

Brenda Laca  
 Université Paris 8 / CNRS UMR 7023 SFL

## Causes and wishes : on the temporal orientation of intensional subjunctives.

### 1. Intensional versus polarity subjunctives

**Mood:** semantic category that “flags out” the relevant properties of the contexts that may embed the proposition it applies to (Farkas 2003, Giorgi & Pianesi 1997: Chap. 5, Portner 1997).

**Intensional subjunctives** → semantic selection on account of the properties of the embedding predicate.

**Polarity subjunctives** → licensing of a dependent element, signaling scopal dependency from certain operator-like elements (roughly, downward entailing ones).

**Four clear-cut properties** (Quer 1998, 2006):<sup>1</sup>

(a) Intensional subjunctives, by contrast with polarity subjunctives, do not alternate with indicatives, as shown in (1a-b):

- 1 a. *Quiere que te vayas/ \*vas.*  
 want.PR.IND.3.SG that you go.PR.SBJ.2SG./ go.PR.IND.2SG  
 ‘S/he wants you to leave’  
 b. *No cree que te vayas/ vas.*  
 not believe.PR.IND.3.SG that you go.PR.SBJ.2SG./ go.PR.IND.2SG  
 ‘S/he does not believe that you are leaving’

(b) Intensional subjunctives do not “spread” to further embedded argument clauses, whereas polarity subjunctives license multiple subjunctive embedding:

- 2 a. *Quiere que digas que está/ \*está bien.*  
 want.PR.IND.3.SG that sayPR.SBJ.2SG that be.PR.IND.3SG/be.PR.SBJ.3SG well  
 ‘S/he wants you to say that it’s all right’  
 b. *No cree que digas que está/ está bien.*  
 not believe.PR.IND.3.SG that sayPR.SBJ.2SG that be.PR.IND.3SG/be.PR.SBJ.3SG well  
 ‘S/he does not believe that you (will) say that it’s all right’

(c) Intensional subjunctives give rise to subject obviation effects that are absent in the case of polarity subjunctives.

- 3 a. *\*Tratamos de que llegemos a tiempo.*  
 Try.PR.IND.1PL of that arrive.PR.SBJ.1PL on time  
 \*‘We are trying that we arrive on time’

<sup>1</sup> Thanks to J. Guéron (p.c.) for pointing out some fundamental unclarity in the distinction between “intensional” and “polarity” subjunctives. Following Quer (2006), I tend to assume that they constitute two different categories, which may converge in the same morphology in some languages. The fact that some languages exhibit intensional subjunctives, but entirely lack polarity subjunctives, while other languages distinguish morphologically between both types, provides some evidence for this split. As for Spanish, some evidence from language acquisition and language attrition seems to point in the same direction (Lozano 1995).

- b. *No estamos seguros de que llegemos a tiempo.*  
 not be.PR.IND.1PL sure of that arrive.PR.SBJ.1PL on time  
 ‘We are not sure we will arrive on time’

(d) The matrix predicates selecting for intensional subjunctives impose a particular temporal orientation on their argument clauses, variously described as future or non-anterior, and usually illustrated by the fact that intensional subjunctives may not exhibit past morphology if the matrix verb is in a present tense (4a). By contrast, this temporal configuration is licit in the case of polarity subjunctives (4b) (see Suñer 1990, Suñer & Padilla Rivera 1987/1990):

- 4 a. *\*Exijo que estuviera en casa.*  
 demand.PR.IND.1SG that be.IMPF.SBJ.3SG at home  
 \*‘I demand that s/he was at home’  
 b. *No creo que estuviera en casa.*  
 not believe.PR.IND.1SG that be.IMPF.SBJ.3SG at home  
 ‘I don’t think s/he was at home’

→ Properties (a) and (b) are quite robust, and they follow naturally from the assumption that intensional subjunctives are selected by the matrix predicate (selection being a local required fit).

→ Properties (c) and (d) are less robust: they are known to vary in subtle ways according to several factors (Quer 1998, 2006).<sup>2</sup>

## 2. The temporal orientation of matrix verbs selecting intensional subjunctives

### 2.1. Matrix verbs selecting for intensional subjunctives (Quer 1998):

(a) **Directives**, like *exigir* ‘require’, *ordenar* ‘order’, *pedir* ‘ask’, *permitir* ‘allow’ are primarily speech-act verbs that perform or report directive or permissive speech acts; some of them may be used –in particular with inanimate subjects- to express various flavours of non-epistemic necessity or possibility.

(b) **Causatives** comprise positive and negative causation verbs, like *dejar* ‘let’, *hacer* ‘make’, *impedir* ‘prevent’, *obligar* ‘force’ and other verbs showing obligatory object-control, as well as verbs of the try/manage type. Most of them, but by far not all, are implicative or neg-implicative verbs.

(c) **Volitionals** form a large and quite heterogeneous class of verbs, which is probably best captured by Kenny’s notion of *Volition*, reporting “the taking up of an attitude of approval to a state of affairs”:<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> J. Guéron (p.c.) reminds me of an example originally proposed by Nicolas Ruwet (see Quer 2006 for further references) that might show some degree of correlation between the third and fourth properties. In fact, obviation effects disappear in the French sentence *Je voudrais que je sois enterré dans mon pays natal* ‘I would like it for me to be buried in my native country’, in which the matrix verb carries conditional morphology. However, the factors influencing obviation effects are complex and poorly described for Spanish, so that an examination of this correlation must be left for further research.

