

THE SUBJUNCTIVE, A MARKER OF ‘SUBORDINANCE’? A COMPARISON BETWEEN GERMAN AND SPANISH^{*}

Hans-Jörg Busch
University of Delaware

ABSTRACT. By comparing Spanish and German, it can be shown that the subjunctive in Spanish (as well as in German) has only a very general grammatical meaning. This meaning can be called ‘procedural,’ and is defined as ‘subordinance’ (= syntactic and semantic subordination under the main predicate or another explicit or implicit contextual element) or ‘contextual alternative.’ In both languages the subjunctive/Konjunktiv is used in noun, adjective and adverb, as well as (pseudo)independent, clauses. This article compares only noun clauses. The focus is on the present subjunctive/Konjunktiv I. It is used in German in direct noun clauses and clauses that are introduced by the conjunction *dass* (‘that’). In direct noun clauses, the Konjunktiv I is mandatory in distinguishing direct and reported (indirect) speech. In clauses introduced by *dass*, the element ‘reported speech’ is signaled by the conjunction and followed by the typical word order with the finite verb at the end of the sentence. Therefore, especially in spoken German, there is a strong tendency to use the indicative in this case. Another use of the Konjunktiv I in German is after wishes. In direct noun clauses, the use of the Konjunktiv I is rare and also signals indirect speech. The Konjunktiv I is often replaced by the Konjunktiv II (past subjunctive), but especially with *dass*-clauses and the indicative.

Keywords. Mood, Subjunctive, Konjunktiv, Subordination, Contextual alternative, Spanish, German

RESUMEN. Mediante una comparación con el alemán, vamos a mostrar que el subjuntivo en español (tal como en alemán) tiene solo un significado gramatical muy general, que se ha calificado de ‘procedural’, y que vamos a definir como ‘subordinancia’ (subordinación sintáctica y semántica bajo el predicado principal u otro elemento contextual explícito o implícito) o ‘alternativa contextual’. En ambas lenguas, el subjuntivo/Konjunktiv se puede usar en cláusulas nominales, adjetivales, adverbiales, tal como en cláusulas (pseudo)independientes. En este artículo solo se compara el uso en cláusulas nominales. Además se centra en el Konjunktiv I, que en alemán se puede usar en cláusulas nominales directas y cláusulas introducidas por la conjunción *dass* (‘que’). En cláusulas nominales directas, el Konjunktiv I es obligatorio para distinguir el habla directa de la indirecta. En cláusulas introducidas por *dass*, el elemento ‘habla indirecta’ es señalado por la conjunción y el orden de palabras típico con el verbo conjugado al final de la oración. Por eso, particularmente en alemán hablado, hay una tendencia muy

^{*} List of abbreviations used in this article: **KONJ I** = (German) Konjunktiv I, **KONJ II** = (German) Konjunktiv II, **SUB** = (Spanish) Subjunctive, **SUB IMPF** (Spanish) Past Subjunctive [imperfecto de subjuntivo], **IND** = Indicative, **IND IMPF** = Imperfecto de indicativo, **PRES** = Present, **PRET** = Preterit, **IMP** = Imperative, **MOD-KONJ I** = Modal Auxiliary Verbs + (German) Konjunktiv I, **INF** = Infinitive. The notation in SMALL CAPS gives a literal translation.

I would like to thank the editor and reviewers of *Borealis* for their extensive comments on the first draft of this article that were very useful in the preparation of the final manuscript. I also would like to thank Ruth Tauber for checking the English part of this article. I am responsible for any remaining errors or omissions.

fuerte hacia el indicativo. Otro uso del Konjunktiv I es para expresar voluntad. En cláusulas nominales directas el uso del Konjunktiv I es raro y también suele indicar ‘habla indirecta’. A menudo el Konjunktiv I, es sustituido por el Konjunktiv II (subjuntivo pasado), pero particularmente por cláusulas con *dass* y el indicativo.

Palabras clave: modo, subjuntivo, Konjunktiv, subordinación, alternativa contextual, español, alemán

1. The current state of affairs

There is certainly no shortage, particularly on partial and comprehensive descriptions of the Spanish subjunctive. Zamorano Aguilar (2005, 19), for example, writes that the variety of criteria and the multitude of approaches is directly proportional to the quantity of studies dedicated to the subjunctive. Still, when it comes to explaining the proper grammatical meaning and function of the subjunctive, the answers have not changed substantially in the last 250 years when you compare what 1) James Harris wrote in 1765 in ‘Hermes or a philosophical inquiry concerning universal grammar’ and what 2) the authors of the Nueva gramática de la lengua española (NGLE) wrote in 2009.

- 1) “If we simply **declare**, or **indicate** [bold added by the author of this article] something to be, or not to be (whether a Perception or Volition, it is equally the same) this constitutes that Mode called the Declarative or Indicative. ... If we **do not** strictly **assert** [bold added by the author of this article], as of something absolute and certain, but as of something possible only, and in the number of Contingents, this makes that Mode, which Grammarians call the Potential; and which becomes on such occasions the leading Mode of the sentence.” (Harris, J., 1765: 140/141)
- 2) “Entre las nociones semánticas unificadoras que se han propuesto en diversos marcos teóricos para explicar las alternancias modales, destaca la que establece como guía o como pauta el grado de compromiso del hablante con la veracidad del contenido que se afirma. De hecho, no pocos autores han replanteado los contextos tradicionales de alternancia modal en función de la naturaleza **NO ASERTIVA** [bold added by the author of this article] del subjuntivo.” (NGLE, 2009: 1869)

The second quote reflects the status quo of the subjunctive debate in the present day if we neglect slight terminological modifications, for example, replace ‘assertion’ with ‘declaration’ (Ruiz Campillo, 2007), and add more recent attempts to relate the subjunctive with already known information and background knowledge (Ahern, 2008). Of course we have learned much about modality, mood, many partial aspects of the subjunctive and about language in general over the years. However, we still haven’t found ‘des Pudels Kern’, which in German means the real and ultimate solution to the problem. Obviously, it would be presumptuous to think that this article could bring about an ultimate solution, but sometimes a comparison with another language, in this case German, having a comparable morphosyntactic category, can help to see things a little clearer.

2. Mood – A universal category?

Already Harris considered moods universal categories, and Lenz, who distinguished ‘juicios asertivos’ (statements about something that the speaker has observed by himself or that he thinks he knows for certain) from ‘juicios problemáticos’ (stating something possible) and ‘juicios apodícticos’ (stating something necessary), uses the comparison with other languages, in his case Mapuche, to describe certain language universals, “La correspondencia e igualdad de construcciones y procedimientos entre idiomas no emparentados, de índole diversa,

son de valor instructivo particular, porque nos hacen ver, o vislumbrar, leyes psicológicas y lógicas que están por encima de todas las lenguas” (Lenz, 1935, 445/6). More recent comparative studies about mood and modality can be found in Palmer (2001), Quer (2009), Roussou (2009), Giorgi (2009), Siegel (2009), Giannakidou (2009), Kempchinsky (2009) and the volume edited by B. Rothstein & R. Thieroff (2010) about mood in the languages of Europe, with articles by Thieroff, Bergs/Heine, De Mulder, Becker, Laca, Quer, and Squartini.

This article compares some uses of the present subjunctive (Spanish) and the Konjunktiv I (German) in noun clauses in order to find out if there is a common denominator and what distinguishes the usage in the two languages. The purpose of the comparison is to detect the general grammatical meaning and the function of the subjunctive.

3. The subjunctive in German

The use of the subjunctive, which in German is called Konjunktiv, is well documented and described, i.e. in grammars (Zifonun et al., 1997; Duden, 1984; Jung, 1980; Engel, 1988; etc.), monographs (Flämig, 1962; Jäger, 1971; Bausch, 1979; etc.), and specialized articles (Kaufmann, 1972; Kasper, 1987; Jung, 1967; Thieroff, 2010; etc.).

