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Abstract

This dissertation proposes a diachronic analysis of the polarity subjunctive from Latin into Modern French. The pattern of the polarity subjunctive in Romance is one where epistemic predicates can license the subjunctive mood rather than the indicative mood in polarity environments, notably under negation, in questions, and in conditional antecedents.

Focussing on the phenomenon in French as a starting point, I present a classification of epistemic triggers for the selection of the polarity subjunctive which is based on their objective and subjective veridicality (Giannakidou & Mari 2015). Within this classification, cognitive-factive predicates (e.g. ‘know’) are observably the first types of predicates which display the pattern of the polarity subjunctive, as early as Vulgar Latin, due to their entailing objective veridicality.

The selection of the polarity subjunctive in Vulgar Latin is in line with the observation that cognitive-factive predicates select the indicative mood in the affirmative across Romance, although Italian and Portuguese can select the subjunctive with other epistemic predicates in the affirmative. Furthermore, ‘remember’ is the only predicate which selects the polarity subjunctive across all Romance languages, being the only acceptable epistemic trigger in Portuguese and one of the only two for Italian.

In Middle French, the other types of epistemic predicates — the verba credendi, notably — adopted and grammaticalized this pattern by the end of the Middle French period. The change occurred before the grammaticalization of est-ce que in questions and the loss of the subjunctive in conditional clauses. This supports the hypothesis that the polarity subjunctive is grammaticalized in Modern French, where est-ce que and if-clauses are incompatible with the subjunctive mood, whereas other question types and conditional antecedents are not, as novel data show.
The diachronic analysis presented in this dissertation explains the inconsistencies in the selection of the polarity subjunctive across Romance languages and within individual languages. Therefore, it can account for cases of polarity subjunctive in Italian and Portuguese, which mostly retain the alternation indicative – subjunctive found in Latin. It further explains the grammaticalized state of the polarity subjunctive in French, until the gradual loss of the subjunctive mood in some of the modern varieties.
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Introduction

**TWO TYPES OF SUBJUNCTIVE IN ROMANCE**

Two types of subjunctive mood have been identified in Romance languages: the “intensional subjunctive” and the “polarity subjunctive” (coined by Stowell 1993).

**The Intensional Subjunctive**

The intensional subjunctive is defined as lexically selected by intensional predicates or conjunctions, i.e. predicates or conjunctions that introduce a set of possible worlds (Karttunen 1973; 1974; Stalnaker 1984; Heim 1992).

Verbs that select the “intensional subjunctive” in Romance languages come in different categories: modal-like predicates that embed the notions of necessity, probability, or rational evaluation (as per Tóth’s 2006 terminology; e.g. ‘it is necessary’, ‘it is possible’, and ‘it is imperative’ as in 1, 2, and 3) and attitude verbs, more specifically desideratives (e.g. ‘want’ as in 4), directives (e.g. ‘ask’ as in 5) — including verbs of permission or prohibition (e.g. ‘autoriser’ and ‘interdire’ in 6 and 7), causatives (e.g. ‘make it so that’ as in 8), and emotive-factives (e.g. ‘be glad’ as in 9), including verbs of fear (e.g. ‘fear’ as in 10) (Farkas 1992; Quer 1997; Manzini 2000; Bianchi 2001; Schlenker 2005; Costantini 2005; Kempchinsky 2009; Villalta 2008, B-Violette 2015; a.o.). In the French examples below, the intensional predicates vouloir, être content, demander, il est nécessaire, and il est probable, always select the subjunctive mood over the indicative mood.¹

¹Note that, although marginal, (2-b) is not completely ungrammatical. The indicative is used instead of the subjunctive in colloquial speech for some speakers of Canadian French. See Chapter 3 for more information about the loss of the subjunctive in Modern French.
(1) a. Il est nécessaire que Cassya se rende à Montréal.
   “It is necessary that Cassya travels to Montreal.”

b. *Il est nécessaire que Cassya se rend à Montréal.
   “It is necessary that Cassya travels to Montreal.”

(2) a. Il est probable qu’ Arthur soit parti.
   “It is possible that Arthur left.”

b. *Il est probable qu’ Arthur est parti.
   “It is possible that Arthur left.”

(3) a. Il est impératif que Lena apprenne à conduire manuel.
   “It is imperative for Lena to learn to drive a manual transmission car.”

b. *Il est impératif que Lena apprend à conduire manuel.
   “It is imperative for Lena to learn to drive a manual transmission car.”

(4) a. Arthur veut qu’ Artémis se rende à Montréal.
   “Arthur wants Artemis to travel to Montreal.”

   “Arthur wants Artemis to travel to Montreal.”

(5) a. Élisabeth a demandé à Arthur qu’ il parte.
   “Elisabeth asked Arthur to leave.”

b. *Élisabeth a demandé à Arthur qu’ il part/partira.
   “Elisabeth asked Arthur to leave.”

(6) a. Cheyanne autorise Christianne à ce que Polly puisse l’accompagner au travail.
   “Cheyanne allows Polly to accompany Christianne to work.”
b. *Cheyanne autorise Christianne à ce que Polly peut l’accompagner au travail. “Cheyanne allows Polly to accompany Christianne to work.”

(7) a. Julia interdit à l’un de ses étudiants que sa mère lui écrive directement à nouveau. “Julia let one of her students know that his mother should not contact her directly again.”

b. *Julia interdit à l’un de ses étudiants que sa mère lui écrive directement à nouveau. “Julia let one of her students know that his mother should not contact her directly again.”

(8) a. Glen fait en sorte que personne ne le reconnaîsse. “Glen makes it so that no one recognizes him.”

b. ??Glen fait en sorte que personne ne le reconnaît. “Glen makes it so that no one recognizes him.”

(9) a. Sissi est contente qu’Artémis soit venue. “Sissi is glad that Artemis came.”

b. ??Sissi est contente qu’Artémis est venue. “Sissi is glad that Artemis came.”

(10) a. Dorothy craint que B. P. D. ne puisse pas obtenir de billets pour le concert. “Dorothy fears that B. P. D. might not be able to get tickets for the concert.”

b. ??Dorothy craint que B. P. D. ne peut pas obtenir de billets pour le concert. “Dorothy fears that B. P. D. might not be able to get tickets for the concert.”
“Dorothy fears that B. P. D. might not be able to get tickets for the concert.”

(French)

Verbs of doubt — I mean here verbs that mean ‘doubt’ in and of themselves, which excludes negated epistemic predicates (e.g. ‘believe not’) — are also considered as intensional predicates by some scholars (e.g. Marques 2018; cf. Quer 1997), as they seem to lexically select the subjunctive; no additional criterion needs to be met for the selection of the subjunctive mood than the presence of this verb alone, as it is the case for other intensional verbs selecting the intensional subjunctive. Whether we have douter (‘doubt’) or ne pas douter (‘doubt not’), the subjunctive would be the mood typically selected in the complement clause.

(11) a. Yujing doute que la corne des rhinocéros soit vraiment composede de la même protéine que nos cheveux.
    “Yujing doubts that the horn of rhinoceros is really made of the same protein as our hair.”

   b. Yujing (ne) doute pas que la corne des rhinocéros soit vraiment composede de la même protéine que nos cheveux.
    “Yujing does not doubt that the horn of rhinoceros is really made of the same protein as our hair.”

(12) a. Yujing doute que la corne des rhinocéros soit vraiment composede de la même protéine que nos cheveux.
    “Yujing doubts that the horn of rhinoceros is really made of the same protein as our hair.”

   b. Yujing (ne) doute pas que la corne des rhinocéros soit vraiment composede de la même protéine que nos cheveux.
    “Yujing does not doubt that the horn of rhinoceros is really made of the same protein as our hair.”

(French)
We can see however that judgements as to the unacceptability of (11-b) and (12-b) are weaker than they are for the unacceptability of the indicative under other types of intensional subjunctive-selecting predicates. This observation is supported by Quer (1995), who argues that verbs like *dub-tar* ‘doubt’ and *negar* ‘deny’, although lexically selecting the intensional subjunctive, display similar properties as predicates that select the polarity subjunctive. Progovac (2005) argues that adver- sative predicates (e.g. ‘deny’ and ‘doubt’) select a negative operator, which would make them a polarity environment and could explain why those types of verbs always select the subjunctive — assuming that polarity has the ability to license the subjunctive mood. Furthermore, additional cross-Romance data can be found to support the observation in (11) and (12).

(13) **No dudo de que estás harto de mí.**

not doubt.1SG of that be.2SG.PRS.IND fed.up with me

“I do not doubt that you are fed up with me.” (Spanish; Fábregas 2014: 13)

The table below summarizes the types of intensional predicates which select the subjunctive mood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>necessity</td>
<td>il faut que</td>
<td>‘it is necessary that’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possibility</td>
<td>il est possible que</td>
<td>‘it is possible that’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rational evaluation</td>
<td>il est impératif que</td>
<td>‘it is imperative that’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desiderative</td>
<td>vouloir</td>
<td>‘want’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directive</td>
<td>demander</td>
<td>‘ask’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- permission</td>
<td>permettre</td>
<td>‘allow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- prohibition</td>
<td>interdire</td>
<td>‘forbid’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>causative</td>
<td>faire en sorte que</td>
<td>‘make it so that’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotive-factive</td>
<td>être content</td>
<td>‘be glad’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- fear</td>
<td>craindre</td>
<td>‘fear’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- doubt</td>
<td>douter</td>
<td>‘doubt’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intensional subjunctive can also be selected in adverbial clauses. The types of conjunctions that select this mood include those that introduce purpose clauses (e.g. ‘so that’ in 14), temporal clauses (e.g. ‘before that’ in 15), concessive clauses (e.g. ‘although’ in 16), and clauses that express fear (e.g. ‘for fear that’ in 17), and restriction (e.g. ‘unless’ in 18) (Manzini 2000; Sanchez-Naranjo
(14) a. Pooja est sortie avec Mr. Fluffington afin qu'il puisse se dégourdir un peu. 
   "Pooja went out with Mr. Fluffington so that he could stretch a bit."

   b. *Pooja est sortie avec Mr. Fluffington afin qu'il peut se dégourdir un peu. 
   "Pooja went out with Mr. Fluffington so that he could stretch a bit."

(15) a. Lavina voulait se réserver un biscuit avant que Sixian les prenne tous. 
   "Lavina wanted to grab a cookie before Sixian would take them all."

   b. *Lavina voulait se réserver un biscuit avant que Sixian les prend tous. 
   "Lavina wanted to grab a cookie before Sixian would take them all."

(16) a. Éloïse prépare du steak pour le souper bien qu'elle soit végétarienne. 
   "Éloïse prepares steak for dinner although she is vegetarian."

   b. ??Éloïse prépare du steak pour le souper bien qu'elle est végétarienne. 
   "Éloïse prepares steak for dinner although she is vegetarian."

(17) a. Lauri-Jo et Matt ont mis Flynn en laisse de peur qu'il ne fasse quelque chose de dangereux. 
   "Lauri-Jo and Matt keep Flynn on a leash for fear that he would do something dangerous. “
b. *Lauri-Jo et Matt ont mis Flynn en laisse de peur qu’il ne fait quelque chose de dangereux.

“Lauri-Jo and Matt keep Flynn on a leash for fear that he would do something dangerous.”

(18) a. Isabelle s’apprête à rester à la maison aujourd’hui, à moins que Drew ne veuille prendre une marche avec elle.

“Issabelle is getting to stay home today, unless Drew wants to take a walk with her.”

b. *Isabelle s’apprête à rester à la maison aujourd’hui, à moins que Drew ne veut prendre une marche avec elle.

“Issabelle is getting to stay home today, unless Drew wants to take a walk with her.”

(French)

Other types of embedded clauses may seem to lexically select the subjunctive mood, those encoding supposition (e.g. ‘supposing that’ in 19) for instance. However, similarly to ‘doubt’, ‘supposing that’ is not as unacceptable with the indicative as other conjunctions.

(19) a. Tu pourrais laisser la fenêtre ouverte, en supposant que Choupie soit sage et (ne) se jette pas du haut du cinquième étage.

“You could leave the window open, supposing that Choupie would be wise not to throw herself out from the fifth floor down.”

b. ?Tu pourrais laisser la fenêtre ouverte, en supposant que Choupie est sage et (ne) se jette pas du haut du cinquième étage.

“You could leave the window open, supposing that Choupie would be wise not to throw herself out from the fifth floor down.”

(French)

The verb ‘suppose’ is one of those predicates which may select the polarity subjunctive in downward entailing environments in Modern French.
Native speakers seem to prefer the subjunctive embedded under the imperative forms (as in 20) of the verb as well as the conjunction *en supposant que*.³

(20) **Supposons** / *suppose* que Choupie est / *soit* sage.

"Let’s suppose / suppose that Choupie is wise.” (French)

The table below summarizes the types of intensional conjunctions which select the subjunctive mood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>purpose</td>
<td><em>afin que</em></td>
<td>‘in order that’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporal</td>
<td><em>avant que</em></td>
<td>‘before that’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concessive</td>
<td><em>bien que</em></td>
<td>‘although’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fear</td>
<td><em>de peur que</em></td>
<td>‘for fear that’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restriction</td>
<td><em>à moins que</em></td>
<td>‘unless’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supposition</td>
<td><em>en supposant que</em></td>
<td>‘supposing that’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Polarity Subjunctive

The polarity subjunctive is said to be licensed by polarity operators, such as negation, the Q(uestion) operator, or the operator found in *if*-clauses (Quer 1998; 2010; Giannakidou 2009; a.o.). The Italian examples below illustrate that the subjunctive is only licensed in the environments listed above (e.g. negation in 21-a; questions in 21-b and 21-c; *if*-clauses in 21-d; affirmative declarative clause in 21-e).

(21) a. **Non sa che io sono/sia andato.**

“He doesn’t know that I have/have:SUBJ gone”

---

³Note also that the imperative forms of epistemic predicates and a gerundive conjunction deriving from an epistemic predicate are not known to select the polarity subjunctive, but may as we can see from the examples here.

³We will see within the next subsection the criteria known to be necessary for the selection of the polarity subjunctive. One of the downward entailments available in some dialects of Italian is conditional antecedents or *if*-clauses. *Si*-clauses (*‘if’*-clauses) can never embed the subjunctive mood in Modern French. Yet, I would argue that the only available French equivalent of conditional antecedents containing an epistemic predicate that selects the subjunctive mood are these expressions introduced here: i.e. imperative forms of fictive predicates like *supposer* (‘suppose’) as well as the conjunction *en supposant que* (‘supposing that’).
b. Sai che lui è/sia andato?
   “Do you know that he has/has:subj gone?”

c. Chi sai che è/sia andato?
   “Who do you know that has/has:subj gone?”

d. Se sai che lui è/sia andato,...
   “If you know that he has/has:subj gone...”

e. So che tu sei/*sia andato.
   “I know that you have/have:subj gone”

(Italian; Manzini 2000: 242)

This first condition for the licensing of the polarity subjunctive can also be generalized as license in downward entailing environments. The entailment relation between the affirmative propositions in (22), which are upward entailing environments, is reversed in the negative propositions (23), which are downward entailing environments.

(22)
   a. I have clothes.
   b. I have footwear. (I have footwear ⇒ I have clothes)
   c. I have socks. (I have socks ⇒ I have footwear)

(23)
   a. I don’t have clothes. (I don’t have clothes ⇒ I don’t have footwear)
   b. I don’t have footwear. (I don’t have footwear ⇒ I don’t have socks)
   c. I don’t have socks.

The second condition concerns the type of predicate that selects the polarity subjunctive. The polarity subjunctive is embedded under epistemic predicates⁴, i.e. predicates which shed light on the state of knowledge of a participant (Hacquard 2006; 2010; Yalcin 2007; Anand & Hacquard 2013). More specifically, we find several types of epistemic predicates which select the subjunctive: cognitive predicates (e.g. the cognitive-factive or “semi-factives” ‘know’, and ‘remember’) as in (24); verba dicendi et declarandi⁵ (or assertive or communicative predicates; e.g. ‘say’) as in (25);

---

⁴Note that epistemic predicates are intensional predicates, but they do not belong to the class of intensional predicates mentioned above that license the intensional subjunctive.

⁵Verba dicendi et declarandi is shortened to verba dicendi throughout.
*(or belief verbs; e.g. ‘believe’) as in (26).

(24) Gianni non sapeva che Maria fosse incinta.
Gianni NEG knew that Maria be.3SG.IMPF.SBJV pregnant
“Gianni didn’t know that Maria was pregnant.” (Italian; Portner 1999: 55)

(25) Jenny (ne) dit pas que San Francisco soit plus accueillant que Boston.
Jenny NEG say not that San Francisco be.3SG.PRS.SBJV more welcoming than Boston
“Jenny is not saying that San Francisco is more welcoming than Boston.” (French)

(26) Juan no cree que tu hijo esté enfermo.
Juan NEG believes that your son be.3SG.PRS.SBJV ill
“Juan doesn’t believe that your son is ill.” (Spanish; Mejías-Bikandi 1996: 173)

These two conditions are required for the licensing of the subjunctive of polarity, but they do not preclude the use of the indicative. Hence both the indicative and the subjunctive moods can be used in the complement of the negative epistemic predicate *croire* ‘know’ in (27-a) and (27-b), while only the indicative is licensed in the subordinate clause in (27-c) and (27-d), which is not a downward entailing environment.

(27) a. Tom (ne) croit pas que Mikki soit partie.
Tom NEG believes not that Mikki is.3SG.PRS.SBJV left
“Tom does not believe that Mikki left.”

b. Tom (ne) croit pas que Mikki est partie.
Tom NEG believes not that Mikki is.3SG.PRS.IND left
“Tom does not believe that Mikki left.”

c. *Tom croit que Mikki soit partie.
Tom believes that Mikki is.3SG.PRS.SBJV left
“Tom believes that Mikki left.”

d. Tom croit que Mikki est partie.
Tom believes that Mikki is.3SG.PRS.IND left

*I include within the class of *verba credendi* the, otherwise, “fictive” predicates (e.g. ‘imagine’) as in ((i)), and some other verbs. See the discussion in Chapter 1.

(i) Stephanie (n’) imagine pas que nous soyons incapables d’ améliorer la compréhension d’ Alexa.
Stephanie NEG imagine not that we be.1PL.PRS.SBJV incapable to improve.INF the comprehension of Alexa.
“Stephanie cannot imagine that we wouldn’t be capable of improving Alexa’s understanding.” (French)
‘Doubt’ fulfills both conditions for the licensing of the polarity subjunctive. First, it is downward entailling as exemplified below. As opposed to ‘know’ which only allows upward entailment (as shown in 28) — where only the more restricted version of a statement entails the more general (“relaxed”) version of the same statement, — ‘doubt’ is a downward-entailing operator since it allows the reverse entailment relation in (29).

\[(28)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{ We know the epidemic spread quickly.} \\
\text{b. } & \text{ We know the epidemic spread quickly via fleas.} \\
& \quad \text{(i) Upward entailment: } (28-b) \Rightarrow (28-a) \\
& \quad \text{(ii) Downward entailment: } *(28-a) \Rightarrow (28-b)
\end{align*}
\]

\[(29)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{ We doubt the epidemic spread quickly.} \\
\text{b. } & \text{ We doubt the epidemic spread quickly via fleas.} \\
& \quad \text{(i) Upward entailment: } *(29-b) \Rightarrow (29-a) \\
& \quad \text{(ii) Downward entailment: } (29-a) \Rightarrow (29-b)
\end{align*}
\]

\[(Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil \textit{et al.} 2009:137)\]

‘Doubt’ also satisfies the second criterion as it is an epistemic predicate, which I classify together with the \textit{verba credendi}. Similarly, ‘supposing that’ and the imperative forms of ‘suppose’ also fulfill both conditions as they are close in meaning to \textit{verba credendi} in conditional antecedents.

\[(30)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{ We should find a cure as soon as possible, supposing that the epidemic spread quickly} \\
\text{b. } & \text{ We should find a cure as soon as possible, supposing that the epidemic spread quickly} \\
& \quad \text{via fleas.} \\
& \quad \text{(i) Upward entailment: } *(30-b) \Rightarrow (30-a) \\
& \quad \text{(ii) Downward entailment: } (30-a) \Rightarrow (30-b)
\end{align*}
\]

\[(31)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{ Suppose that the epidemic spread quickly, then we should find a cure as quickly as possible.}
\end{align*}
\]
b. Suppose that the epidemic spread quickly via fleas, then we should find a cure as quickly as possible.

   (i) Upward entailment: *(31-b) ⇒ (31-a)
   (ii) Downward entailment: (31-a) ⇒ (31-b)

(32) a. We should find a cure as soon as possible, if we think that the epidemic spread quickly.

   b. We should find a cure as soon as possible, if we think that the epidemic spread quickly via fleas.

   (i) Upward entailment: *(32-b) ⇒ (32-a)
   (ii) Downward entailment: (32-a) ⇒ (32-b)

Downward entailment and subordination under an epistemic predicate does not guarantee the availability of the polarity subjunctive within or across Romance, however, as shown below.

(33) a. Nous devrions mettre en place certaines précautions, sachant que l’épidémie se répand rapidement.

   “We should put in place some precautions, knowing that the epidemic is spreading quickly.”

   b. Nous devrions mettre en place certaines précautions, sachant que l’épidémie se répand rapidement par les puces.

   “We should put in place some precautions, knowing that the epidemic is spreading quickly via the fleas.”

   (i) Upward entailment: *(33-b) ⇒ (33-a)
   (ii) Downward entailment: (33-a) ⇒ (33-b)

(French)

The table below summarizes the environments and the types of epistemic predicates necessary for the selection of the polarity subjunctive.
Table 3: Criteria for the selection of the polarity subjunctive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environments</th>
<th>Epistemic Predicates</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negated epistemic predicate</td>
<td>cognitive-factives</td>
<td>savoir</td>
<td>'know'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epistemic predicate in conditional antecedents</td>
<td>verba dicendi</td>
<td>dire</td>
<td>'say'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epistemic predicate in question</td>
<td>verba credendi</td>
<td>croire</td>
<td>'believe'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- doubt</td>
<td>douter</td>
<td></td>
<td>'doubt'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supposition as conditional antecedent</td>
<td>en supposant que supposons</td>
<td></td>
<td>'supposing that'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quer (1998) remarks additional characteristics of the intensional subjunctive and the polarity subjunctive. First, the intensional subjunctive is submitted to tense restrictions due to the requirements of *consecutio temporum*\(^7\) and the future — though not necessarily achievable — status of the embedded subjunctive clause. In (34), the event of leaving must be future with respect to another point in time, which may be understood or have been previously stated in the context.

(34) Karine s’attendait à ce que son fils soit parti.
     Karine expected to this that her son be.3SG.PRS.SBJV left
     “Karine expected her son to have left.” (French)

Also, co-reference is allowed between the subject pronoun of an epistemic predicate that embeds

\(^7\)In Catalan, a past intensional subjunctive cannot be embedded under a present intensional predicate, whereas a past polarity subjunctive can be embedded under a present epistemic predicate in a downward entailing environment.

(i) a. *Vull* que acabés la tesi.
    want.1SG.PRS that finish.3SG.PST.SBJV the dissertation
    “I want her/him to finish the dissertation.”

b. No recorda que en Miquel treballés.
    not remember.3SG.PRS that the Miquel work.3SG.PST.SBJV
    “S/he doesn’t remember that Miquel worked.”

(ii) Je veux qu’elle ait terminé / soit en train de terminer sa thèse.
     I want that she has.AUX.3SG.PRS.SBJV finished / be.AUX.PRS.SBJV in process to finish.INF her dissertation
     “I want her to have finished / be finishing her dissertation.”

(Catalan; Quer 1998)

This particular restriction does not apply to French, however. Imperfect subjunctives are not productively used in French no matter the type of subjunctive. Still, the periphrastic past subjunctive is acceptable below, whether in a progressive sense (as with the auxiliary of ‘to be’ and the expression *en train*) or not.

(ii) Je veux qu’elle ait terminé / soit en train de terminer sa thèse.
     I want that she has.AUX.3SG.PRS.SBJV finished / be.AUX.PRS.SBJV in process to finish.INF her dissertation
     “I want her to have finished / be finishing her dissertation.”

(French)
the polarity subjunctive and the subject of the embedded subjunctive clause, as in (35). With intensional predicates and the intensional subjunctive, co-reference is unacceptable and leads to the disjoint reference effect (or obviation), as shown in (36).

(35) Claude (ne) pense pas qu’il ait vu The Lennon Report.
Claude neg think not that he have.AUX.3SG.PRS.SBJV seen The Lennon Report
“The Claude does not think that he watched The Lennon Report.”

(36) a. Édouard veut qu’il sorti avec ses amis ce soir.
Édouard wants that he go.out.SBJV with his friends this evening
Lit. “Édouard wants that he go out with his friends this evening.”

b. *Ton père t’a demandé que tu ranges ta chambre.
Your father you.SG.CL have.AUX asked that you.SG tidy up.2SG.PRS.SBJV your.SG room.
Lit. “Your father asked you that you tidy up your room.”

(French; B-Violette 2016: 1)

**Issues in Accounting for the Data with Previous Analyses**

The more accepted accounts of the indicative–subjunctive distinction derive from the notions of realis and irrealis (Givón 1994; cf. Farkas 1992). The definitions of realis and irrealis vary depending on who uses those notions. Realis roughly refers to a context that is — at least strongly believed to be, if not simply, — true by the subject of the belief world introduced in the target utterance or a discourse participant (i.e. speaker or addressee) where applicable. Irrealis refers to a context that is weakly believed to be true — in other words, a context involving uncertainty.⁸ More specifically, the subjunctive is typically argued to be selected in irrealis environments (Siegel 2009: 1861), e.g. the subordinate clauses of desiderative, directive, causative, and negated epistemic predicates. Furthermore, it is incompatible with veridical contexts (Giannakidou 1994; 1995; 1997; 1998; 1999; 2009) — i.e. when an “epistemic agent” is committed to the truth of the embedded proposition — or strong “speaker commitment” (Siegel 2009). Giannakidou’s proposal predicts that if the speaker or subject

---

⁸Different definitions of realis and irrealis may be relevant for different languages due to language change (Chafe 1995; Mithun 1995; a.o.).
of an epistemic predicate is committed to the truth of the embedded proposition, the propositional attitude is veridical and selects the indicative mood. If, on the other hand, the propositional attitude is non-veridical, the subjunctive will be selected instead. Similarly, Siegel argues that the indicative is associated with speaker commitment. In (36-a), it is neither known to be true nor strongly believed that Mikki left, hence the negated epistemic introduces a non-veridical environment. In (36-d), it is at least “strongly believed” that she did.

However, there are systematic cases of subjunctive mood in veridical situations across Romance languages, i.e. emotive-factive predicates. Emotive-factive predicates (e.g. ‘be glad’, ‘regret’) are emotive and factive. They express the subject’s emotion with respect to their complement and they presuppose the truth of the complement according to the speaker. This is a veridical situation, yet the subjunctive is used in French.

(37) Maxine est contente que tu sois venu.  
Maxine is glad that you.sg be.prs.sbjv.2sg come  
“Maxine is glad that you came.” (French)

Similarly, causatives involve a presupposition that the speaker is committed to the truth of the embedded proposition (Karttunen 1971a; Horn 1972)⁹, yet they select the subjunctive. (37) implies that Tom did leave in the actual world.

(38) Sissi a fait en sorte que Tom parte.  
Sissi has done such that he leave.3sg.prs.sbjv  
“Sissi made him leave.” (French)

Furthermore, none of the accounts described above seem to be able to explain variation with respect to the selection of the subjunctive within and across the different Romance languages. ‘Hope’ would be expected to introduce a non-veridical environment, as the situation described has not yet happened, and therefore is known not to be true. ‘Hope’ selects the subjunctive in Italian as shown

---

⁹ The following continuation test illustrates that the speaker must be committed to the truth of the subordinate clause.

(i) Sam forced / caused / made Chris (to) stay home.  
# ... but I don’t think he did.
in (39-a), but not in French as shown in (39-b).

(39)  

a. Jean espère que Marie part / partira / *parte demain.  
Jean hopes that Marie leave.3SG.PRS.IND / IND.FUT.3SG / 3SG.PRS.SBJV tomorrow  
“Jean hopes that Marie will leave tomorrow.”

b. Gianni spera che Maria parta domani.  
Gianni hopes that Maria leave. 3SG.PRS.SBJV tomorrow  
“Gianni hopes that Maria will leave tomorrow.”

(ITalian; Costantini 2005: 119)

The use of the polarity subjunctive seems to be inconsistent within Romance languages. Manzini claims that ‘know’ selects the polarity subjunctive in all the polarity environments described above (see 21). However, the native speakers of Italian I consulted do not accept the use of the subjunctive mood with this verb, irrespective of polarity.

(40)  

a. Art sa che Paulo vuole fare carriera da solista.  
Art knows that Paul wants. 3SG.PRS.IND do career solo  
“Art knows that Paul wants a solo career.”

b. *Art sa che Paulo voglia fare carriera da solista.  
Art knows that Paul wants. 3SG.PRS.SBJV do career solo  
“Art knows that Paul wants a solo career.”

(41)  

a. Art non sa che Paulo vuole fare carriera da solista.  
Art NEG knows not that Paul wants. 3SG.PRS.IND do career solo  
“Art does not know that Paul wants a solo career.”

b. ??Art non sa che Paulo voglia fare carriera da solista.  
Art NEG knows not that Paul wants. 3SG.PRS.SBJV do career solo  
“Art does not know that Paul wants a solo career.”

(ITalian)

Other epistemic predicates may take the subjunctive in upward entailing environments.

(42)  

Gianni pensa che parta domani.  
Gianni thinks that leaves(subj) tomorrow  
“Gianni thinks he will leave tomorrow.”  

(ITalian; Costantini 2005: 98)

Furthermore, French unlike Italian does not license the subjunctive in all epistemic downward en-
tailing environments. The antecedent of an if-clause does not, for instance, as illustrated in (43).

(43) Si Yvette croit qu’il y a / *ait des fantômes à Targoviste, il est temps de quitter les lieux.
If Yvette believes that there has.3sg.prs.ind / *have.3sg.prs.sbjv ghosts in Targoviste, it is time to exit the premises.

“If Yvette believes that there are ghosts in Targoviste, it is time to exit the premises.” (French)

In conclusion, current theories of subjunctive use in Romance (i.e. (ir)realis; (non-)veridicality; speaker commitment) cannot provide a unified account of the different types of subjunctive nor can they account for the variation within and across Romance languages.¹⁰

THE PROPOSAL IN A NUTSHELL

My proposal brings new light on the distribution of the subjunctive in Romance via a different approach, namely a historical one. This dissertation accounts for the rise of the polarity subjunctive from Latin to modern Romance languages (French, Italian, Portuguese, Catalan, Spanish, Romanian) and which provides insight into synchronic variations within and across modern Romance languages.

In Early and Classical Latin the polarity subjunctive appears to be nonexistent. In Vulgar Latin and Old Romance, such as Old French and Old Italian, however, I observe that cognitive-factives select the indicative in affirmative declarative clauses, while they select the subjunctive in non-veridical, downward entailing environments. What we know in modern Romance as the “polarity subjunctive” therefore makes its entrance in Vulgar Latin with cognitive-factives. Other epistemic predicates, however, continue to select either indicative or subjunctive in upward entailing environments as well as in downward entailing ones depending on the veridicality intended by the speaker. Below the subjunctive or the indicative can be used with cuidier (i.e. ‘think’) in the same environments.

(44) a. Quidet li reis que el se seit pasmee
think the king that she self be.prs.sbjv swooned

¹⁰Chapters 1 and 2 set the stage for the other issues to be discussed in Chapter 3.
“The king thinks that she swooned.”

