MOOD AND MODAL CONCORD IN SPANISH DIRECTIVE CLAUSES

Tris Faulkner
Kalamazoo College

ABSTRACT. Directive predicates have meanings that are similar to 'order', 'require', 'recommend', and 'advise'. Being volitional in nature, directives are said to form part of the core group of subjunctive-taking predicates (e.g., Villalta 2008). This means that, like desiderative (e.g., *querer que* 'to want that') and purpose clauses (e.g., *para que* 'so that'), they are expected to, and generally do, take the subjunctive. However, findings from the present investigation suggest that, in spite of this description, there are certain contexts in which indicative, directive complements are strongly preferred. Analyses showed that indicative, directive clauses are strongly preferable to subjunctive complements when the matrix directive and embedded verb are both teleological and weak necessity. In such environments, a concord reading is elicited. In the case of subjunctive complements, they are preferable to indicative, only when there is no concord between the main and embedded, directive predicates. These findings are significant, not only because directives are normatively described as requiring the subjunctive, but also because no previous studies have examined a link between mood and modal concord.

Keywords. mood, modal concord, directives, subjunctive, indicative, Spanish

RESUMEN. Los predicados directivos tienen significados similares a 'ordenar', 'requerir', 'recomendar' y 'aconsejar'. Al ser de naturaleza volitiva, se dice que las estructuras directivas forman parte del grupo central de predicados que toman subjuntivo (p. ej., Villalta 2008). Esto significa que, al igual que las cláusulas desiderativas (p. ej., *querer que*) y de propósito (p. ej., *para que*), se espera que tomen subjuntivo, y generalmente lo hacen. Sin embargo, los hallazgos de la presente investigación sugieren que, a pesar de esta descripción, hay ciertos contextos en los que se prefiere que el complemento directivo aparezca en indicativo. Los análisis mostraron que las cláusulas directivas, indicativas son fuertemente preferibles a los complementos en subjuntivo cuando la matriz directiva y el verbo subordinado son tanto teológicos como de necesidad débil. En tales entornos, se obtiene una lectura de concordancia. En el caso de los complementos en subjuntivo, son preferibles a los de indicativo sólo cuando no hay concordancia entre el predicado directivo principal y el subordinado. Estos hallazgos son significativos no solo porque las estructuras directivas se describen como normativamente subjuntivas, sino también porque ningún estudio previo ha identificado un vínculo entre el modo verbal y la concordancia modal.

Palabras clave. modo, concordancia modal, directivos, subjuntivo, indicativo, español

1   Introduction

The present article seeks to describe the patterns that characterize the mood-taking tendencies (i.e., subjunctive vs. indicative) of Spanish directive complements. However, before delving into any specifics, I will first discuss a few topics that may be relevant to an in-depth understanding of the analysis to come.

2   Modality and Mood
2.1   Classifications of Modality

According to Portner (2009), modality can be defined as "the linguistic phenomenon whereby grammar allows one to say things about, or on the basis of, situations which need not be real" (p. 1). In terms of its classifications, it tends to be sub-divided based on the three levels

of linguistic organization on which it operates; i.e., the SUB-SENTENTIAL, SENTENTIAL, and DISCOURSE levels (Portner 2018: 8).

2.1.1 Sub-sentential Modality

"Sub-sentential modality operates **below** the level of the proposition expressed by a complete sentence" (Portner 2018: 8). It includes propositional attitude verbs (e.g., 'think that *x*' or 'regret that *x*'), modal nouns (e.g., 'the necessity/probability/possibility that *x*'), modal adjectives (e.g., 'it is necessary/probable/possible that *x*'), VERBAL MOOD (i.e., subjunctive vs. indicative), and infinitives (e.g., 'to hope that *x*'), among other types (Portner 2018: 8). Sentences (1) through (5), exemplify these categorizations.

(1)   "**He regrets that** his actions were confusing […]" (Davies' COCA 2008-).[1]
        (Propositional attitude verbal phrase)
(2)   "**It is a possibility that** relevant studies have been missed […]"
        (Davies' COCA 2008-). **(Modal nominative phrase)**
(3)   "[…] **It is necessary that** we address your client's change in financial status since
        our initial filings" (Davies' COCA 2008-). **(Modal adjectival phrase)**
(4)   "What do you think you could do for me **if I were** to hire you?"
        (Davies' COCA 2008-). **(Verbal mood)**
(5)   "[…] Is it too much **to hope that** Rebekah will make some amends and join the
        Mystic Falls High gang?" (Davies' COCA 2008-). **(Infinitival phrase)**

2.1.2 Sentential Modality

Sentential modality functions at the level of the **entire** proposition which, therefore, affects the primary meaning of the sentence (Portner 2018: 9). It includes modal auxiliaries like 'can', modal verbs (e.g., 'should' and 'must'), modal adverbs (e.g., 'probably'), and some tense and aspect forms (Portner 2018: 9). Sentences (6) through (10) below exemplify these distinctions.