In German, as in Spanish, there are two simple subjunctive forms: the present (*er gehe – vaya*) and the preterit (past) subjunctive (*er ginge – fuera/ fuese*). There are also analytic forms for the present perfect subjunctive (*er sei gegangen – haya ido*), the past perfect subjunctive (*er wäre gegangen – hubiera/ hubiese ido*), the future subjunctive (*er werde gehen/Ø*) and the future perfect subjunctive (*er werde gegangen sein/Ø*). Furthermore, there is a very popular *würde* form that can replace the simple preterit form (*ginge → würde gehen*). The present, present perfect, future and future perfect subjunctive forms are called Konjunktiv I (KONJ I), and the preterit and past perfect subjunctive forms are called Konjunktiv II (KONJ II).

As far as its meaning, Zifonun et al. (1997, 1785) describe the Konjunktiv as follows:

“Der Konjunktiv zeigt eine Brechung oder Aufhebung der Unmittelbarkeit der interpretativen Bezugnahme auf die beiden primären Koordinaten aktueller Sprecher oder aktuelle Welt an.“ (Translation - The Konjunktiv signals that the reference to the two main coordinates, actual speaker and actual world, is disrupted or cancelled.)

The two coordinates are referred to as “speaker-origo” and “world-origo” (Zifonun et al., 1997, 1785). According to many German grammar, the main function of the present subjunctive (Konjunktiv I – *er gehe*) is to disrupt the speaker-origo so that we are pretty much saying, it is/it was not I who says/said what I said. With the past subjunctive forms (Konjunktiv II – *er ginge*), on the other hand, we say that the world might not be the way we say it is. Flämig (1962, 167) also distinguishes two main functions of the two Konjunktiv forms: the Konjunktiv I for the primary designation of the indirect representation of the statements of others or oneself, and the Konjunktiv II forms, for the primary designation of unreal or imagined events. Zifonun et al., 1997, 1743, conclude that the Konjunktiv excludes directness (direct speech) and facticity (the world the way we say it is). The division between the two domains, speaker and world-origo, however, doesn’t seem possible in the case of volitive sentences, where the present subjunctive doesn’t refer to the actual world. The same goes for the past subjunctive (Konjunktiv II) in contexts where the speaker distances himself from the origin or originator of the proposition. This is often the

case when the present subjunctive forms are morphologically not distinct from the present indicative forms, for example in the first person singular and the first and third person plural where the forms of the indicative and the present subjunctive are always identical, except for the verb *sein* ('to be'):

- (1) Sie sagte, sie haben **IND/ KONJ I** sich erst etwas unterhalten und jetzt lesen **IND/ KONJ I** sie ein Buch. ('Dijo que primero charlaron un poco y que ahora leían un libro.')

The 3rd person plural present Konjunktiv I forms *haben/ lesen*, as shown above, are identical with the 3rd person plural present indicative *haben/ lesen*. Therefore it is common to use the past subjunctive (Konjunktiv II) -or the *würde* form instead-, because the 3rd person plural past subjunctive (Konjunktiv II) forms *hätten/ läsen* are different from the 3rd person plural past indicative *hatten/ lasen*. However, the form *läsen* would only be used in written German:

- (2) Sie sagte, sie hätten **KONJ II** sich erst etwas unterhalten und jetzt läsen **KONJ II** sie ein Buch. ('Dice que primero charlaron un poco y que ahora leían un libro.')

The indicative is seen as the unmarked and default mood ~~and~~ that can be used in all contexts to express something directly or indirectly, factual or not, unless otherwise marked.

The present subjunctive (Konjunktiv I) is mainly used in indirect speech acts (3). All the other uses, volitive or optative speech acts, i.e. in standing phrases and exclamations to express wishes, hopes and desires (4), final (5), concessive (6), comparative (7) ~~and~~ subordinate clauses, are considered archaic or formulaic:

- (3) Er sagt, es sei **KONJ I** bekannt, dass er viel arbeite **KONJ I**. ('Dice que es **IND** conocido que trabaja **IND** mucho.')
- (4) Hoch lebe **KONJ I** das Hochzeitspaar. ('¡(Qué) Vivan **SUB** los novios!')
- (5) Er sprach deutlich, damit sie ihn verstehe **KONJ I**. ('(Él) habló claramente, para que (ella) lo comprenda/comprendiera.') **SUB/ SUB IMPF**.)
- (6) Wie dem auch sei **KONJ I**, ich werde nicht kommen. ('Comoquiera que sea **SUB**, no voy a venir.')
- (7) Es sieht aus, als habe **KONJ I** es geschneit. ('Parece como si hubiera **SUB IMPF** nevado.')

The past subjunctive (Konjunktiv II) is mostly used in modality contexts to express non-facticity, particularly in adverb clauses (i.e. conditional clauses and counterfactual consecutive clauses), and is also used in counterfactual argument and relative clauses. Furthermore, it can be found in indirect speech acts, more or less synonymous with the present subjunctive and to express politeness:

- (8) Sie sagte mir, ich machte sie glücklich. ('Ella me dijo que (yo) la hacía/ haría feliz.')(indirect speech)
- (9) Wenn sie eher käme, würde ich ihr das Haus zeigen./ Käme sie eher, würde ich ihr das Haus zeigen. ('Si viniera más temprano, le mostraría la casa.')(conditional clause)

- (10) Das Wasser ist zu kalt, als dass man darin baden könnte. ('El agua está demasiado fría como para poder bañarse en ella.') (counterfactual consecutive clause)
- (11) Stellen Sie sich doch einmal vor, sie wäre eher gekommen. ('Imagínense por un momento que (ella) hubiera venido más temprano.') (counterfactual argument)
- (12) Es gab niemanden, der es mir gesagt hätte. ('No había nadie que me lo hubiera dicho.') (counterfactual relative clause)
- (13) Ich könnte im Augenblick nicht sagen, wer es getan hat. ('Por el momento no sabría decir quién lo hizo.') (politeness)

The preceding examples show that, systematically, the subjunctive in German has largely the same function as in Spanish, except in indirect speech acts. There is, though, a big difference between the use of the present and past subjunctive forms in both languages. In German they seem to have lost completely their reference to time and become exclusively mood indicators. In noun clauses, for example, a main verb in the present can be followed by either the Konjunktiv I or the Konjunktiv II and the same holds true if the main verb is in preterit:

- (14) Er sagt **PRES**, er habe **KONJ I** drei Schwestern. ('Dice que tiene **IND** tres hermanas.')
- (15) Er sagt **PRES**, er hätte **KONJ II** drei Schwestern. ('Dice que tendría **IND IMPF** tres hermanas.')
- (16) Er sagte **PRET**, er habe **KONJ I** drei Schwestern. ('Dijo que tenía **IND** tres hermanas.')
- (17) Er sagte **PRET**, er hätte **KONJ II** drei Schwestern. ('Dijo que tendría **IND IMPF** tres hermanas.')

~~In Spanish there seems to be a clear division between the present and past subjunctive forms:~~ In Spanish, the standard consecutio temporum is:

- (18) Duda **PRES** que tenga **SUB** tres hermanas.
- (19) Dudó/ Dudaba **PRET/ IMPF** que tuviera **SUB IMPF** tres hermanas.

However, it is easy to find examples that deviate from this rule:

- (20) Duda **PRES** que tuviera **SUB IMPF** tres hermanas.
- (21) Dudó/ Dudaba **PRET/ IMPF** que tenga **SUB** tres hermanas.