<sup>3</sup> The quotation shows that Kenny also includes “attitudes of disapproval” in this class. I will only exemplify positive attitudes in this paper, but it is easy to provide an analysis of their (negative polarity) antonyms (sometimes called ‘adversatives’) by reversing the orderings in the

'The Volition that *p* will be something that is common to hoping that *p*, wanting it to be the case that *p*, wishing, intending to bring it about, being ashamed that not, fearing that not *p*..., and which is absent from merely judging that *p*, knowing that *p*, being certain that *p*, expecting that *p*' (Kenny 1963)

## 2.2. Temporal properties of matrix predicates selecting for subjunctives:

(1) The argument clauses of such matrix verbs cannot host prospective aspect (Spanish *ir* 'go' + *a* 'to' + *Infinitive*, roughly corresponding to the *be-going-to*-construction in English):

5. a. \**Exige que el artículo vaya a tener veinte páginas.*  
demand.PR.IND.3SG that the paper go.PR.SBJ.3SG to have twenty pages  
'S/he demands that the paper be going to be twenty pages long'  
\*S/he demands that the paper be going to be twenty pages long'  
b. \**Hizo que el artículo fuera a tener veinte páginas.*  
make.SP.IND.3SG that the paper go.IMP.F.SBJ.3SG to have twenty pages  
'S/he got the paper to be going to be twenty pages long'  
c. \**Quiero que el artículo vaya a tener veinte páginas*  
want.PR.IND.1SG that the paper go.PR.SBJ.3SG to have twenty pages  
'I want the paper to be going to be twenty pages long'
- Prospective aspect is, by contrast, perfectly acceptable in the case of polarity subjunctives:<sup>4</sup>
6. a. *No creo que el artículo vaya a tener veinte páginas.*  
not believe.PR.IND.1SG that the paper go.PR.SBJ.3SG to have twenty pages  
'I don't think the paper is going to be twenty pages long'  
b. *Poca gente piensa que el gobierno vaya a tener éxito.*  
Few people think.PR.IND.3SG that the government go.PR.SBJ.3SG to have success  
'Few people believe that the government is going to have any success'
- Prospective aspect is also disallowed under future tense, and in the infinitival complements of future-oriented verbs, as for instance *prometer*:<sup>5</sup>

semantic definitions quoted below. As for the inclusion of emotive/ evaluative-factives in the class, its motivation will be discussed below, but –for the sake of clarity- I will not adopt Kenny's proposal of calling them 'volitionals'.

<sup>4</sup> When at all possible, prospective aspect with matrix verbs selecting intensional subjunctives is only licensed in polarity contexts, i.e. we have a curious situation in which subjunctive mood itself is selected by the matrix verb, but the prospective subjunctive behaves as a polarity item:

- (i) *No quiero que el artículo vaya a tener veinte páginas.*  
not want.PR.IND.1SG that the paper go.PR.SBJ.3SG to have twenty pages  
'I don't want the article to be twenty pages long'
- (ii) *Poca gente espera que el gobierno vaya a tener éxito.*  
few people hope.PR.IND.3SG that the government go.PR.SBJ.3SG to have success  
'Few people hope for the government to succeed'

<sup>5</sup> On the complex matter of verbs imposing a future orientation on infinitival complements, see Abusch (2004) and Katz (2004).

7. a. \**El gobierno irá a tener éxito.*  
the government go.FUT.IND.3SG to have success  
'The government will be going to succeed'  
b. \**El gobierno promete ir a tener éxito.*  
the government promise.PR.IND.3SG to go to have success  
'The government promises to be going to succeed'

(2) Matrix verbs with past tense morphology may embed a present tense in the argument clause (the phenomenon is more widely attested in American Spanish varieties, but is not entirely absent in European Spanish):<sup>6</sup>

8. a. *Les aconsejó que actúen dentro de la legalidad.*  
them advise.SP.IND.3SG that act.PR.SBJ.3SG inside of the law  
'S/he advised them to act according to the law'  
b. *Se logró que ambas aerolíneas operen.*  
REFL manage.SP.IND.3SG that both airlines operate with maximal profit.  
'We succeeded in getting both airlines operate with top profits'  
c. *¿Quería Greenpeace que se hable del Banco Mundial?*  
want.IMP.F.IND.3SG Greenpeace that REFL talk.PR.SBJ.3SG of+the Bank World  
'Did Greenpeace want for the World Bank to become a central topic?'

- **Double access effects:** the time of the embedded clause is anchored both to the time of the matrix clause (**T<sub>MATRIX</sub>**) and to Utterance-Time (**UTT-T**). Temporal orientation with regard to **UTT-T** is simultaneous or posterior (temporal-structure-driven interpretation: *statives* give rise to simultaneity, whereas *eventives* not allowing a progressive or a habitual interpretation are forward-shifted. Temporal orientation with regard to **T<sub>MATRIX</sub>** is posterior, which seems to provide a further indication that the matrix verbs induce a future temporal orientation.

(3) Non-uniformity of the three classes of environments with regard to **retrospective/perfect aspect** (*haber* 'have' + *Past Participle*).

- In embedded clauses, the anteriority relation contributed by this aspect can be anchored to **T<sub>MATRIX</sub>**, thus giving rise to configurations with a **past** temporal orientation, in which the time of the embedded event description precedes **T<sub>MATRIX</sub>**.
- The presence of future oriented adverbials or temporal clauses gives rise to future-perfect readings: the result state of the embedded event description is said to hold at the (future) time denoted by the adverbial, and the ensuing temporal orientation need not be **past** with regard to **T<sub>MATRIX</sub>**, since the time of the embedded event description may follow **T<sub>MATRIX</sub>**.<sup>7</sup>
- The complement clauses of directives and causatives may host retrospective

<sup>6</sup> In some American Spanish varieties, this phenomenon seems to be affecting the deictic nature of the present subjunctive, as witnessed by the possible lack of double access effects. See Sessarego (2008a,b) and Laca (2009) for discussion.

