THE TWO SPANISH SUBJUNCTIVES: THE REQUIRED AND DEFAULT SUBJUNCTIVES[*]

Tris Faulkner
Kalamazoo College

ABSTRACT. Standard Spanish grammar states that desideratives (*querer que*), directives (*aconsejar que*), purpose clauses (*para que*), causatives (*hacer que*), emotive-factives (*alegrarse de que*), dubitatives (*dudar que*), modals (*ser posible que*), and negated indicative-normative verbs (e.g., *no creer que*), embed subjunctive complement clauses. However, in spite of this classification, some predicates will exhibit a certain degree of mood variation. For instance, emotive-factives can take indicative complements (Crespo del Río 2014; Faulkner 2021a, 2021b). Similar variability between the moods may also come about in negated epistemic (Bolinger 1991), dubitative (Blake 1981), and modal clauses (Deshors and Waltermire 2019). In the present paper, I propose that such variation stems from the Spanish mood system involving a split between two types of subjunctives: one that is required in non-realistic, preference-based contexts, and another that is the default of propositions that are at least, somewhat realistic. I argue that, whereas non-realistic, preference-based clauses (e.g., desiderative, directive, and purpose clauses) are inflexibly subjunctive, emotive-factive and uncertainty clauses (e.g., negated indicative-normative, dubitative, modal complements) may accept indicative if the speaker intends to add the affirmative or negated proposition to the common ground; i.e., if the speaker intends to assert the complement in question. I close this argument by stating that assertion with the indicative is most likely to occur if the proposition (affirmative or negated) is informative (i.e., new, or unknown to the addressee, important, contrastive, and/or highly likely).

Keywords: non-prescriptive Spanish grammar; semantics; pragmatics; syntax-semantics interface; mood variation

RESUMEN. La gramática española estándar establece que las construcciones desiderativas (*querer que*), directivas (*aconsejar que*), de propósito (*para que*), causativas (*hacer que*), factivo-emotivas (*alegrarse de que*), dubitativas (*dudar que*; *no creer que*), y modales (*ser posible que*) subordinan cláusulas de complemento de subjuntivo. Sin embargo, a pesar de esta clasificación, algunos predicados exhiben un cierto grado de variación modal. Por ejemplo, los factivo-emotivos pueden llevar complementos de indicativo (Crespo del Río 2014; Faulkner 2021a, 2021b). Una variabilidad similar en modo también puede ocurrir en las cláusulas epistémicas negadas (Bolinger 1991), dubitativas (Blake 1981) y modales (Deshors y Waltermire 2019). En el presente artículo, propongo que tal variación surge del sistema de modo español, que implica una división entre dos tipos de subjuntivos: uno que se requiere en contextos no realistas, basados en preferencias, y otro que es la forma por defecto de proposiciones que son, al menos, moderadamente realistas. Argumento que, mientras que las cláusulas no realistas basadas en preferencias (p. ej., cláusulas desiderativas,

directivas y de propósito) son inflexiblemente subjuntivas, las cláusulas emotivas y de incertidumbre (p. ej., indicativo-normativo negado, dubitativo, complementos modales) pueden aceptar complementos indicativos si el hablante tiene la intención de agregar la proposición afirmada o negada al terreno común; es decir, si el hablante pretende darle aserción al complemento en cuestión. Refuerzo este argumento afirmando que es más probable que ocurra una afirmación con el indicativo si la proposición (afirmada o negada) es informativa (es decir, nueva o desconocida para el destinatario, importante, contrastiva o muy probable).

Palabras clave: gramática española no prescriptiva; semántica; pragmática; interfaz sintaxis-semántica; variación de modo

1 Introduction

In the present paper, 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 current study is Lozano (1972)[1], which states that Spanish has both an optative and a DUBITATIVE subjunctive. In the present article, I argue that, whereas one of Spanish's two subjunctives is required, the other is default and can be overridden by the indicative. I will refer to the required subjunctive as SUBJUNCTIVE 1, and the default, "overridable" subjunctive as SUBJUNCTIVE 2. The differences between the two relate to 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, comparative or preference-based predicates (e.g., desideratives, directives, and purpose clauses), subjunctive 2 is the default of emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty (i.e., verbs that express the speaker's apprehension, doubting, or refutation of the proposition in question, such as, dubitatives, negated indicative-normative predicates, 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 section 4, this delineation between the two proposed subjunctives is summarized as relating to one main distinguishing feature: whereas the predicates that select subjunctive 1 compare a non-realistic p or $\neg p$ (i.e., the proposition p or its negation), the predicates that take subjunctive 2 have complements that are at least somewhat realistic. As such, the assertion of p or $\neg p$ is acceptable only in the case of the latter. 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, they are described as taking subjunctive 2 since the propositions they compare are at least somewhat realistic (which, like verbs of uncertainty, makes them

---

[1] Section 5 discusses Lozano (1972) and its connection to the current paper.

accepting of assertion with the indicative). This distinction between the subjunctives is represented in table 1 below:

Table 1: The Two Spanish Subjunctives[2]

	Subjunctive 1	Subjunctive 2	
Contexts used	Non-realistic and preference-based	Somewhat realistic and uninformative	
Predicate types	Volitional	Verbs of uncertainty	Emotive-factives
	Desideratives Directives Purpose clauses	Dubitatives Negated indicative predicates Modals	Emotive-factives
Use	Required	Default	Default
Compare *p* or *¬p*	✓	✕	✓
Can assert *p* or *¬p*	✕	✓	✓

The sections to follow provide some background on the subjunctive-indicative contrast, with the objective of arriving at the main argument that Spanish has two subjunctives. They are organized as follows:

2) The Two Verbal Moods: Indicative and Subjunctive – Section 2 introduces sub-sections 2.1 and 2.2, which discuss the contexts in which indicative and subjunctive are normatively used.
3) Mood Variation in Subjunctive-normative Environments – Section 3 discusses several subjunctive-normative environments in which the use of the indicative is occasionally acceptable; i.e., emotive-factive, negated epistemic, dubitative, and modal clauses.
4) The Required and Default Subjunctives – Section 4 elaborates on the main differences between the environments in which the two proposed subjunctives (required and default) tend to be found: whereas subjunctive 1 is required in volitional, preference-based complements, subjunctive 2 is the default of uninformative, emotive-factive and uncertainty clauses.
5) Revisiting Lozano's (1972) Two Subjunctives – In section 5, I discuss how Lozano's (1972) +optative and ±dubitative subjunctives are both similar to and different from the two subjunctives on which the present paper is focused.
6) Conclusion – Section 6 summarizes the points made throughout sections 1 to 5 by reiterating that the Spanish subjunctive is not a homogenous form. In other words, the subjunctive used in volitional contexts is not the same as that used with verbs

---

[2] First published in Faulkner (2021b).

of uncertainty or emotive-factives (i.e., in the case of the latter, predicates which reveal a truth or an experience, as assessed by the speaker or matrix subject).

