This study looks at natural syntactic processes in the development of verbal mood in first- and second-language acquisition, language change in progress, history, and creolization. Correspondences are examined in the development of the subjunctive vs. the indicative mood. The study presents an integrative perspective, taking into account seemingly disparate linguistic areas in order to reveal universals of markedness. A model of syntactic markedness is proposed that is closely aligned with C. J. Bailey's theoretical views, as well as with Faingold's studies of phonological and morphological development. The model relies on psycholinguistic studies on first- and second-language acquisition, as well as on sociolinguistic variation and change, language history and creolization. The constraints on the development of verbal mood revealed cannot be explained without referring to non-syntactic and non-linguistic factors. Results demonstrate the relevance of second-language learning for markedness theory in particular, as well as for the study of linguistic theory in general, and the relevance of linguistic analysis for foreign language teaching. Pedagogical implications for teaching the subjunctive in American universities are outlined. (Contains 41 references.) (CK)
Teaching Spanish in the US: Grammatical Theory and the Communicative Method
(1)a >m >m >m (the more marked changes to less marked)

b >m >m >m (the presence of the more marked implicates the presence of the less marked)

Principle (1)a predicts that if x changes to y, x is more marked than y, and y is less marked than x. Principle (1)b defines the natural implicational patterns of the system. These principles, however, can be overruled by borrowing of prestige structures and other sociocommunicational processes (see Section 3).

2 The acquisition, learning, change, history, and creolization of verbal mood

This section deals with the development of verbal mood in first language acquisition, second language learning, language change in progress, history, and creolization in Spanish and French, supporting the hierarchy of natural syntactic markedness discussed in section 3.

2.1 Mood in child language

In this section I show errors children make in the acquisition of the subjunctive mood in Spanish and French. Children usually substitute the less marked indicative for the more marked subjunctive. This is a type of error that occurs very frequently.

Data on the acquisition of the subjunctive has been gleaned from Gregoire’s (1947) and Remacle’s (1966) naturalistic studies on the acquisition of Belgian French, as well as Blake’s (1980)
experimental study on the acquisition of Mexican Spanish. Table 1 (next page) displays early substitutions (neutralization) in the acquisition of French and Spanish mood.

In items (1)-(6) in Table 1.1, French-speaking children avoid the subjunctive; they avoid (item (1)) and in certain cases substitute the infinitive (sentence (2)) and (more often) the indicative (sentences (3)-(6)) for the present and past subjunctive. Similarly, in Table 1.2, Spanish-speaking children substitute the less marked indicative for the more marked subjunctive in constructions indicating doubt (examples (1)-(2)) and attitude (examples (3)-(4)).

2.2 Mood in second language learning

Recent work by Pishwa (1989, 1991), as well as earlier work by Eckmann (1977), demonstrates the relevance of data from second language learning for markedness theory (see, further, Andersen 1983, Wode 1983). In this section I show errors English-speaking adults make in the acquisition of the Spanish subjunctive. A questionnaire containing sentences in which the use of the subjunctive is obligatory was given to two groups of (sixty) English-speaking students taking beginners Spanish at the State University of New York (see appendix). Table 2 (next page) displays substitutions in the acquisition of Spanish in the classroom.

In Table 2, as with child language, English-speakers substitute (i) the less marked infinitive and (more often) the present indicative (as well as other ungrammatical structures) for
Table 1
Subjunctive neutralization in child language

Table 1.1
Language acquisition: Neutralization in French-speaking children aged 3, 4, and 5
(Gregoire 1947, Remacle 1966)

Children aged 3 (Gregoire 1947: 117-118)
(1) Avoidance of the subjunctive

(2) Use of the infinitive, "pour" + infinitive instead of "pour que" + subjunctive
pour zeter ('pour jeter') (< pour qu'il jette)

(3) Use of the indicative after "pour que"
Pour qu'il n'tombait pas (< tombât)

Children aged 4 and 5 (Remacle 1966: 303-304)
(i) The indicative
(4) Je voudrais que vous portez la voiture. (< portiez)

(5) Je n'aime pas que tu vas à l'école. (< ailles)

(6) Faudrais qu'je défais 5. (< defasse)

Table 1.2
Language acquisition: Neutralization in Spanish-speaking children aged 4 to 12
(Blake 1980: 75-148; 171-178)

Pilot study: Children aged 4 to 6
(a) Examples
Doubt
(1) María no cree que el... (+ subjunctive)

(2) Mamá duda que el niño... (+ subjunctive)

Attitude
(3) Roberto se alegra de que Jorge... (+ subjunctive)

(4) Mamá tiene miedo que papá... (+ subjunctive)

(b) Error analysis
Construction  Rate of errors

doubt 30.5 %
attitude 30 %
Table 2
Subjunctive neutralization in 2nd language learning:
English speakers of Spanish

First group (Spring 1993)
(i) Present subjunctive

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>present subjunctive</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present indicative</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td><strong>874</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rate of errors= 79.5%

(ii) Past subjunctive

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>past subjunctive</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past indicative</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present indicative</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present subjunctive</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td><strong>874</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rate of errors= 94%

Second group (Fall 1993)
(i) Present subjunctive

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>present subjunctive</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present indicative</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td><strong>551</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rate of errors= 60%

(ii) Past subjunctive

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>past subjunctive</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past indicative</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present indicative</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present subjunctive</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditional</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td><strong>551</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rate of errors= 89%
the more marked present subjunctive in 79.5% (first group) and 60% (second group) of the cases where the present subjunctive is obligatory, and (ii) the less marked present subjunctive, the infinitive, the present indicative, the future, and (more often) the past indicative (as well as other ungrammatical structures) for the more marked past subjunctive in 94% (first group) and 89% (second group) of the cases where the past subjunctive is obligatory.