4. Konjunktiv I and reported speech

A direct speech act consists of a proposition and an illocutionary event, which is a statement, a question or a command. In a reported speech act, the illocutionary part must be rendered with a speech verb or equivalent expression. The most common one would be *sagen* ('to say', 'decir'). These common expressions cannot only be used for simple statements, but also for commands and wishes. For questions, the verb *fragen* ('to ask', 'preguntar') would be used. An original statement could have the following forms:

- (22) Elena: "Maria kommt **IND** morgen." [MARIA COMES TOMORROW.] ('María viene/ va a venir **IND** mañana. (simple statement)

- (23) Elena: „Kommt **IND** Maria morgen?“ [COMES MARIA TOMORROW?] (‘¿Viene/ Va a venir María **IND** mañana?’) (question)
- (24) Elena: “Komm **IMP** bitte morgen, Maria!“ [COME PLEASE TOMORROW, MARIA!] (‘Por favor, ven/ venga **IMP** mañana, María!’) (command)

If someone asked me “What is Elena saying?”, my answer could be:

- (25) Elena sagt, Maria komme **KONJ I** morgen. [ELENA SAYS, MARIA COME TOMORROW.] (‘Elena dice que María viene/ va a venir **IND** mañana.’)
- (26) Elena fragt, ob Maria morgen komme **KONJ I**. [ELENA ASKS, IF MARIA TOMORROW COME.] (‘Ella pregunta si María viene/ va a venir **IND** mañana.’)
- (27) Elena sagt, Maria solle/ möge/ müsse **MOD-KONJ I** morgen kommen. [ELENA SAYS, MARIA MUST/ SHALL TOMORROW COME.] (‘Ella dice que María venga **SUB** mañana.’)

At first glance, the biggest difference between ‘indirect declarations’ (23) in both languages, appears to be the use of the subjunctive in German and the indicative in Spanish. This conclusion, however, is wrong, because it is possible to use the indicative in German in (25) as well. The only problem for the listener in this example is to know whether the proposition is an indirect (28) or a direct quote or declaration (29):

- (28) Elena sagt, Maria kommt **IND** morgen.
- (29) Elena sagt: “Maria kommt **IND** morgen.”

On the other hand, had the original statement been *Ich komme morgen* (‘I am coming tomorrow’), the personal deixis would have shown that this is not a direct quote:

- (30) Elena: “Ich komme morgen.” → What did she say? Elena hat gesagt, sie kommt morgen.

In my opinion, there is no difference in speaker origo between (25) and (28). In both cases, the original speaker is Elena and the actual speaker, or commentator/narrator (‘Berichter’) as Flämig (1962, 49) calls him, am I. The difference is that in (28) the narrator states what Elena did (she SAID something) PLUS Elena’s actual statement (MARIA KOMMT MORGEN), and in (25) he states what Elena did (she SAID something), BUT NOT that Maria actually comes. In (28) we have two statements and in (25) we have only one. This gives way to the assumption that the narrator/commentator distances himself from the truth of Maria’s statement. In other words, ‘Maria komme morgen’ is not an independent statement, but is clearly marked as the subordinated object of ‘sagt’; it doesn’t say anything about whether the event happens or not. From here, it is understandable why the present subjunctive or Konjunktiv I can be reduced to the concept of possibility or neutrality, which makes it ideal for reporting something that another person said. Flämig (1962, 49) described this effect as follows:

“Von der persönlichen Stellungnahme des Sprechers zum Aussageinhalt bleibt die berichtete Rede vorerst frei. Ohne Verantwortlichkeit des Sprechers für den Redehalt wird die Aussage eines anderen als objektive Redewirklichkeit mittelbar aus einer anderen zeitlichen und örtlichen Sicht wiedergegeben.“ (Reported speech remains free from the speaker’s personal bias. Without

assuming responsibility for its content, the speaker indirectly renders the statement of others as objective reality from his actual point of view in time and place.) [To be more consistent, Flämig should have used his own terms 'narrator/ commentator' instead of 'speaker'.] Therefore the Konjunktiv would be ideal for marking speeches, conversations, and ideas as objective 'protocols' (50).

Flämig (1962, 47) continues:

"In der berichtenden Rede hat der Konjunktiv zunächst eine formale Funktion: die Bezeichnung der syntaktischen und logischen Abhängigkeit ... Haupt- und Gliedsatz bilden zusammen einen geschlossenen Satzbogen." (In reported speech, the Konjunktiv has primarily a formal function: the designation of syntactic and logical dependency.... Main and subordinate clause together form a closed sentence frame.)

He explains that this dependency can be marked with a conjunction, a possibility which will be discussed later, but also by other means, especially the context ('Sprechersituation'), which, together with intonation in spoken language, shows whether the subordinated clause is a dependent or an independent statement. Immediately following expressions such as *sagen* ('to say') or *denken* ('to think') even subordinated clauses in indicative with the typical word order of main clauses, can be perceived as independent (28). If the proposition is isolated from the main clause, it is interpreted as a direct speech act and assigned to a speaker. With the subjunctive, on the other hand, the same proposition loses its independence, and signals reported speech even in context without an implicit speech verb. Flämig (1962, 48) continues-concludes:

"Die berichtende Rede setzt also ein Abhängigkeitsverhältnis voraus. Dementsprechend umfasst der Konjunktiv hier zwei sich ergänzende Funktionselemente, nämlich zur Bezeichnung der Abhängigkeit und der mittelbaren Aussage, die gemeinsam in Erscheinung treten, je nach Situation und Kontext mit wechselndem Akzent." (Reported speech implies dependency. Therefore, the Konjunktiv contains two functional elements here that complement each other, particularly in denoting dependency and reported speech that appear together with changing focus depending on the situation and the context.)

For an indirect command (an imperative in the original utterance), (22), we have to use the modal verbs *sollen*, *mögen*, *müssen* ('must, have to') to express the idea of wish/ command. The use of just the present subjunctive ('Maria komme morgen'), in this context, would not be understood as a wish, but only as reported speech.

5. The conjunction *dass* as a maker of dependency

As mentioned earlier, there is another possibility in German to mark reported speech, and this is the use of the subordinating conjunction *dass*, 'that' (Engl.), 'que' (Span.):

- (31) Sie sagt, dass Maria morgen komme SUB. [SHE SAYS, THAT MARIA TOMORROW COME.] ('(Ella) dice que María viene/ va a venir IND mañana.')

In this structure we have two markers of reported speech, the subjunctive verb form AND the subordinating conjunction *dass* with the conjugated verb (*komme*) at the end of the sentence. (There is an interesting tendency in everyday speech in German to use the characteristic word order for direct statements in independent sentences and main clauses also after clearly subordinating conjunctions, i.e. 'weil' ('because'): *Ich habe heute keine Zeit, weil ich muss noch verschiedene Sachen*

erledigen.’ [‘I don’t have time today because I still have to do several things.’] This means that if the dependent clause is seen as a statement by the speaker, there is a tendency to treat it as an independent statement.) The fact that there isn’t just one marker, but several markers of subordination, might be the reason why, especially in everyday conversation, in modern German, the subjunctive is often replaced by the indicative:

- (32) Er sagt, dass Maria morgen kommt **IND**. [HE SAYS, THAT MARIA TOMORROW COMES.] (‘Dice que María viene/ va a venir **IND** mañana.’)