2   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, the nominal clauses that house subjunctive verbs include desiderative (*querer* 'to want'), directive (*aconsejar* 'to advise'), causative (*hacer que* 'to make that'), emotive-factive (*estar contento/a de que* 'to be happy that'), dubitative (*dudar* 'to doubt'), and modal complements (*ser posible que* 'to be possible that'). The subjunctive is also said to be triggered by negation (e.g., *no creer que* 'to not believe that'; *no decir que* 'to not say that'; *no estar seguro/a de que* 'to not be sure that'), as well as required in purpose clauses (*para que* 'so that').

2.1 Normative Variation Between Indicative and Subjunctive

Although the two moods tend to be in complementary distribution, there are certain environments in which their use will overlap. For instance, it is widely known that choice of mood may vary 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 several other non-verbal subordinators (such as, *aunque* 'even though' or 'even if'; *porque* 'because'; *el hecho de que* 'the fact that'; *cuando* 'when', etc.: e.g., - *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'). In addition to these environments, the *Real Academia Española* 'Royal Spanish Academy' (2011), henceforth RAE, identifies various selecting verbs whose complements may exhibit mood variation. They describe the following contrasts as being the most noteworthy.

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 (RAE 2011: 479).

(1) *Le   **dijo**   que actuaba/actuara   de buena fe.*
    Him   tell.PAST.INDIC.3SG   that act.PAST.INDIC/SUBJ.3SG of good faith.

   Indicative: 'S/he/you **told** him/her **that s/he/you acted** in good faith.'
   Subjunctive: 'S/he/you **told** him/her/you **to act** with good faith.'
                                                                    (RAE 2011: 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 (RAE 2011: 479).

(2) *Inicialmente* **pensaba** *que*
Initially   think.PAST.INDIC.1SG that
participaron   *los dos   equipos   sevillanos   con   un   tercer*
participate.PAST.INDIC.3PL the two   teams   Sevillian   with a   third
rival.
rival.
'I was initially thinking that the two Sevillian teams and a third rival participated.'
(Adapted from Razón, as cited in RAE 2011: 479)

(3) *Inicialmente* **estaba** **pensando** *que*
Initially   be.PAST.INDIC.1SG   think.GER   that
participaran   *los dos   equipos   sevillanos   con   un   tercer*
participate.PAST.SUBJ.3PL the two   teams   Sevillian   with a   third
rival.
rival.
'I was initially thinking that the two Sevillian teams and a third rival should participate.'
(Razón as cited in RAE 2011: 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 (RAE 2011: 479).

(4) **Comprendí** *que estaba* *equivocada.*
Understand.PAST.INDIC.1SG that be.PAST.INDIC.1SG   wrong.
'I realized that I was wrong.'
(RAE 2011: 479)

(5) **Comprendo** *que estés* *molesto conmigo.*
Understand.PRES.INDIC.1SG that be.PRES.SUBJ.2SG   annoyed with-me.
'I admit/accept that you are annoyed with me.'
(RAE 2011: 479)

iv. Perception vs. Intention: with verbs like *ver* 'to see', the indicative reveals that the speaker or subject has perceived or seen a particular event, while the subjunctive is used to relay their intent to make said event occur (RAE 2011: 479).

(6) *Siempre* **veía** *que* *cada cosa* **estaba**
Always   see.PAST.INDIC.1SG that   each   thing   be.PAST.INDIC.3SG
en su lugar.
in its place.
'I always saw that everything was always in its place.'

(RAE 2011: 479)

(7) *Siempre **veía** **que** cada cosa **estuviera***
Always   see.PAST.INDIC.1SG   that each thing   be.PAST.SUBJ.3SG
en su lugar.
in its place.
'I always saw to it that everything was always in its place.'

(RAE 2011: 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 (RAE 2011: 479).

(8) *El maestro te **ha** **explicado** que las cosas*
The teacher   you have.PRES.INDIC.3SG   explain.PP that the things
*no **son** como tú pensabas.*
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: 479)

(9) *Eso **explica** **que** las cosas no **sean***
That explain.PRES.INDIC.3SG   that the things not   be.PRES.SUBJ.3PL
como tú piensas.
as   you   think.PRES.INDIC.2SG.
'That explains why things are not as you think.'

(RAE 2011: 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 highlight the informativeness of the subordinate proposition. This idea ties in with the main argument of the present paper, 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) (see: section 4.2).

Conversely, when the complement appears in its default, subjunctive mood, the RAE states that the proposition's affectivity is instead the focus (p. 480).

(10) ***Se quejó de que** el citado*
REFL complain.PAST.INDIC.3SG   of   that the cite.PP
*individuo **había** **propalado** infundios*
individual have.PAST.INDIC.3SG   divulge.PP lies
por la comarca

through the   region.
'S/he complained that the cited individual had spread lies through the region.'

<div align="right">(RAE 2011: 480)</div>

(11)   ***Se   queja   de   que** la   impiedad*
REFL   complain.PRES.INDIC.3SG   of   that   the   impiety
***pretenda**   corromper   el   estudio de las ciencias naturales.*
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.'

<div align="right">(RAE 2011: 480)</div>

vii. Fear vs. Suspicion: With the predicate *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 already transpire(d) (RAE 2011: 480).

(12) *Me **temo**   que va   a   haber   dificultades.*
Me fear.PRES.INDIC.1SG that go.PRES.INDIC.3SG to have.INF difficulties.
'I fear (suspect) that there are going to be some difficulties.'
<div align="right">(Caballero Bonald as cited in RAE 2011: 480)</div>

(13) ***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.'
<div align="right">(RAE 2011: 480)</div>

Examples (1) through (13) show that, similar to the case of conditional, relative, or adverbial clauses (etc.), variation between subjunctive and indicative occurs in the complements of several selecting 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 *alegrarse de que* 'to be happy/pleased that', the indicative's role is to highlight the subordinate proposition's informativeness, following the verb *temer* 'to fear', its role is to relay suspicion. Similarly, whereas the subjunctive after the verb *explicar* 'to explain' discloses the reason for or cause of the proposition, after the predicate *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 (1) to (13) 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., *comprender* 'to understand', *ver* 'to see'), and in others, the compositional meaning of the entire sentence (e.g., *pensar* 'to think', *explicar* 'to explain').

