35
Comentario extraído de un artículo sobre la crianza de los hijos.

Los lectores ya saben que es positivo hablarles mucho a sus hijos.

“Asimismo, recomiendan que los padres deben mantener un diálogo constante con los menores para detectar cambios de comportamiento”.

Muy Aceptable Aceptable Inaceptable Muy Inaceptable
P36

Comentario sacado de un foro sobre computadoras Apple.

El autor del comentario está respondiendo a una pregunta publicada en el foro. Presenta el posible causante del problema que se discute.

“Creo que el causante del problema es el adaptador. Para confirmarlo, te sugiero que hagas todas las comprobaciones apropiadas”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable

P37

Extracto de un sitio de web médico.

Un médico les está informando a los lectores que no deben usar medicinas caseras. Los lectores no sabían de lo peligroso que es usar tratamientos caseros.

“Aconsejamos que no hacen nada casero. Es mejor consultar a su centro de salud en caso de cualquier enfermedad”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable

P38

Mensaje extraído de un artículo sobre un torneo de béisbol femenino.

Se ha mencionado muchas veces que la entrenadora del equipo cree que enfocarse en los estudios es muy importante.

“Como ya se ha mencionado anteriormente, su entrenadora le aconseja al grupo de jóvenes que primero deben enfocarse en sus estudios y luego hacer deportes”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable

P39

Comentario sacado de un artículo político.

Se cita a un político que está informándole a la audiencia de los consejos que le había dado a uno de los candidatos presidenciales.

“Muchos de nosotros estuvimos en contra de él y le sugerimos que no entrara al gobierno, pero no nos hizo caso”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable
P40

**Mensaje sacado de un blog sobre el viaje.**

Una mujer está informándole a otra mamá que debe pasar más tiempo con su hijo antes de irse. La mamá no esperaba este consejo ya que ha estado un mes con su hijo.

“He pasado mucho tiempo con mi hijo ya que va a estar a solas en este país. Te recomiendo que **estés** más tiempo con el tuyo también”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

P41

**Comentario sacado de un artículo sobre la violencia en México.**

Los que van a leer el artículo no sabían que el hermano de Rafael está muerto.

“Las diferencias surgidas causaron que el propio hermano de Rafael **fue** asesinado por los miembros de la pandilla”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

P42

**Mensaje sacado de un artículo de revista sobre una tormenta magnética.**

El autor del artículo está hablando del daño que causó la tormenta. Los lectores ya sabían que la tormenta era catastrófica.

“En la siguiente foto te muestro el severo daño interno causado en el transformador del Servicio Público de Canadá. Ello provocó que casi toda Quebec y algunas ciudades de EE.UU. **quedaran** sin servicio eléctrico”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

P43

**Extracto de un sitio de web dedicado a discusiones sobre la historia.**

Todos los que leen este sitio de web ya saben mucho sobre la historia. El comentario de más abajo no habla de nada de lo que no sepan los lectores.

“Como ya saben, las guerras entre Francia y España provocaron que esta pequeña isla del Caribe se **dividió** en dos colonias distintas”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable
P44

Comentario de un blog sobre la salud.

La persona que escribió esta publicación está repitiendo una historia que ya ha compartido muchas veces en el blog.

“Así que, tenía 2 hemorragias que provocaron que fui al hospital en noviembre del año pasado”.

Muy Aceptable      Aceptable      Inaceptable      Muy Inaceptable

P45

Mensaje de un blog sobre el cristianismo.

El autor está repitiendo algo que ya dijo hace unas semanas. Todos habían leído este comentario anterior.

“Es que no debes albergar en tu corazón rencor hacia nadie; deja que las leyes de Dios hagan justicia, perdona y olvida”.

Muy Aceptable      Aceptable      Inaceptable      Muy Inaceptable

P46

Letra de una canción romántica.

Un hombre está cantando a una mujer y quiere revelar cómo será si ella le da una chance.

“Si quieres formar parte de mi vida, olvidate de ese tipo y deja que yo te escojo”.

Muy Aceptable      Aceptable      Inaceptable      Muy Inaceptable

P47

Comentario extraído de un blog sobre las relaciones.