(Old French; Roland 3724)

b. ge cuit qu’ il est de halt parage

I think that he is of high birth

“I think that he is of high birth’

(Old French; Eneas 1285–6)

I propose that the indicative reports information as known (cf. Bolkestein 1996) with cognitive-factives, and gains an association with objective veridicality. In comparison, the subjunctive is associated with “veridical agnosticism”, i.e. the purpose of the subjunctive is not to express any commitment — whether positive or negative — to the truth of a proposition. This linguistic situation was passed down relatively unchanged onto Italian and Portuguese, where epistemic predicates like ‘believe’ do not need a polarity operator to license the subjunctive, as shown above in (42) for Italian and below in (45) for Portuguese.

(45) O Paulo pensa que eles estejam já divorciados.

the Paul thinks that they be.SBJV.3PL already divorced

“Paul thinks that they might already be divorced.”

(Portuguese; Sitaridou 2007: 205)

The cognitive-factives, however, already behave differently by the time the main modern Romance languages split off. The Portuguese examples below illustrate the unacceptability of the subjunctive embedded under ‘remember’ in affirmative declaratives. The epistemic subject and the speaker know that Ringo was at the hospital for a tonsillectomy; there is no uncertainty with this statement. Hence only the indicative mood is acceptable with those predicates in affirmative declaratives.

(46) a. George recorda que Ringo está no hospital para uma tonsillectomia.

George remembers that Ringo is.3SG.PRS.IND at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.

“George remembers that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

b. *George recorda que Ringo esteja no hospital para uma tonsillectomia.

George remembers that Ringo is.3SG.PRS.SBJV at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.

“George remembers that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

(Brazilian Portuguese)
In the negative, however, the epistemic subject does not remember/know what happened to Ringo. Therefore, he need not believe what is expressed by the embedded proposition. This can explain the reading of doubt reported by some native speakers.

(47) a. George não recorda que Ringo está no hospital para uma tonsillectomia.
    “George does not remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

    b. George não recorda que Ringo esteja no hospital para uma tonsillectomia.
    “George does not remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

    (Brazilian Portuguese)

In the remaining Romance languages (i.e. French, Catalan, Spanish, and Romanian), the cognitive-factives were a determinant trigger for the reanalysis of the indicative mood. The indicative was reanalyzed to contribute an interpretation that the speaker believes in the truth of the embedded proposition based on the mood selection patterns observed with cognitive-factives (cf. Siegel 2009). Until the 17th century, the subjunctive loses a variety of features and environments, including conditional clauses. With the reanalysis of the indicative and some further semantic bleaching, he subjunctive gains a Maximized Presupposition — in contrast to the indicative — that it is unspecified in the context whether someone believes in the truth of the embedded proposition. At the point of transition between Middle French and Modern French, it is strictly restricted to the non-veridical environments known to license the polarity subjunctive today in the complement clauses of epistemic predicates. In affirmative declaratives, the speaker must believe in the truth of the subordinate clause. The various, sometimes distinct, contexts displaying the polarity subjunctive in different Romance languages are due to the different branches reaching different stages of grammaticalization. Grammaticalization, therefore, explains the variation and inconsistencies observed within and across Romance languages. The subjunctive suffers further semantic bleaching in some dialects con-
tributing to its loss in even more situations (cf. Poplack et al. 2013).¹¹

THE CONTENTS

In Chapter 1, I review some of the literature that attempts to account for the polarity subjunctive. Then, focussing on Modern French data, I draw a classification of epistemic predicates based on the type of veridicality they entail. I also discuss the epistemic triggers and polarity licensors necessary to the selection of the polarity subjunctive in French. I demonstrate that, although most of the literature seems to agree that the absence of speaker commitment is relevant to explain the selection of the polarity subjunctive, further conditions need to be met: epistemic predicates in downward entailing environments (under negation and in certain types of questions in French) can take on a meaning similar to that of ‘believe’ in which case they may select the subjunctive in cases where no inference is made about truth commitments from the part of discourse participants. The indicative, in the same conditions, is selected if objective veridicality is expressed.

Chapter 2 provides more information about the Latin and Old French data, so that a diachronic analysis can be posited to explain the observations made about Modern French. It shows that Latin and Old French have two main categories of subjunctive, a volitional subjunctive and a potential subjunctive. Given the semantic contributions of those subjunctives, we cannot assume a unified category of subjunctive, although both types share properties such as counterfactuality, and epistemic or optative modality.

In Chapter 3, I discuss the linguistic changes that took place between Latin and Modern French and propose a diachronic account of the polarity subjunctive that relies on the categorization of epistemic predicates based on veridicality introduced in Chapter 1. Cognitive-factives introduced the pattern of the selection of the subjunctive only in polarity contexts, followed by first-person verba credendi, and finally the remaining epistemic predicates by the 17th century, giving birth to the polarity subjunctive as we know it in French with the paradigmatic croire (“believe’). I further argue that the pattern of the polarity subjunctive in Modern French has been grammaticalized by the end of Middle with evidence from questions and if-clauses.

¹¹See the discussion in Chapter 3.
Chapter 1

The Polarity Subjunctive in Modern French

Here

In this chapter, I first review relevant scholarly literature that attempts to account for the use of the subjunctive in Romance, especially the polarity subjunctive. I then present a classification of epistemic predicates along with further linguistic observations¹, with respect to the selection of the polarity subjunctive in Modern French.

1.1 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this section, I introduce three approaches to the polarity subjunctive: one where mood is tied to the scope of negation, one where it contributes to the evaluation of contextually relevant alternatives, and the other where it expresses commitment towards the truth of the embedded proposition.²

¹The French data presented in this chapter has been submitted to the judgement of five native speakers of Canadian French (including myself) and three native speakers of European French (from France). Examples were transmitted in written form, in randomized order with the interspersion of utterances that did not exhibit the use of the polarity subjunctive, over the course of multiple elicitation sessions. Native speakers were also prompted to share any intuition they might have concerning the interpretation of the utterances presented.

²One recurring issue encountered by several accounts presented in this section is the inability to explain the selection of the subjunctive under emotive-factives and causatives, as mentioned in the Introduction. This is addressed here.
### 1.1.1 The Scope of Negation

In French, the polarity subjunctive is selected in the scope of negation as shown by the contrast between (48-b) — where the subjunctive is not found in a downward entailing environment introduced by negation — and (49-b) — where the subjunctive becomes available when the epistemic predicate is negated.

(48)  
\[\text{a. } \text{Ringo pense que les autres sont plus proches.} \]
\[\text{Ringo thinks that the others are more close} \]
\[\text{“Ringo thinks that the others are closer.”} \]

\[\text{b. } *\text{Ringo pense que les autres soient plus proches.} \]
\[\text{Ringo thinks that the others are more close} \]
\[\text{“Ringo thinks that the others are closer.”} \]

(49)  
\[\text{a. } \text{Ringo (ne) pense pas que les autres sont plus proches.} \]
\[\text{Ringo NEG thinks not that the others are more close} \]
\[\text{“Ringo does not think that the others are closer.”} \]

\[\text{b. } \text{Ringo (ne) pense pas que les autres soient plus proches.} \]
\[\text{Ringo NEG thinks not that the others are more close} \]
\[\text{“Ringo does not think that the others are closer.”} \]

(French)

In the scope of negation, either the indicative or the subjunctive mood can be selected.³ Native speakers report that the indicative implies that someone believes that the embedded proposition is true, whereas the subjunctive does not imply anything to that regard. This particular interpretation contributed by the subjunctive mood is referred to as “veridical agnoticism” throughout. The negation in (49-a) could be interpreted \textit{in situ} — as having originated in the matrix clause — hence emphasis is placed on the fact that Ringo does not think the embedded proposition is true, while the speaker may. The negation in (49-b), on the other hand, would be interpreted as having originated in the embedded clause and moved up to the superordinate clause. This is the gist of Borgonovo's (2003) account of the Spanish polarity subjunctive. More specifically, she argues that the uses of

³Further discussion is needed in the case of Canadian French, where the subjunctive is being lost and consequently always replaced by the indicative. See Chapter 3.
the indicative or the subjunctive express different focal scopes of negation. With the subjunctive, negation applies to the embedded proposition. With the indicative, negation applies to the matrix predicate (see Horn 1978; Bosque 1980; Laka 1990; Sánchez-López 1999 for similar observations).

(50)  

a. Juan no vio que Pedro saliera$_{sbjv}$.
   “Juan didn’t see that Pedro left.”
   More specifically, “There is a relevant event of seeing which took place in the past and of which Juan is the experiencer, and whose percept is not the event denoted by ‘Pedro left’. That is, Juan saw something (focal presupposition), but not the event denoted by the embedded clause.”

b. Juan no vio que Pedro salia$_{ind}$_.
   “Juan didn’t see that Pedro left.”
   More specifically, “There was a non-seeing event of which Juan is the experiencer and whose percept is the event denoted by ‘Pedro left’ (focal presupposition).”

(Spanish; Borgonovo 2003:19)

To further argue for this distinction, Borgonovo examines cases of suspension of mood choice (SMC), e.g. where the use of the subjunctive is prohibited although the environment contains a polarity licensor. SMC occurs when a proposition that would normally include a subjunctive is embedded under a strong intensional predicate — namely a desiderative predicate — as in (51).

(51)  

La prensa quiere que la gente no crea que el ministro es$_{ind}$/*sea$_{sbjv}$ culpable.
   “The media want people not to believe that the minister is guilty.”

(Spanish; Borgonovo 2003:18)

Borgonovo cites Horn (1978) who explains that negation is placed in order to facilitate communication. Therefore, Borgonovo argues that cases of SMC do not display Neg-raising since the position of the negation is crucial to the interpretation of the utterance. For example, no (‘not’) could not have raised from the most embedded clause and needs to be interpreted in situ, as it is the only way the cancel the ambiguity that would arise if Neg-raising was possible here.

To further demonstrate this, Borgonovo discusses the following data. Negative polarity items (NPI) are licensed in downward entailing environments, the same environments that are said to license the polarity subjunctive in Romance. In (52), the NPI idiom “moving a finger” is licensed by the negation that we see in the matrix clause.
No creemos que haya movido un dedo en todo el tiempo que estuvo empleado aquí.  “We do not think (s)he has moved a finger (=worked) in the time she was employed here.”  (Spanish; Borgonovo 2003:23)

If the same clause appears in an SMC context as in (53), the subjunctive is not allowed, but the utterance is also rendered ungrammatical. Borgonovo argues that this is due to the fact that the subjunctive allows for Neg-raising while the indicative doesn’t, hence the NPI idiom is no longer licensed by clausemate negation. As in English, the sequence of a desiderative predicate embedding an epistemic predicate blocks cyclical Neg-raising in Spanish (Horn 1971; see Gajewski 2007 for a detailed analysis). Therefore, the most embedded clause in (53) is not negated.

*Marta quiere que no creamos que Pedro ha movido un dedo en todo el tiempo que estuvo empleado aquí.  “Marta wants us not to believe that Peter has moved a finger (=worked) in the time she was employed here.”  (Spanish; Borgonovo 2003:23)

Another NPI which is used to illustrate the behavior of the subjunctive with respect to the scope of negation is the Spanish temporal adjunct hasta las (“until’). This adjunct is only acceptable with telic predicates when it is licensed by negation.

Juan se quedó hasta las 3 / *Juan llegó hasta las 3.  “Juan stayed until three / *Juan arrived until three.”

Juan no llegó hasta las 3.  “Juan did not arrive until three.”  (Spanish; Borgonovo 2003:23)

This temporal adjunct can be found with a telic predicate when embedded under a polarity subjunctive, which is believed to express Neg-raising.

Juan no cree que María llegue hasta las 3.  “Juan does not believe that Maria will arrive until three.”  (Spanish; Borgonovo 2003:23)

However, in SMC contexts, the same polarity context does not license hasta las because the indicative does not involve Neg-raising and therefore negation cannot license it.

*Si no creyeras que Marta llegó hasta las 3.
"If you did not believe that Marta arrived until three" (Spanish; Borgonovo 2003:24)

Imperatives, counterfactuals, and strong intensional predicates trigger SMC and they all introduce sets of possible worlds that do not model reality according to the epistemic agent. According to Borgonovo, the truth of the embedded proposition is evaluated in those possible worlds. Since the proposition embedded under an SMC trigger — a strong intensional predicate for instance — is not a representation of reality, only negation in the matrix clause should be allowed.⁴

Although native speakers of French tend to agree that when an indicative is embedded under a negative epistemic, the utterance need not be interpreted with Neg-raising, it is difficult to get clear judgements as to mood selection under SMC triggers in subjunctive polarity contexts. An utterance like the following is difficult to parse and seems to allow either indicative or polarity subjunctive, unlike in Spanish.

(57) George voudrait que Paul (ne) croie pas que John est /
     George want.COND.PRS.3SG that Paul NEG believe.SBJV not that John is.PRS.IND.3SG /
     soit parti.
     be.PRS.SBJV.3SG left
     “George would like for Paul not to believe that John left.” (French)

Further semantic distinctions found in French between the use of the indicative over the polarity subjunctive are also not explained in the above account. The subjunctive seems to default to no specific interpretation whereas the indicative suggests that the embedded proposition is true for someone. Finally, Borgonovo’s account of the Spanish polarity subjunctive is applicable to Neg-raising predicates — i.e. verba credendi and perceptive approximation (e.g. ‘seem’, ‘be likely’) which can take the polarity subjunctive in Spanish⁵. However, although she mentions that saber (‘know’) is a polarity subjunctive predicate (see 58), it is not a Neg-raising predicate.

(58) No sabian que Pedro se hubiera.sbjv / había.ind de viaje.
     “They didn’t know that Pedro had gone on a trip.” (Spanish; Borgonovo 2003:17)

⁴It is difficult to understand the exact reasoning behind Borgonovo’s assumption that Neg-raising is impossible under SMC triggers (cf. Kempchinsky 2009: 1805–1806).

⁵Horn (1978) qualifies the following as Neg-raising verbs: verba credendi (reported as “verbs of opinion and expectation”; e.g. ‘think’, ‘imagine’), desideratives (reported separately as “intention” and “volition”; e.g. ‘intend’, ‘want’) and perceptive approximation (e.g. ‘seem’, ‘be likely’).
The verb *savoir* (‘know’) is not a Neg-raising predicate, as illustrated in (59), which cannot be interpreted as “Paul knows that John did not leave”. Therefore, Borgonovo’s account is not transferable to the French polarity subjunctive.

(59) Context: Paul was talking with George when John left. Paul was facing the exit, so he saw John leave, but George had his back turned towards the exit and remained ignorant of the departure throughout the evening.

a. George *ne* sait pas que John est parti.
   “George does not know that John left.”

b. *Paul *ne* sait pas que John est parti.
   “Paul does not know that John left.” (as in “Paul knows that John did not leave”)

To summarize, Borgonovo cannot account for the data on the Romance polarity subjunctive, including some of the semantic interpretations perceived by native speakers (e.g. veridical agnosicism when the subjunctive mood is selected). Some of the epistemic predicates involved in the selection of the polarity subjunctive in Romance do not participate in Neg-raising, and therefore her analysis is irrelevant. Furthermore, the SMC test is not always a reliable test, as it is difficult to gather native speaker judgements in French, for instance.

1.1.2 Comparison of Alternatives

Karttunen (1974) points out that *want* and other attitude verbs allow the projection of presuppositional triggers (e.g. *his* below), which are in accordance with the belief world of the intensional agent. For example, in (60), we obtain the presupposition that Arthur believes that he owns a ball, he must not necessarily own a ball in the actual world.

(60) Arthur wants to play with his ball.

Therefore, Karttunen proposes a semantic for *want* similar to that for *believe*. Heim (1992) further shows that the accessibility relation of *want* is doxastic (as it is for *believe*), i.e. the relation introduced by the predicate is associated with belief (Hintikka 1969). The relation cannot be buletic —
i.e. associated with desires — since the event expressed by the complement clause is not true in any context. Take the example below, both utterances may be true, but they are ranked on a scale of desirability such that (61-a) may not be true in certain contexts. For example, Arthur would rather not ride on Amtrak at all than have to pay a high price for an Amtrak ticket.

(61)  
   b.  Arthur wants to ride on Amtrak from New York to Montreal for free.  

Having in mind to capture Karttunen's generalization, Heim proposes an analysis of desiderative predicates based on Stalnaker's (1984) idea that to want something is to find the occurrence of this thing more desirable than its non-occurrence. Heim uses the concept of comparative similarity among worlds to express this idea; if \( \phi, \psi \) is true in a world \( w \) iff \( \psi \) is true in all \( \phi \)-worlds maximally similar to \( w \) (by a “\( \phi \)-world maximally similar to \( w \)”, we mean a world in which \( \phi \) is true and which resembles \( w \) no less than any other world where \( \phi \) is true) (Heim 1992: 193). (62-b) presupposes that I believe (62-a).

(62)  
   a.  I am sick.  
   b.  I want to get well.  

(62-b) can be true and “I want to have been sick” can be false at the same time. We can see in the table below how it works out. \( w_1 \) is the most desirable world, however it is not part of the worlds doxastically accessible to my beliefs in \( w_0 \), which are such that I believe that I am sick. The other two worlds are part of the worlds doxastically accessible to my beliefs in \( w_0 \), and \( w_2 \) is the most desirable of those. Since, of all the worlds closest to my belief worlds, worlds where I get better are more desirable than worlds where I don’t, (62-b) is true. However, it is not true that “I want to have been sick”, because \( w_1 \) is still the most desirable of worlds.

Based on Heim's observations, Villalta (2008) proposes that predicates which select the intensional subjunctive in Spanish are gradable predicates which trigger a comparison between their propositional complement and its contextual alternatives according to an ordering relation, or a scale, determined by the lexical semantics of the predicate itself. Recall that the predicates that
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World</th>
<th>Desirability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$w_1$: I am healthy all the time</td>
<td>most desirable; Dox$_1$(w$_0$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_2$: I am sick at first and then get well</td>
<td>more desirable than $w_3$; $\in$ in Dox$_1$(w$_0$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_3$: I am sick and I stay sick</td>
<td>least desirable; $\in$ in Dox$_1$(w$_0$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Desirability of worlds in example (62)

select the intensional subjunctive are those which embed the notions of necessity or probability, desiderative predicates, emotive-factives, and directives. Villalta’s analysis thus entails that desiderative predicates (e.g. *vouloir* “want”) and some emotive-factive predicates (e.g. *être content* ‘be glad’) express an ordering relation of desirability. For an utterance like *Victoria wants Sofía to bring a chocolate cake*, the context and table below illustrate how the different contextual alternatives are being compared with each other. The relevant ordering relation for *want* is that of desirability, but another intensional predicate may use different ordering relation, e.g. likelihood in the case of predicates of necessity or probability.

(63) Sofía has promised to bring a dessert to the picnic. Victoria believes that there are three possibilities for what she may actually do. She could prepare a chocolate cake, even though Victoria considers that extremely unlikely because it represents far too much work. She might bring an apple pie, which Victoria considers very likely since she can just buy it at the bakery nearby. Or Sofía might bring ice-cream, which seems most likely to Victoria, since she usually has some in her freezer. Victoria prefers the chocolate cake over the apple pie over the ice cream. (Villalta 2008: 476)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Desirability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$w_1$: Sofía brings a chocolate cake</td>
<td>extremely unlikely</td>
<td>most desirable for Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_2$: Sofía brings an apple pie</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td>more desirable than $w_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_3$: Sofía brings ice cream</td>
<td>most likely</td>
<td>least desirable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2: Desirability of worlds in context (63)

There are other predicates which express a reverse desirability ordering, e.g. *détester* (‘to dislike’) or *regretter* (‘to regret’), such that some contextual alternatives are less desirable than others. As for directive predicates, Villalta accommodates Portner’s (2004, 2007) analysis. Portner argues that imperatives contribute to adding propositions to the To-Do List of the addressee. This To-Do List is considered a subset of the ordering source and imposes an ordering on the common ground.
On this basis, Villalta proposes that directive predicates make reference to the To-Do List and that the propositions subordinated by those predicates are a subset of the set of contextual alternatives. When the predicate expresses an order, the ordering relation is deontic (i.e. associated with obligation or permission); an invitation, a buletic ordering source; a suggestion, a teleological (i.e. associated with purpose) ordering source.

In Villalta’s analysis, the predicates that select the subjunctive mood are analyzed as analogous to other focus sensitive operators such as only. In effect, following Rooth (1992), only also makes reference to a domain of quantification C of contextually determined alternatives. Therefore, a consequence of the analysis reviewed here is that they can also be focus sensitive. This goes in accordance with Dretske’s (1972, 1975) proposal that the propositions embedded by certain propositional attitude verbs may have different meanings depending on the location of focus. The following illustrates how focusing different constituents gives different truth values.

(64) In the linguistics department, at the faculty meeting, the teaching schedules of the different faculty members for the upcoming semester are discussed. There is only one syntactician in the department (John), one phonologist (Lisa), and two semanticists (Lara and Frank). John can only teach syntax. Lara can teach syntax and semantics. There is some controversy on which days John should teach his syntax classes. There are two options: he may teach syntax on Tuesdays and Thursdays, or he may teach syntax on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. Lisa’s preferences are the following: she would prefer it if Lara would teach syntax rather than John. But given that John has to teach syntax, she prefers it if he teaches on Tuesdays and Thursdays rather than on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays (because she wants the teaching slot on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays for her own phonology class, which cannot conflict with the syntax class). (Villalta 2008: 496)

(65) a. Lisa wants John to teach syntax on Tuesdays and Thursdays.
    b. #Lisa wants JOHN to teach syntax on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

(Villalta 2008: 496)

The example in (65-a) is true given the scenario in (64). However, (65-b) is not, since Lisa prefers it if Lara would teach syntax, not John. Other predicates which select the subjunctive are also focus sensitive as shown below.

(66) a. Lisa is glad that John teaches syntax on Tuesdays and Thursdays.
b. #Lisa is glad that John teaches syntax on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

(Villalta 2008: 496)

The same behavior is observed in the complement clauses of causative and directive predicates as well as predicates expressing necessity or possibility.

(67) Ted’s father left a clause in his will stipulating that Ted can only receive his inheritance if he is married by a certain date.

a. His father causes Ted to marry Alice.

b. #His father caused Ted to marry Alice.

(68)

a. His father demanded that Ted marry Alice.

b. #His father demanded that Ted marry Alice.

(69) a. In order to receive his inheritance, it was necessary that Ted marry Alice.

b. #In order to receive his inheritance, it was necessary that Ted marry Alice.

(Villalta 2008: 497)

Predicates that select the indicative mood in Spanish, however, don’t seem to be focus sensitive. For example, both sentences in (70) are true in the same circumstances.

(70) a. Lisa knows that John teaches syntax on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

b. Lisa knows that John teaches syntax on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

(Villalta 2008: 497)

The same goes for verbs of communication (when they select the indicative).

(71) a. Lisa said that John teaches syntax on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

b. Lisa said that John teaches syntax on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

(Villalta 2008: 498)

Modern French doesn’t use the same mechanisms as English (or Spanish) to express focus; that is, pitch is not a characteristic of focus in French. Different phrasings and intonations as well as the
clefting of constituents contribute to the different meanings intended by focus (Féry 2001). When it comes to focusing the constituents of complement clauses in the subjunctive, intonational and phrasing distinctions may be used.

\[(72)\] 

\[
\text{Tom préfère qu’ [Arthur}_F \text{] parte, plutôt qu’il reste.} \\
\text{Tom prefers that Arthur leave.sbjv rather that he stays} \\
\text{“Tom prefers for Arthur to leave, rather that he stays.”} \\
\text{(French)}
\]

If the embedded verb is focused instead as in \((73)\), the sentence is infelicitous, for it is preferable for Arthur to leave rather than for Sissi to leave, it is not preferable for Arthur to leave rather than for him to do something else.

\[(73)\] 

\[
\text{Tom préfère qu’ Arthur [parte}_F \text{], plutôt que Sissi.} \\
\text{Tom prefers that Arthur leave.sbjv rather than Sissi.} \\
\text{“Tom prefers for Arthur to leave, rather than Sissi.”} \\
\text{(French)}
\]

Below, the focus of the embedded verb is felicitous because the contrast is between ‘leaving’ and ‘staying’, not Arthur and someone else.

\[(74)\] 

\[
\text{Tom veut qu’ Arthur [parte}_F \text{], plutôt qu’il reste.} \\
\text{Tom wants that Arthur leave.sbjv rather that he stay} \\
\text{“Tom wants for Arthur to leave, rather than stay.”} \\
\text{(French)}
\]

Clefting results are also acceptable, but the embedded verb may not focus via clefting. In effect, the complement clause in \((75\text{-a})\) is clefted, so that Arthur only may be focused. Complement clauses in the indicative, as in \((75\text{-b})\), may also show clefting in the same way.

\[(75)\] 

\[
a. \text{Tom préfère que ce soit [Arthur}_F \text{] qui parte, plutôt que Sissi.} \\
\text{Tom prefers that it be Arthur who leave.sbjv rather than Sissi} \\
\text{“Tom prefers that it be Arthur leaving rather than Sissi.”} \\
\text{(French)} \\
\]

\[
b. \text{Tom sait que c’est [Arthur}_F \text{] qui est parti, plutôt que Sissi.} \\
\text{Tom knows that it is Arthur who is.IND left rather than Sissi} \\
\text{“Tom knows that it is Arthur who has left, rather than Sissi.”} \\
\text{(French)}
\]

In \((76)\), there doesn’t need to be a contrast between Arthur and Sissi, or ‘leaving’ and ‘staying’, for
either sentence to be felicitous. Thus, predicates that select the indicative instead of the subjunctive
don’t seem to be focus sensitive, as in English and Spanish.

(76) a. Tom sait qu’ [Arthur\textsubscript{F}] est parti.
    Tom knows that Arthur is.IND left
    “Tom knows that Arthur left.”

    b. Tom sait qu’ Arthur est [parti\textsubscript{F}].
    Tom knows that Arthur is.IND left
    “Tom knows that Arthur left.”

(French)

Villalta’s proposal is based on the analysis presented in Rooth (1985, 1992) for only. Since the pred-
icates that select the subjunctive are argued by Villalta to be focus sensitive operators, they may
share the properties of only. Predicates selecting the subjunctive mood are similar to only, and are
thus focus sensitive operators, their domain of quantification C (i.e. the complementizer head) is
constrained by the focus semantic value. The operator (represented by \sim) is adjoined to C and
evaluates the alternatives introduced by the focused constituent. As focus sensitive operators, the
predicates selecting the intensional subjunctive select an operator which is located in the same po-
sition as the subjunctive complementizer que in Modern French.

According to Villalta, the subjunctive mood is an operator that ensures that the evaluation of
alternatives happens at the right moment. It is realized in a MoodP projection above IP. Therefore,
MoodP is responsible for the evaluation of contextual alternatives. The predicates selecting the
subjunctive require the presence of a set of contextual alternatives to the subordinate proposition,
and the subjunctive operator evaluates this set of contextual alternatives. The indicative mood, as
opposed to the subjunctive, is treated by Villalta as an operator also but which is simply an identity
function, for the indicative doesn’t evaluate alternatives at the level of MoodP. Since sentences with
an embedded clause in the indicative can focus different constituents, there needs to be an indicative
operator which can appear in positions other than that in which the subjunctive operator appears,
allowing the indicative operator to evaluate alternatives in positions other than MoodP.

There is a contextually available set of alternatives in the focus semantic value of the IP below
MoodP. This contextually available set of alternatives contains only the ordinary semantic value of IP. This prevents intensional predicates from combining with an embedded clause in the indicative mood. To make sure that the reverse doesn’t happen — that is, that a predicate selecting the indicative doesn’t end up embedding a subjunctive — Villalta proposes a constraint where the subjunctive can only be licensed in the scope of a focus sensitive operator. This constraint prevents the subjunctive from occurring in the complement clause of any predicate other than those selecting the intensional subjunctive, which are focus sensitive operators. This constraint seems circular, yet it allows the unification of the predicates that may select the subjunctive instead of the indicative in particular contexts with those that never select the indicative. In effect, the polarity subjunctive is argued to behave like the intensional subjunctive in evaluating the contextual alternatives introduced in the embedded clause, since the polarity subjunctive is licensed by focus sensitive operators in Spanish; that is, negation and question operators.

Villalta’s account comes short with respect to the lack of a focus sensitive operators other than intensional predicates, the selection of the polarity subjunctive, and intensional predicates selecting the indicative rather than the subjunctive. The account assumes that predicates selecting the intensional subjunctive are always focus sensitive operators even when there is no instantiation of focus. In effect, focus is not always discernible in subjunctive complement clauses, but Villalta argues that the subjunctive is always selected by a focus sensitive operator and that its contribution to the semantics of a sentence is to evaluate contextual alternatives. In the absence of actual focus, we still need to assume that the subjunctive contributes an evaluation of alternatives for Villalta’s proposal to apply to the selection of the subjunctive in Romance. The default alternatives of (77) could then be the ones expressed by the complement clause, i.e. “Arthur left” and “Arthur didn’t leave”.

(77) Tom ne pense pas qu’ Arthur soit parti.
    Tom neg thinks not that Arthur is sbjv left
    “Tom does not think that Arthur has left.”  (French)

Those alternatives would need to be evaluated with respect to the belief world of the epistemic agent, i.e. Tom. However, how could such a proposal account for native speaker judgements with respect
to speaker commitment or veridicality and its influence on the indicative – subjunctive distinction. In addition, there exist desiderative predicates which do not consistently select the intensional subjunctive, e.g. espérer (‘hope’).

(78) a. Paul espère que les autres ont choisi quelqu’un d’autre qu’ Allen Paul hopes that the others have,3SG.PRS.IND chosen someone other than Allen Klein pour être leur gérant.
    "Paul hopes that the others have chosen someone other than Allen Klein to be their manager."

b. *Paul espère que les autres aient choisi quelqu’un d’autre qu’ Allen Paul hopes that the others have,3SG.PRS.SBJV chosen someone other than Allen Klein pour être leur gérant.
    "Paul hopes that the others have chosen someone other than Allen Klein to be their manager."

(79) a. Paul (n’) espère pas que les autres ont choisi quelqu’un d’autre qu’ Allen Paul NEG hopes not that the others have,3SG.PRS.IND chosen someone other than Allen Klein pour être leur gérant.
    "Paul does not hope that the others have chosen someone other than Allen Klein to be their manager."

b. ??Paul (n’) espère pas que les autres aient choisi quelqu’un d’autre qu’ Allen Klein pour être leur gérant.
    "Paul does not hope that the others have chosen someone other than Allen Klein to be their manager."

(Villalta’s account of the subjunctive is meant to account for the selection of the intensional subjunctive. It may appear desirable to extend her analysis to also account for the polarity subjunctive by postulating that this type of subjunctive also involves a comparison of contextually relevant alternatives — at least some of which being \( p \) and \( \neg p \), where \( p \) is the embedded proposition, — as this approach could unify both types of subjunctives and explain the interpretation of veridical agnosticism perceived by native speakers when the polarity subjunctive is used. Villalta’s
1.1.3 Commitment to Truth

Many scholars have posited that the indicative is used to mark commitment on the part of a participant in the context, either the subject of the epistemic predicate or the speaker. This section introduces a few of these accounts.

1.1.3.1 Competition

One of the accounts that propose that the distinction indicative – polarity subjunctive is based on truth commitment is Schlenker’s (2005). Following Farkas (1992), Schlenker proposes an account of the subjunctive in French which relies on the notion of competition with other moods. Three types of subjunctive indeed seem to alternate with other moods in French. The jussive subjunctive is used instead of an imperative, when the imperative form is not available — that is, at a person other than second-person or first-person plural.

