MOOD AND PRESUPPOSITION IN SPANISH

ABSTRACT. There is a set of Spanish verbs which admit both Indicative and Subjunctive complements. The Indicative complementizer is correlated with a positive presupposition about the truth of the complement; the Subjunctive implies a neutral attitude. This paper shows that these presuppositions must be reflected in the underlying structure of the complement and cannot be explained through the use of surface structure interpretation rules because the presuppositional nature of the subordinate clause affects the application of a number of transformations, even very early ones.

Indicative and Subjunctive restrictive relative clauses imply the same types of presuppositions as the Indicative and Subjunctive complements respectively. They can be explained through the same type of configurations which can account for the syntactic and semantic behavior of the two types of complements.

INTRODUCTION*

This paper shows that the presuppositions made by the speakers about the truth value of certain complements affect not only the form of those complements but the applicability of certain transformations (e.g. Equi-NP Deletion, Neg(ative)-incorporation, Neg-transportation, and Subject-raising), as well as certain constraints such as tense restrictions.

There is a class of presuppositions which, in an adequate grammar of Spanish, must be marked in some way in the underlying structure of the sentences they affect. These presuppositions cannot be accounted for in terms of surface structure interpretation rules, which do not affect the syntactic form of the configuration.

The phenomena discussed in this article indicate that there are verbs which do not determine the nature of their complementizers. There are cases in Spanish in which the choice of the complementizer in the verb phrase complement is not dependent upon the verb of the main sentence but on semantic factors (i.e. presupposition) which are independent from that verb.

A particular interpretation is many times implicit in a given complement construction. Complementizers reflect meaningful aspects of the sentences in which they are constituents. This paper discusses the problem of how to formalize and explain those presuppositions which are reflected in the form of certain complements and in restrictive relative clauses.

* A brief and earlier version of this paper was read at the 1970 Summer Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America under the title 'Indicatives, subjunctives, and presupposition in Spanish'. I am very grateful to Adrienne Lehrer for her helpful comments.
Our conclusion is that these presuppositions are best explained by the underlying structure attributed to the complement-sentence itself. Complements which involve a positive presupposition about their truth value are not embedded in the surface matrix in underlying structure; they function as conjuncts and should perhaps be considered as complements of an abstract verb of supposing which is to the left of the performative.

The outline of this paper is as follows. The introduction defines the domain of this study. Section 1 discusses the rule of Neg-transportation in connection with the Indicative complement and the Subjunctive complement. Section 2 discusses Equi-NP Deletion. Section 3 tense restrictions. Section 4 Neg-incorporation. Section 5 Subject-raising. Section 6 some of the semantic factors which differentiate the two complements. Section 7 discusses restrictive relative clauses and Section 8 proposes a solution which accounts for the data presented in all previous sections.

It has been noted repeatedly that there are verbs in Spanish which admit both Indicative and Subjunctive complementizers. For instance, *parecer* 'to seem', when it is the matrix verb, can be followed by an embedded sentence whose verb is either in the Subjunctive Mood or in the Indicative.

1. *Le parece que venga mañana* (Subj.) 'It seems to him that he is coming tomorrow'.
2. *Le parece que viene mañana* (Ind.) 'It seems to him that he is coming tomorrow'.

Another example of this phenomenon is found in connection with the verb *creer* 'to believe' when preceded by the negative particle *no*.

---

1 For those readers who are not very familiar with Spanish I will provide, where relevant, the Mood of the embedded verb. (Ind.): Indicative; (Subj.): Subjunctive.
2 The semantic distinctions which will be discussed in this paper do not have one-to-one correlations in English. Rather than providing a gloss which reflects the meaning but not the form of the Equi-NP example, we will follow this convention: when an Indicative and a Subjunctive example differ as to the nature of their presuppositions alone, but both of them are grammatical and are not starred, we will provide a gloss for the example which is listed first, and we will then assume that the same gloss applies to the second one even though the nature of the presuppositions differs. There are glosses in which the use of *may* or some other lexical item indicating uncertainty reflects the Spanish meaning, but in a number of cases this is not true. See also footnote 4.
3 In my dialect a non-negative, non-interrogative matrix whose verb is *creer* can only be followed by an Indicative complement. But as we will discuss later on, a sentence of the type of (i) is ambiguous as far as presuppositions are concerned.

(i) *Mi primo cree que ganaste* (Ind.) 'My cousin believes that you won'.

However, there are dialects of Spanish in which the formal distinction between complements is found with non-negative, non-interrogative matrices as well. Gili Gaya (1961, p. 135) gives the following two sentences as grammatical structures:
Although the two sentences in (2) have identical glosses in English, they are not synonymous in Spanish. In (2a) there is no presupposition on the part of the speaker about the truth of the complement. The speaker has a neutral attitude and simply reports what the runners believe. In (2b) the speaker presupposes that the complement is true, that is, that the Belgian did truly win the race. In other words, the speaker has a positive attitude and assumes that the action to which the complement is referring has occurred. The Indicative denotes certainty while the Subjunctive does not.

These presuppositions remain constant in question-type sentences. When the embedded verb is in the Indicative, the speaker presupposes the truth of the complement. When the embedded verb is in the Subjunctive, there is no presupposition made by the speaker. In interrogative sentences the verb creer can be followed by both Indicative and Subjunctive complementizers, even when it is not preceded by a negation. (3a) and (4a) are parallel to (2a) as far as the presuppositional nature of the complement is concerned. (3b) and (4b) parallel (2b).

Verbs which behave like parecer (that is, which take Subjunctive and Indicative complementizers in non-negative, non-interrogative structures as well) are admitir ‘to admit’, alegrarse de ‘to be glad’, confiar ‘to hope’, comprender ‘to understand’, desconfiar de ‘to suspect’, entender ‘to understand’,

Since in my dialect (ii) a is ungrammatical, I will limit myself to the discussion of structures whose matrix is negative or interrogative. Parecer ‘to seem’ and other verbs which we will list later in the paper function in my dialect like creer in Gili Gaya’s dialect.

4 The difference in meaning between (3a) and (3b) might be reflected in the following glosses. For (3a): ‘Does it seem to you that he might be coming?’, and for (3b): ‘Does it seem to you that he’s coming? As he actually is’. But for the reasons provided in footnote 2, we will assume that (3a) and (3b) have the same English gloss.
esperar 'to hope', estar de acuerdo en 'to agree', negar 'to deny', sospechar 'to suspect', suponer 'to suppose', and temerse 'to be afraid'.

Verbs which behave like creer (that is, not allowing Subjunctive complementizers in non-negative, non-interrogative sentences) are contar 'to tell', explicar 'to explain', relatar 'to narrate', decir 'to say' (only as a verb of saying and not as a verb of command), opinar 'to be of the opinion'.

To provide an explanation for the sentences in (1)–(4) the following possibilities seem to be open for investigation:

a) To assume that there is some factor in the underlying structure of each (a)–(b) pair of sentences which accounts for their different presuppositions. The difference could be explained in terms of the matrix verb (by assuming that there are two homophonous lexical items parecer in the lexicon, two lexical items admitir, etc.), or by assigning the difference to the underlying structure of the complement itself (for instance, as proposed by Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1968) for factive and non-factive verbs). With this approach we are implying that different presuppositions involve different underlying representations.

b) To assume that syntactically some verbs may be marked to take both Subjunctive and Indicative complementizers in an optional way and that there is nothing in the underlying structure of each (a) sentence which differentiates it from its (b) counterpart. Since the only difference between each (a)–(b) pair of sentences is the nature of their respective presuppositions, we can assume that presuppositions should not be reflected in underlying structure. A surface structure interpretation rule could assign different interpretations to the sentences we are discussing. Presupposition is therefore a question of surface structure. This is basically the approach proposed by Chomsky in his recent paper 'Deep structure, surface structure, and semantic interpretation' (Chomsky, 1968).

Before trying to decide this matter, let us consider some of the differences between Subjunctive and Indicative complements. We will return to points (a) and (b) in Section 8 of this paper.