<sup>7</sup> On the analysis of future perfect readings as resultatives, see Demirdache & Uribe-Etxeberria (2008)

aspect, but only in the presence of future oriented adverbials or temporal clauses that ensure future-perfect readings, and thus the possibility of a non-past temporal orientation:

9. a. *Pide que hayamos completado el informe \*(para el jueves/*  
ask.PR.IND.3SG that have.PR.SBJ.1.PL completed the report for the thursday  
*(para) cuando vuelva).*  
for when return.PR.SBJ.3SG  
'S/he demands for us to have completed the report by Thursday/by the time s/he comes back'  
b. *Consiguió que hubieran completado el informe \*(para el jueves).*  
manage.SP.IND.3SG that have.IMPF.SBJ.3PL completed the report for the thursday  
'S/he managed to get them complete the report by Thursday'
- Directives and causatives pattern in this respect like verbs imposing a future orientation on the infinitival clauses they embed:
10. a. *Promete haber completado el informe \*(para el jueves).*  
promise.PR.IND.3SG have completed the report for the thursday  
'S/he promises to have completed the report by Thursday'
- Volitionals diverge from this pattern, and this in ways that reveal the lack of homogeneity of this class of verbs. There is one volitional, *querer* 'want', whose behavior is close to that of directives and causatives with regard to retrospective aspect.<sup>8</sup> The rest, however, admit retrospective aspect also in configurations which cannot but induce a **past** temporal orientation
11. a. *Quiere que hayamos completado el informe \*(para el jueves/*  
want.PR.IND.3SG that have.PR.SBJ.1.PL completed the report for the thursday  
*(para) cuando vuelva)*  
for when return.PR.SBJ.3SG  
'S/he wants us to have completed the report by Thursday/ by the time she comes back'  
b. *?\*Quiere que Pedro se haya instalado en Madrid.*  
want.PR.IND.3SG that Pedro REFL have.PR.SBJ.3.SG settled in Madrid.  
'\*S/he wants Pedro to have settled in Madrid'
12. a. *?Desea que Pedro se haya instalado en Madrid. [+EPISTEMIC*  
wish.PR.IND.3SG that Pedro REFL have.PR.SBJ.3.SG settled in Madrid UNCERTAIN.]  
b. *Espera que Pedro se haya instalado en Madrid. [+EPISTEMIC*  
hope.PR.IND.3SG that Pedro REFL have.PR.SBJ.3.SG settled in Madrid UNCERTAIN.]  
c. *Prefiere que Pedro se haya instalado en Madrid. [+/-EPIST.*  
prefer.PR.IND.3SG that Pedro REFL have.PR.SBJ.3.SG settled in Madrid UNCERTAIN.]  
'S/he wishes/ hopes/ prefers for Pedro to have settled in Madrid'

<sup>8</sup> Other verbs showing the same behavior are *anhelar* 'long for', *apetecer* 'feel like', *pretender* 'pretend'. They are even more clearly future-oriented than *querer*, since conditional morphology does not license past orientation in these cases.

- A parallel with modals: Modals are usually held to be forward-shifting environments (Enç 1996, Condoravdi 2001). Spanish modals share with future-oriented contexts the impossibility of hosting prospective aspect:
13. *\*El artículo debe/puede ir a tener veinte páginas.*  
the paper must/may go to have twenty pages  
\*'The paper must/may be going to be twenty pages long'
- In spite of their putative forward-shifting nature, modals can also embed perfect infinitives that give rise to past temporal orientation:
14. *Pedro debe/ puede haberse instalado en Madrid. [+EPISTEMIC UNCERTAIN.]*  
'Pedro must/may have settled in Madrid.'
- Epistemic interpretation: the truth value of the prejacent is decided at **UTT-T**, but the speaker does not know in which way it has been decided.  
→ *Desear* and *esperar*, when embedding argument clauses with a past temporal orientation (12a-b) also convey epistemic uncertainty on the side of the subject of the attitude  
**Diversity constraint:** the modal base providing the background for interpretation should contain both *p*-worlds and  $\neg p$ -worlds (Condoravdi 2001, Werner 2003). Since propositions with a past temporal orientation are decided at the time of evaluation, only epistemic uncertainty warrants diversity in such cases. Volitionals are subject to the same constraint (Laca 2009).
- Further parallelism between (some) volitionals and modals  
The temporal orientation of modals embedding simple infinitives varies according to the temporal structure (Vendlerian class) of the described situation (Condoravdi 2001, Copley 2008), and modal flavour correlates with temporal orientation  
simple eventive infinitives → forward-shifting → "deontic" modality  
stative infinitives → simultaneity or forward-shifting → epistemic or deontic modality (cf. 15):
15. The article must be twenty pages long.  
(i) It is required that the article be twenty pages long.  
(ii) It is inferrable that the article is twenty pages long.
- Volitionals compatible with a past orientation show a similar pattern:  
embedded stative descriptions → simultaneous or forward-shifted  
simultaneous readings → epistemic uncertainty:
16. a. *Pedro desea/espera que María esté ya en Madrid.*  
Pedro wishes/ hopes that María be.PR.SBJ.3SG already in Madrid  
'Pedro wishes/ hopes for María to be already in Madrid'  
b. *Pedro desea/espera que María esté en Madrid mañana.*  
Pedro wishes/ hopes that María be.PR.SBJ.3SG in Madrid tomorrow.  
'Pedro wishes/ hopes for María to be in Madrid tomorrow'