(80)  

(a) Que votre Altesse soit prudente !
   “That your Highness be.sbjv cautious!” (=“Let her Majesty be cautious!”)

(b) #Que tu sois prudent ! / Sois prudent !
   “#That you be.sbjv prudent!” / “Be.2.sbjv.impv cautious!”

(c) #Que nous soyons prudents ! / Soyons prudents !
   “#That we be.sbjv cautious!” / “(Let’s) be.1.pl.impv cautious!”

(d) #Que vous soyez prudents ! / Soyez prudents !
   “#That you.pl be.sbjv cautious!” / “Be.2.pl.impv cautious!”

(French; Schlenker 2005: 11)

The intensional subjunctive sometimes alternates with the infinitive (cf. Farkas 1992; see B-Violette 2015, 2016, about this phenomenon in French).

(81)  

(a) Jean veut qu’il vi, k parte
   “Jean wants that he leave.sbjv”

(b) Jean veut PRO, partir
   “Jean wants to leave.INF”
Lastly, the polarity subjunctive alternates with the indicative, as we have seen.

(49') a. Ringo (ne) pense pas que les autres sont plus proches.  
Ringo NEG thinks not that the others are.3SG.PRS.IND more close  
"Ringo does not think that the others are closer."

b. Ringo (ne) pense pas que les autres soient plus proches.  
Ringo NEG thinks not that the others are.3SG.PRS.SBJV more close  
"Ringo does not think that the others are closer."

According to Schlenker, example (80) illustrates that in all those cases the subjunctive does not carry any particular semantics. He further follows Farkas (2003) and argues that the indicative introduces a presupposition that someone is committed to the truth of the embedded proposition and that this presupposition must apply to a world belonging to the context set of an individual (i.e. the speaker or another participant in the discourse).⁶ Schlenker postulates Maximize Presupposition! (cf. Heim 1991), which allows for the grammatical feature with the strongest possible presuppositions to win over other possible features. In which case, the indicative must win over the polarity subjunctive in the relevant contexts unless that mood is not available or another mood carries the same or a stronger presupposition. Therefore, the indicative wins over the subjunctive to assert truth commitment on someone’s part, but the subjunctive is used otherwise. This seems to match native speaker judgement. In (82), for example, the embedded clause is being asserted in (82-a) because the indicative carries the presupposition that the proposition is true according to the speaker. (82-c) demonstrates that the contradiction of this presupposition yields infelicity, since “I deny” contradicts the assertion of the embedded clause, in this case the subjunctive can win over the indicative (as in 82-d) as the form that holds the strongest presupposition, i.e. the indicative is not available. The subjunctive does not carry any presupposition, safe for the presupposition that is not that of the indicative. Therefore, (82-b) is also acceptable; it does not compete with the indicative,

⁶He does not provide further evidence that truth commitment is a presupposition introduced by the indicative than the fact that the polarity subjunctive is only found in those contexts in which presuppositions hold, e.g. in the scope of negation and in questions.
since it is used to express that the indicative presupposition does not apply; the embedded clause is not asserted. The subjunctive here is used to express that the speaker does not intend to commit any judgement as to the truth of the embedded proposition.

(82)  
   a. Jean nie qu’il pleut.IND.  
       “Jean denies that it rains.”
   
   b. Jean nie qu’il pleuve.SBJV  
       “Jean denies that it rain.”
   
   c. #Je nie qu’il pleut.IND.  
       “I deny that it rains.”; becomes Ok if it is made clear that someone asserted that it’s raining
   
   d. Je nie qu’il pleuve.SBJV.  
       “I deny that it rain.”

(French; Schlenker 2005: 23)

Furthermore, Schlenker’s analysis also accounts for the selection of the intensional subjunctive and — more importantly, as accounts of the subjunctive based on speaker commitment tend to fail to do so — for emotive-factives and causatives only selecting the subjunctive in French. He follows Quer (1997) in arguing that emotives and causatives involve counterfactual reasoning.

(83)  
   Jean est heureux qu’il pleuve / *pleut.  
   John is happy that it rains.SBJV / IND  
   “John is happy that it is raining.”  

(French)

Although “John is happy that it is raining” suggests that John believes that it is raining, and that he is happy about it, it actually carries a counterfactual meaning where “John would be less happy if it were not raining”, hence the worlds considered are not in John’s context set, i.e. his belief world. This presupposition failure causes the subjunctive to be selected instead of the indicative. Schlenker argues that the situation is similar for causatives. However, some questions remain: why does the reformulation of this counterfactual situation below allow for the indicative rather than the subjunctive?

(84)  
   Jean est moins heureux s’/quand il ne pleut / *pleuve pas.  
   John is less happy if/when it NEG rains.IND / SBJV not
Schlenker mentions that conditionals of the form “if \( p \)” are always interpreted as introducing a presupposition applying to the context set of a discourse participant. However, this assumption is not explained in much detail and conditionals and emotive-factives are therefore still an issue for Schlenker’s proposal.

1.1.3.2 Speaker Commitment

Siegel (2009) argues that the indicative introduces a conventional implicature/presupposition that the speaker is committed to the truth of the embedded clause. On the other hand, the subjunctive is used to indicate a dissociation of the speaker with respect to the truth of that proposition. Siegel presents several tests to confirm this assumption. First, a continuation that contradicts the presupposition of speaker commitment is acceptable when the proposition contains the polarity subjunctive, but not when the indicative is used instead.

(85) a. El degà no creu [que els estudiants es mereixin un premi].
“The dean does not believe that the students self deserve a prize.”

(i) ... i jo tampoc no ho crec
“and I do not believe it either.”

(ii) ... però jo crec que sí
“but I believe they do.”

b. El degà no creu [que els estudiants es mereixen un premi].
“The dean does not believe that the students self deserve a prize.”

(i) #... i jo tampoc no ho crec
“and I do not believe it either.”

(ii) ... però jo crec que sí
“but I believe they do.”

(Catalan; Quer 1998)

French does not quite behave like Catalan here. As mentioned previously, the distinction between (86-a) and (86-b) seems to be rather that no assumption is made as to whether someone believes the embedded proposition when the subjunctive is selected, whereas the indicative is in-
terpreted as implying that someone does believe in it, possibly the speaker.

(86)  
a. Le doyen ne pense pas que les étudiants aient mérité un prix.  
“The dean does not believe that the students deserved a prize.”

(i) ... et je le pense pas non plus  
“and I do not believe it either.”

(ii) ... mais je pense que si  
“but I believe they do.”

b. Le doyen ne pense pas que les étudiants ont mérité un prix.  
“The dean does not believe that the students deserve a prize.”

(i) ... et je (ne) le pense pas non plus. Mais, clairement, quelqu’un doit le croire puisque les étudiants ont reçu un prix.  
“and I do not believe it either. But, clearly, someone must believe it, since the students did receive a prize.”

(ii) ... mais je pense que si  
“but I believe they do.”

(Siegel 2009: 1864–1865)

Siegel’s second argument is that belief verbs in Italian show an alternation between the indicative and subjunctive even in affirmative declarative contexts.

(87)  
a. Gianni crede che Mario abbia vinto il premio.  
“Gianni believes that Mario has won the prize.”

(i) ...ma io penso che non sia vero.  
“... but I think it is not true.”

(ii) Gianni crede che Mario ha vinto il premio.  
“Gianni believes that Mario has won the prize.”

#... ma io penso che non sia vero.  
“... but I think it is not true.”

The same verbs show that the subjunctive does not trigger a presupposition that the speaker is committed to the truth of the embedded proposition under a factivity test (Melvold 1991) involving the addition of ‘finally’.

7The use of ‘finally’ forces the interpretation of speaker commitment.
Finally, it seems that first-person subjects are incompatible with an indicative embedded within a context that licenses the polarity subjunctive. Siegel argues that this is due to a clash between the speaker’s belief and the presupposition introduced by the indicative, i.e. the commitment of the speaker to the truth of the proposition.

In Italian affirmative declarative contexts, the same phenomenon is observed with belief verbs.

However, in this case, the incompatibility of the indicative in the context is not due to contradiction but rather to infelicitous repetition. The first-person as subject of an epistemic predicate already establishes that the speaker thinks the embedded proposition is true; combined with the presupposition introduced by the indicative, we get redundancy. Siegel (2009) argues that the factivity of emotive-factives and causatives, and the use of a first-person subject to a belief verb with the indicative in Italian would be an infelicitous repetition to the presupposition introduced by indicative propositions, such that the subjunctive is selected by those predicates instead of the indicative. The following examples are provided to illustrate the infelicity of repetition.⁸ (91-b) particularly shows that redundancy is infelicitous with emotive-factives due to their factivity.

(i) a. Sam believes that Chris finished the project... but I don’t think he did.
b. Sam finally believes that Chris finished the project... # but I don’t think he did

---

⁸Repetition may be felicitous in some contexts, as discussed by Horn (1993). Siegel (2009) doesn’t attempt to exemplify how this situation can extend to polarity contexts, due to the variation in use of the subjunctive and indicative under emotive-factive predicates across Romance. See her paper for the relevant discussion (Siegel 2009:1867–1869).
Therefore, if the indicative does indeed introduce a presupposition that the speaker is committed to the truth of the proposition, the pairing of emotive-factives and indicatives would cause such an infelicitous redundancy.⁹ We would expect an emotive-factive to be incompatible with an embedded indicative, since the same factivity would be contributed both by the matrix predicate and the embedded indicative mood.

Furthermore, Siegel cannot account for the continuation judgements in French, where the continuation test does not strictly illustrate that the indicative implies speaker commitment.

---

⁹Cognitive-factives (e.g. “know”), as opposed to emotive-factives, embed a proposition in the indicative in non-polarity contexts. Siegel points out that emotive-factive predicates do not share the properties of true factives.

(i) 
   a. I regret/resent the fact that John is here.
   b. I regret/resent John’s being here.

(ii) 
   a. *I know/realize the fact that John is here.
   b. *I know/realize John’s being here.

(Siegel 2009: 1867)

In addition, these “semi-factives” (Karttunen 1971b) are often used to introduce new information (Noonan 1985; Spennader 2003), unlike emotive-factives (Mejias-Bikandi 1998). These facts prompt Siegel to argue that this type of predicates does not introduce a presupposition of factivity, but rather new information, and that there is therefore no redundancy with the indicative.
1.1.3.3 Speaker Commitment vs. Subject Uncertainty

The comparison offered by Siegel (2009) between the polarity subjunctive in Romance and the apparently similar phenomenon in languages of the Balkans — namely Modern Greek and Bulgarian — is relevant to the analysis of the French polarity subjunctive. It was previously mentioned that some of the Romance languages allow either the indicative or the subjunctive in polar environments (e.g. Catalan), and even in affirmative declaratives (e.g. Italian).

(93) a. Nomizo oti / *na efige.
    think.1sg that.ind / sbjv left
    “I think that he left.”

    b. Dhen nomizo oti / na efige.
    not think.1sg that.ind / sbjv left
    “I don’t think that he left.”

    (Modern Greek; Philippaki-Warburton 1993)

(94) a. Mislja če / *da Paulina e izjala tortata.
    think.1sg that.ind / sbjv Paulina be.3sg eaten cake.def
    “I think that Paulina ate the cake.”

    b. Ne mislja {če Paulina / Paulina da} e izjala tortata.
    not think.1sg that.ind Paulina / Paulina sbjv be.3sg eaten cake.def
    “I don’t think that Paulina ate the cake.”

    (Bulgarian; Siegel 2009: 1871)

In addition, Balkan languages allow the use of a first-person subject with the indicative. Following Siegel’s (2009) reasoning, the possibility to use a first-person subject suggests that the indicative does not introduce a presupposition that clashes with the speaker’s belief. The following continuation test also shows that there is no presupposition that the speaker is committed to the truth of the indicative proposition.

(95) Ivan ne misli če Paulina e izjala tortata.
    Ivan doesn’t think that.ind Paulina ate the cake
    “... and I don’t think she did either.”

    (Bulgarian; Siegel 2009: 1872)

Given that the indicative introduces no presupposition that could cause infelicitous repetition with
a presupposition of factivity, Siegel predicts that emotive-factives in languages of the Balkans can embed an indicative proposition.

(96) Ivan suszialjava che [sic] otkradna parite.
    I. regret.3SG that.IND steal.PST money.DEF
    “Ivan regrets that he stole the money.” (Bulgarian; Siegel 2009: 1872)

(97) O Pavlos lipate pu efige i Roxani.
    the Paul is.sad.3SG that.IND left.3SG the Roxanne
    “Paul regrets that Roxanne left.” (Modern Greek; Giannakidou 1998)

Siegel (2009) assumes the difference between the selection of the indicative and that of the polarity subjunctive in languages of the Balkans is due to an added interpretation that the subject is uncertain of the truth of the embedded proposition in the subjunctive. She takes as evidence the fact that Neg-raising is only possible in the indicative (i.e. the negation applies to the subordinate predicate), whereas the subjunctive cases show negation in its base position. This is illustrated in (98), where Romanian patterns like other languages of the Balkan.¹⁰

(98) a. Ion nu crede că a venit Ana.
    Ion not believe.3SG that.IND have.3SG come Ana
    “John doesn’t believe that Anna came.” (= “John thinks Anna didn’t come.”)

b. Ion nu crede să fi venit Ana.
    Ion not believe.3SG SBJV be come Ana
    “John doesn’t believe that Anna came.” (= “John weakly believes that Anna didn’t come, but he is unsure.”)

    (Romanian; Siegel 2009: 1874; from Farkas 1992)

Siegel contrasts this example with one from French, used to exemplify that both the embedded subjunctive and indicative moods allow for a Neg-raising reading.

(99) a. Il ne pense pas que j’en suis capable.
    he neg think.PRS.3SG not that I of it be.IND able
    “He doesn’t think that I am capable of it.” (= “I am capable of it, but he doesn’t think so.”)

b. Il ne pense pas que j’en suis capable.
    be NEG think.PRS.3SG not that I of it be.SBJV able

¹⁰Romanian is part of the Balkan sprachbund, along with Modern Greek and Bulgarian, among others.
“He doesn’t think that I am capable of it.” (= “It is his belief that I am not capable of it.”)

(French; Siegel 2009:1874; from Farkas 1992)

In (99-a), we can further interpret the utterance as “I am capable of it, but he thinks I am not”, with Neg-raising.¹¹ According to Siegel, subject uncertainty is not relevant to account for the French polarity subjunctive, and is certainly not sufficient to account for native speaker judgements with respect to the distinction between the indicative and the polarity subjunctive.

1.1.3.4 Veridicality

Giannakidou (1994, 1995, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2009, 2011) uses the notion of veridicality to explain mood choice in Modern Greek, an analysis which she tries to extend to the Romance languages. A proposition is veridical if the speaker or an epistemic subject is committed to the truth of a subordinate clause (cf. Siegel 2009), in which case she adds that “a truth inference is available”. In Greek, the indicative is selected with veridical propositions. Verba dicendi (which she calls “assertives”, e.g. leo ‘say’), verba credendi (referred to as “epistemic predicates”; i.e. pistevo “believe” and I add the fiction verbs, e.g. fandazome ‘imagine’; see 100-a), and cognitive predicates (e.g. gnorizo ‘know’ referred to as “factive”, see 100-b; and thimame ‘remember’ referred to as an “epistemic factive”) embed a subordinate clause in the indicative in Greek.¹²

(100) a. O Pavlos pistevi oti I Maria efije.
thef Paul believe.3SG that.IND the Mary left
“Paul believes that Mary left.”

b. Kseri oti aγorasa ena aftokinito.
know.3SG that.IND bought.1SG a car
“He knows that I bought a car.” (Modern Greek; Giannakidou 2011:7)

Non-veridical contexts do not involve the commitment of an epistemic agent. Volitionals (e.g. thelo ‘want’; see 101), directives (e.g. dhiaza ‘order’), modals (e.g. prepi ‘must’), permissives (e.g. epitrepo

¹¹The examples cited above are in agreement with the native speaker judgements I collected. Note, however, that the difference between (99-a) and (99-b) seems to lie in whether it is implied that I am capable or not. We will come back to this below.

¹²A discussion targeting a relevant classification of epistemic triggers to the polarity subjunctive follows below.
‘allow’), and negative predicates (e.g. *arnume* ‘refuse’) are such environments and they select the subjunctive in Greek.

(101) I Maria theli na aγorasi ena aftokinito.

the Maria wants that. SBJV buy.3SG a car

“Maria wants that we buy a car.”

(Modern Greek; Giannakidou 2011:8)

Negation is non-veridical and can therefore trigger the use of the subjunctive, in the complement clauses of epistemic predicates for instance.

(102) a. Pistevo oti irthe o Janis

believe.1SG that.IND came.3SG the John

“I believe that John came.”

b. Dhen pistevo oti irthe o Janis.

NEG believe.1SG that.IND came.3SG the John

“I don’t believe that John came.”

c. Dhen pistevo na irthe o Janis.

believe.1SG that. SBJV came.3SG the John

“I don’t expect that John came. (I would hope he didn’t.)”

(Modern Greek; Giannakidou 2011:16)

In Greek, the selection of the subjunctive in this situation is optional and introduces a different interpretation (as shown in 102-c), where the speaker is not committed to the truth of the embedded proposition and the epistemic predicate is actually interpreted as a desiderative predicate introducing a non-veridical context.

1.1.4 The Issue of Emotive-Factives

With the veridical – non-veridical distinction, Giannakidou is able to account for the selection of the subjunctive in Greek and Romance languages in a variety of environments. However, Greek and Romance contrast with respect to emotive-factive verbs. In Greek, those verbs embed a subordinate clause introduced by the indicative complementizer *pu*.¹³ This behaviour may be expected as emotive-factive predicates involve factivity and are characterized as veridical (Giannakidou 1998,

---

¹³Among two indicative complementizers in Greek, *pu* is specifically selected by emotive-factive predicates, whereas *oti* is selected in other environments, such as the complements of epistemic predicates (cf. Christidis 1981; Varlokosta 1994; Roussou 1994, 2000).
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(103) O Pavlos lipate pu efije i Roxani.
the Paul is sad.3SG that.IND left.3SG the Roxani
“Paul regrets that Roxanne left.” (Modern Greek; Giannakidou 2011:3)

In Romance, however, emotive-factive predicates select the subjunctive mood.

(104) a. Jean regrette que Marie ait lu ce livre.
John regrets that Mary have.3SG.SBJV read this book
“John regrets that Mary has read this book.” (French)

b. Gianni rimpiange che Maria abbia letto questo libro.
John regrets that Mary have.3SG.SBJV read this book
“John regrets that Mary has read this book.” (Italian; Giannakidou & Mari 2015:181)

The above accounts of the subjunctive involving truth commitment and uncertainty cannot explain this distinction. Giannakidou & Mari (2015) discuss the issue and attempt to explain it in terms of veridicality. They remark that emotive-factives contrast a fact with a mental or emotional state as illustrated below (Baker 1970).

(105) John wrongly believes that Mary got married, and he regrets that she is no longer unmarried.
(Egré 2008:30)

Therefore, Giannakidou & Mari classify emotive-factives as subjectively veridical, whereas cognitive-factives like ‘know’ carry a presupposition that they are objectively veridical. These two categories of verbs contrast with belief verbs and other epistemic predicates which do not carry any presupposition, be it veridical or not. Since the embedded proposition is believed to be true by the subject of the emotive-factive, its truth in the actual world or in the belief world of the speaker does not matter. The relevant definitions are copied below.

(106) Veridicality

a. Objectively veridical spaces
The set of worlds \( M = w \) is objectively veridical with respect to a proposition \( p \) iff \( w \in p \).
b. Subjectively veridical spaces
An epistemic state (a set of worlds) \( M(i) \) relative to an individual anchor \( i \) is veridical with respect to a proposition \( p \) iff all worlds in \( M(i) \) are \( p \)-worlds.

(107) Non-veridicality

a. Objectively nonveridical spaces
Given the utterance time \( t_u \), \( M_{\text{metaphysical}} \) determined at \( t_u \) is nonveridical with respect to a proposition \( p \). (At least one world in \( M_{\text{metaphysical}} \), but not all, is a \( \neg p \) world.)

b. Subjectively nonveridical spaces
An epistemic state (a set of worlds) \( M(i) \) relative to an individual anchor \( i \) is non-veridical with respect to a proposition \( p \) iff at least one world in \( M(i) \), but not all, is a \( \neg p \) world.

(Giannakidou & Mari 2015: 197)

Non-factive epistemic verbs assert subjective veridicality in the affirmative, so do factive predicates. In (108-a), the presupposition that “John left” is introduced by the cognitive-factive ‘know’ below, hence it is an objectively veridical presupposition (i.e. the proposition is veridical in all worlds). However, it need not be believed by all discourse participants that “John left”, only that the speaker believes it. Therefore, the assertion in (108-b) is, in contrast, subjectively veridical.

(108) a. George knows that John left.

b. #Falsely believing that he saw John leave, George knows that John left.

Emotive-factives, on the other hand, introduce a presupposition that the embedded proposition is subjectively veridical, as the speaker need not be committed to its truth (i.e. the proposition is non-homogeneously veridical).

(109) Falsely believing that he had inflicted a fatal wound, Oedipus regretted killing the stranger on the road to Thebes. (Klein 1975, quoted in Gazdar 1979:122)

The assertion of emotive-factives, in contrast, is subjectively non-veridical because the emotive modal base of these verbs contains \( p \)-worlds and \( \neg p \)-worlds. In fact, emotive-factive predicates are also gradable; that is, a gradable predicate like “tall’ or “be happy’ maps the entity associated with the property of being tall or happy to a degree on a height or happiness scale. The highest and
lowest degrees on the scale are associated with $p$ and $\neg p$ respectively. — e.g. tall and short or happy and unhappy. Like gradable predicates, emotive-factives are a) compatible with degree modifiers (e.g. “very’); b) can be used in comparative sentences (cf. Kennedy 2007).

(110) a. John is very irritated/happy that Mary came.
   b. I am more/less irritated than you. (Giannakidou & Mari 2015)

The emotive modal base of emotive-factive verbs is comparable to modal bases where $p$ is not entailed by the verb, and, therefore, — as long as there is at least one $\neg p$ world — they assert subjective non-veridicality. No matter the shortcomings of Villalta’s analysis, as Giannakidou and Mari (2015) argue, the gradability associated with intensional triggers make them non-veridical environments. Intensional predicates, such as emotive-factives involve thresholds for $p$ and $\neg p$ worlds. The scalability of those predicates introduces a set of contextual alternatives where at least one world is a $\neg p$ world. This satisfies the criteria for non-veridical environments.

So far, veridicality is the notion that is the most applicable to data regarding the polarity subjunctive in Romance, and with Giannakidou & Mari’s addendum on emotive-factives some of the issues raised in the Introduction can be disregarded. A few problems remain, however, including the differences in the selection of the indicative vs. the polarity subjunctive within and across Romance.

1.2 FURTHER OBSERVATIONS

In this section, I provide further observations that would need to be explained in an account of the French polarity subjunctive. First, I show how some of the accounts presented above meet native speaker judgements. It was mentioned above that previous accounts cannot provide a unified analysis of the subjunctive in Romance, but this chapter does not attempt to either. See the discussion in Chapter 3 for a discussion of emotive-factives.

1.2.1 Epistemic Triggers

Before moving on, it is important to discuss and define the categories of epistemic predicates which will be referred to below. Recall that the types of epistemic predicates that license the polarity sub-
junctive are the following: cognitive-factives (e.g. ‘know’), *verba dicendi* (e.g. ‘say’), *verba credendi* (e.g. ‘believe’). The features which make these categories distinct and those which unify them are discussed in this subsection.

1.2.1.1 **Factivity vs. Veridicality**

Throughout the literature, a variety of predicates are assumed to be factive (e.g. ‘factive’, ‘discover’, ‘realize’, ‘remember’, ‘regret’) without further comparative tests. Factivity is usually defined as the property of a predicate to presuppose the truth of its complement (Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1968). This inference that a proposition is true must hold in all environments, including under the scope of negation, in questions, or in conditional antecedents. In (111), for instance, the presupposition that the complement of ‘know’ is “true” — more specifically, believed by the speaker — holds in a) the affirmative, b) under negation, c) in a *yes/no* question, and d) in a conditional antecedent (112).

(111) a. Alan knows that you are smart.
   (i) ... and I believe it too.
   (ii) ... #but I don’t think so.

b. Alan does not know that you are smart.
   (i) ... but I believe it.
   (ii) ... #and I don’t think so either.

c. Does Alan know that you are smart?
   (i) ... because I think you are.
   (ii) ... #although I don’t think you are.

(112) #If I knew that unicorn existed, I would try to get one as a pet.

Compare with a non-factive predicate, e.g. ‘believe’. In (113), the commitment of the speaker with respect to the truth of the embedded proposition is not implied in any way.

(113) a. Alan believes that you are smart.
   (i) ... and I believe it too.
(ii) ... but I don’t think so.

b. Alan does not believe that you are smart.
   (i) ... but I believe it.
   (ii) ... and I don’t think so either.

c. Does Alan believe that you are smart?
   (i) ... because I think you are.
   (ii) ... although I don’t think you are.

‘Know’, however, is not always factive. In a variety of languages (see Kiefer 1978 for Hungarian; Özyıldız 2016, 2017a, for Turkish; a.o.), it has been reported that equivalents of ‘know’ are not infelicitous when the truth of their complement is contradicted.

(114) Context: Trump won the election, but...

\[ \text{Tunç Bernie kazan-dı diye biliyor.} \]
\[ \text{tunç Bernie won₃SG.PST diye knows} \]

“Tunç thinks (lit. #knows) that Bernie won.”

Rough semantics: “Tunç knows something, which gives rise to the belief that Bernie won.”

(Turkish; Özyıldız 2016: 184)¹⁴

Similarly, so-called “factives” may have non-factive uses in English. We can see in (115-a) that ‘know’ looses its factivity under negation when its subject is a first-person pronoun.

(115) I don’t know that this isn’t our car.
where there is no presupposition that ‘this isn’t our car’

(Özyıldız 2016: 185)

Karttunen (1971b) observes that placing “factive” utterances under the scope of negation is a good test¹⁵, that is less faillible than question environments and conditional antecedents. He reports

---

¹⁴Özyıldız (2016) explains that the expression \textit{diye bil-} means ‘think’, as \textit{diye} introduces a belief proposition.

¹⁵One exception that he mentions is one where “there is an emphatic denial of somebody else’s previous assertion”.

(i) John DIDN’T regret that he had not told the truth. How could he have done that when he knew that what he had said was true?

(Karttunen 1971b: 63)

It has been observed by various scholars that information structure can affect grammaticality judgements and salvage utterances that would be infelicitous otherwise (Skopeteas et al. 2009 for Georgian; Ahn 2014 for English; a.o.). For instance, Özyıldız (2017b) shows that in Turkish the nuclear pitch accent must fall on the matrix verb when it must be
that among the utterances below, only (116-a) and (117-a) were always judged as factive by his informants. In light of the inconsistent behaviour of ‘realize’ and ‘discover’, Karttunen sorts them in a “semi-factive” category.

(116) a. Did you regret that you had not told the truth?
    b. Did you realize that you had not told the truth?
    c. Did you discover that you had not told the truth?

(Karttunen 1971b: 63)

(117) a. If I regret later that I have not told the truth, I will confess it to everyone.
    b. If I realize later that I have not told the truth, I will confess it to everyone.
    c. If I discover later that I have not told the truth, I will confess it to everyone.

(Karttunen 1971b: 64)

Out of the predicates tested in this section, only ‘regret’ and other emotive-factive predicates seem to be “true” factives. ‘Know’ comes close to bearing a factive presupposition in all environments followed by ‘discover’ and ‘realize’. ‘Remember’ is often assumed to be factive (or “semi-factive”; Williamson 2000, a.o.). However, it seems to contrast with ‘know’ (and the examples in 111 and 117).

(118) a. Mark remembers that you were there, but I think you weren’t.

interpreted as factive.

Arguably, intonation might play a role in cancelling the factivity of ‘know’ under negation in English, as utterances like (115) seem to carry a different intonational contour as other utterances with a negated factive, e.g. John doesn't know that this isn't our car for which the factive presupposition still holds. However, the same utterance as (ii-a) without emphasis on the matrix predicate would be infelicitous. Therefore, we should not discard this type of utterance due to the different intonation. Perhaps the emphasis in (ii-a) corresponds to the focus argued to trigger the comparison of contextually relevant alternatives by Villalta (2008).

(ii) a. I don't KNOW that John left (= I don’t believe he did)
    b. I don’t know that John left. (= I don’t believe that he left on his own accord; I think he might have been kicked out)

Note also that this is not the same kind of intonation mentioned by Karttunen for ((i)), as intonation placed on the do-auxiliary and its negation questions the whole affirmative utterance without negation, i.e. It is not the case that John regrets that he has not told the truth. Finally, other intonational contours are also possible, notably one with contrastive focus on the embedded predicate.
b. Mark does not remember that you were there, and I think you weren’t either.

c. Does Mark remember that you were there? Because I don’t think you were.

d. If Mark remembers that you were there, he’s wrong.

e. I don’t REMEMBER that you were there. (= I don’t believe that you were; I don’t remember any evidence to suggest that you were)

Yet, ‘remember’ does not quite fit into other categories of predicates. As Higginbotham (2003) points out, ‘remember’ is distinct from ‘imagine’, the non-factivity of which is not debatable.

(119) Mary remembered/imagined the party for her 33rd birthday/a tree.  

(Higginbotham 2003)

Despite the absence of a factive presupposition in the complement of ‘remember’ in (119-b–e), this predicate seems to imply or entail that the speaker believes in the truth of the embedded proposition — in the absence of any indication that he actually does not, whether contextually or via a continuation of the idea expressed (as with but I think you weren’t in 120-a). The table below presents a summary of the tests the various so-called “factives” have been submitted to in this section.

Table 1.3: Factivity of Verbs in Different Environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment/Verb</th>
<th>Emotive-factives</th>
<th>‘know’</th>
<th>‘discover’, ‘realize’</th>
<th>‘remember’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-person</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under negation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If-clause</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other epistemic predicates also entail truth commitment by the speaker, rather than presuppose it, in certain — but not all — environments. All predicates that behave in this way are said to be veridical (e.g. Egré 2008; Anand & Hacquard 2013). Veridical predicates can be sorted in different subgroups based how easily their veridicality can be cancelled. The cognitive-factive ‘know’, as we’ve seen, presupposes speaker commitment in most contexts. The other cognitive predicates, ‘remember’, ‘it is true’, and ‘it is certain’, entail speaker commitment but do not presuppose it. The impersonal formation of ‘it is true’ and ‘it is certain’ ties their veridicality to the speaker of the utterance in the affirmative. In negative environments, ‘it is true’ and ‘it is certain’ are not veridical.
however, as shown in (120-b), where the embedded clause cannot be true for the speaker.

(120) a. It is true/certain that Joey Molland was in Arlington yesterday. I believe he was.

b. It is not true/certain that Joey Molland was in Arlington yesterday, #but I believe he was.

c. Is it true/certain that Joey Molland was in Arlington yesterday? Because I believe he was.

d. If it is true/certain that Joey Molland was in Arlington yesterday — and I believe he was, — ...

The remaining categories of epistemic predicates known to be involved in the selection of the polarity subjunctive do not generally entail speaker commitment, but rather commitment of the epistemic agent — which can be the speaker, if the subject of epistemic predicate is a first-person pronoun — towards the truth of the embedded proposition, as shown in (113). First, there are the verba cre-dendi, where ‘be certain/sure’ and ‘be convinced’ suggest a higher degree of subject commitment than ‘think’, ‘believe’, ‘it seems (to pro)’, ‘imagine’, and ‘suppose.’¹⁶ Then, there are the verba dicendi (e.g. ‘say’) when used in the sense of ‘claim’ to express a strong belief.