1. NEGATIVE-TRANSPORTATION

Creer and parecer are verbs which optionally undergo Neg-transportation. Neg-transportation is the rule which moves a negation from its original position in an embedded structure to the matrix.5

Faced with paradigms of the type of (5) we can ask ourselves how sentences

5 This transformation is studied in detail and motivated in (Rivero, 1969b), and in (Rivero, 1970a).
(5b) and (5c) are related to (5a). Are (5b) and (5c) the result of Neg-transportation and are they both syntactically related to (5a)?

(5)  
   a. Cree que no es inteligente 'He believes that he is not intelligent'.  
   b. No cree que sea inteligente (Subj.) 'He doesn’t believe that he is intelligent'.  
   c. No cree que es inteligente (Ind.).

If both (5b) and (5c) are the result of Neg-transportation, it would mean that they are related in similar ways to (5a), and the difference in Mood does not indicate a dissimilarity in underlying structure. To find an answer to this question consider the following sentences.

(6)  
   a. Mi hermano cree que no entiendas palabra de francés 'My brother believes that you don’t understand a word of French'.  
   b. Mi hermano no cree que entiendas palabra de francés (Subj.) 'My brother doesn’t believe that you understand a word of French'.  
   c. *Mi hermano no cree que entiendas palabra de francés (Ind.).

Palabra de... is an idiomatic expression which is grammatical only when it is a constituent of a negated clause in underlying structure. In (6b) palabra de... is grammatical even though the negation appears in the matrix sentence. We must therefore conclude that the negation originated in the embedded structure and was later on moved to a different position. The examination of the sentences in (6) leads us to the conclusion that, when the complement is in the Indicative and the negation appears in the surface structure of the matrix sentence, the location of the negative particle cannot be the result of Neg-transportation. This is motivated by the ungrammaticality of (6c). On the other hand, when the negation appears in the matrix and the embedded verb is in the Subjunctive, the structure has undergone Neg-transportation, as indicated by the grammaticality of (6b). In other words, (6a) and (6b) have a common underlying structure while the structure which underlies (6c) does not meet the structural index of Neg-transportation and is therefore different. In (6a) and (6b) the negative originates in the embedded structure. In (6c) it can only originate in the matrix.

Examples with gota de... (an expression with the same characteristics as

6 In a recent article, D. Bolinger (1968) states that sentences whose complement verb is in the Indicative and whose matrix is negative are those which result from Neg-transportation. That is, (i) could be the result of the application of this rule:

(i)  
   No creo que es inteligente (Ind.) ‘I don’t believe that he is intelligent’.

As the following discussion shows, the surface structure of (i) cannot be explained through Neg-transportation.
palabra de...), en absoluto\(^7\) and hasta-Time adverbials\(^8\) in sentences with punctual verbs confirm our conclusions.

(7) a. Cree que no probastegota de vino ‘He believes that you didn’t touch a drop of wine’.
    b. No cree que probarasgota de vino (Subj.) ‘He doesn’t believe that you touched a drop of wine’.
    c. *No cree que probastegota de vino (Ind.).

(8) a. Cree que no habló en absoluto ‘He believes that he didn’t talk at all’.
    b. No cree que hablara en absoluto (Subj.) ‘He doesn’t believe that he talked at all’.
    c. *No cree que habló en absoluto (Ind.).

(9) a. Cree que el tren no llega hasta las siete ‘He believes that the train doesn’t arrive until seven o’clock’.
    b. No cree que el tren llegue hasta las siete (Subj.) ‘He doesn’t believe that the train arrives until seven o’clock’.
    c. *No cree que el tren llega hasta las siete (Ind.).

The ungrammaticality of (6c)–(9c) leads us to conclude that the negative which appears in the matrix sentence of these examples could not have originated in the embedded clause; therefore, a structure whose subordinate verb is in the Indicative has not undergone Neg-transportation. This conclusion is supported by the readings we get in sentences which have undergone Sentence-pronominalization. Consider the following examples.

(10) a. Juan no cree que María venga y yo creo también (Subj.) ‘John doesn’t believe that Mary will come and I believe the same thing (literally: it) too’.

\(^7\) Palabra de..., gota de..., and en absoluto must be constituents of a negated sentence in underlying structure in order to be grammatical. Neg-incorporation, the process which inserts negative features across sentence boundaries, does not apply to these elements. For instance, in (i)\(a\) Neg-incorporation applies to form nada, although the embedded sentence is not negative in underlying structure. As the ungrammaticality of (i)\(b–d\) indicates, Neg-incorporation can never account for the negative character of palabra de..., gota de..., and en absoluto.

(i) a. No me di cuenta de que dijera nada ‘I didn’t realize that he said anything’.
    b. *No me di cuenta de que hablara en absoluto.
    c. *No me di cuenta de que hablara palabra de francés.
    d. *No me di cuenta de que bebiera gota de vino.

\(^8\) In sentences with a punctual verb, time adverbials with the preposition hasta are grammatical only when the string is negative.

(i) a. *Se dio cuenta hasta las siete.
    b. No se dio cuenta hasta las siete ‘He didn’t realize (it) until seven o’clock’.
b. *Juan no cree que Maria viene y yo lo creo (*también) (Ind.) 'John doesn’t believe that Mary will come \{and\} I believe it (*too)*.

(10a) indicates that John and I are of the same opinion and agree on the fact that Mary will probably not come. (10b) indicates two opposite beliefs: John doesn’t believe that Mary is coming but I do believe it. Notice that this difference in readings is expressed in Spanish by the difference in Mood in the embedded verb: Indicative vs. Subjunctive.

In connection with Neg-transportation these facts are easy to explain. In (10a) *lo* ‘it’ is pronominalizing a string of the form *Maria no viene* ‘Mary is not coming’, that is, a string which is identical to the embedded sentence of the first conjunct before Neg-transportation applies to it. Later on, when the transformation applies to this first conjunct, it transports the negative to the matrix, where it remains up to surface structure. This implies that Sentence-pronominalization has preceded Neg-transportation. In (10b), given that the form of the first conjunct cannot be the result of Neg-transportation, *lo* could not be pronominalizing a negative string but only a non-negative one, *Maria viene* ‘Mary is coming’. This is exactly what the reading of (10b) indicates and it is confirmed by the fact that the addition of *también* ‘too’ makes (10b) an incongruous sentence given that the first and the second conjunct express opposite beliefs. Sentences of the type of (10a) and (10b) motivate the assumption that a structure whose embedded clause is in the Indicative has not undergone Neg-transportation.

Sentences with *parecer* support the same conclusions. When the negation appears in the surface structure of the matrix sentence and the verb of the subordinate clause is in the Indicative, that negation could not have originated in the embedded sentence.

9 We will assume that sentences of the type of (i) have an underlying structure as in (PMi),

\[
\text{NP} \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{Juan} \quad \text{parece} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{SI} \\
\text{que llueve}
\]

and that there is a rule (Flip or Psych-movement) which transforms the underlying subject into an indirect object.

(i) *A Juan le parece que llueve* ‘It seems to John that it is raining’.

(PMi) meets the structural index of Neg-transportation in the same way as structures whose matrix verb is *creer.*
(11) a. *No parece que probara gota de vino (Subj.) ‘It doesn’t seem that he touched a drop of wine’.
    b. *No parece que probó gota de vino (Ind.).

(12) a. No parece que hablara en absoluto (Subj.) ‘It doesn’t seem that he talked at all’.
    b. *No parece que habló en absoluto (Ind.).

In other words, sentences of the type of (13a) have an underlying structure which meets the structural description of Neg-transportation while sentences of the type of (13b) do not.

(13) a. Parece que Carmen no viniera (Subj.) ‘It seems that Carmen didn’t come’.
    b. Parece que Carmen no vino (Ind.).

2. EQUI-NP DELETION

A second rule which differentiates structures with an embedded Indicative from those with an embedded Subjunctive is Equi-NP Deletion. Some of the aspects of this rule in the grammar of Spanish are discussed in (Perlmutter, 1968) and in (Rivero, 1969a).

In connection with the results obtained in the previous section, it is possible to show which complementizer is related to the structure which undergoes Equi-NP Deletion. Consider the following sentences.