(6)   "She **can** dance like a pro while singing live" (Davies' COCA 2008-).
        (Ability 'can')
(7)   "There is no time. You **must** leave before the wizard locks the gates"
        (Davies' COCA 2008-). **(Modal verb)**
(8)   "**Probably**, he wanted to get back at Ella" (Davies' COCA 2008-). **(Modal adverb)**
(9)   "She **will be** sorry" (Davies' COCA 2008-). **(Future tense)**
(10)   "They **are building** a case" (Davies' COCA 2008-). **(Progressive aspect)**

2.1.3 Discourse Modality

At this level of linguistic organization, modality directly contributes meaning in **discourse** (Portner 2018: 9). Some examples include SENTENCE MOOD (e.g., declarative, interrogative, and imperative), evidentiality, and the performative meanings of modal auxiliaries and adverbs (Portner 2018: 9); see examples (11) to (14) below.

(11)   "Just shup up, damn you… Just shut the hell up!" (Davies' COCA 2008-).
        (Imperative)
(12)   "*El profesor español Calderón, y el académico belga Morren, han llegado por
        distintos caminos á unas mismas, ó al menos muy parecidas conclusiones. **Ambos
        opinan que** el fenómeno de la nutrición vegetal á expensas de diferentes individuos*

---

[1] COCA: The Corpus of Contemporary American English – see Davies (2008-)

animales, es más general de lo que podría creerse en presencia de los anteriores datos. (9-1878-ASEHN)
'The Spanish professor, Calderon and the Belgian academician, Morren, have arrived by different routes at the same, or at least very similar, conclusions. **They both believe that** the phenomenon of plant nutrition at the expense of different individual animals is more general than one might think in the light of the previous data'"(Kotwica 2018: 68). **(Evidentiality)**

(13)   "*Ahora bien, se reconoce también universalmente que toda la muchedumbre de células, contenidas en una planta pluricelular, proceden de la célula única, por que comenzó aquélla (...).* (10-1878-ASEHN)
'However, **it is also universally recognized** that the whole mass of cells contained in a multicellular plant are derived from the single cell from which it originated (…)'" (Kotwica 2018: 68). **(Evidentiality)**

(14)   "[…] She **might** fancy a visit" (Davies' COCA 2008-). **(Modal auxiliary)**

2.2   Classifications of Sentential Modality

In the case of sentential modality (2.1.2), Portner (2018, 2009) distinguishes between three primary categories: EPISTEMIC, PRIORITY, and DYNAMIC modals. Epistemic modality concerns what can be concluded based on the knowledge that a particular individual possesses (Portner 2018: 10).

(15)   "Consumers **might** run out of things to buy, the stock market **might** crash, or a recession **might** occur" (Davies' COCA 2008-). **(Epistemic)**

Priority modals, on the other hand, concern rules, desires, and goals which serve to identify a given possibility as being more important, or better than another (Portner 2009). They include DEONTIC (i.e., "regulatory" modals, e.g., 'must'), BOULETIC (i.e., desire-based modals, e.g., 'should'), and TELEOLOGICAL (i.e., goal-oriented modals, e.g., 'could') modal predicates.

(16)   "Garbage **must** be discarded properly or it will draw bears"
        (Davies' COCA 2008-). **(Deontic)**
(17)   "You **should** call Sam and let him know you're ok" (Davies' COCA 2008-).
        (Bouletic)
(18)   "Or, you **could** add some to [the] processed pickles or olives already sitting in the fridge" (Davies' COCA 2008-). **(Teleological)**

Finally, dynamic modality concerns how certain events may turn out, based on factual circumstances (Portner 2018). It includes volitional (e.g., ability modals like 'can'), intrinsic (e.g., modals that indicate future possibilities, as determined by historical patterns), and quantificational modal statements (i.e., existential and universal modal sentences) (Portner 2018).

(19)   "I **can** run ten miles in my sleep" (Davies' COCA 2008-). **(Volitional)**
(20)   "**Every** empire eventually **falls**" (Portner 2018: 11). **(Intrinsic)**
(21)   "Dogs **can** be really clever" (Davies' COCA 2008-). **(Existential)**
(22)   "It is a myth that dog **will** eat everything" (Davies' COCA 2008-). **(Universal)**

2.3   Verbal and Sentence Mood

As discussed briefly in section (2.1), the term MOOD corresponds with both sub-sentential (verbal mood) and sentential modalities (sentence mood). Whereas verbal mood (abbreviated

as **VM** in the examples to follow) is the category that includes indicatives and subjunctives, sentence mood (abbreviated as **SM** in the examples to come) is that which entails interrogatives, declaratives, and imperatives (Portner 2018). Sentences (23) through (27) provide examples of this contrast.

