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1. Introduction

In this paper I will discuss the effects that a Danish modal verb of deontic obligation has on the VP with event interpretation that it may govern. These VPs with event interpretation differ from VPs with event interpretation governed by other modals in that they do not allow the event verbs *ja* ("yes"), *blive* ("become"), and one of the two types of *söme* ("come"), but require either the state verbs *have* ("have"), *varr* ("be") or some special construction (bare adverbial of direction or g-passive).

Section 2 is an introduction to modals in Danish, especially w.r.t. the distinction epistemic/root. Before the central data are set forth in section 4, section 3 introduces the basic idea of the analysis, that some verbs, although they do not take any arguments (i.e. they do not assign any thematic roles), assign an "additional" thematic role. Section 5 and 6 analyse the data and attempt to put this analysis in terms of the analysis suggested in section 3. Section 7 lists a series of further facts that the proposed analysis accounts for straightforwardly, before the conclusion in section 8.

The different types of data discussed in this paper were first brought together and discussed in a very interesting paper by Erik Hansen (1972), and in the appendix I comment specifically on a proposal of his, the so-called "interessee"-construction, in that I suggest that it does not exist as such.

2. Modal Verbs

I will consider the following verbs to be modals in Danish: *vills*, *skulle*, *sötte*, *kunne*, *burde*, *burde*, and *gåle*. As for their translations and use, see (5)-(11) in section 2.1 below.

Here I will briefly state three (sets of) properties that these verbs have:

1. They may be followed by infinitives without the infinitival marker at

(1) a. Jeg *vill* (*at*) go home now

b. Jeg *skulde* (*at*) go home now

2. They do not feel like reading anymore

b. Jeg *overkunne* (*at*) go more

"I am too exhausted to read anymore"

---
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Erik Hansen (1977) reports that both turde ("dare") and skibe ("feel inclined to") are beginning to accept infinitives with at (hence the lack of a star inside the bracket in (2a)), whereas believe ("need"), which is not treated as a modal in the present paper, is beginning to be accepted with infinitives without at.

ii) Modals also behave differently from (most) other verbs w. r. t. tag questions, as shown in Lundskær-Nielsen (1983: 8). Most frequently tags are just ikke ("not") for positive statements and vel for negative ones, but real tag questions like the ones used in English are also possible, and here the verb sige ("do") must be inserted in all cases, except have ("have"), være ("be"), and the modals where it cannot be inserted:

(3) a. Hun har ikke læst min artikel, har/har hun vel?  
    "She has not read my article, has/she done it?"

(4) a. Han fik salet huset, gører/gør han ikke?  
    "He got the house painted, did/did he not (too)?"

(5) a. vilte. Han vil overleve chocket  
    "He will survive the chock"

(6) a. skulle (report)  
    Han skal tjene mange penge  
    "He is said to make a lot of money"

(7) a. måtte. Hun måtte sove tungt  
    "She had to be sound asleep"

(8) a. kunne  
    Det kan let gå galt  
    "Things may easily go wrong"

(9) a. burde  
    Det burde slå til  
    "That ought to be enough"

Below I list the modals in Danish, giving examples of their epistemic and their root use. Only when relevant in this article have I made a further distinction between more than one epistemic or between more than one root use. As shown by Davidsen-Nielsen (1988), many more such distinctions are possible. (Note that the examples are listed as to their preferred interpretation. Almost all may be ambiguous given the appropriate context.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPISTEMIC</th>
<th>ROOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) a. vilte.</td>
<td>b. vilte.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han vil overleve chocket</td>
<td>Han vil læse linguistik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;He will survive the chock&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;He wants to read linguistics&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) a. skulle (report)</td>
<td>b. skulle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han skal tjene mange penge</td>
<td>Han skal gå i skole hver dag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;He is said to make a lot of money&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;He must go to school every day&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii) Finally, modals are often said to be morphologically deficient, in that they do not have e.g. an imperative or a present participle. This is not unique to modals, as it also goes for e.g. få ("get"), have ("have"), besidde, aje (both "possess"), skyle ("owe"). The question is also whether this is really a morphological phenomenon, as it could be argued to be more of a semantic one, especially as regards the imperative.