The table below summarizes the discussion regarding the classification of epistemic predicates taking finite complement clauses, regardless of the moods that can be embedded in those complements in Romance. I sorted these verbs based on whether they presuppose or entail speaker commitment vs. subject commitment. Henceforth, I use Giannakidou & Mari’s terminology to refer to the first set of verbs — those that entail speaker commitment — as objectively veridical, and the second set — those predicates that only imply subject commitment — as subjectively veridical.

1.2.1.2 Cognitive Predicate: ‘Remember’

To link back to the review of the literature, the French polarity subjunctive does not seem to be associated with a specific scope of negation but rather with further commitment to the truth of the embedded clause in the indicative than in the subjunctive. Se souvenir (‘remember’) provides good

¹⁶‘It seems’ is categorized as a verb of perceptive approximation and ‘imagine’ as a fictive, however, the uses we are interested in — those where the polarity subjunctive can be licensed in Romance — assimilates them to the verba credendi.
Table 1.4: Classification of Epistemic Predicates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Speaker commitment</th>
<th>Subject commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive-factives</td>
<td>‘know’</td>
<td>✓ (presupposition)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitives</td>
<td>‘remember’</td>
<td>✓ (entailment)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘it is true’</td>
<td>✓ (entailment, except with negation)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘it is certain’</td>
<td>✓ (entailment, except with negation)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verba credendi</td>
<td>‘be sure/certain’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘be convinced’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘believe’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘think’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘it seems (to pro)’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘imagine’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘suppose’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verba dicendi</td>
<td>‘say’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

examples to show how the accounts introduced above can apply to the French polarity subjunctive.

First, in the affirmative, the continuation in (121-a-i) shows that it is not sufficient for the speaker to not be committed to the truth of the embedded proposition in order to license the subjunctive (contra Siegel 2009). It is not because I do not believe the proposition that it is not true.

(121) a. George se souvient que Ringo est à l’hôpital pour une tonsillectomie.
George remembers that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.

"George remembers that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy."

(i) ... mais je ne le crois pas.
"... but I do not believe it."

(ii) ... mais personne ne le croit; tous savent que Ringo est simplement chez lui.
"... but no one believes it. Everyone knows that Ringo is at home."

b. *George se souvient que Ringo soit à l’hôpital pour une tonsillectomie.
George remembers that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.

"George remembers that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy."
In the scope of negation, both the indicative and the polarity subjunctive can be selected. First, the examples in (122) illustrate that different scopes of negation do not affect the selection of the embedded mood, since se souvenir (‘remember’) does not allow Neg-raising; an interpretation where George remembers that Ringo is not at the hospital is not possible. However, George may not believe that Ringo is not at the hospital, or believe that he is not, but those readings are not directly implied by the utterance.

In (122-b-i), George believes the embedded clause and the speaker probably does too; in (122-b-ii) the speaker does; in (122-b-iii) a third party (i.e. Paul) does and the speaker probably does too. In (122-b-iv), the speaker only weakly believes the embedded proposition to be false. In (122-b-v), everyone believes it to be false, but it is unclear how committed the speaker is. If the subjunctive is selected instead of the indicative, however, all continuations are acceptable, as the subjunctive does not express any inference about commitment to the truth of the embedded clause (pace Farkas 2003, and by extension Schlenker 2005).

(122) a. George (ne) se souvient pas que Ringo est à l’hôpital pour une tonsillectomie.
“George does not remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

   (i) ... mais George le sait maintenant qu’on le lui a dit.
       “... but George knows it now that he was told.”

   (ii) ... mais je le sais/crois.
        “... but I know/believe it.”

   (iii) ... mais Paul le sait/croit.
        “... but Paul knows/believes it.”

   (iv) ... et moi je ne le crois pas.
        “... and I don’t either.”

b. George (ne) se souvient pas que Ringo soit à l’hôpital pour une tonsillectomie.
“George does not remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”
... mais George le sait maintenant qu’on le lui a dit.
“... but George knows it now that he was told.”

... mais je le sais/crois.
“... but I know/believe it.”

... mais Paul le sait/croit.
“... but Paul knows/believes it.”

... et moi je ne le crois pas.
“... and I don't believe it either.”

(123) and (124) below are provided to illustrate native speaker intuition when the speaker is the subject of the epistemic predicate. In the affirmative, it is difficult to contradict the truth of the embedded clause. The speaker is committed to the truth of this proposition through remembrance.

(123-a-i) illustrates that truth in the actual world is not important, but rather truth in the epistemic world of the agent. By comparing (121) and (123), we can deduce that only the epistemic world of the speaker has precedence over it. However, in (123), the speaker is the epistemic agent, therefore contradiction is not possible.

(123) a. Je me souviens que Ringo est à l’hôpital pour une tonsillectomie.
   “I remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

   i. ... (?) mais c’est faux, il n’y est pas. Donc, j’ai dû l’imaginer.
      “... but it’s wrong. He is not. So I must have imagined it.”

   ii. ... mais je ne le crois pas.
        “... but I do not believe it.”

b. *Je me souviens que Ringo soit à l’hôpital pour une tonsillectomie.
   “I remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

In the negative, the subjunctive still does not imply any commitment to the truth of the embedded proposition. The indicative is associated with commitment to the truth of this proposition, and becomes marginal with a continuation where the speaker is not committed to it (i.e. 124-a-iv).

(124) a. Je (ne) me souviens pas que Ringo est à l’hôpital pour une
       “I NEG remember not that Ringo is.3SG.PRS.IND at the hospital for a
tonsillectomie.

tonsillectomy

“I do not remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

(i) ... mais je le sais maintenant qu’on me l’a dit.
“... but I know it now that I was told.”

(ii) ... et je ne le crois pas non plus.
“... and I don’t believe it either.”

b. Je (ne) me souviens pas que Ringo soit à l’hôpital pour une
I ne remember not that Ringo is.3SG.PRS.SBJV at the hospital for a
tonsillectomie.
tonsillectomy

“I do not remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

(i) ... mais je le sais maintenant qu’on me l’a dit.
“... but I know it now that I was told.”

(ii) ... et je ne le crois pas non plus.
“... and I don’t believe it either.”

Therefore, the French indicative seems to be associated with a certain commitment towards the
truth of the subordinate proposition in the epistemic world of a discourse participant, i.e. the subject
of an epistemic predicate, but most saliently the speaker.¹⁷

¹⁷Se rappeler (‘remember’) behaves similarly to se souvenir (‘remember’).

(i) a. George se rappelle que Ringo est à l’hôpital pour une tonsillectomie.
George remembers that Ringo is.3SG.PRS.IND at the hospital for a tonsillectomy

“George remembers that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

b. *George se rappelle que Ringo soit à l’hôpital pour une tonsillectomie.
George remembers that Ringo is.3SG.PRS.SBJV at the hospital for a tonsillectomy

“George remembers that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

(ii) a. George (ne) se rappelle pas que Ringo est à l’hôpital pour une tonsillectomie.
George neg remembers not that Ringo is.3SG.PRS.IND at the hospital for a tonsillectomy

“George does not remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

b. George (ne) se rappelle pas que Ringo soit à l’hôpital pour une tonsillectomie.
George neg remembers not that Ringo is.3SG.PRS.SBJV at the hospital for a tonsillectomy

“George does not remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”
1.2.1.3 Cognitive-factive: ‘Know’

‘Know’ is a cognitive-factive¹⁸, and as such it behaves differently from ‘remember’ in French. For most native speakers, savoir (‘know’) can only select the indicative even in downward entailing contexts.

(125) a. Art sait que Paul veut faire carrière solo.
   Art knows that Paul wants to have a solo career.
   “Art knows that Paul wants a solo career.”

b. *Art sait que Paul veuille faire carrière solo.
   Art knows that Paul wants.3SG.PRS.SBJV do career solo
   “Art knows that Paul wants a solo career.”

(126) a. Art (ne) sait pas que Paul veut faire carrière solo.
   Art NEG knows not that Paul wants.3SG.PRS.IND do career solo
   “Art does not know that Paul wants a solo career.”

b. %Art (ne) sait pas que Paul veuille faire carrière solo.
   Art NEG knows not that Paul wants.3SG.PRS.SBJV do career solo
   “Art does not know that Paul wants a solo career.”

1.2.1.4 First-person Effect

The subjunctive with the negated verb ‘know’ may be more acceptable for certain French speakers in the sense “it is not the case that I know for sure that Paul wants a solo career”, in response to a statement or a supposition as an expression of disbelief or a way to oppose the truth of the previous statement. ‘Know’ as ‘believe’ is therefore more similar to ‘remember’, which itself carries a meaning of belief, i.e. believing that something was known (a “fact” that need not be true). The first-person here makes the belief interpretation of ‘know’ more acceptable. Similarly to the English example in (115), the utterance below would be contradictory if ‘know’ didn’t switch to a belief interpretation

¹⁸Note that ‘discover’ and ‘realize’ cannot select the polarity subjunctive in French as they need to be past-oriented and are therefore incompatible with the French subjunctive, since the necessary forms to respect consecutio temporum, i.e. the imperfect or the pluperfect subjunctive are no longer available in most varieties of Modern French.

(i) Brian a découvert / réalisé que Freddie était / *fût condamné.
   Brian has.AUX discovered / realized that Freddie was.3SG.IPF.IND / 3SG.IPF.SBJV condemned
   “Brian discovered that Freddie was condemned.”
and subsequently licensed the subjunctive, granted that the indicative embedded under ‘know not’
carries a presupposition that the proposition is veridical, but ‘I know not’ requires that it does not.

(127) - Je pense — je suis sûr que Paul veut faire carrière solo.
- “I think — I am sure Paul wants.IND a solo career.”
- (?)Je ne sais pas que Paul veuille faire carrière solo. En fait, je crois bien que non.
- “I don’t know that Paul wants. SBJV a solo career. In fact, I think not.”

Different degrees of grammaticality depending on the grammatical person of the epistemic agent
were not observed with ‘remember’ and are not observable with the other types of predicates either.
We might expect to see stronger acceptability with the first-person subject of a negated epistemic
and an embedded subjunctive, given speaker commitment is directly weakened via negation (as
opposed to when a third-person is the epistemic agent). However, this is not the case, except with
the cognitive-factive ‘know’.

### 1.2.1.5 Another Cognitive Predicates: ‘It is true’

Another cognitive predicate would be ‘it is true’.

(128) a. Il est vrai que Creeque Alley dépeint l’histoire des membres du groupe The Mamas & the Papas.
   “It is true that Creeque Alley depicts the story of the members of the band The Mamas & the Papas.”

b. *Il est vrai que Creeque Alley dépeigne l’histoire des membres du groupe The Mamas & the Papas.
   “It is true that Creeque Alley depicts the story of the members of the band The Mamas & the Papas.”

(129) a. Il (n’) est pas vrai que Creeque Alley dépeint l’histoire des membres du groupe The Mamas & the Papas.
   “It is not true that Creeque Alley depicts the story of the members of the band The Mamas & the Papas.”
b. %Il (n’) est pas vrai que Creeque Alley dépeigne l’histoire des membres du groupe The Mamas & the Papas.

“It is not true that Creeque Alley depicts the story of the members of the band The Mamas & the Papas.”

Much like savoir (‘know’), est vrai (‘is true’) can select the polarity subjunctive under negation for some native speakers of French. If the indicative implies that the speaker is strongly committed to the truth of the embedded proposition, why can it appear under ‘is not true’?¹⁹

1.2.1.6 Verba Credendi

Among verbs of belief, croire (‘believe’) and penser (‘think’) are typically used as paradigms of the selection of the polarity subjunctive across Romance. Under negation the verba credendi may select the indicative or the polarity subjunctive. As is the case for the factives, the polarity subjunctive seems to be a vacuous mood which contributes veridical agnosticism in (131-b) and (49′-b) below.

(130) a. Certaines Apple scruffs croient que Paul est mort.
     some Apple scruffs believe that Paul is dead
     “Some Apple scruffs believe that Paul is dead.”

b. *Certaines Apple scruffs croient que Paul soit mort.
     some Apple scruffs believe that Paul is dead
     “Some Apple scruffs believe that Paul is dead.”

(131) a. Certaines Apple scruffs (ne) croient pas que Paul est mort.
     some Apple scruffs NEG believe not that Paul is dead
     “Some Apple scruffs do not believe that Paul is dead.”

(i) #... mais Paul n’est pas mort.
     “... but Paul is not dead.”

b. Certaines Apple scruffs (ne) croient pas que Paul soit mort.
     some Apple scruffs NEG believe not that Paul is dead
     “Some Apple scruffs do not believe that Paul is dead.”

‘Think’ behaves similarly and even seems to take on the same meaning of belief.

¹⁹The account of the Romance subjunctive in this dissertation relies on a diachronic analysis, therefore the full array of data here will only fully be explained in Chapter 3.
A few more predicates can be said to behave in the same way. Like ‘believe’ and ‘think’, être certain / sûr / convaincu (‘be certain / sure / convinced’) already inherently express commitment to the truth of the embedded clause by the epistemic subject, i.e. George and Paul below, but under negation that commitment is overwritten. The indicative seems to contribute the additional inference that the speaker is committed to the truth of the embedded proposition.

(132) a. George Martin est sûr / certain que Paul peut composer la musique pour la bande-annonce de Family Way.
   “George Martin is sure that Paul can write the music for the soundtrack of The Family Way.”

b. *George Martin est sûr / certain que Paul puisse composer la musique pour la bande-annonce de Family Way.
   “George Martin is sure that Paul can write the music for the soundtrack of The Family Way.”

(133) a. George Martin (n’) est pas sûr / certain que Paul peut composer la musique pour la bande-annonce de Family Way.
   “George Martin is not sure / certain that Paul can write the music for the soundtrack of The Family Way.”
George Martin is not sure that Paul can write the music for the soundtrack of The Family Way.

“George Martin est pas sûr / certain que Paul puisse composer la musique pour la bande-annonce de Family Way.

“George Martin is not sure that Paul can write the music for the soundtrack of The Family Way.”

a. Paul est convaincu que God Only Knows est la meilleure composition de Brian Wilson. Paul is convinced that God Only Knows is Brian Wilson's best composition.

“Paul is convinced that God Only Knows is Brian Wilson's best composition.”


“Paul is convinced that God Only Knows is Brian Wilson's best composition.”

Finally, sembler (“seem”) is also interpreted like “believe”, and even more strongly when a dative clitic accompanies it as an epistemic agent.²⁰ Therefore, il me / nous / lui / leur te / vous semble (‘it

²⁰ Without the dative epistemic agent, ‘it seems’ can assume a more general source of belief, e.g. “it is widely believed that”, which may make the predicate more compatible with the veridical agnosticism contributed by the subjunctive. The dative clitic blocks this possible interpretation and provides an epistemic agent. The presence of an epistemic agent provides a logophoric center — i.e. an attitude holder (Charnavel 2017) — which may force the incompatibility of the subjunctive in the affirmative.
seems to me / us / him/her / them / you’) is a polarity subjunctive predicate as in (136) and (137), but *il semble* (‘it seems’) without an explicit epistemic agent is not as in (138) and (139). If the epistemic agent is omitted, the subjunctive becomes acceptable in the affirmative as shown in (138-b).²¹ The indicative therefore is incompatible with a continuation that contradicts speaker commitment in (138-a), even in the absence of an epistemic agent hence this incompatibility cannot be due to redundancy (*pace* Siegel 2009).

(136)  a.  *Il me semble que Badfinger est sous-estimé.*  
       *It seems to me that Badfinger is underrated.*

    b.  *??Il me semble que Badfinger soit sous-estimé.*  
       *It seems to me that Badfinger is underrated.*

(137)  a.  *Il (ne) me semble pas que Badfinger est sous-estimé.*  
       *It does not seem that Badfinger is underrated.*

    b.  *Il (ne) me semble pas que Badfinger soit sous-estimé.*  
       *It does not seem that Badfinger is underrated.*

(138)  a.  *Il semble que Badfinger est sous-estimé.*  
       *It seems that Badfinger is underrated.*

    (i)  *#... mais Badfinger n’est pas sous-estimé.*  
       *... but Badfinger is not underestimated.*

    b.  *Il semble que Badfinger soit sous-estimé.*  
       *It seems that Badfinger is underrated.*

²¹The subjunctive, when selected in non-polarity contexts, is also said to express empathy (Becker 2010). For instance, with the verb *comprendre* (“understand”), the subjunctive is used to express that the epistemic subject empathizes with the embedded subject rather than simply computes the fact that he left.

(i)  a.  *Linda comprend que John est parti parce qu’il s’ennuyait.*  
       *Linda understands that John is.3SG.PRS.IND left because (he) was bored.*

    b.  *Linda comprend que John soit parti parce qu’il s’ennuyait.*  
       *Linda understands that John is.3SG.PRS.SBJV left because (he) was bored.*
... mais Badfinger n’est pas sous-estimé.
“... but Badfinger is not underestimated.”

Il (ne) semble pas que Badfinger est sous-estimé.
“It does not seem that Badfinger is underrated.”

Il (ne) semble pas que Badfinger soit sous-estimé.
“It does not seem that Badfinger is underrated.”

Fictive predicates form another subclass of verba credendi and introduce fictional worlds, seemingly more remote than the belief world of the speaker (e.g. imaginer ‘imagine’ and supposer ‘suppose’). In the affirmative the indicative can’t seem to be contradicted with continuations that apply to the speaker’s belief with respect to the actual world, as shown in (140-a-i). Therefore, the inference that there is speaker commitment with respect to the truth of the embedded proposition is not strictly associated with the indicative. However, under negation, fiction predicates and the indicative seem to take a different meaning. In (141), the negated fiction predicate may be interpreted as ‘believe not’ with a subordinate clause in the indicative, or as “in the epistemic agent’s imagination, it is not the case that”. In the latter case, the indicative can’t seem to be contradicted in (141-a-i), as it is the case in the affirmative. With the other interpretation (in 141-a-ii), the indicative is incompatible with strong non-commitment of the speaker towards the truth of the embedded proposition.

John imagine que le monde vit en paix.
“John imagines that the world lives in peace.”

(i) ... et/mais le monde ne vit pas en paix.
“... and/but the world doesn’t live in peace.”

*John imagine que le monde vive en paix.
“John imagines that the world lives in peace.”

John (n’) imagine pas que le monde vit en paix.
“John does not imagine that the world lives in peace.”
... et le monde ne vit pas en paix.
“... and the world doesn’t live in peace.” (=“the world does not live in peace in
John’s imagination, and I strongly believe it does not in the actual world either’)

(ii) #... mais le monde ne vit pas en paix.
“... but the world doesn’t live in peace.” (=“John does not believe that the world
lives in peace, but I strongly don’t believe it does either’)

b. John (n’) imagine pas que le monde vive en paix.
John NEG imagines not that the world lives.3SG.PRS.SBJV in peace
“John does not imagine that the world lives in peace.”

(142) a. Je suppose que John et Paul se font désirer.
I suppose that John and Paul SELF make.IND desire
“I suppose that John and Paul are playing hard to get.”

b. *Je suppose que John et Paul se fassent désirer.
I suppose that John and Paul SELF make.SBJV desire
“I suppose that John and Paul are playing hard to get.”

(143) a. Je (ne) suppose pas que John et Paul se font désirer.
I NEG suppose not that John and Paul SELF make.IND desire
“I do not suppose that John and Paul are playing hard to get.”

b. Je (ne) suppose pas que John et Paul se fassent désirer.
I NEG suppose not that John and Paul SELF make.SBJV desire
“I do not suppose that John and Paul are playing hard to get.”

1.2.1.7 Verba Dicendi

The verba dicendi are those predicates which describe the speech act, e.g. ‘say’, ‘claim’, etc. In cer-
tain contexts — and specifically those that interest us,— they seem to carry a belief meaning. For
instance, in the environments that select the polarity subjunctive as in (145-b), dire (‘say’) — or
rather ne pas dire (‘say not’) can express that the epistemic subject does not believe the content of
the embedded clause. Yet, the same implication does not apply when the indicative is selected, as in
(145-a). With the indicative, only the speech act itself is negated and not the belief associated with
it. Also, in the absence of a belief meaning, the indicative is not incompatible with the contradiction
of speaker commitment in (145-a-i); the subjunctive is not either.
In summary, the above data has shown that the indicative mood implies a certain level of commitment on the part of the speaker. However, this inference is not always readily available (contra Schlenker 2005; Siegel 2009; Giannakidou 2011); it appears to be available in the environments that select the polarity subjunctive when the superordinate predicate can be interpreted as an expression of belief. I will come back to the synchronic analysis of the French polarity subjunctive below, and further explain the selection of the polarity subjunctive in Romance in Chapter 3.

1.2.2 Polarity Triggers

As briefly demonstrated in the introduction, the polarity subjunctive is said to be licensed in epistemic downward entailing environments. While I mentioned that such environments can be introduced by superordinate negation, a Q(uestion) operator, or within an if-clause, French epistemic predicates select the subjunctive only in a subset of these situations. The selection of the polarity subjunctive under a range of negated epistemic predicates as been presented above, therefore this section considers whether the French polarity subjunctive is licensed in questions and if-clauses.
1.2.2.1 Questions

Question operators do not necessarily contribute to the selection of the polarity subjunctive in French. There exist a few different ways to form yes/no questions and wh-questions — or qu-questions to adjust to the morphology of the language — in French. Yes/no questions can be formed by 1) inversion, 2) fronting of est-ce que, 3) modifying the intonation of the utterance, or 4) adding a question particle after the auxiliary or the verb, in the absence of an auxiliary.

Inversion of the matrix verb and its subject pronoun — i.e. the addition of a subject pronoun after the verb or auxiliary if the subject is a non-pronominal DP — is the formal way to form a yes/no question. The polarity subjunctive is acceptable in this case, as demonstrated in (146-b), as long as a relevant epistemic trigger is present (e.g. pense “believe’ here).

(146) Inversion

a. Ringo pense-t-il que les autres sont plus proches ?
Ringo thinks-he that the others are.3SG.PRS.IND more close
“Does Ringo think that the others are closer?”

(i) ... je crois qu’ils le sont.
“... I believe that they are.”

(ii) ... je ne crois pas qu’ils le sont.
“... I do not believe that they are.”

(iii) ... ils ne le sont pas.
“... they are not.”

b. Ringo pense-t-il que les autres soient plus proches ?
Ringo thinks-he that the others are.3SG.PRS.SBJV more close
“Does Ringo think that the others are closer?”

Canadian French has a different mechanism to construct yes/no questions: that is, the addition of the interrogative particle tu after the verb in what takes the same shape as the declarative equivalent of the utterance.²²

(147) -tu particle in Canadian French

²²Note, however, that the subjunctive is on its way out in Canadian French, such that it may difficult to rely on these judgements. See Chapter 3 for a more detailed description of the facts.
a. Ringo (il) pense-tu que les autres sont plus proches?
Ringo he thinks-Q that the others are.3SG.PRS.IND more close
“Does Ringo think that the others are closer?”

(i) ... je crois qu’ils le sont.
“... I believe that they are.”

(ii) ... je ne crois pas qu’ils le sont.
“... I do not believe that they are.”

(iii) ... ils ne le sont pas.
“... they are not.”

b. Ringo (il) pense-tu que les autres soient plus proches?
Ringo he thinks-Q that the others are.3SG.PRS.SBJV more close
“Does Ringo think that the others are closer?”

Questions are address-see-oriented and need not imply any commitment on the part of the speaker or anyone else in the discourse. This may be why the polarity subjunctive is acceptable in (146-b) and (147-b) above. I illustrated in the section above that, when the polarity subjunctive is selected, commitment to the truth of the embedded clause on the part of the speaker may be disregarded. The above examples are questions, and therefore don’t imply truth commitment on the part of anyone, hence the subjunctive is acceptable. The inability of the indicative to be contradicted will be explained when we get to Chapter 3.

Under est-ce que (see 148) or in echo questions (see 149), the polarity subjunctive is marginal, if not unacceptable.

(148) Est-ce que

a. Est-ce que Ringo pense que les autres sont plus proches?
is-it that Ringo thinks that the others are.3SG.PRS.IND more close
“Does Ringo think that the others are closer?”

b. *Est-ce que Ringo pense que les autres soient plus proches?
is-it that Ringo thinks that the others are.3SG.PRS.SBJV more close
“Does Ringo think that the others are closer?”
(149) Rising intonation / echo question

a. Ringo pense que les autres sont plus proches?
   Ringo thinks that the others are more close
   “Does Ringo think that the others are closer?”

b. ??Ringo pense que les autres soient plus proches?
   Ringo thinks that the others are more close
   “Does Ringo think that the others are closer?”

Qu-questions can be formed via 1) fronting of a qu-word with “inversion”; 2) fronting of a qu-word without inversion; 3) fronting of a qu-word and est-ce que; 4) fronting of a qu-word and a cleft (i.e. c'est “it is’); 4) clefting and qu- in situ; and 5) qu-in situ. Similarly to yes/no questions, qu-questions can only select the polarity subjunctive in French when there is fronting of the qu-word, with or without inversion (i.e. inversion of the matrix auxiliary or the matrix verb, in the absence of an auxiliary, and its subject pronoun, or the addition of a pronoun after the verb or auxiliary if the subject is a non-pronominal DP), as long as no other syntactic formation is added to the question (see 150).

(150) Qu-questions & inversion

a. Qui Ringo pense-t-il qui est plus proche?
   who Ringo thinks-he who is more close
   “Who does he think is closer?”

b. Qui Ringo pense-t-il qui soit plus proche?
   who Ringo thinks-he who is more close
   “Who does he think is closer?”

(151) Qu-questions without inversion

a. Qui Ringo pense qui est plus proche?
   who Ringo thinks who is more close
   “Who does he think is closer?”

b. Qui Ringo pense qui soit plus proche?
   who Ringo thinks who is more close
   “Who does he think is closer?”

In all other cases, the polarity subjunctive is unacceptable.²³ The examples in (152)–(153) are sim-

²³The Canadian French question particle tu is unacceptable in qu-questions.
ilar to (148), as they all involve a derivation of clefting. Est-ce que itself comes from the inversion of the cleft c'est followed by the relative pronoun que. The history of est-ce que and these question formations is discussed in Chapter 3, which further explains why the polarity subjunctive is unacceptable with these formations.

(152) Qu-questions & est-ce que

a. Qui est-ce que Ringo pense qui est plus proche ?
   who is-it that Ringo thinks who is.3SG.PRS.IND more close
   “Who does he think is closer?”

b. *Qui est-ce que Ringo pense qui soit plus proche ?
   who is-it that Ringo thinks who is.3SG.PRS.SBJV more close
   “Who does he think is closer?”

(153) Qu-questions with clefting

a. Qui c’est que Ringo pense qui est plus proche ?
   who it is that Ringo thinks who is.3SG.PRS.IND more close
   “Who does he think is closer?”

b. *Qui c’est que Ringo pense qui soit plus proche ?
   who it is that Ringo thinks who is.3SG.PRS.SBJV more close
   “Who does he think is closer?”

(154) Qu-questions with clefting, without fronting

a. C’est qui que Ringo pense qui est plus proche ?
   it is who that Ringo thinks who is.3SG.PRS.IND more close
   “Who does he think is closer?”

b. *C’est qui que Ringo pense qui soit plus proche ?
   it is who that Ringo thinks who is.3SG.PRS.SBJV more close
   “Who does he think is closer?”

(155) Qu-questions in situ

a. Ringo pense que qui est plus proche ?
   Ringo thinks that who is.3SG.PRS.IND more close
   “Who does Ringo think is closer?”

b. *Ringo pense que qui soit plus proche ?
   Ringo thinks that who is.3SG.PRS.SBJV more close
   “Who does Ringo think is closer?”
(149) is, in turn, similar to (155) as they do not involve any other transformation than the modification of intonation, so that the utterance can be recognized as a question. Both forms originate from what we know as “echo questions”, in that they repeat what was uttered previously by a discourse participant under the form of a question. This form of question can be used to gather more information as to what the speaker failed to hear in the previous discourse or to express attitude towards what was heard (Blakemore 1994 a.o.). Therefore, echo question are different from standard yes/no questions as they are not purely addressee-oriented. As such, they can express that the speaker takes a certain position with respect to the truth of the embedded clause.

This section introduced different types of question formations in French, some of which may select the polarity subjunctive. It was shown that questions that do not involve clefting or those that are not echo questions cannot select the polarity subjunctive. This is due to what they imply (or used to imply historically) with respect to speaker expectations of the truth. Chapter 3 will provide more details and explanations.

1.2.2.2 If-clauses

If-clause antecedents are known as downward entailing environments, but they do not select the polarity subjunctive in French. This goes in accordance with the rejection of the hypothesis that polarity triggers the selection of the subjunctive in epistemic environments. We might expect, however, that speaker commitment is excluded in if-clauses. Conditionals introduce possible worlds where a proposition like “George thinks that Ringo is sick” may be true, yet nothing is really said about the truth of this proposition in the belief worlds of George or the speaker. Therefore, we might expect (156-b) to be acceptable. However, it seems that the antecedent below is interpreted as being possible in the belief world of the speaker.

(156) a. Si George pense que Ringo est malade, il devrait lui apporter de la soupe.

“If George thinks that Ringo is sick, he should bring him some soup.”
b. *Si George pense que Ringo soit malade, il devrait lui apporter de la soupe.
   If George thinks that Ringo is sick, he should bring him some soup.

“If George thinks that Ringo is sick, he should bring him some soup.”

Schlenker (2005) makes similar observations for the example below, where he explains that the speaker must believe that the addressee will play tomorrow.

(157) If you play tomorrow, you will win. (Schlenker 2005:6)

He further argues that if-clauses introduce worlds that are compatible with what the speaker believes or says (based on Stalnaker 1968; 1975). It is not the actual belief world of the speaker but a similar world. For example, in (158), the speaker need not really believe that the Earth is really flat, rather “if’ introduces a world where the speaker would believe that the Earth is flat; s/he could be talking about a video game world in which the Earth is flat.

(158) Si la terre est plate, les océans doivent être statiques.
   if the earth is flat the oceans must be static
   “If the Earth is flat, the oceans must be static.”

Therefore, in the speaker’s belief world in (156-a), George should bring Ringo some soup because he believes that Ringo is sick. In the context, George is committed to the truth of the proposition, so the veridicality of the utterance makes it incompatible with the subjunctive.²⁴

²⁴Schlenker provides examples where the subjunctive is found in if-clauses, but not in direct subordination to if.

(i) a. Si Jean était ici, nous serions contents.
   If Jean was here, we would be happy
   “If John were here (right now), we would be happy”

b. *Si Jean soit ici, nous serions contents.
   If Jean be sbjv here, we would be happy
   “If John were here (right now), we would be happy”

(ii) a. Si Jean rencontre une personne qui soit malade, il la réconfortera
   If Jean meets a person that be sbjv sick, he her comfort-will

b. Si Jean rencontrent une personne qui soit malade, il la réconforterait
   If Jean met a person that be sbjv sick, he her comfort-would

(Schlenker 2005:20)

(iii) a. Si Jean vient et qu’il est malade, nous le soignerons.
   If Jean comes and that he is sick, we him will take care of
The following example of a conditional would be understood as counterfactual, in the sense that (159) is uttered because the content of the if-clause is false in the actual world.