(23)   *Lorena,* ***consulté***   *con un médico para contestarte.*
         Lorena,   consult.PAST.INDIC.1SG with a   doctor   for   answer.INF.you
         'Lorena, I consulted with a doctor in order to answer you.'
         (Davies' Corpus del Español 2016-). **(Indicative) (VM)**

(24)   *Carla, yo te   recomiendo*   *que* ***consultes***
         Carla,   I   you recommend.PRES.INDIC.1SG   that consult.PRES.SUBJ.2SG
         con un neurólogo.
         with a   neurologist.
         'Carla, I recommend that you consult with a neurologist.'
         (Davies' Corpus del Español 2016-). **(Subjunctive) (VM)**

(25)   *¿**En qué** proyectos te   gusta*   *participar?*
          In which projects   you   please.PRES.INDIC.3SG   participate.INF
         'In which projects do you like to participate?'
         (Davies' Corpus del Español 2016-). **(Interrogative) (SM)**

(26)   ***A   mí no me gusta***   ***participar***
          OBJ me not   me please.PRES.INDIC.3SG   participate.INF
         en intercambio de regalos
          in exchange   of   gifts
          "I don't like participating in gift exchanges."
         (Davies' Corpus del Español 2016-). **(Declarative) (SM)**

(27)   *¡**Participemos**,*   *la democracia es*   *nuestra!*
         Participate.PRES.IMP.1PL, the democracy be.PRES.INDIC.3SG   ours
         'Let's participate, democracy is ours!'
         (Davies' Corpus del Español 2016-). **(Imperative) (SM)**

In example (23) above, we can observe that the predicate *consultar* 'to consult' is conjugated in the preterite tense of the indicative mood. This makes sense since the goal of the statement is to communicate a fact rather than a desire or will. However, in (24), a directive statement, we see that the same verb *consultar* appears in the present subjunctive. Again, this is not unexpected since a recommendation, which may or may not be heeded (i.e., a non-fact), is being relayed. Sentences (25), (26), and (27) represent sentence mood, where each respectively denotes a question, declaration, and command.

2.4   Modality, Mood, and Directives
In section (2), we appropriately discussed the relationship between modality (the linguistic phenomenon which allows us to talk about situations which may or may not be real (Portner 2018)) and mood (linguistic forms which express modal meaning (Portner 2018)), a distinction which directly ties in with the main argument to be introduced in the present paper. In the units to come, we will examine how the mood of a directive, subordinate clause (i.e., the (non)requirement of the subjunctive) is influenced by the type of modality attached to the particular directive statement (i.e., teleological).

3   Comparison-based Semantics and Directive Predicates
Directive predicates have meanings similar to 'order', 'require', 'recommend', and 'advise'. They "report directive speech acts of the kind which would be performed with imperative

clauses" (Portner 2018: 72). Being volitional in nature, directives are said to form part of the core group of subjunctive-taking predicates (e.g., Anand and Hacquard 2013; Portner 2018). This means that, like desiderative (e.g., *querer que* 'to want that') and purpose clauses (*para que* 'so that'), they are expected to, and generally do, take the subjunctive (e.g., Borrego et al. 1989; Portner 2018; Romero 2012; Villalta 2008).

(28) *Le   aconsejó/recomendó   que lo*
      S/he/you   advise/recommend.PAST.INDIC.3SG   that him
      perdonara.
      forgive.PAST.SUBJ.3SG
      'You/she/he advised/recommended that s/he/you forgive him.'
      (Adapted from Borrego et al. 1989)

Although there is no standard analysis, directives tend to be analyzed as involving a COMPARISON-BASED semantics (e.g., Giorgi and Pianesi 1997; Portner 2018; Villalta 2008). This theory, described by Giorgi and Pianesi (1997), puts forth that, it is always the case that, for any given language, NON-REALISTIC contexts of evaluation pattern together with non-empty ORDERING SOURCES, with respect to the choice of the **subjunctive** as the (grammatical) mood of a modalized clause (pp. 213-214). This, they state, is the reason for which volitional, desiderative, and directive contexts consistently induce the subjunctive across languages (p. 213). Let's explore this idea further with some examples.

(29) *Juan quiere   que María se   marche.*
      John want.PRES.INDIC.3SG   that Mary   REFL leave.PRES.SUBJ.3SG
      'John wants Mary to leave.'
      (Adapted from Giorgi and Pianesi 1997)
(30) *Juan desea   que María se   marche.*
      John desire.PRES.INDIC.3SG   that Mary   REFL leave.PRES.SUBJ.3SG
      'John desires that Mary leave.'
      (Adapted from Giorgi and Pianesi 1997)

