

INDICATIVE AND  
SUBJUNCTIVE MODE

It was shown in the previous section that the indicative and subjunctive forms, as tense forms, have different potentials in modern Spanish. This means that two quite different contrasts between indicative and subjunctive need to be presented to the student. One is concerned with the function of forms in terms of tense; the other deals with the difference in mode. In some instances, as will be shown presently, these two functions are fused.

It has been repeatedly stated that language serves as a medium of communication only because it is a system based on contrasts. It has also been pointed out that there are differences which perform no function. The allophones of a phoneme do not contrast with each other functionally; neither do the allomorphs of a morpheme. Similarly, the difference between *haber* and *estar* for location is not a meaningful contrast. It is the product of useless specialization. Difference, in short, may or may not be significant to communication. It is functionally significant only when contrast is possible.

In many of the patterns in which the indicative and subjunctive mode forms appear there is no possibility of contrast. Only one or the other form may be used, and it follows, consequently, that the modal suffix performs no significant function. Under these conditions three quite different questions need to be answered in order to understand the use of the modal forms. One needs to know why each form is used, the environments or patterns in which each appears, and whether any meaning should be attached to its usage.

The answer to why a form is used must be divided into two parts. One part deals with arbitrary conventions; the other deals with meaningful contrasts. Neither the system nor the logic behind the native's way of organizing reality can be understood if these are confused.

The basic, arbitrary difference between the use of the Indicative and the Subjunctive is simple to state. The Indicative is used in either a main or a subordinate clause. The Subjunctive, with very minor exceptions, is used only in a subordinate clause. This is a most significant fact. First, the name of the mode is descriptive of this role. Second, the two modes can stand in contrast only when both may appear in a subordinate clause. Third, whenever only one appears, the modal suffix performs no contrastive function and usage is the product of arbitrary convention. Fourth, usage depends on two factors, linguistic structure and the Spaniard's way of organizing reality. In other words, the nature of the message and the manner of expressing it serve as joint cues for choice. As a result, the first step toward understanding the problem is to isolate the types of messages which are carried by subordinate clauses.

The Spaniard, as already observed, divides all of reality into two grand sets, entities and events. These are the two prime subjects of discourse, and, as a result, all reality may be organized by seven basic formulae:

1. An entity performs an event.
2. An entity is described or defined by an attribute.
3. An entity is described or defined by an event.
4. There is a relationship between two entities.
5. An event is described or defined by an attribute.
6. An event is described or defined by an event.
7. There is a relationship between two events.

Four of these formulae have linguistic equivalents in which the contrast between the two modes is not involved. A simple statement about an entity performing an event consists of only one clause (*Pedro trabaja*). The attributes of entities and events are expressed by adjectives or adverbs, and the relationships between entities are shown either by prepositions or by the difference between subject and object. By elimination, then, it is obvious that the modal contrast can be significant in only three formulae:

1. An entity is described by an event.
2. An event is described by an event.
3. There is a relationship between events.

The first two formulae appear in adjectival and adverbial clauses. The third encompasses all other patterns. The relationship between events may be shown in three ways: (1) by a preposition, (2) by an adverb, and (3) by the fact that the subordinate clause is the object of the main clause verb. The subordinate clause is joined to the main clause either by *que*, *donde*, or a conjunctive adverb (*cuando*, *mientras*, *como*). These are the structural patterns to be considered. What now must be determined is how the native's organization of reality provides the cues for choice.

A culture as such never sends a message, and, as a result, the role of the individual speaker and his private relationship with reality serve as the crucial factors in the choice of modal forms. Because no actual experience can be reported until after it has been either initiated or terminated, the speaker, at the instant of speaking, divides all reality into two private or personal sets: (1) what is already experienced or known and (2) what is yet to be experienced or known. Since experience, rather obviously, embraces both events and entities, the speaker may categorize both in the same fashion. From the point of view of the criteria of classification there is no fundamental difference between an event or an entity of which the speaker has or does not have experience. However, because there are different linguistic patterns for dealing with events and entities, it is useful to discuss them separately.