- *Querer* patterns like directionals and causatives, in as far as it rules out a simultaneous temporal orientation:
17. a. \**Pedro quiere que María esté ya en Madrid.*  
Pedro wants that María be.PR.SBJ.3SG already in Madrid  
'Pedro wants Maria to be already in Madrid'  
b. \**Pedro ordena que María esté ya en Madrid.*  
Pedro orders that María be.PR.SBJ.3SG already in Madrid  
'Pedro commands that Maria (should) be already in Madrid'  
c. \**Pedro trata de que María esté ya en Madrid.*  
Pedro tries of that María be.PR.SBJ.3SG already in Madrid  
'Pedro is trying for María to be already in Madrid'
- Conditional morphology on *querer*, however, renders possible both a past and a simultaneous temporal orientation, which are still ruled out for directionals and causatives :
18. a. *Pedro querría que María se hubiera instalado en Madrid.*  
Pedro want.COND that María REFL have.IMPF.SBJ.3SG settled in Madrid  
'Pedro would like Maria to have settled in Madrid'  
b. *Pedro querría que María estuviera ya en Madrid.*  
Pedro want.COND that María be.PR.SBJ.3SG already in Madrid  
'Pedro would like it for Maria to be already in Madrid'  
c. \**Pedro ordenaría que María se hubiera instalado en Madrid.*  
Pedro order.COND that María REFL have.IMPF.SBJ.3SG settled in Madrid  
'Pedro would order that Maria (should) have settled in Madrid'

→ In the presence of conditional morphology volitionals pattern like modals. They give rise to two construals, (a) epistemic uncertainty and (b) counterfactual.

- 19 *Pedro querría que María se hubiera instalado en Madrid.*  
(i) *pero no sabe si lo ha hecho o no.*  
'but he doesn't know whether or not she has'  
(ii) *y lamenta que se haya decidido por Barcelona.*  
'and he regrets that she should have chosen Barcelona'
- 20 *María debería haberse instalado en Madrid.*  
Maria must.COND have-REFL settled in Madrid  
'Maria should have settled in Madrid'  
(i) *¿Sabes si lo ha hecho?*  
'Do you know if she has?'  
(ii) *pero se decidió por Barcelona.*  
but she chose Barcelona.

- Shared properties of both construals:

- (i) the truth value of the argument clause of volitionals or, respectively, of the

prejacent proposition in the case of modals, is seen as decided at **UTT-T**;  
(ii) they are felicitous in contexts in which the falsity of this propositional content is entertained.

- Difference between the construals:

knowledge-state attributed to the bearer of the attitude in the case of volitionals, or to the speaker in the case of (unembedded) modals (epistemic uncertainty versus certainty of falsehood).

### Questions

- (i) what is the difference between directives and causatives, on the one hand, which show a uniform future temporal orientation, and volitionals and modals, on the other hand, which show some symptoms of future temporal orientation, but are nonetheless compatible with a past temporal orientation?  
(ii) what is the source of the epistemic uncertainty felicity condition that holds for modals and for (most) volitionals?  
(iii) why is epistemic uncertainty as to a past issue not enough for licensing a past temporal orientation for a verb like *querer*?  
(iv) why does conditional morphology in this case, but not in the case of directives or causatives, lift the ban against past temporal orientation?

### 3. The semantics of volitionals

Two rival approaches to the semantics of volitionals:

- Volitionals are to be treated as propositional attitude verbs.
- Volitionals differ from propositional attitude verbs.
- The difference hinges on the type of semantic object that the argument clause of the volitional is assumed to denote.

#### 3.1. Heim's classic treatment of the semantics of attitude verbs (Heim 1992):

- the argument clause of a volitional is a proposition.
- the volitional does not express universal quantification over a set of accessible worlds, but orders the doxastic alternatives of the attitude bearer, ranking worlds that verify the proposition expressed in the argument clause higher than worlds that do not verify it:

- 21 'α wants φ' is true in w iff  
for every w' ∈ Dox<sub>α</sub>(w):  
every φ-world maximally similar to w' is more desirable to α in w than any non-φ-world maximally similar to w' (Heim 1992: 193)

Kratzerian double-background approach: combination of a doxastic modal base with a bouletic ordering source.

→ **Diversity condition:** volitionals carry a presupposition according to which the bearer of the attitude neither believes φ nor non-φ (Heim 1992: 198). The modal base Dox<sub>α</sub>(w)

contains both  $\phi$ - and non- $\phi$ -worlds-<sup>9</sup> This is necessary in order to avoid situations in which one of the set of worlds being ranked should be the empty set. If there were no  $\phi$ -worlds (or no non- $\phi$ -worlds) in the modal base, universal quantification restricted by the empty set would give rise to vacuous truth.

**NB:** this presupposition provides an answer to question (ii) above by establishing a necessary link between  $\phi$ -diversity and comparative ordering of worlds (see also Werner (2003) on modals and the vacuousness of ordering which would result from lack of  $\phi$ -diversity).

