

Modals & Aspect 1

Anisa Schardl

March 5, 2008

- (1) mun kannattais(i) syödä tämä salaatti
1SG.GEN should.3SG eat.INF this.NOM salad.NOM
'I should eat this salad'

(1) is good if it's because the salad is healthy. If it's because your mom told you to eat it, it's not good, unless you assume your mom had a good reason for saying that.

- (2) mun ei kannattaisi syödä tätä salaattia
1SG.GEN NEG.3SG should eat.INF this.PART salad.PART
'I shouldn't eat this salad'

(2) is good if you're allergic to the salad. It's also good if there's a law against eating the salad. Hanna feels like you might eat the salad anyway, but it's not for sure.

- (3) mun pitäis syödä kanaa
1SG.GEN supposed.to eat.INF chicken.PART
'I should eat the chicken'

(3) is good if you're being considerate of the many vegetarians and limited vegetarian options. You wouldn't say something with *kannattaisi* in this case.

- (4) #mun kannattaisi syödä kanaa
1SG.GEN should eat.INF chicken.PART

(4) is bad for the vegetarian reading. It's also bad if you're supposed to eat the chicken because of arbitrary rules.

- (5) Marin täytyy polttaa
Mary.GEN must.3SG smoke.INF
'Mary has to smoke'

(5) is ok if there is a law that says she has to smoke, like if she's in a medical study. (5) is also ok if she is addicted, and therefore has to smoke. Epistemic reading is bad: that is, reasoning that she is a smoker.

- (6) Marin on pakko polttaa
Mary.GEN COP.3SG required smoke.INF
'Mary has to smoke'

Same readings available as (5).

- (7) Mari on röökillä
 Mary.NOM COP.3SG smoking.ADESS
 ‘Mary is smoking (right now)’
- (8) Marin täytyy olla polttamassa
 Mary.GEN must.3SG COP smoke.NMLZ.INESS
 ‘Mary must be smoking’

(8) is ok with an existential reading (she’s not in her office, so she must be smoking,) but not with a circumstantial reading (she must be smoking right now because she’s addicted and she hasn’t smoked for awhile) or a deontic reading (she must smoke right now because of the medical study she’s in.)

- (9) Marin täytyy poltta nyt
 Mary.GEN must.3SG smoke.INF now
 ‘Mary must smoke now’

Using the same scenarios as above, the denotic reading is ok, the epistemic reading is bad, and the circumstantial reading is borderline.

- (10) mun on pakko poltta nyt
 1SG.GEN COP.3SG required smoke.INF now
 ‘I need to smoke now’

(10) means that you’re jonesing.

- (11) Mari poltti ennen
 Mary.NOM smoke.PST.3SG once
 ‘Mary used to smoke’
- (12) Mari oli tupakoitsia
 Mary.NOM COP.PST.3SG smoke.?
 ‘Mary used to smoke’
- (13) Marin täytyi poltta ennen
 Mary.GEN must.PST.3SG smoke.INF once
 ‘Mary had to smoke’

For (13), deontic is ok, circumstantial is ok, epistemic is borderline with heavy prosody.

- (14) Marin pitäisi poltta
 Mary.GEN supposed-to.3SG smoke.INF
 ‘Mary should smoke’

For (14), circumstantial is bad, deontic is good, hearsay reading is borderline.

- (15) Marin pitäisi olla polttamassa
 Mary.GEN supposed-to.3SG COP.INF smoke.NL.INESS
 ‘Mary should be smoking now’

For (15), deontic reading is ok, hearsay is ok, circumstantial bad.

- (16) Marin pitäisi polttaa nyt
 Mary.GEN supposed-to.3SG smoke.INF now
 ‘Mary should smoke now’

For (16), deontic reading is ok, hearsay is bad, circumstantial is ok, teleological is ok (she should smoke now because she doesn't have time later.)

- (17) Marin olisi pitänyt polttaa
Mary.GEN COP.?.3SG like.PTCP smoke.INF
'Mary should have been smoking, but she didn't'

For (17), denotic is ok, hearsay is bad, circumstantial is ok, teleological is ok.

- (18) Marin tuli polttaa (amount)
Mary.GEN come.PST.3SG smoke.INF (amount)
'Mary was told to smoke'

(18) is not ok with a circumstantial or epistemic reading.

- (19) Marin piti polttaa
Mary.GEN like.PST.3SG smoke.INF
'Mary had to smoke'

For (19), deontic is ok, circumstantial is ok, epistemic is not ok.

- (20) Mari luultavasti poltti
Mary.NOM probably smoke.PST.3SG
'Mary probably smoked'