<div align="center">76</div>

3 Mood Variation in Subjunctive-normative Environments

In addition to standard variation between subjunctive and indicative, are the non-standard fluctuations between moods that occur in certain "subjunctive-requiring", nominal clauses. For instance, although generally inclined to taking the subjunctive, emotive-factives (e.g., *ser bueno/malo que* 'it is good/bad that') may at times accept indicative complements (Bolinger 1991; Blake 1981; Crespo del Río 2014; Farkas 1992b; Faulkner 2021a, 2021b; 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 negation (e.g., *no creer que* 'to not believe that'; *no estar seguro/a de que* 'to not be sure that') (e.g., Bolinger 1991; Borrego et. al 1989; Kowal 2007; Portner, 2018; Quer 1998, 2001, 2009; Waltermire 2017), in dubitative clauses (e.g., *dudar que* 'to doubt that') (Blake 1981; Kowal 2007; Waltermire 2017), and with modal expressions (e.g., *ser posible que* 'to be possible that') (Borrego et. al 1989; Deshors and Waltermire 2019; Kowal 2007). The following sections corroborate these points with examples.

3.1 Emotive-factives[3]

Although regularly described as requiring the subjunctive (Alonso-Cortés 1981; Giannakidou 2017; Gili Gaya 1960; Ruiz Campillo 2001, 2008; Villalta 2008), it is relatively widely known that Spanish emotive-factives can also allow for indicative (Blake 1981; Crespo del Río 2014; Farkas 1992b; Faulkner 2021a, 2021b; 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 (14) embodies their default choice of mood, indicative complements, like that of (15), are not uncommon (Blake 1982; Crespo del Río 2014; Terrell and Hooper 1974; RAE 2011).

(14)   ***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: 221)

(15)   ***Me sorprendió***   ***que*** *ustedes no*   ***pudieron***
            Me surprise.PAST.INDIC.3SG   that   you-all   not   can.PAST.INDIC.3PL
            ayudarnos   *con*   *el*   *plan.*
            help.INF-us   with   the   plan.
            'It surprised me that you couldn't help us with the plan.'

                                                       (Terrell and García 1977: 221)

3.2 Negated Indicative-normative Predicates

A factor often claimed to trigger the subjunctive is negation (e.g., Borrego et. al 1989; Farkas 1992b; Giorgi and Pianesi 1997; Portner 2018). It is, thus, a commonly held view that certain indicative-normative predicates take 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

---

[3] Emotive-factives are also referred to as 'evaluative' predicates.

Terrell 1977; Giorgi and Pianesi 1997; Quer 2001, 2009; Studerus 1995). Thus, either subjunctive or indicative may be admissible in examples (16) and (17) to follow, which involve negated epistemic verbs.

(16) *Marta **no cree*** *que Pedro **sea/es***
  Marta not believe.PRES.INDIC.3SG   that Pedro   be.PRES.SUBJ/INDIC.3SG
  culpable.
  guilty.
  'Marta does not believe that Pedro is guilty.'

<div align="right">(Borgonovo and Prévost 2003: 151)</div>

(17) *La   gente   muchas   veces **no   cree***   ***que***
  The people many   times not believe.PRES.INDIC.3SG   that
  puede/pueda   *llegar   a ese   nuevo nivel que Dios*
  can.PRES.INDIC/SUBJ.3SG   arrive.INF to that new   level that God
  tiene   para ellos.
  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.'

<div align="right">(Adapted from Davies' Corpus del Español 2016)</div>

3.3 Dubitatives

  Like emotive-factives and negated indicative-normative predicates, dubitatives are also regularly described as being governed by the subjunctive (Borrego et al. 2013; Ramsey 1956; Villalta 2008).

(18) ***Dudo***   *que   sea*   *culpable.*
  Doubt.PRES.INDIC.1SG that   be.PRES.SUBJ.3SG   guilt
  'I doubt that s/he is guilty.'

<div align="right">(Ramsey 1956: 419)</div>

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

(19) ***Dudo***   *que tiene*   *razón.*
  Doubt.PRES.INDIC.1SG   that have.PRES.INDIC.3SG   reason.
  'I doubt that s/he is right.'

<div align="right">(Fente as cited in Kowal 2007: 58)</div>

(20) *Algunos **dudan***   *que él lo **escribió***.
  Some   doubt.PRES.INDIC.3PL that he it   write.PAST.INDIC.3SG.
  'Some doubt that he wrote it.'

<div align="right">(Davies' Corpus del Español 2016)</div>

3.4 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 (21) and (22) below should be considered grammatical.

(21) ***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: 203)

(22) ***Es posible que hayan*** *terminado ya.*
Be.PRES.INDIC.3SG possible that have.PRES.SUBJ.3PL finish.PP already.
'It is possible that they have already finished.'

(Terrell and Hooper 1974: 487)

However, in spite of these claims, native speakers will sometimes opt for indicative modal complements (c.f., Borrego et. al 1989; Deshors and Waltermire 2019; García and Terrell 1977). Examples (23) and (24) illustrate this point further.

(23) ***Es posible que quiere*** *destacar*
Be.PRES.INDIC.3SG possible that want.PRES.INDIC.3SG highlight.INF
que es algo que debe ser
that be.PRES.INDIC.3SG something that must.PRES.INDIC.3SG be.INF
respetado en vez de depositado en el sótano.
respect.PP instead-of deposit.PP in the basement.
'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)

(24) ***Es probable que*** *los precios allí* ***serán***
Be.PRES.INDIC.3SG probable that the prices there be.FUT.3PL
más bajos
more low.
'It is probable/likely that the prices there will be lower.'

(García and Terrell 1977: 220)

As introduced in section 1, both verbs of uncertainty (negated indicative-normative predicates, 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. In other words, the subjunctive that can at times be replaced by the indicative. In section 4, I will propose that the replacement of subjunctive with indicative, in these contexts, tends to occur when the complement is informative (new or unknown to the addressee, important, contrastive, and/or highly probable).