2.1 Two types of meaning: Epistemic vs. root.

The distinction between epistemic modals and root modals is a well-known one. As a brief summary of this distinction, let me quote Platzack (1979: 44), who says that "the epistemic sense ... qualifies the truth value of the sentence containing the modal", and that "the root sense ... expresses necessity, obligation, permission, will, or ability on behalf of an agent which usually, but not necessarily, is expressed by the ... subject of the sentence".
The root modals may be divided into two groups, deontic (vil le, skulle, måtte, kunne (permission), burde) and non-deontic (kanne (ability), tørde, side). The deontic modals may be further divided into those concerned with obligation (ville, skulle, måtte (obligation), burde) and permission (måtte (permission), kunne (permission)).

However, the main two groups to be distinguished below are one consisting of deontic obligation modals (ville, skulle, måtte (obligation), burde) and permission (måtte (permission), kunne (permission)), and another one consisting of all the others (måtte (permission), kunne (ability), tørde, side).

2.2 Differences between epistemic and root modals.

The five subsections below discuss different distinctions between epistemic and root modals. This is done mainly so that the reader may see on what I base the classification of a particular use of a modal as epistemic or root. This is particularly relevant in the appendix.

In other words, all that sections 2.2.1 - 2.2.5 amount to is a discussion of various tests for epistemic vs. root. Although it obviously is desirable, I will not try to explain the data, but content myself with grouping them for classificational purposes.

2.2.1 Tense.

Whereas epistemic modals cannot occur in perfect or past perfect, root ones may:

(12) a. Han bar villet tjene mange penge
    "He has been going to earn a lot of money"
  b. Han bar villet tjene mange penge
    "He has wanted to earn a lot of money"

However, Davidsen-Nielsen (1988:ch. 2, p. 26) lists the two following examples of epistemis in the perfect (13), which admittedly are not completely unacceptable (my underlining and judgments):

(13) a. Han bar skullet bo i Aarhus
    "He has been said to live in Aarhus = He is said to have lived in Aarhus"
  b. Der kan måske nok have været tale om en fejl
    "There has maybe probably could be talk about a mistake = It might have been a mistake"

He is therefore lead to say that epistemic modals "do not normally occur in the past participle" (my emphasis).

In my view the perfect in (13), although clearly realised on the epistemic modals, really is the perfect of the main verbs. One argument is that (13a,b) mean exactly the same as (14a,b), where it is the main verb that occurs in the perfect tense:

(14) a. Han skal have boet i Aarhus
    "He is said to have lived in Aarhus"
  b. Han kan måske nok have været tale om en fejl
    "There can maybe probably have been talk about a mistake = It might have been a mistake"

Another argument is based on the interpretation of (13a) when an adverbial like "since 1983" is added:

(15) Han har skullet boet i Aarhus siden 1983
    "He has been said to live in Aarhus since 1983"

The interpretation of (15) clearly is that his living in Aarhus reportedly started in 1983, and not that the reports of his living in Aarhus started in 1983. In other words, the adverbial modifies the main verb, not the modal. As an adverbial like "since 1983" can only modify a perfect tense, as can be seen in (16), I again find that, in spite of appearances, it is the main verb that is in the perfect rather than the modal in (13) and (15).

(16) a. Han skal have boet i Aarhus siden 1983
    "He is said to have lived in Aarhus since 1983"
  b. Han skal bo i Aarhus siden 1983
    "He is said to live in Aarhus since 1983"

The two views make two different predictions w.r.t. the possibility of both the modal and the main verb occurring in the perfect: If the modal is possible in the perfect, both verbs should be possible in the perfect, whereas if the perfect somehow is misplaced from the main verb to the modal in the examples above, then both verbs should not be possible in the perfect. To my ear two perfects are not possible, and this is compatible only with the latter view: 
(17) a. *Han *har skullet have boet i Arhus
   "He has been said to have lived in Arhus"
   b. *Der har måske nok *kunnet have været tale om en fejl
   "There has maybe probably could have been talk about a mistake"

This analysis might suggest that the occurrence of epistemic modals in perfect or past perfect is not prevented by a syntactic condition as such, as (13) does occur, but rather a restriction of a different kind, perhaps a semantic one. 3

2.2.2 Empty categories as subjects.
Epistemic modals cannot have PRO as subject (whether it is arbitrary PRO, as in (18), or not, as in (19)), whereas root modals can:

(18) a. *Det er behageligt PRO at ville tjene mange penge hurtigt
   "It is pleasant to be going to earn a lot of money quickly"
   b. Det er moderne PRO at ville tjene mange penge hurtigt
   "It is fashionable to want to earn a lot of money quickly"