(159)  

a. Si Ringo pensait que les autres sont /étaient
if Ringo thought.3SG.IND.IPFF that the others are.3SG.PRS.IND /were.3SG.IND.IPFF
plus proches, il quitterait le groupe.
much closer he leave.3SG.COND.PRS the band
“If Ringo thought that the others are/were closer, he would leave the band.”

b. *Si Ringo pensait que les autres soient /aient
if Ringo thought.3SG.IND.IPFF that the others are.3SG.PRS.SBJV /were.3SG.SBJV.IPFF
ét  été plus proches, il quitterait le groupe.
been more close he leave.3SG.COND.PRS the band
“If Ringo thought that the others are/were closer, he would leave the band.”

Yet, conditionals of the type in (159) are not necessarily counterfactual, as discussed in Schlenker 2005 (cf. Stalnaker 1975; Bittner 2001; Lycan 2001; Schlenker 2004). In (160-a), both the first and the second if-clauses are taken to be possible by the speaker, otherwise they would contradict each other and render the utterance ungrammatical. In (160-b), the if-clause must be taken to be true by the speaker.

(160)  

a. If the USA threw its weapons into the sea tomorrow, there would be war; but if the USA and the other nuclear powers all threw their weapons into the sea tomorrow, there would be peace. (Schlenker 2005:5)

b. If the butler had done it, we would have found just the clues which we in fact found. (Stalnaker 1975; from Anderson 1951)

I take it that the possible counterfactuality of conditionals like (159) does not affect the selection of the subjunctive. French if-clauses are analyzed as introducing a world associated with the belief world of the speaker. Therefore, the speaker is thought to believe that “Ringo thought that the others
were closer”, no matter whether it is true or false in the actual belief world of the speaker. This may be why the indicative rather than the polarity subjunctive is selected in if-clauses. Recall, however, the following examples taken from the introduction.

(19') a. Tu pourrais laisser la fenêtre ouverte, en supposant que Choupie soiet sage et (ne) se jette pas du haut du cinquième étage. be.3SG.PRS.SBJV wise and NEG REFL throw not from height of the fifth floor “You could leave the window open, supposing that Choupie would be wise not to throw herself out from the fifth floor down.”

b. ?Tu pourrais laisser la fenêtre ouverte, en supposant que Choupie est sage et (ne) se jette pas du haut du cinquième étage. be.3SG.PRS.IND wise and NEG REFL throw not from height of the fifth floor “You could leave the window open, supposing that Choupie would be wise not to throw herself out from the fifth floor down.”

(20') Supposons / suppose / imaginons / imagine que Choupie est / soit / sage. be.3SG.PRS.IND / 3SG.PRS.SBJV wise “Let’s suppose / suppose that Choupie is wise.”

These cases, with imperative forms of fictive predicates, i.e. ‘suppose’ and ‘imagine’ and the conjunction ‘en supposant que’, are the only examples of the selection of the polarity subjunctive in “conditional” contexts in French. However, since we can see here that the polarity subjunctive can be selected in such contexts, there must be another reason why si-clause do not allow the selection of the polarity subjunctive, which may be due to the diachronic development of these constructions.

1.3 Relevant Synchronic Conclusions

In this chapter, I reviewed the relevant literature that strives to account for the polarity subjunctive and data that illustrates the uses of the polarity subjunctive in Modern French. The data showed that the selection of the indicative vs. that of the subjunctive in environments that license the polarity subjunctive cannot be accounted for by different scopes of negation (contra Borgonovo 2003), given that some of the predicates that can embed the polarity subjunctive do not allow Neg-raising.
Furthermore, veridicality or speaker commitment to the truth of the embedded proposition is not a sufficient condition to explain the selection of the indicative instead of the subjunctive. In fact, the indicative does not always imply that the speaker is committed to the truth of the embedded proposition (contra Schlenker 2005; Siegel 2009). It is the case, however, that the indicative in polarity contexts is associated with speaker commitment (or veridicality) in cases where the matrix predicate is interpreted as a belief verb (pace Farkas 2003; Schlenker 2005; Siegel 2009; Giannakidou 2011) and that it can be contradicted by a continuation that implies strong speaker commitment against the truth of the subordinate clause (cf. Giannakidou’s “anti-veridicality”). Although the subjunctive seems to be a default mood, as it does not contribute any particular interpretation (following Schlenker 2005), it is associated with a disregard for speaker commitment (cf. Giannakidou’s “non-veridicality”) and does not always contrast with a veridical indicative (contra a competition account).

The French data showed that the polarity subjunctive is selected by epistemic predicates including cognitive-factives, other cognitive predicates like `remember’ and ‘it is true’, verba credendi, and verba dicendi.

The polarity subjunctive is licensed under negation and in some types of questions (i.e. those that do not involve clefting, est-ce que, and do not consist of echo questions). However, not all downward entailing environments can select the polarity subjunctive; if-clauses, for instance, cannot. I demonstrated that conditional antecedents are not always incompatible with the polarity subjunctive in French, as fictive predicates in the imperative or conjunctions like en supposant que (‘supposing that’) satisfy the requirements the license it. Finally, contexts in which (non-)veridicality is relevant for the selection of the polarity subjunctive vs. the indicative consist of an epistemic predicate interpreted as a belief verb, irrespectively of whether the same predicate can carry another, more specific meaning in the affirmative.
Table 1.5 summarizes the environments where the polarity subjunctive is licensed (where -
stands for negation and ? for questions); the types of predicates that can license it in those en-
vvironments, and some of the native speaker judgements shown above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Predicate</th>
<th>Verbs (examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive-factives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-/? IND / %sBjv</td>
<td>savoir “know’ (125–126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive predicates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-/? IND / sBjv</td>
<td>se souvenir “remember’ (121–122); se rappeler “remember’ ((i)–(ii))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-/? IND / %sBjv</td>
<td>est vrai “is true’ (128–129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verba credendi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-/? IND / sBjv</td>
<td>penser “think’ (48–49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>croire “believe’ (130–131)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>me semble “seems to me’ (136–137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>être sûr/certain “be sure/certain’ (132–133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>être convaincu “be convinced’ (134–135)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditional antecedent: IMPV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPV; en supposant que</td>
<td>imaginer “imagine’ (140–141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>supposer “suppose’ (142–143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verba dicendi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-/? IND / sBjv</td>
<td>dire “say’ (144–145)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.6 demonstrates the types of questions which can select the polarity subjunctive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Question</th>
<th>Polarity Subjunctive (examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>y/n question with inversion</td>
<td>✓ (161)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y/n without inversion + question particle tu</td>
<td>✓ (147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>est-ce que y/n question</td>
<td>✗ (148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>echo y/n question</td>
<td>✗ (149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu-fronting with inversion</td>
<td>✓ (150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu-fronting without inversion</td>
<td>✓ (151)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu-fronting + est-ce que</td>
<td>✗ (152)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu-fronting + clefting</td>
<td>✗ (153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleft + Qu-word</td>
<td>✗ (154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu-in situ</td>
<td>✗ (155)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 2

The Polarity Subjunctive in Latin & Old French

There

We can conclude from the previous chapter that it is difficult to pinpoint one consistent cause for the selection of the polarity subjunctive in Modern French — and, as we’ve discussed in the Introduction, for the French or even Romance subjunctive as a whole. Some of the other Romance languages¹ show similar patterns as those presented in Chapter 1, but some also show different patterns. Italian and Portuguese, for instance, don’t select the polarity subjunctive with belief verbs, as those predicates can appear with a subjunctive clause even in upward entailment environments.

(161) Gianni crede che Maria abbia telefonato.
     “Gianni believes that Maria called.”
     (Italian; Giorgi 2006: 106)

(162) Acredito que a Maria estaja doente.
     “I believe that Maria is ill.”
     (Portuguese; Marques 2010: 145)

¹The Catalan data presented in this chapter has been submitted to the judgement of two native speakers of seemingly different dialects, as one of my informants required the use of determiners before proper nouns and the other did not. The Spanish data came from two native speakers, one from Spain and the other from Latin America; the Italian data from three native speakers; the Portuguese date from two native speakers of Brazilian Portuguese; and the Romanian data from two native speakers. All informants were submitted similar data. Examples were transmitted in written form, in randomized order with the interspersion of utterances that did not exhibit the use of the polarity subjunctive, over the course of multiple elicitation sessions. Native speakers were also prompted to share any intuition they might have concerning the interpretation of the utterances presented.
On the other hand, Catalan, Spanish, Romanian, and French belief verbs cannot select the subjunctive in the affirmative, but only in polarity contexts.

(163)  *Creuen que l’ Andrea estigui molt cansat.
       “They believe that Andrea SBJV very tired.” (Catalan; Quer 2001)

(164)  Creo que está / *esté cansada.
       “I think she is.IND / *SBJV tired.” (Spanish; Quer 2009: 6)

(165)  Io crede că a venit Ana / *să fi venit.
       “I believe that Ana has.IND / *SBJV come.” (Romanian; adapted from Farkas 1992: 70)

(166)  Je crois qu’ elle est / *soit fatigué.
       “I think she is.IND / *SBJV tired.” (French; Quer 2009: 6)

Among those, only Catalan and French select the polarity subjunctive with fiction predicates, as in (167) and (168).

(167)  a. (El) John imagina que el món viu en pau.
       (the) John imagines that the world lives.3SG.PRS.IND in peace
       “John imagines that the world lives in peace.”

       b. *(El) John imagina que el món visqui en pau.
       (the) John imagines that the world lives.3SG.PRS.SBJV in peace
       “John imagines that the world lives in peace.”

       (Catalan)

(168)  a. (El) John no imagina que el món viu en pau.
       (the) John NEG imagines that the world lives.3SG.PRS.IND in peace
       “John does not imagine that the world lives in peace.”

       b. (El) John no imagina que el món visqui en pau.
       (the) John NEG imagines that the world lives.3SG.PRS.SBJV in peace
       “John does not imagine that the world lives in peace.”

       (Catalan)

On the other hand, Spanish for instance does not.

(169)  a. John imagina que el mundo vive en paz.
       John imagines that the world lives.3SG.PRS.IND in peace

78
“John imagines that the world lives in peace.”

b. *John imagina que el mundo viva en paz.
   John imagines that the world lives in peace.
   “John imagines that the world lives in peace.”

(Spanish)

(170) a. John no imagina que el mundo vive en paz.
   John NEG imagines that the world lives in peace.
   “John does not imagine that the world lives in peace.”

b. *John no imagina que el mundo viva en paz.
   John NEG imagines that the world lives in peace.
   “John does not imagine that the world lives in peace.”

(Spanish)

Catalan and French can also select the subjunctive in non-polarity contexts with ‘seem’ as long as no overt or understood epistemic agent accompanies it (as in 171; cf. 172 where the agent “me’ is present).

(171) a. Sembla que (el) Badfinger està subestimat.
   seems that Badfinger is underrated
   “It seems that Badfinger is underrated.”

b. ?Sembla que (el) Badfinger estigui subestimat.
   seems that Badfinger is underrated
   “It seems that Badfinger is underrated.”

(Catalan)

(172) a. em sembla que (el) Badfinger està subestimat.
   me.DAT seems that Badfinger is underrated
   “It seems to me that Badfinger is underrated.”

b. *em sembla que (el) Badfinger estigui subestimat.
   me.DAT seems that Badfinger is underrated
   “It seems to me that Badfinger is underrated.”

(Catalan)

In Spanish, however, ‘seem’ cannot select the subjunctive in non-polarity contexts, whether an epistemic agent is present (as in 174) or not (as in 173).
(173)  a. Parece que Badfinger está subestimado.
seems that Badfinger is.3SG.PRS.IND underrated
“It seems that Badfinger is underrated.”

b. *Parece que Badfinger esté subestimado.
seems that Badfinger is.3SG.PRS.SBJV underrated
“It seems that Badfinger is underrated.”

(Spanish)

(174)  a. Me parece que Badfinger está subestimado.
me.DAT seems that Badfinger is.3SG.PRS.IND underrated
“It seems to me that Badfinger is underrated.”

b. *Me parece que Badfinger esté subestimado.
me.DAT seems that Badfinger is.3SG.PRS.SBJV underrated
“It seems to me that Badfinger is underrated.”

(Spanish)

All the data I collected from native speakers of Italian, French, Catalan, Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese, and Romanian, are summarized in the tables that follow. In the row “Type of polarity” are listed the polarity environments which apply to each language; “−” is for negation and “?” is for questions. A tilde indicates a possible alternation between the indicative mood and the subjunctive mood. A slash indicates a split in grammaticality judgements between native speakers. A “+” means an affirmative utterance. Pink cells show predicates that participate in the selection of the polarity subjunctive; they display the selection of the indicative in the affirmative and the polarity subjunctive in polar environments. Blue is used to highlight different patterns with ‘it seems’ depending on whether a dative epistemic agent is present.

Italian and Brazilian Portuguese do not prohibit the use of the subjunctive in the affirmative except in three cases (with cells highlighted in green and yellow). Interestingly, these three predicates are the ones we determined to be objectively veridical in Chapter 1. They select the indicative in the affirmative, where they entail speaker commitment, across all Romance languages studied. Note the inconsistencies in mood selection in the table, some of which I already mentioned. Despite those inconsistencies and the fact that Italian and Brazilian Portuguese do not generally license the polarity subjunctive, one predicate seems to behave the same across all Romance languages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of polarity</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Catalan</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
<th>Romanian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘know’</td>
<td>sapere</td>
<td>savoir</td>
<td>saper</td>
<td>saber</td>
<td>saber</td>
<td>a sti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polar env.</td>
<td>IND / IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND / IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘remember’</td>
<td>ricordare</td>
<td>se souvenir;</td>
<td>recordar</td>
<td>recuerdar</td>
<td>recordar</td>
<td>a iși aminti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polar env.</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘it is true’</td>
<td>essere vero</td>
<td>être vrai</td>
<td>estar cert</td>
<td>ser verdad</td>
<td>ser verdade</td>
<td>e adevarat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polar env.</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘be sure /’</td>
<td>essere sicuro;</td>
<td>être sûr;</td>
<td>estar segur</td>
<td>estar seguro</td>
<td>ser certo</td>
<td>e sigur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certain</td>
<td>essere certo</td>
<td>être certain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polar env.</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘be convinced’</td>
<td>essere convinto</td>
<td>être convaincu</td>
<td>estar convencut</td>
<td>estar convencido</td>
<td>ser convencido</td>
<td>e convins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polar env.</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘believe’</td>
<td>credere</td>
<td>croire</td>
<td>creure</td>
<td>creer</td>
<td>creer</td>
<td>a crede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polar env.</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘think’</td>
<td>pensare</td>
<td>penser</td>
<td>pensar</td>
<td>piensar</td>
<td>pensar</td>
<td>a gandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polar env.</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of polarity</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Romanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘it seems to pro’</td>
<td>DAT.CL <strong>sembrare</strong></td>
<td>DAT.CL <strong>sembler</strong></td>
<td>DAT.CL <strong>semblar</strong></td>
<td>DAT.CL <strong>parecer</strong></td>
<td><strong>parecer-DAT.CL</strong></td>
<td>DAT.CL se pare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ polar env.</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘it seems’</td>
<td><strong>sembrare</strong></td>
<td>sembler</td>
<td><strong>semblar</strong></td>
<td><strong>parecer</strong></td>
<td>parecer</td>
<td>pare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ polar env.</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘imagine’</td>
<td><strong>imaginare</strong></td>
<td>imaginer</td>
<td><strong>imaginar</strong></td>
<td><strong>imaginär</strong></td>
<td>imaginär</td>
<td>a-si imagina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ polar env.</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(incl. IMPV)</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘suppose’</td>
<td>assumere; supporre</td>
<td>supposer</td>
<td>suposar</td>
<td>suponer</td>
<td>achar</td>
<td>a banui; presupune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ polar env.</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘say’</td>
<td><strong>dire</strong></td>
<td><strong>dire</strong></td>
<td><strong>dir</strong></td>
<td><strong>decir</strong></td>
<td><strong>dizer</strong></td>
<td>a zice; spune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ polar env.</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All of those Romance languages select the polarity subjunctive with at least one predicate, i.e. ‘remember’ (in green).

(175)  a. George ricorda che Ringo è in ospedale per una tonsillectomia.

   “George remembers that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

   (Italian)

   b. ??George ricorda che Ringo sia in ospedale per una tonsillectomia.

   “George remembers that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

   (Italian)

(176)  a. George non ricorda che Ringo è in ospedale per una tonsillectomia.

   “George does not remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

   (Italian)

   b. George non ricorda che Ringo sia in ospedale per una tonsillectomia.

   “George does not remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

   (Italian)

(121’)  a. George se souvient que Ringo est à l’hôpital pour une tonsillectomie.

   “George remembers that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

   (French)

   b. *George se souvient que Ringo soit à l’hôpital pour une tonsillectomie.

   “George remembers that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

   (French)
a. George (ne) se souvient pas que Ringo est à l’ hôpital pour une tonsillectomie.
George NEG remembers not that Ringo is.3SG.PRS.IND at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.
“George does not remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

b. George (ne) se souvient pas que Ringo soit à l’ hôpital pour une tonsillectomie.
George NEG remembers not that Ringo is.3SG.PRS.SBJV at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.
“George does not remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

(French)

(177) a. (El) George recorda que (el) Ringo està a l’hospital a causa d’ una amigdalectomia.
(the) George remembers that Ringo is.3SG.PRS.IND at the hospital because of a tonsillectomy
“George remembers that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

b. *(El) George recorda que (el) Ringo estigui a l’hospital a causa d’ una amigdalectomia.
(the) George remembers that Ringo is.3SG.PRS.SBJV at the hospital because of a tonsillectomy
“George remembers that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

(Catalan)

(178) a. (El) George no recorda que (el) Ringo està a l’ hospital a causa d’ una amigdalectomia.
(the) George NEG remembers not that Ringo is.3SG.PRS.IND at the hospital because of a tonsillectomy
“George does not remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

b. (El) George no recorda que (el) Ringo estigui a l’ hospital a causa d’ una amigdalectomia.
(the) George NEG remembers not that Ringo is.3SG.PRS.SBJV at the hospital because of a tonsillectomy
“George does not remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

(Catalan)

(179) a. George recuerda que Ringo está en el hospital por una amigdalectomia.
George remembers that Ringo is.3SG.PRS.IND at the hospital for a tonsillectomy
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“George remembers that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

b. *George recuerda que Ringo esté en el hospital por una amigdalectomía.
   “George remembers that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

(180) a. ?George no recuerda que Ringo está en el hospital por una amigdalectomía.
   “George does not remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

b. George no recuerda que Ringo esté en el hospital por una amigdalectomía.
   “George does not remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

(181) a. George recorda que Ringo está no hospital para uma tonsillectomia.
   “George remembers that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

b. *George recorda que Ringo esteja no hospital para uma tonsillectomia.
   “George remembers that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

(182) a. George não recorda que Ringo está no hospital para uma tonsillectomia.
   “George does not remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

b. George não recorda que Ringo esteja no hospital para uma tonsillectomia.
   “George does not remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”
tonsillectomia.
tonsillectomy

“George does not remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

(Brazilian Portuguese)

(183) a. George îşi aminteşte că Ringo e la spital pentru o
tonsillectomie

“George remembers that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

b. *George îşi aminteşte ca Ringo să fie la spital pentru o
tonsillectomie

“George remembers that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

(Romanian)

(184) a. George nu îşi aminteşte că Ringo e la spital pentru o
tonsillectomie

“George does not remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

b. George nu îşi aminteşte ca Ringo să fie la spital pentru o
tonsillectomie

“George does not remember that Ringo is at the hospital for a tonsillectomy.”

(Romanian)

This uniformity across Romance languages suggests that the polarity subjunctive may have developed from a common source, possibly “Mother Romance”, i.e. Latin. In some of the daughter languages, there is further data which point to an origin from an earlier state of the language and deserve a diachronic explanation (e.g. est-ce que in Modern French). This chapter is dedicated to discussing the uses of the subjunctive in Latin and Old French², so as to expose the origins of the Modern

²In addition to the review of the relevant literature, I undertook further data collection in Late Latin, Vulgar Latin, and Old French. For Late Latin, I used the works in the Digital Library of Late-Antique Latin Texts (dilibLT): http://diliblt.lett.unipmn.it. Here is a link to the license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/legalcode. For Old French, I used the works in the Base de français médiéval (BFM): http://bfm.ens-lyon.fr/.
French polarity subjunctive.

2.1 THE SUBJUNCTIVE IN LATIN AND OLD FRENCH

It is difficult to pinpoint one common denominator for all uses of the subjunctive in Latin and Old French, as for Modern French. Therefore, this section is dedicated to present the relevant uses known as well as some of the literature attempting to account for the Latin and Old French subjunctives.

2.1.1 Uses of the Subjunctive in Latin

Pinkster (2015) asserts that certain uses of the subjunctive are purely “grammatical” (in the sense of “grammaticalized”) in Latin, specifying that these grammatical uses could have originated from certain semantic functions predating early Latin, and therefore that they are not functional synchronically. Yet, he further presents the different uses of the subjunctive in Latin and categorizes this mood into two main categories: the deontic subjunctive and the potential subjunctive further divided into non-factual and counterfactual situations.

2.1.1.1 The Deontic Subjunctive

According to Pinkster, the Latin deontic subjunctive is further categorized in three: for commands, wishes, and concessions, although it does not present additional morphemes for any of the distinctions. In addition to the apparent semantic distinction with the potential subjunctive, the deontic subjunctive can be differentiated in the early and classical period by its use of the negation *ne* — where applicable — instead of the negation *non*.

First, the deontic subjunctive is used in commands and prohibitions. As such, it can be used as an imperative, to supplement for personal forms inexistent in the actual Latin imperative mood (e.g. the third-person which will be expressed by the jussive or *coniunctivus iussivus*; see 185-c) or provide further semantic distinctions such as adhortation (*coniunctivus adhortativus*; see 185-a) or exhortation (*coniunctivus exhortativus*; see 185-b).
The deontic subjunctive also applies to wishes, although some grammars classify this use as jussive.

Finally, the deontic subjunctive appears in concessive constructions of the type below, where the subjunctive brings about a desired, supposed/granted situation.
The deontic subjunctive can also be referred to as “volitive” (Pinskter 2015). Subtypes of the deontic subjunctive all involve a desiderative meaning. The case of wishes is obvious. Imperatives are — sometimes realizable — wishes expresses as orders, e.g. “Go” is another way to say “I want you to go”. As for the concessives given above, the volitional connection is not so clear. Do they express a wish that something be believed so for the sake of an argument, e.g. “Suppose that Paul was never a Beatle” is somewhat equivalent to “I want for Paul not to be a Beatle in this argument”? In concessives introduced by conjunctions such as ‘although’ (or French bien que) or examples like (187-a), the concessive clause expresses a situation counter to expectations given that the main clause is true. For instance, given “although she was on vacation, she worked a few hours every day”, knowing that she worked it is a surprise that she was actually on vacation. As for the suppositions in (187-b), however, a counterfactual connection is more obvious, where ‘suppose’ is simply a way to set up an “unreal” situation other than by using the conjunction ‘if’ or ‘should’.

In direct speech, the Modern French subjunctive behaves similarly. The adhortative (188-a) and the exhortative (188-b) can be expressed in the imperative, but the subjunctive can supplement missing forms of the imperative (i.e. the jussive subjunctive), or be used as an optative (188-c).

\[(188) \quad \begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{Allons-y} ! \\
& \quad \text{go.1PL.PRS.IMPV-there} \\
& \quad \text{“Let’s go!”}
\end{align*}
\]

\[(188) \quad \begin{align*}
b. & \quad \text{Allez} ! \\
& \quad \text{go.2PL.PRS.IMPV} \\
& \quad \text{“Go!”}
\end{align*}
\]

\[(188) \quad \begin{align*}
c. & \quad \text{Qu’il parte} ! \\
& \quad \text{that he leave.3SG.PRS.SBJV} \\
& \quad \text{“Let him leave / May he leave!”}
\end{align*}
\]

(French)

The Latin subjunctive can also be found in the complement of desideratives (or volitional predicates), as in (189), and directive predicates, as in (190).³

³The infinitive or an accusativus cum infinitivo construction can also appear with those predicates. The former is used when the subject of the embedded clause must be coreferential with the subject of the matrix (in the case of desiderative predicates). The latter is used when the embedded subject is disjoint from the subject of the matrix.
(189)  
volo  
exquiras  
want.1sg.prs.ind  enquire.2sg.prs.sbjv
“I want you to enquire.”  
(Latin; Cic. Att. 8)

(190)  
mandat  
Belgas  
adeat  
this.m.dat.sg  ask.3sg.prs.ind  belgian.acc.pl  to.go.3sg.prs.sbjv
“he asks him to go find the Belgians’”  
(Latin; Cæs. G. 3)

In Modern French, the subjunctive can also appear in the complement of desiderative predicates, as well as in indirect commands, permissions, and prohibitions. These are cases of the so-called “intensional subjunctive”, where the subjunctive needs to be selected by a predicate introducing the relevant volitive meaning.

(191) a.  
Élisabeth  
veut  
qu’ elle k  
parte.  
“Elisabeth wants her to leave.”

b.  
Élisabeth  
a  
demandé à Arthur qu’ il  
parte.  
“Elisabeth asked Arthur to leave.”

(i)  
a.  
volo  
esse  
be.inf  
liber.  
free.nom.sg  
“i want to be free.”  
(Plaut. Trin. 440)

b.  
Senatus  
te  
volut  
mihi  
ummos,  
me  
tibi  
frumentum  
give.inf  
“the senate wanted you to give me money, and me to give you the wheat.”  
(Cic. II Verr. 3, 197)  
(Latin; translated by Costantini 2009: 82)

The subjunctive, on the other hand, is mostly used in cases of obviation. Similarly, in Modern French, the subjunctive appears with desiderative predicates and directive predicates in cases of obviation, whereas the infinitive is used to express coreference (see Ruwet 1984; Farkas 1992; Schlenker 2005; Costantini 2009; B-Violette 2015 and 2016).

(ii)  
a.  
Je  
veux  
prendre  
/ faire  
une  
marche.  
“I want to go on a walk.”

b.  
Je  
veux que tu  
prennes  
/ fasses  
une  
marche.  
“I want you to go on a walk.”  
(French)
c. Le médecin a permis/interdit à Arthur que ses parents lui rendent visite.
   Lit. “The doctor allowed/forbade Arthur for his parents to visit him.”
   (French; B-Violette 2015: 9–10)

2.1.1.2 The Potential Subjunctive

The potential subjunctive (or *coniunctivus potentialis*) is used to express a potential situation, something that may or not be true, or may not be believed to be true. Pinkster (2015: 482–3) specifies that the “speaker [is not] committing himself to the assertion that this indeed, was, is, or will be the case” and that the subjunctive “make[s] the statement less direct and milder than it would be in the indicative”.⁴ This type of Latin subjunctive is not dependent on selection by an epistemic predicate. In fact, it can affect the predicate itself to render a conditional statement.

(192) Magis dicas, si scias quod ego scio.
   “You’d say that all the more if you knew what I know.”
   (Latin; Pl. Mil. 1429; translated by Pinkster 2015: 484)

The Latin potential subjunctive also appears in the complement of epistemic predicates, but it is selected by the complementizer introducing the embedded clause. In most cases, we find the conjunction *ut*.

(193) a. ... clamare coeperunt sibi ut haberet
   “they begin to claim that he should have the inheritance for himself” (Cic. Ver. 2,47)

b. dixeram de re publica ut sileremus
   “You have said that we keep silent about politics.”
   (Cic. Br. 157)

⁴Note the formulation in terms of speaker commitment. Cf. the discussions about speaker commitment and veridicality in Chapter 1.
The subjunctive alternates with the infinitive (or Acl) in the complement of epistemic predicates, as we can see below with the belief predicate *puto* (‘think’), the negated cognitive-factive *nescio* (‘know not’), and the verb of saying *dico* (‘say’).

(194) a. *puto* me teneri
think.1SG.PRS.IND me.ACC.SG hold.PASS.INF
“I think that I am taken.” (Cic. *Att*. 12, 18, 1)

b. *nesciebam* vitæ brevem esse cursum?
not.know.1SG.IPF.IND life.GEN.SG short.ACC.SG be.INF course.ACC.SG
“I did not know the course of life to be short.” (Cic. *Sest*. 47)

c. *dic* convenisse, egisse te de nuptiis
say.2SG.PRS.IMPV meet.INF go.on.PF.INF you.ACC.SG about marriage.ABL.PL
Say that you met and went on about the marriage. (Ter. *Heau*. 863)

The polarity subjunctive and the intensional subjunctive selected by predicates expressing possibility in Modern French would be closest to the Latin potential subjunctive. However, where Modern French needs an intensional predicate or a polarity trigger together with an epistemic predicate, the Latin subjunctive doesn’t and it introduces epistemic/potential modality or veridicality agnosticism without the need for a superordinate intensional predicate (e.g. 187, 192).

2.1.1.3 The Counterfactual Subjunctive

It must be mentioned that Pinkster argues that the counterfactual subjunctive (*coniunctivus irrealis*) needs to be differentiated from the deontic and potential subjunctives. What distinguishes this type of Latin subjunctive from the others concerns concurrent or past events which could not have taken place.

keep.quiet.PF.INF wish.1SG.IPF.SBJV
“I wish I’d kept quiet.” (Pl. *Cur*. 512)

b. *Quid igitur hunc paucorum annorum iuvare potuisset?*
how then this.M.ACC.SG few.GEN.PL year.GEN.PL help.INF can.3SG.PL.PF.SBJV
“How, then, could he have gained any advantage by the addition of a few more years of life?” (Cic. *Amic*. 11)
Pinkster’s argument in favour of this additional category is that the imperfect and the pluperfect subjunctive are not, to the present subjunctive, what the imperfect is to the indicative. That is to say that the past tense of the subjunctive does not solely contribute a difference from the indicative in terms of tense, but also in terms of counterfactuality. I must disagree with that statement as we have seen examples of deontic and potential subjunctive which introduce a notion of counterfactuality. Furthermore, a subjunctive with future temporal or volitional association, or a potential association does not correspond to what would be factual in the context. In fact, Pinkster did mention that the use of the potential subjunctive meant that the speaker was not committed to the truth of its clause. Therefore, the subjunctive can simply be associated with “veridical agnosticism”; events that are not believed to be true by the speaker at the time of the speech act. This is in line with the account of the French polarity subjunctive adopted earlier in this dissertation.

2.1.2 Uses of the Subjunctive in Old French

In Old French, similar categories of subjunctive have been identified. Jensen (2017)⁵ presents two main categories of subjunctive.⁶

2.1.2.1 The Volitional Subjunctive

The first is the volitional subjunctive, and the second the subjunctive of doubt. The first category is used to express wishes, orders, exclamation, or concession in main and embedded clauses. In

---

⁵Subsequent examples in this subsection are taken from Jensen (2017). Excluded from Jensen’s dataset are examples with first- and second-person plural forms as they are the same in the subjunctive as they are in the indicative.

⁶We see the apparition of the complementizer que (‘that’) in Old French, as well increased usage of finite complement clauses. This complementizer has been argued to derive from different sources, including the relative pronoun quod (‘which’; Bichakjian 1982), the causal conjunction quia (‘because’; Herman 1963), or another form of the relative pronoun, having undergone phonetic erosion.
subordinate clauses\textsuperscript{7}, the volitional subjunctive is selected by desiderative predicates and directive predicates.\textsuperscript{8}

(196) a. Je veuil bien qu’ il aillent ensemble.
   “I would like for them to go together.” (Rose 4590)

b. J’ ordonne qu’ après mon trespas a mes hoirs en face
   “I order that after my death, the demand is made to my heirs.” (Villon 771)

The indicative rarely appears in the same contexts, but they may as in (197).

