

Modals & Aspect 3

Anisa Schardl

April 11, 2008

- (1) Marin tarttee polttaa
Mary.GEN need.3SG smoke.INF
'Mary needs to smoke'
- (2) *Marin tarttee olla polttamassa
Mary.GEN need.3SG COP.INF smoke.NMLZ.INESS
- (3) Marin täytyy olla polttamassa
Mary.GEN must.3SG COP.INF smoke.NMLZ.INESS
'Mary must be smoking'

(3) has a deontic reading. The epistemic reading sounds stupid. Also, the reading in which Mary is going to smoke sound bad.

- (4) Marin täytyy polttaa nyt
Mary.GEN must.3SG smoke.INF now
'Mary must smoke now'

(4) is better than (3) for the epistemic reading.

- (5) mun täytyy olla polttamassa
1SG.GEN must.3SG COP.INF smoke.NMLZ.INESS
'I must be smoking'

For (5), deontic is ok, going to smoke is bad.

- (6) mun täytyy mennä tupakalle
1SG.GEN must.3SG go.INF smoke.ALL
'I have to go smoke'
- (7) #Marin on tarvinnut polttamassa
Mary.GEN COP.3SG need.PTCP smoke.NMLZ.INESS
'Mary needs to smoke'

(7) sounds sort of stupid. It's ok if Mary has to smoke as treatment. Deontic reading is not very good.

- (8) #Marin on tarvinnut syödä salaattia
Mary.GEN COP.3SG need.PTCP eat.INF salad.PART
'Mary has needed to eat the salad'

(8) sounds dumb, but has a teleological reading. Hanna would prefer *täytyynyt*.

- (9) Marin ei tartte syödä salaattia
Mary.GEN NEG.3SG need eat.INF salad.PART

‘Mary does not need to eat the salad’

(9) is ok if Mary is healthy enough without eating the salad, or if Mary’s parents didn’t make her eat the salad.

- (10) Marin ei tartte olla polttamassa
Mary.GEN NEG.3SG need COP.INF smoke.NMLZ.INESS
‘Mary does not need to be smoking’

For (10), a circumstantial reading is ok, a deontic reading is better.

- (11) Marin ei ole tarvinut polttaa
Mary.GEN NEG.3SG COP need.PTCP smoke.INF
‘Mary didn’t need to smoke (e.g. for days)’

(11) is good for a deontic reading, circumstantial is ok, but not as good.

- (12) Marin ei ole tarvinut polttaa enään
Mary.GEN NEG.3SG COP need.PTCP smoke.INF anymore
‘Mary didn’t need to smoke anymore’

(12) means that Mary probably doesn’t smoke anymore, and she had to smoke in the past.

- (13) Marin ei ole tarvinut polttaa
Mary.GEN NEG.3SG COP need.PTCP smoke.INF
‘Mary didn’t need to smoke’

(13) has a deontic reading, and it’s possible that Mary has never smoked.

- (14) neuloa
knit.INF

- (15) Joni osaa neuloa
John.NOM know-how.3SG knit.INF
‘John knows how to knit’

- (16) Joni ei osaa neuloa
John.NOM NEG.3SG know-how knit.INF
‘John can’t knit’

- (17) osaako Joni neuloa?
know-how.INTERR John.NOM knit.INF
‘can John knit?’

- (18) *Joni osaa olla neulomassa
John.NOM know-how.3SG COP.INF knit.NMLZ.INESS

- (19) Joni on neulomassa
John.NOM COP.3SG knit.NMLZ.INESS
‘John is knitting’

- (20) Joni on osannut neuloa
John.NOM COP.3SG know-how.PTCP knit.INF
‘John knew how to knit’

- (20) means that John doesn't know how to knit any more.
- (21) Joni on aina osannut neuloa
John.NOM COP.3SG always know-how.PTCP knit.INF
'John always knew how to knit'
- (22) Joni ei ole neulomassa
John.NOM NEG.3SG COP knit.NMLZ.INESS
'John is not knitting (now)'
- (23) *Joni ei osaa olla neulomassa
John.NOM NEG.3SG know-how COP.INF knit.NMLZ.INESS
- (24) Joni ei ole osannut neuloa ennen
John.NOM NEG.3SG COP know-how.PTCP knit.INF before
'once upon a time, John didn't know how to knit'
- (25) Joni ei osannut neuloa (ennen)
John.NOM NEG.3SG know-how.PTCP knit.INF (before)
'John didn't know how to knit'
- (26) Jonin kannattaisi syödä kalaa
John.GEN should.3SG eat.INF fish.PART
'John should eat fish'

(26) is good if fish is good for John, or because fish is cheap. It is not good in an arbitrary/deontic reading in which John is supposed to eat the fish but there are no consequences if he eats the spaghetti instead, but it is still ok with this reading.

- (27) Jonin pitäisi syödä kalaa
John.GEN supposed-to.3SG eat.INF fish.PART
'John is supposed to eat the fish'

(27) is better than (26) in the deontic context.

- (28) tänään sataa
today rain.3SG
'it's raining today'
- (29) *huomenna kannattaisi sataa
tomorrow should.3SG rain.INF
- (30) kannattaa
support (like political support)
- (31) kannatella
support (like architectural supports)
- (32) Jonin kannattaisi olla syömässä
John.GEN should.3SG COP.INF eat.NMLZ.INESS
'John should be eating'

(32) is good because John doesn't have time later. Epistemic is bad (I know that John is eating something, but I don't know what... well, he should be eating the fish.) It's good if it's because it's healthy. Bad with the arbitrary/deontic reading.

- (33) Jonin ei kannattaisi olla syömässä
John.GEN NEG.3SG should.3SG COP.INF eat.NMLZ.INESS

‘John should not be eating’

(33) is only good if something bad is going to happen if John is eating.

(34) Jonin ei pitäisi olla syömässä
John.GEN NEG.3SG supposed-to COP.INF eat.NMLZ.INESS
‘John should not be eating’

(34) is alright under a deontic reading – like iff John is not allowed to eat in class.

(35) kannattanut

(36) *kannattaisinut