(19) a. *Han drømte om PRO at kunne være rejst til London
   "He dreamt that he might have gone to London"
   b. Han drømte om PRO at kunne svømme
   "He dreamt about being able to swim"

Both kinds may have a wh-trace as subject,

(20) a. Hvem t kan have sendt de 50 røde roser?
   "Who might have sent the 50 red roses?"
   b. Hvem t kan svømme over Kanalen?
   "Who is able to swim across the Channel?"

whereas the picture is less clear when it comes to having an NP-trace as subject (i.e. being embedded under a raising verb). Here the epistemic seems to vary somewhat, (21a,b):

(21) a. Det ser ud til t at ville blive godt vejir i eftermiddag
   "It seems to will become nice weather this afternoon =
   "This afternoon seems to be going to be nice"
   b. Hun forekommer mig t at måtte have sovet under forelæsningen
   "She appears to me to must have slept during the lecture"
   c. Han ser ud til t at vilde at gove alting på en gang
   "He seems to want to do everything simultaneously"

2.2.3 Ordering and combination.
Epistemic modals may not be embedded under root ones, (22b), whereas root modals may be embedded under epistemic ones, (22a):

(22) a. De skall ville bygge et hus
   "They are said to want to build a house"
   b. *De vil gerne skulle have tjent en milion"
   "They would like to be said to have made a million"

A modal cannot be combined with itself, not even in its two different readings:

(23) a. *Han skall skulle så til lagen hver uge
   "He is said to want to see a doctor every week"
   b. *Han kan kunne svømme længere end du tror
   "She might be able to swim further than you think"

As for the combination of two epistemic, (24a-d), or two root modals, (24e-h), it seems that both are possible, but only if the second of the two modals is kunne (Cf. also Østklær Jensen (1987:28) and the ex. in Thráinsson (1986:262, n13)): 4

4. Though this kunne, as well as the one in the following example is undoubtedly epistemic, it seems that it may appear in the perfect tense, cf. section 2.2.1. I have no satisfactory explanation to offer:

(i) a. Det måtte have kunnet stå på en side
   "It must have been possible to fit it onto one page"
   b. *Det måtte have kunnet have stået på en side
   "It must have been possible to have fitted it onto one page"

(ii) a. Der ville let have kunnet gå noget galt
   "It would easily have been possible that something went wrong"
   b. *Der ville let have kunnet være stået noget galt
   "It would easily have been possible that something had gone wrong"

(iii) a. Det må have kunnet regne i dagevis i det gamle Rom, at dømme efter...
   "It must have been possible for it to rain for days in ancient Rome, judging from ..."
   b. *Det må have kunnet have regnet i dagevis i det gamle Rom...
   "It must have been possible for it to have rained for days in ancient Rome, ..."

3. In the framework of Vikner (1985:93-96), such a restriction could be said to rule out interpretations of sentences involving epistemic modals where the event point precedes the second point of reference. Of course the question of why these representations should be ruled out is still unanswered. Also unanswered is the question of why the perfect of the epistemic in (13) is better than the one in (12a).
This is actually not a difference between epistemic and root modals, as I disagree with Platzack (1979:46), who claims that only root modals may have det ("it") as complement (in Swedish). I do not find this to be the case for Danish, both kinds may have this complement. The examples show that epistemic modals do indeed have "it" as a (substitute for their) complement:

   "He will be at home all day. So will she."

   "He is supposed to have gone to London. - Oh, he is? I just saw him."

  c. Jeg lover Dem, aviserne skal afsløre denne valgsvindel. Og det skal de elektroniske medier også.
   "I promise you that the papers will reveal this election fraud. And so will the electronic media."

  d. Klokken må have været gylt halv ti. - Ja, det må den vel.
   "It must have been around 9.30 - Yes, it must have."

  e. De må have været temmelig berusede. Og det må vi egentlig også.
   "They must have been rather drunk. And so must we."

  f. Kan brevene være kommet allerede i mandag? - Ja, det kan de godt.
   "Might the letters have arrived already Monday? - Yes, they might."

  g. Pengene burde række. - Nå, så det burde de?
   "The money should be enough. - Oh, they should?"

(see also Hansen (1972:24) and Østkjer Jensen (1987:53)).