2.3 Mood in language change in progress

In this section I study subjunctive neutralization in language change in progress in Latin American and Iberian dialects of Spanish, as well as Belgian and Parisian French. Table 3 (next page) displays substitutions in France and Belgium.

As with child language and second language learning, in Table 3, items (1)-(28), French speakers substitute the less marked conditional (sentences (2)-(5)), the future (sentences (6)-(9)), and (more often) the indicative (sentences (1), (10)-(28)) for the more marked present and past subjunctive. Table 4 (next page) presents substitutions in modern Spanish.

In Table 4.1, items (1)-(21), Latin American and Iberian Spanish speakers show variation in or/and substitute the less marked future (sentences (11), (16)-(19)) and (more often) the present (sentences (1)-(3), (7), (9), (12), (20)-(21)) and present-perfect indicative (sentences (2)-(13)) for the more marked present and present-perfect subjunctive; they also replace the less marked past indicative (sentences (5)-(6), (8), (10), (14)) for the more
Table 3
Language change in progress: Subjunctive neutralization in French
(Cohen 1965, Pohl 1962)

Table 3.1
Subjunctive neutralization in France
(Cohen 1965: 190-191)

(i) The indicative
  (1) ...à moins qu’il vient. (< vienne)

(ii) The conditional
  (2) Je viendrai a moins qu’il pleuvrait. (< pleuve)
  (3) je lui aurais parlé, a moins qu’il n’aurait pas été là. (< ait)

Table 3.2
Subjunctive neutralization in Belgium
(Pohl 1962)

(i) The conditional (p. 87)
  (4) Il faudrait que tu regarderais s’ils sont faits. (< regardes)

(ii) The simple future (p. 88, 100)
  (6) Nous sommes assez tard, porvu qu’il sera patient. (< soit)

(iii) The periphrastic future (p. 88)
  (8) Tout le monde a peur qu’il va attraper une attaque.
(< attrape)

(iv) The indicative
  (a) Influence and obligation (pp. 91-92)
  (10) Je voudrais qu’elle prenne une fois quinze jours. (< prenne)

  (b) after "pour que", "pourvu que", "avant que", "jusqu’à ce que"
  (pp. 92-93)
  (13) qu’elle tâche de tirer son plan por que on se remet.
(< remette)

  (14) pourvu qu’elle est chauffée, c’est le principal.
(< soit chauffée)

  (15) de manière à ce que je sais. (< sache)
(16) avant que tu *pars*, donne-moi de l’argent. (< partes)
(17) jusqu’à ce que tu *verras*. (< voies)

(c) expectation, wish, desire (p. 94)
(18) j’attends que ça s’éclaireit. (< eclaircisse)

(19) Je souhaite de tout mon coeur, qu’elle *est remise* de ses
emotions... (< soit)

(d) impersonal expressions showing uncertitude
(20) C’est bizarre qu’on n’a toujours pas vu le journal. (< ait vu)

(21) il est bien regrettable que vous n’avez pas pu aboutir.
(< ayez pu)

(e) after "à moins que" (pp. 94-95)
(22) a moins que le jeune homme *sait* le monter. (< sache)

(23) a moins qu’elle *est* ici. (< soit)

(f) generic, alternative (p. 95)
(24) qu’ils font ça le matin, ça je ne *dirais* pas. (< dise)

(g) after "non que", "malgré que", "quoique", etc. (p. 95)
(25) ... quoique, elle m’a fait un petit mot. (< ait fait)

(26) non pas qu’elle *avait* des explications à me demander. (< eût)

(h) emotion (pp. 95 - 96)
(27) Hé bien ! je suis content que ma pendule *est faite*.
(< soit faite)

(28) je n’aime pas que ça *va* trop vite. (< aille)
Table 4
Language change in progress: Subjunctive neutralization in modern Spanish

Table 4.1
Subjunctive Neutralization in modern Latin American and Iberian Spanish

Latin America and Spain
(i) Present subjunctive - indicative (Goldin 1974: 300)
(1)a Me alegro que esté aquí.
(1)b Me alegro que esté aquí.

(ii) Present perfect subjunctive - indicative (Goldin 1974: 300)
(2)a Es una lástima que haya ido.
(2)b Es una lástima que ha ido.

Madrid
(iii) Present indicative (Salaun 1972: 15)
(3) Si quisieran escucharme les dije la verdad. (< diría?)

