

Ana Bravo & Axelle Vatrican  
(U. de Murcia / U. de Toulon)  
ana.bravo@um.es / axelle.vatrican@univ-tln.fr

*Chronos 11th International Conference on Actionality, Tense, Aspect,  
Modality/Evidentiality,*  
Scuola Normale Superiore – Pisa, June 16th-18th, 2014

## On the non-temporal conditionals in Spanish: Semantics of self-licensing contexts

### 1. Goals

- (I) ANALYSIS modal / non-factual conditionals in self-licensing contexts against a decompositional semantics of conditional morphology (CM)<sup>1</sup>
- (II) SEMANTICS of the CM in Spanish (NGLE, § 23.15, Rojo & Veiga 1999: 2916)

### 2. Introduction

One temporal (as in (1)) and two modal ((2) & (3)) uses of Sp. Conditional:

A) TEMPORAL → posteriority wrt a past moment: Pospretérito (Bello 1847: § 634); (R-H)+(R-E) (Carrasco Gutiérrez 1998, a.o.)

---

<sup>1</sup> Abreviations: CM: conditional morphology; TCM: temporal conditional morphology; M1CM: modal 1 conditional morphology; M2CM: modal 2 conditional morphology; SLCM: self-licensing conditional morphology

(1) La prensa **anunció** <sub>e1</sub> (R-H) el martes que el presidente **dimitiría** <sub>e2</sub> (R-E) el jueves → e1 < e2  
'The press claimed on Tuesday that the president would quit on Thursday'

B) MODAL 1. PROBABILITY CONDITIONAL → expresses a hypothetical opinion about a past situation ((2a)=(2b)):

- (2) a. En aquella época, Juan **tendría** unos 50 años.  
b. En aquella época, Juan tenía probablemente unos 50 años.  
'At that time, Juan should be about 50 years old'

C) MODAL 2. NON-FACTUAL CONDITIONAL (Iatridou 2000; RAE-ASALE 2009: 23.15 s) → introduces in the present of enunciation a hypothetical construction 'si  $p \rightarrow q$ ', (if  $p$ , then  $q$ ) so that the two situations  $p$  and  $q$  are situated in a possible world:

(3) Pedro se **compraría** un coche nuevo (si tuviese garaje).  
'Pedro would buy a new car (if he had a garage)'

➤ The SITUATION described in  $p$  either is explicit or is recovered from the context; otherwise, the sentence is odd (#):

(4) a. # Pedro se compraría un coche nuevo.  
b. Si tuviese garaje, Pedro se compraría un coche nuevo. (= (3))

(5) a. # Pedro estaría en la playa.  
b. Si pudiese, Pedro estaría en la playa.  
'If it were possible, Pedro would be at the beach'

➤ TEMPORAL AND MODAL CONDITIONAL is semantically and (presumably) syntactically a dependent category.

➤ Exceptions to this generalization in (6) and (7):

(6) a. Mi jefe **lamentaría** que Juan se comprara un coche nuevo →  
b. [Si Juan se comprara un coche nuevo]<sub>i</sub>, mi jefe lo<sub>i</sub> lamentaría.  
'If Juan bought a new car, my boss would regret it'

- (7) a. A mi jefe le **gustaría** que Juan se comprara un coche nuevo →  
 b. [Si Juan se comprara un coche nuevo], a mi jefe le gustaría [∅].  
 'If Juan bought a new car, my boss would be pleased / \*would like it'

Both in (6a) and (7a) a protasis –so to say- not depending on the context can be obtained and as a consequence CM is self-licensed.

- The question arises: how can we account for it?
- In this talk:

(i) We will demonstrate that one exception exists since CM in some cases can be internally legitimated: MODAL verbs (*querer, deber*) all together with EMOTIVE-FACTIVE verbs (*gustar, lamentar*) can be used in self-licensing contexts with CM.