4   The Required and Default Subjunctives

As discussed in sections 2 and 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, as well as with several indicative-normative predicates (e.g., *comprender* 'to understand', *pensar* 'to think', etc.). However, we also saw examples of mood variation that is not traditionally considered to be grammatical (see: section 3). For instance, in spite of the subjunctive being described as required with negation, dubitatives, and modals (e.g., Real Academia 2011; Romero 2012), these environments do at times exhibit variability with the indicative (e.g., Blake 1981; Borrego et. al 1989; 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 section, I will argue that the alternations between moods that occur in the complements of emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty (e.g., negated indicative-normative verbs, dubitatives, and modals), relate to the speaker's intent to assert their commitment to the subordinate proposition (or its negation). In this way, the proposition gets added to the current common ground, and the hearer's attention is called to its importance or value.[4] Thus, in the case of examples (15), (16), (19), and (23) (repeated below as 25, 26, 27, and 28), 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.

(25) *Me* **sorprendió**   **que** *ustedes no* **pudieron**
     Me surprise.PAST.INDIC.3SG   that you-all not can.PAST.INDIC.3PL
     ayudarnos   con el plan.
     help.INF-us   with the plan.
     'It surprised me that you couldn't help us with the plan.'

                                                              (Terrell and García 1977: 221)

(26) *Marta* **no   cree**   **que** *Pedro* **sea/es**
     Marta not believe.PRES.INDIC.3SG   that Pedro   be.PRES.SUBJ/INDIC.3SG
     culpable.
     guilty.
     'Marta does not believe that Pedro is guilty.'

                                                              (Borgonovo and Prévost 2003: 151)

(27) **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: 58)

---

[4] All arguments posed in this paper stem from native speaker judgments (see: Faulkner 2021b).

(28) ***Es   posible que quiere   destacar***
Be.PRES.INDIC.3SG possible that want.PRES.INDIC.3SG highlight.INF
que es   algo   que debe   ser
that be.PRES.INDIC.3SG something that must.PRES.INDIC.3SG   be.INF
respetado en vez de   depositado en el sótano.
respect.PP instead-of   deposit.PP in the basement.
'It is possible that she wants to point out that it is 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). Thus, if (the default) subjunctive had been used in either of the prior examples (i.e., examples 25-28), the affirmative (e.g., *Me sorprendió que x*) or negated (e.g., *Dudo que x*) proposition would likely have been uninformative; i.e., old/already known, unimportant, non-contrastive, and/or highly unlikely. That is, taken for granted and, therefore, not warranting of assertion or highlighting. 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 3, the examples above demonstrate that this option may be available to speakers using emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty (i.e., predicates that express the speaker or subject's apprehension, doubting, or refutation of the proposition in question, for example, negated indicative-normative verbs, dubitatives, and modals). Contrarily, it is unavailable to a speaker using a non-realistic, preference-based 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 (e.g., desideratives, directives, and purpose clauses), we see that they make up the core, subjunctive-governing verbs and expressions, which put forth the speaker or subject's (dis)preferences; i.e., propositions that are non-realistic and cannot be assumed to materialize in the actual world. These predicates compare the complement proposition or its negation (i.e., *p* or ¬*p*) to alternative propositions. For instance, in examples (29) through (31), the speaker or subject's dis(preferred) outcome is that Mary gets the job (as compared to some other end result).

(29)   **Desideratives (compare *p* or ¬*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.
(30)   **Directive Clauses (compare *p* or ¬*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.

(31)   **Purpose Clauses (compare *p* or ¬*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 whether the complement reveals a desire (29), suggestion (30), or intention (31), the subject's (dis)preferred end result (as compared to alternative outcomes) is what is being relayed. That is, that Mary be (or not be) the individual selected for the job in question.

Different from the predicates in group 1, the predicates in group 2 (i.e., emotive-factives, negated indicative-normative predicates, dubitatives, and modals) represent a particular truth (e.g., emotive-factives) or an experience (e.g., a doubted, disbelieved, refuted, or (im)possible proposition, as assessed by the speaker or matrix subject based on their experiences); i.e., propositions that are potentially realistic - meaning that the speaker assumes that they could or have materialize(d) in the actual world. Thus, whereas in example (32), the subject's truth is that Mary got the job, in sentences (33) through (35), the uncertainty regarding Mary's prospective offer (or rejection) results from the subject's experiences; e.g., their experiences regarding Mary's credentials, personality, application, potential as a worker, etc.

(32)   **Emotive-factives (can assert *p* or ¬*p*; compares *p* or ¬*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.
(33)   **Dubitatives (can assert *p* or ¬*p*)**
      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.
(34)   **Negated Indicative-normative Predicates (can assert *p* or ¬*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.
(35)   **Modals (can assert *p* or ¬*p*)**
      a) **It is (not/im)possible that** Mary got the job.
      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 a non-realistic *p* or ¬*p*. As such, they require the subjunctive and have been deemed ASSERTION-AVERSE (see: section 4.1). Conversely, the verbs and expressions in group 2 (i.e., emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty) take propositions that are closer to the actual world and are, therefore, at least somewhat realistic. Thus, their complements (whether affirmative or negated) may occasionally appear in the indicative (i.e., *p* or ¬*p* can be asserted). We can, therefore, confer this group of predicates the label of ASSERTION-INCLINED (see: section 4.2). However, as stated previously, assertion is most likely to occur when the particular complement is informative. In this way, the hearer gets alerted to the proposition's contextual value (i.e., its informativeness, e.g., its newness, importance, contrastiveness, and/or high likelihood).

A question that may come up relates to why emotive-factives, which have been argued by some linguists to have a comparison-based semantics (*p* or ¬*p* is compared) (e.g., Giorgi and Pianesi 1997; Villalta 2008), form part of group 2. Although their semantics involves comparison (see: example 32 above), unlike the predicates in group 1, they are able to compare propositions that are realistic. 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 4.2). Therefore, as related to examples (32) through (35), Spanish speakers may choose to assert any of the listed complements with indicative, especially when informative. Accordingly, whereas with assertion-averse predicates (29-31; 36-38) the use of the subjunctive is inflexible (i.e., the subjunctive is required), with the assertion-inclined predicates indicative may at times be available (25-28).

(36)   ***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: 34)

(37)   *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: 34)

(38)   *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 assertion-averse versus the assertion-inclined verbs and expressions, relate to a split between subjunctives. Whereas the subjunctive used with the core subjunctive, volitional 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).

4.1 Assertion-averse Predicates and Subjunctive 1

As mentioned in the preceding sections, assertion-averse 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 (e.g., 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, as related to example 39 below) 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, see: example 39), the purpose of the complement is to express the subject's (dis)preferred end result; i.e., *p* or ¬*p* is compared to some contextual alternative. 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 (39), (40), and (41) to follow, each volitional complement discloses the subject's desire for Mary to have gotten the job.