The same applies to other communication verbs such as *erzählen* (‘to tell’, ‘contar’) and *annehmen* (‘to suppose’, ‘asumir’), as well as verbs that not only report what another person said, but also indicate how the narrator interprets what the other person said and the effect it has on the narrator. Some examples are *zugeben* (‘to admit’, ‘admitir’), *warnen* (‘to warn’, ‘advertir’), *vorwerfen*, *beschuldigen* or *vorhalten* (‘to accuse’, ‘acusar’), *bedauern* (‘to regret’, ‘lamentar’):

- (33) Er hat ihm erzählt, Maria komme **KONJ I** morgen. (‘(Él) le ha contado que María viene/ va a venir **IND** mañana.’)
 (34) Er hat ihm erzählt, dass Maria morgen komme **KONJ I**. (‘(Él) le ha contado que María viene/ va a venir **IND** mañana.’)
 (35) Er hat ihm erzählt, dass Maria morgen kommt **IND**. (‘(Él) le ha contado que María viene/ va a venir **IND** mañana.’)
 (36) Er hat angenommen, Maria komme **KONJ I** morgen. (‘(Él) ha asumido que María viene/ va a venir **IND** mañana.’)
 (37) Er hat angenommen, dass Maria morgen komme **KONJ I**. (‘(Él) ha asumido que María viene/ va a venir **IND** mañana.’)
 (38) Er hat angenommen, dass Maria morgen kommt **IND**. (‘(Él) ha asumido que María viene/ va a venir **IND** mañana.’)
 (39) Er hat ihm vorgeworfen, er sei **KONJ I** voreingenommen. (‘(Él) le ha acusado de tener **INF** prejuicios.’)
 (40) Er hat ihm vorgeworfen, dass er voreingenommen sei **KONJ I**. (‘(Él) le ha acusado de tener **INF** prejuicios.’)
 (41) Er hat ihm vorgeworfen, dass er voreingenommen ist **IND**. (‘(Él) le ha acusado de tener **INF** prejuicios.’)

(39) – (41) are similar to the examples cited by Fabregas (2009: 168) to show the change in communicative value of the lexeme *reprochar* which is very similar to *acusar*, and can be used with the indicative and the subjunctive in Spanish:

- (42) María me reprochó que estoy **IND** engordando.
 (43) María me reprochó que esté **SUB** engordando.

According to Fábregas, in example (42), we have TWO asserted statements ((María le reprochó algo al hablante)¹ + (el hablante está engordando)²), and in (43) we have only ONE asserted statement (María le reprochó algo al hablante) + the repetition of something that the listener already knew (which is presupposed). Because the example is taken out of context, it is difficult to verify if the subjunctive in (43) really signals presupposed information. What seems clear, however, is that the content of the subordinated clause in (43) is NOT just treated as a piece of

information, but also as a personal comment of the narrator, about how he evaluates what Maria said and the effect that it made on him. By definition, a reproach, a critique, a scolding, an admonishment, etc., expresses that the originator of the message (Maria), doesn't want the recipient to do what she actually said, but the contrary ('que (yo) NO engorde'):

- (44) María no quiere que (yo) engorde **SUB**.
 (45) A María no le gusta que (yo) engorde **SUB**.

At the same time, by not treating the message as just a piece of information, with the subjunctive, the narrator distances himself from it and leaves open the possibility that the information is correct or wrong. In German we could translate example (42) as:

- (46) Maria warf mir vor, dass ich dick geworden bin **IND**. (This is a free translation. The literal translation would be 'Maria warf mir vor, dass ich immer dicker werde.' However, the verb *werden* ('to become') doesn't have clearly distinct Konjunktiv I forms, and therefore the verb *sein* ('to be') is better suited to illustrate the differences.)

For example (45) we have several possibilities in German:

- (47) Maria warf mir vor, ich sei **KONJ I** dick geworden.
 (48) Maria warf mir vor, dass ich dick geworden sei **KONJ I**.
 (49) Maria warf mir vor, ich wäre **KONJ II** dick geworden.
 (50) María warf mir vor, dass ich dick geworden wäre **KONJ II**.

With the KONJ II the narrator indicates that the statement is wrong. Zifonun et al., 1997, 1765, state that both structures, the one with the Konjunktiv and without the conjunction *dass* vs. with the conjunction *dass* and the indicative, are interchangeable. This is probably the case, especially in spoken German. Flämig (68) noted as well that after a main clause in the present, the majority of noun clauses introduced by the conjunction *dass* were in the indicative because the grammatical dependency was marked sufficiently with the conjunction. An additional marking with the subjunctive was not necessary. He also noted, "Damit verliert der Konjunktiv im *dass*-Satz ... seine Funktion als Normalmodus mittelbarer Wiedergabe.... An seine Stelle tritt der Indikativ." (When the Konjunktiv in a *dass*-clause loses its function as a standard mood of reported speech...it is replaced by the indicative.) After main clauses in the past tense, however, for several reasons (Flämig, 70-76), the present subjunctive as a marker of reported speech, is more frequent. On the other hand, the comparison of example (46) with the examples (47) – (50), also shows that even in subordinated *dass*-clauses, the KONJ I does not lose its capacity to present the original message NOT as an absolute fact, or just as a piece of information, but just as a possibility. By the same token, the KONJ II never loses its meaning 'counterfactuality.'

6. The subjunctive as a marker of 'subordinance'

In the previous section it has been shown that the present subjunctive in German functions basically as a marker of subordination and signals that the proposition in which it stands is incomplete and must be interpreted with the help of other contextual elements; specifically the meaning of the main or matrix verb. To come back to our

example, ‘*Maria komme morgen*’ is not an independent statement. It is either an indirect speech act or the expression of a wish (in old fashioned German). It has also been shown that even in subordinated *dass*-clauses the KONJ I doesn’t lose its capacity to present the original message NOT as an absolute fact, or just as a piece of information, but as a possibility. This confirms the general assumption that the subjunctive cannot be used for assessing or declaring something or linked to the theory that this mood is a marker of subordination or ‘subordinance.’ This idea was developed by Tagagaki (1984), among others, especially in part 3 of his article, pages 250-253. He bases his theory on the simple fact “that a simple, declarative sentence is typically indicative” (1984: 250). Then he introduces “the term INDEPENDENCY to define such a characteristic that a simple, declarative sentence may possess” (1984: 251), and formulates the following rule: (19) INDEPENDENCY = the quality of a proposition “affirmatively evaluated” and also “stated”.

He exemplifies “affirmatively evaluated” with the matrix verb CREO (QUE) and “stated” with DIGO (QUE). (251). His term ‘independency’ equals the term ‘assertion.’ Accordingly, ‘SUBORDINANCE’ stands for the opposite of ‘assertion.’ Finally, he correlates ‘independency’ with the indicative and ‘subordinance’ (syntactic and semantic subordination) with the subjunctive. For Tagagaki, an otherwise complete proposition or sentence with a verb in subjunctive does not have independency, because it has not yet achieved the “stating force” and only “the status of a logical propositional structure”. Therefore, the subjunctive can only stand in dependent clauses, and all independent uses of subjunctive forms that R. Lenz (1935, 445) considers the remains of earlier linguistic stages, are seen as dependent on an underlying matrix.

Ahern (2008) also departs from the idea that the indicative corresponds to assertion and the subjunctive to non-assertion. She writes, “The use of the indicative marks the clause as information that is being asserted, and the subjunctive shows that the proposition is being expressed as non-assertion.” (2008: 204) She reintroduces the old idea, which seems to have gotten lost in the frenzy to find THE basic meaning of the subjunctive, namely that there are different kinds of meaning involved in the production of utterances, and that languages are modular systems. In other words, the linguistic competence of a speaker consists of many domains, from the phonetic to the pragmatic level. The semantic content, especially of morphemes, graphemes and grammatical structures, is very general and the “role of inferential processes in utterance interpretation is to enrich” and update the content “in order to lead to the intended interpretation” (p. 210). Based on relevant theoretical premises, she distinguishes between conceptual and procedural expressions. These are distinctions introduced by Blakemore (1987) and further developed by Wilson and Sperber (1993), according to Ahern. Categories such as mood are considered part of procedural expressions that “constitute simple instructions indicating how the conceptual content of the utterance is to be interpreted”. This produces the effect that “although the embedded clauses...are in theory structurally lower than the subordinating verb, their mood determines the overall interpretation”. Ahern uses this idea to explain the change of meaning in “double selection verbs” such as *decir* in the example, *Juan dice que son las siete*. (‘Juan says it is seven o’clock.’) and *Juan dice que María vaya al cine con él*. (‘Juan tells María to go to the movies with him.’), which can also be seen in examples (25) and (27), copied below as (51) and (52):