2.2.5 Pseudo-clefts.


(26) a. Det eneste han yil er at svare på spørgsmålet
   "The only thing he wants to is answer the question"

  b. Det eneste han skal er at svare på spørgsmålet
   "The only thing he has to is answer the question"

  c. Det eneste han absolut må er at svare på spørgsmålet
   "The only thing he absolutely must to is answer the question"

  d. Det eneste han godt må er at løne min cykel
   "The only thing he may is borrow my bicycle"

  e. Det eneste han godt kan er at løne min cykel
   "The only thing he can is borrow my bicycle"

  f. En af de ting han ikke kan er at svømme over Kanalen
   "One of the things he cannot is swim across the Channel"

  g. En af de ting han absolut må er at svare på spørgsmålet
   "One of the things he absolutely ought to is answer the question"

  h. En af de ting han ikke kan er at svømme over Kanalen
   "One of the things he dare not is swim across the Channel"

  i. En af de ting han ikke må er at svømme over Kanalen
   "One of the things he doesn’t feel like is swim across the Channel"

---

5 For some unknown reason, det has to be in topicalised position (Specifier of CP), as in the (a) examples below, and cannot occur in normal object position, cf. the (b) examples below. This is different from main verb, (iv), and also from the main verb use of kunne ("can"). (iii):

(i) a. Det skal han ikke
   "It shall/is-said he not"

   b. *Han skal det ikke
   "He shall/is-said it not"

(ii) a. Det kan han ikke
   "It may/can he not"

   b. *Han kan det ikke
   "He may/can it not"

(iii) a. Det kan han ikke
   "It knows he not"

   b. Han kan det ikke
   "He knows it not"

(iv) a. Det hørte han ikke
   "It heard he not"

   b. Han hørte det ikke
   "He heard it not"
(27) a. *Det han vil i morgen er at tabe kampen om mesterskabet
   "What he will tomorrow is to lose the fight about the championship"
   b. *Det han efter sigende skal er at stemme på de Konservative
   "What he is said to is vote for the Conservatives"
   c. *Det han nok skal er at rykke op efter sig og anden gang
   "What he shall is to clean up after himself another time"
   d. *Det han måtte var at have sovet under foredraget
   "What she must was have slept during the talk"
   e. *Det han kan er at have sovet over sig
   "What she might is to have overslept"
   f. *Det han burde var at have videt det
   "What she ought to was have known it"

3. Analysis.

3.1 8-roles and Additional 8-roles.

Thematic roles, or 9-roles are roles that are assigned by verbs, prepositions, or adjectives, to argument NPs. Examples of 9-roles are agent, theme, goal, source, experiencer. The assignment of 9-roles is constrained by the 9-criterion, which says a) that each 9-role must be assigned to one and only one argument, and b) each argument must receive one and only one 9-role.

This has often been modified by the addition of other kinds of roles to the ones constrained by the 9-criterion, e.g. Zubizarreta (1982) or Grimshaw (1986), to mention but a few.

Here I want to suggest the existence of what I will call an "additional 9-role". The idea is that this kind of 9-role is assigned by obligation root modals and also by få ("get"), bli ("become"), and one of the two types of komme ("come").

This additional 9-role may be assigned to an argument that already has a 9-role, cf. the idea in Zubizarreta (1982:41,123) that 9-roles exist that are invisible for the 9-criterion. However, as opposed to Zubizarreta, I want to suggest that one additional 9-role may be assigned to each argument, BUT NOT TWO. The intuition is that two additional 9-roles would give the argument too much "9-burden", much like an argument cannot receive more than one normal 9-role, which again suggests that additional 9-roles are not completely invisible to the 9-criterion.

Thus one half of the 9-criterion seems to hold completely for additional 9-roles as they must be assigned to one and only one argument. The other half of the 9-criterion only holds halfway, as an argument may not receive more than one additional 9-role (in addition to a normal 9-role), but it may receive less than one additional 9-role. Furthermore, as will be discussed in connection with (57), there is a case where an argument would seem to be grammatical without any normal 9-role, surviving on an additional 9-role only.

The three verbs that assign an additional 9-role (apart from the obligation root modals), få ("get"), bli ("become"), and one type of komme ("come"), are all event verbs that are the counterparts of the state verbs have ("have"), have ("be"). The difference between the two sets is thus that the event verbs assign an additional 9-role to their subject, and the state ones do not. This corresponds to the intuition that the event expressions have all the implications of the state ones plus some more.