(ii) We will argue that there is a need to distinguish between FACTIVE-EMOTIVE (*lamentar, gustar*) and NON FACTIVE-EMOTIVE (*apetecer, tener ganas*) conditionals –departing from Laca (2010)-.

(iii) Within the group of FACTIVE-EMOTIVE VERBS, we need to distinguish between two classes since *gustar* and *lamentar* differ in meaning –also departing from Laca (2010)-:

- (8)a. A mi jefe le **gustaría** que Juan se comprara un coche nuevo.  
 b. = Mi jefe desea que Juan se compre un coche nuevo  
 (9)a. Mi jefe **lamentaría** que Juan se comprara un coche nuevo.  
 b. # Mi jefe no desea que Juan se compre un coche nuevo

### 3. Self-licensing contexts. Emotive-factive predicates of the *lamentar*-type

*Lamentar* 'to regret', *sorprender* 'to get surprised', *gustar* 'to please', are all factive predicates. However, we will argue for splitting them in two groups: one with *lamentar, sorprender* and other emotive-factive predicates and one with *gustar, encantar* 'to please very much', and *preferir* ('to prefer').

- (10) Mi jefe **lamentaría** que Juan se comprara un coche nuevo.

**3.1.** The CM IN (10) IS LICENSED in two ways –also Kreutz (1998) for French-:

A) We can add a protasis as 'si fuese mejor que el suyo' ('if it were better than his'):

- (11) a. Mi jefe **lamentaría** que Juan se comprara un coche nuevo →  
 b. Mi jefe **lamentaría** que Juan se comprara un coche nuevo, si fuese mejor que el suyo.

B) Or the subordinate clause is 'changed' into a protasis (internal):

- (12) a. Mi jefe **lamentaría** que Juan se comprara un coche nuevo →  
 b. [Si Juan se comprara un coche nuevo]<sub>i</sub>, mi jefe lo<sub>i</sub> lamentaría.

In (10) we find the antecedent in the sentence itself; it is not always necessary to add any external element (Rivero 1978 y RAE-ASALE 2009). In this case, the protasis *si Juan se comprara un coche nuevo* is an argument –a complement- of the verb *lamentar* (Pesetsky 1991 -after Thompson 2012-, Kreutz 1998).

#### 3.2. ¿MEANING OF THE CONSTRUCTION?

- (10) is an equivalent of a hypothetical construction (Karttunen 1971, Pesetsky 1991: 62, Kreutz 1998, Laca 2010, Thompson 2012).

- DEFINITION: If  $p \rightarrow q$  'assume  $p$  so that the assertion of  $q$  makes sense' (Montolío 1999: 3649; Comrie 1986: 78).

- CM POTENTIALLY ALLOWS FOR A DOUBLE SCOPE READING (KREUTZ 1998, COPLEY 2009):

- a. WIDE SCOPE →  $-ría$  [*lamentar que p*] = If [ $p \rightarrow q$ ]  
 b. NARROW SCOPE → [*lamentar*] [ $-ría$  [ $p$ ]]

#### 3.3 TRUTH EVALUATION AND TENSE ANCHORING

¿Where is evaluated 'If  $p \rightarrow q$ '?

- IN A POSSIBLE WORLD: *Mi jefe lamentaría que Juan se comprara un coche nuevo* is an assertion about a possible world different from the actual/present world: if in another possible world, which is not the present world, Juan buying a new car happened, then the outcome would be that my boss would regret it.  $p$  can be either 'present' or 'future' (Iatridou 2000).

- IN THE PRESENT WORLD: we assert the truth of the entailment relation between both propositions  $p$  and  $q$ :  $\langle \text{if } p, q \rangle$  means that to the speaker, it is true that if  $p$ , then  $q$ , but neither  $p$ 's truth nor  $q$ 's truth is asserted.

4. We notice that in *consecutio temporum* contexts only the MODAL INTERPRETATION (as in Section 2.C above) is possible, while the TEMPORAL INTERPRETATION IS DISALLOWED (see section 2.A), as shown in (13) and (14).