- Extending the semantics for volitionals to counterfactual desire reports and to factive predicates expressing an attitude of approval (Heim 1992): in both cases, the doxastic modal base is minimally revised in order to admit the relevant worlds not included in the actual doxastic alternatives of the bearer of the attitude: the  $\phi$ -worlds, which are ranked higher in the case of counterfactual wishes, and, respectively, the non- $\phi$ -worlds, which are ranked lower in the case of positive evaluative factives.
22. ' $\alpha$  wishes  $\phi$ ' is true in  $w$  iff  
for every  $w' \in \text{rev}\phi(\text{Dox}_\alpha(w))$ :  
every  $\phi$ -world maximally similar to  $w'$  is more desirable to  $\alpha$  in  $w$  than any non- $\phi$ -world maximally similar to  $w'$
23. ' $\alpha$  is glad that  $\phi$ ' is true in  $w$  iff  
for every  $w' \in \text{rev}\neg\phi(\text{Dox}_\alpha(w))$ :  
every  $\phi$ -world maximally similar to  $w'$  is more desirable to  $\alpha$  in  $w$  than any non- $\phi$ -world maximally similar to  $w'$

→ *Want*, *wish* (when embedding an *irrealis* complement) and *be glad* share a core evaluative semantics that ranks the (most similar) worlds verifying the argument clause higher than those not verifying it.

They differ as to the characteristics of the doxastic modal base,

- $\phi$ -diverse doxastic base in the case of *want*,
- doxastic base incompatible with  $\phi$  in the case of *wish* + revision
- doxastic base incompatible with non- $\phi$  in the case of *be glad* + revision

Supporting evidence for the unification of volitionals with evaluative-factives: in the presence of conditional morphology<sup>10</sup>, sentences containing evaluative-factives are very close in meaning to sentences containing volitionals:

24. a. Peter wishes that Mary had settled in Madrid.

<sup>9</sup> As far as volitionals are concerned, the intuition as to the necessity of doxastic  $\phi$ -diversity is widespread, and is also found in Hintikkian treatments of volitionals, which do not rely on ordering of alternatives. Thus, Zimmermann (2006) formulates a bridge axiom relating epistemic and bouletic modality which has the effect of ensuring that uncertainty as to  $p$  follows from the desire of wanting  $p$  to hold.

<sup>10</sup> I will assume for the purposes of this discussion that *wish* is to be analysed as *want* + conditional morphology (Iatridou & von Stechow 2008).

- b. Peter would have liked it for Mary to settle in Madrid.

Problem: the fact that *querer* (or *want*) does not allow a past temporal orientation is entirely unexpected in the light of definition (21), since the definition only requires uncertainty of the bearer of the attitude as to  $\phi$ :

25. Peter wants Mary to have settled in Madrid \*(by next week)

### 3.2. Portner (1997) on non-persistent situations

- not all argument clauses denote the same type of object
  - propositions as sets of possible worlds and propositions as sets of situations.  
Possible worlds are complete specifications of entire world-histories, situations are smaller spatiotemporal parts of possible worlds → possible worlds can be conceived of as maximal situations.
  - Persistent propositions contain every supersituation in the set of situations they denote.
  - Non-persistent propositions do not extend to whole world histories. The propositions denoted by imperatives, as well as by infinitives and subjunctives embedded under directives are non-persistent sets of situations: they are future-oriented, because the situations involved start after the reference situation (utterance situation in unembedded contexts; embedding situation denoted by the matrix clause in embedded contexts).
  - Ginzburg and Sag (2001): non-persistent, inherently future-oriented propositions are **outcomes**.
  - Truth and falsity do not apply to outcomes. By contrast, outcomes can be fulfilled or not, according to the existence or not in the world of evaluation of a situation starting after the reference situation that supports the description of the outcome:
26. a. John said that Mary would arrive early, and what he said is true.  
b. John told Mary to arrive early, and what he said is true/ was fulfilled.
- This account can be extended to causatives. Since the vast majority of causatives are implicative, they entail the fulfilment of their complement.<sup>11</sup>

### 3.2. Applying Portner's suggestions to volitionals

Volitionals can be treated both as propositional attitudes and as outcome-embedding

<sup>11</sup> The fact that implicative verbs take the subjunctive constitutes a major problem for all accounts of subjunctive selection based on the notion of non-veridicality (see Quer 1998). Relating causatives to outcomes seems a more natural move than appealing, as Quer does (1998, Chapt. 2, section 5.3), to the "non-veridical epistemic model representing future realizations of the world according to the main subject". Quer's proposal fails to account for non-animate causative subjects, which cannot possibly introduce epistemic models:

(i) *El buen tiempo hizo/ contribuyó a/ ayudó a que la fiesta fuera un éxito.*  
The fine weather made/contributed to/helped to that the party be.IMP.F.SBJ. a success  
'The fine weather contributed to the success of the party'

predicates.

→ Volitionals as propositional attitudes: bouletic alternatives are sets of worlds

27. For any situation  $s$ ,  $\text{Bul}_\alpha(s) = \{w : w \in \text{Dox}_\alpha(s) \text{ and } w \text{ satisfies } \alpha\text{'s desires in } s \text{ at least as well as any other world in } \text{Dox}_\alpha(s)\}$

→ Volitionals as outcome-embedding predicates: bouletic alternatives are modeled in terms of plans for action.

- Plans are conceived of as possible situations “which follow the agent through a course of actions that ultimately results in the desired state”. The “desired state” is described by a non-persistent proposition, an outcome, since it is a part of a situation (the plan) that starts after the reference situation and does not extend backwards in time (Portner 1997).

(a) Volitionals that convey evaluations take propositions as their complements → temporal configurations as in staple propositional attitudes.

(b) Volitionals that convey dispositions for action take outcomes as their complements → temporal configurations that are legitimate for directives and causatives.

