

# Whatever happened to Sequence of Tense?\*

## *O que aconteceu com a Sequência Temporal?*

Brenda Laca\*\*

### ABSTRACT

This paper addresses apparent violations of Sequence of Tense in subjunctive clauses in some Spanish varieties. We show that the coexistence of simultaneous interpretations for the past and the present subjunctive under a matrix past invalidates a crucial prediction of some theories of Sequence of Tense. We then conduct a corpus-based investigation of the [PRESENT UNDER PAST]- pattern in indicative and subjunctive complement clauses in Argentinian Spanish, whose results indicate that there are two distributionally and semantically distinct manifestations of this pattern, one involving indicative and polarity subjunctive clauses, the other involving intensional and factive subjunctive clauses. This provides further evidence in favor of Quer's (1998, 2006, 2016) hypothesis as to the central relevance of the divide between intensional and polarity subjunctives.

8

Keywords: subjunctive clauses, sequence of tense, Argentinian Spanish.

\*I'd like to thank the audience at the 12th Workshop in Formal Linguistics, Curitiba, for their remarks and questions, and Patricia Cabredo-Hofherr, Anamaria Falaus, and Oana Lungu for their invaluable advice on a first version of this paper. I gratefully acknowledge support from ANII, *Sistema Nacional de Investigadores*, Uruguay.

\*\*Departamento de romanística y español, FHUCE, Universidad de la República, Montevideo, Uruguay.

RESUMO

9

Este artigo discute violações aparentes de Sequência Temporal em orações no subjuntivo em algumas variedades do espanhol. Mostramos que a coexistência de interpretações simultâneas para o passado e o presente do subjuntivo com um passado na oração principal invalida uma hipótese central de algumas teorias sobre Sequência Temporal. A partir de uma pesquisa baseada em corpus, investigamos o padrão [PRESENTE sub, PASSADO princ] em orações-complemento no indicativo e no subjuntivo no espanhol argentino. Os resultados indicam que há, distribucional e semanticamente, duas manifestações distintas nesse padrão, uma envolvendo indicativo e orações de subjuntivo polar, a outra com relação a orações intensionais e factivas no subjuntivo. Tais fatos favorecem amplamente a hipótese de Quer (1998) sobre a relevância central da divisão entre subjuntivos intensionais e de polaridade.

Palavras-chave: orações subjuntivas, sequência temporal, espanhol argentino.

Formal accounts of the distribution and interpretation of embedded tenses face considerable difficulties when confronted to the complex patterns of cross-linguistic variation that characterize this domain (OGIHARA; SHARVIT, 2012). In this paper, I'd like to add a small stone to the building by exploring the tense of subjunctive clauses embedded under attitude verbs in Argentinian Spanish (ASp).<sup>1</sup> In a nutshell, the problem that I will address is illustrated by examples like (1):

- (1) *Engels quería que él se siga dedicando a la agitación política y continuara con sus análisis filosóficos*<sup>2</sup>  
 Engels wanted that he refl go-on.PRES.SBJ devoting to the agitation politic and continue.IMPF.SBJ with his analyses philosophical...  
 'Engels wanted him to devote himself further to political activism and to continue with his philosophical analyses'

---

1 See Laca (2010) for a detailed analysis of subjunctive tenses in Spanish in which the similarities between the subjunctive and the indicative system are emphasized. In particular, imperfect subjunctives and imperfect indicatives give rise to the same puzzles concerning their distribution and interpretation. See also Costantini (2007) on Italian.

2 Unless otherwise stated, all data are extracted from Davies, *Corpus del Español* <<http://corpusdelespanol.org>>, subcorpus *Web/Dialects*, section Argentina.

The complement clause in (1) contains a present subjunctive coordinated to a past subjunctive. Both have exactly the same temporal interpretation, they are simultaneous to the matrix past tense - simultaneous being here a technical term whose definition will be given presently. This configuration goes against the predictions of most parametrized theories of SoT. It bears witness to a weakening of the indexical nature of the present subjunctive in some non-standard varieties of Spanish, a phenomenon which is frequently mentioned in descriptive grammars (cf. for instance RAE-ASALE, 2009, §24.1b, 8n-q), but has seldom been explored in detail (see however SESSAREGO, 2008, 2010; for a variationist approach, and more recently GUAJARDO, 2017; LACA, 2018).

The paper is structured as follows: in the first section, I briefly summarize two theories of SoT. In Section 2, I present SoT in subjunctive clauses. Section 3 is devoted to the findings on the [PRESENT UNDER PAST] -pattern in intensional subjunctive clauses across Spanish varieties reported in Guajardo (2017). Section 4 is devoted to an exploratory corpus study of the [PRESENT UNDER PAST]- pattern in indicative and subjunctive complement clauses in ASp, whose results provide evidence for the existence of two distributionally and semantically distinct manifestations of this pattern. Section 5 concludes.

## 1. Embedded Tenses and the SoT-Parameter

It is a well-known fact that the interpretation of tenses in subordinate clauses differs from the one obtained in matrix clauses, in such a way that there is some sort of interpretive dependency of the subordinate tense ( $T_{sub}$ ) on the matrix tense ( $T_{matrix}$ ). But this dependency takes different forms, and varies in one and the same language and across languages according (i) to the nature of the subordinate clause -whether it is a complement, a relative or a temporal clause, (ii) to that of  $T_{matrix}$  - whether it is past or future, (iii) to that of  $T_{sub}$  -whether it is present or past, etc. Due to space limitations I will restrict the discussion of what is sometimes called the SoT-Parameter to complement clauses of attitude verbs in cases where  $T_{matrix}$  is past. I will first introduce a morphological theory of SoT and then a syntactic-semantic one.

### 1.1 Zero-tense morphology and the SoT-parameter

Demirdache and Lungu (2008, 2011) build their account of SoT on the semantic notion of zero-tense (KRATZER, 1998). Zero-tenses are time-arguments (like temporal pronouns) with no temporal features of their own, which must be bound by a local antecedent. The binding relation enforces simultaneity between the time of the event dominated by the zero-tense and the time which acts as its local antecedent, the temporal variable contributed by  $T_{matrix}$ . In their account, the difference between so-called SoT-languages, like English, and non-SoT-languages,

like Japanese, is simply a difference in the morphological realization of the semantic zero-tense.

Thus, in SoT-languages, the morphological realization of zero-tense is determined via agreement between the zero-tense and its antecedent (Tmatrix). A +PAST Tmatrix will require for the zero-tense to be expressed by a morphological tense bearing the +PAST agreement feature (with the proviso that this tense should not be perfective).<sup>3</sup> As a consequence, the pattern [PAST UNDER PAST] is ambiguous between a simultaneous interpretation (when past morphology in Tsub is the expression of zero-tense) and a back-shifted interpretation (when past morphology in Tsub is the expression of a semantic past tense):

- (2) a. John said that Mary was pregnant. (*Simultaneous or Back-shifted*)  
 b. JOHN PAST<sub>1</sub> say that Mary Ø<sub>1</sub> be pregnant.  
 c. John PAST<sub>1</sub> say that Mary PAST<sub>1</sub> be pregnant.