(iv) Past indicative
(4) canté replaces cantaran

Mexico (Lope Blanch 1958)
(a) Emotion (p. 383)
(5) Estoy muy satisfecha de que supo terminarlo el solo. (< supiera)

(6) No lo puedo remediar: me da coraje que lo hizo sin mi permiso. (< hiciera)

(b) Possibility (p. 384)
(7) Habiendo la posibilidad de que el producto protege al niño tocado por el virus. (< proteja)

(8) Es muy probable que el crimen fue cometido dos horas después de que... (< fuera)

(c) Doubt and negation (p. 384)
(9) No creo que lo saben. (< sepan)

(10) Niegan que se efectuó una violación de los derechos individuales. (< efectuara)

(d) Relative phrases (p. 384)
(11) Los elementos del PRI se disciplinarán a los acuerdos que tomará la próxima convención. (< tome)

(12) Deberán presentar el visto bueno por medio del que se haga constar que el aparato de que se trata no ofrece ningún peligro. (< trate ?)
Spain (Lope Blanch 1958: 384)
(13) Mucho me alegra que no ha caído en el vacío mi escrito. (< haya caído)

(14) y aunque no hay noticias concretas, lo probable es que murió en Alcalá de Henares. (< muriera)

Spain and Mexico (Lope Blanch 1958: 385)
(iv) Present subjunctive - future indicative
(16)a Es posible que llueva.
(16)b Posiblemente llouverá.

(17)a Es probable que haya terminado.
(17)b Probablemente lo terminó.

(18)a No creo que vuelva.
(18)b No creo que volverá.

(19)a El libro que proximamente escriba, sera mejor.
(19)b El libro que proximamente escribiré, sera mejor.

Los Angeles (US) (Silva-Corvalán 1993)
(20) Lo voy a dejar hasta que se caiga. (< caiga)

(21) Quiero viajar por muchas partes hasta que me case. (< case)
Table 4.2
Subjunctive neutralization in modern Latin American and Iberian Spanish:
A department of Spanish language

(i) Present subjunctive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>present subjunctive</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indefinite</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rate of error = 2.6%

(ii) Past subjunctive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>past subjunctive</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present perfect subjunctive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past perfect subjunctive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past indicative</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present indicative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rate of error = 13.8%
Table 4.3
Subjunctive neutralization in Argentine Spanish

(i) Present subjunctive

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>present subjunctive</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present indicative</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present perfect subjunctive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td><strong>456</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rate of errors = 2%

(ii) Past subjunctive

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>past subjunctive</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past indicative</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past perfect subjunctive</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present perfect subjunctive</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present indicative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present subjunctive</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditional</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td><strong>456</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rate of error = 35%
marked past subjunctive.

In Table 4.2 I show the use of the subjunctive by Spanish-speaking faculty members of the Spanish department of an American university (see appendix). The Spanish-speaking professors substitute the less marked infinitive and the indefinite for the more marked present subjunctive in 2.6% of the cases where the present subjunctive is obligatory; as with child language and second language learning (see above) they also neutralize the past subjunctive to a larger extent, since they substitute the less marked present-perfect subjunctive, the past-perfect subjunctive, the past indicative, the present indicative, and the infinitive for the more marked past subjunctive in 13.8% of the cases where the past subjunctive is obligatory.

In Table 4.3 I show the use of the subjunctive by Spanish-speaking Argentine students at the University of Buenos Aires (see appendix). As with the Spanish professors (as well as child language and second language speakers), the native speakers of Argentine Spanish substitute the less marked infinitive (and more often) the indicative (and in one case the present-perfect subjunctive) for the more marked present subjunctive in 2% of the cases where the present subjunctive is obligatory; they also neutralize the more marked past subjunctive to a very large extent (in 35% of the cases where the past subjunctive is obligatory).

2.4 Mood in history

In this section I study the neutralization of the present and the past subjunctive in the history of Spanish and French, as shown
in Table 5 (next page).

As with child language, second language learning, and language change in progress, in Medieval Spanish the less marked present indicative replaces the more marked present subjunctive, as shown in sentences (1)-(4) in Table 5.1. Similarly, in Table 5.2, in seventeenth century French, the less marked present indicative substitutes for the more marked present subjunctive (sentences (1)-(2), (4)-(5), (7), while the less marked past indicative substitutes for the more marked past subjunctive (sentences (3), (6)).

2.5 Mood in creolization

In this section I study the emergence of a new subjunctive in Papiamentu and Haitian creole. French-based Haitian creole is spoken by more than five million people in the island of Hispaniola, which Haiti shares with the Dominican Republic. Papiamentu is a Spanish and Portuguese creole spoken by over 200,000 people in the islands of Curacao, Aruba, and Bonaire (Netherland Antilles) (see, further, Faingold 1992a, forthcoming). Table 6 (next page) displays Papiamentu and Haitian creole verb systems. Less marked mood distinctions (subjunctive vs indicative) in Papiamentu appear to be systematically markered by zero forms (Maurer 1993). Table 6.1 displays the Tense-Mood-Aspect system of Papiamentu. Work in progress by Michel DeGraff (forthcoming) seems to suggest that zero markers might be also used to mark the subjunctive in Haitian creole, as shown in Table 6.2 item (6).
Table 5
History: Subjunctive neutralization in Spanish and French