#### 4. The heterogeneity of volitionals

Volitionals embedding proposition-like objects can, like assertion and belief predicates, embed yes/no-answers to a question (Faloutsos 2009):

28. [*¿Van a invitar a Juan?*  
'Are they going to invite Juan?]  
a. *Pedro cree/ dice que no.*  
Pedro believes/says that no.  
'Pedro believes/ says they aren't'  
b. *Espero/ Prefiero que no.*  
I hope/ I prefer that no.  
'I hope not/ I'd rather they wouldn't'  
c. *\*Deseo/\*Quiero que no.*  
I wish / I want that no  
'\*I wish/want not'

*Esperar* as an epistemic verb with a presupposed positive evaluation.

- no ban on past temporal orientation (by contrast with volitionals, past subjunctives embedded under a non-past matrix verb are possible, cf. (29a))
- positive evaluation is maintained under negative or interrogative operators, which only take the belief component in their scope (cf. 29b versus 29c)

29. a. *Espero que estuviera en Madrid ayer.*  
Hope.PR.IND.1SG that be.IMPF.SBJ. in Madrid yesterday.  
'I hope s/he was in Madrid yesterday'  
b. *No espero que me paguen.*  
Not hope.PR.IND.1SG that me pay.PR.SBJ.3PL  
'I do not hope to be paid'

c. *No deseo que me paguen.*

Not wish.PR.IND.1SG that me pay.PR.SBJ.3PL  
'I do not wish to be paid'

30. a. *¿Esperas que te paguen por esto? Pues te equivocas, no te pagarán.*  
Do you hope to be paid for this? Well, you're wrong, they won't.  
b. *¿Deseas que te paguen por esto? #Pues te equivocas, no te pagarán.*  
Do you wish to be paid for this? #Well, you're wrong, they won't.

- esperar* is the only Spanish volitional also allowing for indicative complement clauses.<sup>12</sup>

*Preferir* as an alternative-ordering predicate

- Preferir* is not even subject to the epistemic uncertainty felicity condition that holds for the other volitionals (cf. 31a)
- It is in itself insensitive to the characteristics of the doxastic modal base ( $\phi$ -diverse, incompatible with non- $\phi$ , incompatible with  $\phi$ )
- Preferir* ranks an alternative higher than other alternatives and thus corresponds exactly to the comparative, scalar semantics for volitionals developed by Villalta (2008).<sup>13</sup>

31. a. *Prefiero que me lo hayas dicho (en lugar de ocultármelo)*  
prefer.PR.1.SG that me it have.PR.SBJ.3.SG told (instead of hiding it from me)  
'You did well to tell me about it, instead of hiding it from me'  
b. *Preferiría que me lo hubieras dicho (en lugar de ocultármelo)*  
prefer.COND.1.SG that me it have.IMPF.SBJ.3.SG told (instead of hiding it from me)  
'I'd rather you had told me about it, instead of hiding it from me'

*Querer* as an outcome or proposition-embedding verb

- Querer* patterns like directives and causatives in most respects, indicating that it selects for outcomes.
- Querer* + conditional morphology differs from directives and causatives, since it allows for a past temporal orientation.
- Idle and impossible wishes

“Treating desire in terms of fulfilling plans seems to entail that one can only want what one gets in some belief world. Though this may be true as a default, it is certainly possible to want things which one believes to be impossible. The solution, suggested by Stalnaker (1987), is to allow the use of a background set of alternatives other than the agent's doxastic set  $\text{Dox}_\alpha$ .” (Portner 1997: 176)

**Claims :**

- (i) revising a set of doxastic alternatives in order to include a proposition that is incompatible with the relevant agent's beliefs is always marked in Spanish by means of conditional morphology;

<sup>12</sup> Note that in French, *espérer* selects for the indicative, and in English, *hope* takes indicative *that*-clauses.

<sup>13</sup> Villalta (2008) proposes an alternative-ranking semantics for all verbs selecting for subjunctive complements in Spanish. By contrast, I assume that this semantics only captures a small subset of volitionals.

- (ii) under such a revision, bouletic alternatives are propositions (sets of possible worlds) and not outcomes;
- (iii) statements or reports of desires are not uniform: some of them report dispositions for action, others simply involve an evaluation.
- indicative morphology on *querer* attributes to the bearer of the attitude a belief as to the possibility of *p*, which is absent in the presence of conditional morphology:
- 32 a. *Pedro está loco: quiere llegar a la luna de un salto.*  
'Pedro is mad: he wants to jump to the moon'  
b. *Pedro está loco: #querría llegar a la luna de un salto.*  
'Pedro is mad: he would like to jump to the moon'
- in the presence of conditional morphology, *querer* is very close in meaning to both *preferir* and to evaluative-factives, which do not select for outcomes, but for propositions:<sup>14</sup>
- 33 a. *Querría que María estuviera en Madrid.*  
want.COND.1SG. that Maria be.IMPF.SBJ. in Madrid  
'I would like it for Maria to be in Madrid'  
b. *Preferiría que María estuviera en Madrid.*  
prefer.COND.1SG. that Maria be.IMPF.SBJ. in Madrid  
'I'd prefer it for María to be in Madrid'  
c. *Me gustaría que María estuviera en Madrid.*  
me please.COND.3SG. that Maria be.IMPF.SBJ. in Madrid  
'I'd like it for Maria to be in Madrid'  
d. *Me alegraría que María estuviera en Madrid.*  
me rejoice.COND.1SG. that Maria be.IMPF.SBJ. in Madrid  
'I would be happy if María were (to be) in Madrid)
- Conditional morphology alters the presuppositional nature of evaluative-factives.