(39)   **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.

(40)   **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.

(41)   **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: *[b]eing 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 (Giorgi and Pianesi 1997: 212).

With the previous points in mind, let us now assume that all assertion-averse 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/does something so that p or $\neg p$ (or wanted/recommended/required/prohibited/did something so that p or $\neg p$), the complement proposition is non-realistic, since it cannot be assumed that their desire will materialize in the actual world. This explains why indicative is disallowed in the complements of the predicates that take subjunctive 1. Similar to what Quer (2009) states about conditional statements, I argue that the indicative can only appear in complements that represent propositions that are close enough to the actual world.[5] Conversely, complements which represent propositions that are distant or disjoint from the current world (non-realistic), require the subjunctive. Therefore, the complements of the subjunctive-1-taking predicates can never be asserted with indicative, since the matrix subject is not able to commit themself 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 only likely to take place when the proposition is at least somewhat realistic; i.e., propositions that the speaker or subject can commit to since they may materialize in the actual 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. Such propositions are close to the current world and can, thus, be asserted so that they get added to the common ground. As will be discussed further in section 4.2, this is most likely to occur when the proposition is informative (new, important, contrastive, and/or highly likely). This appears to be why examples (42), (43), and (44) 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.

(42)   **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 a new blog, so the readers don't know anything about his relationship, neither do they know the woman.] [6]
*Mi mujer **prefiere**   **que** el mensaje **es**
My lady   prefer.PRES.INDIC.3SG   that the message be.PRES.INDIC.3SG
comunicado   de tantas   maneras creativas como   sea
communicate.PP   of so-many ways   creative   as   be.PRES.SUBJ.3SG

---

[5] 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).

[6] All contexts that precede Spanish examples are invented and were extracted from Faulkner (2021b); i.e., the contexts in parentheses that precede examples (42), (43), (44), (47), (48), (50), (51), (52), (56), and (57). However, all examples following these contexts are authentic. Additionally, as mentioned in *Footnote 4*, all arguments regarding the acceptability of each contextualized item stem from native speaker consultations.

possible.
possible
Por eso existen   las florerías   y   negocios de tarjetas.
for that exist.PRES.INDIC.3PL the flower-shops and businesses of cards.
'My wife prefers that the message be communicated in as many creative ways as possible. For this reason flower shops and card businesses exist.'

(43)   **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.*
Advise.PRES.INDIC.1PL   that not make.PRES.INDIC.3PL   nothing homemade
Es   mejor consultar   a su   centro de salud en caso de
Be.PRES.INDIC.3SG better consult.INF to your center of health in case of
cualquier   enfermedad.
any   illness.
'We advise that you don't make anything homemade. It is better to consult with your health center in the case of any illness.'

(44)   **Purpose**
[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*
Hello to everyone, finish.PRES.INDIC.1SG of create.INF   this blog
por casualidad. Mi intención es   hacer   difusión de todo lo
by   chance   My intention be.PRES.INDIC.3SG make.INF diffusion of all   the
*increíble   de las plantas **para que puede**   llegar   esta*
incredible of the plants   for   that can.PRES.INDIC.3SG   arrive.INF this
información   a mucha gente.
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 their complements are assumed to be non-realistic, no matter how informative they may be, variation with the indicative (the assertion of the subordinate proposition) is never possible; i.e., they are assertion-averse. Subjunctive-1-taking predicates require the subjunctive so as to signal their propositions' distance from the common ground.
   It may, nonetheless, be argued that there are circumstances in which the assertion of a volitional statement is possible. For instance, in example (45) 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 the case of the present paper, my claim is

that it is the complement of the volitional predicate that cannot be asserted, as opposed to a following conjunctive sentence.

(45)   *Juan* **quiere**   **que** *María*   **venga**   *y*
       John want.PRES.INDIC.3SG that Mary   come.PRES.SUBJ.3SG   and
       lo hará.
       it   do.FUT.3SG
       'John wants Mary to come and she will.'

4.2   Assertion-inclined Predicates and Subjunctive 2

As mentioned in sections 1 and 4.1, 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, doubted, or refuted (as assessed by the speaker or subject, based on their experiences), or
   iii.   are (im)possible (as assessed by the speaker or subject, based on their experiences).

This is why Spanish has emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty (negated indicative-normative predicates, dubitatives, and modals) sometimes taking the indicative. With these verbs, the speaker is able to assert their 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 (i.e., not required and, thus, overridable by the indicative), 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 and dubitative predicates, 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.

4.2.1   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 (46) below, Mary is assumed to have gotten the job.

(46)   **Me alegra**   **que** *María* **haya**
           Me make.happy.PRES.INDIC.3SG that   Mary   have.PRES.SUBJ.3SG
           conseguido *el*   *trabajo.*
           get.PP   the job.
           '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 (e.g., Faulkner, 2021a; Giorgi and Pianesi 1997; Villalta 2008). For instance, if we look again at example (46), we can infer that the matrix subject's happiness stems from their 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; Ruiz Campillo 2001, 2008; Sessarego 2016). This means that in using an emotive-factive, the speaker assumes that their addressee is already in the know about what the complement affair entails. As Faulkner (2021a) 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., Faulkner 2021a, 2021b; 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 their mental model. Thus, whereas the indicative may be acceptable in a context like that of (47), where the information being discussed is new to the addressee(s) in question, it is unlikely to be acceptable in (48), a proposition that is described as already being known to the hearer or reader (i.e., old information).

(47)   **'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*
Hello, my baby has.PRES.INDIC.3SG 7 months, be.PRES.INDIC.3SG well in

*el peso   y   el tamaño para su edad, pero **me preocupa***
the weight and   the size   for   his age, but   me worry.PRES.INDIC.3SG
***que** no le   **agrada**   mucho la   comida.*
that not him   please.PRES.INDIC.3SG much   the food.
Todavía   toma   leche materna.
Still   take.PRES.INDIC.3SG milk maternal.
'Hello, my baby is 7 months, he is good in weight and size for his age, but it worries me that food doesn't please him much. He is still on breast milk.'

(48)   **'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*
  Have.PRES.INDIC.1SG now more   of 3 years date.GER with my   girlfriend
y   como ya   sabes,   es   atea
and as   already know.PRES.INDIC.2SG be.PRES.INDIC.3SG atheist.
*¿**Es**   **malo que   salgo**   con   ella?*
Be.PRES.INDIC.3SG   bad   that   go-out.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?'