- (51) Sie sagt, Maria komme **SUB** morgen. [SHE SAYS, MARIA COME TOMORROW.]
 (‘Ella dice que María viene/ va a venir **IND** mañana.’) (indirect speech)

- (52) Sie sagt, Maria solle/ möge/ müsse **MOD-SUB** morgen kommen. [SHE SAYS, MARIA MUST/ SHALL TOMORROW COME.] ('Ella dice que María venga **SUB** mañana.') (indirect speech + wish)

Because of its lack of predicative force, compared with the indicative, the subjunctive can only be used in contexts of subordination and interpreted in combination with the main verb of the sentence. With the subjunctive we cannot state anything and represent it as something independent from "personal or social bias." (Bolinger, 1953, 461) In the following example (53), the use of the subjunctive prevents us from interpreting *a la universidad le sea más rentable dedicar este espacio para acoger a nuevos estudiantes* as an absolute and independent statement, 'for the university it is more economical to use this space for taking in new students,' an "item of information", an "assessment" or a "declaration" by the speaker. Because English doesn't use the subjunctive in this context, we could translate the example as, 'maybe it is more profitable for the university to ...', with the adverb ('maybe'), or just as, 'it is my understanding that it is more profitable for the university to...', without any modal marker. Due to the lack of a productive verb mood system, the English speaker is conditioned to rely more on 'lexical clues' in the main clause ('it is my understanding'), which equally expresses "personal or social bias".

- (53) Para Martínez, "es una pena que una colección de este tipo, con un valor histórico -que no científico- indudable pueda perderse. La colección, de 6.000 piezas, ocupa una planta entera de la Facultad de Medicina de París y entiendo que a la universidad le sea más rentable dedicar este espacio para acoger a nuevos estudiantes. (REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA: Banco de datos (CREA) [en línea]. Corpus de referencia del español actual. <<http://www.rae.es>> [10/18/2013]

7. The subjunctive after expressions of wish order, desire, doubt, opposition and prohibition in German

As we have shown above, the main function of the present subjunctive (Konjunktiv I) in German is to mark reported speech in subordinated clauses. Furthermore, it is used in syntactically independent clauses, especially in standing phrases and exclamations to express wishes, hopes and desires, which also include requests, warning, exhortations, curses, etc. In dependent noun clauses all the examples without the conjunction *dass* are similar to example (27), reproduced below as example (54):

- (54) Elena sagt, Maria solle/ möge/ müsse **MOD-KONJ I** morgen kommen. [SHE SAYS MARIA MUST/ SHALL TOMORROW COME.] ('Ella dice que María venga **SUB** mañana.')

Here the original proposition is already a wish or a request and *sagen* ('to say', 'decir') is used as a volitive verb. The Konjunktiv in (54) only adds the information 'reported speech'.

The following is an example with the verb *wünschen* ('to wish', 'desear') in the main clause, which can also be used as a verb of communication:

- (55) Er wünscht, sie bleibe **KONJ I** noch länger./ Er wünscht, sie möge **MOD KONJ I** noch länger bleiben. [HE WISHES, SHE STAY A LITTLE LONGER. / HE

WISHES, SHE MAY A LITTLE LONGER STAY.] (‘(Él) desea que (ella) se quede **SUB** más tiempo.’)

The Konjunktiv I, again, would signal reported speech. Nevertheless, German speakers would probably use the Konjunktiv II in this case and say:

- (56) Er wünscht, sie bleibe **KONJ II** noch länger./ Er wünscht, sie möge **KONJ I** noch länger bleiben. [HE WISHES SHE STAYED A LITTLE LONGER. / HE WISHES SHE MAY STAY A LITTLE LONGER.] (‘(Él) desea que (ella) se quede **SUB** más tiempo.’)

The Konjunktiv II used here has substituted the Konjunktiv I for two reasons: First, even though the KONJ I form is marked as a subjunctive form (the indicative would be *bleibt*), it resembles the first person present indicative *bleibe*. Second, the Konjunktiv II, which stems from the preterit, signals non-facticity, which could be interpreted as a mental operation such as, ‘If she STAYED, why would you wish for it?’

Again it would be possible here to use the subordinating conjunction ‘*dass*’ with the dependent verb in subjunctive (57) or in indicative (58):

- (57) Er wünscht, dass sie noch länger bleibe **KONJ I**/ bleibe **KONJ II**. [HE WISHES THAT SHE A LITTLE LONGER STAY/ STAYED.] (‘(Él) desea que (ella) se quede **SUB** más tiempo.)
- (58) Er wünscht, dass sie noch länger bleibt **IND**. [HE WISHES THAT SHE A LITTLE LONGER STAYS.] (‘(Él) desea que (ella) se quede **SUB** más tiempo.’)

The possibility to use either the SUB or the IND in the two German examples (57) and (58), again, might lie in the characteristic word order with the final position of the verb, indicating that the dependent clause is not to be understood as an independent statement, but as the object of the main verb that characterizes the dependent clause clearly as a wish and not a reality. It would sound strange in German to use the dependent verb in IND and with the typical word order for declarations:

- (59) [?]Er wünscht, sie bleibt **IND** noch. [HE WISHES SHE STAYS A LITTLE LONGER.] (‘*(Él) desea que (ella) se queda **IND** más tiempo.’)

The reason for this is the fact that we now have two contradicting statements, ‘he wishes (something)’ and ‘she continues to stay.’ A listener would ask, ‘If she continues to stay, why would he still have to wish for it?’ The dependent proposition is the object of a wish and must, therefore, look like a wish. The NGLÉ (2009) refers to this as ‘compatibility’ or ‘semantic agreement’, “Las relaciones que cabe establecer entre elementos inductores de modo son todavía más estrechas. El régimen constituye una forma de compatibilidad o de CONGRUENCIA SEMÁNTICA,…” (1869/70) This also has to do with the fact that the possible fulfillment of wishes in the present always points to an uncertain future. Therefore, the use of the present indicative in German and Spanish (59) sounds ungrammatical. This suggests that the meaning of the subjunctive is indeed minimal and limited to signal subordination, and that the meaning of wish (and, consequently, futurity, non-reality, etc.) is almost completely realized by the main verb and other contextual elements. The KONJ II in German signals less probability and even counterfacticity, but this might just be the effect of the contradiction between the typical meaning of the main predicate and a remnant of

the meaning of the preterit. This is why A. Bello (1981) wrote, "Llámanse MODOS las inflexiones del verbo en cuanto provienen de la influencia o régimen de una palabra o frase a que esté o pueda estar subordinado" (327). Those who quote Bello, for example R. Lenz (1935), who criticizes the Venezuelan author and writes: "[Bello] parte de la base de que las formas estén o puedan estar dependientes de ciertos verbos dominantes" (452), which by the way, is an excellent example of the meaning of the subjunctive, often forget to mention that, in the first four editions of his grammar, the author also mentions the contrast between assertion and non-assertion. Here he wrote: "El Modo indicativo sirve para los juicios afirmativos o negativos, sea de la persona que habla, sea de otra persona indicada en la proposición de que dependa el verbo. (p. 330)... Llámanse subjuntivas las formas verbales en que no se afirma ni se niega (p. 337)". This idea, though, disappears in the last edition, which became the starting point for all subsequent editions of his grammar.

In English, where the subjunctive is used even less than in German, the only possibility to translate the German examples (57) and (58) seems with a modal verb:

(60) He wishes (that) she could/would stay longer.