Table 5.1
History: Subjunctive neutralization in medieval Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present indicative (Lope Blanch 1958: 384)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Plázeme que assí lo siente. (˘ sienta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) ... pero mucho plazer tengo que de tan fiel gente andas acompañado. (˘ andes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) ... y deseemos ir adonde naide nos menosprecia. (˘ menosprecie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) No creo que hay caballero en el mundo tan... (˘ haya)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2
History: Subjunctive neutralization in XVIIth century French (Haase 1965)

(i) The indicative in concessive phrases with a ‘positive’ verb after "quelque...qu.” (p.177)
| (1) ce ne sera pas sans vous aller baiser la main, en quelque part que vous serez. (˘ soyez) |
| (2) Quelque plaisir que j’ai d’avoir de vos nouvelles, j’avoue, etc. (˘ aie) |

(ii) The indicative in conjunctive phrases with "que" after desire or wish
| (a) after "Dieu permet", "le Ciel permet" (p.181) |
| (3) Le ciel permit q’un seule se trouva... (˘ trouvât) |
| (b) after "attendre" (p. 181) |
| (4) J’attends de votre complaisance que deéorsmais partout vous fuirez ma présence. (˘ fuyiez) |

(iii) The indicative with concessive conjunctions "quoique", "bien que", "encore que" (pp. 194 - 195).
| (5) Quoique j’ai joué fort éturdiment, je ne me suis pas portant si fort emporté. (˘ sois) |
| (6) Examinons la chose avec équité, bien qu’en matière de langage il suffit que plusieurs de meilleurs juges de la langue rejettent une façon de parler. (˘ suffise) |
| (7) Encore que cela est vrai en un sens pour quelques âmes... (˘ soit) |
Table 6
Creolization: Spanish- and French-based creoles

Table 6.1
Creolization: Papiamentu verbal system
(Andersen 1990, p.c.; Maurer 1993)

(i) Tense - aspect - mood
(1) ta imperfective J ta kome...
   'J eats/is eating...'
(2) a perfective J a kome...
   'J ate/has eaten/used to eat...'
(3) tabata past imperfective J tabata kome...
   'J was eating/used to eat...'
(4) sa habitual J sa kome...
   'J usually eats...'
(5)a lo future J lo kome...
   'J will eat...'
(5)b lo bai future J lo bai kome
   'J is going to eat it'
(6) 0 subjunctive (Si) J eats...
     '(If) J eats...'

Table 6.2
Creolization: Haitian verbal system
(DeGraff forthcoming)

(i) Tense - aspect - mood
(1) ap imperfective J ap manje...
   'J is eating...'
(2)a 0 perfective J manje...
   'J ate/has eaten...'
(2)b te perfective J te manje...
   'J had eaten...'
(3)a t(e) ap past imperfective J t(e) ap manje...
   'J was eating...'
(3)b te konn past imperfective J te konn manje...
   'J used to eat...'
(4) 0 habitual J manje (+ context)
    'J eats (+ context)
(5)b pral future J pral manje...
    'J will eat...'
(5)h ap future J ap manje...
    'J is going to eat...'
(6) 0 subjunctive (?) si J manje...
    'if J eats...'
3 Syntactic markedness

This section presents a model of syntactic markedness to account for the development of mood in the languages and linguistic systems in Section 2.

3.1 A developmental model of syntactic markedness

This paper adopts Faingold's (1992a, 1994, forthcoming) model of markedness. The model aims to reveal universal mechanisms of language development as well as biological and sociocommunicational constraints on language change. The approach takes into account language acquisition and language learning, as well as pidgin, creoles, history, etc. on the assumption that these are areas that reflect universals of markedness. This version of markedness theory explains possible changes as reflecting natural processes and is relevant for constructing implicational hierarchies. These hierarchies are used to test the hypothesis that less marked (phonological, morphological, and syntactic) structures chronologically antecede (or in certain cases cooccur with) or replace more marked structures in the development of linguistic systems. In certain cases the directionality of change is reversed for sociocommunicational reasons (e.g. borrowing, decreolization). In this framework assignment of markedness values is not arbitrary but the result of logically independent empirically-based tests which capture significant relationships between phenomena which would be otherwise unrelated. The model of markedness in Table 7 is adapted from Faingold (1992a, 1994, forthcoming) for the study of syntactic development. I show that developments in the
acquisition, learning, variation, history, and creolization of Spanish and French are meaningfully accounted for by such model. Table 7 displays relevant areas and mechanisms of syntactic markedness.

Table 7
A developmental model of markedness
(Faingold 1992a, 1994)

(1) Identification of marked structures
(a) System-inernal areas: (i) child language, (ii) second language acquisition
(b) System-external areas: (i) language history, (ii) language change in progress, (iii) creolization, (iv) crossfield correspondences, (v) crosslinguistic correspondences, (vi) neutralization, (vii) markedness and constructional iconicity

(2) Mechanisms of development
(a) Neurobiological mechanisms: (i) psychosemantic constraints, (ii) naturalness
(b) Sociocommunicational mechanisms: (i) borrowing, (ii) language variation

(1) Identification of marked structures
(a) System-internal areas

(i) Language acquisition: This measure concerns the early availability of linguistic forms to the child. markedness theory states that children select unmarked forms (e.g. indicatives) and omit or replace marked (e.g. subjunctives) with unmarked forms (e.g. indicatives, infinitives) (see Section 2.1).