In the pattern [PRESENT UNDER PAST], present morphology in Tsub is interpreted both with regard to Tmatrix and with regard to Utterance Time (Utt-T), present tense being indexical in a SoT-language. This gives rise to so-called Double-Access Readings (DAR), which require for the time of the situation described in the complement clause to overlap both Tmatrix and Utt-T. DAR-effects emerge clearly to the foreground when world-knowledge excludes such a duration for the situation, as in:

- (3) (#Two years ago) John said that Mary is pregnant. (*DAR-effect*)

[PRESENT UNDER PAST] configurations in SoT languages necessarily give rise to DAR-readings. But DAR-readings are not acceptable with just any type of matrix verb. In particular, they seem to be more easily accepted when the matrix verb is a speech-act verb (GIORGI; PIANESI, 2000). As a result, in a SoT language a [PRESENT UNDER PAST] configuration will either give rise to DAR-effects or be degraded because the semantic environment does not license DAR.

By contrast, in non-SoT languages, the morphological exponent of zero-tense is the tense bearing the default/unmarked feature (+PRESENT). As a result, the pattern [PAST UNDER PAST] unambiguously gives rise to back-shifted readings (as in 4), and the pattern [PRESENT UNDER PAST] gives rise to simultaneous readings lacking any DAR-effect (as in 5):

- (4) JAP  
 a. *John-wa Mary-ga ninsinsi- te i-ta to it-ta.* (*Back-shifted only*)  
 John-TOP Mary-NOM pregnant-PROG-PAST COMP say-PAST  
 ‘John said that Mary was (=had been) pregnant’  
 b. John PAST<sub>1</sub> say that Mary PAST<sub>1</sub> be pregnant.

<sup>3</sup> This requirement accounts for the fact that simultaneous readings require the imperfective past in Romance, and only arise with stative, habitual and progressive pasts in English. The reasons for this constraint will not be explored in this paper.

LACA, B:  
Whatever  
happened  
to Sequence  
of Tense?

- (5) JAP
- a. *John-wa Mary-ga ninsinsi- te i-ru to it-ta. (Simultaneous)*  
John-TOP Mary-NOM pregnant-PROG-PRES COMP say-PAST  
'John said that Mary was pregnant'
- b. John PAST<sub>1</sub> say that Mary Ø<sub>1</sub> be pregnant.

Therefore, non-SoT languages, like Japanese, are characterized by the fact that the [PAST-UNDER-PAST] configuration cannot yield a simultaneous construal. By contrast, SoT-languages are characterized by the fact that the [PRESENT-UNDER-PAST] configuration gives rise to DAR-effects.

Example (1) above goes against the predictions of the SoT-parameter as formulated by Demirdache and Lungu (2008, 2011). In the second conjunct, the [PAST-UNDER-PAST] configuration yields a simultaneous construal, but in the first conjunct, the [PRESENT-UNDER-PAST] configuration does not give rise to a DAR-effect: at Utt-T (which we can set for sure in the 21st Century) there is -regrettably- no chance for Marx to further devote himself to political activism. In other words, the first conjunct is Japanese-like, the second is English-like.

### 1.2 Syntactic-semantic parameters: deletion, relative present and the two-parameter theory

In their survey on embedded tenses Ogihara and Sharvit (2012) try to combine the common assumptions and the respective advantages of the two most influential theories of SoT, Abusch's Upper Limit Constraint and Ogihara's copy theory, in order to account not only for the basic facts introduced in the previous section, but also for the diverging behavior of languages such as Hebrew and Russian.<sup>4</sup>

Both theories share the assumption that there are at least two parameters in the domain, not only one, and that these parameters involve different operations on formal structures, different rules of interpretation. The first parameter is the "deletion" parameter: some languages, like English, but not Japanese, have a deletion rule:

A tense that is c-commanded by an agreeing tense (past-under-past, present-under-present) may optionally be converted into a zero-tense [...] A past tense that has undergone deletion [...] must be bound (OGIHARA; SHARVIT, 2012, p. 646)

A plus value in the deletion parameter explains the simultaneous reading obtained for (2a) in English: the feature +PAST can be deleted under a local higher past tense, and the resulting zero tense is bound by the latter. A minus value explains

<sup>4</sup> Space limitations prevent us from mentioning more than the bare essentials of Ogihara and Sharvit's proposal. The reader should refer to the original article to have the full view.

the absence of the simultaneous reading for (4) in Japanese: in this language, there is no possible tense deletion.

The second parameter concerns the existence or lack of an “inborn relative present tense”: this is a present tense that is interpreted in relation to a time introduced by the closest higher tense, i.e. a present that must be locally bound (a non-indexical present tense). English lacks an inborn relative present, but Japanese and Hebrew do have one. The plus value of the inborn relative present parameter accounts for the possibility of the simultaneous reading for (5) in Japanese. By contrast, the minus value accounts for the obligatoriness of DAR-effects in (3) for English: the English present is always indexical.

Now, from a theoretical standpoint, Demirdache and Lungu’s account is superior to that of Ogihara and Sharvit’s. It squares well with the Borer-Chomsky Conjecture, namely that all parameters of variation are attributable to differences in features of particular items in the lexicon. In fact, the SoT parameter involves just the different morphological exponency of a semantic object, the zero-tense. By contrast, Ogihara and Sharvit have to assume that languages differ as to the existence of rules of interpretation (deletion, obligatory binding without deletion), which furthermore seem to be optional where they exist. But, interestingly, our problematic initial example (1) is predicted as a possibility in their approach. In fact, they conclude their paper with the question:

is there a language which, like English, has a “deletion” rule, but, like Japanese, has an inborn relative present that can be bound (i.e. can receive a simultaneous reading)? (OGIHARA; SHARVIT, 2012, p. 663).

14

Subjunctive clauses under past attitude verbs in ASp. -as illustrated in (1) - seem to behave precisely in this way, which makes them all the more interesting as a topic of inquiry.

## 2. SoT in subjunctive clauses

SoT has been almost exclusively explored for clauses in the indicative mood (but see QUER, 1998, on Catalan; GIORGI, 2006, 2009, on Italian; LACA, 2010, on Spanish). The reason for this neglect lies partly in the traditional view according to which Tense in subjunctive clauses is defective: if subjunctive tenses are “anaphoric” in the sense of Picallo (1985) and Giorgi (2009), i.e. mere “agreement markers” with the matrix tense, there would not be much to be said about them, except for the fact that they are expected to show consistent agreement patterns between T<sub>matrix</sub> and T<sub>sub</sub>, or strict SoT. However, there are clear indications that subjunctive clauses may introduce an additional dimension of variation in the domain of SoT, as shown by a brief comparison of Contemporary French and Standard Spanish.