El sujeto está compartiendo por primera vez algo que experimentó hace un año.

“No les he dicho antes, pero, conozco a una persona que por sus celos hizo que su esposo dejara de trabajar”.

Muy Aceptable      Aceptable      Inaceptable      Muy Inaceptable
**P48**

*Extracto de un relato argentino.*

Una mujer está informándole a su hija de lo que pasó cuando pensó que iba a morir. La hija no sabía de esta experiencia.

“Así que, besé a tu padre por última vez e hice que me prometiera que te cuidaría y te amarías tanto como yo te amo”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable

**P49**

*Comentario sacado de un blog titulado “plantas que ayudan a curarnos del cáncer”*

Esta bloguera está presentando su nuevo blog a lectores que nunca lo han visitado. Está por primera vez compartiendo la razón por la que lo ha creado.

“Hola a todos, acabo de crear este blog por casualidad. Mi intención es hacer difusión de todo lo increíble de las plantas para que puede llegar esta información a mucha gente”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable

**P50**

*Comentario extraído de un blog sobre los deportes.*

Este hombre está hablando del hecho que entrena en el velódromo. Los lectores ya saben de esto.

“Por desgracia, me dirijo al velódromo para que puedo seguir entrenando ya que se ha cerrado el estadio nacional”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable

**P51**

*Mensaje sacado de un foro que discute la importancia del internet.*

El autor del comentario está compartiendo por primera vez su opinión sobre lo importante que es el internet.

“Para tener un mundo más igualitario, la única solución sería dar acceso al internet a todos para que puedan gozar de las mismas ventajas”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable
Extracto sacado de un relato sobre la disolución de un matrimonio.

La sirvienta de casa recién descubrió que el señor de la casa está teniendo una aventura. El señor le ha rogado que no diga nada a su esposa.

“María, favor de deshacer mi cama para que mi esposa crea que dormí en casa”.

Muy Aceptable Aceptable Inaceptable Muy Inaceptable

Comentario sacado de un artículo que habla del futuro de un estadio nacional.

La presidenta del país está reiterando que no se va a cambiar el nombre del estadio. Ya ha mencionado esto muchas veces, pero la gente sigue estando preocupada.

“Como he dicho, no se preocupen, voy a comunicarme con la empresa para que el estadio seguir conservando su nombre original”.

Muy Aceptable Aceptable Inaceptable Muy Inaceptable

Comentario sacado de un blog sobre un nuevo documental independiente.

La autora del comentario está informándole al director de la película que le gustó mucho. El director no sabía que sería tan bien recibida su obra.

“Estimado Andrés,

Muchas felicitaciones por tus trabajos documentales. Me gustaría poder compartir este documental con otras personas para que puedan conocer y entender un poco mejor la situación actual sobre este tema.”

Muy Aceptable Aceptable Inaceptable Muy Inaceptable

Mensaje extraído de artículo titulado: “Aprender a usar los podcasts.”

Los lectores ya sabían que el artículo trataría de aprender a descargar y escuchar podcasts.

“Bueno, creo que ya sabes lo que es un podcast. Ahora voy a darte algunos consejos para que puedas aprender cómo descargar y escucharlos”.
P56

Comentario extraído de un foro sobre el desempleo.

El autor del comentario está compartiendo una experiencia de la que no saben los lectores.

“Les quiero decir que me metí en un gran problema. Estoy buscando ayuda para que puedo cancelar mi contrato de trabajo y deshacerme de esa compañía”.

P57

Comentario extraído de un foro de internet sobre el aspecto físico.

Este comentario está dirigido a lectores que no saben del aspecto físico de la mujer en cuestión.

“Mi padre dice que no hay nada mejor que un poco de carne en los huesos. Cree que es bueno que mi madre esté un poco gordita”.

P58

Comentario extraído de un artículo periodístico titulado: Todo lo que necesitas saber sobre el iPod nano 5.

Este comentario está dirigido a gente que ya está informada de los cambios que está implementando Apple.

“Como hemos comentado al principio del artículo, es asombroso que Apple ha conseguido meter aún más tecnología el iPod nano sin cambiar sus dimensiones”.