(ii) Second language learning: Less marked structures (e.g. the present indicative, the infinitive, the future) are learned before more marked forms (e.g. the past subjunctive) (see Section 2.2).
(b) System-external areas

(i) Language history: Less marked structures (e.g. the present indicative) usually substitute for more marked structures (e.g. the present subjunctive), and not vice-versa. The directionality of change can be reversed by borrowing and markedness-reversal (see Section 2.4; see, further, Faingold 1991).

(ii) Language change in progress: Less marked structures usually substitute for more marked structures here as well (see Section 2.3).

(iii) Creolization: Less marked structures substitute for more marked forms to a very large extent in the emergence of creole languages (see Section 2.5; see, further, Faingold 1992a).

(iv) Crossfield correspondences: The study of language in all its aspects yields useful insights for an empirical definition of markedness, as well as for the identification of markedness values. If correspondences are found between implicational relationships and linguistic fields, it makes sense to seek for a common explanation to account for developments in all domains. General principles are thus revealed: Marked elements are less stable and usually change before unmarked ones; unmarked structures occur earlier in diverse linguistic areas (see Section 2).

(v) Crosslinguistic correspondences: The study of crosslinguistic universals (and variation) yields useful insights for the
identification of markedness values. If correspondences, as well as the widespread use of unmarked structures, are found across diverse languages and linguistic systems, it makes sense to seek for common explanations to account for universal principles of development.

(vi) Neutralization: A distinction can be lost in a particular environment; the unmarked form survives, e.g. children and adults neutralize the distinction between indicative and subjunctive mood: The least marked indicatives, as we have seen, survive (see Section 2).

(vii) Markedness and constructional iconicity: An overt additional form is present. The more marked subjunctive is markered (bears the marker) in Spanish and French while other less marked systems such as creoles have zero forms (see Section 2.5)

(2) Mechanisms of development
(a) Neurobiological mechanisms
(i) Psychological and semantic constraints: These concern language specific as well as cognitive difficulties in the acquisition and learning of structures, showing a strong bias towards less marked forms—particularly in first language acquisition and second language learning (see Section 3.4.1; see, further, Goldin 1974, Karmiloff-Smith 1979).

(ii) Naturalness: Linguistic structures are considered more
natural if they are less marked, and conversely less natural if they are more marked (see Section 1; see, further, Bailey 1982, 1992).

(b) Sociocommunicational mechanisms

(i) Borrowing: Prestigious elements are borrowed in language history and creolization. These can be more, as well as less, marked.

(ii) Language variation: Reduced access to more formal principles and varieties of a language can lead to the loss of more marked structures such as subjunctives (see Section 3.4.2; see, further, Ocampo 1990, Silva-Corvalan 1993).

3.2 The grammatical system

This study adopts Bailey's (1992) methodology for the study of grammatical systems (see Faingold 1994, forthcoming). It presents a method for listing, classifying, and analyzing linguistic data in terms of naturalness (see Sections 1 and 3.1), yielding phonological, as well as morphological, and syntactic hierarchies of markedness. Table 8 (next page) delineates Bailey's (1992) method for the study of grammatical systems.

Table 8 displays (1) a map of the data, (2) a list of the data, and (3) a classification of the data, yielding (4) an analysis of the data in terms of naturalness, i.e. a hierarchy of markedness.
Table 8
Listing, classifying, analysing, and system
(Bailey 1992)

(1) Data map

1: abce
2: a
3: abc
4: ab
5: abcd
6: ab
7: abce
8: a
9: abcd
10: abc

Data: a, b, c, d, e

(2) List
System 1 has abce
System 2 has a
System 3 has abc
System 4 has ab
System 5 has abcd
System 6 has ab
System 7 has abce
System 8 has a
System 9 has abcd
System 10 has abc

(3) Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With e</th>
<th>Without e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>2, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ab</td>
<td>4, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abc</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abcd</td>
<td>5, 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) Analysis: The grammatical system
\( e/d >> c >> b >> a \)

(Notations: / "and/or"; >> "implies")
Table 9

Mood in child language, language learning, language change in progress, history, creolization: markedness rules

1) \(\text{present subjunctive} \rightarrow \text{present indicative}\)
   child language (French, Spanish), 2nd language learning (Spanish),
   language change in progress (French, Spanish), Koinéization
   (Spanish), history (French)

2) \(\text{past subjunctive} \rightarrow \text{past indicative}\)
   2nd language learning (Spanish), language change in progress
   (French, Spanish)

3) \(\text{present subjunctive} \rightarrow \text{future indicative}\)
   language in progress (French, Spanish), creolization (French)

4) \(\text{past subjunctive} \rightarrow \text{present subjunctive}\)
   2nd language learning (Spanish), history (French)