## 2.1 Contemporary French

French is undoubtedly an SoT language in the indicative mood. DAR-effects in [PRESENT-UNDER-PAST] configurations show that it has an indexical present (6a), and simultaneous construals in [PAST-UNDER-PAST] configurations (6b) indicate that past can be the (agreement) expression of zero-tense.

(6)FR

- a. #*Il y a deux ans, Jean a dit que Marie est enceinte.*  
it there has two years Jean has said that Marie be.PRES pregnant  
#’Two years ago, John said that Mary is pregnant’
- b. *Jean a dit que Marie était enceinte.*  
Jean has said that Marie be.PAST pregnant  
‘John said that Mary was pregnant’

But in subjunctive clauses, [PRESENT-UNDER-PAST] configurations do not give rise to DAR-effects:

(7) FR

- Il y a deux ans, Jean s’était réjoui que Marie soit enceinte.*  
it there has two years Jean REFL-was rejoiced that Marie be.PRES.SBJ pregnant  
‘Two years ago, John had expressed his satisfaction that Mary was pregnant’

What happens with [PAST-UNDER-PAST] configurations simply cannot be tested, because of the lack of a (non-perfective) past subjunctive in Contemporary French. Clearly, if the non-SoT appearance of the subjunctive mood in French is simply the consequence of the demise of the non-perfective past form (*imparfait du subjonctif*), French only shows that an available present/(non-perfective) past contrast is necessary for SoT to manifest itself.

## 2.2 Standard Spanish

Standard Spanish has preserved the non-perfective past form for the subjunctive (IMPF.SBJ) and has an indexical present both in the indicative and in the subjunctive mood (LACA, 2010). As we will see in the next section, this does not necessarily apply to all Spanish varieties, particularly in less formal registers. (8a-b) and (9a-b) show that both moods behave in the same way: the [PAST-UNDER-PAST] configurations can give rise to simultaneous interpretations, and the [PRESENT-UNDER-PAST] configurations invariably give rise to DAR-effects.

(8)

- a. *Hace dos años Juan dijo que María estaba embarazada.* [IMPF.IND as zero-tense]  
do3SG two years Juan said that María be.IMPF.IND pregnant  
‘Two years ago, John said that Mary was pregnant’



- b. *Hace dos años Juan dudó que María estuviera embarazada.* [IMPF.SBJ as zero-tense]  
do3SG two years Juan doubted that María be.IMPF.SBJ pregnant  
'Two years ago, John doubted that Mary was pregnant'

(9)

- a. (#*Hace dos años*) *Juan dijo que María está embarazada.* [DAR-effects with PRS.IND]  
do3SG two years Juan said that María be.PRS.IND pregnant  
(#'Two years ago), John said that Mary is pregnant'
- b. (# *Hace dos años*) *Juan dudó que María esté embarazada.* [DAR-effects with PRS.SBJ]  
do3SG two years Juan doubted that María bePRES.SBJ pregnant  
(#'Two years ago), John doubted that Mary is pregnant'

Subjunctive mood is often lexically selected by forward-shifting predicates, such as directives, that is, by predicates which require that the time of the event described in the subordinate clause be after Tmatrix. The contrast between [PAST-UNDER-PAST] AND [PRESENT-UNDER-PAST] subsists in these forward-shifting environments (see GIORGI, 2009, p. 1846; for analogous data in Italian).

(10)

- a. *El magnate ordenó que compraran aquella mansión.* [PAST-UNDER-PAST]  
the millionaire ordered that I buy.IMPF.SBJ.3.PL that mansion
- b. *El magnate ordenó que compren aquella mansión.* [PRESENT-UNDER-PAST]  
the millionaire ordered that buy.PRS.SBJ.3.PLthat mansion  
'That millionaire ordered to buy that mansion'

16

The temporal configuration for [PRESENT-UNDER-PAST] in such environments is similar (but not identical) to run-of -the-mill DAR: the time of the eventuality described in the subjunctive clause must be **after** both Tmatrix and Utt-T.

(11)

- a. Tmatrix-----UTT-T----- [PAST-UNDER-PAST]  
[BUY-THAT-MANSION] [BUY-THAT-MANSION] [BUY-THAT-MANSION]
- b. Tmatrix----- UTT-T----- [PRESENT-UNDER-PAST]  
[BUY-THAT-MANSION]

Whereas the past subjunctive does not order the time of the event with regard to Utt-T, so that it may precede, follow or overlap it, the present subjunctive clearly orders the time of the event after Utt-T.

Thus, both the present indicative and the present subjunctive are indexical, and Standard Spanish is a SoT-language on this account. It is also a SoT-language on the account that [PAST-UNDER-PAST] configurations can give rise to simultaneous interpretations (cf. 8a). Please recall that these two properties are predicted to strictly correlate in Demirdache and Lungu's approach, but not in Ogihara and Sharvit's.

However, there are clear indications of a weakening of the indexical nature of the present subjunctive in some subjunctive clauses. Instances of [PRESENT-UNDER-PAST] configurations without DAR-effects are sporadically attested in Standard Peninsular Spanish, as mentioned in Laca (2010) with regard to the following example:

- (12) *España consiguió que en la cumbre europea de*  
Spain get.SP that in the summit European of  
*Turín los Países miembros de la UE se comprometan*  
Torino the countries members of the EU REFL commit.PR.SBJ  
*a eliminar el terrorismo como delito político.*  
to eliminate the terrorism as crime political  
“Spain obtained from EU member states at the Torino summit the commitment  
to eliminate terrorism as a political crime.” (*El Mundo* 31/03/1996)<sup>5</sup>

There are several indications that this phenomenon is much more frequent in some regional varieties (see SESSAREGO, 2008, 2010). Its distribution across varieties has recently been explored in detail in Guajardo (2017), to which we devote the next section.

### 3. [PRESENT UNDER PAST] configurations in intensional subjunctive clauses

17

In his dissertation, Guajardo (2017) conducts a statistically sophisticated corpus study of the patterns [PAST UNDER PAST] and [PRESENT UNDER PAST] for the subjunctive in three Spanish varieties: Spain, Mexico and Argentina. The study is based on the annotated subcorpus “Web/Dialects” of Mark Davies’ *Corpus del español* (2 billion words), which has proved to be an excellent resource for accessing less formal registers in all Spanish varieties.