P59

Comentario extraído de un blog sobre el racismo:

Esta persona escribe su comentario en apoyo de una mujer que compartió que había experimentado el racismo.
“Belén, lo siento. Me entristece que haya individuos tan ignorantes. Son cerrados de mente y odian como nadie”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable

P60

Noticia extraída de un blog sobre el maquillaje:

Esta bloguera está presentando una nueva marca a lectores que no la conocían antes.

“¡Chiquillas! ¡Estoy muy contenta de poder presentarles por primera vez en el blog a la marca COE! El primer producto que probé fue Sun Splashed Mango, lo cual es una loción con un aroma cítrico. Me encanta que dura mucho en la piel”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable

P61

Comentario extraído de un foro de internet titulado: Menú diario para bebés de 6 a 9 meses.

Esta mamá está hablando de los hábitos alimentarios de su hijo. Esta información es nueva para estos lectores.

“Hola, mi bebe tiene 7 meses, está bien en el peso y el tamaño para su edad, pero me preocupa que no le agrada mucho la comida. Todavía toma leche materna”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable

P62

Comentario sacado de un blog sobre ser mamá:

Esta mamá revela una historia personal a lectores que no la conocen ni conocen a su hija.

“Hola a todos. Les quiero contar lo que pasó con mi hija. Es absolutamente horrible que los niños en su colegio le traten mal. Cada día sufre acoso escolar”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable

P63

Comentario extraído de un blog sobre la religión:
Este hombre le hace una pregunta a un pastor luego de haberle hablado muchas veces de la relación que tiene con una chica.

“Tengo ahora más de 3 años saliendo con mi novia y como ya sabes, es atea. ¿Es malo que salgo con ella?”

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

P64

**Comentario agregado por un lector de un blog titulado: Visitando la casa de Julio Cortázar.**

*El autor del comentario está conversando con alguien que también tiene interés en la escritura de Cortázar.*

“Me encanta que te guste Cortázar. Me pone muy feliz eso ya que era un excelente escritor”.

A.2  **Context-free Section of the Acceptability Judgment Task (AJT)**

P65

“Quiero que este problema se resuelva lo antes posible para salvar a esos niños Vulnerables”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

P66

“Siempre oigo a los padres en las sesiones de mediación decir: Sólo quiero que mis hijos son felices”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

P67

“Parece que prefieres que me voy. Así que, buenas noches”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable
P68
“Preferimos que hagas tu pedido por correo electrónico, pero si deseas más información, puedes llamarnos al número indicado abajo”.

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable

P69
“El ordenamiento de todas las cosas pertenece a Dios; preferimos que Dios elige por nosotros”.

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable

P70
“Los niños esperan que existan regularidades en la matemática. Y las hay”.

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable

P71
“La mayoría de las mujeres infieles esperan que el hombre se haga cargo de los gastos cuando tienen una cita o viajan juntos”.

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable

P72
“Necesitamos que este problema se resuelva a la mayor brevedad para la tranquilidad de estos ciudadanos”.

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable

P73
“Te aconsejo que tomes unos días para reflexionar sobre el futuro que realmente desees”.

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable

P74
“Algunos lectores me aconsejan que escriba en forma más positiva sobre este o aquel tema”.

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable
“Le recomendamos que usa el aceite de oliva dos veces por semana como mínimo”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Les sugiero que se roman un rato para mirar el mar y disfrutar de esta vista preciosa”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Las instrucciones sólo recomiendan que no se intenta hacer más de una lección por día”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Les aconsejo que no dejan de tomar la medicación como indica el profesional”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Si quieres chequear si tu navegador está soportado, te sugerimos que visites esta página”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Si usted decide viajar, le sugerimos que lleve con usted la documentación necesaria para demostrar su cambio de estado civil”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Es increíble que por fin nos encontramos con un gobierno que hace lo que hay que hacer en interés del país”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Me enoja que me hicieron comprar una nueva batería y ahora quieren cobrarme por otra”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable
P83
“Es fantástico que todos los sacrificios que he hecho ahora están siendo recompensados”.