## Experience Versus Anticipation: Events

At PP all events must belong to one of three categories: (1) those which have been initiated or terminated, (2) those which are in progress, and (3) those being anticipated. The speaker, at PP, may have experience or knowledge of those events already initiated or terminated and of those in progress. He must anticipate those yet to take place. When two events are set in relation to each other, both may be classed either as experienced or anticipated. The difference, obviously, must be shown by some form of the verb. The nature of the relationship, in contrast, is indicated by the lexicon. To put this into a message a third factor, the syntactic pattern, must be added.

When two events are set in relation to each other by an adverb and when both events are described as already experienced, the facts may be expressed by the Present Indicative and two coordinate clauses:

*El llega y luego me lo quita.  
Promete y después no lo hace.  
Lo oye e inmediatamente llora.*

To indicate that the same two events, having the same relationship, are anticipated, the Present is replaced by the Future:

*El llegará y luego me lo quitará.  
Prometerá y después no lo hará.  
Lo oirá e inmediatamente llorará.*

The message expressed by the Future and two coordinate clauses can also be sent by changing the pattern to a main and a subordinate clause. When this transformation is used, the verb of the subordinate clause is put into the Subjunctive:

*El llegará y luego me lo quitará. Me lo quitará luego que llegue.  
Prometerá y después no lo hará. No lo hará después que prometa.  
Lo oirá e inmediatamente llorará. Llorará inmediatamente que lo oiga.*

Three very significant facts are now to be observed. First, the cue to the use of the Subjunctive is not to be found in the message but in the syntactic structure. The subordinate clause signals the use of the Subjunctive. Second, the Future in a coordinate clause and the Subjunctive in a subordinate clause express the same order relation to PP. The Subjunctive, in short, indicates anticipation. Third, the adverb in these examples does not modify the event described in the subordinate clauses. It gives, rather, the relationship of the event in the main clause to the event of the subordinate clause. This may be readily demonstrated to the student by transformations of the following type:

<i>La oirás y después estarás encantado.</i>	<i>Estarás encantado después que la oigas.</i>
<i>La oirás e inmediatamente estarás encantado.</i>	<i>Estarás encantado inmediatamente que la oigas.</i>
<i>La oirás y luego estarás encantado.</i>	<i>Estarás encantado luego que la oigas.</i>

In all the examples just cited the Subjunctive, like the Future, simply indicates anticipation at PP. There is no foundation for the traditional belief that it also suggests some doubt about the event taking place. There is nothing more certain than death, especially to a man in his terminal agony, yet one may say to him, *No te preocupes. Se hará inmediatamente que mueras.*

The Future and the Subjunctive, as just demonstrated, are used in speaking of anticipated events. The only possible minimal contrast with this is, obviously, the Present and the Indicative. This means, in



other words, that experienced events are described by the Indicative in both main and coordinate clauses. Compare:

*El llega y luego me lo quita. Me lo quita luego que llega.*  
*Promete y después no lo hace. No lo hace después que promete.*  
*Lo oye e inmediatamente llora. Lloro inmediatamente que lo oye.*

It should now be obvious that the student's attention needs to be focused on four sets of contrasting factors: (1) experience versus anticipation, (2) Present versus Future, (3) Indicative versus Subjunctive, and (4) coordinate versus subordinate clause. A fifth factor, the overt statement of a relationship between the two events, is also a necessary ingredient. When all these factors are present, modal differences can be described in terms of the basic structure of the tense system. What has been customarily so during the extended present and is, therefore, considered to be currently true, is contrasted with what is anticipated at PP, that is, posterior to PP. The basic contrast, then, is between simultaneity with PP (Present and Indicative) and posteriority to PP (Future and Subjunctive). Compare:

*Nos la da luego que llega. Nos la dará luego que llegue.*  
*Lo hace siempre que me visita. Lo hará siempre que me visite.*

It is pedagogically important to observe, at this juncture, that the patterns just described are customarily taught via translations from English to Spanish. It is obvious that the student will understand the contrasts much better and will have a greater control of the patterns of Spanish if transformations are used. There are four alternate points of departure for the creation of drill exercises: the two coordinate clause patterns and the two subordinate clause patterns. A second type of drill can be constructed by changing the nature of the relationship between the two events. The student, obviously, needs to recognize these relationships since they are one of the factors involved in the basic pattern.