(14) a. No cree que sea inglesa (Subj.) ‘She doesn’t believe that she is English’.
    b. No cree que es inglesa (Ind.).
    c. No cree ser inglesa ‘She doesn’t believe that she is (lit. to be) English’.

We are concerned here and in the following examples with that reading in which the subject of the matrix and that of the embedded sentence of (14a) and (14b) are coreferential. (14a) and (14b) are structures which have not undergone Equi-NP Deletion. Creer is a verb which is optionally marked for this transformation and in example (14c) Equi-NP Deletion has applied.

There are dialects in which (13a) is an ungrammatical sentence. The use of the Subjunctive is an aspect of the syntax of Spanish which is undergoing many changes and which varies widely from dialect to dialect. Old Spanish allowed an extensive number of verbs to take both Subjunctive and Indicative complements with the types of presuppositions discussed in this paper; many of those verbs have now been restricted to only one fixed complementizer and it seems that the process is continuing and that in the future of the Spanish language an increasingly smaller number of verbs will be grammatical with two kinds of complements.
The question we may ask at this point is how (14c) is related to (14a) and (14b). Is it possible that the underlying structures of (14a) and (14b) undergo Equi-NP Deletion to be transformed into the same surface structure, namely (14c)? Is (14c) transformationally related to only one of them and if so, which one?

As the following examples indicate, structures whose embedded verb is in the Subjunctive and structures which have undergone Equi-NP Deletion share a common underlying structure; structures whose embedded verb is in the Indicative when the matrix is negative are unrelated syntactically to the first two.

(15)  a. *No cree que haya mencionado palabra del asunto (Subj.) ‘He doesn’t believe that he mentioned a word about the matter’.
    b. *No cree que ha mencionado palabra del asunto (Ind.).
    c. No cree haber mencionado palabra del asunto ‘He doesn’t believe that he mentioned (lit. to have mentioned) a word about the matter’.

In (15a) Neg-transportation has applied moving the negative from the embedded clause into the matrix. This is why *palabra de... is grammatical although the negative does not appear in the same surface clause as this constituent. (15b) is ungrammatical because, as demonstrated in the previous section, the negative could not have originated in the embedded structure; under those conditions, the constraint that *palabra de... be the constituent of an underlying negated clause is violated. Since (15a) and the example which has undergone Equi-NP Deletion, (15c), have the same degree of grammaticality, we must conclude that they are related transformationally. The underlying structure of (15b) does not undergo Equi-NP Deletion; if we claimed that it did, we could not account for the difference in grammaticality between (15b) and (15c). It could be argued that the grammaticality of *palabra de... in (15c) is due to the pruning of the embedded S-node, in which case (15b) and (15c) could have the same underlying structure. A proof that this is not possible is presented in Section 5.

Additional examples which lead us to the same conclusions are:

(16)  a. No cree que bebiera gota de vino en el banquete (Subj.) ‘He doesn’t believe that he touched a drop of wine at the banquet’.
    b. *No cree que bebió gota de vino en el banquete (Ind.).
    c. No cree haber bebido gota de vino en el banquete ‘He doesn’t believe that he touched (lit. to have touched) a drop of wine at the banquet’.

(17)  a. No cree que hablara en absoluto (Subj.) ‘He doesn’t believe that he talked at all’.
b. *No cree que habló en absoluto (Ind.).

c. No cree haber hablado en absoluto 'He doesn’t believe he talked (lit. to have talked) at all'.

(18) a. No cree que se enterara hasta la mañana (Subj.) 'He doesn’t believe he learned about it until morning'.

b. *No cree que se enteró hasta la mañana (Ind.).

c. No cree haberse enterado hasta la mañana 'He doesn’t believe he learned (lit. to have learned) about it until morning'.

In (16), (17), and (18), the sentences with the Subjunctive in the embedded sentence and those with an Infinitive which results from Equi-NP Deletion have the same degree of grammaticality.

Equi-NP Deletion is the second rule which is sensitive to the Indicative-Subjunctive distinction. Structures underlying those sentences whose complementizer is in the Indicative do not meet the structural description of Equi-NP Deletion; those whose complementizer is a Subjunctive meet the index of the transformation.

3. TENSE RESTRICTIONS

A third aspect which differentiates, in a syntactic way, structures with an embedded Subjunctive from those with an embedded Indicative is the sequence of tenses in the tree.

When the complement sentence is in the Indicative there are no tense restrictions between the matrix verb and the embedded verb. Any sequence of tenses is grammatical.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
(19) & a. & cree \\
& b. & creía \\
& c. & creyó \\
& d. & ha creído \\
& e. & Juan no habla creído que María ha venido \\
& f. & habrá creído habrá venido \\
& g. & habría creído habría venido \\
& h. & creerá vendrá \\
& i. & creería vendría \\
\end{array}
\]

'John doesn’t believe (in any tense) that Mary comes (in any tense)'.

The event which is mentioned in the complement may precede, follow or be simultaneous with the event mentioned in the matrix. The event in the embedded sentence is logically independent from that of the matrix. There
is always a context in which any of the sequences presented in (19) is grammatical. *Parecer* functions in the same way:

(20) a. A Juan le pareció que María vino
b. A Juan parecía que María venía
c. pareció

‘It seems (or any other tense) to John that Mary comes (or any other tense)’.

The verbs listed in the introduction behave alike in this respect. They do not have tense restrictions when their complement is in the Indicative; that is, any sequence of two tenses is grammatical.

When the complement verb is in the Subjunctive there are tense restrictions; that is, not all sequences of two tenses are grammatical. It is beyond the scope of this paper to present an exhaustive list of those sequences which are grammatical and those which are deviant. We will simply give a few examples of ungrammatical sequences to motivate our assertion:

(21) a. *Juan no creyó que María venga (Subj.).
b. *Juan no creyó que María haya venido (Subj.).
c. *Juan no ha creído que María viniera (Subj.).
d. *Juan no había creído que María viniera (Subj.).
e. *Juan no habrá creído que María venga (Subj.).

(22) a. *A Juan le pareció que María venga (Subj.).
b. *A Juan le habría parecido que María venga (Subj.).

As shown by the ungrammaticality of certain sequences of tenses when the subordinate verb is in the Subjunctive, there is a logical correlation between the verb of the matrix and that of the embedded clause. The subordinate verb is not independent from the matrix verb.

Our examples have shown that the constraint which states which sequences of tenses are permissible does not apply to structures with Indicative complementizers, but it does apply to strings whose complement is in the Subjunctive.

Tense restrictions are also found in questions whose embedded clause is in the Subjunctive. Indicatives do not exhibit restrictions.

(22) a. ¿Creía Vd. que es rusa? (Ind.) ‘Did you believe that she is Russian?’
b. *¿Creía Vd. que sea rusa? (Subj.).

In (22a) we find that the sequence Past-Present is grammatical when the Mood of the subordinate verb is Indicative. In (22b) the same sequence,
Past-Present, is ungrammatical due to the Mood of the embedded verb, in this case Subjunctive.

The lack of synonymy between the Subjunctive and the Indicative complements in that which concerns the nature of their presuppositions and the tense restrictions which apply in a similar fashion to all the verbs we have listed show that the phenomena we are discussing are very general and not limited to a small class of verbs marked for Neg-transportation and/or Equi-NP Deletion.

4. NEG-INCORPORATION

There is another transformation which differentiates the Subjunctive from the Indicative complementizer: Neg-incorporation. Neg-incorporation is the rule which applies across sentence boundaries to insert negative features in certain constituents. Consider the following examples.

(23)  a. No confiaba en que estuviera diciendo nada (Subj.) 'I was not confident that he was saying anything'.
     b. *No confiaba en que estaba diciendo nada (Ind.).

Confiar 'to be confident' is a verb which does not provide a favorable environment for Neg-transportation. This implies that the negative which appears in the matrix of example (23a) could not have originated in the underlying structure of the embedded clause. Nada 'nothing, anything' is a lexical item which in order to be grammatical in simple sentences must precede the verb if there is no other negative word which precedes that verb:

(24)  a. No como nada 'I don’t eat anything'.
     b. Nada como 'I don’t eat anything'.
     c. Nunca como nada 'I never eat anything'
     d. No como nada nunca 'I never eat anything'.