As related to sentences (29) and (30), "[…] The proposition 'Mary leaves' is evaluated with respect to the set of John's wishes and desires" (p. 212). This would make the context of evaluation, with respect to both sentences, non-realistic, since we cannot, in any way, assume that John's (or anyone's) desires will materialize in the actual world (p. 212). "Such a set being normative[2], John's desires contribute the ordering source by establishing a bouletic conversational background" (p. 212). This means that John's desires are understood to be ranked or ordered based on his preferences. Thus, in the case of (29) and (30), 'Mary leaving' is ordered or ranked higher (i.e., preferred) as compared to 'Mary staying'. Let's now examine how this concerns directives. If we look back at example (28), repeated below as (31), the proposition 'he is forgiven' is evaluated in terms of what the subject deems possible or necessary with respect to the achievement of a particular goal (i.e., what the particular individual recommends or advises) (e.g., Portner 2018; von Fintel 2006). However, although said subject may order his suggestion (i.e., a teleological ordering source is present) as more important than other, contextually, relevant alternatives (see Villalta 2008) (e.g., that he not be forgiven or that a grudge be upheld), like (29) and (30), the evaluation context is non-realistic, in that recommendations cannot ever be assumed to materialize in the actual world.

---

[2] The set of John's wishes and desires.

(31) *Le*   ***aconsejó/recomendó***   *que lo*
      S/he/you advise/recommend.PAST.INDIC.3SG   that   him
      perdonara*.*
      forgive.PAST.SUBJ.3SG
      'S/he/you advised/recommended that s/he/you forgive him'; as opposed to *not*
      forgiving him.
      (Adapted from Borrego et al. 1989)

Apart from teleological directive statements, which as we saw in (31), prioritize that certain actions take place over others for the fulfilment of a particular goal (i.e., directives that concern suggestions or recommendations, e.g., *sugerir* 'to suggest' and *recomendar* 'to recommend), are directives that express DEONTICITY and BOULETICITY. While directives with deontic ordering sources concern priority based on rules, regulations, or the law, thus, focusing on what is 'right' or 'wrong' (i.e., directives that express commands, mandates, and requirements, e.g., *mandar* 'to order' and *requerir* 'to require'), those whose ordering source is bouletic prioritize the particular subject's personal desires (i.e., directives that convey invitations or permission to carry out a certain act, e.g., *invitar* 'to invite' and *permitir* 'to permit'). Thus, whereas (31) may be understood to be a teleological directive statement, (32) and (33) might respectively be interpreted as deontic and bouletic.

(32) *Le*   ***ordenó/mandó***   *que lo*
      S/he/you advise/recommend.PAST.INDIC.3SG   that   him
      perdonara*.*
      forgive.PAST.SUBJ.3SG
      'S/he/you ordered/commanded that s/he/you forgive him.'
      (Adapted from Borrego et al. 1989)
(33) *Le*   ***invitó a/permitió***   *que lo*
      S/he/you invite/permit.PAST.INDIC.3SG   that   him
      perdonara*.*
      forgive.PAST.SUBJ.3SG
      'S/he/you invited/permitted that s/he/you forgive him.'
      (Adapted from Borrego et al. 1989)

While these sub-categories are not assumed to be mutually exclusive (Portner 2018), it is important to point out that all three contexts are understood to represent comparativity (i.e., the subject's ranking of contextually-relevant alternatives; see Villalta 2008); in each case, the subject prioritizes the individual being forgiven over some alternate, future outcome (e.g., the person in question being convicted, further blamed and persecuted, resented, punished or penalized, or avenged). As discussed by Giorgi and Pianesi (1997), this coincides with each environment's requirement of a subjunctive subordinate clause.

4   The Theory Behind Modal Concord
4.1   Modal Operators
Modal operators (or elements) are words that indicate that a particular proposition should be interpreted as *not*, necessarily concerning a situation that is real or true (see Portner 2018). Examples include 'may', 'might', 'can', 'should', 'must', 'have to', 'recommend that', 'suggest that', 'to be necessary/obligatory that', and so on. As can be inferred from the aforementioned examples, modal operators are not equal across the board, since they may vary based on their various STRENGTHs (Portner 2018). For instance, whereas 'may', 'might', and 'it is possible that' are sometimes referred to as WEAK or POSSIBILTY modals, 'must', 'should',

and 'ought' tend to be labeled STRONG or NECESSITY modals (Portner 2018). Strong modals can be further subdivided into STRONG NECESSITY (e.g., 'must' or 'have to') and WEAK NECESSITY modals (e.g., 'should' or 'recommend') (e.g., Portner 2018). In the section to follow, we will examine how sentences with more than one modal operator may be interpreted differently depending on the strength (e.g., weak necessity vs. strong necessity) and type (e.g., deontic, teleological, or bouletic) of each modal element.

4.2 Cumulative and Concord Modal Readings

4.2.1 Cumulative Modal Readings

If we take a look at sentences (34) and (35) below, we can observe that, whereas (34) has only one modal operator, *recomiendan que* 'they recommend that', (35) has two, *recomiendan que* 'they recommend that' and *sea obligatorio* 'it be obligatory'. In both cases, a subjunctive subordinate clause is required.