5) \(\text{present subjunctive} \rightarrow \text{infinitive}\)
   2nd language learning (Spanish), language change in progress
   (Spanish)

6) \(\text{present subjunctive} \rightarrow \text{infinitive}\)
   2nd language learning (Spanish), language change in progress
   (Spanish)

7) \(\text{past subjunctive} \rightarrow \text{future indicative}\)
   2nd language learning (Spanish)

8) \(\text{present subjunctive} \rightarrow \text{periphrastic future}\)
   language change in progress (French)

9) \(\text{present perfect subjunctive} \rightarrow \text{future indicative}\)
   language change in progress (Spanish)

10) \(\text{present perfect subjunctive} \rightarrow \text{present perfect indicative}\)
    language change in progress (Spanish)

11) \(\text{past subjunctive} \rightarrow \text{present perfect subjunctive}\)
    language change in progress (Spanish)

12) \(\text{past subjunctive} \rightarrow \text{past perfect subjunctive}\)
    language change in progress (Spanish)

13) \(\text{present subjunctive} \rightarrow \text{conditional}\)
    language change in progress (French)

14) \(\text{present subjunctive} \rightarrow \text{0 present subjunctive}\)
    creolization (Spanish, French (?))

15) \(\text{past subjunctive} \rightarrow \text{0 present subjunctive}\)
    creolization (Spanish, French (?))
3.3 Verbal mood in developmental syntax

In this section I apply the model of syntactic markedness discussed in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 (see, also, Section 1) to explain the development of verbal mood in child language, second language learning, language change in progress, history, and creolization. I reveal a hierarchy of markedness that explains the development of mood in Spanish and French in terms of syntactic naturalness, as well as biological and sociocommunicational mechanisms of development. Table 9 (next page) classifies the data discussed in Section 2 in terms of markedness rules.

Table 9 displays 15 markedness rules. Table 10 presents a hierarchy of markedness rules.

Table 10
A hierarchy of markedness rules

(14), (15) >> (7)-(13) >> (5), (6) >> (2)-(4) >> (1)

(1) <m (2)-(4) <m (5), (6) <m (7)-(13) <m (14), (15)

>> = implies
<m = less marked

The ranking in the hierarchy of markedness in Table 10 follows from the criteria for identifying marked structures and mechanisms of development in table 7. Table 11 (next page) lists the selected criteria for the ranking of the markedness rules of verbal mood in Spanish and French.
Table 11
Markedness criteria

Rule (1)
(a)(i) child language, (a)(ii) 2nd language acquisition, (b)(i) history, (b)(ii) language change in progress, (b)(iv) crossfield correspondences, (b)(v) crosslinguistics correspondences, (b)(vi) neutralization, (b)(viii) kcinéization

Rule (2)
(a)(ii) 2nd language acquisition, (b)(ii) language change in progress, (b)(iv) crossfield correspondences, (b)(v) crosslinguistic correspondences, (b)(vi) neutralization

Rule (3)
(b)(ii) language change in progress, (b)(iii) creolization, (b)(iv) crossfield correspondences, (b)(v) crosslinguistic correspondences, (b)(vi) neutralization

Rule (4)
(a)(ii) 2nd language acquisition, (b)(i) history, (b)(iv) crossfield correspondences, (b)(v) crosslinguistic correspondences, (b)(vi) neutralization

Rules (5) and (6)
(a)(ii) 2nd language acquisition, (b)(ii) language change in progress, (b)(iv) crossfield correspondences, (b)(vi) neutralization

Rule (7)
(a)(ii) 2nd language acquisition, (b)(vi) neutralization

Rules (8) - (13)
(b)(ii) language change in progress, (b)(vi) neutralization

Rules (14) and (15)
(b)(vii) markedness and constructional iconicity
Rule (1) is the least marked of all rules of verbal mood in Spanish and French; the reason is that it complies with eight criteria in Table 7: \((a)(i), (ii); (b)(i), (ii), (iv), (v), (vi))

Rules (2)-(4) are more marked than Rule (1). The reason is that the former are less widespread than the latter. Rule (2) complies with five criteria in Table 7: \((a)(ii); (b)(ii), (iv), (v), (vi))

Similarly, Rules (3) \((b)(ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vi)) and (4) \((a)(ii); (b)(i), (iv), (v), (vi)) also comply with five criteria in Table 7, while Rule (1), as we have seen, complies with eight criteria in Table 7.

Rules (5)-(6) are more marked than rules (1)-(4). The reason is that the former are less widespread than the latter. Rules (5)-(6) comply with four criteria in Table 7: \((a)(ii); (b)(ii), (iv), (vi))

While Rules (1) and Rules (2)-(4), as we have seen, comply with eight and five criteria respectively.

Rules (7)-(13) are more marked than rules (1)-(6). The reason is that the former are less widespread than the latter. Rule (7) complies with only two criteria in Table 7: \((b)(ii), (iv))

Similarly, rules (8)-(13) \((b)(ii), (vi)) also comply with two criteria in Table 7, while Rules (1), (2)-(4), and (5)-(6), as we have seen, comply with eight, five, and four criteria respectively.