The verb *hoffen* ('to hope', 'esperar') is very similar:

- (61) Er hofft, dass sie noch bleibe **KONJ I** / bliebe **KONJ II**. Er hofft, dass sie noch bleiben möge **KONJ I**. ('(Él) espera que (ella) se quede **SUB** más tiempo.')
- (62) Er hofft, dass sie noch bleibt **IND**. ('(Él) espera que (ella) se quede **SUB** más tiempo.')
- (63) ?Er hofft, sie bleibt **IND** noch. [***(ÉL) ESPERA (ELLA) SE QUEDA IND MÁS TIEMPO.**]

The same goes for the verb *wollen* ('to wish/want', 'querer'). Here the **IND** and the typical word order for a declaration does not only sound strange, but is clearly ungrammatical:

- (64) *Er will, sie bleibt **IND** noch. [***(ÉL) QUIERE, (ELLA) SE QUEDA IND MÁS TIEMPO.**]

After expressions of doubt, for example *ich glaube nicht* ('I don't think', 'no creo'), German doesn't use the subjunctive. The use of the subordinating conjunction '*dass*' (65) and the resulting sentence structure are mandatory and the omission (66) leads to an ungrammatical sentence:

- (65) Ich glaube nicht, dass er noch kommt **IND**. [***NO CREO, QUE (ÉL) TODAVÍA VIENE IND.**]
- (66) *Ich glaube nicht, er kommt **IND** noch. [***NO CREO, (ÉL) VIENE IND TODAVÍA.**]

The same is true for other expressions of doubt, such as *bezweifeln* ('to doubt, 'dudar'), *es ist unmöglich* ('it is impossible', 'es imposible'), etc.:

- (67) Ich bezweifle, dass er noch kommt **IND**. [***DUDO, QUE (ÉL) TODAVÍA VIENE IND.**]
- (68) *Ich bezweifle, er kommt **IND** noch. [***DUDO, (ÉL) VIENE IND TODAVÍA.**]

- (69) Es ist unmöglich, dass er noch kommt **IND**. [*ES IMPOSIBLE, QUE (ÉL) TODAVÍA VIENE **IND**.]
- (70) *Es ist unmöglich, er kommt (IND) noch. [*ES IMPOSIBLE, (ÉL) VIENE **IND** TODAVÍA.]

The comparison between volitive expressions (*sagen, wünschen, hoffen, sollen*), and verbs of doubt (*nicht glauben, bezweifeln*), both of which are normally used with the subjunctive in Spanish, shows that the main function of the Konjunktiv I in German is to mark reported (indirect) speech in subordinated clauses that otherwise couldn't be recognized as such or mistaken for direct speech acts, that is, statements made by the original speaker. Wishes and similar concepts can be expressed with the Konjunktiv I, but to avoid this double function (reported speech and volition), German also uses modal auxiliary verbs (*müssen, sollen, mögen, wollen*, etc.) or the Konjunktiv II. In subordinated *dass*-clauses, there is a strong tendency to use the indicative because the main verb characterizes the dependent clause clearly as a wish and not a reality. Expressions of doubts and negative judgments are not expressed with the Konjunktiv in German because they don't report but contradict what others say; it does not seem to be a function of the Konjunktiv.

8. The subjunctive after expressions of wish order, desire, doubt, opposition and prohibition in Spanish

Generally speaking, in Spanish, all verbs and expressions in the main clause that characterize the content of a subordinated noun clause not as an independent statement but as an intention or negative judgment of the speaker or sentence subject, are normally used with the subjunctive. We can find this mood in combination with wishes, orders, aspirations, hopes, needs, suggestions, advice, opposition, disagreement, doubts or other feelings of the speaker or sentence subject. What distinguishes these expressions from verbs and expressions that are used with the indicative, is that the speaker or sentence subject tries to influence, manipulate and modify whatever is expressed in the dependent clause. Here are some examples:

- (71) Dice que Juan vendrá **IND** mañana. (The coming is presented as a statement.)
- (72) Sé que Juan vendrá **IND** mañana. (The coming is presented as a statement.)
- (73) Creo que Juan vendrá **IND** mañana. (The coming is presented as a statement.)
- (74) Estoy convencido de que Juan vendrá **IND** mañana. (The coming is presented as a statement)
- (75) Quiero que Juan venga **SUB** mañana. (The coming is presented as the speaker's intention and therefore non-existent at the time of utterance.)
- (76) Dudo que Juan venga **SUB** mañana. (The coming is presented as contrary to the speaker's intention and non-existent at the time of utterance.)
- (77) Es posible que Juan venga **SUB** mañana. (The coming is presented as a possibility and non-existent at the time of utterance.)
- (78) Temo que Juan venga **SUB** mañana. (The coming is presented as contrary to the speaker's intention and non-existent at the time of utterance.)
- (79) Me alegro que Juan venga **SUB** mañana. (The coming is presented as dependent on the speaker's positive feelings or intention and non-existent at the time of utterance.)

All noun clauses are marked as subordinated clauses by the conjunction *que*, which is mandatory in these contexts. The indicative of the dependent verb marks the event

as a statement, a piece of information, and specifies the meaning of the polysemous verb *decir* in the following examples as *informar* (80), as opposed to *querer que* with the subjunctive (81).

- (80) Dice que Juan vendrá **IND** mañana. (= 'Informa que Juan vendrá mañana.')
(81) Dice que Juan venga **SUB** mañana (= 'Quiere que Juan venga mañana.')

In Spanish there is no need to use the subjunctive to mark reported (indirect) speech because here subordination is already signaled with the conjunction *que*. There are only a few exceptions with what Delbecque and Lamiroy call, "verbos de orientación prospectiva, en particular, de temor, voluntad y deseo" (1999: 2006) that can be used under certain conditions, without the conjunction *que*, but ONLY with the subjunctive:

- (82) Temo lleven **SUB** retraso a causa del tráfico.
(83) Una señora esperaba se le concediera **SUB** pensión por ser nieta legítima de José Manuel Díaz [Maroquín, Blas Gil; Tomado del DCRLC, s.v. esperar] (both examples taken from Delbecque/ Lamiroy)

As can be seen in the previous two examples, because in Spanish the subjunctive is not used to signal reported or indirect speech, the difference between present and past subjunctive is temporal and obeys the rules of *consecutio temporum*.

9. Stand-alone subjunctives and subordination

The fact that the subjunctive can also be used in (pseudo)independent phrases and exclamation, does not contradict the nature of the subjunctive as a marker of subordination. Exclamations such as *¡Viva el rey!* or *Que viva el rey!* are highly contextualized and depend on an implicit subject, in this case the people shouting it, and an implicit main verb such as *queremos que* or *deseamos que*.

Neither does the fact that the indicative can be used in subordinate clauses contradict the idea of the subjunctive as marker of subordination.

- (84) Juan cree que María está **IND** enferma.
(85) Juan no cree que María esté **SUB** enferma.

Even though both noun clauses are subordinated, only the noun clause in (84) could stand alone or be converted to a main clause, coordinated with another main clause:

- (86) María está enferma y Juan lo cree.

This is not possible in (85). All we can do is guessing what Juan believes if he doesn't believe that Marie is sick. The most obvious conclusion is that Marie is not sick. This is what De Jonge (2001), among others, calls a 'contextual alternative.' Therefore, because we cannot declare anything directly with the subjunctive, speakers use it as a polite way to express the contrary of what is said.

Because in Spanish, the conjunction *que*, with the exception of some very rare uses, is necessary to introduce any kind of noun clause, contrary to German and English, for example, speakers use the subjunctive as an additional marker of semantic subordination under the predicate of the main clause.