→ Evaluative-factives and volitionals

The temporal orientation of evaluative-factives is exactly the opposite to that of other matrix verbs selecting for intensional subjunctives:

- (a) they can embed prospective aspect (cf. 34a),  
(b) they enforce simultaneous interpretations with states (cf. 34b), and  
(c) they give rise to scheduled readings in contexts in which an episodic eventive forces forward-shifting, so that they are felt to be inadequate if the event in question is not amenable to scheduling (cf. 34c):

<sup>14</sup> I would like to thank Jean-Baptiste Guillon and Alexandre Cremmers for stimulating discussion on this point.

- 34 a. *Me alegra que vayan a demoler ese edificio.*  
me rejoice.PR.IND.3SG. that go.PR.SBJ.3PL to tear down this building.  
'I'm glad they are going to tear down this building'  
b. *Me alegra que el artículo tenga veinte páginas.*  
me rejoice.PR.IND.3SG. that the paper have.PR.SBJ.3SG twenty pages  
'I'm glad the paper is twenty pages long'  
c. *#Me alegra que María gane la próxima carrera.*  
me rejoice.PR.IND.3SG. that Mary win.PR.SBJ.3SG the next race  
'#I'm glad María wins/is winning the next race'

- These temporal effects are grounded in factivity: the truth of the argument clause is presupposed to be settled at the time of evaluation. Only past and present facts, - and scheduled future situations- fulfill the settledness presupposition.
- When evaluative-factives bear conditional morphology, forward-shifting of states becomes possible and scheduling effects disappear:

- 35 a. *Me alegraría que el artículo tuviera veinte páginas.*  
me rejoice.COND.3SG. that the paper have.IMPF.SBJ.3SG twenty pages  
'I'd be glad if the paper were (to be) twenty pages long'  
b. *Me alegraría que María ganara la próxima carrera.*  
me rejoice.COND.3SG. that Mary win.IMPF.SBJ.3G the next race  
'I'd be glad if Mary were to win the next race'

→ Licensing of conditional morphology: (a) by an embedding verb of assertion or belief in the past tense, giving rise to "future of the past" interpretations, or (b) by an *irrealis* antecedent, giving rise to modal interpretations (future-less-vivid or counterfactual conditional assertions).

→ Non-overtly licensed uses of conditional morphology:

- accommodation of a restriction corresponding to an *irrealis* antecedent, which is generally retrieved from material in the previous context (Corblin 2002: 255-261).
- "self-licensing" by building the missing restriction from the presuppositions of the sentence itself: the interpretation need not rely on the previous context (Kasper 1992)
- "self-licensing" seems however restricted to the case of modals, volitionals and evaluative-factives .

- 36 a. *#Pedro sabría que María ganó la carrera.*  
Pedro know.COND that Maria win.SP.IND the race.  
'Pedro would know that Maria won the race'  
b. *#La orquesta dejaría de tocar.*  
The band stop.COND of play  
'The band would stop playing'

#### Claim:

Self-licensing conditional morphology indicates that there is a ranking of alternatives and the highest among them do not necessarily belong to the relevant doxastic modal base (the beliefs of the bearer of the attitude or to those of the speaker in the case of modals). With evaluative-factives, this indication has the immediate effect of suspending

the presupposition as to the truth of the argument clause. With volitionals, it has the effect of suppressing the assumption as to the possibility of the complement clause.

- Supporting evidence: the pseudo-volitional *esperar*, which does not assert a ranking of alternatives, does not give rise to self-licensing effects when bearing conditional morphology:

37 #*Pedro esperaba que María estuviera en Madrid.*  
 Pedro hope.COND that María be.IMPF.SBJ in Madrid  
 ‘Pedro would hope for Maria to be in Madrid’

→ With modals the effect of conditional morphology is that of widening the modal base to include alternatives not entertained by the speaker.

- Supporting evidence: contradictory propositions can only be embedded by modals bearing conditional morphology.

38 a. *Pedro podría/\*puede no estar donde está.*  
 Pedro can.COND/can.PR.IND not be where is.  
 ‘Pedro might not have been where he actually is’  
 b. *Pedro no debería / no \*debe haber hecho lo que hizo.*  
 Pedro not must.COND/not must.PR.IND have done what he did.  
 ‘Pedro should not have done what he did’

	Temporal orientation	Self-licensing of conditional morphology	Conditional morphology and past orientation	Diversity condition	Semantic type of the argument
causatives/ directives	non-past	no	impossible	no	outcome
factive-evaluatives	non-future	yes	not required	no	proposition
<i>esperar</i> ‘hope’	none	no	not required	yes	proposition
<i>preferir</i> ‘prefer’	none	yes	not required	no	outcome/ proposition
<i>desear</i> ‘want-wish’	non-past	yes	not required	yes	outcome/ proposition
<i>querer</i> ‘want’	non-past	yes	required	yes	outcome/ proposition
modals	?non-past	yes	not required	yes	outcome/ proposition

**Table 1: An overview of the properties of predicates embedding intensional subjunctives and of modals**

**5. Conclusion and perspectives**

→ Differences in temporal orientation are grounded in differences as to the types of semantic objects denoted by selected argument clauses.

- An obligatory future or non-anterior orientation signals that the relevant object is not a proposition (a set of possible worlds), but an outcome (a situation or eventuality that ensues from a cause or is targeted by a disposition to bring it about).
- Lack of future orientation –as exhibited by evaluative-factives- is an indication that the relevant object is a fact (a proposition believed to be true by the bearer of the attitude).
- The puzzling behaviour of volitionals can be accounted for by assuming that they may be interpreted as dispositions to act, in which case the complement is construed as an outcome, or else they may carry the semantics of non-factive evaluatives, in which case the complement is construed as a proposition.

→ Conditional morphology explicitly indicates widening of the domain of doxastic alternatives and contributes to blurring the difference between factive and non-factive-evaluatives.