(25)  a. *Como nada.
     b. *Como nada nunca.
     c. *Como nunca nada.

In (23a) there is no negation in the same simplex as nada but the grammaticality of the structure is explained as the result of Neg-incorporation. This rule assigns a negative feature to the form which underlies nada, and it works across sentence boundaries. As the ungrammaticality of (23b) indicates, Neg-incorporation does not apply when the complement is in the Indicative. Other examples with additional lexical items of a negative nature follow.

(26)  a. No confiaba en que viniera nadie (Subj.) 'He was not confident that anyone was coming'.
b. *No confiaba en que venía nadie (Ind.).

(27) a. No confiaba en que se lo dijeran nunca (Subj.) 'He was not confident on being told at any time'.
   b. *No confiaba en que se lo decían nunca (Ind.).

In examples with creer and parecer the same situation is found. Neg-incorporation applies when the complement is in the Subjunctive but not when it is in the Indicative.

(28) a. No cree que hablará con nadie (Subj.) 'He doesn't believe that he talked to anyone'.
   b. *No cree que hablaban con nadie (Ind.).

(29) a. No le parecía que viniera nunca (Subj.) 'It didn't seem to him that he was coming at any time'.
   b. *No le parecía que venía nunca (Ind.).

It could be argued that (28a) and (29a) are not cases of Neg-incorporation across sentence boundaries if it is assumed that Neg-incorporation applies before Neg-transportation. At the moment in which the rule which assigns negative features applies, the negation would still be in its basic position, that is, in the embedded structure. If this ordering is adopted, (28a) and (29a) constitute another argument for the assumption that Neg-transportation applies only to the structures whose complement is a Subjunctive, while examples (26) and (27) motivate in an independent way the assumption that Neg-incorporation does not apply when the complement is in the Indicative. Since any of the given orders supports some of our conclusions and none contradicts them, we will not try to find out in which relative sequence Neg-transportation and Neg-incorporation should apply.

5. SUBJECT-RAISING

Another transformation which differentiates Indicative and Subjunctive subordinate clauses is Subject-raising (also called It-replacement or It-substitution).

Subject-raising operates in Spanish in the following way. Consider the examples in (30).

(30) a. Le parece que Lola es la mejor (Ind.) 'It seems to him that Lola is the best one'.
   b. Le parece que Lola sea la mejor (Subj.).
   c. Lola le parece ser la mejor 'Lola seems to him to be the best one'.

At the moment in which Subject-raising applies, the structure which underlies (30c) and, either (30a) or (30b), or both, is (PM1) (the verb of the em-
The embedded clause is in the Indicative only for expository purposes. At this point we still don’t know how (30c) is related to (30a) and (30b). The subject of the lower sentence is then raised to the matrix where it comes to function as the subject of the higher verb, and it becomes independent from the embedded clause. That in (31c) the matrix verb agrees in number with los payasos ‘the clowns’ indicates that this constituent has come to be the subject of the matrix.

(31)  a. *Le parece que estos payasos son los mejores* *(Ind.)* ‘It seems to him that these clowns are the best ones’.

b. *Le parece que estos payasos sean los mejores* *(Subj.)*.

c. *Estos payasos le parecen ser los mejores* ‘These clowns seem to him to be the best ones’.

The subjectless verb of the embedded clause is transformed into an Infinitive, the embedded sentence is extraposed to the end of the string, and its S-node is pruned.

Subject-raising and Equi-NP Deletion are mutually exclusive. If one of the rules applies to a given structure, it removes that NP which is needed if the structural description of the other rule is to be met. This explains why, although we find sentences of the type of (32a) in which *Lola* and *ella* ‘she’ are coreferential, sentences of the type of (32b) can never have an interpretation where the subject of *parecer* and that of *ser* are coreferential. (32b) is the result of Subject-raising.

(32)  a. *A Lola, le parece que ella*$_x$ [es]

      [sea] [la]

      [melhor]

      

      [((Ind.))]

      [((Subj.))]

‘It seems to Lola, that she$_x$ is the best one’.

b. *Lola parece ser la mejor* ‘Lola seems to be the best one’.

The structure underlying (32a) can also undergo Equi-NP Deletion, as (33) shows. As indicated by the presence of the preposition in (33), Subject-raising has not occurred. The fact that the matrix verb does not agree in number with los payasos in (34) leads us to the same conclusion.
(33)  A Lola le parece ser la mejor ‘It seems to Lola that she is (lit. to be) the best one’

(34)  A los payasos les parece ser los mejores ‘It seems to the clowns that they are (lit. to be) the best ones’.

Parecer undergoes both Equi-NP Deletion and Subject-raising, but since the rules are incompatible, the following argument and the discussion presented in the section on Equi-NP Deletion should be considered as independent, although they have parallel developments.

Consider the following sentences:

(35)  a. No le parece que Lola hable palabra de francés (Subj.) ‘It doesn’t seem to him that Lola speaks a word of French’.
   b. *No le parece que Lola habla palabra de francés (Ind.).
   c. Lola no le parece hablar palabra de francés ‘Lola doesn’t seem to him to speak a word of French’.

(35a) has undergone Neg-transportation as the grammaticality of palabra de... in the embedded clause indicates. As demonstrated in Section 1, the structure whose complement is in the Indicative cannot undergo Neg-transportation; this explains the ungrammaticality of (35b). (35c) has undergone Subject-raising, and, as the non-deviance of palabra de... shows, it has also undergone Neg-transportation. We must conclude that (35a) and (35c) have the same underlying structure, given that they have the same degree of grammaticality, and we must also assume that (35b) cannot have the same underlying structure as (35a) and (35c). In other words, the underlying structure whose complement is in the Indicative in surface structure does not meet the structural description of Subject-raising. The underlying structure whose surface representation has a Subjunctive complementizer does meet the structural description of the transformation and it may undergo it.

It could be argued that the grammaticality of (35c) and that of (15c) in Section 2 of this paper is due to the pruning of a number of S-nodes which make palabra de... a constituent of a negative sentence in derived or in surface structure. That this is not so is demonstrated by the following examples:

(36)  a. *No recordó decir palabra de francés.
   b. No recordó decir nada ‘He didn’t remember to say anything’.

Recordar ‘to remember’ is a verb which is not marked for Neg-transportation. The negation which precedes the main verb in the sentences in (36) could have originated only in the matrix sentence of the underlying structure. Both examples in (36) have undergone Equi-NP Deletion, which implies that their embedded S-node has been pruned (this pruning is motivated in (Rivero,
1969a)), (36b) is grammatical because Neg-incorporation has applied and assigned a negative feature to the form which underlies nada. There is no deep structure constraint in Spanish stating that the underlying form of nada must be the constituent of a negated clause, in order for nada to be grammatical in surface structure. (36a) is ungrammatical because palabra de... was not a constituent of a negated clause in UNDERLYING STRUCTURE and there is no Neg-incorporation rule applying to this constituent to make it grammatical once this condition is not met. Although (36a) is a simple sentence in its derived structure, it is not grammatical because in its underlying structure it violated the condition connected with palabra de... Since (36a) is similar to (35c) in that both sentences are simple in their surface structure, we have proven that the grammaticality of (35c) is due to the application of Neg-transportation and not to the pruning of S-nodes which result in palabra de... being in a negated sentence in surface structure.

We must conclude that Indicative complementizers are the reflection of structures which do not undergo Subject-raising while Subjunctive complementizers are connected with structures which may undergo the transformation.

6. ADDITIONAL SEMANTIC ARGUMENTS

After briefly noticing a difference in presuppositions between a Subjunctive and an Indicative complementizer, we have merely concentrated on the syntactic differences exhibited by these complements, but there are some purely semantic factors which differentiate them as well.

Consider the following questions:

(37)  a. ¿No crees que María sea bonita? (Subj.) ‘Don’t you believe that Mary is pretty?’.
    b. ¿No crees que María es bonita? (Ind.)