(197) a. Ço ne vuelt il que sa medre le sachet.
   “He does not want his mother to know it.” (Alexis 249)

b. Je ne veull pas que tu me dis d’ avoir garce
   “I do not want you to tell me to have a woman’ (Garçon 135)

Jensen argues that the above indicative dis is due to poetic license and mentions that other cases involve modality under the form of conditionals.

\textsuperscript{7}The subjunctive is used more often than the infinitive in cases where obviation occurs in Modern French (cf. Arteaga 1993; Martineau 1994, 1995).

\textsuperscript{8}As in Modern French, verbs of expectation (e.g. attendre “expect”), prohibition (e.g. interdire “prohibit”), and permission (e.g. permettre “allow”) are also included in this category.
(198)  
Et mes sire Kes ot talant, qu’il demanderoit  la bataille.
and my lord Kes have.3SG.PRET.IND desire that he.3SG.COND.PRES the battle
“And my lord Kes had the desire, to ask for battle.”  (Old French; Yvain 2228)

The directive ordonner (‘order’) only takes the future indicative if the order must be executed as per the request of an ultimate authority — such as the king’s — when there is no room left for doubt about the possibility that it will be executed.

(199)  
l’on ordonna que le roy ne verroit point le roi
3SG.EXCL.PRO order.3SG.PRET.IND that the king NEG see.3SG.COND.PRES at.all the king
d’Angleterre
of England
“it was ordered that the king would not see the king of England at all”
(Old French; Paris 25,10)

Jensen further lists “effort” and “prevention” as subcategories of volitional subjunctives. Those are the equivalent of Modern French causatives.

(200)  
faites que jou voise avoec.
do.2PL.PRS.IND that I go.1SG.PRS.SBJV with
“make it so that I go with [him]’
(Old French; Ponthieu 516)

The case of “prevention” is similar as it seems to involve a negated result. For example, empêcher que (‘prevent that’) is similar to faire en sorte que ne pas (‘make it so that not’).

(201)  
Et est si clere qu’el n’enpeesche pas que les especes... ne soient
and is so clear that he NEG prevent not that the species... NEG be.3PL.PRS.SBJV presented.
presented
“And it is so clear that he does not prevent the species to be introduced.”
(Old French; Chirurgie 224)

If a volitional interpretation is missing and a fact is being committed to instead, attitude verbs which can be associated with the volitional subjunctive take the indicative.

(202)  
Si te confesse que j’ay tort.
thus you.2SG.DAT.CL confess that I have.1SG.PRS.IND wrong
“Thus I confess to you that I am wrong.”
(Old French; Griseldis 1227)

Similarly, if an action is promised or guaranteed, the indicative is more frequent.
I promise you and swear on my faith that tomorrow in the early morning I will send letters to Spain. (Old French; Paris 5,28)

Apart from volitional predicates, some judgement predicates select the subjunctive due to their volitional semantics, according to Jensen. For instance, verbs of necessity consistently select the subjunctive in Old French.

It is necessary for the whole body to die. (Old French; Chirurgie 358)

The indicative is, as we’ve seen, used to express a fact.
a. Mult sovent le blasmeient que tel vie meneit very often him.Acc.Cl blame.3pl.Ipf.Ind that such life lead.3sg.Ipf.Ind
They would blame him often for leading such a life. (Becket 3621)

b. Bien m’agree que vous et moy sommes d’accort. well me.Dat.Cl agree that you.Pl and me are.1pl.Prs.Ind in agreement
“It pleases me that you and I are in agreement.” (Mel. 2379)

c. Et quant il plot a Nostre Seignor que les teniebres de la nuit and when it please.3sg.Pret.Ind to Our Lord that the dark of the night furent abessies be.3pl.Pret.Ind lowered
“It happened that the dark of the night diminished’ (Queste 21,11)

d. est ce donc droiz que il a ainsi descouvert nostre conseil? is it thus right that he have.3sg.Prs.Ind thus discovered our counsel
“Is it right that he discovered our counsel?” (Vergi 808)

(207) demonstrates that a downward entailing environment, such as a question, does not necessarily call for the subjunctive.

According to Jensen, emotive predicates behave differently from judgement predicates in selecting the indicative in Old French, unless they involve volition, an element of fear, or unless the predicate is interpreted as a declarative.

(208)  

a. j’enraige que je n’ay mon argent. I enrage.1sg.Prs.Ind that I neg have.1sg.Prs.Ind my money
“I enrage for not having my money.” (Pathelin 828)

b. je seroye moult joyeux que fussent conjoins par mariage I be.1sg.Cond.Pres very happy that be.3pl.Prs.Sbjv joined by marriage ensemble.
together
“I would be very happy for them to be joined together by marriage.” (Paris 14,33)

c. il n’a cure qu’on le conoisse. he neg have.3sg.Prs.Ind care that 3sg.Excl.Pro him.Acc.CL know.3sg.Prs.Sbjv
“he takes no heed to be known.” (Lancelot 6043)

d. Ne veulent pas qu’ele se plaigne Que largement ne neg want.3pl.Prs.Ind not that she self complain that fully neg
soit paiee. be.3sg.Prs.Sbjv paid
“They do not want for her to complain about it not being fully paid.” (Anjou 1828) (Old French)

I disagree with this statement and would argue that the subjunctive with emotive predicates should be interpreted similarly to the subjunctive with judgement predicates, where (208-a) takes the indicative because it is factual or objectively veridical (as we’ve discussed, they are emotive-factives), and (208-c) takes the subjunctive since the speaker does not deem it important whether the event in the subordinate clause is a fact or not. The other examples can be explained with volition.

As hinted at above, Jensen separates emotive predicates from predicates which express fear according to their behaviour with respect to mood selection. Jensen mentions that fear (e.g. ‘be afraid that’) expresses a negated desire (e.g. ‘desire that not’) hence always takes the subjunctive⁹.

(209) j’ay eu grand paour que vous eussez aucun grant damage.

“I was afraid that you would have had great damage.” (Old French; Quinze Joies 101)

Finally, we come to the category which is associated with the polarity subjunctive in Modern French. According to Jensen, utterances expressing certainty, likelihood, or probability include intensional predicates which select the indicative (210), while uncertainty, doubt, or impossibility is associated instead with the subjunctive (211). The difference can be subtle: for instance, cuidier (‘think’) selects the indicative but cuidier bien (‘think well’) selects the subjunctive, since the addition of the

⁹Solltmann (1918) found some examples of fear predicates with indicatives.

(i) Et crirent qu’assez tost l’ocirroit, Se devant li son main and fear.3PL.PRS.IND that enough early him.ACC.CL kill.3SG.COND.PRES if in.front him his hand feroit do.3SG.COND.PRES

“And they fear that he would kill him soon, if his hand were before him.” (Erec 223)

However, the conditional provides a modal element that the subjunctive cannot provide, as it is part of a conditional statement. Similarly, the indicative is used below to express the existence of a past action, which the subjunctive cannot.

(ii) Ço diseient et ço cremeient Que li Normant pres les siveient. that say.1PL.IPF.IND and that fear.3PL.IPF.IND that the Normans close them.ACC.CL follow.3PL.IPF.IND

“They said so and so they feared that the Normans were following them close.” (Rou III 8887)
adverb *bien* attenuates belief/certainty, according to Jensen. This distinction is not always consistent as we shall see in examples further below; it arguably finds its source in the intention of the speaker rather than in functional elements found within the same utterance.

(210)  

a. **si saibien que vos estes prestrs.**  
indeed know.1.SG.PRS.IND well that you.PL be.2.PL.PRS.IND priests  
“indeed I know [very] well that you are priests.”  
(Quest 54,2)

b. **Bien est verté que j’ay amé.**  
well is truth that I have.1.SG.PRS.IND loved  
“It is true that I have loved.”  
(Villon 193)

c. **Et je cuits que cist dui destrier sont vostre.**  
and I think.1.SG.PRS.IND that these two steeds be.3.PL.PRS.IND yours.PL  
“And I think that these two steeds are yours.”  
(Lancelot 282)

(211)  

a. **car il doute que li feus ne soit entremellez**  
because he doubt.3.SG.PRS.IND that the branches expl be.3.SG.PRS.SBJV intertwined de venim.  
of venom  
“because he suspects that the branches are intertwined with venom”  
(Quest 94,21)

b. **Je cuide bien que ce soit voir.**  
I think well that it be.3.SG.PRS.SBJV true  
“I would think that it is true.”  
(Gace 2791)

c. **Quidet li reis qu’ele se seit pasmede**  
think.3.SG.IPF.IND the king that she self be.3.SG.PRS.SBJV swooned  
“The king thinks that she fainted” [in a context where the reader learns that she is dead]  
(Rol 3724)

d. **Il est bien fol de ainsi legierement despendre ung si grant tresor,**  
he be.. 3.SG.PRS.IND well mad to thus lightly depend a so great treasure  
lequel est impossible qu’il luy puisse longuement which be.3.SG.PRS.IND impossible that it him.DAT.CL can.3.SG.PRS.SBJV long.ADV  
durer.  
last  
“He is quite mad to depend thus upon such a great treasure which could not last him long.”  
(Paris 34,12)

Therefore the subjunctive is used to express an attenuated belief (e.g. 211-b), false belief (e.g. 211-
c), but it can also be used euphemistically (e.g. 212).

\[(212)\text{ce croi je bien qu’ ele soit morte this think.1SG.PRS.IND I well that she be.3SG.PRS.SBJV dead} \]

“I think that she may be dead.”

(Old French; Vergi 875)

Supposition selects the subjunctive, like in Modern French.

\[(213)\text{a. Prendons que je voise vers soy take.1SG.IMPV that I go.1SG.PRS.IND towards self} \]

“Take it that I go towards you.”

\[(\text{Mel. 1399})\]

\[(213)\text{b. nous suposon que ele soit procurer selonc la we suppose.1PL.PRS.IND that she be.3SG.PRS.SBJV procured according the doctrine Thederic.}\]

\[\text{“we suppose that she was given the doctrine of Thederic.” (Chirurgie 1204)}\]

(Old French)

Unlike in Modern French, fictive predicates however are observed with the indicative.

\[(214)\text{J’y imagine... Que c’ est nature feminine I imagine.1SG.PRS.IND... that it be.3SG.PRS.IND nature feminine} \]

“I imagine that it is feminine nature’

(Old French; Villon 609)

Similarly, faire accroire (“make believe’) also takes the indicative.

\[(215)\text{car l’ on lui fait acroire que son pere because 3SG.EXCL.PRO him.DAT.CL make.3SG.PRS.IND to.believe.INF that his father}\]

\[\text{ou sa mere les li ont donnez. and his mother them.ACC.CL him.DAT.CL have.3PL.PRS.IND give.INF} \]

“because he has been made to believe that his father or his mother gave it to him.”

(Old French; Quinze Joies 10)

Jensen suggests that the indicative here is associated with the strong belief of the persuaded individual. I propose instead that the use of the indicative still depends on the perspective of the speaker and what they desire to express, as it is clearer with some other verbs that the subjunctive and indicative can be used interchangeably depending on the interpretation desired. ‘Seem’, for instance, can come with either.
(216)  a. Bien pert qu’il est après mangier.
    “It seem.3SG.PRS.IND that he is about to eat.”  (Yvain 590)

    b. Et en son visage bien pert Que de douleur ait moult
    “And it appears in his face that he suffered from much pain.”  (Gace 1325)

    c. Il semble que Dex me veult nuire.
    “It seems that God wants to harm me.”  (Anjou 4852)

    d. Je semble que vous soiez yvres.
    “It seems to me that you are drunk.”  (Théophile 372)

(Old French)

Similarly, ‘seem’ accompanied by a dative clitic can take either the subjunctive or the indicative.

(217)  a. et lui semble qu’il n’a aultre chouse a
    “and it seems to him that there is nothing else to do.”  (Quinze Joies 11)

    b. ce me semble que ce soit mout grant senefiance
    “It seems to me that it would be of great significance’  (Queste 83,17)

(Old French)

‘Pretend’ behaves similarly, although the speaker knows when using this verb that the embedded clause is not true.

(218)  a. et fet sanblant qu’il ait peor.
    “and he pretends that he is afraid.”  (Lancelot 5672)

    b. laquelle fait semblant qu’il ne lui en
    “which.F.SG do.3SG.PRS.IND seeming that he NEG him.DAT.CL in
    matter.3SG.PRS.IND
which pretends that it does not matter to her” (Quinze Joies 18)

(Old French)

In the above section, I presented the mainstream categorizations of the subjunctive in Latin and Old French. We observed that the different uses of the subjunctive tends to be separated in two categories: the volitional or desiderative subjunctive and the potential subjunctive. This dichotomy mirrors the situation in Modern French, where there is an intensional, often selected by verbs with a volitional element (i.e. verbs of necessity, desideratives, and directives), and a polarity subjunctive, triggered in the complement of epistemic predicates sometimes explicitly expressing improbability and doubt.

2.2 Discussion of the Status of the Subjunctive in Old Romance

I summarize my observations with respect to the Old Romance data, discuss the analyses put forth to explain the Old Romance data presented in the last section, and propose an analysis for the older languages.

2.2.1 Irrealis

The notions of realis and irrealis are often used to account for mood selection in Romance, especially in Latin. For the purpose of this brief discussion, we will differentiate irrealis from the dissociation of a speaker from the belief that an event is true, which will be discussed below. Irrealis is taken to signify that an event does not belong to the actual world (of a speaker’s belief).

Winters (1987), among others, proposes non-reality as the semantic contribution of the subjunctive in Old French. As we observed from Jensen’s (2017) data, the indicative is used in situations associated with “reality” (from the point of view of the speaker), i.e. to express factivity, certainty, or guaranteed results. However, we also observed that the future indicative and the conditional indicative can be used instead of the subjunctive. Those tenses do not correspond to “reality”. Furthermore, fictive predicates and other verbal expressions associated with non-reality may select the indicative instead of the subjunctive. If the indicative is also compatible with irrealis, it is reasonable
to conclude that this notion cannot explain mood selection in Latin.⁰

2.2.2 The Mood of Subordination

The Latin subjunctive has also been argued to be the mood of subordination (Kruczkiewicz 1894, a.o.). Similarly, Murphy (2008) argues that some of the (increased) uses of the subjunctive in the evolution of the French language is due to the syntheticity of *que* (‘that’) and the subjunctive. *Que* being the form of the French complementizer, this would make the embedded subjunctive the mood of complementation. However, other moods have been observed in subordinate clauses in Latin and French, and often the subjunctive alternates with the indicative in the complements of epistemic predicates (introduced by *que* in French). That is not to say that *que* is not part of the French subjunctive paradigm, but rather that it cannot be the main or only reason for its selection.

2.2.3 Non-Veridicality

I concluded the last chapter by adopting an approach to the polarity subjunctive in Modern French in terms of speaker commitment (or veridicality). I will address the question whether a similar approach can account for the Old Romance data here. When reviewing Pinkster and Jensen above, I stressed, in the sections about the potential subjunctive or subjunctive of doubt, that they both mention that the subjunctive is used when doubt is expressed or there is a lack of commitment whether an action was, is, or will be carried out or not, or for an attenuated effect. The indicative, on the other hand, is said to express factivity or certainty. This is mostly in line with the notion of veridicality defined earlier.¹¹

2.2.4 The Differences between Latin and Old French

The figure below summarizes the different uses of the volitional subjunctive, the potential subjunctive, and the indicative in Latin and Old French.

---

⁰See De Haan (2012) for an in depth discussion of why realis and irrealis cannot be grammatical features.

¹¹A euphemic/polite use of the subjunctive is not explained via an account in terms veridicality, but that is not to say that such a use could not have developed from anti-veridical uses of the subjunctive.
Some differences between these two stages are worth reiterating. In Latin, the subjunctive need not be subordinated under an attitude predicate. It can appear in main clauses to contribute the semantic interpretations discussed earlier, i.e. a volitional element or a potential element. The deontic (or volitional) subjunctive is the continuation of the Proto-Indo-European optative and therefore expresses wishes. In subordinate clauses, most attitude predicates take the infinitive or the AcI construction, and rarely do they take the subjunctive which may also be specifically selected by certain complementizers (e.g. *ut* ‘so that’).\(^1\) Finally, the potential subjunctive need not appear in down-

---

\(^1\)It is not the case that the licensing of the subjunctive under a specific set of complementizers has evolved into the use of the subjunctive in Old French (any such complementizer was replaced by — and would be the equivalent of — *que* ‘that’ there). Complementizer use in Latin, so far, does not provide clues as to the development of the polarity subjunctive in Romance.

The directionality of complements also seems irrelevant. Latin subordinate clauses appear as branching either to the left or to the right of the main verb. Early and classical texts are reported to show more left-branching clauses than right-branching ones with morphological subordination, and more right-branching than left-branching with clauses introduced by a conjunction. Murphy (2008) reports, across various texts, 78–79% left-branching of morphologically subordinated clauses versus 21–22% for subordinate clauses introduced by a conjunction. Bamman *et al.* (2008) report ratios for the use of AcI instead of subordinate clauses introduced by *quod* (“which” > “because” > “that”) and *quia* (“because” > “that”) with verbs of saying and verbs of perception of 99.5% for classical authors versus 25–30% for...
ward entailing environments.

In Old French, the use of the subjunctive in main clauses is more restricted. In embedded clauses, the infinitive and AcI constructions are mostly replaced with finite clauses which may be in the subjunctive or the indicative depending on the speaker's intentions. These moods are most often embedded under attitude verbs which already express volition or counterfactuality. The subjunctive appears more frequently in downward entailing environments than the indicative does, since negation and question environments contribute to an interpretation of uncertainty.

2.2.5 The Semantic Contribution of the Subjunctive

In this subsection, I will attend to determine 1) whether there is one single unified account for the subjunctive in Old Romance, and 2) what semantic contribution is offered by the subjunctive.

2.2.5.1 Emotive-factives

To answer the first question, let us discuss whether we can find a common denominator for the volitional subjunctive and the potential subjunctive. In Latin and Old French, the emotive-factives do not consistently select the indicative, as their factivity might entail. In fact, emotive-factives may select either mood in Old French (see 208) and in Latin (e.g. gaudeo ‘be delighted’; laetor ‘rejoice’; admiratus esse ‘be admiring’ in 219 and 220), in addition to the infinitive and accusativus cum infinitivo constructions.

(219) Classical Latin

a. sane gaudeo, quod te interpellavi

indeed rejoice.1SG.PRS.IND that you.SG.ACC.CL interrupt.1SG.PF.IND

‘indeed I rejoice for having interrupted you’ (Cic. Leg. 3,1,1)

later authors. They further report ratios for the left placement of complements instead of right placement of 46.5% for classical authors and 0–3% for later authors. Late texts are reported to show more conjunctions and, therefore, more right-branching subordination. It is argued that Latin underwent a change from SOV to SVO word order, together with the development of determiners from demonstrative pronouns, which has further influenced the preference for right-branching subordination (Calboli 1978; Lehmann 1989; Cuzzolin 1994). Furthermore, the loss of the AcI construction can be correlated with the loss of case markings between Vulgar Latin and the older Romance languages (Herman 1989).

Chapter 3 focusses on the development and grammaticalization of the subjunctive in Romance, and therefore will provide more information as to the changes between Latin and Old French that led to the rise of the polarity subjunctive.
b. admiratusque sum, quod nihilo minus ad me tua manu scripsisses.  
   “and I am admiring that nonetheless you would write to me with your own hand”  
   (Cic. Att. 6,9,6)

In (219-a), the emotive-factive *gaudeo* (‘rejoice’) selects the indicative as the complement clause refers to an event accomplished in the past. In (219-b), even though the event expressed by the subordinate clause has been realized as well, the setting is slightly different and calls for a subjunctive. The embedded clause is in fact an event counter to expectations as supported by the presence of *nihilo minus* (‘nonetheless’). The context is that the addressee of the letter was known to be sick, and Cicero is pleasantly surprised to receive news from him by his own hand. This is a disguised concessive situation, where *even though* the addressee was sick, he still wrote to Cicero; *whether* he was sick or not, the addressee would still write. Note here the emphasized element of the paraphrases I advance.¹³

Note also that, with the last interpretation in mind, no time is specified as to the realization of the embedded event. The subjunctive is consistently used in this situation when embedded under attitude predicates.

(220) Late Latin

a. gaudet quod nullam iam habeat cum mortuo societatem  
   “he rejoices that he never should have any society with the dead”  
   (Heg. 5,53,45)

b. dicunt ergo laetari se, quod futuras aerumnas suas felicitatis eius prosperitate ualeant  
   “therefore they say to rejoice that they should be worth avoiding his future tribulations for the prosperity of his happiness.”  
   (Lact. Plac. 2,20)

¹³The focal particle ‘even’ (Rooth 1985) and the disjunctive element ‘whether’ introduce a set of alternatives, which links back to Villalta’s analysis of the subjunctive introduced in Chapter 1.
c. Gaudet ergo, quia illi occidere, quos
rejoice.3SG.PRS.IND thus because/that they kill.3PL.PF.IND those.ACC
iusserat
command.3SG.PLUF.IND
“Therefore he rejoices, because/that they killed those he commanded them to”
(Adnot. super Luc. 5,371)

Here, (220-c) shows an indicative in the complement of the emotive-factive predicate while the
(220-a) and (220-b) show a subjunctive. The case of (220-c) is similar to that of (219-a), where the
perfect indicative is used to indicate that the event has been realized in the past. For the other two
examples, no time is specified for the realization of the event; only a non-specific time is specified in
(220-b), i.e. ‘never’. In both cases, the experiencer should rejoice at the prospect of the embedded
event, whether it will be realized or not is unimportant. There is a set of alternatives associated with
the realization of the subordinate event and some are more desirable than others.

(208’) Old French

a. j’ enraige que je n’ ay mon argent.
I enrage.1SG.PRS.IND that I NEG have.1SG.PRS.IND my money
“I enrage for not having my money.” (Pathelin 828)

b. je seroye moult joyeux que fussent conjoines par mariage
I be.1SG.COND.PRES very happy that be.3PL.PRS.SBJV joined by marriage
together
“I would be very happy for them to be joined together by marriage.” (Paris 14,33)

c. il n’ a cure qu’ on le conoisse.
he NEG have.3SG.PRS.IND care that 3SG.EXCL.PRO him.ACC.CL know.3SG.PRS.SBJV
“he takes no heed to be known.” (Lancelot 6043)

The situation is similar in Old French, where (220-a) selects the indicative as the embedded clause
represents a current situation — at the time. In (220-b) and (220-c), no specific time is expressed
for the realization of the embedded event and it is — at least — not indicated whether it will ever
be realized.

As the Old Romance data suggest, the indicative can be selected by attitude predicates to express
the specific point in time in which the embedded event is realized, while the subjunctive doesn’t.
This “veridical agnosticism” is one common denominator between the volitional and potential subjunctives.

2.2.5.2 Counterfactuality, Epistemic Modality, and Optative Modality

Some studies of grammaticalization suggest a link between epistemic modality, optative modality, conditional modality, and counterfactuality.

Traugott (1985: 291–2) identifies five main sources of if-markers cross-linguistically: 1) words associated with epistemic modality (i.e. possibility or doubt according to Traugott) or optative modality (e.g. suppose); 2) existential copulas (e.g. Swahili i-ki-wa ‘it being that’); 3) interrogatives (e.g. Hua -ve); 4) topic markers or demonstratives (e.g. Lat. and Rom. si); or 5) expressions of temporal origin (e.g. when(ever), so long as). The fourth source type applies to Latin and Romance, where the conditional marker si derives from Proto-Italic *sei (Lat. si ‘if’ < ‘in this’; ‘so’ or ‘in that’ as in sidis placet ‘so/in that it pleases the gods’).¹⁴ Therefore there was a time when the conditional marker in (192) contributed to indicating that the situation discussed was counterfactual as “You’d say that all the more in this [situation where] you know what I know’.

(192') Magis dicas, si scias quod ego more say.2SG.PRS.SBJV if know.2SG.PRS.SBJV what.ACC.SG I.NOM.SG
scio.
know.1SG.PRS.IND
“You’d say that all the more if you knew what I know.’

(Latin; Pl. Mil. 1429; translated by Pinkster 2015: 484)

The other sources of conditional markers contribute to the same semantics. The first source, for instance, also applies to Latin, as it can explain the concessive uses of the deictic subjunctive as well as the example in (221) that Pinkster takes to be a case of potential subjunctive.

(221) Vel hoc quis non credat...?
or/If you’d like this.ACC.SG who.NOM.SG NEG believe.3SG.PRS.SBJV
“Who would not believe this...?”

(Latin; Ter. An. 489; translated by Pinkster 2015: 485)

¹⁴赛伊 may come from the locative singular of *so-, the Proto-Indo-European deictic pronoun “this, that’ (de Vaan 2018).
The conjunction vel (‘or’) comes from PIE *welsi ‘you wish’ (> *wels > *well), the second-person singular form of the verb ‘want’ (Walde-Hoffman II 1954). Given this etymological origin, we can see where this type of subjunctive could have come from. (221) could be interpreted as “Who do you want not to believe this”, if vel had a volitive meaning. The concessive can be interpreted similarly. We can see from the English translations of the above (220 and 221) how volitional semantics can be relevant to the development of potential modality. Furthermore, the Latin subjunctive is a merger of the Proto-Indo-European subjunctive and optative moods (Jasanoff 1991, a.o.).

Similarly in English, “would’ comes from the Old English wolde, a past form of willan ‘will’ or ‘want’. Van Gelderen (2011) adopts a feature-based approach to language change. She argues that wolde (‘wanted’) was characterized by semantic features of volition, expectation, and intention, as the past tense form of willan (‘want’).

(222) ta þreo kingess... forenn till Herode king To witenn whatt he wollde.
“The three kings went to King Herod to know what he wanted.”
(Old English; Ormulum 6571; Middle English Dictionary)

When willan’s (‘want’) semantic features are reanalyzed as a formal feature “future” for it to become the future auxiliary “will”, its past tense also loses its volitional, expectational, and intentional features (i.e. it underwent semantic bleaching), and gains the grammatical feature “past future” (where will have = would). In Middle English, the past tense modals further underwent semantic bleaching to lose all “past” association and became “conditional”, as the modal association in addition to the past tense of would produced a hypothetical meaning (Bybee 1995). Ziegeler (2000) further argues that volitional modality and past tense need to be interpreted as an event that was not realized and that is, hence, counterfactual. As would stopped being accompanied by nominal complements, it was re-categorized as an auxiliary instead of a true verb (Lightfoot 1979, 1991; cf. Warner 1983). Finally, would undergoes reduction/erosion in Modern English, e.g. “I’d go!”.

In Classical Latin, declarative verbs and perception verbs can embed clauses in the subjunctive mood introduced by the conjunction ut. Ut derives from ‘how, as, so that’, related to the Proto-Indo-European interrogative *kwu- ‘where, how’ (> P.It. *kwutVs ‘how’; de Vaan 2018). Palmer (1906) argues that jussive and optative clauses used to include the expression associated with the
original meaning of *ut* — i.e. ‘in some way’ — and that frequency of use caused this adverb to lose this meaning and become the complementizer *ut* governing the subjunctive mood, as we know it in Latin. In this case, *ut* was originally accompanied by deontic modality, which is further associated with counterfactuality, as we’ve discussed.

The relation can also be inversed where counterfactuality leads to optative modality. The Ancient Greek ὀφείλω (‘owe’), for instance, started off as a verb, was reinterpreted as an auxiliary of deontic necessity (‘be obliged to’) due to contexts with a following infinitive, or was subjectified to express epistemic necessity (‘be certain to’), came to be used for counterfactual assertions, and was finally grammaticalized as an optative particle (Allan 2013). Allan further reports that as it became an auxiliary and then a optative element, it came to be place initially. It is placed initially 0% of the time as the lexical verb ‘owe’, 57% as an element of counterfactual assertion, and 76% as an optative element. This is in line with Ancient Greek syntax, where more grammaticalized element tend to appear near the beginning of the clause.

(223) Stage I: Lexical verb ‘owe a debt’

πολέσιν γάρ Ἐπειοὶ χρείος ὀφείλον
polésin gár epeioí khreĩos ópheílon
“For to many the Epeians owed a debt” (Λ 688; Allan 2013: 11)

(224) Stage IIa: Deontic necessity ‘must, be obliged to’

ἐγὼ δὲ ὀφείλω λέγειν τὰ λεγόμενα, πειθέσθαι μὲν οὐ ταντάπασι ὀφείλω
egó dè opheílō légein tā legómena peíthesthai men ou tantápasí opheílō
“I must say what is bold, but I don’t have to believe it at all”
(Hdt. 7.152.3; Allan 2013: 13)

(225) Stage IIb: Epistemic necessity ‘must, be certain to’

Εἰ δὲ ἐπίζων πρὸς πᾶν τὸ λεγόμενον μὴ τὸ βέβαιον ἀποδέξεις, σφάλλεσθαι
Ei dè epízōn prós pān tō legómenon mē tō bébaion apodéxeis, sphálleseis
But if you quarrel with all that is said and cannot put forth a secure position, you must be mistaken just as he who holds the contrary opinion” (Hdt. 7.50.2; Allan 2013: 14)
Stage III: Counterfactual assertions ‘should (have)’

μῆτερ ἐπεὶ μέτεκες γε μινυθάδιόν περ ἔοντα, τιμὴν πέρ μοι ὀφελλέν
μέτερ ἐπεὶ μέτεκες γε μινυθάδιόν περ ἔοντα, τιμὴν πέρ μοι ὀφελλέν

Stage IV: Counterfactual wish ‘if only’

a. οὐλὸμεν αἰθ’ ὀφελλές ἀεικελίου στρατοῦ ἄλλοι σμαίνειν, μὴ δ’ ἀμμίν ἄ
oułómen aith’ òphelles aeikelíou stratoû álloû smainein, mē d’ámmin a
ëssémen
“I wish you directed some other, unworthy army, and were not lord over us.”

(Ξ 834)

b. ἀλλὰ σε γῆρας τείρει ομίων ὡς ὀφελέν τις ἀνδρῶν ἄλλοις ἔχειν, σὺ δὲ
allá se gēras teírei omion hōs òphelén tis andrôn állos échein, sù dè
kourotéroisi meteínai
“But age weakens you which comes to all, if only some other of the fighters had your
age and you were one of the young men!”

(Δ 315–6)

(Ancient Greek; Allan 2013: 20)

Similarly, the conditional conjunction ‘if’ can be used in optative constructions as ‘if only’ in English or the French equivalent si seulement.

No matter the connection between counterfactuality, epistemic modality, or optative modality, we still need to determine one consistent interpretation associated with these that can be attributed to the subjunctive. Unlike the Modern French subjunctive which is always accompanied by a “trigger” which bears volitional, non-veridical, or optative semantics¹⁵, it is more obvious in main clauses that the Latin and Old French subjunctives can contribute a specific interpretation. For instance, the Latin and Old French subjunctive can be used as an imperative (as in 228-a), a supposition (as in 228-b), or an optative (as in 229).

¹⁵Chapter 3 provides more information as to the grammaticalization of the Modern French subjunctive.
All three seem to be more commonly “imperative” forms and the relevant, additional interpretation is supplied by the context in Old Romance. Therefore, in main clauses, the subjunctive has illocutionary force. In subordinate clauses, however, two distinct contexts may still select the subjunctive. The interpretations associated with these contexts are: 1) illocutionary force when embedded under volitional predicates (including directive predicates and other predicates that we discussed selected the volitional subjunctive); and 2) veridical agnosticism in other epistemic contexts as well as in conditionals, as discussed. Even though, we can collapse certain cases of volitional and potential subjunctive in subordinate clauses into one single category as well, such that we would only have one category of embedded subjunctive, i.e. the subjunctive which contributes to veridical

16All three can be translated into Modern French with an imperative or a subjunctive supplying for a lack of imperative forms.