(13) La prensa **anunció** (e1) el martes que el presidente **dimitiría** (e2) el jueves.  $\rightarrow e1 < e2$   
'The press claimed on Tuesday that the president would quit on Thursday'

(14) a. #La prensa **aseguró** (e1) el martes que el director **lamentaría** (e2) el viernes que los estudiantes estuviesen enfermos.  $-/\rightarrow e1 < e2$   
'The press asserted on Tuesday that the president would regret on Friday that the students were ill'  
b. La prensa confirmó que si los estudiantes estuviesen enfermos, el director lo lamentaría.

There is no temporal relation for (12) between *confirmar* and *lamentar*, but there is a temporal relation between *confirmar* and the condition construction [si están enfermos, lo lamenta].

➤ The interpretation of the conditional is identical for independent (9) and subordinate contexts (14).

#### 4.1. Self-licensing contexts. Emotive-factive predicates of the *gustar*-type

(15) A mi jefe le **gustaría** que Juan se comprara un coche nuevo.  
'My boss wishes that Juan bought a new car'

4.1. The conditional form of *gustar* has a different meaning since it means 'wishes' ('desear') (von Stechow & Iatridou 2008), and not 'to be pleased' (*agradar, satisfacer*).

#### 4.2. TRUTH EVALUATION AND TENSE ANCHORING

- IN A POSSIBLE WORLD: it should be noticed that in (15) *a mi jefe le gustaría* lit. to my boss LE-DAT.3SG. please.CONDITIONAL.3.SG does not mean in a possible world, the situation of *gustar* would occur, if Juan bought a new car; the sentence has not to be read respect to a possible world.

- IN THE PRESENT: the subject expresses the desire for things to be different from how they actually are (Iatridou and von Stechow 2008). There is an assertion about the actual world, since the statement means *Mi jefe desea que Juan se compre un coche nuevo* 'My boss wishes that John bought a new car'. The sentence needs to be read respect to the present.

#### 4.3. ¿HOW CAN WE OBTAIN SUCH MEANING?

Semantically, and so literally, we assert that in a possible world, if *Juan buys a new car*, *my boss will be pleased*. If we admit this interpretation, it is clear that 'gustar' means 'be pleased' and not 'wishes', as shown in (16).

(16) a. A mi jefe le gustaría que Juan se comprara un coche nuevo.  
b. Si Juan se comprara un coche nuevo, le agradaría.  
c. \*Si Juan se comprara un coche nuevo, lo desearía.

#### 4.4. FIRST CONCLUSION

Self-licensing conditionals are allowed with factive-emotive verbs: verbs like *lamentar*, *sorprender* form the first group since the CM locates the hypothetical relation in a possible world different from the actual one. Verbs like *gustar* form the second group as temporal perspective is present-speech time. ('a counterfactual wish' Iatridou 2000; von Stechow & Iatridou 2008). (Laca 2010: 12: 'sentences containing evaluative-factives are very close in meaning to sentences containing volitionals').

movies this afternoon'

The most common interpretation is (25c), in which *gustaría* is similar to a volitional verb as *desear* or *querer* in present (NGLE).

## 5. Previous analysis

### 5.1 Politeness Conditionals and pragmatic accommodation (Rivero 1978 y RAE-ASALE 2009)

(i) Politeness or mitigation of meaning though CM cannot account for these examples:

1) Conditional meaning of *lamentar* is not explained (not a politeness one)

❖ as an equivalence with present tense is impossible:

(17) Mi jefe lamentaría que Juan se comprara un coche nuevo.

(18) # Mi jefe lamenta que Juan se compre un coche nuevo.

(19) Le gustaría comprarse un coche nuevo.

(20) #Le gusta comprarse un coche nuevo.

❖ While it is with modal verbs:

(21) Mi jefe {querría ~ quiere} hablar con usted.

(22) My boss {wants ~ would like} to talk with you.