Although it would be difficult to reflect it in an English gloss, (37a) and (37b) are not paraphrases, and the nature of their presuppositions affect their use and the expected answers. (37a) is a repetition of what the person who is being questioned has said. The speaker already knows the opinion of the hearer and he simply wants a confirmation. A way to render this meaning into English and to differentiate it from the meaning of the Indicative sentence would be through the following gloss: ‘Is it true that your opinion happens to be that Mary is not pretty?’. The speaker remains neutral, he does not let us know his feelings about Mary’s beauty or lack of it. A surprising answer to this question would be ‘Sí, creo que es bonita’ ‘Yes, I believe she is pretty’. In (37b) the speaker is committed to the truth of the complement; he assumes that Mary is pretty and he is actually asking if the hearer agrees
with him. This is rendered into English by the following sentence: 'I believe that Mary is pretty, don't you agree with me?'. In other words, in (37b) the presupposition is 'Mary is pretty' and in (37a) it is 'You believe that Mary is not pretty'. An appropriate answer to (37b) is 'Si, estoy de acuerdo contigo' 'Yes, I agree with you', but this would be an incongruous answer to (37a). (37a) is the structure which has undergone Neg-transportation and it is synonymous with (38).

(38)  ¿Crees que María no es bonita? 'Do you believe that Mary is not pretty?'

(37b) is not at all synonymous with (38).

Consider now the following sentences:

(39)  a. No creen que son más altos de lo que son (Ind.) ‘They don’t believe they are taller than they are’.

b. No creen que sean más altos de lo que son (Subj.).

Although any sentence with comparatives poses a number of problems which await solution, the important point is that (39b) can NEVER have a reading which is contradictory while (39a) can have one interpretation which is contradictory. (39a) constitutes a contradiction when it is assigned a reading in which the speaker assumes the truth of the complement. The speaker presupposes that son más altos de lo que son ‘they are taller than they are’ is true. In that interpretation it is stated that some people don’t believe that which the speaker himself assumes to be true, but the speaker’s presupposition involves a contradiction. Since that sort of presupposition is not found in (39b), there is no contradictory reading.

7. RELATIVE CLAUSES

We have limited ourselves so far to the discussion of complement sentences, but there is another area of Spanish syntax where similar distinctions between Subjunctives and Indicatives are made: restrictive relative clauses. Consider the following examples.

(40)  a. Los que se consideran capaces serán los mejores (Ind.) ‘Those who consider themselves able (to do it) will be the best ones’.

b. Los que se consideren capaces serán los mejores (Subj.).

In (40a), a structure whose relative clause is in the Indicative, there is a positive presupposition, namely that there exist some people who consider themselves as fit to do something. In (40b), the string whose relative clause is in the Subjunctive, there is no presupposition with respect to the existence
of these same people. There may or may not be people who meet that condition, but in the event they exist, they will be the best ones. Notice that the only formal difference between (40a) and (40b) is the Subjunctive-Indicative distinction.

The presuppositions involved in the sentences in (40) are exactly the same ones we found with Subjunctive and Indicative complements. The Subjunctive complement involved no presupposition, a restrictive relative clause in the Subjunctive involves no presupposition about the existence of the things talked about. An Indicative complement implies that the speaker presupposes the truth of the complement, a restrictive relative with an Indicative verb implies the truth of that relative clause in the same way.

The difference in presuppositions is seen very clearly in the following examples:

(41) a. Los que se consideran capaces, *si es que existe alguno, serán los mejores (Ind.).
   b. Los que se consideren capaces, si es que existe alguno, serán los mejores (Subj.) ‘Those who consider themselves able to (do it), in the event there is any, will be the best ones’.

(41a) is an incongruous sentence in that it assumes that it is true that there are people who feel capable of doing something while at the same time doubting it. Since there is no presupposition of this kind involved in (41b), this last example is not incongruous.

When an NP is modified by a quantifier with a negative element incorporated into it (e.g. ninguno ‘none’) the only possible Mood in the restrictive relative clause is the Subjunctive. This seems to correlate with the semantic fact that one cannot assume that something is true while denying its existence at the same time.

(42) a. Ningún obrero que se considere capaz lo hará (Subj.) ‘No worker who considers himself able (to do it) will do it’.
   b. *Ningún obrero que se considera capaz lo hará (Ind.).

In the same manner as some semantic properties of verbs determine the nature of the complementizer, some matrix verbs determine the Mood of the restrictive relative clause. When there is a factive verb in the matrix the complement is assumed to be true and so is the restrictive relative clause:

(43) a. Sabe que viene (Ind.) ‘He knows that he is coming’.
   b. *Sabe que venga (Subj).

(44) a. Conoce a un mecánico que sabe hacerlo (Ind.) ‘He knows a mechanic who knows how to do it’.
   b. *Conoce a un mecánico que sepa hacerlo (Subj.).
Subjunctive relative clauses have tense restrictions, just like Subjunctive complementizers; Indicative complements and Indicative restrictive relative clauses do not have tense restrictions.

(45) a. *Los que no sean capaces de hacerlo ya habían venido (Subj.).
    b. Los que son capaces de hacerlo ya habían venido (Ind.) 'Those who are able to do it had already come'.

From these set of parallelisms we must conclude that restrictive relative clauses and the complements we have discussed in this paper treat presuppositions in a similar fashion and that the best analysis should capture this fact.

8. THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

How are we to explain the differences we have been discussing throughout this paper between Subjunctive and Indicative complementizers?

The first obvious solution would be to consider that each verb we have presented represents two homophonous lexical entries, V1 and V2, which take different complementizers. This would account for the disparity of meaning we find between Subjunctive and Indicative complements, although this difference would then be attributed to the matrix verb and not to the embedded clause itself, which doesn’t seem to reflect the facts. V1 would be marked so as to take an Indicative complementizer; V2 to take a Subjunctive one.

The first objection to this solution is that none of the verbs we have discussed in this paper can be clearly attributed to two different syntactic/semantic groups. To see this point in a clearer way let us consider a verb such as decir ‘to tell’. Decir can be classified semantically as a verb of command or as a verb of saying and syntactically it can take two complements which correlate with the two readings.

(46) a. Le digo que estudie (Subj.) 'I tell him to study'.
    b. Le digo que estudia (Ind.) 'I tell him that he is studying'.

(46a) is clearly reporting an order. In that example decir is a verb of command and the string is related to such forms as Le ordeno que estudie 'I order him to study'. This is motivated by the fact that when the embedded clause is in the Subjunctive, the matrix cannot have a first person subject.

(47) a. *Me digo que estudie yo (Subj.). '*I tell myself to study'.
    b. *Me ordeno que estudie yo (Subj.) '*I order myself to study'.

Decir in (46b) is a verb of telling, not of ordering, and it is related to strings of the form Le cuento que estudia 'I tell him that he is studying'. The
constraint which applies to verbs of command does not apply to verbs of telling, as seen in the following examples:

(48)  
    a.  *Me digo a mí mismo que estudio* (Ind.) 'I tell myself that I study'.  
        b.  *Me cuento a mí mismo que estudio* (Ind.) 'I tell myself that I study'.

The readings of decir and the syntactic behavior which correlates with each one of the readings would lead us to consider that there are two distinct lexical items decir.

A second verb in which two different meanings are apparent is sentir which can be glossed in English by either 'to feel' or 'to be sorry'. With an Indicative complementizer sentir can only be interpreted as 'to feel' and it is then in the same semantic class as notar 'to notice, to feel'.

(49)  
    a.  *Siento que viene* (Ind.) 'I feel that he is coming'.  
        b.  *Noto que viene* (Ind.) 'I notice that he is coming'.

With a Subjunctive complementizer sentir can only be interpreted as 'to be sorry' and it is in the same class as dar pena 'to make sad'.

(50)  
    a.  *Siento que venga* (Subj.) 'I am sorry that he is coming'.  
        b.  *Me da pena que venga* (Subj.) 'It makes me sad that he is coming'.

Notice that with the two kinds of sentir the truth of the complement is presupposed. This implies that there is no simple and automatic way to equate a Subjunctive with no presupposition about the truth of the complement, and an Indicative complementizer with a positive presupposition. We will return to this point later on.