Guajardo concentrates on the subjunctive complement clauses selected by two volitional predicates (*querer* ‘want’ and *esperar* ‘hope’) and two causative predicates (*lograr* ‘manage’ and *hacer* ‘make’). One of his major findings is that the frequency of the [PRESENT UNDER PAST]-pattern in these environments characterizes Argentinian Spanish, as can be seen from the percentages reached by the pattern in each region in Table 1:

5 REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA: Banco de datos (CREA) [en línea]. Corpus de referencia del español actual. Available at: <http://www.rae.es>. Access: dec. 30, 2008.

	Argentina			Mexico			Spain		
	Pres	Past	%Pres	Pres	Past	%Pres	Pres	Past	%Pres
querer <sub>IMPF</sub>	185	361	33.88	45	688	6.14	37	1021	3.49
esperar <sub>IMPF</sub>	58	154	27.36	23	326	6.59	10	550	1.79
lograr <sub>SP</sub>	23	44	34.33	6	67	8.22	8	62	11.43
hacer <sub>SP</sub>	113	328	25.62	29	445	6.12	30	712	4.04
Total	379	887	30.00	103	1526	6.32	85	2345	3.50

Table 1: Total token counts in present subjunctive and past subjunctive and percentage of present tense subjunctive  
Source: Adapted from GUAJARDO, 2017, p. 58 (Table 3.1)

Furthermore, Guajardo also shows that the distribution of the pattern is not affected by the embedded verb. i.e. it is not the case that a rise in the number of instances of [PRESENT UNDER PAST] is caused by the tendency of a small number of lexical verbs to appear in the present subjunctive.

Recall, however, that the mere frequency of the [PRESENT UNDER PAST] pattern is not a sufficient indication that something is happening to SoT in subjunctive clauses. A [PRESENT UNDER PAST] pattern producing DAR-effects, as stated above, is perfectly in agreement with what is predicted for a SoT-language in which present tense is indexical.

Guajardo (2017, Chap. 4) addresses this question in an experimental study which completes his corpus-based investigation. This study is a sentence acceptability task submitted to speakers from the three relevant countries. In it, both the acceptability of the [PRESENT UNDER PAST] pattern for subjunctive complement clauses of a volitional (*querer* ‘want’), a directive (*pedir* ‘ask’) and a causative verb (*lograr* ‘manage’) and the factors possibly mitigating this acceptability are investigated. Among these factors, the temporal location of the eventuality with regard to Utt-T, such as it is fixed by temporal adverbs, is of paramount importance. The experimental conditions take the form of four possible combinations, as illustrated in (13):

(13)

- a. [PRESENT UNDER PAST], Tsub before Utt-T  
*Quería que María limpie el cuarto ayer.*  
 want.IMPF.3SG that Maria clean.PRES.SUBJ. the room yesterday
- b. [PRESENT UNDER PAST], Tsub after Utt-T  
*Quería que María limpie el cuarto mañana.*  
 want.IMPF.3SG that Maria clean.PRES.SUBJ. the room tomorrow
- c. [PAST UNDER PAST], Tsub before Utt-T  
*Quería que María limpiara el cuarto ayer.*  
 want.IMPF.3SG that Maria clean.PRES.PAST. the room yesterday
- d. [PAST UNDER PAST], Tsub after Utt-T  
*Quería que María limpiara el cuarto mañana.*  
 want.IMPF.3SG that Maria clean.PAST.SUBJ. the room tomorrow

If the acceptability of (13a) is not significantly different from that of (13b) or (13c), one may conclude that the [PRESENT UNDER PAST] pattern is not associated with DAR-effects. Abstracting from details concerning the statistical methods employed, the results of the experimental study show that

DAR-effects in Argentina are not available neither with *pedir* nor with *querer*. The only main predicate that shows a clearly significant interaction between SubjTense and Interpretation is *lograr*. Even so [...] the DAR-effect size is about half of what it is in Mexico and Spain (GUAJARDO, 2017, p. 119).

Now, Guajardo restricts his attention to subjunctive clauses embedded under volitional, directive and causative predicates. Such verbs select for a particular type of subjunctive complement clause: the type identified by Quer (1998) as intensional subjunctive clauses, which we characterize below (Section 4.1.) Laca (2015) had in fact suggested that the source for the loss of the contrast between present and past subjunctive was to be sought in intensional subjunctive clauses. By taking this intuition for granted, Guajardo (2017) fails to show:

- (i) whether there are differences in the distribution and interpretation of the [PRESENT UNDER PAST] pattern between subjunctive and indicative clauses.
- (ii) whether there are differences in the [PRESENT UNDER PAST]-pattern between intensional subjunctive clauses and other types of subjunctive clauses.

These questions are crucial. If there is no difference between subjunctive and indicative clauses as regards the [PRESENT UNDER PAST] pattern, it can be assumed that there is a general drift away from SoT in the varieties of Spanish exhibiting a higher frequency of this pattern. Correspondingly, if there is no difference between intensional subjunctive and other (namely polarity) subjunctive clauses, Laca's (2015) suggested correlation between SoT-violation and the structure of intensional subjunctive clauses does not obtain.

The data analysed in Laca (2018) seem to show that there are indeed differences. In the following section, we report on an exploratory corpus investigation of the same corpus used in Guajardo (2017) and Laca (2018), which rather clearly confirms the hypothesis that the source of non-SoT grammar (characterized by a non-indexical present) is to be found in intensional subjunctive clauses, but with a couple of unexpected twists.

#### 4. The [present under past]-pattern in ASp.

This section contains a comparison of the distribution and interpretation of the [PRESENT UNDER PAST]-pattern in ASp. in intensional subjunctive clauses, in indicative clauses, and in polarity subjunctive clauses. First, however, it is necessary to briefly recall the properties that distinguish intensional from polarity subjunctive clauses, since the issue is often blurred by the assumption that intensional subjunctives are simply obligatory subjunctives, whereas polarity subjunctives are optional or alternating subjunctives.

##### 4.1 What are intensional subjunctive clauses?

According to Quer's (1998, 2006) original proposal, intensional subjunctives differ from polarity subjunctives in four major properties: fixedness of mood-choice, locality, subject-obviation effects and temporal orientation. In the following, we contrast pairwise an intensional and a polarity subjunctive for each of these properties.