(34) ***Recomiendan que se usen en***
Recommend.PRES.INDIC.3PL that   PASSIVE- REFL use.PRES.SUBJ.3SG in
la fase temprana.
the phase early.
'They recommend that it be used in the early phase.'
(Adapted from Davies' Corpus del Español 2016)

(35) ***Recomiendan que sea obligatorio***
Recommend.PRES.INDIC.3PL that be.PRES.SUBJ.3SG   mandatory
usarlos en la fase temprana.
use.INF-them   in the phase   early.
'They recommend that it be obligatory to use them in the early phase.'
(Adapted from Davies' Corpus del Español 2016)

In the case of (35), where the two modal operators are of different strengths (i.e., *recomendar que* → weak necessity, *ser obligatorio* → strong necessity) and types of modality (i.e., *recomendar que* → teleological, *ser obligatorio* → deontic), a CUMULATIVE modal reading is manifested (e.g., Geurts and Huitink 2006; Zeijlstra 2007). This is to say that the matrix and embedded predicates are understood as two, distinct modal expressions; i.e., there is a **recommendation that there be an obligation** to use the object in question in the relevant early phase(s). Thus, the matrix directive (*recomiendan que* 'they recommend that') is interpreted as introducing a second directive instruction, which is that they be (made) obligatory.

4.2.2   Concord Modal Readings

In addition to statements like that of example (35) (i.e., sentences that contain two modal elements of differing strengths and modalities, which results in a cumulative modal reading), are environments in which a CONCORD modal reading is manifested (Geurts and Huitink 2006). Geurts and Huitink (2006) define MODAL CONCORD as the phenomenon in which a sentence with two modal operators, is interpreted as if it contained only a single modal expression (p. 1). They state that there are two constraints that influence the manifestation of a concord construction. The first is that the two modal expressions in question have to be of the same type; for example, both have to be deontic, or teleological, or bouletic, or epistemic[3], and so on

---

[3] As mentioned in section (2), epistemic modality encompasses conclusions that can be drawn based on what a particular individual knows (see Portner 2018). An additional example of such a statement is the following: "The prince thought some witchcraft **must** be at work, and he hastened away before the return of the shepherdess" (Davie's COCA 2008-).

(p. 3). The second is that both have to possess "the same, or at least similar, quantificational force" (p. 3); (e.g., weak, weak necessity, strong necessity, etc.) (see Portner 2018). For instance:

"The preferred interpretation of [36] is the concord reading which says that the speaker considers it possible that you have read his monograph, not the cumulative one, according to which he thinks it is possible that it is possible that you have done so. Similarly, [37] expresses that there is an obligation to use power carts, not that it is obligatory that there is an obligation to use power carts. Thus, even though [36] and [37] contain two modal expressions each, the sentences are interpreted as if they contained just a single modal operator" (Geurts and Huintink 2006: 1).

(36)   *You **may possibly** have read my little monograph upon the subject.*
        It is possible that ~~it is possible that~~ you have read my little monograph upon the subject.
        'It is possible that you have read my little monograph upon the subject.'
        (Adapted from Geurts and Huintink 2006: 1)
(37)   *Power carts **must mandatorily** be used on cart paths where provided.*
        It is obligatory ~~that there be an obligation~~ to use power carts on cart paths where provided.
        'It is obligatory to use power carts on cart paths where provided.'
        (Adapted from Geurts and Huintink 2006: 1)

Thus, because *may* and *possibly* and *must* and *mandatorily* are of similar modality (i.e., *may* and *possibly* are both epistemic; *must* and *mandatorily* are both deontic) and strength (i.e., *may* and *possibly* are both 'weak'; *must* and *mandatorily* are both 'strong necessity'), each example is interpreted as if only one of their two modal operators were present.

In the sections to follow, I will show that, in the case of Spanish, similar concord can occur in directive clauses. This, however, only occurs when both the matrix directive and modal verb it embeds are weak necessity and teleological. Accordingly, if the subordinate predicate in example (35) had instead been of equivalent modality (teleological) and strength (weak necessity) to *recomendar*, a concord reading would have been manifested. As I will discuss, this also determines if the complement will appear in subjunctive or indicative.

5   Mood and Modal Concord
5.1   *Mood and Modal Concord in Directive Complements*
Although described as core subjunctive selectors (e.g., Villalta 2008), native speaker judgments[4] suggest that indicative directive complements are strongly preferable to subjunctive clauses when a weak necessity and teleological matrix directive embeds a modal verb of equivalent strength and type[5]. In these cases, there is concord between the matrix and subordinate predicates. For instance, in the case of example (38), the preferred reading is concord, where the sentence gets interpreted as if only one of the two modal elements were present; i.e., 'Those who defend its utilization **recommend its use** during the first 24 hours', as opposed to the cumulative, 'Those who defend its utilization **recommend that there be a recommendation** that they be used during the first 24 hours.' As such, the complement appears in the indicative.

---

[4] See Faulkner 2021b for details on the experimental study that influenced this conclusion.