In the examples presented so far the relationship has been expressed by an adverb, and the dependent clause has been introduced by the subordinating conjunction *que*. Both of these functions can be fulfilled by the adverbial conjunction *cuando*. The contrast between Present and Future, Indicative and Subjunctive remains unchanged:

*Lo hacemos cuando llegan. Lo haremos cuando lleguen.*

The relationships between events which are most commonly described in the patterns under discussion are:

1. The occurrence of one event is accompanied by or associated with the occurrence of another:

*Las cortamos cuando salen. Las cortaremos cuando salgan.*

2. One event always accompanies the occurrence of another:

*Las cortamos siempre que salen. Las cortaremos siempre que salgan.*

3. The regularity of the association is expressed by a prepositional phrase:

*Las cortamos a medida que salen. Las cortaremos a medida que salgan.*

4. The interval between the two events is indicated by an adverb:

*Las cortamos tan pronto como salen. Las cortaremos tan pronto como salgan.*

5. The endurance of one event in relation to the initiation or termination of another is indicated by a preposition:

*Sigue trabajando hasta que ve la solución. Seguirá trabajando hasta que vea la solución.*

*Se queda hasta que se termina la tarea. Se quedará hasta que se termine la tarea.*

6. The terminus of movement through space is shown by a preposition:

*Vamos en el jeep hasta donde es posible. Iremos en el jeep hasta donde sea posible.*

7. The manner in which one event takes place is determined by the other:

*Patrón, lo hacemos como Vd. quiere. Patrón, lo haremos como Vd. quiera.*

8. The place where one event takes place is determined by the other:

*Ya sabes que voy a donde tú me mandas. Ya sabes que iré a donde tú me mandes.*

9. One of the three order relations is established between the two events. These are shown by *antes*, *mientras* ~ *cuando*, and *después*.

Patterns of usage appear to be in a violent state of flux. *Mientras* is used either with or without *que* (*Mientras esté aquí, lo haremos* ~ *Lo haremos mientras que esté aquí.*). The *de* is frequently omitted from

*antes de que* and *después de que*, but its potential use permits the infinitive as an alternate of either the Indicative or the Subjunctive:

*Esto se hace antes de llegar el tren. Esto se hará antes de llegar el tren.*

Classical usage demands the Subjunctive after *antes de que* and *después de que* both for experienced and anticipated events. This nullifies the basic contrast shown in all other patterns and the Indicative appears to be gaining ground in speaking of experienced events. Some speakers avoid the conflict by using the neutral infinitive construction.

Spanish convention assigns specialized roles to *cuando* and *mientras* which are paralleled rather precisely by the difference between *when* and *while*. *Cuando* is not used to express simultaneity at PP; it appears only in constructions which deal with recall or anticipation. *Mientras* does not have this restriction; it may express recalled, current, or anticipated simultaneity:

*Lo hacen cuando (mientras) está aquí. Están haciéndolo mientras está aquí. Lo harán cuando (mientras) esté aquí.*

In the last example *mientras* may imply either that the subject is or is not here; *cuando* clearly indicates that the arrival is anticipated. Note that the nature of the related events may force *cuando* to have the meaning of posteriority, not simultaneity: *Lo harán cuando llegue* is not the same as *Lo harán mientras llegue*.

Once the student has control of the various relationships possible in Spanish, translations from Spanish to English are needed to fix the differences in patterns. English never translates *que* as *that*. The two clauses are linked either with *as* or only with a translation of whatever precedes *que*: *luego que* (*as soon as*); *hasta que* (*until*). The tenses used by both languages are identical. Spanish differs from English only in its redundant contrast between Indicative and Subjunctive. English shows a contrast only between the two main verbs; the subordinate clause is always Present Indicative (*We do it when he comes*; *We will do it when he comes*).

#### Experience Versus Anticipation: Entities

The relationship between entities and events may be organized from two different points of view. First, emphasis may be placed on the entity as the performer of the event (*Los perros ladran* = *The dogs*

*are barking*). Second, the event may be considered as a means of defining or describing the subject entity (*Los perros ladran; los pájaros cantan* = *Dogs bark; birds sing*). This same function is performed by a verb in a subordinate clause (*Habla de los perros que ladran*).

The entity and its descriptive event can, like an event and its descriptive event, be experienced or anticipated, and the same rule, as a result, governs the use of the Indicative and the Subjunctive.