Firstly, intensional subjunctives, by contrast with polarity subjunctives, do not alternate with indicatives. Thus, the indicative mood is excluded in (14a), but it is licit in (14b):

(14)

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

20

Secondly, intensional subjunctives do not spread to further embedded argument clauses, whereas polarity subjunctives license multiple subjunctive embedding, possibly giving rise to "cascades" of subjunctives. Thus, in (15a) the subjunctive is licensed in the complement clause of the subjunctive trigger, the verb *querer* 'want', but it is impossible in the complement clause embedded under *decir* 'say'. By contrast, in (15b), negation of the main clause licenses both the subjunctive in the complement clause of *creer* 'believe', and in the complement clause of *decir* 'say':

(15)

- a. *Quiere*                      *que digas*                      *que está/*  
want.PRES.IND.3SG that say.PRES.SUBJ.2SG that be.PRES.IND.3SG /  
\**esté*                      *bien.*  
be.PRES.SUBJ.3SG well  
'S/he wants you to say that it's all right'

- b. *No cree* *que digas* *que está/*  
not believe.PRES.IND.3SG that say.PRES.SUBJ.2SG that PRES.IND.3SG /  
*esté* *bien.*  
be.PRES.SUBJ.3SG well  
'S/he does not believe that you (will) say that it's all right'

Thirdly, intensional subjunctives give rise to subject-obviation effects that are absent in the case of polarity subjunctives. Thus, the matrix subject and the embedded subject cannot be co-referential in (16a), but they may be co-referential in (16b):

- (16)
- a. *\*Tratamos* *de que lleguemos* *a tiempo.*  
Try.PRES.IND.1PL of that arrive.PRES.SUBJ.1PL on time  
'\*We are trying that we arrive on time'
- b. *No estamos* *seguros de que lleguemos* *a tiempo.*  
not be.PRES.IND.1PL sure of that arrive.PRES.SUBJ.1PL on time  
'We are not sure we will arrive on time'

Finally, the matrix predicates selecting for intensional subjunctives impose a particular temporal orientation on their argument clauses. This temporal orientation is future or non-anterior. This is usually illustrated by the unacceptability of the [past-under-present] configuration (17a), which is licit in the case of polarity subjunctives (17b) (see SUÑER, 1990; SUÑER; PADILLA RIVERA, 1987, 1990; LACA, 2015):

- (17)
- a. *\*Exijo* *que estuviera* *en casa.*  
demand.PRES.IND.1SG that be.IMPF.SUBJ.3SG at home  
'\*I demand that s/he was at home'
- b. *No creo que estuviera en casa.*  
not believe.PRES.IND.1SG that be.IMPF.SUBJ.3SG at home  
'I don't think s/he was at home'

The first two properties indicate that intensional subjunctives are selected by their triggers: selection is both obligatory and local. The last two could be symptoms of a defective functional structure for the subjunctive clause (see LACA, 2015).

The predicates selecting for intensional subjunctives comprise roughly attitudes of preference (volitionals, i.e. verbs of the WANT-type and directives, i.e. verbs of the COMMAND-type), as well as causatives (verbs of the try- or MAKE-type) and implicatives (verbs of the MANAGE-type). Guajardo's study is confined precisely to this type of subjunctive triggers and their complement clauses. But we actually do not know whether ASp, the variety for which Guajardo has conclusively found non-SoT-grammar in intensional subjunctive clauses, exhibits analogous phenomena in other environments, such as indicative complement clauses or polarity subjunctive clauses.

## 4.2 Indicative [PRESENT UNDER PAST] versus [PAST UNDER PAST]

As a first step, we examine whether indicative complement clauses display symptoms of non-SoT-grammar. In order to do this, we searched the corpus for occurrences of [PRESENT UNDER PAST] and [PAST UNDER PAST] for the matrix verbs *decir* ‘say, tell’ and *asegurar* ‘assure’, two speech-act verbs, and *pensar* ‘think’, a mental attitude verb. The query asked for present indicative or imperfect indicative co-occurrences at a 6-or-less-word distance to the right of the simple past indicative 3SG of the respective lemma. The results of the query are given in Table 2.

	Pres. Ind	Impf. Ind.	
<b>dijo que</b> say/tell-3sgSP	8038 tokens in 1st 100 coll.	6133 tokens in 1st 100 coll.	
<b>aseguró que</b> assert-3sgSP	4336 tokens in 1st 100 coll.	477 tokens in 1st 100 coll.	
<b>pensó que</b> think-3sgSP	29	611	%Pres 4.74

Table 2: Total token counts in Present Indicative and Past Indicative

Source: own elaboration.

The first comment concerns the very high frequency of both *decir* ‘say, tell’ and *asegurar* ‘assure’ in these environments, which only allows us to scan the hits obtained in the first 100 collocations. In this restricted universe, [PRESENT UNDER PAST] is more frequent than [PAST UNDER PAST] (almost 10 times more frequent in the case of *asegurar* ‘assure’). The obvious question is whether the high frequency of the [PRESENT UNDER PAST]-pattern in the Indicative with *decir* ‘say/tell’ and *asegurar* ‘assert, assure’ indicates that non-SoT- grammar, the weakening of the indexical nature of the present, also affects the indicative mood.

The answer is clearly negative. If the weakening of the indexical nature of the present tense held across the board, we would expect the frequency of the [PRESENT UNDER PAST]-pattern to be high for all matrix verbs. This is clearly not the case: for *pensar* ‘think’, a mental attitude verb, the number of hits is much lower, so that we can give percentages. And 4.74 as a percentage for the Present is much lower than the mean with the subjunctive in Table 1 (30.00 %Pres).

It is crucial at this point to recall that [PRESENT UNDER PAST] configurations only constitute evidence for non-SoT grammar (for the weakening of the indexical nature of the present) if they do not give rise to DAR-effects. The difference between *decir* ‘say/tell’ and *asegurar* ‘assure’, on the one hand, and *pensar* ‘think’, on the other, is that the former are speech-act verbs, whereas the latter reports a mental attitude. Now, Giorgi and Pianesi (2000) and Giorgi (2006, 2009) have argued for a strong association between the possibility of DAR-effects and reported speech. In fact, they claim that DAR-configurations are restricted to reported-speech environments, and that they are not compatible with predicates reporting a mental attitude. Even

if what Giorgi and Pianesi have discovered is not, as we will see, an absolute rule, but a strong tendency, it suggests an explanation for the figures in Table 2. The high frequency of the [PRESENT UNDER PAST]-pattern in the indicative with *decir* ‘say/tell’ and *asegurar* ‘assert, assure’ simply reflects the frequency of DAR-effects in reported speech, and does not indicate a weakening of the indexical nature of the Present Indicative.