It is clear that the proposition in example (47) 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 (48) 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 47), 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 (48), where the speaker is discussing information that is familiar to the conversational participants, variability with the indicative is unlikely. In uninformative contexts (48), 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.

4.2.2   Negated Indicative-normative Predicates
    Negated epistemic complements are one example of a negated context in which the subjunctive is considered the norm. They relay the speaker or matrix subject's doubts regarding a particular situation or happening. Thus, in example (49) 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.

(49)   *Juan **no cree**   que María **haya***
            Juan not believe.PRES.INDIC.3SG that Mary   have.PRES.SUBJ.3SG

> ***conseguido*** *el   trabajo.*
> got.PP   the job
> 'John doesn't believe that Mary got the job.'

As was previously stated, in many cases, negation is considered a trigger for the subjunctive (e.g., Borrego et. al 1989; 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, 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 (50) 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 gas. In example (51), 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 their 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.

(50)   '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   politizar   este asunto.
Have.PRES.INDIC.3SG people that try.PRES.INDIC.3SG politicize.INF this issue.
No es   verdad que tiene *que ver   con*
Not be.PRES.INDIC.3SG truth   that have.PRES.INDIC.3SG-to-do with
explotación petrolera,   sostuvo   el   presidente.
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.'

(51)   '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*
I   not think.PRES.INDIC.1SG that the men   be.PRES.INDIC.3PL all
iguales. Hay   hombres que quieren
equal.   Have.PRES.INDIC.3PL men   that want.PRES.INDIC.3PL
casarse   y   que quieren   abrirnos   puertas.
get-married.INF and that want.PRES.INDIC.3PL open.INF-us doors.
'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 a statement such as (52) to follow would be dispreferred. Since (52) involves a negated 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 is likely to be deemed redundant or unnecessary. Indicative, negated epistemic complements are most likely to be acceptable when the speaker intends to add a new, contrastive perspective to the discourse environment.

(52)   'Uninformative' Negated Epistemic Complements
[Comment extracted from a blog about religion. The author of the comment is reiterating the fact that all of the blog's participants are friends, even if they have different points of view. The blog's readers are already well-acquainted with this perspective.]
??***No creo***   *que los   que estamos*   *en   protesta*
  Not believe.PRES.INDIC.1SG   that them that be.PRES.INDIC.1PL in   protest
somos   *enemigos de los   que están*   *de acuerdo.*
  be.PRES.INDIC.1PL enemies   of   them that be.PRES.INDIC.3PL of agreement.
'I don't believe that those that are in protest are enemies of those who are in agreement.'

4.2.3   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 the subject holds concerning the likelihood of the proposition being discussed. For instance, in example (53) 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.

(53) *Juan **duda**   que María **haya**   **conseguido** el*
      John doubt.PRES.INDIC.3SG that Mary   have.PRES.SUBJ.3SG gotten   the
      trabajo.
      job.
      'John doubts that Mary got the job.'

Although Spanish dubitatives have the subjunctive as their default, speakers may opt for 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 (54) below, the indicative is considered acceptable if the speaker intends to make known their disagreement with a previously mentioned statement (e.g., Smead, 1994). Thus, the use of the indicative signals the contrastive effect of the doubted proposition.

(54) ***Dudo***   *que el profeta **vuelve**.*
      Doubt.PRES.INDIC.1SG   that the prophet return.PRES.INDIC.3SG
      (implica   *que alguien ha*
      (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.'

In using an indicative, dubitative complement, the speaker does not take for granted that their disagreement is background information that the hearer already knows. Alternatively, their 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 (55), it would not necessarily be inferred that it had previously been affirmed that the prophet was returning. Contrastiveness would, therefore, not inevitably be manifested.

(55)   ***Dudo***   ***que*** *el profeta* ***vuelva****.*
         Doubt.PRES.INDIC.1SG that the prophet return.PRES.SUBJ.3SG
         'I doubt that the prophet is returning.'

(Adapted from Bell 1990: 92 as cited in Smead 1994)

The proposition in (54) 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 (56) to follow. In this particular example, the speaker indicates in two ways that the dubitative statement is contrastive. The first means by which they do 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 their disagreement with the previous answer they provided by means of the contrastive *yo* 'I', the use of *sin embargo* 'however', as well as through the explicit mentioning of their 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 their agreement with the implied previous statement (that email marketing would have a lengthy life), the speaker follows up by affirming their disagreement with the negated proposition. Thus, like example (54), the dubitative proposition of (56) is informative, in that it is contrastive and, thus, brings something new to the addressee's mental model.

(56)   **'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*
The truth   be.PRES.INDIC.3SG that many   doubt.PRES.INDIC.3PL that the
email marketing ***va***   *a   seguir   vivo. Sin embargo, yo   no*
email marketing go.PRES.INDIC.3SG to continue   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.'

Both (54) and (56) demonstrate that the speaker's choice to use an indicative, dubitative complement may result from the intent to bring the contradicted proposition into the common ground. Therefore, in a context like that of (57) to follow, we can assume 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.

(57)　　　'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*
　Doubt.PRES.INDIC.1SG　that many　readers　have.PAST.INDIC.PL interest
en la entrevista　con　ese　artista.
in　the interview　with　that　artista.
'I doubt that many readers had interest in the interview with that artist.'

4.4　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).

(58)　　　**Es**　　　　　　　**posible**　**que** *María* **haya**
　　　　　Be.PRES.INDIC.3SG　possible　that　Mary　have.PRES.SUBJ.3SG
　　　　　conseguido *el　trabajo*.
　　　　　get.PP　　　the work.
　　　　　'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 emotive-factives and the other verbs of uncertainty (negated indicative-normative predicates and dubitatives), the use of the indicative in a possibility clause serves primarily 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.