When the speaker has experienced both the entity and the associated descriptive event, the subordinate verb is in the Indicative:

*Tiene un perro que ladra mucho.*

When the speaker has no experience of the entity mentioned and, of course, the descriptive event, the subordinate verb is in the Subjunctive:

*Quiero un perro que ladre mucho.*

Since entities may also be described by predicate adjectives, the verb in the subordinate clause may be a copula:

*Tiene una mujer que es buena. Busco una mujer que sea buena.*

It should be noted that the difference between a definite and an indefinite antecedent is not a crucial factor in the choice. The antecedent noun may be modified by the definite article:

*Se le da al hombre que salta primero. Se le dará al hombre que salte primero.*

Or by the indefinite article:

*Tengo una criada que cocina bien. Necesito una criada que cocine bien.*

Students frequently have trouble understanding these contrastive functions. The precise difference can readily be established by using transformations. The sentence *Tengo una criada que cocina bien* actually composed of two basic sentences: *Tengo una criada. Cocina bien*. Both make sense. In contrast, the sentence *Necesito una criada que cocine bien* cannot be recast as *Necesita una criada. Cocina bien*. The speaker has no experience of the servant nor of her skills and cannot, as a result, make a positive statement. English exhibits the same limitations:

I have a servant. She cooks well.  
 I need a servant. She cooks well.



In both languages the non-experienced entity can be described only by a verb in a dependent clause.<sup>1</sup> Spanish adds the Subjunctive to avoid confusion.

#### Experience Versus Non-Experience: Events and Entities

In the two previous sections the contrast between Indicative and Subjunctive was based on the difference between experience and anticipation. This difference can be reformulated as experience versus non-experience, a contrast which explains several uses of the Indicative and the Subjunctive.

When the speaker has no experience or knowledge of an entity, that entity is described, in an adjectival clause, by a verb in the subjunctive mode. Compare:

*Hay un hombre que puede hacerlo. No hay hombre que pueda hacerlo.*

The same underlying principle explains the contrast between the following examples:

The speaker anticipates: *Le agradeceré lo que haga por mi hermana.*  
The speaker has no experience: *Le agradezco lo que haya hecho por mi hermana.*

The speaker knows what was done: *Le agradezco lo que ha hecho por mi hermana.*

It is only one step from what has been experienced to what one may conclude from inference, circumstantial evidence, or simply blind faith. There are two possible conclusions. The speaker accepts the evidence as equivalent to actual experience or an equivalent to non-experience. Each attitude is expressed overtly by the main clause and redundantly by the modal contrast in the subordinate clause. For example:

<i>Es evidente que han llegado.</i>	<i>Es imposible que hayan llegado.</i>
<i>Creo que han llegado.</i>	<i>No creo que hayan llegado.</i>
<i>Estoy seguro que han llegado.</i>	<i>Dudo que hayan llegado.</i>
<i>Me imagino que han llegado.</i>	<i>No me imagino que hayan llegado.</i>

Non-experience (or the lack of positive knowledge) can, as just demonstrated, be relevant to what has or has not happened, to what is going on, and, of course, to what is being anticipated. Only logic and the life situation determine the tense of the dependent verb:

*Es imposible que ~~ya~~ hubiera llegado.*  
*No creo que estuviera allí entonces.*  
*Dudo que se vaya mañana.*

<sup>1</sup>The basic idea, of course, can be expressed by the statement "Some servant will cook well" (*Alguna criada cocinará bien*). The tense is Future to indicate anticipation.

Non-experience (or the lack of positive knowledge) accounts for the subjunctive mode in the following formulae:

*Dondequiera que vayan . . .*  
*Quienquiera que sea . . .*  
*Cualquier razón que den . . .*  
*Por mal que canten . . .*  
*Por mucho que corran . . .*

There are times when the speaker, for lack of knowledge or evidence, can only vacillate between a negative or positive conclusion. Under these conditions he may hedge in either direction by the appropriate choice of mode:

*Temo que han llegado.* (The evidence is reasonably conclusive.)  
*Temo que hayan llegado.* (The evidence is inconclusive.)

This duality is especially common when the verb is modified by *tal vez*, *acaso*, or *quizás*. These are the only common constructions in which the Subjunctive does not appear in a subordinate clause. As a result, to avoid confusion with the Imperative, the Subjunctive tends to follow these modifiers; the Indicative, more frequently, precedes:

*Tal vez sea así. Es así, tal vez.*

It is important to make clear to the student that non-experience may be accounted for in three ways: (1) the event is yet to take place or the entity is yet to be encountered, (2) the event cannot take place or the entity does not exist, and (3) the speaker has not experienced the event (though it may have taken place) or has not encountered the entity (though it may exist).