As illustrated in examples (18a) and (18b), the embedded present is interpreted both with regard to Tmatrix and with regard to Utt-T, as an indexical present should in SoT-grammar:

(18)

- a. *Vitette Sellanes dijo que es un profesional y que no se arrepiente.*  
Vittete Sellanes say.SP that be.PRES.IND.3SG a professional and that not REFL  
repent.PRES.IND.3SG  
‘Vitette Sellanes said that he is a professional and that he has no regrets’
- b. *Insaurralde aseguró que es un día histórico.*  
Insaurralde assure.SP that be.PRES.IND.3SG a day historical  
‘Insaurralde assured that today is a historical date’

In order to confirm this impression, 220 occurrences of the [PRESENT UNDER PAST]-pattern in the indicative were randomly extracted from the original sample and individually examined. Only 1 example was found which could possibly count as an instance of [PRESENT UNDER PAST] without a DAR-effect (i.e., with a present tense not interpreted as simultaneous to Utt-T), namely:

(19) *Fabián Rossi se acaba de ir de la casa de Iliana Calabro.*

Fabián Rossi REFL finish.PRES.IND.3SG of go of the house of Iliana Calabro  
*Se fue con un bolsito.*  
REFL go.SP.3SG with a small+bag  
*Dijo que lo hace para preservar a la familia.*  
say.SP.3SG that it do.PRES.IND.3SG for preserve to the family  
‘Fabián Rossi has just left Iliana Calabro’s home. He left with a small bag.  
He said he is doing it in order to preserve the family’

In fact, the distribution and interpretation of the [PRESENT UNDER PAST]-pattern in indicative complement clauses differs clearly from those found in intensional subjunctive clauses. In indicative complement clauses, the pattern is only frequent with speech act verbs and consistently triggers DAR-effects. In the following section, we show that DAR-effects apparently play no role in the case of intensional subjunctive clauses. Previously, however, it is necessary to reflect for a moment on the peculiarities of DAR in such environments.





- (23)
- a. *Me pidió que le compre una casa, y se la compré.*  
me asked.3.SG that him buy.PRES.SBJ.3SG a house and him her bought  
'He asked me to buy him a house, and I bought it for him'
- b. *Me pidió que le compre una casa, pero no se la compré.*  
me asked.3.SG that him buy.PRES.SBJ.3SG a house but not him her bought  
'He asked me to buy him a house, but I didn't buy it for him'

This extends further to cases in which the context makes it clear that the issue has been settled at UTT-T, without specifying in which way. So, for instance, in example (24) we do not know whether or not the players followed the request of the coach, but, the game being over at UTT-T, we know that the issue whether they did or not is settled.

- (24) *En el entretiempo el técnico nos pidió que nos paremos bien y que juguemos por abajo* [ARG., corpus CREA, <<http://www.rae.es>> 12/29/2016]  
in the half-time the coach us asked that us stand.PRES.SBJ.1PL well and that play.PRES.SBJ.1PL by down  
'At half-time, the coach asked us to stand our ground and to play it down'

#### 4.4 Lack of DAR-effects in intensional subjunctive clauses

With this in mind, a pilot corpus search was conducted for a speech act verb (*ordenar* 'to order') and for an implicative verb (*conseguir* 'to manage'). The query asked for present subjunctive or imperfect subjunctive co-occurrences at a 6-or-less-word distance to the right of the simple past indicative 3SG of the respective lemma. The results of the query are given in Table 3.

	Pres. Sbj.	Impf. Sbj.	%Pres
<b>ordenó que</b> order-3sgSP	102	221	31.57
<b>consiguió que</b> manage-3sgSP	36	128	21.95

Table 3: Total token counts in Present Subjunctive and Past Subjunctive for a directive and an implicative/causative verb

Source: data from LACA, 2018.

All the extracted [PRESENT UNDER PAST]-tokens for these two verbs, as well as a sample of 230 [PRESENT UNDER PAST]-tokens with **quería que** 'want-Impf.1&3Sg' (extracted with the same query pattern) were examined for absence of DAR-effects. Recall from the previous section that absence of DAR-effects means that the context reveals the issue to be settled at Utt-T. The results are clear cut: there are numerous examples (making for about one tenth of the total number for each matrix verb) of the [PRESENT UNDER PAST]-pattern without DAR-effects. (26) to (28) give a miscellaneous illustration of the temporal configuration (25):

(25) Tmatrix-----UTT-T-----

[T-SETTLEDNESS SBJ-CLAUSE]

(26)

- a. *Este ordenó que me lleven al hospital, con lo que me trasladaron*  
this order.SP that me take.PRES.SBJ.3PL to+the hospital, with it that me  
transport.SP.3PL  
*en el Móvil*  
in the patrol  
‘He ordered them to take me to the hospital, so they drove me there in the  
patrol car’
- b. *una multa de 780.000 pesos[...que] es una consecuencia de el incumplimiento a la*  
*medida cautelar dictada en enero de 2013.*  
‘a 780.000 pesos fine [...which] is a consequence of their non-compliance  
with the precautionary measure issued in January 2013.’  
*En aquel momento se le ordenó que cese inmediatamente*  
in that moment REFL him order.SP that cease.PRES.SBJ.3SG immediately  
*la dispensa de medicamentos de venta libre*  
the dispensation of medicines of sale free  
‘At that time he was ordered to immediately stop selling non  
prescription drugs’

(27) *se realizó otra conferencia en la que se consiguió que el rector*  
REFL perform..SP another conference in the that REFL manage.SP that the rector  
*Benjamín Kuchen disertar a favor de la Ley de la Igualdad*  
Benjamín Kuchen lecture.PRES.SBJ.3SG to favor of the Law of the Equality  
‘There was a further conference, at which they got Rector Benjamín  
Kuchen to speak in favor of the Equality Law’

(28)

- a. *Quería que se vayan, se fueron, listo...*  
want.IMPF.1SG. that REFL go.PRES.SBJ.3PL REFL go.SP.3PL, ready  
‘I wanted them to go away, they went away, and that’s it’
- b. *el sábado, cuando vi el boxeo, yo quería que gane Maravilla*  
the Saturday when saw1SG the boxing I want.IMPF. that win.PRES.  
SBJ.3SG Maravilla  
‘On Saturday, as I watched the fight, I wanted Maravilla to win’

The results of this exploratory corpus search show a clear difference in the [PRESENT UNDER PAST]-pattern between the indicative and intensional subjunctives. With the indicative, the pattern gives rise to DAR-effects and is thus in accordance with the SoT interpretation (indexical present). The frequency of the pattern is furthermore clearly sensitive to the difference between speech act verbs and non-speech act verbs in the matrix sentence, as predicted by Giorgi and Pianesi’s account

of DAR. By contrast, with intensional subjunctives the pattern does not necessarily give rise to DAR-effects, and thus it does not correspond to SoT grammar. There is some sensitivity to the difference between speech act verbs and non-speech act verbs, but the deviation is much slighter (%Pres 31.57 versus %Pres 21,95%) than in the case of the indicative (cf. Table 2).