[5] Thank you to my reviewers who importantly pointed out the following: "*Deber* is not intrinsically a weak necessity modal, since it [can also be] equivalent to *must*. However, it can acquire this meaning through its use in the conditional (*debería* = he, she, you, it *should*) or, as in this case, interpretatively when combined with *recommend*)".

(38)   *Aquellos que defienden   su   utilización*
        Those   who defend.PRES.INDIC.3PL its   utilization
        recomiendan   que deben   usarse
        recommend.PRES.INDIC.3PL that should.PRES.INDIC.3PL use.INF
        en la fase   temprana (primeras 24 horas).
        in the phase early   (first   24 hours).
        Those who defend its utilization **recommend that they should** be used in the
        early phase (during the first 24 hours).
        **'Those who defend its utilization recommend that they be used in the early phase
        (during the first 24 hours).'**
        (Davies' Corpus del Español 2016)

Like (38), the matrix (*aconsejar*) and subordinate (*deber*) verbs in (39) parallel each other with respect to both type of modality (teleological) and quantificational force (weak necessity). The subordinate clause, thus, appears in the indicative, with a concord reading being elicited; i.e., 'As has already been mentioned previously, their trainer **advises the group of youths to focus** first on their studies and later on sports', rather than, '…their trainer **advises that the group be advised** to focus first on their studies and later on sports.'

(39)   *Como ya   se   ha   mencionado*
        As   already IMPERSONAL have.PRES.INDIC.3SG mention.PP
        anteriormente, su entrenadora le   aconseja   al   grupo
        previously,   their trainer   them   advise.PRES.INDIC.3SG to-the group
        de jóvenes que primero deben   enfocarse
        of youths   that first   should.PRES.INDIC.3PL focus.INF.PASSIVE-REFL
        en sus   estudios y   luego hacer   deportes.
        on their studies   and later do.INF   sports.
        As has already been mentioned previously, their trainer **advises** that the group of youths
        ~~should~~ first focus on their studies and later do sports.
        **'As has already been mentioned previously, their trainer advises that the
        group of youths focus first on their studies and later on sports.'**
        (Davies' Corpus del Español 2016)

Different from examples (38) and (39), subjunctive is required in the complements of sentences (40) and (41). Let's take a look at each in order to identify how and why they are dissimilar to the former.

(40)   ***Recomiendan   que se   usen   en la fase***
        Recommend.PRES.INDIC.3PL that   REFL use.PRES.SUBJ.3PL in the phase
        temprana.
        early.
        'They recommend that they be used in the early phase.'
        (Adapted from Davies' Corpus del Español 2016)

In the case of (40), our matrix verb is *recomendar* 'to recommend', while our embedded predicate is *usar* 'to use'. As an expression of modality, *recomendar* allows us to say things about situations which need not be real; i.e., situations which may or may not materialize in the actual world (see Portner 2018). Thus, in parsing (40), we understand that situations in which the objects in question are used in the early phase are preferable to situations in which they are not (e.g.,: Portner 2018). However, with the proposition being modal, we know that

the objects in question may *not* be used in said early phases, and instead in later phases, or even, possibly none at all. On the contrary, the predicate *usar*, unlike *recomendar*, does not inherently express modality; i.e., it does not represent situations which need not be real, without modifications to its tense or mood. Instead, the clauses in which it may appear tend to discuss situations believed by the speaker or subject to be true. Thus, since sentence (40) contains only one modal element (i.e., the matrix *recomendar*), subjunctive is the only acceptable mood of the subordinate complement.

(41)   ***Recomiendan***   ***que sea/*es***   ***obligatorio***
Recommend.PRES.INDIC.3PL that be.PRES.SUBJ/INDIC.3SG   mandatory
usarlos   en la fase   temprana.
use.INF-them in the phase   early.
'They recommend that it be obligatory to use them in the early phase.'
(Adapted from Davies' Corpus del Español 2016)

In contrast to (40), which we'll refer to as a mono-modal environment, sentence (41) contains two modal expressions (i.e., *recomendar* and *ser obligatorio*). Nonetheless, different from examples (38) and (39), the modal operators it contains are of different strengths (*recomendar* → weak necessity; *ser obligatorio* → strong necessity) and types of modality (*recomendar* → teleological; *ser obligatorio* → deontic). Accordingly, concordance between the two modal operators does not occur, causing each to be interpreted as an individual unit (i.e., as two distinct modal expressions). A cumulative reading, therefore, results, making subjunctive the only acceptable mood in which the complement can appear.

It is, however, important to point out that concord between a directive and embedded modal, of type and strength other than teleological and weak necessity, does not take place (e.g., contexts in which both predicates are deontic + strong necessity, or bouletic + strong necessity, or bouletic + weak necessity, and so on). Similar to expressions like *ser possible/probable que* 'to be possible/probable that' (which show variability with the indicative), both the directive and subordinate modals have to be located on the weaker end of the continuum for an indicative complement (and, consequently, modal concord) to become acceptable; i.e., the two expressions have to be of equivalent or similar "weakness" and, therefore, cannot refer to rules, orders, or any other necessity-oriented (i.e., strong) instructions. For this reason, indicative subordinate clauses would not be acceptable (see examples 42 and 43 below).