Rules (14)-(15) are the more marked of all rules of verbal mood.
The reason is that they comply with only one criteria in table 7 (1) ((b)(viii)).

3.4 Explaining syntactic development

As in Faingold (1992a, 1994, Forthcoming), in this work, explanation is non-autonomous (Bailey 1982, 1992, forthcoming). In explaining linguistic development we take into account relevant evidence from other disciplines such as biology, psychology, sociology, etc., as well as linguistics. In certain instances non-autonomous explanations are unavailable, and more formal explanations in terms of innate knowledge are the best we can attempt. These explanations may be given in terms of theoretical constructs, which in turn remain to be explained by some sort of biological, psychological, or sociocommunicational reality. Thus, the hierarchy of syntactic rules in Section 3.3 is explained in terms of biological (innate 'naturalness'), psychological, and sociocommunicational mechanisms of development (see Section 3.1).

3.4.1 Psychological and semantic constraints on mood development

The choice or/and loss (neutralization) of mood distinctions in languages such as Spanish is not so much related to surface syntax as to truth values and the speaker’s belief about the world. The constraints involved in mood development cannot be stated without reference to semantics and psychology. Below I discuss a small number of psychological and semantic constraints leading to choice (or neutralization) of the Spanish subjunctive (see Bull 1965, Goldin 1974, Lakoff 1971, McCawley 1968).
(1) Syntactic principles

Very little syntactic knowledge is needed to use the Spanish subjunctive: (a) The subjunctive occurs in complex sentences, which contain two or more verbs with a connector linking the two or more clauses (usually que 'that', but also si 'if, cuando 'when', and a few others); (b) the subjunctive verb is located in the subordinate clause--the one following the connector (i.e. on the right of the written form).

(2) Psychological and semantic constraints

The choice, as well as the neutralization, of the Spanish subjunctive is constrained by (a) the speaker's psychological reactions (e.g. dislike, surprise, fright, etc.) and (b) semantic presuppositions (See Table 7 (2)).

(2)a Psychological reactions

The main verb can determine that the verb be in the subjunctive; this is the case when the main verb is a reaction verb (e.g. lastima 'pity', alegrarse 'happy', sentir 'sorry', etc.). A reaction is defined as the speaker's emotional evaluation of a real or imaginary object or situation.

Thus, if the main verb indicates a reaction, the subordinate verb is subjunctive (see, e.g., sentence (1)a, in Table 4.1, Me alegro que esté aquí. 'I'm happy that he is here.').

(2)b Semantic presupposition

Semantic presupposition is concerned with a subordinate verb
connected to a main verb that does not indicate a reaction (e.g. creer 'believe', saber 'know', dudar 'doubt', etc.). It involves the speaker's belief (logical presupposition) about a certain event or state. A speaker, thus, can have a positive, indefinite, or negative presupposition about an event or state.

The speaker has a positive presupposition if he or she knows or thinks that the event or state he is discussing is true. When a speaker has a positive presupposition about a state or event, he or she uses the indicative (e.g. Creo que el es un buen alumno. 'I think he is a good student.'). In contrast, the speaker will use the subjunctive if he or she has an indefinite (see, e.g., sentence (15), in appendix 1, Busco un restaurante donde sirvan comida mexicana auténtica. 'I'm looking for a restaurant that (would) serve authentic Mexican food.') or a negative presupposition (see, e.g., sentence (3), in appendix 1, No creo que el coche esté en buenas condiciones. 'I don't think the car is in good condition.' In sentence (15) the speaker is looking for a restaurant that serves authentic Mexican food but he is not sure whether one such restaurant exists, while in (3) he or she believes the subordinate proposition not to be the case (of being in good shape).

3.4.2 Sociocommunicational constraints on mood variation and change

Certain facts of syntactic development such as the loss and variation of the more marked subjunctive vs the less marked indicative in language acquisition, second language learning, language change in progress, creolization, koinéization, and history can be explained in sociocommunicational terms, such as a.
1 Introduction

In earlier work, I have studied phonological (Faingold 1989, 1990, 1992a, 1992b, 1993a, 1993d) and morphological (Faingold 1993b, 1994, forthcoming) developments, as well as correspondences between child language, creolization, and historical change; these works were carried out from an integrative perspective, with the aim of discovering language universals as well as constraints on language development and change. A model of markedness was presented to account for a wide range of linguistic phenomena.

As in earlier work, this paper assumes that less marked structures are acquired earlier by children and creoles and tend to be the basis of neutralization and analogical change in child language, as well as second language learning, language change in progress, and historical change, and that there exists a range of permissible structures in all linguistic domains. This work is a contribution to the theory of dynamic developmentalism, as presented in the papers just mentioned, as well as in Bailey (1973, 1982, 1992, forthcoming), W. Mayerthaler (1981), Pishwa (1991), and others, and is a companion to Faingold (1994, forthcoming). More specifically, I deal with syntactic issues: The acquisition, learning, historical development, and creolization of verbal mood in Spanish and French as well as certain Spanish- and French-based creoles.