(i) a. Que chacun dise ce qu’il veut.
   “Let each one say what he pleases.”
   b. Appelle-les chiens de chasse...
   “Whether you call them hunting dogs...”
   c. Qu’ils reposent en paix au paradis.
   “May they rest in peace in paradise.”
   (French)
agnosticism. However, we cannot argue for the illocutionary subjunctive in main clauses to also be collapsed together with the other type of subjunctive. Although the volitional subjunctive in embedded clause can find a volitional trigger in a desiderative or directive matrix predicate, the volitional subjunctive main clauses cannot and therefore, this subjunctive carries an additional optative interpretation which the potential subjunctive doesn’t.

2.3 Relevant Conclusions

In this chapter, I have presented the mainstream classifications of the subjunctive in Latin and Old French. Both stages of Romance present two types of subjunctive, i.e. the volitional subjunctive and the potential subjunctive. Further discussion concluded that the subjunctive in subordinate clauses can be interpreted as veridical agnostic, such that it is non-veridical like the Modern French subjunctive. However, in Latin and Old French, there is a need for two categories of subjunctive as subjunctives in main clause contribute a further interpretation, that is optative modality or illocutionary force. The topic of the development and grammaticalization of the subjunctive is discussed in the next chapter.
Chapter 3

A Diachronic Approach to the Polarity Subjunctive

*Everywhere*

In this chapter, I discuss the diachronic changes that occur between Latin and Modern French which influence the selection of the so-called “polarity subjunctive” in the latter. I further provide a diachronic analysis that can explain for the Modern French facts.

3.1 An Introduction to Grammaticalization

Grammaticalization (or “grammaticization”; coined by Meillet 1912 as *grammaticalisation*) is the process whereby a linguistic element (either a lexical or a functional item) undergoes a series of changes to become further functional or grammatical (Traugott 1989; Hopper & Traugott 1993; a.o.). The first element studied in such a grammatical development is referred to as the “source” — although it need not be the very original instance of the element in question — and the endpoint determined by the scholar performing the study is called the “target”. The development from one point to the other is a “cline”. Although grammaticalization can be a cycle (Van Gelderen 2011), it follows a unidirectional path until a new lexical or functional element is used to renew some functions lost during the cline, at which point a new process of grammaticalization starts and may follow similar
steps. Therefore, the cycle takes the form of a spiral rather than a closed circle. Finally, grammaticalization is a gradual process where the dating of stages is difficult, and certain, more lexicalized uses still occur even if a form has been grammaticalized (Haspelmath 1999) — or started undergoing grammaticalization.

3.1.1 Stages of Grammaticalization

One of the steps towards grammaticalization is reanalysis, when language users reconsider the meaning or function of a linguistic element. For example, as we will see in more details below, as the relative pronoun *quod* (‘which’) could be understood as causal in some environments it appeared in, it was reanalyzed as a causal conjunction. Decategorization or morphological reduction is when reanalysis causes loss in morphological properties, e.g. agreement with relative antecedent.

Semantic bleaching occurs when the item loses some specific semantic meaning associated with it, e.g. *quod* (‘which’ > ‘because’ > ‘that’) lost causal and relative meaning and it became a full complementizer. Semantic bleaching may involve specialization, which occurs when elements with the overlapping uses become more specialized into accomplishing a more restricted set of functions (e.g. *quoniam* ‘because, that’, for instance, was specialized in reintroducing a cause salient in the context). If one function takes more than one explicit form, the process of acquiring the newest form is called “layering” (e.g. when multiple conjunctions came to be used as complementizers in Latin). If one form takes more than one function, the process of acquiring the latest functions is called “divergence” (e.g. relative pronouns diverge when they acquire a causal function).

Finally, phonetic erosion occurs when phonological changes affect the grammatical element, e.g. as a Latin pronoun became *que* (‘that’) and as *que* is further elided when elision occurs (e.g. *que* ‘that’ + *il* ‘he’ > *qu’il* ‘that he’). Renewal is an additional step which replaces a grammatical meaning or category lost during grammaticalization with another, e.g. the causal meaning of *quia* or *quod* is renewed in French by the addition of a preposition to form *por que* ‘because’. As in phonological change, certain patterns of language change are more likely to occur during grammaticalization, e.g. adverb to postposition to morphological affix. The obligatory use of a grammatical mood in subordinate clauses is the final step of a given grammaticalization tendency, where lexical verbs may be
reanalyzed as modal auxiliaries, then as a morphological affix for mood, and, as the pattern is generalized, the mood becomes selected obligatorily in some subordinate clauses (Bybee et al. 1994; De Haan 2006; Nuyts 2006).

3.1.2 Subjectification

Subjectification is a specific type of grammaticalization, where an element used objectively gains a more subject-oriented interpretation (Langacker 1990, 2003, a.o.). English while, for example, was subjectified as it shifted from marker of a temporal relation (i.e. ‘during’) to bear concessive meaning (i.e. ‘although’), which expresses counterexpectancy, and therefore relates to the expectations of the speaker. In the case of modals, epistemic modality is the most grammaticalized type of modality, as it unidirectionally underwent subjectification (Van der Auwera & Plungian 1998; Allan 2013).

3.1.3 Grammaticalization Contexts

Diewald (2002) discusses three types of contexts characteristic of grammaticalization. Untypical contexts are those new contexts where a lexical or functional element is not usual, but where a new reading can arise as a conversational implicature. The critical context is general enough as to allow for structure or semantic ambiguity which allows for multiple readings of a linguistic element, thanks to which a new function is acquired. Finally, isolating contexts are those in which the new function can be isolated from the old uses of the same element. Language contact — although often considered as another, separate force that may drive language change — can contribute to grammaticalization (Hein & Kuteva 2010, a.o.); areal diffusion is a factor of linguistic convergence across different languages found in close contact and can trigger the existence of the types of contexts necessary for grammaticalization.

3.2 Language Change between Latin and Old French

As mentioned briefly in Chapter 2, some of the explicit changes relevant for the study of the development of the subjunctive between Latin and Old French are changes in complement clauses.
3.2.1 From Left-Branching to Right-Branching Subordination

The scholarly literature has moved back and forth between assuming that Latin is an SOV language (e.g. Lehmann 1974) and refuting this assumption by arguing for a lack of evidence in its favour (Adams 1976; Pinkster 1991; a.o.). Although this discussion is beyond the scope of this dissertation, it is worth pointing out some of the main arguments exchanged about the word order of Latin. Following typological studies on word order such as Greenberg’s (1963), it has been observed that Latin shares some characteristics of SOV languages: a relatively high frequency of utterances with SO or OV word order (depending on the period and the text; Bamman & Crane 2006) as in (230-a), a high frequency of left-branching adjectives (230-a), subordinate clauses (230-b), postpositions (230-c), and genitive-noun (230-d) word order.

(230) a. tu mihi sollicito animo praesto fuisti
you.sg.nom me.dat troubled.abl.sg mind.abl.sg present.be.3sg.pf.ind
“you were there for me with a troubled mind” (Cic. Fam. 3,1)

b. in meis esse malui
in mine.abl.pl be.inf prefer.1sg.pf.ind
“I preferred to be among my own” (Cic. Fam. 3,6)

c. Haec tecum coram malueram
this.acc.pl you.with talk.personally prefer.1sg.plpf.ind
“I would have preferred discussing these things with you” (Cic. Fam. 3,14)

d. optimarum artium scientiam et maximarum rerum
best.gen.pl arts.gen knowledge.acc.sg and greatest.gen.pl deeds.gen
gloriam
glory.acc.sg
“knowledge of the best arts and glory of the greatest deeds” (Cic. Fam. 3,11)

(Latin)

However, Latin is not a fully head-final language, as Japanese is; other word orders including VO (such as SVO and VSO) are not rare in Latin (e.g. 231-a). More specifically, subordinate clauses — especially heavier ones — can be right-branching (231-b); the Latin postpositions are an archaic residue, as Classical Latin mostly uses prepositions (231-c); and other specifier phrases are left-branching, including relative pronouns (231-c) and conjunctions (231-d).
a. Legi tuas litteras
   read.1SG.PF.IND your.SG.ACC-PL letters.ACC
   "I read your letters" (Cic. Fam. 10,1)

b. putavi esse hominem commonendum
   think.1SG.PF.IND be.INF man.ACC.SG aware.ACC.SG
   "I thought to be a man aware" (Cic. Fam. 10,8)

c. Acilius, qui in Graeciam cum legionibus missus est
   Acilius who.NOM.SG in Greece.ACC with legions.ABL sent is
   "Acilis, who is sent into Greece with legions" (Cic. Fam. 30,8)

d. sed non tui stomachi
   but NEG your.SG.GEN-SG taste.GEN.SG
   "but not to your taste" (Cic. Fam. 1,4)
   (Latin)

Latin, therefore, shows a mixed syntactic system which must derive from a more head-final origin as hinted by archaic postpositions, and suffixal nominal and verbal morphology. Natural languages do not necessarily follow head directionality in all their phrases. No matter the most accurate word order specification of Latin, the language undergoes a shift from mostly left-branching complement clauses — right-branching in some cases, notably when the clause is heavier and would involve more strain on the processing memory of the speaker and his addressee, — as reported continuously by scholars (Bonnet 1890; Vennemann 1975; Bauer 1995; Murphy 2008). This change has been argued to stem from the erosion of morphological cases and a consequent need to specify syntactic relations via word order (Vennemann 1975). This position is refutable, however (cf. Harris 1978); Bauer (1995) reminds us that the shift is observed before notable case erosion and that even in Old French, the SVO (with verb-second characteristics) word order of which is not controversial, displays some case markings. Therefore, morphological erosion is not the trigger for the structural changes displayed in Latin.

Raible (1992) also notes that although main clauses — “seemingly” — undergo SOV to SVO changes, embedded clauses conserve their SOV tendencies more strongly. Various Indo-European languages show strict verb final properties in subordinate clauses, while SVO — with verb-second — word order is observed in main clauses, e.g. Ancient Greek for the phonologically light forms of
the verb εἰμι (‘I am’, hence the verb ‘to be’), Vedic Sanskrit¹, and German.

(232) Audio frater et episcopē, quia regis gratiam
hear.1SG.PRS.IND brother.VOC.SG and bishop.VOC.SG that king.GEN.SG favour.ACC.SG
non habes
NEG possess.2SG.PRS.IND
“I hear, my brother and bishop, that you do not have the king’s favour”

(Vulgar Latin; Greg. Hist. Franc. 223,3)

According to Bybee (2001), subordinate clauses are the last to show conservatism of old forms, while main clauses lead with innovation. Syntactic changes are therefore more significant in main clauses.

3.2.2 Mood Changes in Vulgar Latin

Bonnet (1890) writes about the particularities of the language — and writing — of Gregory of Tours. Some of the differences he observes between Gregory and the classical authors are worth noting here. First, he notices that the indicative takes sometimes the place of the subjunctive in conditional clauses.

(233) si ille moreretur, tibi regnum illius
if he die.3SG.PRS.SBJV you.DAT.SG reign.NOM.SG this.ONE.GEN.SG
reddebatūr
return.3SG.PASS.IPF.IND
“If he were to die, his reign would return to you”  (Vulgar Latin; Greg. Hist. Franc. 2,40)

Furthermore, Bonnet observes less rigidity in the selection of mood with subordinating conjunctions such as ut (‘in order that’), cum (‘when’), dum (‘while; until’), and quamquam (‘although’).

(234) eo tempore grauiter egrotavit ita ut capillus eius a
this.ABLE.SG time.ABL.SG severely be.sick.3SG.PF.IND thus that hair.NOM.PL his from
nimia febre decederunt
excessive.ABL.SG fever.ABL.SG fall.3PL.PF.IND
“This time, he was severely sick, so that his hair fell from the excessive fever”

(Vulgar Latin; Greg. Hist. Franc. 4,16)

We can see in (234), for instance, that ut takes the indicative, although it is used in a resultative sense in the example above and would therefore take the subjunctive in the works of the classical

¹See B-Violette (2016, ms.) about this Ancient Greek and Vedic Sanskrit phenomenon.
authors. Bonnet, therefore, argues that the distinction between the different uses of these propositions, which call for the selection of different moods, is somewhat bleached. For example, *cum* is associated with a temporal meaning if followed by the indicative (‘when’) and a concessive (‘although’) when followed by the subjunctive, and yet it appears followed by the indicative in the concessive clause below.

(235) *cum* debui puritatis stolam induere, haec mihi
although have.to.1SG.PF.IND purity.GEN.SG stola.ACC.SG wear.INF this me.DAT
uestis honos exhibuit
clothing.NOM.SG charge.NOM.SG consist.of.3SG.PF.IND
“Although I had to wear the stola of purity, this clothing of mine consisted of a burden”

(Vulgar Latin; Greg. Hist. Franc. 1,47)

*Cum* in (235) can also be taken as a temporal ‘when’ which could explain the use of the indicative. However, we cannot be certain whether Gregory wanted to express counterexpectancy, which would require a concessive reading and the selection of the subjunctive, or simply a temporal relation. Often the line between the indicative and the subjunctive uses of the Latin subordinating conjunctions is not clear, as in (235), and only depends on the author’s perspective and his communicative intention in the discourse. On the other hand, sometimes the communicative intention is made clear in the context such that the presence of the indicative or the subjunctive does not influence the interpretation, e.g. in (234) where the presence of *ita* reinforces the resultative reading. Generally speaking, however, Latin subordinating conjunctions seem to undergo semantic bleaching.

### 3.2.3 The Grammaticalization of Complementizers in Old Romance

In parallel with the syntactic changes in the orientation of constituents in Latin, subordinate clauses underwent additional changes as to their construction. Infinitive clauses and the AcI construction which were more frequent in the complement of certain predicates in Classical Latin already displayed a decrease in use in Late Latin, and are less frequent than their counterpart, i.e. finite clauses. These finite clauses can still be embedded under matrix predicates without conjunctions, but the use of conjunctions is also increasing in Vulgar Latin and they undergo alterations in use and mean-
ing to become complementizers. Some have argued for a Greek influence on subordination type
in Latin (Mayen 1889). The causal conjunction *quia* (‘because’), for instance, is used to introduce
direct discourse in later Latin texts, and the hellenistic influence from *ότι* (‘thus’) is obvious when
it comes to translations of religious texts.

(236) a. ὡμολόγησεν ὅτι ἐγὼ οὐχ εἰμί ὁ Χριστός
hōmológēsen ἥτι ἐγὼ oukh eimi ho Khristós

(Ancient Greek)

b. et confessus est quia ego non sum Christus
and confessed that I neg am Christ
“And he confessed, ‘I am not the Christ.’”

(Latin) (Bonnet 1890: 665)

I will use the Latin relative pronoun *quod* (‘which’) as an example of grammaticalization towards
the function of complementizer. First, it came to be associated with a causal relation, as shown in
(237).

(237) occupandum Vesontionem quod est
occup.grdv.acc.m Vesontio.acc.m rel.pron.nom.n.sg/because be.3sg.prs.ind
oppidum maximum Sequanorum
town.nom.m greatest.nom Sequani.gen.pl
“to seize Vesontio, which/because (it) is the largest town of the Sequani”

(Latin; Cæs., Gall. 1.38; from Murphy 2008: 146).

Furthermore, the word lost all functions as a relative pronoun, as it lost agreement with its po-
tential antecedents, e.g. *amicus* in (238).

(238) Helvetiis erat amicus, quod ex ea civitate
Helvetii.dat be.3sg.ipf.ind friend.nom.m because from that.abl state.abl
Orgetorigis filiam in matrimonium duxerat
Orgetorix.gen daughter.acc into marriage.acc lead.3sg.plupf.ind
“he was friendly to the Helvetii because from that state he had taken Orgetorix’s daughter
in marriage”

(Latin; Cæs., Gall. 1.38; from Murphy 2008: 147)

This conjunction underwent further semantic bleaching and took on a more generalized mean-
ing.
(239) haec est autem vallis ingens et planissima, in this.nom be.3sg.prs.ind moreover valley.nom great.nom and flat.nom in qua filii Israel commorati sunt rel.prn.abl children.nom Israel.gen remain.nom.pl.ptcpl be.3pl.prs.ind his diebus, quod sanctus Moyses ascendit in these.abl days.abl when/because/that holy.nom Moses.nom ascend.3sg.pf.ind into montem Domini mountain.acc Lord.gen

“now this is the great and flat valley wherein the children of Israel waited during those days, when/because/that holy Moses went up into the mount of the Lord”

(Vulgar Latin; Pereg. 2.2; from Murphy 2008: 147)

Finally, it took on a fully grammatical function as a complementizer, the first to undergo the full development among *quoniam* ‘since’ and *quia* ‘because’, both of which kept a fairly specialized semantics in comparison to *quod* (Herman 1963).

(240) Pharao, quando vidit, quod filii Israel dimiserant Pharao when see.3sg.pf.ind that children.nom Israel.gen abandon.3pl.plupf.ind eum, ... isset cum omni exercituum intra Rameses him.acc go.3sg.plupf.sbjv with all.abl army.abl his.abl inside Ramses.acc

“when Pharaoh saw that the children of Israel had escaped him, ... he went with all his army into Ramses” (Vulgar Latin; Pereg. 8.5; from Murphy 2008: 148)

Therefore, *quod* became favoured as complementizer, until a phonetically eroded form, deriving from a pronoun or conjunction — which developed into *que* (‘that’) and the exact nature of which is still controversial — which underwent a similar grammaticalization process as *quod*, became available in Old French at the beginning of the 6th century (Herman 1963). French *que* (‘that’) could be given a causal interpretation at times, while it is in fact fully grammaticalized.

(241) a. n’ i ad icel ne demeint irance que il neg there is dem.pron neg show.3pl.prs.ind anger.obl that/because they.nom ne sunt a Rollant le cataigne neg be.3pl.prs.ind at Rolland.obl the.obl captain.obl

“there isn’t anyone that does not display anger that/because he is not with Roland the captain” (Roland 1845–6)

b. melz me venist, amis, que morte fusse better me.dat come.3sg.ipf.sbjv friend.nom that dead.nom be.1sg.ipf.sbjv

“it would be better for me, my beloved, that/if I were dead” (Alex. 485; from Murphy 2008: 151)
The other, non-complementizer, interpretations of *quod* and *que* are renewed with the addition of prepositions and conjunctions in Old French, e.g. the preposition *por* combined with *que* gives ‘because’.

(242) *por qe Deus cel edre li donat*  

because God.NOM this.OBL ivy.OBL him.DAT give.3SG.PRET.IND  

“because God gave him this ivy” (Old French; *Frag. Val.*; from Murphy 2008: 174)

3.3 **Veridicality from Latin to Modern French**

Cuzzolin (1994) studies the increasing substitution of the AcI construction with *verba dicendi* with finite complement clauses introduced by *quod* (‘that’). He argues that the AcI was gradually replaced by finite complement clauses introduced by *quod* from the more assertive matrix predicates to the less assertive, following Hooper’s (1975) categorization of verbal factivity and assertiveness (Cuzzolin 2013a).

Hooper (1975) advances that predicates can be sorted in four groups based on factivity and “assertiveness” (or veridicality).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1: Hooper’s Categorization of Predicates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factivity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factive predicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-factive predicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong assertive predicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak assertive predicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-assertive predicates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I make the observation further below that, similarly, the pattern known as that of the polarity subjunctive — with the selection of the subjunctive mood only in polarity environments and that of the indicative in the affirmative — seems to have spread following a similar classification of epistemic predicates. Cuzzolin observes that *quod*-clauses surpass the AcI construction as complements of intensional predicates from the factives to the assertive predicates. He observes that, first — and before emotive-factives,— *scire* is found with *quod* as a complementizer.
Early Latin

Equidem scio iam filius quod amet
indeed know.1SG.PRS.IND already son.NOM.SG that love.3SG.PRS.SBJV
meus Istanc meretricem e proxumo Philaenium
my.NOM.SG that.ACC.SG.F prostitute.ACC.SG from near.ABL.SG Philaenium

“Indeed I already know that my son loves that prostitute from next door, Philaenium”

(PAsin. 52–3)

Classical Latin

Scis enim, quod epulum dedi
know.2SG.PRS.IND because that public.meal.ACC.SG give.1SG.PF.IND

“Because you know that I gave the epulum”

(Petron. 71,9)

Late Latin

a. scio quod amore fallaris
know.1SG.PRS.IND that love.ABL.SG cheat.2SG.PASS.PRS.SBJV

“I know that you are cheated by love”

(Symm. Epist. 9,87,1)

b. Deus, tu scis quod non feci scelus.
God, you know.2SG.PRS.IND that neg make.1SG.PF.IND crime.ACC.SG

“God, you know that I did not crime.”

(ApolHist. 32)

Raible (1992) further advances that the AcI construction does not mark modality, and therefore does not carry any of the semantic distinctions contributed by the indicative or the subjunctive. An incentive to use finite subordinate clauses may therefore be to allow mood distinctions that the infinitive cannot. Other sources argue that the subjunctive and the infinitive both contribute what I identified as “veridical agnosticism” (cf. Bonnet 1890), while the indicative and the AcI further contribute expressive content (Torrego 1986).

Notice that in some of the examples above, the subordinate clause selected by scire (‘know’) is in the subjunctive mood. The complementizer introducing the clauses does not determine the mood used. There is a tendency for quod (‘that’) to combine with the subjunctive (Raible 1992; Murphy 2008), although — as we’ve seen — there are cases where it doesn’t. The inverse is true for quia (‘because; that’) which tends to be followed by the indicative.
3.3.1 Epistemic Predicates in Latin and Old French

Recall the terminology introduced in Chapter 1, where the semi-factives ‘know’ and ‘remember’ were determined to be objectively veridical, as they entail speaker commitment in a variety of environments, while other epistemic predicates are subjectively veridical, as they inherently entail the epistemic agent’s commitment only.

In Chapter 2, it was discussed that the subjunctive in Latin and Old French is commonly associated with counterfactuality or counterexpectancy. ‘Know’, as demonstrated in Chapter 1, is factive, cross-linguistically in most environments. Therefore, we would expect that it should not select the subjunctive in those environments, namely affirmatives. Raible (1992) argues that cases of factives subordinating the subjunctive in affirmative, declarative clauses, stem from stylistic or imitative choices in Latin as he deems this behaviour “scandalizing”.

(246) a. Scio enim, quia valde me bene ames.
   know.1sg.prs.ind indeed that greatly me.acc love.2sg.prs.sbjv
   “Indeed I know that you like me very much.” (Digests 44,7,61,1; from Raible 1992)

b. Scire autem nos convenit, quod nulla in hoc
   know.inf however us.acc come.3sg.prs.ind that no.nom.sg in this.abl.sg
   loco gaudeat stella nisi sola Luna
   place.abl.sg rejoice.3sg.prs.sbjv star.nom.sg except lone.nom.sg moon.nom.sg
   “However he comes to know that no star rejoices in this place, except for only the moon.”
   (Math. II, 19,9; from Raible 1992)

Bonnet (1890) reports seemingly identical utterances in the texts of Gregory of Tours with quod (‘that’) followed by the indicative in some cases and the subjunctive in others. Epistemic predicates are reported to select the indicative when conveying a proposition as factual — or at least believed to be true by the speaker; hence veridical,— while the subjunctive is allowed otherwise (Raible 1992; cf. Bonnet 1890 who argues that the choice of the subjunctive or the indicative lies in the author’s intention to convey realis or not). Ignorans (‘being ignorant’), in (247-a) for instance, implies that the speaker knows something that the epistemic agent does not. Similarly with ‘remember’ in (247-b), the epistemic agent does not remember what the speaker knows to be true.
Vulgar Latin

a. ignorans, quod... regis vocitantur liberi, ignorant that... king.gen.sg call.3pl.pass.prs.ind free
   “being ignorant of the fact that free men were called king” (Greg. Hist. Franc. 228,9)

b. Sed nec memor fuit Childeherthus quod... semper but and.not memory.nom.sg be.3sg.pf.ind Childebert.nom.sg that... always
   confused lead.away.3sg.pf.ind
   “But Childebert did not remember that he always departed confused.”
   (Greg. Hist. Franc. 148,10)

Hence, the superordinate predicates are objectively veridical in the contexts above. ‘I know’, ‘you know’, ‘you do not know’, ‘he knows’, ‘he does not know’, ‘you ignore’, ‘he ignores’, are all objectively veridical according to Raible as they presuppose that the speaker believes the contents of the embedded clause to be true. If ‘I do not know’ and ‘I ignore’ were meant to be factive, on the other hand, that would trigger a conflict, in the present tense, between the belief of the first-person epistemic agent and that of the speaker, which is the same point of perspective. Hence, ‘I do not know’ and ‘I ignore’ can be employed to express the disbelief of the speaker rather than his lack of knowledge in something that he knows to be true. This point can explain why some speakers of French accept the negated first-person ‘know’ with a subjunctive complement clause, as discussed in Chapter 1.

(127′) - Je pense — je suis sûr que Paul veut faire carrière solo.
   - “I think — I am sure Paul wants a solo career.”
   - (?)Je ne sais pas que Paul veuille faire carrière solo. En fait, je crois bien que non.
   - “I don’t know that Paul wants a solo career. In fact, I think not.”
   (Modern French)

Similarly, the factive meaning of the Modern French ignorer (‘not know’ vs. ‘ignore’) is semantically ill-formed, in present tense, with a first-person subject and an embedded indicative, as there is a conflict between not knowing and yet knowing that it is true. In the imperfect, on the other hand, there is no such conflict as the speaker’s ignorance is past and therefore fully replaced by the belief in the truth of the embedded clause.
(248) a. Je ne sais pas que Derek écrit un roman basé sur les légendes arthuréennes.
   “I don’t know that Derek writes a novel based on the Arthurean legends.”

b. J’ai ignoré que Derek écrivait un roman.
   “I did not know that Derek was writing a novel.”

(French)

The conflict in present tense is also avoided if ignore (‘not know’) selects the subjunctive. This verb, therefore, becomes anti-veridical and expresses weak belief (like ‘know’ in 127’). The issue with the imperfect in this case is that the subjunctive cannot be used in consecutio temporum, since Modern French lost the use of the imperfect subjunctive.²

(249) a. Je ne sais pas que Derek écrit un roman.
   “I don’t know that Derek writes a novel.”

b. *J’ai ignoré que Derek écrivit un roman.
   “I did not know that Derek was writing a novel.”

(French)

Raible (1992) reasons similarly and argues that, in the writings of Gregory of Tours, depending on the epistemic agent, the epistemic predicate may be objectively veridical and as such select the indicative rather than the subjunctive. The epistemic selection of the subjunctive and the indicative in Gregory’s work is therefore systematic and somewhat predictable.

Raible raises an interesting datapoint regarding preposed subordinate clauses. Scholars provide statistical data, time and time again, that subordinate clauses become more frequently right-branching. Raible himself mentions 225 examples of subordinate clauses branching to the right of matrix predicates in Historia Francorum among which only six subordinate clauses are left-branching,

²This is the case for most native speakers. The imperfect subjunctive can still be used in high register as well. However, if high register is the only context where the imperfect subjunctive is acceptable to native speakers, it is arguably not a “native” or productive form.
five of which are found under epistemic predicates. Those five utterances all show the subjunctive mood in the preposed subordinate clause.

(250) Quod autem ab eo vel deinceps fratribus sim tonsuratus, manifestum est omnibus... “However that I would be trimmed (would have my hair cut) by him or by my brothers successively, is manifest to all...” (Vulgar Latin; Greg. Hist. Franc.)

Similarly, in Modern French, a subordinate clause in the subjunctive can precede a matrix factive predicate. In this case, the subordinate is not the object of the matrix, since it already has the object clitic le (‘it’). Therefore, the subjunctive in the left-dislocated subordinate can be taken as potential or expressive.

(251) %Que Pierre soit malade, je le sais. “Whether [or not you think] Pierre is sick, I know it.” (Modern French; Raible 1992: 22)

Clitic Left-Dislocation (CLLD) does not result from movement from the position of the verbal complement to the left periphery (Cinque 1977, 1984; Iatridou 1995; De Cat 2013; Kempchinsky 2013; a.o.). Therefore, the left-dislocated clause is extra-sentential as hinted by the required use of the resumptive clitic pronoun in the matrix clause.

Furthermore, in Italian, obviation can be weakened when the subordinate clause is left-dislocated as topic or focus; otherwise, coreference between the subject of an attitude verb and the subject of its complement clause is not acceptable.³

(252) a. Gianni pensa che pro½ legga il libro presto. “Gianni thinks he/she will read the book soon.” (Costantini 2009:21)

b. Che pro½ abbia fatto POCHI ERRORI, Gianni pensa. “Gianni thinks that he/she has made FEW mistakes.” (Costantini 2009:60)

³I cannot provide similar examples for French as my informants dislike left-dislocated “subordinate” clauses.
Therefore, left-dislocation of clauses disturbs the syntactic relations we would normally observe in an utterance, as shown in (252). Information structural patterns, including those involving topic or focus, are known to disturb syntactic processes.

Bonnet (1890: 716–9) explains that Gregory’s writing style stands out from that of the classical authors in that he makes extensive use of right-dislocation of words or expressions which take a particular importance in the discourse.

(253)  
ideoque ncese est ut sub significatione personarum gloria  
for.this.and necessary is that under distinction.ABL.SG persons.gen glory.nom.sg  
detur deo.  
give.3SG.PASS.PRS.SBJV god.dat.sg  
“And for this, it is necessary that glory be given to God under the distinction of persons.”  
(Vulgar Latin; Greg. Hist. Franc. 20)

Left-dislocated subordinate clauses are simply a way to express emphasis and are not necessarily connected syntactically to the rest of the utterance. Given Latin’s tendency to drop arguments, including a potential resumptive pronoun in the matrix or subject pronouns — whether there is obviation or not,— it is not possible to provide sufficient evidence of the extra-sentential status of Latin left-dislocated clauses. However, I assume that they do not participate in the same syntactic relationships as other subordinate clauses do.

In Old French⁴, the “factives” are observed with the indicative, except with negation where they may take the subjunctive.

(254)  
a. Mais nus ne set que ce soit il.  
but nobody NEG know.3SG.PRS.IND that it be.3SG.PRS.SBJV he  
“But nobody knows that it is he”  
(Angl. 125)

b. Ne sorent que il fuissent frere.  
NEG know.3PL.PF.IND that they be.3PL.IPFF.SBJV brother  
“They did not know that they were brothers.”  
(Angl. 95)

(Old French; Winters 1987: 614)

(255) Ne savoie que je fusse feruz par m’ iniquité, et jujéz par ma  
NEG know that I were.sbjv.ipf stricken by my iniquity and judged by my

⁴I reiterate here that, for Old French, I used the works in the Base de français médiéval (BFM): http://bfm.ens-lyon.fr/, which consists of 153 texts covering a period from the 9th century to the end of the 15th century. Therefore, it covers a majority of Old French (8th–14th century) texts, as well as some Middle French (14th–early 17th century) texts.
deserte, et ke cest jujemenz fust de ma mauvaise justice
punishment and that this judgement were. SBJV. IPF of my bad justice
“I did not know that I was stricken by my own iniquity, and judged by my punishment that
this judgement was due to my injustice”
(Old French; Dial. Âme, 243)

In some cases, the subjunctive even seems surprising as its complement expresses something
known to be a fact. It would be dubious to consider that the speaker intended to make the comple-
ment of set (‘knows’) non-assertive here, given that she makes it clear that it is true.