(42)   ***Ordenan***   ***que sea/*es***   ***obligatorio***
Order.PRES.INDIC.3PL that be.PRES.SUBJ/INDIC.3SG   mandatory
usarlos   en la fase   temprana.
use.INF-them in the phase   early.
'They order that it be obligatory to use them in the early phase.'
(Adapted from Davies' Corpus del Español 2016)
(43)   ***Permiten***   ***que puedan/*pueden***
Recommend.PRES.INDIC.3PL that can.PRES.SUBJ/INDIC.3PL
usarlos   en la fase   temprana.
use.INF-them in the phase   early.
'They permit that they can use them in the early phase.'
(Adapted from Davies' Corpus del Español 2016)

We have, so far, seen that subjunctive complements are required in mono-modal directive environments (where the matrix directive is the only modal present), as well as in bi-modal directive sentences where the matrix and embedded predicates are not (both) teleological and

weak necessity. In each context, the matrix directive introduces a comparative or preference-based, secondary instruction (which cannot be assumed to materialize in the actual world), represented by the verb of the subordinate complement. Conversely, we have suggested that indicative directive complements are strongly preferable to subjunctive clauses in bi-modal sentences where the matrix and subordinate predicates **parallel** each other in terms of type of modality (teleological) and quantificational force (weak necessity). What we have not yet discussed, however, are the reasons for which these selection patterns occur. In the section to follow, I explain how the presence or absence of modal force influences the mood of the directive complement.

5.2   Mood and Modal Force

In order to better understand the relationship between mood and modal force, it might be helpful to re-examine the adaptations of examples (36) and (37) listed below.

(44)   You **may** have read my little monograph upon the subject.
         (Adapted from Geurts and Huintink 2006: 1)
(45)   You **possibly** have read my little monograph upon the subject.
         (Adapted from Geurts and Huintink 2006: 1)
(46)   You have **possibly** read my little monograph upon the subject.
         (Adapted from Geurts and Huintink 2006: 1)
(47)   Power carts **must** be used on cart paths where provided.
         (Adapted from Geurts and Huintink 2006: 1)
(48)   It is **mandatory/obligatory** that power carts be used on cart paths where provided.
         (Adapted from Geurts and Huintink 2006: 1)

In the case of (44), the inclusion of the modal auxiliary *may* puts forth that there is **some** world in which the addressee has read the speaker's monograph (see Portner 2018). Said world may be the actual world, a dream world, an imagined world, and so on. Similarly, with the modal adverb *possibly*, examples (45) and (46) express that some such world (in which the addressee has perused the subject's monologue) exists. Unlike the former, with the inclusion of *must* and *mandatory*, examples (47) and (48) express that in **all** relevant worlds, the proposition is to hold; i.e., that power carts are to be used on cart paths where provided. Thus, whereas the modals in (44), (45), and (46) represent existential quantification, those of (47) and (48) possess universal force. Accordingly, in all five cases, the relevant modal expression carries some kind of modal force (whether it be existential or universal). With this in mind, let's now take a look at the original sentences, repeated below as (49) and (50).

(49)   "You may possibly have read my little monograph upon the subject"
         (Geurts and Huintink 2006: 1).
(50)   "Power carts must mandatorily be used on cart paths where provided"
         (Geurts and Huintink 2006: 1).

We stated, in section (2), that, since each example had two modal expressions of similar modality type and strength, the sentences get interpreted as if only a single modal operator were present. As such, (49) and (50) get interpreted as follows:

(51)   You **may** ~~possibly~~ have read my little monograph upon the subject.
        (Adapted from Geurts and Huintink 2006: 1)
                                    or
(52)   You ~~may~~ **possibly** have read my little monograph upon the subject.
        (Adapted from Geurts and Huintink 2006: 1)

(53)   Power carts **must** ~~mandatorily~~ be used on cart paths where provided.
        (Adapted from Geurts and Huintink 2006)
                                    or
(54)   Power carts ~~must~~ **mandatorily** be used on cart paths where provided.
        (Adapted from Geurts and Huintink 2006: 1)

Put differently, in each statement, only one of the two modal elements carries modal force.