Muy Aceptable Aceptable Inaceptable Muy Inaceptable

P84
“Es una lástima que muchos de nosotros no podamos contribuir a nuestra comunidad o al mundo en general por estar tan ocupados”.

Muy Aceptable Aceptable Inaceptable Muy Inaceptable

P85
“Es fascinante que haya una conexión entre estos tipos de alucinaciones y la genética”.

Muy Aceptable Aceptable Inaceptable Muy Inaceptable

P86
“Es fantástico que les gustan los libros desde tan pequeñitos”.

Muy Aceptable Aceptable Inaceptable Muy Inaceptable

P87
“Me encanta que todos sus productos vengan con un sticker que indica el olor y el estado de ánimo que genera”.

Muy Aceptable Aceptable Inaceptable Muy Inaceptable

P88
“Es una lástima que los juicios orales no pueden ser grabados”.

Muy Aceptable Aceptable Inaceptable Muy Inaceptable

P89
“No es cierto que la gente te va a aceptar”.

Muy Aceptable Aceptable Inaceptable Muy Inaceptable
“No pienso que lo contrario es mejor, ni me equivoco al decirlo”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable

“Por otro lado, aseguró que no cree que la televisión sea un medio “menor” frente al teatro, como afirman algunos de sus colegas”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable

“Durante la campaña presidencial, el gobernador Bush dejó en claro que no cree que el presidente Clinton merezca la buena imagen que tiene en el continente”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable

“He intentado hablar con él, pero me dice que le mentí, que le falta el respeto que está muy decepcionado y que no cree que vuelva a confiar en mí”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable

“Es que no está seguro de que el valor del oro se mantenga en el caso de una verdadera catástrofe económica”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable

“La conclusión es que no estamos seguros de que hubo colusión.”

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable

“No estoy seguro de que entienden la importancia del honor”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable
“Allí Dios causó que Moisés cayó gravemente enfermo”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Esto provocó que haya por lo menos cuatro incendios de pastizales en distintos puntos de la ciudad”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Las lluvias en los días previos y durante la cosecha provocaron que la cantidad de trigo analizado ha sido algo menos del 50% de la campaña anterior”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Me diste esperanzas y fe de que lo mejor está por venir, y mucho más importante, causaste que vuelva a creer en el amor”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Bastantes rechazos en diferentes agencias de modelos hicieron que mintiera sobre su edad para poder incorporarse en alguna, ya que la consideraban una vieja”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“El tipo dejó que una sonrisa franca le cubrió el rostro”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Así que soltó una gran carcajada y dejó que el ratón se fuera”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable
“El clima caliente y soleado, y el aire estancado causaron que el ozono en el centro de la ciudad se elevó a niveles dañinos a la salud”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Qué va a ser de mí, dudo que en ningún bar me puedan servir todo el alcohol que necesito para olvidar”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“En lo personal, dudo que pueda manejarlo bien”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“La ciencia aún no ha contestado satisfactoriamente estos interrogantes, y hay quienes dudan que lo haga algún día”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Si la gravitación fuera diez veces menos fuerte, es dudoso que las estrellas y los planetas se formaran”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Es dudoso que los romanos intentaron seguir las leyes judías con respecto a la paliza”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Es dudoso que esta empresa pueda tener éxito, pero al menos se intenta salvar las apariencias”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable
“La mayoría de los astrónomos dudan que algunos grandes cometas o asteroides se hayan estrellado en la Tierra en los pasados 10,000 años”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Las mujeres que pasamos los 30, dudamos que “ese” hombre existe, pero conservamos la ilusión de encontrar algo, que al menos, se le parezca un poco”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Es probable que sientas una corriente que recorre tu cuerpo”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Debería ser consciente de que es probable que quieren cobrar una tasa más elevada de lo normal”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Es posible que también estás sujeto a términos y a condiciones adicionales”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Por otro lado, es posible que en el futuro tengo que despedirla por mi situación económica”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

“Siempre hay la posibilidad de que el material tiene que ser retirado o confiscado si no cumple con las leyes locales”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable
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P118
“Es posible que nunca se sepa con exactitud si esa historia era cierta o si se trató de una exageración”.