(256) A tort sui apelee dame... Ne set que je soie pucele
to wrong am called dame NEG knows that I be. 1SG.PRS.SBJV virgin
“Wrongly am I called ‘dame’... He does not know that I am a virgin”
(Old French; Cligés 5240)

The indicative is available in interrogative clauses modifying the complement of savoir (‘savoir’),
and so is the subjunctive.

(257) il ne set que l’ enfes en a fet ne ne ne puet
he NEG knows what the child of it have. 3SG.PRS.IND done neither NEG can. 3SG.PRS.IND
savoir know
“he does not know what the child did with it and neither can he know”
(Old French; Beauvais. 15)

(258) car il ne set quel chose puisse avenir de ceste semblance
because he NEG knows what thing can. 3SG.PRS.SBJV happen from this likeness
“because he does not know what could come from this whatever it seems to be”
(Old French; Queste 15)

Here the indicative – subjunctive distinction is as we’ve discussed where the indicative expresses
objective veridicality, and the subjunctive agnosticism as to whether the event has, is, or will be. In
another example of a relative clause, the subjunctive is used to express potential necessity.

(259) Parthonopieus ne set que face
Parthonopieus NEG knows what do. 3SG.PRS.SBJV
“Parthonopieus does not know what [he should] do”
(Old French; Thèbes 8699)

In declarative affirmatives, savoir (‘know’) is only observed with the indicative.⁵

---

⁵I exclude conditional clauses where the subjunctive is expected, as in Latin.
(260) car il set bien que ce est hermitages.
because he knows well that it is hermitage
“because he knows that is it the dwelling of a hermit” (Old French; Queste 229,13)

‘Remember’ would behave in the same way, although I was unable to find an example of a negated
‘remember’ in the relevant context.

(261) a. Or vos soviegne que vos me devez un
but you.pl.cl remember.3sg.prssbjv that you.pl.cl owe.2pl.prs.ind a
guerridon.
payment
“But you may remember that you owe me payment.” (Old French; Queste I,8,30)

b. tout me sovient il a la foize que jeo vous
all me.cl remember.3sg.prssind it at the same time that you.pl.cl
corousoie
anger.1sg.pf.ind
“I remember all the same that I angered you.” (Old French; Lancastre 1)

One instance of a negated sovient (‘he remembers’) was found within a question. However,
negated questions imply speaker preconception and are assertions that may or not may not require
confirmation by the addressee. Therefore, in (262), the speaker expresses a belief that the addressee
was an agent in the event expressed by the subordinate clause. This assertion requires the use of the
indicative mood in the embedded clause.

(262) Don ne te sovient il que tu As an la cort
then neg you.sg.cl remember.3sg.prssind it that you have.2sg.prssind the court the
le roi Artu Contre lui bataille arramie ?
kings Arthur against him battle held
“Then do you not remember that you have held battle against king Arthur at his court ?”
(Old French; Lancelot 5035)

Epistemic predicates, in contrast to factives, allow the subjunctive in affirmative clauses. In other
words, epistemic predicates can take both the indicative and the subjunctive in their complement.

(i) car se len set que nos soions de la meson le roi Artus
because if it.in knows that we be.1pl.prs.sbjv from the house the king Arthur
“if it is known, that we are from the house of king Arthur” (Queste 229,13)
(263)  a. Fantosme coident que cen seit.
    ghost think that it of.it be.PRS.SBJV
    “They think that it is one, a ghost.”  (Chronique rimée du Mont Saint-Michel 3568)

    b. ge cuit qu’il est de halt parage et de celestial linage
    I think that he is.PRS.IND of high birth and of heavenly lineage
    “I think that he is of high birth and heavenly lineage.”  (Eneas 1285–6)

(264)  et je croi bien qu’il le feist
    and I believe well that he it does.PRS.IND
    “and I believe he does it.”  (Thèbes 2 6447)

(265)  Ne cuic qu’il se puisse desfendre
    NEG think that he SELF can.PRS.SBJV defend
    “I don’t think that he can defend himself.”  (Bel. Inc. 1114)

(266)  Certes ge ne pans ne ne croi Que ge onques mes vos veïsse Ne
certainly I NEG think NEG NEG believe that I never you.pl see.SBJV.IPF NEG
rien nule vos mesfeïsse
    nothing no you.pl mis-do.SBJV.IPF
    “Certainly, I do not think nor do I believe that I would have ever seen you or done you
wrong in any way”  (Perceval, 3953–5)
    (Old French)

Again (as in 256), whether the speaker has already hinted at the fact that the embedded clause
is true or not does not seem to influence the choice of mood, as the subjunctive is acceptable in
(267).⁶

(267)  Car bien sai que mes frere est morz, Ne croi pas que il soit as
    because well know that my brother is dead NEG believe NEG that he be.PRS.SBJV at
    porz
    port
    “Because I know well that my brother is dead, I do not believe that he is at port”
    (Old French; Cligés, 2581–2582)

Note that with first-person verba credendi, both the subjunctive and the indicative is found in the
affirmative, as in (268). In the negative, however, the subjunctive is always found, as in (269).

⁶In all the texts from my corpus, I did not find examples of negated factives or other epistemic with the indicative.
However, there were already too few examples of such predicates with the subjunctive to argue that the absence of
indicative is significant.
Therefore, *verba credendi* in Old French do not reflect the same pattern of selection of the subjunctive as that found in cognitive-factives in Vulgar Latin and Old French.

### 3.3.2 Changes in Middle French

In Middle French, the data is also similar, however, there are some examples of the subjunctive used as a conditional in affirmative factives.

(I know that I would have ignored the reason for my speeches in order to follow it.)  
*Middle French; Montaigne, Essais, chap. 1, bk. 3*

The use of the subjunctive underwent some changes between Old French and Middle French, notably the substitution of the subjunctive by the indicative in indirect questions during the 12th century (Haase 1965; Kuckenheim 1967).

Conditional antecedent *if*-clauses — or *si*-clauses to use the terminology of the language — came to lose the subjunctive in the 16th century (Chifflet 1659; Dauzat 1930). The subjunctive was still in use in the matrix clauses from which *si*-clauses depended.
Finally, epistemic predicates in the affirmative stopped selecting the subjunctive in the 17th century (Haase 1965), which saw the rise of the polarity subjunctive.

3.4 Diachronic Proposal

In this section, I argue that the pattern of the polarity subjunctive takes its origin in the complement clauses of objectively veridical, cognitive predicates in Vulgar Latin. The pattern further spread to subjectively veridical predicates through different stages of French. This process is similar to that argued by Cuzzolin (1994) for the spread of quod complement clauses in Latin. He argues that the development follows Hooper’s (1975) categorization. However, I observe that the development of the polarity subjunctive follows a slightly different generalization.

I start this discussion with Vulgar Latin, as I have reviewed more data starting from this period on and as the language shows higher frequency of finite subordinate clauses with the predicates above. As we have discussed, epistemic predicates, such as cognitive-factives (e.g. ‘know’), cognitive predicates (e.g. ‘remember’), verba credendi (e.g. ‘believe’), and verba dicendi (e.g. ‘say’) may select the infinitive, the indicative, or the subjunctive mood in Latin depending on the intention of the speaker. In Old French, emotive-factives and verbs of possibility still select either the indicative or subjunctive mood, as we have seen in Chapter 2. The cognitive predicates, including the cognitive-factives, seem to consistently select the indicative in the affirmative and (possibly) both moods in the negative as well as in questions.

This situation follows the classification of epistemic predicates I presented in Chapter 1. I add the emotive-factives and verbs of possibility in the table as well. It was demonstrated in Chapter 2 that emotive-factives in Latin and Old French are not purely factive. I showed that the subjunctive mood can be embedded under those predicates and that it contributes to the interpretation that the event in the embedded clause infers no specific time for its realization. When the indicative is embedded under emotive-factives, the embedded proposition is presented as factual. Therefore,
emotive-factives embed the indicative when they are meant to be objectively veridical and the subjunctive otherwise. Emotive-factives are not subjectively veridical. Based on our observations, emotive-factives (in teal) can occupy two positions in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Obj. veridical</th>
<th>Subj. veridical</th>
<th>Mood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotive-factives</td>
<td>‘be glad’ (as factive)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>IND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive-factives</td>
<td>‘know’ (non-polar env.)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>IND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(polar env.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitives</td>
<td>‘remember’</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>IND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verba credendi</td>
<td>‘believe; think’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fictives</td>
<td>‘imagine’ (affirmative)</td>
<td>✔ (in fictive world)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>IND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive-factives</td>
<td>‘know’ (polar env.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verba dicendi</td>
<td>‘say’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>IND ~ SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotive-factives</td>
<td>‘be glad’ (event realization not implied)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility</td>
<td>‘it is possible’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, cognitive-factives (in green) can also occupy two positions. The top position shows cognitive-factives when they bear a factive presupposition, i.e. when they are objectively veridical. They are also subjectively veridical as the epistemic agent holds the cognitive attitude expressed by the predicate, except under negation. The verba credendi and verba dicendi are not objectively veridical and their subjective veridicality depends on the environment (e.g. the polarity of the utterance).

We observe from Table 3.2 that the indicative is associated with a certain degree of veridicality, including objective veridicality. It is difficult to tell what exactly triggers the selection of the subjunctive rather than the indicative, as we have seen that the verba credendi can select either mood irrespectively of the polarity of the predicate's environment.

I propose that language change affects the above predicates from the top down. As observed above, first, the cognitive predicates (i.e. ‘know’, ‘remember’) consistently select the indicative in

---

7It is not necessary for the attitude holder to have expressed commitment towards a certain attitude to be reported has holding this attitude. In other words, for Paul is glad that John came to be uttered, Paul need not have expressed his feelings towards John's coming to the speaker and it need not be true that Paul is glad that John came. Only the speaker’s belief towards Paul’s attitude is expressed. This is also applicable to epistemic predicates. However, we still assume they are subjectively veridical, as the speaker must believe that the attitude holder believes in the truth of the embedded proposition.
the affirmative. In the negative, both the indicative and the subjunctive can be observed starting in Vulgar Latin and throughout Old French depending on whether the speaker intends to express commitment or not. It is only in the 17th century that the same patterns extends to the *verba credendi*, which give us the paradigmatic pattern of the polarity subjunctive as we know it in Modern French today.

Between the two periods, the subjunctive mood underwent semantic bleaching as it got lost in a variety of environments. First, in Vulgar Latin, the potential subjunctive is more strongly associated with subordination. In Old French, it becomes restricted by the presence of *que* (‘that’). There is a clearer correlation between the indicative and objective veridicality, ensuing from the fact that the cognitive-factives presuppose or entail speaker commitment but that the subjunctive, as passed down from Latin, contributes to “counter-factuality”. This explains how ‘know’ and ‘remember’ behave similarly across all main Romance languages with respect to mood selection; as they select the indicative in the affirmative and ‘remember’ displays the pattern of the polarity subjunctive, even in Italian and Brazilian Portuguese.

Other epistemic predicates, i.e. the *verba credendi* and the *verba dicendi*, behave more differently across Romance, as the different branches of Romance developed a different mood system. In Old French and Middle French, the *verba credendi* continued to select the indicative and the subjunctive no matter the polarity of the utterance as they did in Vulgar Latin. However, the distinction indicative – subjunctive and their specific semantic contribution had changed with the more specific meaning entailed by the indicative and the semantic bleaching that continued to affect the subjunctive.

I argue that the pattern observed with the cognitive-factives specifically influenced that of the other epistemic predicates even more. We already discussed in Chapter 1 how negated cognitive predicates can be interpreted in an epistemic sense in Modern French and English. The critical context where there exists ambiguity between the epistemic meaning and the factive meaning consists of a negated first-person, in the present tense (e.g. ‘I don’t know’), where the subjective veridicality is canceled. Since the subject and the speaker are the same point of perspective in this case,
there is a possibility for the objective veridicality to be canceled as well. This pattern where subjective veridicality is negated and objective veridicality is not available can be obtained with the *verba credendi* as well. They are not inherently objectively veridical and, if the verb is negated, the subjective veridicality must be also. By the time of Modern French, given cognitive-factives showed the same “veridical” features as *verba credendi* under negation, they gained the same pattern via analogy. The indicative was not strictly associated with factivity, but with veridicality. The subjunctive had continued being lost in more environments, due to semantic bleaching, such that its interpretation became a default one, due to competition with other moods (*pace* Schlenker 2005).

In parallel to the development of the polarity subjunctive as we know it in present day French, emotive-factives were affected as well by semantic bleaching of the subjunctive. We saw in Chapter 2 how counterfactuality could cause the selection of the subjunctive in complement clauses to emotive-factives. The consequent interpretation cancels the objective veridicality of these predicates and gives them similar “veridical” features as predicates which consistently select the subjunctive. We need to assume that the pattern where emotive-factives consistently select the subjunctive became fixed due to the fact that the subjunctive had lost all independent semantic contribution. Before that time, however, it needs to have contributed to a scenario that would make emotive-factives only select the subjunctive. Therefore, while the indicative became associated with objective veridicality, the subjunctive could have contributed to the evaluation of alternatives (*pace* Villalta 2008; Giannikidou & Mari 2015).

Finally, I suggest that the pattern of the polarity subjunctive is a fixed one, such that it is no more possible to express anti-veridicality with the subjunctive in non-polarity environments with epistemic predicates. The discussion from questions and *if*-clauses below provides some evidence in favour of this hypothesis.

### 3.4.1 French Questions

*Est-ce que* is attested as early as Old French, but only appears to be in more regular use as a *yes/no* interrogative in the 16th century (Foulet 1921; Rouquier 2003). It originates as a *c’est*-cleft (‘it is’-cleft) which underwent interrogative inversion (Dufter 2008). It gradually underwent semantic bleach-
ing in order to be employed solely as an interrogative and became fully grammaticalized around the 15th century (Gaiffe et al. 1936; see also Damourette & Pichon 1930). Foulet (1921) describes the chronological steps that preceded the appearance of est-ce que as follows. Old French would form questions via subject–verb inversion and wh-questions with fronting of the wh-word.

(272) Old French questions

a. Sire cumpainz, faites le vus de gret?
   lord companion do.2PL.PRS.IND it you.PL of will
   “Lord, my companion, do you do it willingly?”
   (Roland 2000)

b. E par quele gent quidet il espleitier tant?
   and by which people think.3SG.PRS.IND he accomplish so
   “And by which people does he think to have it accomplished so?”
   (Roland 395)

The topic slot coming before verb-second in Old French was often satisfied with the subject.⁸ Therefore, in questions, the topicalized subject could appear before the question word.

(273) Topicalization of subjects in Old French

a. Nostre escu por quoi furent fet?
   our shield for what be.3PL.PF.IND made
   “Our shields, what were they made for?”
   (Cligés 1303)

b. Mes sa parole que li coste?
   but his speech what him.DAT.CL cost.3SG.PRS.IND
   “But his speech, what does it cost him?”
   (Renart 782)

The demonstrative could be used as a topicalized subject as well.

(274) ce que puet estre?
   that what can.3SG.PRS.IND be.INF
   “That, what can it be?”
   (Old French; Yvain 1109)

Finally, clefting was allowed in questions, where the wh-word could be fronted before the cleft.

Evidence for the grammaticalization of est-ce que lies in the lack of agreement in person, number, or tense on the verbal element of this interrogative in Modern French (Grevisse 1993).

---

⁸This fact is often proposed as the trigger from a verb-second word order to a regular SVO syntactic pattern in the history of French.
(275) *Est-ce que in Modern French

a. Est-ce que John et Paul sont partis?
   is-it that John and Paul are left
   “Did John and Paul leave?”

b. *Sont-ce que John et Paul sont partis?
   be.3PL.PRS.IND-it that John and Paul are left
   “Did John and Paul leave?” (French)

Furthermore, productive question formation from clefts would follow the following pattern. Therefore, *est-ce que can no longer be taken as a cleft with inversion in Modern French.⁹

(276) Clefting and Questions in Modern French

a. C’est John qui est parti.
   it is John who is left
   “It is John who left.”

b. Est-ce John qui est parti?
   is-it John who is left
   “Is it John who left?”

Compare this lack of agreement in Modern French with the agreement still possible in Middle French (in the 16th century in this case).

(277) *Sont ce noz sens qui prestent au sujekt ces diverses conditions, et que les
   Are it our senses that lend to the subject these various conditions and that the

---

⁹Clefting in French (Dufter 2008), as in English, lost agreement between the focussed DP and the clefted copula by the 16th century (Hatcher 1948).

(i) a. ?Ce sont John et Paul qui sont partis.
   it be.3PL.PRS.IND John and Paul who are left
   “It is *are John and Paul who left.”

b. ??Sont-ce John et Paul qui sont partis?
   be.3PL.PRS.IND-it John and Paul who are left
   “Is / *are it John and Paul who left?” (French)

(ii) a. Ce estes vous que je doy remercier
   it be.2PL you.PL that I must.1SG thank
   “It is you whom I have to thank.” (Middle French; Antoine de la Sale)

b. C’estes / est vous que je dois remercier.
   it be.2PL / 3SG you.PL that I must.1SG thank
   “It is you whom I have to thank.” (Modern French) (Dufter 2008)
subjects n’ en ayent pourtant qu’ une?
subjects NEG of.it have.3PL.PRS.SBJV however only one
“This is it that our senses attribute these various conditions and that the subjects still have but one?”
(Middle French; Montaigne, *Essais*, bk. II chap. 12)

The Modern French grammaticalized expression is simply used to mark *yes/no* questions. However, the polarity subjunctive is not selected in these types of questions. We could argue that this restriction was fixed before the 15th and 16th centuries when *est-ce que* was grammaticalized because clefting implied factivity and was therefore incompatible with the subjunctive. The other strategies for *yes/no* questions are compatible with the polarity subjunctive, i.e. simple subject–verb inversion (as in 146-b) or the use of the French Canadian interrogative particle *tu* (as in 147-b).

(146-b’) Ringo pense-t-il que les autres soient plus proches?
Ringo thinks-he that the others are.3SG.PRS.SBJV more close
“Does Ringo think that the others are closer?”
(French)

(147-b’) Ringo (il) pense-tu que les autres soient plus proches?
Ringo he thinks-Q that the others are.3SG.PRS.SBJV more close
“Does Ringo think that the others are closer?”
(Canadian French)

Inversion is also compatible with the subjunctive in *wh*-questions.

(150-b’) Qui Ringo pense-t-il qui soit plus proche?
who Ringo thinks-he who is.3SG.PRS.SBJV more close
“Who does he think is closer?”
(French)

Terry (1970) argues that inversion is preferred over other interrogative strategies in rhetorical or exclamatory questions, as it does not imply any expected answer from the part of the speaker.

Both of these strategies predate the grammaticalization of *est-ce que*. Inversion of the subject is illustrated above and chronologically precedes the first uses of *est-ce que*. The use of an interrogative particle has been dated back to the 1450s (Robert 1993), as the inverted subject pronoun *il* (‘he; it’) preceded by a third-person morpheme *t* (e.g. *dist il* “said he”) was phonetically eroded to [ti] and reanalyzed as a question particle in contexts where a full subject was also present at the front of the utterance. This *ti* is still an interrogative particle in Picard, and is said to have developed into *tu* in
Canadian French.

The other forms of yes/no questions and the wh-question involving clefting, est-ce que/qui, or wh-in situ must therefore be marked in such a way that they are not compatible with the polarity subjunctive. For the case of yes/no questions with only question intonation and wh-in situ questions, they originate from echo questions, i.e. questions in which the speaker confirms information from an utterance heard previously, such that the interrogator already thinks he knows (for having heard it previously) that something is factual.

(149-b') ? Ringo pense que les autres soient plus proches ?
Ringo thinks that the others are.3SG.PRS.SBJV more close
“Does Ringo think that the others are closer?” (French)

(155-b') * Ringo pense que qui soit plus proche ?
Ringo thinks that who is.3SG.PRS.SBJV more close
“Who does Ringo think is closer?” (French)

As already mentioned previously, clefting implies factivity as well, hence it results in incompatibility with the subjunctive.

(154-b') * C’ est qui que Ringo pense qui soit plus proche ?
it is who that Ringo thinks who is.3SG.PRS.SBJV more close
“Who does he think is closer?” (French)

(153-b') * Qui c’ est que Ringo pense qui soit plus proche ?
who it is that Ringo thinks who is.3SG.PRS.SBJV more close
“Who does he think is closer?” (French)

Finally, all other strategies involve est-ce que.

(148-b') * Est-ce que Ringo pense que les autres soient plus proches ?
is-it that Ringo thinks that the others are.3SG.PRS.SBJV more close
“Does Ringo think that the others are closer?” (French)

(152-b') * Qui est-ce que Ringo pense qui soit plus proche ?
who is-it that Ringo thinks who is.3SG.PRS.SBJV more close
“Who does he think is closer?” (French)
In addition to its point of origin as a cleft, *est-ce que* is argued to be marked in a number of ways in Modern French. Coveney (2002) claims that modern day *est-ce que* is, unlike its not yet fully grammaticalized ancestor, incompatible with questions for which the interrogator expects a particular answer. According to Behnstedt (1973), on the other hand, *est-ce que* is unlikely to appear in rhetorical questions. Borillo (1979) interprets *est-ce que* yes/no questions as confirmation requests, where the speaker holds expectations as to the answer requested. Léon (2004) adds that either agreement or disagreement can be expected from the answers to *est-ce que* yes/no questions, although agreement is generally preferred (cf. Sacks 1973).

Gaiffe *et al.* (1936) and Dauzat (1958) argue that emphatic interrogatives have a tendency to include *est-ce que*. Similarly, Terry (1970) and Fontaney (1991) propose that *est-ce que* is favoured in affective rhetorical questions, which involve impatience or doubt and an eagerness to get an answer to the question. Terry argues that, since *que* cannot bear stress, the accentual inflection required in questions needs to shift to the entire utterances when *est-ce que* is the strategy used in yes/no questions.

The contribution of *est-ce que* in Modern French is not such that it would make it incompatible with the subjunctive. It’s origin in Old French, however, makes it a question formation strategy that would select the indicative mood due to its objective veridicality. The expression has been grammaticalized as an interrogative in the 15–16th century (Foulet 1921; Gaiffe *et al.* 1936; Rouquier 2003), by the time the pattern of the polarity subjunctive is finally observed consistently with all epistemic predicates. The development of *est-ce que* therefore provides evidence that the pattern of the polarity subjunctive known to Modern French has been fully grammaticalized before *est-ce que* became a interrogative that did not specifically entail objective veridicality. Otherwise, the polarity subjunctive would be available in this type of questions as well, since it does not produce that inference anymore. Similarly, counterfactual *if*-clauses used to select the “conditional” subjunctive in both antecedent and matrix clauses. The polarity subjunctive cannot be embedded within *if*-clauses in Modern French; this obligatory subjunctive was not lost in conditionals (Chifflet 1659; Dauzat) until after the grammaticalization of the polarity subjunctive pattern.
3.4.2 Gradual Loss of the Subjunctive in Modern French

As mentioned previously, the subjunctive mood is used less frequently than prescribed in standard French, and even seems on its way to extinction in certain contexts, depending on the dialect. First, the imperfect and pluperfect subjunctives are not productive in most spoken French varieties (Dauzat 1950, 1958, a.o.), except for a few dialects. These forms of the subjunctive seem productive in Île-aux-Coudres, Québec (Seutin 1975), Guernsey Norman (Jones 2000), parts of Nova Scotia (Gesner 1979; Comeau 2011), and other regions speaking Acadian French (Neumann-Holzschuh & Wiesmath 2006).

(278) Si tu voulais manger tu te plantais ton jardinage pour l’hiver...

“If you wanted to eat, you had to plant your gardening for the winter...”

(Île-Madame, Nova Scotia; Corpus Wiesmath)

(279) Faulait qu’elle allisse sur une montagne.

“She needed to go on a mountain.”

(New-Foundland; Brasseur cited by Neumann-Holzschuh & Wiesmath 2006: 240)

(280) J’aimais pas ça la chasse aux MOOSE faulait trop que tu travelis.

“I didn’t like hunting moose, you had to travel too much.”

(New-Brunswick; Wiesmath 2006: 3)

In Laurentian French, the subjunctive is used less productively and in lesser contexts in colloquial speech (Poplack 2001). It is repeatedly shown to be even less likely to be used outside of volitional or deontic situations (Cohen 1965; Price 1971). One clear trigger of the subjunctive is *falloir* ‘must; need to’ as it is responsible for the majority of subjunctive selection in Acadian, Ontario, and Laurentian French (Comeau 2011; Grimm 2015). Furthermore, it is reported to be the most frequently used predicate of necessity, being used 98% of the time in a sample of spoken Ontario-Hull French (Lealess 2005); 88% of the time in a sample of spoken Montreal French (Thibault 1991); and 89%–94% of the time in different corpora of Ontarian French (Grimm 2015). Yet, even this verb does not consistently select the subjunctive across speakers.
(281) Il faut qu’on y aille.
   it is necessary that we there go.
   “We need to go.”

(282) a. Faut que tu mets ton manteau.
   “You have to put your coat on.”

   b. Fallait on le lisait des fois en classe.
   “We had to read it sometimes in class.”

   c. Faudrait que ça serait quelque chose à trancher.
   “It would have to be something to sort out.” (Grimm 2015: 82)

Similarly, desiderative predicates may select the occasional indicative:

(283) Tu aimerais qu’il guérit ta paralysie, parce je suis paralysée dans le visage.
   “You would like for him to cure your paralysis, because my face is paralyzed.”

   (Poplack et al. 2013: 141)

Posner (1997) argues that the subjunctive is not productive in Modern French, hat it is simply associated with elevated speech, and that its use is the result of hypercorrection. In a similar vein, the study in Poplack (1997) shows that professionals belonging to the highest socioeconomic class have a higher tendency to select the subjunctive. Poplack et al. (2013) further argue that the data available to native speakers is not always sufficient to extract clear correspondences between form and function, causing a semantic weakening or even loss of some forms. Recall that Bybee (2001) demonstrated that subordinate clauses are the last to show conservatism of old forms, while main clauses lead with innovation. This follows from the grammaticalization trend mentioned above whereby subordinate clauses are the last to adopt grammaticalized mood. This account explains why, although the Canadian French subjunctive has undergone loss of semantic distinction with the indicative which can now appear in the complement of any intensional predicate, including volitional predicates and verbs of necessity, the subjunctive may still be selected under certain predicates (e.g. falloir) and be used on more frequent verbs (e.g. ‘have’, ‘be’, ‘do’, etc.; Poplack 1997).
3.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I discussed the changes having occurred between the different stages of Latin and French, and proposed a diachronic analysis to explain the existence of the polarity subjunctive in Modern French, which is further undergoing a gradual loss of the subjunctive mood. This analysis can account for similarities between the main branches of Romance with respect to the selection of the indicative or the subjunctive mood under epistemic predicates, and the lack of licensing of the polarity subjunctive in some types of questions and if-clauses in Modern French.
Conclusions

In this dissertation, I have accounted for the development of the polarity subjunctive into Modern French via a diachronic analysis.

Summary of Contents

In chapter 1, I reviewed the literature that attempts to account for the polarity subjunctive and — at least some — cases of intensional subjunctive in Modern Romance. I provided some data from French to illustrate how the different proposals cannot account for the full range of data on the polarity subjunctive. The distinction between the indicative and the subjunctive cannot be explained via an account based on different scopes of negation. In addition, proposals based on veridicality or commitment to the truth cannot account for the lack of polarity subjunctive in some environments, e.g. if-clauses in French and Catalan or questions in Spanish. Finally, claiming that the indicative carries a veridical presupposition is problematic, as the indicative is not consistently selected by emotive-factive predicates in Romance.

New contributions to the study of the polarity subjunctive include a close study of different types of predicates and environments that select the polarity subjunctive in Modern French. Types of epistemic triggers found in French are cognitive-factives (e.g. ‘know’), cognitive predicates (e.g. ‘it is true’, ‘remember’), verba credendi (e.g. ‘believe’, ‘think’, ‘be sure’, ‘be convinced’, ‘imagine’, ‘suppose’), and verba dicendi (e.g. ‘say’). All involve an element of belief in the negative when the polarity subjunctive can be selected, with some stronger judgements in the first-person in the case of semi-factives. The subjunctive is applicable to the other persons as well, but the justification is more difficult to explain synchronically. Relevant polarity environments in French are negation,
some types of questions. More specifically, the question formation strategies compatible with the polarity subjunctive are: subject–verb inversion, the addition of the interrogative particle *tu*, and *qu*-fronting. Questions with *est-ce que*, clefting, and question formed via intonation alone cannot license the polarity subjunctive. *Si*-clauses do not license the polarity subjunctive in Modern French either. However, I observed that some conditional antecedents do license the polarity subjunctive, namely those involving a fictive predicate in the imperative (e.g. *imaginons* ‘imagine’) or as a conjunction (e.g. *en supposant que*). The diachronic analysis explain the (non-)development of the polarity subjunctive in the above environments.

In chapter 2, I observed, after gathering cross-linguistic data regarding the polarity subjunctive in Modern Romance, that cognitive-factives behaves similarly in all main Romance languages: 1) they select the indicative in upward entailing environments; 2) ‘remember’ consistently displays the polarity subjunctive pattern under negation, even in languages that do not seem to have the polarity subjunctive (i.e. Italian and Portuguese). I then proceeded to present the Old Romance facts in order to determine how these patterns arose. I discussed the classification of different types of subjunctive in Latin and Old French. Both stages seemed to have two types of subjunctive, one of which can be seen as similar to the polarity subjunctive. Yet, the range of contexts where it may occur and the semantic implications of the potential subjunctive don’t quite match that of the polarity subjunctive.

In chapter 3, I confirmed the hypothesis that cognitive-factives are at the source of the polarity subjunctive in Modern Romance and follow from the veridical features presented in Chapter 1 in the classification of epistemic predicates. I exposed different changes in the use of the subjunctive from Late Latin to Modern French.

The cognitive-factives first showed the polarity subjunctive pattern, as the Latin subjunctive was incompatible with their objective veridicality. Consequently, the indicative came to be associated with objective veridicality. Given that cognitive predicates can be interpreted as epistemics in the environments where they allow the polarity subjunctive, the *verba credendi* gained the same pattern via analogy. In French, the subjunctive was lost in conditional clauses and *est-ce que* was grammati-
calized as a way to mark questions after the pattern of the polarity subjunctive grammaticalized to consistently apply to epistemic predicates. Hence, some French questions cannot license the polarity subjunctive and if-clauses cannot either.

**FURTHER QUESTIONS**

Other cross-Romance and cross-dialectal differences are due to slight variations in the generalization of the polarity subjunctive pattern (e.g. the pattern may not have generalized to fictive predicates in Spanish and Romanian) and the different degrees of loss of the subjunctive. In French, for instance, the subjunctive is being replaced by the indicative in all subordinate clauses, yet it seems to first get lost in the complement of cognitive-factives, followed by veridical predicates, and finally, but less frequently, to non-veridical predicates (which are the cases of intensional subjunctive). This pattern of loss also seems to follow the classification of epistemic predicates from Chapter 1 and 3.

More research is needed to fully account for the development of the polarity subjunctive in branches other than French, Italian, and Brazilian Portuguese. It would be particularly interesting to determine whether epistemic predicates consistently undergo changes in complementation from objectively veridical to subjectively veridical predicates and what particular properties of those predicates are at play in the development of complementation.

Although questions still remain to be answer with respect to the polarity subjunctive in Romance, this research is one more step towards 1) explaining the characteristics shared by the two types of subjunctive, i.e. the intensional subjunctive and the polarity subjunctive; 2) the selection of the subjunctive by emotive-factive predicates; and 3) cross-linguistic differences within and across different Romance languages.
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