→ Unifying the class of volitionals in terms of a ranking semantics for “attitudes of approval” (Kenny 1963, Heim 1992) was an undoubtedly important step in developing a semantics for attitude verbs, and in clarifying their relation to belief attitudes. But over and above the ranking semantics all volitionals share, the differences exhibited in their grammatical behaviour seem to be of greater logical importance than Kenny was prepared to admit.

→ Open question: do “smaller” semantic objects, like outcomes, correspond to “simpler” syntactic objects, and correspondingly, do “bigger” semantic objects, like propositions, correspond to “more complex” syntactic objects?

- Attempts to define the relevant syntactic objects in terms of (surface) strings are doomed to failure, because of the heterogeneity of the verb classes selecting for subjunctive/infinitival/indicative complements (Rochette 1988, Portner 1997).



## References

- Abusch, Dorit. 2004. On the temporal composition of infinitives. *The Syntax of Time*, ed. by J. Guéron & J. Lecarme. MIT Press. 27-54.
- Condoravdi, Cleo. 2001. Temporal interpretations of modals. Modals for the present and for the past. *Stanford Papers on Semantics* ed. by D. Beaver & al., 59-87. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Copley, Bridget. 2008. Temporal orientation in conditionals, in J. Guéron & J. Lecarme (eds) *Time and Modality*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Corblin, Francis. 2002. *Représentation du discours et sémantique formelle*. Paris. PUF.
- Demirdache, H. & M. Uribe- Etxebarria. 2008. Scope and anaphora with time arguments: the case of perfect modals". *Lingua* 118.1790-1815.
- Enç, Mürvet. 1996. Tense and modality. *The handbook of contemporary semantic theory*, ed. by Sh. Lappin. Oxford. Blackwell. 345-358.
- Falaus, Anamaria. 2009. *Polarity items and dependent indefinites in Romanian*. PhDiss. University of Nantes
- Farkas, Donka. 2003. Assertion, belief and mood choice. Paper presented at the *Workshop on Conditional and Unconditional Modality, ESSLLI*, Vienna.
- von Fintel, Kai 1999. The presupposition of subjunctive conditionals. In Sauerland, U. and Percus, O., editors, *The Interpretive Tract*, MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, 25. 29-44.
- von Fintel, Kai & Iatridou, Sabine. 2008. How to say *ought* in foreign: the composition of weak necessity modals, in *Time and modality*, ed. By J. Guéron,& J. Lecarme. Berlin. Springer.
- Ginzburg, Jonathan & Sag, Ivan. 2001. *Interrogative investigations*. Stanford: CSLI Lecture Notes.
- Giorgi, Alessandra & Pianesi, Fabio. 1997. *Tense and aspect*, New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heim, Irene. 1992. Presupposition projection and the semantics of attitude verbs. *Journal of Semantics* 9. 183-221.
- Karttunen, Lauri. 1971. Implicative verbs. *Language* 47, 2. 340-359.
- Katz, Graham. 2004. (A)temporal complements, *Audiat Vox Sapientiae*, ed by C. Féry & W. Sternefeld. Berlin: Akademie. 240-258.
- Kasper, Walter. 1992. Presuppositions, composition, and simple subjunctives. *Journal of Semantics* 9. 307-331.
- Kenny, Anthony 1963. *Action, emotion and will*. London. Routledge.
- Laca, Brenda 2007. Mood in Spanish. *Mood in the languages of Europe*, ed by Bjorn Rothstein & Rolf Thieroff. Amsterdam: Benjamins. (to appear)
- Laca, Brenda. 2008. On modal tenses and tensed modals, *Proceedings of CHRONOS 2008*, ed. by Chiyo Nishida & Cinzia Russi (to appear).
- Laca, Brenda. 2009. The puzzle of subjunctive tenses. *Proceedings of Going Romance 2008* (to appear).
- Lozano, Anthony G. 1995. Cognitive development, deontic and epistemic subjunctives, *Hispanic Linguistics* 6/7. 93-114.
- Pesetsky, David. 1991. *Zero syntax, Vol. II*. (unpublished manuscript)
- Portner, Paul 1997. The semantics of mood, complementation, and conversational force. *Natural Language Semantics* 8, 167-212.
- Quer, Josep. 1998. *Mood at the interface*. PhD Dissertation, University of Utrecht.
- Quer, Josep. 2006. Subjunctives. *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, ed. by Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk, vol. IV, 660-684. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Rochette, Anne. 1988. *Semantic and syntactic aspects of Romance sentential complementation*. PhD Dissertation. MIT.
- Sessarego, Sandro. 2008a. Spanish Concordantia Temporum: an old issue, new solutions. Ms. The Ohio State University
- Smith, Carlota. 1991. *The parameter of aspect*. Dordrecht : Kluwer Academic Press.
- Suñer, Margarita. 1990. El tiempo en las subordinadas. *Tiempo y aspecto en español*, ed. by Ignacio Bosque. 77-105. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Suñer, Margarita & Padilla Rivera, José. 1987/1990. Concordancia temporal y subjuntivo. Bosque 1990 *Indicativo y subjuntivo*. Madrid: Taurus. 185-201.
- Villalta, Elizabeth. 2008. Mood and gradability. An investigation of subjunctive mood in Spanish. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31.467-522.
- Werner, Thomas. 2003. *Deducing the future and distinguishing the past: temporal interpretation in modal sentences in English*. PhD Dissertation. Rutgers.
- Zimmerman, Thomas Ede. 2006. Knowledge and desire, from a German perspective. *A Festschrift for Kjell Johann Soebo*. Oslo. 211-223.