Verbs such as admitir, confiar, parecer, suponer, etc., do not have different readings depending on the type of complement which follows them. There is nothing in the interpretation of the verb itself which differentiates *Le parece que venga* (Subj.) from *Le parece que viene* (Ind.) 'It seems to him that he is coming'. To see this in more detail let us consider the verb admitir in the following examples.

(51)  
    a.  *Admite que vino el inspector* (Ind.) 'He admits that the inspector came'.  
        b.  *Admite que viniera el inspector* (Subj.)

In the sentences presented in (51) we find the same types of differences we have discussed throughout this paper. In (51a) there is a presupposition on the part of the speaker that the complement is true: this is formally reflected by the presence of the Indicative in the embedded clause. In (51b) there is no presupposition about the truth of the complement; the speaker merely
reports that somebody admitted X: this is formally reflected by the Subjunctive. The interpretation of doubt and of lack of certainty which is assigned in some cases to the use of the Subjunctive can be explained for certain verbs as the lack of commitment on the part of the speaker.

The verb of the matrix has the same reading in (51a) as in (51b). The person talked about has performed exactly the same action in both (51a) and (51b). The matrix verb does not in any way reflect the position of the speaker, and, as the two kinds of complementizers indicate, admitir does not imply that the complement must be necessarily assumed to be true as is the case with factive verbs such as saber ‘to know’.

To show that it is not admitir itself which contributes to the difference in meaning between (51a) and (51b), let us set up these sentences in a specific context. Suppose a prisoner is being interrogated and the interrogator knows that an inspector visited that prisoner but the prisoner himself is unaware of this. After several hours the prisoner admits that the inspector visited him. The interrogator then makes a report of the form of (51a) where he is actually stating that the prisoner has finally admitted what he, the interrogator, considers to be the truth. If the person interrogating the prisoner had not known that the inspector had come, when the prisoner would have made his confession, (51b) would imply that the interrogator is simply reporting what happened but that he himself does not have a way to evaluate the importance of the confession. If the prisoner had been interrogated for hours in search of that specific admission, that is, that the inspector came, the uttering of (51b), once the confession is made, would be totally inappropriate, only (51a) would do.

Notice that the action of the prisoner himself is exactly the same in (51a) and (51b) and that he may not be aware at all of what the interrogator already knows or assumes to be true.

Although it might be necessary to set two lexical items V1 and V2 for some of the verbs we listed at the beginning of the paper\(^\text{11}\), it is obvious that this solution does not apply to the majority of the verbs we have presented.

There is syntactic evidence which motivates the assumption that the Subjunctive-Indicative distinction should not be attributed to the matrix verb. Lexical items with distinct readings cannot be deleted under identity conditions of a purely formal nature. If we have two lexical items V1 and V2 of identical phonological form, we cannot delete one of them under formal identity conditions with the other one because semantically they are

\(^{11}\) Of the different verbs we have discussed, it is perhaps creer which most clearly offers two shades of meaning. One of its readings is equivalent to ‘think’ and the other one to ‘believe somebody’s claim’. At this point it would be as logical to attribute this semantic difference to the two underlying configurations we will propose later on in the paper, but we feel that the question remains open for a few cases.
different. Consider the verb sentir which, as we have already mentioned, is to be interpreted as ‘to feel’ when it is in the Subjunctive.

(52)  
   a. *Siento que María va al médico y que se rompiera la pierna.12
       ‘I hear (lit. I feel) that Mary is going to the doctor and I am sorry that she broke her leg’.
   b. *Siento que María va al médico y que se rompiera la pierna.12

In (52a) the first conjunct has as its matrix verb sentir1 ‘to feel’ and the second conjunct has sentir2 ‘to be sorry’. Since their phonological form is the same, it could be expected that the second sentir could be deleted under this kind of identity condition with the first sentir. The deviance of (52b), where the deletion has been performed, indicates that a mere identity of form is not sufficient for this process of deletion. Compare (52b) with (53b) where a deletion has been performed with identity not only in form but in semantic representation as well.

(53)  
   a. *Siento que María vaya al médico y que se rompiera la pierna ‘I am sorry that Mary is going to the doctor and I am sorry that she broke her leg’.
   b. Siento que María vaya al médico y que se rompiera la pierna ‘I am sorry that Mary is going to the doctor and that she broke her leg’.

The possibility of deletion should provide a test for the semantic identity or non-identity of the verbs which can be followed by both Indicative and Subjunctive complements. If a verb which is followed by an Indicative complementizer can be deleted under identity conditions with that same verb when followed by a Subjunctive complementizer or vice versa, we would have reason to believe that we are dealing with one unique verb and that the difference in presuppositions is not attributable to the semantic content of the verb itself.

(54)  
   a. A Lola no le parece que haga frío (Subj.) ni le parece que hace calor (Ind.) ‘It doesn’t seem to Lola that it is cold nor does it seem to her that it is hot’.

12 Sentences of the type of Dijo que estaba lloviendo y que viniera inmediatamente ‘He said that it was raining and that he was to come immediately’ seem to constitute counter-examples to the assumption that phonological identity is not a sufficient condition for deletion. There are two arguments which indicate that these counterexamples are only apparent: first, the example discussed here is a paraphrase of Dijo que viniera inmediatamente porque estaba lloviendo ‘He told him to come immediately because it was raining’; and second, the Indicative complement must always be the first conjunct even if there is no precedence in time: *Dijo que viniera inmediatamente y que llovía. In other words, it is plausible to assume that the source of the example is not a PM with a first main verb decir of telling and a second conjoined main verb of ordering, but rather a PM with a verb of ordering and a causal clause.
b. A Lola no le parece que haga frío ni que hace calor ‘It doesn’t seem to Lola that it is hot nor that it is cold’.

The fact that in (54b) the parecer which appeared in the second conjunct has been deleted under identity conditions with the parecer in the first conjunct indicates that we are dealing with only one verb phonologically and semantically speaking. In (54) we find the expected presuppositions associated with the complements. The second conjunct states that the speaker feels that it is a fact that it is hot. The first conjunct merely reflects Lola’s opinion.

Another argument which seems to support the assumption that the presuppositional nature of the complement is not due to the matrix verb is the fact that we found the same distinctions in presuppositions among restrictive relative clauses and that in most cases they are completely independent from the matrix verb. If we want to capture the parallelisms between restrictive relatives and the complements, the close dependency between a matrix verb and the presupposition of its complement versus the independence of the restrictive clause would be hard to explain as a common phenomenon.

To eliminate the possibility of explaining these different presuppositions in terms of the matrix verb implies that there are cases in which that verb does not control the nature of its complement, but that the complement depends on other semantic factors than those provided by the main clause.

If the two different complements cannot be explained in terms of two distinct matrix verbs, two possibilities seem to be open:

a) The two complementizers are simply optional and their presuppositional nature is indicated by surface structure interpretation rules (of the type of those proposed by Chomsky (1968) to account for stress phenomena correlated with presuppositions).

b) Some factors in the underlying structure of the complements we have discussed determines their presuppositional nature. The presuppositions are reflected in the underlying form of a sentence.

When facing these two possibilities we are actually asking at which level presupposition should be accounted for in a generative grammar of Spanish.

It should be fairly clear at this point that the position that presuppositions should be a matter of surface structure is incorrect for the complements we have discussed. We have presented five different syntactic criteria which differentiate the two constructions: Neg-transportation, Neg-incorporation, Equi-NP Deletion, Subject raising, and tense restrictions. Some of the transformations which differentiate the two complements are early rules in Spanish. For instance, Neg-transportation is a very early cyclic rule which applies before Quantifier reduction and Adverb reduction (see (Rivero, 1969a)). In view of the fact that the nature of the presuppositions in a given
structure must be distinguished when very early transformations apply, it is unrevealing to attempt to account for presuppositions in terms of late principles of semantics.

To save this approach we would have to take a number of arbitrary steps. First, certain verbs should be marked as taking Indicative or Subjunctive complementizers in an optional way, with no interpretation associated with them when inserted. The presence of the Indicative complementizer would block Neg-transportation, Neg-incorporation, Equi-NP Deletion, and Subject-raising. A constraint on tense restrictions would apply to those strings in which the Subjunctive complementizer has been selected.