Muy Aceptable      Aceptable      Inaceptable      Muy Inaceptable

P119
“Es probable que a fin de mes la factura te venga bastante inflada por estar llamando a números internacionales”.

Muy Aceptable      Aceptable      Inaceptable      Muy Inaceptable

P120
“Siempre hay la posibilidad de que algo salga mal”.

Muy Aceptable      Aceptable      Inaceptable      Muy Inaceptable

P121
“Señor, favor de subirse los pantalones para que no se moja”.

Muy Aceptable      Aceptable      Inaceptable      Muy Inaceptable

P122
“Entonces, tienes que hablarle para que lo repare”.

Muy Aceptable      Aceptable      Inaceptable      Muy Inaceptable

P123
“Tienes que aprender que el tiempo sólo existe para que haces uso de él”.

Muy Aceptable      Aceptable      Inaceptable      Muy Inaceptable

P124
“Ya aprendimos cómo programar un Tweet para que sale publicado en otro momento”.

Muy Aceptable      Aceptable      Inaceptable      Muy Inaceptable

P125
“Putin envió una petición a Siria para que renuncie sus armas químicas”.

Muy Aceptable      Aceptable      Inaceptable      Muy Inaceptable
“Me encantaría conocerla para que ella en persona me cuenta de su hermosa vida”.

“Deberás orar para que Él te da la felicidad que aquí puedes encontrar”.

“Pero, señaló Bachelet, para que haya reconciliación tiene que haber verdad y justicia”
APPENDIX B: CONTEXTUALIZED ACCEPTABILITY JUDGMENT TASK (AJT)
FROM THE FOLLOW-UP INVESTIGATION

P1
Reseña de un libro que habla de la historia de América Latina.

Los lectores no saben de qué se trata el libro. No lo han leído.

“El libro nos recomienda que **conviene** entender el proceso emancipatorio del siglo XIX para mejor entender el presente”.

Muy Aceptable      Aceptable      Inaceptable      Muy Inaceptable

P2
Extracto de un sitio de web sobre el catolicismo.

Los lectores ya saben de lo que el Papa Francisco ha dicho sobre la Virgen María.

“El Papa Francisco nos recomienda que **cuidemos** nuestras relaciones con la Virgen María, pues si no lo hacemos podemos correr el peligro de quedarnos huérfanos”.

Muy Aceptable      Aceptable      Inaceptable      Muy Inaceptable

P3
Comentario extraído de un artículo sobre la crianza de los hijos.

Los lectores ya saben que es positivo hablarles mucho a sus hijos.

“Asimismo, recomiendan que los padres **deben** mantener un diálogo constante con los menores para detectar cambios de comportamiento”.

Muy Aceptable      Aceptable      Inaceptable      Muy Inaceptable

P4
Comentario sacado de un foro sobre computadoras Apple.

El autor del comentario está respondiendo a una pregunta publicada en el foro. Presenta el posible causante del problema que se discute.
“Creo que el causante del problema es el adaptador. Para confirmarlo, te sugiero que **hagas** todas las comprobaciones apropiadas”.

Muy Aceptable       Aceptable       Inaceptable       Muy Inaceptable

---

**P5**

**Extracto de un sitio de web médico.**

Un médico les está informando a los lectores que no deben usar medicinas caseras. Los lectores no sabían de lo peligroso que es usar tratamientos caseros.

“Aconsejamos que no **hacen** nada casero. Es mejor consultar a su centro de salud en caso de cualquier enfermedad”.

Muy Aceptable       Aceptable       Inaceptable       Muy Inaceptable

---

**P6**

**Mensaje extraído de un artículo sobre un torneo de béisbol femenino.**

Se ha mencionado muchas veces que la entrenadora del equipo cree que enfocarse en los estudios es muy importante.

“Como ya se ha mencionado anteriormente, su entrenadora le aconseja al grupo de jóvenes que primero **deben** enfocarse en sus estudios y luego hacer deportes”.

Muy Aceptable       Aceptable       Inaceptable       Muy Inaceptable

---

**P7**

**Comentario sacado de un artículo político.**

Se cita a un político que está informándole a la audiencia de los consejos que le había dado a uno de los candidatos presidenciales.