English offers some cues for choice. *However* plus a modifier frequently takes *to be* in the Subjunctive (*However honest he be . . .*). *Whatever* plus *may* is one English way of talking about non-experience:

I am grateful for what you have done for my sister.  
I am grateful for whatever you may have done for my sister.

#### The Relationship of Events to Events

In the previous section the relationship between the speaker and the event (or entity) under consideration played an important role in determining the choice between the two modes. The present section deals with relationships between events and with specific ways of organizing these relationships. The contrast between experience and anticipation (non-experience) has no direct bearing on how the events are organized nor on the choice of the mode.

The relationship between two events may be either casual or significant. Events which just happen to take place, for example, at the same time, in serial order, or in the same locale are only casually related to each other (*La gente viene y va; Come y fuma; Estaba allí cuando lo ví*, etc.). Two events have a significant relationship when the occurrence of one is in some way dependent upon the occurrence of the other. In theory this relationship may be formulated in two fundamental ways. First, one event causes the second to take place. Second, an event or a state results from the occurrence of an event. This relationship does not need to be causal. Both of these relationships may be stated covertly by two coordinate clauses and the indicative mode. The hearer, of course, must infer the relationship. Cause and effect are covertly expressed in:

*Se golpea el vidrio y se rompe.*  
*Papá vuelve y mamá se alegra.*  
*Le da el veneno y muere.*

The resulting event (or state) can readily be defined in:

*Abre la llave y el agua sale.*  
*Corre mucho y se pone cansado.*  
*Lo pongo aquí y está satisfecha.*

All of these statements can be recast so that the events are anticipated. This does not cause a change in mode (*Papá volverá y mamá se alegrará; Abrirá la llave y el agua saldrá*, etc.). They can also be recast so that the events are treated as hypothetical. The clause containing the causal or result-producing event is modified by *si*. Both verbs are in the Indicative:

*Si se golpea el vidrio, se rompe.*  
*Si abre la llave, el agua sale.*

The Indicative is still used when the events are anticipated:

*Si papá vuelve, mamá se alegrará.*  
*Si corre mucho, se pondrá cansado.*

To express these relationships overtly Spanish must use a relative word, either a preposition (or prepositional phrase) or an adverb. When the relationship is expressed by a preposition, one event may be treated, in special instances, as the object of the preposition and be expressed by the infinitive:

*Al golpearse, el vidrio se rompe.*  
*Corre para ponerse cansado.*  
*Sin abrir la llave, el agua no sale.*

However, whenever any one of these statements is transformed into a main and a subordinate clause, the verb of the subordinate clause is always in the subjunctive mode:

*Se golpea el vidrio para que se rompa.*  
*Abre la llave para que salga el agua.*  
*Papá vuelve para que mamá se alegre.*

What cues the choice of the Subjunctive is (1) the nature of the relationship and (2) the use of a subordinate clause which, in all instances, is introduced by *que*. The nature of the relationship is expressed by the preposition (prepositional phrase) or the adverb which precedes the conjunctive *que*. In principle, either event may be in either clause, and either, as a result, may be described by the Indicative or the Subjunctive. This alternation is not determined by linguistic factors but by the way the speaker formulates the relationship between the two events. There are several standard patterns.

1. It is asserted that one event is performed to produce the resulting event. Slightly different overtones are indicated by different prepositions or prepositional phrases:

*Te he traído aquí para que se lo digas a mamá.*  
*Te he traído aquí a que se lo digas a mamá.*  
*Te he traído aquí a fin de que se lo digas a mamá.*

2. It is stated that one event cannot take place without producing the resulting event:

*No se golpea el vidrio sin que se rompa.*  
*No se abre la llave sin que salga el agua.*  
*Papá no vuelve sin que mamá se alegre.*

It is to be noted that *sin*, in these patterns, is simply the negative of *para* and its synonyms. Compare:

*Golpea el vidrio para que se rompa.*  
*No golpea el vidrio sin que se rompa.*

3. The speaker predicts that the resulting event will take place provided the other takes place. The resulting event is now in the main clause and the result-producing event is in the subordinate clause:

*El vidrio se romperá con tal que lo golpees.*  
*El agua saldrá con tal que abras la llave.*  
*Mamá se alegrará con tal que papá vuelva.*



The negative of this formulation is expressed by *no plus aun*:

*El vidrio no se romperá aunque lo golpees.*  
*El agua no saldrá aunque abras la llave.*  
*Mamá no se alegrará aunque papá vuelva.*

A different kind of negative takes *no plus a menos*:

*El vidrio no se romperá a menos que lo golpees.*  
*El agua no saldrá a menos que abras la llave.*  
*Mamá no se alegrará a menos que papá vuelva.*

4. It is understood that the result-producing event must be performed in just a certain way to produce the second event. The manner or way of producing the result is indicated by *de manera* or *de modo*:

*Se colocará de manera que se vea.*  
*Se colocará de modo que se vea.*

These statements, contrary to many texts, are not simply free variants of *Se colocará para que se vea*. In the first two examples the manner of performing one event leads to the other. With *para* the event itself produces the result. There is a fundamental difference between *Lo golpea para que se rompa* and *Lo golpea de manera que se rompa*. The first deals with intent (purpose); the second reveals the skill of the performer.

5. The formula with *si* is transformed into a pattern taking a subordinate clause:

*Si golpeas el vidrio, se romperá.*  
*En caso de que golpees el vidrio, se romperá.*

6. The speaker commands the listener to perform the result-producing event. The preposition indicating the relationship may be omitted (*Levántate que te vean mejor*) or expressed (*Levántate para que te vean mejor*). The speaker may also command the listener to perform the causal event in such a way that the desired result is produced (*¡Hombre! Colócalo de manera que se vea.*).

The student must be made to observe that there are three factors involved in the choice of mode: (1) one event does not take place without the other, (2) the relationship between the two events may be covertly or overtly expressed, and (3) the presence or absence of a subordinate clause. In practice two factors are sufficient to indicate the proper choice of mode: the nature of the relationship and the type of clause. Coordinate clauses take the Indicative. An independent clause plus a prepositional phrase takes the Indicative and the Infinitive.

tive. The subordinate clause, then, is the linguistic signal for the use of the Subjunctive. Since the Indicative cannot stand in contrast with the Subjunctive in these patterns, it follows that the form performs no special function. The conditions under which it appears can be stated; its function, however, cannot be meaningfully described. Usage depends upon arbitrary conventions.

Since the pattern ultimately determines the choice of mode, the student cannot be taught discrimination without pattern changes. Saturation drills, which teach morphology and vocabulary, can be created by producing variations within a given pattern. Choice drills are possible only when one pattern is transformed into another. There are two useful types of transformation: (1) from Indicative to Subjunctive and vice versa, and (2) from one logical formulation to another. The cues for the second type of drill are *para, sin, con tal, aun, a menos, de manera*, etc.

#### Physical Cause Versus Verbal Cause

In all of the examples cited in the previous section a purely physical activity caused or led to the resulting event. A faucet is opened and the water pours out; father returns and mother is happy. Speech, like purely physical activity, can cause or lead to the resulting event: *Papá lo dice y mamá se alegra; Papá lo dice para que mamá se alegre.*

The most direct and forceful use of speech to cause an event to take place is the employment of the imperative mode (*Salga, venga, coma, alégrate*, etc.). To report, in indirect discourse, the use of the Imperative requires a subordinate clause. For example:

PEDRO. ¡Salga!  
 JOSÉ. ¿Qué dice?  
 MARÍA. Dice que salga.

The Subjunctive, in other words, is used in indirect discourse to report the use of the Imperative. For example, *Papá dice, —¡Alégrate!* is transformed into *Papá dice que te alegres*. The same two factors discussed in the previous section are present: (1) a causal event, the command, and (2) a subordinate clause. The principle may be confirmed by comparing the two following transformations:

*Papá dice, —¡Alégrate!*      *Papá dice que te alegres.*  
*Papá dice, —¡Se alegra!*      *Papá dice que se alegre.*

In the first example Papá uses the Imperative to cause, or at least to attempt to cause, the action of the person spoken to. This is reflected in the transformation by the use of the Subjunctive which, it should be

noted in this case, describes an anticipated event. In the second example Papá is reporting on his observation, in short, his experience, and this is shown by the Indicative.