#### 4.5 [PRESENT UNDER PAST] versus [PAST UNDER PAST] with polarity subjunctives

As discussed in Section 4.1. above, in the complements of attitude verbs, intensional subjunctives contrast with polarity subjunctives. The latter are licensed in negative-like environments, as illustrated in the following examples. These include sentential negation, as in (29a), but also decreasing quantifiers, as in (29b) and lexical verbs which are logically negation-like (29c).<sup>7</sup>

(29)

- a. *No cree* *que te vayas.*  
not believe.PRES.IND.3SG that you go.PRES.SBJ.2SG  
'S/he does not believe that you are leaving'
- b. *Pocas personas dijeron que fueran a participar.*  
few persons say.SP that go.IMP.F.SBJ.3PL to participate  
'Few people said they were going to participate'
- c. *Duda de que vayan a participar.*  
doubt.PRES.IND.1SG of that go.PRES.SBJ.3PL to participate  
'S/he doubts they are going to participate'

27

We now have to establish whether the [PRESENT UNDER PAST] configuration with polarity subjunctives follows the intensional subjunctive or rather the indicative pattern. In order to do this, we conducted a corpus search for a mental attitude verb (*creer* 'to order'), for a negative verb which is also a mental attitude verb (*dudar* 'doubt'), and for a negative verb which is also a speech act verb (*descartar* 'to exclude')<sup>8</sup>. The query asked for present subjunctive or imperfect subjunctive co-occurrences at a 6-or-less-word distance to the right of the imperfect or the simple past indicative 3sg of the respective lemma. The results of the query are given in Table 4.

<sup>7</sup> They behave logically as negation does because, when applied to a disjunction of contradictory propositions, they give rise to a contradiction, thus producing the same effect as applying propositional negation to a disjunction of contradictory propositions, to wit  $\neg (p \vee \neg p)$ . On this definition of negative lexical verbs, see Aguilar-Guevara *et al.* (2011).

<sup>8</sup> The choice of past tense form for the matrix verbs (imperfect or perfective simple past) was made on considerations of frequency, as in Guajardo (2017).

	Pres. Sb	Impf. Sbj.	%Pres
<b>creía que</b> believe.IMPF1&3sg	2	62	3.12
<b>dudaba (de) que</b> doubt.IMPF.1&3sg	1	14	7.14
<b>descartó que</b> exclude.SP.3sg	201	22	90.13

Table 4: Total token counts in Present Subjunctive and Past Subjunctive for polarity subjunctives and %Present Subjunctive

Source: own elaboration.

The results show a very clear difference in the [present under past] -pattern between polarity and intensional subjunctives. With polarity subjunctives, the distribution and interpretation of the pattern mirrors that of the indicative:

- With mental attitude verbs (*creer* ‘believe’ and *dudar* ‘doubt’), the [PRESENT UNDER PAST]-pattern has a very low relative frequency, in the same range as that of the [PRESENT UNDER PAST]-pattern in the indicative with the mental attitude verb *pensar* ‘think’ (cf. Table 2).
- With the speech-act verb *descartar* ‘exclude’, the [PRESENT UNDER PAST]-pattern has a very high relative frequency, in the same range as that of the [PRESENT UNDER PAST]-pattern in the indicative with the speech act verb *asegurar* ‘assert, assure’.

Moreover, among the 201 occurrences of the [PRESENT UNDER PAST]-pattern with *descartar* ‘exclude’, there are no instances of [PRESENT UNDER PAST] without a DAR-effect: all cases correspond to the temporal configuration in which the time of the situation described in the complement clause overlaps both Tmatrix and Utt-T, as exemplified in (30):

(30) *El economista descartó que **exista** alguna cláusula secreta en el convenio rubricado.*

the economist excluded that exist.PRES.SBJ.3SG some clause secret in the treaty signed

‘The economist excluded the existence of any secret clause in the signed treaty’

In other words, the distribution and interpretation of [PRESENT UNDER PAST] under *descartar* ‘exclude’ (licensing a polarity subjunctive) pattern with those of the indicative under *asegurar* ‘assert’, and not with those under *ordenar* ‘order’ (selecting for an intensional subjunctive). Like the indicative, the pattern for polarity subjunctives corresponds thus to SoT-grammar, with an indexical present.

#### 4.6 Taking stock

Even if our investigation of the [present under past]-configuration in ASp is exploratory and should be completed or replicated for other matrix verbs, one result seems rather conclusive: the configuration instantiates two different patterns of distribution and interpretation, a SoT-pattern with the indicative and with polarity subjunctives, which exhibits systematic DAR-effects and is sensitive to the contrast between reported-speech and mental-attitude contexts, and a non-SoT-pattern with intensional subjunctives, in which DAR-effects are not obligatory and which is not (or is much less) sensitive to the contrast between reported-speech and mental-attitude contexts. It is in this latter pattern that the present subjunctive does not behave as an indexical. This means that the loss of the indexical nature of the present is not correlated with subjunctive mood itself, but with a type of complement clause in the subjunctive.

Furthermore, when contrasting intensional and polarity subjunctives we have found additional evidence in favour of Quer's hypothesis as to the non-homogeneity of subjunctives. The distribution and interpretation of the [present under past]-configuration in ASp provides yet another property with regard to which intensional and polarity subjunctives differ.

Finally, by paying attention to the contrast between speech act and non-speech act verbs, some indirect confirmation for Giorgi and Pianesi's hypothesis emerged: with the indexical present, the one characterizing both indicative mood and polarity subjunctives, DAR-effects are clearly associated with reported-speech contexts.

#### 5. Conclusion and outlook

The most important result of this research is that the weakening of the indexical nature of the present in ASp is correlated not with subjunctive mood itself, but with a particular type of subjunctive clauses. From the material discussed in this paper, it could be concluded that the relevant type of subjunctive clauses are the complement clauses of directive, volitional and causative predicates. And it would be tempting to establish a correlation between this fact and the manifold indications suggesting that such complement clauses have a defective functional structure. However, the problem is that, as reported in Laca (2018), the complement clauses of emotive-factive predicates, such as *lamentar* 'regret', *sorprender* 'surprise' also instantiate the non-SoT pattern, even slightly more frequently than attitudes of preference. These factive subjunctive clauses do not fit well into the intensional/polarity dichotomy (QUER, 1998, 2016), on the one hand, and there is no reason to assume that they have a defective functional structure, on the other. Thus, the question as to which properties of intensional and factive subjunctive clauses favor non-SoT grammar must be left to further research.