2) Not all of the examples have the implicature 'I wish it could be':

(23) Mi jefe lamentaría que Juan se comprara un coche nuevo.

Does not necessarily entail he doesn't want *p*.

(24) Le gustaría comprarse un coche nuevo.

Entails he wants *p*.

2. (25a) can be an equivalent of (25b) or (25c): orientation to a possible world or to the present world.

(25) a. Me gustaría ir al cine esta tarde.

b. 'Si tuviera dinero, me gustaría ir al cine esta tarde'

If I had Money, I would like to go to the movies this afternoon'

c. 'Ahora mismo deseo ir al cine esta tarde'

'I wish I could go right now to the movies', 'I want to go to the

### 5.2. CM as a unitary semantic mark (Laca 2010)

1. **PROPOSAL:** CM indicates that the proposition does not belong to the present evaluation world, and this has a consequence in different ways on modals, factives and volitionals.

#### 2. PROBLEMS:

1. This cannot account for the different meanings of *lamentar* (conditional construction with self-licensing context) and *gustar* (not a conditional construction, volitional - priority).

#### 2. SCALAR MEANING WITH MODALS

Modal verbs + CM → *podría* ('could') y *debería* ('should') as PRIORITY MODALS: 'among the favoured worlds, *p*-worlds are better than *non-p*-worlds' (von Stechow 2008; Portner 2009). *Deberías ayudarla*: among lots of alternatives, *ayudarla* is the favoured one.

3. Not all of the emotive verbs admit self-licensing contexts.

➤ Laca (2010) claims that the scalar semantics of the verb is the feature which accounts for this: as an example, *esperar* lit. wait lacks this feature and cannot share this context.

(26) #Pedro esperaría que María estuviera en Madrid. (ej.(37), Laca 2010)  
'Pedro would expect for M. to be in Madrid'

➤ However, *apetecer* y *tener ganas* ('appeal, go for') have a scalar semantics similar to *gustar* and *lamentar* and disallow self-licensing CM:

- (27) # A mi jefe le apetecería que Juan se comprara un coche nuevo.  
 (28) # Mi jefe tendría ganas de que Juan se comprara un coche nuevo.  
 “My boss would go for John buying a new car’

4. *Querría*, as a non lexicalized form, needs an implicit protasis:

(29) Pedro querría ser astronauta #(si pudiera) = ‘would want’

- This consists in the ambiguity underscored by von Fintel & Iatridou (2008: 20): in Romance languages, *querer* + Conditional morphology means ‘wish’ (30) or ‘would want’ (29).

(30) Querría una barra de pan, por favor = ‘wish’

➤ SUMMARY SO FAR

	Self-licensing contexts	Meaning: present world / possible world
<i>Lamentaría</i>	Yes	Conditional (possible)
<i>Gustaría</i>	Yes	Volitional (present)
<i>Apetecería</i>	No	Volitional (possible)
<b>Modals</b>	Sí	Priority (present)

## 6. Our proposal

6.1 HYPOTHESIS: Mainly relying on Iatridou (2000), Leonetti (2006), Iatridou and von Fintel (2008), Escandell (2013), Rivero (2014).

-RÍA	[+tense]	[+aspect]	[+ modality]
-r	[R-E]		Inferentiality
-ía	[R-H]		CF
-ía		Imperfect	Scalarity → priority

*Lamentar* + CM → CF, Scalarity

*Deber* + CM → scalarity

*Gustaría* → scalarity

6.2 Meaning of a conditional/hypothetical construction: the *lamentar* type construction

→ Semantically licensed (Kasper 1992 –in Laca 2010–, Kreutz 1998) with FACTIVE EMOTIVE VERBS:

➤ *Lamentaría* → *lamentar* + CM

-ría [[comprarse un coche]<sub>i</sub> lamentar [~~comprarse un coche~~]<sub>i</sub>]

Similar to tripartite structures for conditionals in Thompson (2012: 256):