10. Subjunctive and Infinitive

From this perspective, the subjunctive could be a transitional mood between the indicative, which is fully operable due to its marks of person and tense, and the infinitive. The latter can never form the predicate of independent sentences because it is lacking any reference to person and tense. It can only be used in very specific contexts, for example the word ‘Enter’ on signs posted in front of a store. The subjunctive, finally, with its two basic conjugations in modern Spanish (if we exclude the two perfective analytic forms and consider the two past subjunctive forms – *hablara/hablase*– more or less interchangeable), but with only one form for first and third person singular, stands somehow in between the indicative and the infinitive. The same idea was put forward by Dietrich (1981). From a structural linguistic perspective and based upon the notions of “actualité” and “inactualité” that Coseriu (1976) used to describe the verb system in the Romance languages, Dietrich (1981, 404) reaches the conclusion that one can notice the “inactualité de l’acción” in the subjunctive as well as in the infinitive. He writes:

“Si le subjonctif exclut la prise en consideration de la réalisation de l’action et que l’indicatif l’inclut expressément par une détermination grammaticale, l’infinitif est beaucoup plus vague et, de par sa signification catégorématique, ne fait que nommer l’action dans sa forme la plus inactuelle possible... Cela n’empêche pas que, du point de vue modal, l’infinitif se révèle entre la forme la plus proche du subjonctif, et viceversa.” (If the subjunctive excludes taking into consideration the realization of the action and if the indicative includes it specifically with the help of a grammatical specification, the infinitive is much more unspecific, and, due to its meaning as a grammatical category, only expresses the action in the most virtual form possible. Despite of the difference and from the point of view of mood, the infinitive proves to be the closest form to the subjunctive and vice versa.) (1981, 404-405)

One could even go one step further and argue that, in English, the subjunctive has been almost entirely replaced by the infinitive:

- (87) I will ask the administration that the course be cancelled. (**SUB** in written and educated English)
 (88) I will ask the administration to cancel the course. (**INF** in everyday English)

This hypothesis would explain why the infinitive in Spanish is used for commands, for example for instructions in textbooks, instead of formal commands, for which we use the third person subjunctive:

- (89) Rellenar los siguientes espacios punteados ... Señalar los elementos de la situación ... Indicar los elementos ...

~~instead of formal commands, for which we use the third person subjunctive:~~

- (90) Rellene los siguientes espacios punteados ... Señale los elementos de la situación ... Indique los elementos ...

The reason for this is that both the subjunctive and the infinitive can only be used in very specific situations where the roles of “who has to do what” are clearly defined and could be paraphrased with:

- (91) Es necesario rellenar ... señalar ... indicar ...

- (92) Es necesario que rellene ... señale ... indique ...

Even though in Spanish the subjunctive is not used to characterize indirect speech, we can very often find the infinitive in this context:

- (93) El Roto, que dice ser optimista a pesar de la desesperanza que transmiten sus dibujos, tampoco se considera un humorista puro. (REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA: Banco de datos (CREA) en línea. Corpus de referencia del español actual. <<http://www.rae.es>> [10/18/2013])
- (94) El comunicado de la federación de Barcelona -que dice ser "consciente del sacrificio" que supone para Pujol que "un hombre tan fundamental para el partido" esté en disposición de "multiplicar su capacidad de trabajo en la obtención de la alcaldía"- constituye, de hecho, el primer material de campaña de las elecciones locales de 1995. (REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA: Banco de datos (CREA) en línea. Corpus de referencia del español actual. <<http://www.rae.es>> [10/18/2013])

11. Conclusions and outlook

The comparison of Spanish and German shows that the subjunctive and the Konjunktiv in both languages signal subordination and dependency. Because the subjunctive is a grammatical, specifically a morphological category, there is no need to assign it a single conceptual meaning, but just a very general (grammatical) one. This meaning that, following A. Ahren's argument, could be called procedural, is activated to express that a predicate should not be taken as an absolute statement, but as something that must be interpreted or processed according to the context, and, in the case of the subjunctive/ Konjunktiv, as something that signals a "contextual alternative."

This explains why the subjunctive use, even in the Romance languages, represents only a small percentage compared with the indicative. The economy of language reserves the subjunctive for those situations, requiring additional steps in the interpretation of messages and can have a variety of communicative functions, i.e. for indirect (polite) commands (95); expression of intentions, ideas or hypothesis (96); doubt, polite rebuttal, negation, critique, disapproval (95); uncertainty, indecisiveness, hesitancy (97), etc.

- (95) Quiero que vayas al cine con tu hermana. Me gustaría que fueras al cine con tu hermana. Es necesario que vayas al cine con tu hermana. ¿Es posible que vayas al cine con tu hermana? Mi sueño es que vayas al cine con tu hermana.
- (96) He pensado que sea usted el que se encargue del asunto.
- (97) a. Dudo que las guerras sean necesarias. No creo que las guerras sean necesarias. No me gusta la filosofía que las guerras sean necesarias. Piensa en la idea que las guerras sean necesarias. Me entristece la idea que las guerras sean necesarias.
- b. "Desgraciadamente la atmósfera del hospital se refleja en el aspecto del presidente, no puedo decir que parezca sano", declaró anoche Iliushin a la agencia Tass. (REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA: Banco de datos (CREA) en línea. Corpus de referencia del español actual. <<http://www.rae.es>> [10/18/2013])
- (98) a. Ahora bien, no sé que tan democrático sea que esas decisiones queden circunscritas al Conac, por un lado, o al Congreso, por el otro. (REAL

ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA: Banco de datos (CREA) en línea. Corpus de referencia del español actual. <<http://www.rae.es>> [10/18/2013]

b. "Es lo único que tengo claro", dice, aunque espera "que me vengan a visitar mis hijas -la nieta no estoy seguro que venga- y otros familiares y amigos que son entrañables y estoy seguro que van a venir". (REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA: Banco de datos (CREA) en línea. Corpus de referencia del español actual. <<http://www.rae.es>> [10/18/2013])

c. Vendré cuando tenga tiempo.

This also answers the question why matrix verbs expressing emotions with ‘factitive’ objects are usually followed by the subjunctive, at least in peninsular Spanish, but also with the indicative, especially in Latin American Spanish. Here is a good example with ‘*alegrarse de*’:

- (99) a. Calixto y Florinda caminaban tomados de la mano repasando recuerdos, admirando los cambios producidos en la arquitectura de algunos lugares o, inclusive, modificaciones en el trazo urbano de Montetur que, entonces, ya comenzaba a vencer el sopor de pueblo relegado para lanzarse a la loca carrera de crecimiento que lo convirtió en ciudad, con todos los conflictos que ello produce. Se dirigieron a la casa de Jonás Viricochea, pues Calixto había traído un obsequio para su amigo y salvador. Encontraron al flaco en sus quehaceres cotidianos; pues entraron de rondón.
¡Cuánto me alegro que hayas venido! Ayer supe de tu llegada y me extrañaba... (REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA: Banco de datos (CREA) en línea. Corpus de referencia del español actual. <<http://www.rae.es>> [10/18/2013])

Jonás Viricochea doesn't say *me alegro que has venido* because stating the obvious fact would be absurd. Jonás' intention here is to criticize, indirectly and with subtlety, that Calixto has not come earlier to see him. The indicative would not convey the same message.

The same applies to propositions introduced by *aunque* followed by a ‘fact’, which are often seen as exceptions that cannot be explained with crude truth semantics, such as the following example:

- (100) Para conseguirlo reiteró su confianza plena en Fernando Vázquez como responsable técnico: "Sería justo que a un entrenador gallego que hemos contratado con mucha ilusión se le reconociese su trabajo. Es un hombre que sabe lo que hace, pero hay que tener en cuenta la dificultad de esta categoría. Espero que en Balaídos la gente entienda que aunque sea gallego está capacitado. Llevamos catorce años sin estar en Segunda y entiendo que esto es difícil, pero ascender sería algo muy bonito", matizó. (REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA: Banco de datos (CREA) en línea. Corpus de referencia del español actual. <<http://www.rae.es>> [10/18/2013])

In my opinion, this has nothing to do with a ‘presupposed’ or ‘thematic’ use, nor should it be an exception. *Aunque sea gallego* is not a statement, because it had already been stated in the sentence before with *un entrenador gallego que hemos contratado*, and means ‘aunque es sólo gallego’ or ‘aunque no es un entrenador de fama mundial’. With the subjunctive we always invite the listener or reader to think

and to go beyond what is said or written. By the same token, the use of the subjunctive also opens the door to deception, purposely nebulous messages, distraction, unexpected turns in the argument structure, manipulation, etc., as has been shown by Lavandera (1990). The subjunctive creates a fictitious, alternative world and signals that the dependent predicate must be interpreted according to the context and not taken as a literal statement. With the subjunctive we don't refer to something that IS (exists, is going on, is considered a fact, happens, etc.), but something that COULD BE or COULD NOT BE (hypothetical, is contrary to what is said, fictitious, intended, etc.)