“Muchos de nosotros estuviéramos en contra de él y le sugerimos que no **entra** al gobierno, pero no nos hizo caso”.

Muy Aceptable       Aceptable       Inaceptable       Muy Inaceptable
Mensaje sacado de un blog sobre el viaje.

Una mujer está informándole a otra mamá que debe pasar más tiempo con su hijo antes de irse. La mamá no esperaba este consejo ya que ha estado un mes con su hijo.

“He pasado mucho tiempo con mi hijo ya que va a estar a solas en este país. Te recomiendo que estés más tiempo con el tuyo también”.

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable

Comentario extraído de un blog que tiene que ver con la salud.

Los lectores ya saben que es importante comer bien.

“La nutrióloga explica que debemos aprender a comer hasta satisfacernos y no hasta llenarnos y recomienda que debemos comer a las horas requeridas”.

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable

Comentario sacado de un artículo periodístico sobre la medicina natural.

Los lectores del artículo no saben que la planta en cuestión puede ser tóxica.

“Algunos investigadores sugieren que no deben ingerirse cantidades grandes de esta planta, porque podría producir toxicidad”.

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable

Comentario extraído de un sitio de web que trata del ejercicio.

Todos los lectores saben que es importante hacer ejercicio.

“Nos aconsejan que tenemos que hacer deporte, que es muy importante para cuidar el buen funcionamiento del cuerpo”.

Muy Aceptable   Aceptable   Inaceptable   Muy Inaceptable
Mensaje sacado de un blog político.

El autor está informándoles a los lectores de que muchos dicen que sería menos polémico apoyar al candidato político en cuestión.

“Algunos me aconsejan que debo quedarme calladito porque voy contra la unidad”.

Muy Aceptable Aceptable Inaceptable Muy Inaceptable

Comentario extraído de un artículo periodístico sobre la comida.

El autor del artículo está informándoles a los lectores de que es peligroso ingerir el producto en cuestión después de 24 horas. Los lectores no sabían eso.

“Todos recomiendan que deben usarse durante las primeras 24 horas”.

Muy Aceptable Aceptable Inaceptable Muy Inaceptable

Este comentario fue extraído de un sitio de web que trata de la salud.

Los lectores están aprendiendo de una nueva vacuna. No saben nada en cuanto a cómo debe administrarse.

“Los médicos recomiendan que se pone esta vacuna a las niñas de 11 y 12 años de edad”.

Muy Aceptable Aceptable Inaceptable Muy Inaceptable

Mensaje sacado de un blog sobre la escritura.

Los que leen el blog no conocen a la persona que ha escrito el comentario ni saben que lo han dicho que escribe en forma negativa.

“Algunos lectores me aconsejan que escribo en forma más positiva sobre este o aquel tema”.

Muy Aceptable Aceptable Inaceptable Muy Inaceptable
P16

Mensaje sacado de un blog sobre la tecnología.

El autor del comentario está compartiendo por primera vez lo que le han dicho sobre el uso de cierto servicio.

“Nos recomiendan que no pagamos nada hasta haber completado los tres pasos anteriores”.

Muy Aceptable      Aceptable      Inaceptable      Muy Inaceptable

P17

Comentario sacado de un blog sobre la tecnología.

Los lectores ya saben que hay que actualizar frecuentemente Windows 7.

“Nos recomiendan que mantenemos las actualizaciones de Windows al día para asegurarnos de estar protegido”.

Muy Aceptable      Aceptable      Inaceptable      Muy Inaceptable

P18

Mensaje sacado del sitio de web de la embajada de cierto país.

Se ha mencionado muchas veces que sería mejor hacer el proceso en cuestión en Estados Unidos.

“Por falta de información a veces la gente va por el camino erróneo. Nosotros recomendamos que lo hacen en Estados Unidos”.

Muy Aceptable      Aceptable      Inaceptable      Muy Inaceptable

P19

Mensaje extraído de un artículo periodístico con información sobre el Triángulo de las Bermudas.

Se ha mencionado anteriormente en el artículo que los investigadores quieren que todos tengan acceso a sus conclusiones.