As for restrictive relative clauses an Indicative or Subjunctive Mood would optionally be inserted in them, presumably through some arbitrary marker and with no interpretation attached at this point, to be later interpreted by the same surface structure interpretation rule which assigns readings to complements. A constraint on tense restrictions would have to apply once the Subjunctive Mood has been chosen.

The first problem with this solution, besides its arbitrary nature and lack of explanatory power, is how to block the transformations. If we attached a condition of the following form to each one of the rules,

\textit{Condition A}: The transformation blocks when there is an Indicative marker in the complement.

we would block certain processes incorrectly. For instance, creer, one of the verbs which in certain dialects can only take an Indicative complementizer when it is not preceded by no, may undergo Equi-NP Deletion both in negative and non-negative matrices. A string with a non-negative matrix and an Indicative complementizer has the same underlying structure as a string whose main verb is not negated and which has undergone Equi-NP Deletion.

\begin{align*}
(55) \ & a. \textit{Cree hacerlo bien} \ '\text{He believes he does (lit. to do) it right}'. \\
\ & b. \textit{Cree que lo hace bien} \ (\textit{Ind.}) \ '\text{He believes that he does it right}'. \\
\ & c. \textit{*Cree que lo haga bien} \ (\textit{Subj.}).
\end{align*}

(55b) is an ambiguous sentence in those dialects, such as mine, where (55c) is ungrammatical. (55b) can receive an interpretation where the speaker assumes the truth of the complement or one where the speaker remains neutral. The formal distinction between Indicatives and Subjunctives has been lost in a number of dialects but the two presuppositional readings

\footnote{The marking could be \([+\text{Indicative}]\) or \([-\text{Indicative}].\) We feel that the arguments presented below argue not only against surface structure interpretation rules but against the use of features as well, no matter at which point the feature receives an interpretation.}
remain. However, (55a) is not an ambiguous sentence, it cannot imply that the speaker presupposes the truth of the complement. These facts correlate with the phenomena we have discussed already: it is only that structure which does not have a presupposition on the part of the speaker which is the one which undergoes Equi-NP Deletion. Since the surface structure interpretation rule would not allow us to mark the presuppositions before the transformations, or at least before early transformations, these facts could not be reflected. Given the sentences in (55) condition A would block Equi-NP Deletion incorrectly. If we allow two different underlying representations for (55b), one for each presupposition, then it is easy to account for the lack of ambiguity in (55a) by indicating that only one of the underlying structures meets the structural condition of Equi-NP Deletion.

The second problem would be how to assign the correct presupposition to the right structure. Although the Subjunctive has been associated, in this discussion, with a neutral attitude as far as presuppositions are concerned, this has been a coincidence and at no time have we stated that the Subjunctive implies in an automatic way a 'neutral presupposition' or no presupposition. There are Subjunctive structures which presuppose the truth of the complement.

(56) _Es raro que llueva_ (Subj.) 'It is strange that it is raining' or 'Rain (ing) is strange'.

In many dialects _Es raro_ admits only a Subjunctive complementizer, not an Indicative one. This does not imply that (56) can only be interpreted as involving no presupposition about the truth of the complement. (56) is an ambiguous sentence, as indicated by the two English glosses we have provided for it. The first interpretation presupposes the truth of the complement: it is raining and I feel that that is strange. The second reading does not assume that the complement is true; it is a general statement and it may be uttered even if no rain is present: rain is a curious phenomenon whenever it happens to rain. We can see that the Subjunctive of an embedded clause may not be associated with a predetermined type of presupposition.

An Indicative complementizer need not be associated with the presupposition that the complement is true. When we discussed (54) we indicated that for those dialects which do not allow a non-negated _creer_ to be followed by a Subjunctive complementizer, (54b) was an ambiguous sentence.

If we had a surface structure interpretation rule stating that Indicative complementizers should be assigned the presupposition that the complement sentence is true while stating at the same time that Subjunctives involve no such presupposition, we would not account for the readings found in sentences of the type of (56) and (54b). Furthermore, there would be no way
to associate the Subjunctive with the Infinitive which is the result of Equi-NP Deletion and Subject-raising, showing that the Subjunctive and the Infinitive involve the same neutral attitude on the part of the speaker. Even if we provided still another surface structure interpretation rule stating that these Infinitives have no positive presuppositions associated with them, it would be an accidental fact not at all related to the Subjunctive complements. In other words, the presuppositions which hold for Subjunctive complements hold for Infinitives as well. If we used surface structure interpretation rules to capture these facts we would need two separate rules, one for each surface structure, for what is a common and unique phenomenon.

Having shown that it is unlikely that the type of presuppositions we are discussing can be dealt with by late rules of semantics, we must conclude that there is some difference in the underlying structure of the two complements which accounts for their different readings and for their different syntactic behavior.

A proposal which has been made to account for some facts similar to the ones discussed in this paper is to set two kinds of complement structures, which, in Spanish, would correspond roughly to (PM2) and (PM3) (see Kiparsky and Kiparsky, 1968) for a discussion of these structures).

(PM2)  

```
NP
|   el hecho de que
\|_______\__
  |        |
  |        |
  S       S
Juan viene
```

Indicative complementizer

(PM3)  

```
NP
|             
\|_______\__
  |        |
  |        |
  S       S
Juan venga
```

Subjunctive complementizer

Verbs such as *confiar, parecer, admitir, and creer* (when negated), among others, would take two different complements under this proposal. This would automatically explain the differences in meaning in the complements and some of the syntactic phenomena which differentiate them. As Kiparsky and Kiparsky have pointed out, factives (that is, verbs which take complements of the type of (PM2) and only those) lack tense restrictions of the type discussed in Section 3 of this paper, and they never undergo Neg-transportation; with (PM2) as the underlying structure of a factive complement there

---

14 We do not claim that the lexical item *hecho* 'fact' appears in the underlying structure of the sentences we are discussing, but since this proposal will be rejected we will not elaborate any further what sort of elements should actually appear in (PM2).
is a natural explanation for this blocking; these structures are subject to the Complex NP Constraint (Ross, 1967) which states that no constituent can be moved out of the S in (PM2). If we accepted the Kiparsky's' proposal and assumed that the Indicative complementizer reflects an underlying structure of the type of (PM2), we would have an explanation of why Neg-transportation does not apply with an Indicative complement, and why Subject-raising does not either. However, there are counterexamples to this analysis:

a) Factive verbs undergo Equi-NP Deletion while the Indicative complements we have discussed do not.

\[(57)\]
\[a. \text{Sé hacerlo 'I know how to do it'.} \]
\[b. \text{Siento ser un estorbo 'I am sorry to be a nuisance'.} \]

Independent of this counterexample, the Complex NP Constraint cannot provide an explanation of why Indicative complements do not undergo Equi-NP Deletion.

Furthermore, sentences with an overt el hecho de in surface structure may undergo Equi-NP Deletion.

\[(58)\]
\[a. \text{Odio trabajar 'I hate to work'.} \]
\[b. \text{Odio el hecho de trabajar 'I hate the fact of working'.} \]

b) Neg-incorporation works across el hecho de strings but it does not work for Indicative complements.

\[(59)\]
\[\text{No me gusta el hecho de que diga nada 'I dislike his saying anything'.} \]

c) In questions, constituents can be moved out of both Indicative and Subjunctive complements. This indicates that the Complex NP Constraint does not operate on Indicative complements at least when Question Formation applies.

\[(60)\]
\[a. \text{¿Quién no cree Juan que viniera? (Subj.) 'Who does John think didn’t come?'}. \]
\[b. \text{¿Quién no cree Juan que vino? (Ind.).} \]

In view of these counterexamples we must conclude that it is incorrect to assume that an Indicative complement has an underlying structure of the form of (PM2).

---

\[15\]
Since elements can be moved out of complements of factive verbs when they are questioned, this counterexample could be refuted by deleting el hecho de que or a similar string before Question Formation applies. In that case the Complex NP Constraint would no longer be violated if the transformation moves a constituent.
What is the solution we propose to deal with the differences between Subjunctive and Indicative complements?