In these examples the Indicative and the Subjunctive stand in meaningful contrast with each other. Both patterns exhibit a subordinate clause, and the cue for choice, quite obviously, lies in the relationship between the two events. There are three basic patterns:

1. The subject of the main verb observes the activity of the subject of the dependent verb: *Juan ve que Pedro sale; Yo noto que ya tienes el dinero; Yo observo que ya lo has terminado*. The same pattern is used when the subject of the main verb has positive knowledge of the activity of the subject of the dependent verb (*Entiendo que ya lo has terminado*). The Indicative is used in the subordinate clause.

2. The subject of the main verb predicts the activity of the subject of the dependent verb (*Digo que vendrá*). This becomes, in indirect discourse, *Dice que vendrá*. The Indicative is used in the subordinate clause.

3. The subject of the main verb attempts to influence (cause) the action of the subject of the dependent verb by speech: *Insisto en que vaya*. The Subjunctive is used in the subordinate clause. This may be reformulated in indirect discourse in two ways. First, by simply changing the person of the verb (*Insiste en que vaya*) and, second, by using a cover verb which describes the causal event as speech (*Dice que vaya*). This second alternative is most important in teaching.

Since speech, in these patterns, is used to cause or influence action, a rather large number of verbs have only one major function, namely, to describe the manner of speaking. For example, *gritar* is, in fact, *decir en voz muy alta; mandar* is *decir con autoridad y firmeza*. Other verbs of this type are *pedir, rogar, insistir, murmurar, suplicar, decretar, demandar, clamar*, etc. All of these verbs may be used in indirect discourse to describe the attitude of the speaker and the way he uses the Imperative. The speaker, for example, says *salga*:

With tremendous volume:      *Grita que salga.*  
 With authoritative intonation:      *Manda que salga.*  
 In barely audible fashion:      *Murmura que salga.*  
 Timidly and gently:      *Ruega que salga.*  
 Tearfully and beggingly:      *Suplica que salga.*  
 Politely but firmly:      *Pide que salga.*  
 Emphatically and repeatedly:      *Insiste que salga.*

Emphatically and imperiously:      *Demanda que salga.*  
 Solemnly and officially:      *Decreta que salga.*  
 Gently and fatherly:      *Aconseja que salga.*

It is to be noted, now, that these verbs need to be divided into two sub-sets. One set describes only the manner of articulation, the way of uttering words (*decir, gritar, murmurar, gruñir, clamar*, etc.). These verbs, as a result, may describe either the manner of reporting events or the way of saying the Imperative. The objective situation, then, provides the only cue to choice of the proper mode. Compare:

*Dice que salta.*      *Dice que salte.*  
*Grita que salta.*      *Grita que salte.*

The other sub-set is composed of verbs which describe the general manner of the speaker while attempting to influence the actions of others. These verbs cue the Subjunctive (*mandar, pedir, rogar, suplicar*, etc.). It is fairly obvious that the first set will be used only in indirect discourse. The speaker who is already shouting does not need to describe the fact to his hearer. The second set, however, may be used by the speaker to express his attitude when there are reasons for not making them obvious by overt actions. The words, in short, may function as a substitute for overt demonstrations of the various attitudes.

The most direct, emphatic, and forceful way of using speech to cause or influence action is, as already stated, the imperative mode. In real life situations the same result can be achieved, in many instances, by less forceful means. A general can cause a private to act by merely stating his wish (*Quiero que vaya*). A counselor can influence the behavior of his client simply by expressing his hope (*Espero que lo haga*). In many real life situations the choice of these alternatives is dictated by social amenities or practical facts. There is a tremendous difference between an employee saying to his boss *Insisto en que me pague más* and *Quiero que me pague más*. Both, however, are attempts to influence behavior. The least insistent and most diplomatic utterance (also the most timid) is *Espero que me pague más*. From the point of view of the student, however, these differences are irrelevant in learning to choose between the Indicative and the Subjunctive. Any attempt, intent, or desire to influence the action of the subject of the dependent verb cues the use of the Subjunctive. It is needless to say that the cause and effect relationship cannot exist unless there are two entities and two events involved. *Quiero ir* describes what the speaker wants to do. *Quiero que Vd. vaya* describes what the speaker