(59)　　　*Cualquier　persona　que　está　　　　　　presionando　demasiado*
　　　　　Whichever　person　　that　be.PRES.INDIC.3SG　pressure.GER　too-much

a. *es　　　　　　　　　　posible　que　tiene　　　　　　　　otras intenciones*
be.PRES.INDIC.3SG　possible　that　have.PRES.INDIC.3SG　other intentions
diferentes　a　los　sentimientos　que　tú　tienes　　　　　　　　o
different　to　the　feelings　　　　that　you　have.PRES.INDIC.2SG or

b. *es　　　　　　　　　　posible　que　esté　　　　　　　pensando*
be.PRES.INDIC.3SG　possible　that　be.PRES.SUBJ.3SG think.GER
en ejecutar　　　una　estafa　que　acabará　con　usted
on carry-out.INF　a　　fraud　　that end.FUT　　with you
perder　su　propio dinero.
lose.INF your own　　money

'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*
Be.PRES.INDIC.3SG　possible　that　the person　　work.PRES.SUBJ.3SG
por teléfono　en　un país　　extranjero, tratando　de encontrar　formas　de
by　telephone in　a　country foreign,　　try.GER　of　find.INF　forms　　of
obtener　　una tarjeta verde o　acceder　　a　su　　cuenta　de banco o
obtain.INF a　　card　　green or access.INF　to your account of bank　or
un vuelo a su　　país,　　o　el　dinero　para　un　vuelo que nunca
a　flight to your country, or the money for　　a　　flight　that never
va　　　　　　　　　a　usar.
go.PRES.INDIC.3SG　to use.INF

'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 their money. Use *c* talks about the likelihood that the person works by phone in a
foreign country, with the intention of scamming the addressee out of a green card, their
bank account information, or money for a flight. The modal expression in use *a*, however,
states that it is possible that the party 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 (60) below. In this case, the use of the indicative seems to relate to the announcing of a new possibility.

(60) ***Es*** ***posible que va*** *a decir*
Be.PRES.INDIC.3SG possible that go.PRES.INDIC.3SG to say.INF
que usted es una persona mala persona…
that you be.PRES.INDIC.3SG a person bad person
'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 appears that 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.

5   Revisiting Lozano's (1972) Two Subjunctives

In the previous sections, we proposed that Spanish has both a required and a default, overridable subjunctive. However, as mentioned in section 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 sub-categories 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*[7]" (p. 77). He provides the following sentences as examples of this distinction.

---

[7] It is important to point out that negation in Spanish may take forms other than that of the use of the preverb *no*; for example, *nadie* 'no one', *nunca* 'never', etc.

Table 2: The Optative-Dubitative Distinction According to Lozano (1972)[8]

THE FEATURE [+OPTATIVE]		THE FEATURE [±DUBITATIVE]
(61)	***Quiero*** *que lo* ***hagas****.* Want.1SG that it do.SUBJ.2SG 'I want you to do it.'	***Dudo*** *que lo* ***hagas****.* Doubt.1SG that it do.SUBJ.2SG 'I doubt that you'll do it.'
(62)	***No quiero*** *que lo* Not want.1SG that it ***hagas****.* do.SUBJ.2SG 'I don't want you to do it.'	***No dudo*** *que lo* ***hagas****.* Not doubt.1SG that it do.SUBJ.2SG 'I don't doubt that you'll do it.'
(63)	*****No quiero*** *que lo* Not want.1SG that it ***haces****.* do.INDIC.2SG *'I don't want you to do it'	***No dudo*** *que lo* ***haces****.* Not doubt.1SG that it do.INDIC.2SG 'I don't doubt that you'll do it.'
(64)	*****Quiero*** *que lo* ***haces****.* Want.1SG that it do.INDIC.2SG *'I want you to do it.'	*****Dudo*** *que lo* ***haces****.* Doubt.1SG that it do.INDIC.2SG *'I doubt that you'll do it.'

Similar to the present study, 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 paper, 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 discussed in section 4.2; both emotive-factive (4.2.1) and (affirmative) dubitative clauses (4.2.3) 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

---

[8] First published in Faulkner (2021b).

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 – non-realistic, preference-based predicates (e.g., desideratives, directives, and purpose clauses), and group 2 – emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty (i.e., negated indicative-normative predicates, dubitatives, and expressions of possibility).

6   Conclusions

In this paper, I argued that Spanish has two subjunctives; subjunctive 1 and subjunctive 2. We stated that subjunctive 1 is selected by the core, subjunctive, volitional predicates (e.g., desideratives, directives, and purpose clauses), while subjunctive 2 is found in the complements of emotive-factives and verbs of uncertainty (negated indicative-normative predicates, dubitatives, and modals). Subjunctive 1 is licensed by predicates which cannot assert p or $\neg p$ since the propositions contained in their complements 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 propositions that are at least somewhat realistic. Propositions that are somewhat realistic are those which are not far from the common ground. I argued 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 $\neg p$. 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, their propositions may be realistic (thus, making it possible for subjunctive to be replaced by 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). 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.

Tris Faulkner, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Spanish Linguistics
Department of Spanish Language and Literature
Dewing Hall: DEW203B
Kalamazoo College
1200 Academy St
Kalamazoo, MI 49006

tris.faulkner@kzoo.edu;
trisfaulkner.phd@gmail.com
ORCID ID 0000-0002-9099-0057

References

Alonso-Cortés, A. M. (1981). *Gramática del subjuntivo*. Madrid, Ed. Cátedra.

Bello, A. (1847). *Gramática de la lengua castellana*. Buenos Aires, Losada.

Becker, M. G. (2010). Principles of mood change in evaluative contexts: The case of French, in *Modality and Mood in Romance : Modal interpretation, mood selection, and mood alternation*, edited by Martin G. Becker and Eva-Maria Remberger, Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 2010, pp. 209-234. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110234343.2.209

Blanch, Lope J. M. (1958). Algunos usos de indicativo por subjuntivo en oraciones subordinadas. *Nueva Revista De Filología Hispánica* (NRFH), 12(3/4), pp. 383-385. https://doi.org/10.24201/nrfh.v12i3/4.3061

Blake, R. (1981). Some Empirically Based Observations on Adult Usage of the Subjunctive Mood in Mexico City, in James Lantolf & Gregory Stone (Eds.), *Current Research in Romance Languages*, pp. 13-22. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Blake, R. (1982). El uso del subjuntivo con cláusulas nominales: regla obligatoria o variable. *Actas Del Primer Congreso Internacional Sobre El Español De América*. Río Piedras. Puerto Rico: Universidad De Puerto Rico, pp. 351–360.

Bolinger, D. (1991). *Essays on Spanish Words & Grammar*, in J.H. Silverman (Ed.), Essays in Spanish: Words and Grammar. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta Hispanic Monographs, pp. 207-210.

Borgonovo, C. & Prevost, P. (2003). Knowledge of polarity subjunctive in L2 Spanish, in B. Beachley, A. Brown & F. Conlin (Eds.), BUCLD 27: *Proceedings of the 27th Boston University Conference on Language Development*,1, pp. 150–161. Somerville: Cascadilla Press.