The Subjunctive complement does not constitute a problem. Semantically it is a report of the opinion of the person who is the subject of the matrix verb and does not involve a presupposition on the part of the speaker. Its configuration meets the structural description of Neg-transportation, Subject-raising, Equi-NP Deletion, and Neg-incorporation. It is subject to tense restrictions as we would expect from a clause whose verb depends on the matrix verb. A transitive complementation can account for every one of these features and it is the sort of underlying structure which has been generally presented in the literature. Strings whose complement is in the Subjunctive have the underlying structure presented in (PM4).

The underlying structure of the Indicative complements is not so obvious. Although in surface structure it functions as a regular complement embedded into the matrix, it involves a presupposition which is not made by the subject of the matrix verb but by somebody else who is not mentioned in an overt manner in the string. Syntactically, it cannot undergo Neg-transportation, Subject-raising, Equi-NP Deletion, or Neg-incorporation although it has the derived structure of a regular complement. It is not subject to tense restrictions either.

All these facts are explained in a unitary way if we assume that the Indicative complement does not originate as the complement of the matrix in which it appears embedded in surface structure. This complement is introduced outside the clause in which it ultimately appears. The Indicative complement originates as a conjunct. Consider example (61):

\[(61) \quad \text{Admite que el ruiseñor canta (Ind.) 'He admits that the nightingale is singing'}.\]

This sentence would have a structure roughly of the type of (62):
(62) \((El \, ruiseñor \, canta) \,(Lo \, admite)^{16}\) ('The nightingale is singing') ('He admits it').

At the moment in which Neg-transportation and all the other transformations discussed in this paper apply, the configuration which will become the Indicative complement is still an independent proposition. The rules are blocked and they do not affect the form of the complement.

The Subjunctive complement originates as an embedded clause of the surface matrix. When the structure is checked to see if the conditions which are necessary for the application of the transformations are met, the complement sentence is embedded in its surface matrix and if, as an example, the matrix verb is one like \textit{creer} 'to believe' and the embedded structure is negated, there is nothing to prevent the transformation of Neg-transportation from applying. Motivation for the proposal that an Indicative complement originates as a conjunct is provided by the way successive Indicative complements affect each other. Let us consider the following example:

(63) \textit{No cree que María admite que cometió un error} 'He doesn't believe that Mary admits (\textit{Ind.}) that she made (\textit{Ind.}) an error'.

The interpretation of (63) indicates that the degree of embedding does not affect the presuppositional nature of the complement. The clause \textit{que cometió un error} carries with it the presupposition made by the speaker that Mary did indeed make an error. The speaker presupposes as well the truth of the highest embedded clause: it is true that she admits it. In other words, if we provide an underlying structure in which each complement in (63) is embedded into each other we do not reflect the fact that each complement is independent not only from the clause which immediately dominates it but from any higher clause as well. The theory which explains the complements of (63) as conjuncts captures easily this lack of dependency:

(64) \textit{((María cometió un error) (María lo admite)) (El no lo cree)}

'((Mary made an error) (Mary admits it)) (He doesn't believe it).'

Consider now example (65):

\(^{16}\)To differentiate an assertion from a presupposition our assumption would be that these Indicative complements which we are treating as independent conjuncts are embedded in their underlying structure in an abstract verb of supposing, but at this point we cannot present any evidence to support this claim. Under this proposal (61) would be derived from:

(i) \textit{(Supongo, es verdad que el ruiseñor canta) (Lo admite)} 'I suppose or it is true that the nightingale is singing) (He admits it)'.

We are not discussing the problem of how to represent the string both as a presupposition and as an embedded complement, so no theoretical significance should be attached to our use of \textit{it} in the second conjunct.
(65)  *No cree que Maria admita que cometió un error* ‘He doesn’t believe that Mary admits (Subj.) that she made (Ind.) an error’.

In this last sentence the speaker presupposes that it is true that Mary made an error but he remains neutral about the admission. In other words *que Maria admita* is the report of somebody else’s opinion but in *que cometió un error* the speaker reports his own opinion. With the assumption that certain complements derive from conjuncts, the association of the last complement with the speaker and its independence from the surface matrix is easily explained:

(66)  *(Maria cometió un error) (El no cree que Maria lo admita)* ‘(Mary made an error) (He doesn’t believe that she admits it (Subj.))’.

Presuppositions remain constant under negation and under questioning while performative verbs lose their performative interpretation when questioned or when negated (see Austin, 1962) and (Ross, 1968) for a discussion of performatives, and (Rivero, 1970b) for some arguments in favor of their postulation in Spanish). To account for this difference we could assume that the Indicative complement originates as a conjunct of the performative. This proposal has the advantage of providing an explanation of the presuppositionals facts connected with restrictive relative clauses. As we have already mentioned, the Indicative restrictive relative clause involves a positive presupposition about its truth. The Subjunctive relative involves no such presupposition. If we accept the hypothesis that relative clauses should be derived from conjoined sentences, the phenomena we have discussed with respect to the relatives are explained if we place the Indicative clause outside of the performative, as a conjunct, while the Subjunctive clause remains within the performative structure.17

17 The fact that subjunctive relative clauses have tense restrictions does not constitute a counterexample to the claim that they derive from conjunctions because there are tense restrictions, with certain verbs, across conjuncts:

(i)  a.  *Imago los errores que cometieron y me entra una gran preocupación* ‘I imagine the errors they made and I become very worried’

b.  *Imago los errores que cometieron y me entró una gran preocupación* ‘I imagine the errors they made and I became very worried’.

It is to explain this lack of restrictions in the part of the Indicative relative clause together with its presuppositional nature that we place it outside of the performative structure. With the proposal advanced in footnote 16, (i) would be derived from a structure of the following type:

(ii)  *(Es verdad, supongo que algunos hablan) (Yo digo que ellos serán castigados)* ‘(It is true or I suppose that some talk) (I say that they will be punished)’

A Subjunctive relative would derive from:

(iii)  *(Yo digo (que hablan) (que serán castigados))* ‘(I say (that they talk) (that they will be punished))’
For those verbs such as *creer* 'to believe' and *raro* 'strange' which in certain dialects admit only one complementizer but the two different presupposition- al readings, we need some late transformations which readjust the form of the complement. That is, we assign two different underlying structures to each of the sentences in (67):

(67) a. *Cree que es verdad (Ind.)* 'He believes that it is true'.
    b. *Es raro que el cielo no tenga color (Subj.)* 'It is strange that the sky has no color'.

In one of the underlying structures the embedded sentence is treated as a conjunct and it involves the presupposition that the complement is true. The second underlying structure has its complement embedded in the surface matrix and involves no presupposition about the truth of the complement. This presumably produces both an Indicative and a Subjunctive complementizer (as is the case in a number of dialects), which need readjustment by a transformation in those cases in which the sentences in (67) are the only grammatical ones.

**CONCLUSIONS**

In this paper we have demonstrated that the presuppositional nature of the complement affects its syntactic behavior. Complements which involve a positive presupposition with respect to their truth value and which are formally marked in some cases with an Indicative Mood block the following processes: Neg-transportation, Neg-incorporation, Equi-NP Deletion, and Subject-raising. These same complements are not subject to tense restrictions in connection with the matrix verb. Complements which involve no positive presupposition about the truth value of their content meet the structural index of these same transformations and are subject to constraints on the sequence of permissible tenses.

Having shown that the presuppositional nature of the complement cannot be attributed to the matrix verb, we first conclude that these presuppositions cannot be explained through the use of surface structure interpretation rules. This is because these presuppositions affect the application of very early transformational rules. The investigation of the underlying structure of the complement itself leads to the rejection of the complement structure proposed in (Kiparsky and Kiparsky, 1968) to account for these two kinds of complements in Spanish. The assumption that the Indicative complement originates as a conjunct of the abstract performative explains the syntactic and semantic behavior of this complement and its differences with the Subjunctive complement. This same underlying structure can explain the parallelisms between Indicative complements and Indicative restrictives on the one
hand, and Subjunctive complements and Subjunctive restrictives on the other.

This paper motivates the assumption that presuppositions must be reflected in the underlying structure of sentences, and that presuppositions have a definite syntactic structure which affects the application of the transformations.
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