“Los investigadores recomiendan que sus conclusiones son incluidas en las cartas de navegación para evitar las desapariciones de Buques en el Triángulo de las Bermudas”.

Muy Aceptable      Aceptable      Inaceptable      Muy Inaceptable
**P20**

**Mensaje sacado de un blog sobre el amor.**

Los lectores ya saben que el autor del comentario sigue pensando en su ex novia. Todos piensan que debe vivir su vida sin ella.

“Muchos me aconsejan que dejó de pensar en ella”.

Muy Aceptable       Aceptable       Inaceptable       Muy Inaceptable

**P21**

**El siguiente comentario fue sacado de un blog sobre la cristiandad.**

_Todos los que siguen este blog han leído muchas veces la biblia._

“Pablo nos recomienda que debamos orar sin cesar, es decir, platicar con Jesús en todo tiempo”.

Muy Aceptable       Aceptable       Inaceptable       Muy Inaceptable

**P22**

**Comentario de un sitio de web sobre la salud.**

_Todos los que han visitado este sitio de web son médicos y saben mucho sobre las vacunas y cómo y cuándo deben administrarse._

“Recomiendan que las personas con enfermedades cardiovasculares deban vacunarse contra la gripe y la neumonía”.

Muy Aceptable       Aceptable       Inaceptable       Muy Inaceptable

**P23**

**Comentario sacado de un blog sobre la migración.**

_Se ha mencionado muchas veces en el blog que los venezolanos creen que es muy importante no contaminar el medioambiente._

“Venezolanos extranjeros aconsejan a Chilenos que tengan que cuidar el país”.

Muy Aceptable       Aceptable       Inaceptable       Muy Inaceptable
P24

Extracto de un artículo periodístico sobre las enfermedades.

Todos los lectores ya saben que la leche materna puede transmitir ciertas enfermedades.

“Los médicos recomiendan que una madre enferma no debe alimentar con seno materno a su hijo”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

P25

Comentario sacado de un artículo periodístico sobre cómo alimentarse bien.

Los lectores no saben que es recomendable comer una merienda cada día.

“Los nutricionistas recomiendan que se debe incluir al menos una merienda diaria en el plan de alimentación”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

P26

Extracto de un blog sobre la crianza de los hijos.

El autor está mencionando algo del que no sabían los lectores.

“Los psicólogos no recomiendan que se deba inducir a los niños a ejecutar actividades deportivas”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

P27

Extracto de un artículo periodístico sobre el parto.

Los lectores no sabían que ponerse una epidural a una mujer no era tan común.

“¿Está la epidural asociada con el proceso fisiológico del parto? Los expertos recomiendan que deba ponerse solo cuando la mujer lo requiera”.

Muy Aceptable    Aceptable    Inaceptable    Muy Inaceptable

P28

Extracto de un artículo periodístico sobre la seguridad.
Los lectores no sabían que el parque del que está hablando el autor no era seguro.

“Las autoridades recomiendan que deban siempre prestar completa atención al camino que se recorre en este parque”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable

P29

**Extracto de un sitio de web sobre el amor.**

Los lectores no sabían que las acciones eran más importantes que las palabras en cuanto al amor.

“Te aconsejamos que expreses a tu novia todo el amor que tú tienes por ella a través tus acciones en vez de palabras”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable

P30

**Extracto de un sitio de web sobre la música.**

Todos los lectores ya saben que el músico en cuestión quiere que escuchen su nuevo disco.

“Aconsejamos que este disco sea escuchado, saboreado, deborado”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable

P31

**Extracto de un blog sobre la salud.**

Los lectores no sabían que el método contraceptivo que estaban usando era peligroso.

“Te aconsejamos que te cambies a la píldora con la antelación requerida”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable

P32

**Extracto de un sitio de web académico.**

Todos los que han leído este sitio ya sabían que era importante mantener un ambiente colaborativo en la escuela de la que se habla.
“Para el primer ciclo, aconsejamos que el docente y el coordinador(a) trabajen en forma colaborativa”.

Muy Aceptable  Aceptable  Inaceptable  Muy Inaceptable
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