References

- Ahern, A. (2008). Mood Choice and Sentence Interpretation in Spanish. *Cahiers Chronos*, 13: 201-214.
- Bausch, K. (1979). *Modalität und Konjunktivgebrauch in der gesprochenen deutschen Standardsprache*. Teil I. München, Hueber.
- Bello, A. (1981). *Gramática de la lengua castellana destinada al uso de los americanos*. Edited by Ramón Trujillo. Santa Cruz de Tenerife.
- Becker, M. (2010). Mood in Portuguese, in B. Rothstein & R. Thieroff (eds.), *Mood in the Languages of Europe*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. 179-197.
- Bergs, A. & L. Heine (2010). Mood in English, in B. Rothstein & R. Thieroff (eds.) *Mood in the Languages of Europe*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. 103-114.
- Blakemore, D. (1987). *Semantic Constraints on Relevance*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Bolinger, D. L. (1953). Verbs of Emotion. *Hispania* 36 (4), pp. 459-461. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/334792>
- Bosque, I. (1990). *Indicativo y subjuntivo*. Madrid, Taurus Universitaria.
- Coseriu, E. (1976). *Das romanische Verbalsystem*. Herausgegeben und bearbeitet von Hansbert Bertsch. Tübingen.
- De Jonge, B. (2001). Spanish Subjunctive Mood: One Form, More than One Meaning?, in Reineke Bok-Bennema et al. (eds.), *Adverbial Modification/La modification adverbiale. Proceedings from the Fifth Colloquium on Romance Linguistics*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. 79-92.
- De Mulder, W. (2010). Mood in French, in B. Rothstein & R. Thieroff (eds.), *Mood in the Languages of Europe*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
- Delbecque, N. & B. Lamiroy (1999). La subordinación sustantiva: Las subordinadas enunciativas en los complementos verbales, in I. Bosque & V. Delmonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. Madrid, Espasa Calpe, pp. 1965-2081.
- Dietrich, W. (1981). Actualité et inactualité de l' action: Les fonctions modales dans le système verbal des langues romanes. *Logos semantikos* 4, pp. 395-416.
- Duden (1984). *Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*. 4. Auflage. Mannheim, Bibliographisches Institut.
- Engel, U. (1988). *Deutsche Grammatik*. 2. Auflage. Heidelberg, Groos.
- RAE (1973), *Esbozo de una nueva gramática de la lengua española [Esbozo]*. Madrid, Espasa Calpe.
- Fábregas, A. (2009). Una contribución a la enseñanza del indicativo y del subjuntivo en ELE. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada* 8, pp. 151-173.
- Flämig, W. (1962). *Zum Konjunktiv in der deutschen Sprache der Gegenwart*. Berlin.

- Giannakidou, A. (2009). The dependency of the subjunctive revisited: Temporal semantics and polarity. *Lingua* 119, pp. 1883-1908. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2008.11.007>
- Giorgi, A. (2009). Toward a syntax of the subjunctive mood. *Lingua* 119, 12: 1837-1858. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2008.11.008>
- Harris, J. (1765). *Hermes or a philosophical inquiry concerning universal grammar*. London.
- Jäger, S. (1971). *Der Konjunktiv in der deutschen Sprache der Gegenwart*. München/Düsseldorf, Hueber/ Schwann.
- Jung, W. (1967). *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*. VEB Bibliographisches Institut Leipzig.
- Jung, W. (1980). *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*. 6. Auflage. Leipzig, Bibliographisches Institut.
- Kasper, W. (1987). *Semantik des Konjunktivs II in Deklarativsätzen des Deutschen*. Tübingen, Niemeyer. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783111371597>
- Kaufmann, G. (1972). *Das konjunktivische Bedingungsgefüge im heutigen Deutsch*. Tübingen, Narr.
- Kempchinsky, P. (2009). What can the subjunctive disjoint reference effect tell us about the subjunctive? *Lingua* 119, pp. 1788-1810. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2008.11.009>
- Laca, B. (2010). Mood in Spanish, in B. Rothstein & R. Thieroff (eds.), *Mood in the Languages of Europe*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. 199-220.
- Lavandera, B. R. (1990). El cambio de modo como estrategia de discurso. Indicativo y subjuntivo, in I. Bosque (coord.), *Indicativo y subjuntivo*. Madrid, Taurus Universitaria, pp. 330-357.
- Lenz, R. (1935). *La oración y sus partes. Estudios de gramática general y castellana*. Tercera edición. Madrid, Centro de Estudios Históricos.
- Moliner, M. (2001). *Diccionario de uso del español*. Madrid, Gredos.
- Palmer, F. R. (2001). *Mood and Modality*. Second edition. Cambridge, Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139167178>
- Poplack, S., Lealess, A. and Dion, N. (2013). The evolving grammar of the French subjunctive. *PROBUS: International Journal of Latin and Romance Linguistics* 25 (1), pp. 139-195.
- Quer, J. (2009). Twist of mood: The distribution and interpretation of indicative and subjunctive. *Lingua* 119, pp. 1779-1787. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2008.12.003>
- Quer, J. (2010). Mood in Catalan. In: B. Rothstein & R. Thieroff (eds.), *Mood in the Languages of Europe*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. 221-236.
- Real Academia Española (2009). *Nueva gramática de la lengua española* (NGLE). Madrid, Espasa.
- Real Academia Española. *Diccionario de la lengua española*. <http://rae.es/recursos/diccionarios/drae>.
- Real Academia Española. *Banco de datos (CREA) en línea. Corpus de referencia del español actual*. <http://corpus.rae.es/creanet.html>.
- Rothstein, B. & Thieroff, R. (2010). *Mood in the Languages of Europe*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/slcs.120>
- Roussou, A. (2009). In the mood for control. *Lingua* 119, pp. 1811-1836. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2008.11.010>
- Ruiz Campillo, J. P. (2007). El concepto de no-declaración como valor del subjuntivo. Protocolo de instrucción operativa de la selección modal en español. *Actas*

- del programa de formación para profesorado de ELE 2006-2007*. München, Insituto Cervantes, pp. 89-146.
- Siegel, L. (2009). Mood selection in Romance and Balkan. *Lingua* 119, pp. 1859-1882. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2008.11.006>
- Squartini, M. (2010). Mood in Italian, in B. Rothstein & R. Thieroff (eds.), *Mood in the Languages of Europe*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. 236-250.
- Takagaki, T. (1984). Subjunctive as the Marker of Subordination. *Hispania* 67 (2), pp. 248-256. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/341735>
- Thieroff, R. (2010). Mood in German, in B. Rothstein & R. Thieroff (eds.), *Mood in the Languages of Europe*. Amsterdam, Benjamins, pp. 132-154.
- Wilson, D. & Sperber, D. (1993). Linguistic form and relevance. *Lingua* 90, pp. 1-25. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841\(93\)90058-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(93)90058-5)
- Zamorano Aguilar, A. (2005). *El subjuntivo en la historia de la gramática española (1771-1973)*. Madrid, Arco Libros, S.L.
- Zifonun *et al.* (1997). *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin / New York, Walter de Gruyter