This paper adopts Bailey's (1982, 1992) formal concept of markedness and naturalness, as in (1) below (see, further, Faingold 1992a, 1992b, 1993d):
reduced access to more formal principles (and varieties) of the language (Table 7 (2)), combined with psychological and semantic constraints such as those discussed in Section 3.4.1 (see, further, Ocampo 1990, Sila-Corvalán 1993). For example, mood variation in Modern Latin American and Iberian Spanish, in sentences, in Table 4.1, (1)a Me alegro que esté (subjunctive) aquí. 'I'm happy the he be here.' vs (1)b Me alegro que está (indicative) aquí. 'I'm happy that he is here.' can be explained in terms of psychological reactions (see above), since certain speakers of Latin American and Iberian Spanish who use the indicative in sentences such as (1)b do not seem to have access to the psychological reaction principle affecting speakers of more literate (less coloquial) dialects of Spanish (see Section 3.4.1; see, further, Bull 1965, Goldin 1974).

Thus, a combination of biological (innate naturalness), psychological, semantic, and syntactic principles and constraints on language development, helps us explain variation and loss of the more marked subjunctive, as well as the preference for the less marked indicative.

4 Pedagogical implications

This section outlines some of the pedagogical implications of this study for the teaching of the Spanish subjunctive. The pedagogical implications of this study are to a certain extent also relevant for the teaching of the subjunctive/indicative distinction in other languages as well.
4.1 Teaching linguistic and non-linguistic principles

The number of syntactic principles, psychological, and semantic constraints affecting the choice of mood in Spanish is very small (see section 3.4.1).

One can make a list of the principles and constraints involved in the finding of locus and choice of Spanish mood, in the order indicated below.

(1) Locus of verbal mood: The subjunctive verb is located in a subordinate clause, to the right of the connector (que 'that', si 'if', etc.)

(2) Choice of verbal mood:
   (a) Psychological reaction: If the main verb indicates an emotional reaction, then the subordinate verb is in the subjunctive. If the main verb does not indicate a reaction, go to (2)(b) below.
   (b) Logical presupposition: If the speaker has a positive presupposition about a state or an event expressed in the subordinate verb, the verb is in the indicative; in contrast, if he or she has a negative or an indefinite presupposition about a state or event expressed in the subordinate verb the verb is in the subjunctive.

4.2 The natural order of acquisition

The rules for the use of the subjunctive are acquired (or learned) in a natural order that cannot be hurried by the instructor (or the parent) (see Krashen & Terrel 1983). Second
language learners, as well as children, as we have seen, substitute the less marked (more natural) indicative for the more marked (less natural) subjunctive consistently (see Sections 2.1, 2.2).

The natural order of acquisition of mood distinctions (e.g. the indicative is acquired before the subjunctive) is the basis for my recommendation that the use of the subjunctive be taught by the language instructor only after the student acquires a certain degree of mastery and confidence in the use of the present, past, and future indicative structures.

It might be necessary, perhaps, to change the syllabae and textbooks that are being employed for teaching beginners Spanish at most U.S universities (e.g. Knorre et al 1989). Rather than teaching the subjunctive in detail in beginners Spanish, it probably makes more sense to teach the use of the latter in depth in more advanced classes (e.g. intermediate Spanish).

5 Summary and conclusions

I have studied natural syntactic processes in the development of verbal mood in first and second language acquisition, language change in progress, history, and creolization. Correspondences were examined in the development of the subjunctive vs. the indicative mood. The study presented a deliberately integrative perspective, taking into account seemingly disparate linguistic areas with the purpose of revealing universals of markedness.

A model of syntactic markedness has been proposed; one closely aligned with C. J. Bailey's theoretical views, as well as with Faingold's studies of phonological and morphological
development (e.g. 1992a, 1994, forthcoming). This model relies on psycholinguistic studies on first and second language acquisition, as well as on sociolinguistic variation and change, language history, and creolization.

The rules and constraints on the development of verbal mood revealed in this study cannot be explained without making reference to non-syntactic (e.g. semantic), as well as non-linguistic (psychological, sociocommunicational) factors. In this sense, this study argues against the compartmentalization of linguistic domains (in, e.g., phonology vs morphology, syntax vs semantics, semantics vs pragmatics, etc.) and the autonomy of syntax, as well as the autonomy of linguistics from other human sciences such as psychology, sociology, and history.

I have found strong parallels in the acquisition of Spanish by native speakers Spanish vs English speakers learning Spanish in the classroom. These results demonstrate the relevance of second language learning for markedness theory in particular, as well as for the study of linguistic theory in general. The fieldwork results in first language acquisition (native speakers of Argentine Spanish living in Buenos Aires, Latin American and Iberian professors living in the U.S) and second language learning (English-speaking students living in the U.S) suggest that, to a certain extent, the indicative appears to be gaining ground over the subjunctive in colloquial as well as in more educated varieties of Spanish.

This study demonstrates also the relevance of linguistic analysis for the teaching of foreign languages. On the basis of
the linguistic as well as non-linguistic findings in this work, I have outlined some pedagogical implications for the teaching of the subjunctive in American universities; the pedagogical advice given in this work relies on the notions of markedness and naturalness, as well as psychological, sociological, and linguistic considerations.
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