Let's now discuss how this relates to verbal mood. We have already pointed out that subjunctive complements are required in two types of directive clauses: 1) in mono-modal directive statements (i.e., directive complements which do not contain a modal expression); and 2) in bi-modal directive environments, where the matrix directive and subordinate expression are of modality types and strengths other than teleological and weak necessity; e.g., both are on the stronger end of the quantificational spectrum and are non-teleological, or only one of the two is teleological and weak necessity. Contrarily, for bi-modal environments in which the matrix directive and embedded verb are on the weaker end of the continuum and teleological, we said that indicative complements are strongly preferred. We have, therefore, delineated three contexts that influence the mood of a relevant directive complement: 1) mono-modal environments, where the complement takes subjunctive; 2) bi-modal environments, where the complement takes subjunctive; and 3) bi-modal environments, where the complement takes indicative. Thus, in only one of the three contexts is indicative ever acceptable. What, however, explains this? Let's start off with the subjunctive. In both the mono-modal and bi-modal contexts in which it is required, the main verb of the subordinate clause (i.e., the predicate that directly follows *que* 'that') represents the preference or comparison that is being put forth. In mono-modal environments, the preference (i.e., the proposition) being instructed takes the form of a non-modal verb (e.g., *Recomiendan que se usen...* 'They recommend that they are used…'), while in bi-modal environments, the subordinate verb leading the comparative proposition is modal. Since in the case of the latter, the matrix and subordinate modals are interpreted separately (i.e., cumulatively), each has to carry its own modal force. This makes sense if we view the subjunctive as being tied to a comparison of alternatives or an ordering of preferences (as related to the comparison-based theory of mood selection – see Giorgi and Pianesi (1997) and Villalta (2008)). If we compare this to the bi-modal environments in which the indicative is used, we see that the subordinate modal carries no quantificational force of its own. Put differently, it is not interpreted cumulatively and a concord construction is, instead, manifested. We could almost say that the presence of the subordinate modal is redundant, since the actual preference or recommendation being relayed is what follows. Therefore, whereas in (55), the subordinate modal carries modal force (and is, thus, interpreted as the particular preference or recommendation being instructed), the embedded modal in (56) carries none, consequently, making it non-imperative. In the case of (56), the relevant action being recommended is located in the second part of the embedded clause; i.e., the unit following *deber*. We can, subsequently, conclude that, contexts in which the matrix and subordinate directives are either strong and non-teleological or mis-matched (in terms of strength and modality) are interpreted cumulatively, while those in which the main and subordinate predicates are teleological and weak necessity elicit a concord modal reading.

(55)   ***Recomiendan que sea obligatorio*** *usarse en la fase temprana.*
'They recommend that it be obligatory to use them in the early phase.'
(Adapted from Davies' Corpus del Español 2016)

(56)   *Aquellos que defienden su utilización* ***recomiendan que deben*** *usarse en la fase temprana (primeras 24 horas).*
'Those who defend its utilization recommend that they be used during the first 24 hours.'
(Adapted from Davies' Corpus del Español 2016)

6   Concluding Remarks

The main points discussed in the present paper can be summarized as follows. Three contexts determine the mood of directive complements in Spanish:

- In mono-modal environments, the complement takes the subjunctive;
- In bi-modal environments, where the strength and type of the matrix and subordinate modals are strong and non-teleological, or mis-matched, the complement takes the subjunctive and a cumulative reading is manifested;
- In bi-modal environments, where the modality and strength of the matrix and subordinate modals are both teleological and weak necessity, the complement takes the indicative and a concord reading is manifested.

These findings are significant, not only because directive clauses are generally described as requiring the subjunctive, but also because no previous studies (to my knowledge) have suggested that mood and modal concord behave in tandem. For future studies, it would be interesting to explore if such concord occurs in other volitive and desiderative contexts, as related to both Spanish and other Romance languages.

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
Anand, P., & Hacquard, V. 2013. Epistemics and Attitudes. Semantics and Pragmatics. Semantics and Pragmatics, 6 pp. 1-59. https://doi.org/10.3765/sp.6.8
Borrego, J., Gómez-Asencio, J., & Prieto, E. 1989. El Subjuntivo: Valores y Usos. España: Sociedad General Española de Librería.
Davies, M. 2008-. Corpus of Contemporary American English. Retroceded from https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/
Davies, M. 2016-. El Corpus del Español. Retroceded from https://www.corpusdelespanol.org/

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

Geurts, B., & Huitink, J. 2006. Modal Concord. In Paul Dekker & Hedde Zeijlstra (eds.) Proceedings of the ESSLLI 2006 workshop 'Concord Phenomena at the Syntax-Semantics Interface', pp. 15–20. University of Málaga.

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

Kotwica, D. 2018. Exploring Evidentiality in Spanish Biology Articles (1850–1920): Intersubjectivity and Accessibility of Evidences. In Figueras Bates, C., & Cabedo Nebot, A., (Eds.) *Perspectives on Evidentiality in Spanish: Explorations Across* Genres, pp. 49–70. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.290.03kot

Portner, P. 2009. Modality. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

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

von Fintel, K. 2006. Modality and Language. In Borchert, D. M., (Ed.) Encyclopedia of Philosophy – Second Edition. Detroit: MacMillan Reference USA.

Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2007. Modal Concord. Semantics and Linguistic Theory 1, pp. 317-332. https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v17i0.2961