- (31) a. It would be wonderful if the fog lifted.  
 b.  $\forall s [s \in \text{the fog lifts} \wedge s \in \text{BEST}_{<}(\text{the fog lifts})] \text{ wonderful}(s)$   
 c.  $\text{BEST}_{<}(p) = \{s \in p: \neg \exists s' \in p(s' <_s s)\}$

B) With NON FACTIVE VERBS, we cannot form a self-licensing conditional construction as shown in (31-33):

(31) Pedro **esperaría** que María estuviera en Madrid. (ej.(37), Laca 2010)  
 # Si María estuviera en Madrid, Pedro lo esperaría.

(32) A mi jefe le **apetecería** que Juan se comprara un coche nuevo<sup>2</sup>.  
 #Si Juan se comprara un coche nuevo, a mi jefe le apetecería.  
 = A mi jefe le apetecería que Juan se comprara un coche nuevo, si fuese peor que el suyo.

(33) Mi jefe **tendría ganas** de que Juan se comprara un coche nuevo.  
 #Si Juan se comprara un coche nuevo, mi jefe tendría ganas.

## 6.2. They need to be EMOTIVE VERBS (KREUTZ 1998):

<sup>2</sup> Another example: ‘Me apetecería que ganara Del Bosque, es un hombre 10’ (*El Mundo*, 04/12/2012).

A) WITH EMOTIVE FACTIVE VERBS: *lamentar, sorprender, encantar, gustar, etc.*

B) WITH NON EMOTIVE FACTIVE VERBS as *recordar* ('to remember'), *descubrir* ('to discover'), *saber* ('to know'), *darse cuenta* ('to realize'):

(34) a. Juan {**recordaría/descubriría**} que Pedro se compró un coche.  
b. ??Si Pedro se comprara un coche nuevo, Juan lo {recordaría/descubriría}.

(35) a. {**Sabría/se daría cuenta de**} que María está/estaba embarazada.  
b. ?? Si María estuviera embarazada, {lo sabría/se daría cuenta de ello}.

➤ This is not the most common interpretation.

C) WHY EMOTIVE VERBS?

➤ Laca's proposal (2010) is the scalar semantics of the verbs. We claim that there exist other reasons to account for it.

➤ They share the property of being causative [+causer] (Pesetsky 1995); verbs like *lamentar, sorprender* refer to an event which triggers an outcome, a resultant state: *sorprender* 1) a cause provokes an event (surprise) 2) it gives rise to the state of being surprised (Cabeza 1996: 132).

❖ Conditional construction is allowed with emotive verbs in which, the protasis is the CAUSER and the apodosis the RESULTATIVE STATE:

(36) Si Juan se comprara un coche nuevo [causer], su jefe lo lamentaría [resultative state].

(37) \*Si Juan se comprara un coche nuevo [causer], a su jefe le apetecería.

❖ This appears to be very clear if we translate the examples into French:

(38) a. Si Juan se comprara un coche nuevo, su jefe lo lamentaría.

b. \*Si Juan s'achetait une voiture neuve, son patron le {regretterait/ le déplorerait} [event].

c. Si Juan s'achetait une voiture neuve, son patron serait déçu [state].

(39) a. Pedro agradecería mucho que María le ayudara.

b. ??Si María l'aidait, Pedro la remercierait [event].

c. Si María l'aidait [causer], Pedro lui en serait très reconnaissant [state].

➤ **PREDICTION** → PRESUMABLY Emotive-factives with two AS (Pesetsky 1995: 198 and ff.) → only CAUSER / EXP allows for SLCM:

(40) a. A Pedro le sorprendería que María estuviese embarazada. (SLCM)

'That M. were pregnant would surprise P.'

b. ?? Pedro estaría sorprendido con el hecho de que M. estuviese embarazada.