As stated in Section 1, the coexistence of simultaneity readings for embedded past subjunctives with non-indexical readings for present subjunctives poses a serious problem for the SoT-parameter as defined by Demirdache and Lungu (2008, 2011). In fact, the authors report on similar findings for embedded indicative tenses in French child language, and explain them by appealing to the multiple grammar hypothesis: up to a certain age, children would have access to two (or more) concurrent grammars, an SoT one and a non-SoT one<sup>9</sup>. The multiple-grammar-hypothesis is also entirely plausible in the case of language change, and there can be no doubt that in ASp there is an ongoing change affecting subjunctive tenses. However, there is a piece of evidence which requires reflection. If the multiple-grammar hypothesis is correct, the example with which this discussion was started, which we repeat below for convenience, should be a case of code-switching between a non-SoT and a SoT-grammar:

- (31) *Engels quería que él se **sig**a dedicando a la agitación política y*  
 Engels wanted that he REFL go-on.PRES.SBJ devoting to the agitation  
 politic and  
***continuara** con sus análisis filosóficos*  
 continue.impf.sbj with his analyses philosophical..  
 ‘Engels wanted him to devote himself further to political activism and to  
 continue with his philosophical analyses’

30

The problem, however, is that this pattern, which is relatively well documented, only exists in this order: a non-indexical present subjunctive followed by a simultaneity expressing past subjunctive. And this is not the type of regularity which one would expect for code-switching phenomena. Actually, it looks a lot like a rule of grammar, of a single grammar. This is the second important question which must be left to further research.

---

<sup>9</sup> In later work, Lungu (2012, p. 58) suggests that the existence of some languages, as for instance Upper Austrian, in which both a past and a present may express a simultaneous construal, speaks in favor of the continuity hypothesis over the multiple grammar hypothesis: French child language would converge with the setting for other languages (such as Upper Austrian or , for that matter, ASp as far as a particular type of subjunctive clauses is concerned), and not yet to the target language.

AGUILAR-GUEVARA, Ana; ALONI, Maria; PORT, Angelika; SIMIK, RADEK; DE VOS, Machteld; ZEIJLSTRA, Hedde. Semantics and pragmatics of indefinites, a methodology for a synchronic and diachronic corpus study. *In: DIPPER, Stefanie; ZINSMEISTER, Heike (eds.). Beyond Semantics: Corpus-based investigations of pragmatic and discourse phenomena. Proceedings of the DGfS Workshop, Göttingen, February 23-25, 2011. Bochum: University of Bochum, 2011. p. 1-16.*

CORPUS CREA. Real Academia Española. Available at: <http://www.rae.es>.

CONDORAVDI, Cleo. Temporal interpretation of modals: modals for the present and for the past. *In: BEAVER, David; CASILLAS, Luis; CLARK, Brady; KAUFMANN, Stefan. The Construction of Meaning: Standford, CA: CSLI Publications, 2002. p. 59-88.*

COSTANTINI, Francesco. On tense mismatch and a morphosyntactic theory of SOT. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa*, v. 32, 39-64, 2007.

DAVIES, Markus. BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY. *Corpus del Español*. Available at: <http://corpusdelespanol.org>.

DEMIRDACHE, Hamida; Lungu, Oana. Sequence of Tense in (French) Child Language. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook*, v. 8, p. 101-130, 2008.

DEMIRDACHE, Hamida; Lungu, Oana. Zero-tense vs. indexical construals of the present in French L1. *In: Musan, Renate; Rathert, Monika (eds.). Tense across Languages. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, 2011. p. 233-256.*

31

GIORGI, Alessandra. A syntactic way to subjunctive. *University of Venice WpiL*, vol. 16, 2006.

GIORGI, Alessandra. Toward a syntax of the subjunctive mood. *Lingua*, v. 119, p. 1937-1858, 2009.

GIORGI, Alessandra; Pianesi, Fabio. Sequence of Tense Phenomena in Italian: a Morphosyntactic Analysis. *Probus*, v. 12, p. 1-32, 2000.

GUAJARDO, Gustavo. *Subjunctive and sequence of tense in three Spanish varieties: Corpus and experimental studies of change in progress. 2017. Dissertation (Ph.D.) – University of California (UCLA) at San Diego, San Diego, 2017.*

KRATZER, Angelika. More structural analogies between Pronouns and Tenses. *In: STROLOVITCH, Devon ; LAWSON, Aaron (eds.). Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistics Theory (SALT) VIII. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 1998. p. 92-110.*

LACA, Brenda. The puzzle of subjunctive tenses. *In: Bok-Benemma, Reineke; Kampers-Mahne, Brigitte; Hollebrandse, Bart. Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2008 – Selected Papers from ‘Going Romance’ Groningen 2008. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2010. p. 171-194.*



LACA, Brenda. On the temporal orientation of intensional subjunctives. *In: Guéron, Jacqueline. (ed.). Sentence and Discourse – Hommage to Carlota Smith.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. p. 23-44.

LACA, Brenda. Algunas observaciones sobre el subjuntivo y el parámetro de la concordancia temporal. *In: Bosque, Ignacio; Costa, Sylvia; Malcuori, Marisa (eds.). Palabras en lluvia minuciosa. Veinte visitas a la gramática del español inspiradas por Angela di Tullio.* Madrid: Vervuert, 2018. p. 221-236.

LUNGU, Oana. *Le temps en contexte subordonné: de la perspective de l'acquisition du français langue maternelle.* 2012. Dissertation (Ph.D.) – Université de Nantes, Nantes, 2012.

OGIHARA, Toshiyuki; Sharvit, Yael. Embedded Tenses. *In: Binnick, Robert (ed.). The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. p. 638-668.

PICALLO, Carme. El nudo FLEX y el parámetro de sujeto nulo. *In: Bosque, Ignacio (ed.). Indicativo y subjuntivo.* Madrid: Taurus, 1985/1990. p. 202-233.

QUER, Josep. *Mood at the interface.* Dissertation (Ph.D.) – University of Utrecht, Utrecht, 1998.

QUER, Josep. Subjunctives. *In: Everaert, Martin; van Riemsdijk, Henk (eds.). The Blackwell Companion to Syntax, vol. IV.* Oxford: Blackwell, 2006. p. 660-684.

QUER, Josep. Mood. *In: Ledgeway, Adam; Maiden, Martin (eds.). The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. p. 954-967.

RAE-ASALE. *Nueva gramática de la lengua española.* Real Academia Española. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 2009.

SESSAREGO, Sandro. Spanish Concordantia Temporum: an old issue, new solutions. *In: WESTMORELAND, Maurice; THOMAS, Juan Antonio (eds.). Selected Proceedings of the 4<sup>th</sup> International Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics.* Sommerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, 2008. p. 91-99.

SESSAREGO, Sandro. Temporal concord and Latin American Spanish Dialects: A Generic Blueprint. *Revista Iberoamericana de Lingüística*, v. 5, p. 137-169, 2010.

SUÑER, Margarita. El tiempo en las subordinadas. *In: Bosque, Ignacio (ed.). Tiempo y aspecto en español.* Madrid: Cátedra, 1990. p. 77-105.

SUÑER, Margarita; Padilla Rivera, José. Concordancia temporal y subjuntivo. *In: BOSQUE, Ignacio (ed.). Indicativo y subjuntivo.* Madrid: Taurus, 1987/1990. p. 185-201.