Borrego, J., Asensi, J. G. & Prieto, E. (1989). *El subjuntivo: valores y usos*. Madrid: Sociedad General Española de Librería.

Borrego, et al. (2013). *Gramática de Referencia Para La enseñanza de Español: La combinación de Oraciones*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.

Crespo del Río, C. (2014). *Tense and Mood Variation in Spanish Nominal Subordinates: The Case of Peruvian Varieties*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Davies, M. (2016). El Corpus del Español. Retroceded from https://www.corpusdelespanol.org/

Deshors, S. C., & Waltermire, M. (2019). The indicative vs. subjunctive alternation with expressions of possibility in Spanish. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 24(1), pp. 67-97. https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.17038.des

Farkas, D. F. (1992b). On the Semantics of Subjunctive Complements, in P. Hirschbühler, (Ed.), *Romance Languages and Modern Linguistic Theory: Selected papers from the XX Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, pp. 69-105. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.91.07far

Faulkner, T. (2021a). Prescriptively or Descriptively Speaking? How 'Information-quality' Influences Mood Variation in Spanish Emotive-factive Clauses. *Pragmatics*, 31(3), pp. 357-381. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.19044.fau

Faulkner, T. (2021b). *A Systematic Investigation of the Spanish Subjunctive: Mood Variation in Subjunctive Clauses*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University.

García, M. E., & Terrell, T. (1977). Is the Use of Mood in Spanish Subject to Variable Constraints?, in M.P. Hagiwara (Ed.), *Studies in Romance Linguistics: Proceedings of the Fifth Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, pp. 214-226. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Giannakidou, A. (2017) Evaluative Subjunctive and Nonveridicality, in Joanna Blaszczak, Anastasia Giannakidou, Dorota Klimek-Jankowska and Krzysztof Migdalski (Eds.), *Mood, Aspect, Modality Revisited*: *New Answers to Old Questions*, pp. 177-217. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226363660.003.0005

Gili Gaya, S. (1960). *Curso superior de sintaxis española*. Barcelona: Publicaciones y Ediciones Spes.

Gili Gaya, S. (1980). *Curso superior de sintaxis española*. Barcelona: Bibliograf.

Giorgi, A., & Pianesi, F. (1997). *Tense and Aspect: From Semantics to Morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gregory, A. E., & Lunn, P. V. (2012). A Concept-based Approach to the Subjunctive. *Hispania*, 95(2), pp. 333-343.

Hooper, J. (1975). On Assertive Predicates. *Syntax and Semantics* 4, pp. 91-124. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368828_005

Kowal, J. (2007). La elección del modo subjuntivo en las subordinadas nominales. *Lingüística Española Actual*, 29(1), pp. 45-72.

Laca, B. (2010). Mood in Spanish, in B. R. Rothstein & R. Thieroff (Eds.), *Studies in Language Companion Series Mood in the Languages of Europe*, pp. 198-220. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.120.11lac

Lozano, A. G. (1972). Subjunctives, Transformations and Features in Spanish. *Hispania*, 55(1), 76-90. https://doi.org/10.2307/338249

Lunn, P. V. (1989). Spanish mood and the prototype of assertability. *Linguistics*, 27(4), 687-702. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1989.27.4.687

Mejías-Bikandi, E. (1998). Pragmatic Presupposition and Old Information in the Use of the Subjunctive Mood in Spanish. *Hispania*, 81(4), pp. 9-41. https://doi.org/10.2307/345807

Portner, P. (2018). *Mood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199547524.001.0001

Portner, P. & Rubinstein, A. (2020). Desire, belief, and semantic composition: variation in mood selection with desire predicates. *Natural Language Semantics*, 28(4), pp. 343–393. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11050-020-09167-7

Quer, J. (1998). *Mood at the Interface*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.

Quer, J. (2001). Interpreting mood. *Probus*, 13(1), pp. 81-111. https://doi.org/10.1515/prbs.13.1.81

Quer, J. (2009). Twists of mood: The distribution and interpretation of indicative and subjunctive. *Lingua*, 119(12), pp. 1779–1787. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2008.12.003

Ramsey, M. M., & Spaulding, R. K. (1956). *A Textbook of Modern Spanish: As Now Written and Spoken in Castile and the Spanish American Republics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Real Academia de la Lengua Española (RAE). (2011). *Nueva gramática de la lengua española: Manual*. Madrid: Espasa Libros.

Romero, M. (2012). Mood Selection in Romance Complement Clauses. *SinFonIJA*, 5, pp. 1-6.

Ruiz Campillo, J. P. (2001). El subjuntivo es lógico: una actividad de concienciación. *Cervantes*, 2, pp. 33-36.

Ruiz Campillo, J. P. (2008). El Valor Central del Subjuntivo, ¿Informatividad o Declaratividad? *marcoELE, Revista de Didáctica ELE*, 7, pp. 1-44.

Sessarego, C. (2016). A Discourse-Pragmatic Approach to Teaching Indicative/Subjunctive Mood Selection in the Intermediate Spanish Language Class: New Information versus Reformulation. *Hispania*, 99(3), pp. 392-406. https://doi.org/10.1353/hpn.2016.0067

Silva-Corvalán, C. (1994). The gradual loss of mood distinctions in Los Angeles Spanish. Language, *Variation, and Change*, 6, pp. 255-272. https://doi.org/10.1017/S095439450000168X

Smead, R. (1994). Sobre La Elección De Modo Para Las Dubitativas Factivas y Las Cognoscitivas/Aseverativas Negadas: Tendencias Entre Monolingües Y Bilingües. *Hispanic Journal*, 15(2), pp. 271-289.

Stalnaker, R. (2002). Common Ground. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 25(5/6), pp. 701-721. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020867916902

Studerus, L. (1995). Mood Variability in Border Spanish. *Bilingual Review*, 20(2), pp. 99-113.

Terrell, T., & Hooper, J. (1974). A Semantically Based Analysis of Mood in Spanish. *Hispania*, 57(3), pp. 484-494. https://doi.org/10.2307/339187

Villalta, E. (2008). Mood and gradability: An investigation of the subjunctive mood in Spanish. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 31(4), pp. 467–522. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10988-008-9046-x

Waltermire, M. (2017). Mood variation after expressions of uncertainty in Spanish. *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics*, 10(2), pp. 349-372. https://doi.org/10.1515/shll-2017-0011