'P. would be surprised at the fact that M. be pregnant'

➤ NON EMOTIVE FACTIVE VERBS IN ADDITION do not select subjunctive mood, hence they lack the required temporal construction (*Si -ra, -ría*) (Kreutz 1998).

❖ Only temporal or probability interpretation is admitted:

(41) El presidente {descubriría/recordaría} que sus empleados lo **engañaban** → e1 < e2. TCM /\*SLCM

'The president would {discover / remember} whether his employees were cheating him'

❖ The same for *lamentaría* + indicative

(42) a. Juan **lamentaría** que su jefe se compró un coche. M1CM/ \*SLCM/  
'John would regret that his boss bought a car'

b. # Si su jefe se comprara un coche, Juan lo lamentaría.

c. 'Es altamente probable que Juan lamentara que su jefe se compró un coche'

(41) with a complement in indicative, it gives rise to an evaluation respect to the speech-time present 'es altamente probable' (Quer 1998), and syntactically, it is upon *lamentar*.

6.3 Scalarity → a preference about the actual world: the *gustar* +CM and modals +CM type

1. Conditional form *gustaría* SUSPENDS THE FACTIVITY of the verb since we cannot assert the truth of the embedded proposition *Juan se comprara un coche nuevo* in the statement *a mi jefe le gustaría que Juan se comprara un coche nuevo*.

2. We notice that the interpretation of the sentence is obtained with RESPECT TO THE PRESENT SPEECH TIME ('desea que') and not with respect to a possible world ('le agradaría'); this entails a change of meaning, and turns it into a volitional verb:

(43) A mi jefe le gustaría que Juan se comprara un coche nuevo.

(44) Mi jefe desea que Juan se compre un coche nuevo.

➤ Hence, semantics of *apetecer* is identical as *gustar* + *ía*.

3. A SCALAR MEANING: PRIORITY (Portner 2009 and von Stechow & Iatridou 2008)

➤ In the present, the conditional gives rise to a scalar meaning (crucially, contrary to Laca 2008):

A) It can express A WISH: VOLITIONAL

❖ We shall claim that Volition can be obtained:

- Semantically: *apetecer*, *tener ganas*, *gustaría* (lexicalized)

- Pragmatically: *encantaría* (not lexicalized) which can entail a counterfactual wish or not.

- *Gustaría* as the lexicalization of a pragmatic inference in the relevant context (Traugott and Dasher 2002) triggered by the narrow scope reading of CM WITH EMOTIVE-FACTIVES:

a. WIDE SCOPE → *-ría* [*lamentar que p*] = If [*p* → *q*]

b. NARROW SCOPE → [*lamentar*] [*-ría* [*p*]]

B) An EPISTEMIC MEANING → TASTE PREDICATES:

C) FURTHER EVIDENCE: In French these conditionals have a present anchoring: CM= 'present' (H,R,E).

*On dirait* (fr.) lit. SE.PRON say.COND.3SG.

(45) On **dirait** qu'il va pleuvoir.

a. 'Parece que va a llover.' 'It seems it is going to rain'

b. 'In a different possible world, one would say that it will rain'

➤ *Ca te dirait* (fr.) lit. it SE.PRON say.COND.3SG.

(46) a. ¿Ca te dirait d'aller au cinéma?

b. ¿Te apetece ir al cine?

'Would you like to go to the theatre?'

➤ *aimerait* (fr.) lit. it. love.COND.3SG.

(47) Mon patron **aimerait** que Jean s'achète une voiture neuve

b. \*Si Jean s'achetait une voiture neuve, mon patron aimerait cela.

c. Mi jefe quiere que J. se compre un coche nuevo.

➤ Predicates that inherently convey *priority* or a *preference* → similar meaning: *prefer*,

(48) {Preferiría / Convendría / Sería conveniente} que fueras.

## 6. Further research

A) Relation of the three features in terms of grammaticalization:

- (i) if aspect is more basic, is scalarity more basic also? It seems so: there are predicates that express priority but not CF;
- (ii) correspondingly, CF entails priority: It seems so.
- (iii) What about posteriority?
- (iv) Does grammaticalization wrt to scalarity imply the retention (since BPP 1994, von Fintel 1995) of the context licensing and the ability to be internally licensed?

B) Morphology or semantics?

### REFERENCES:

- BELLO, A. 1997, [1878], *Gramática de la lengua castellana*, Madrid, Edaf.
- CABEZA, C. 1996, «Presuposiciones y completivas de sujeto (con predicados de afección psíquica)», *E.L.U.A.*, 11, 123-138.
- CAMPOS, H. 1999, «Transitividad e intransitividad » en I. Bosque & V. Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, 1519-1574.
- COMRIE, B. 1986, «Conditionals: Typologie», en E. Traugott et al., *On Conditionals*, Cambridge, 77-99.
- COPLEY, B. 2009. *The semantics of the future*. New York : Routledge.
- TRAUGOTT, E.C. & Dasher, R. 2002. *Regularity in semantic change*. Cambridge: CUP.
- ESCANDELL, M. V. 2013. Evidential futures. M. KISSINE, P. DE BRABANTER & S. SHARIFZADEH (EDS.) *Future Times, Future Tenses*. Oxford : OUP.
- IATRIDOU, S. 2000, «The Grammatical Ingredients in Counterfactuality», *Linguistic Inquiry* 31, 2, 231-270.
- KARTTUNEN, L. 1971, «Some Observations on Factivity», *Papers in Linguistics*, 5, 55-69.
- LACA, B. 2010, «On the temporal orientation of intensional subjunctives in Spanish», in R.-M Dechaine, C. Delmas, J.Guéron (eds.) *Hommage to Carlota Smith*.
- LEONETTI, M. 2006.
- MONTOLÍO, E. 1999, «Las construcciones condicionales», en I. Bosque & V. Demonte (eds), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, 3644-3737.

MOSS, S. 2012, «On the pragmatics of counterfactuals», *Noûs*, 46, 3, 561-586.

- PESETSKY, D. 1991, *Zero Syntax*, vol. 2: Infinitives, Ms. MIT.
- PORTNER, P., 2008, *Modality*, Oxford University Press.
- QUER, J, 1998, *Mood at the Interface*, LOT diss.
- REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA, 2009, *Nueva Gramática de la lengua española*, Madrid, Espasa.
- RIEGEL, M., PELAT, J.C. & RIOUL, R. 2009 [1994], *Grammaire méthodique du français*, París, PUF.
- RIVERO, M. L. 1978. «Un ejemplo de metodología de filosofía analítica en la semántica lingüística: la cortesía y los actos verbales», *Revista española de lingüística*, vol. 8, núm. 1, 77-103.
- RIVERO, M.L. 2014.
- ROJO, G. & VEIGA, A. 1999, «El tiempo verbal. Los tiempos simples», en I. Bosque & V. Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, 2867-2934.
- STALNAKER, R. 1968, «A theory of Conditionals», in N. Rescher (ed), *Studies in Logical Theory*, 98-112.
- TRAUGOTT, E. [et al], 1986, *On Conditionals*, Cambridge.
- THOMPSON, A. 2012. «Deriving Some Properties of Protasis-Referring Conditionals» In *Proceedings of the 29<sup>th</sup> West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Jaehoon Choi et al., 250-258. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla, Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #2709.
- VATRICAN, A. 2013, «El condicional de cortesía en español: la hipótesis como forma de atenuación», en A. Cabedo Nebot, M. J. Aguilar Ruiz & E. López-Navarra Vidal (eds), *Estudios de lingüística: investigaciones, propuestas y aplicaciones*, Universitat de València, 469-480.
- VON FINTEL, K. & IATRIDOU, S. 2008, «How to say *Ought* in Foreign: the Composition of Weak Necessity Modals», en GUÉRON, J. & J. LECARME (eds). 2008, *Time and Modality*, Nueva York, Springer