(28) a. Han har tre biler
   "He has three cars"
   b. Han får tre biler
   "He gets three cars"

(29) a. Han er professor
   "He is a professor"
   b. Han bliver professor
   "He becomes a professor"

(30) a. Han er i London
   "He is in London"
   b. Han kommer til London
   "He arrives in London"

3.2 Raising or Control.

In accordance with the thematic properties set out above, i.e. that modals do not assign normal 9-roles, I will follow Zubizarreta's (1982:133-34) suggestion (given for French) that modals are like raising verbs: The subject of a modal is base-generated somewhere else, and moved into the subject position.6 (33a) is an example of a raising verb and (33b) of a modal (in this case ambiguous w.r.t. epistemic/deontic).

(31) a. Hani ser ud til at more sig
   "He seems to enjoy himself"
   b. Hani skal til at more sig
   "He is said to/must enjoy himself"

An alternative would be to analyse modals as parallel to control verbs:

(32) Hani loverde hende PRO at more sig
   "He promised her to enjoy himself"

6. It should be noted that raising verbs and modals are different in important ways, e.g. in that raising verbs allow expletive subjects, and modals do not:

(1) Det ser ud til at han morer sig
   "It seems that he enjoys himself"

(11) *Det skal at han morer sig
   "It is said/must that he enjoys himself"
As my analysis in the following sections is built on a prohibition against assigning more than one additional $\Theta$-role to an argument, I have to adopt the raising analysis, where there is only one argument, the chain in (33a), whereas a control analysis would have three arguments, as in (33b), the chains headed by hun, by the first PRO, and by the second PRO:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\Gamma(\Theta) & \Gamma(\Theta) & \Theta \\
(33) & a. & *Hun vil blive hånden af \\
& & *Hun vil blive hånden af \\
& b. & Hun vil blive hånden af \\
\end{array}
\]

(As discussed in section 4, this is an ungrammatical sentence, and I account for the ungrammaticality by assuming that (33a) is the right analysis, and that at most one $\Theta$-role (as assigned by arrestet) and one additional $\Theta$-role (as assigned by blive, and also by vil in its root sense) may be assigned to one chain. (33a) violates this as two additional $\Theta$-roles are assigned to the chain, but if the analysis of (33b) was on the right track, I could not rule out the sentence.)

I have no independent evidence to offer at present. The characteristic difference between raising and control is that in raising constructions like (31a) "he" has one role, the one of "amuser of himself" which is assigned to the trace by "amuse", whereas in (32) "he" has two roles, one of "promiser of something to her" which is assigned to "he" by "promise", as well as one of "amuser of himself" which is assigned to PRO by "amuse". Thanks to the coreference (the so-called "control") between "he" and PRO in (32), the referent of "he" ends up with both these two roles. When comparing this to the modal construction, (31b), it is not so clear whether the subject of the modal ends up with one role, that of "amuser of himself", or two, "amuser of himself" as well as "someone whom something is reported of"/"someone who must something". Indeed, the analysis that obligation root modals assign additional $\Theta$-roles is based on the intuition that there is such a role as "someone who must something", as this is exactly what is represented by the additional $\Theta$-role assigned by skulle in its root use in (31b) = (34a).

To sum up, my suggestion (which admittedly is not based on strong indepen dent evidence) is that a main verb, like more ("amuse") assigns a real $\Theta$-role, whereas an obligation root modal assigns an additional $\Theta$-role, as in (34a) (and so does få ("get"), blive ("become"), and one of the two types of komme ("come")), and a modal which is not an obligation root one, does not assign any $\Theta$-role whatsoever, as in (34b):

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\Gamma(\Theta) & \Gamma(\Theta) & \Theta \\
(34) & a. & Han skal ti more sig \\
& & "He must enjoy himself" \\
& b. & Han skal ti more sig \\
& & "He is said to enjoy himself" \\
\end{array}
\]

4. Data

The hypothesis presented in section 3.1, that no more than one "additional $\Theta$-role" may be assigned to an argument, makes the prediction that none of the different kinds of verbs that assign such an additional $\Theta$-role role may be combined. As for combinations of (obligation) root modals with each other this has already been mentioned above, (24g,h), and will not be discussed further.7 Below I will concentrate on combinations of obligation root modals with the three other verbs mentioned in section 3, få ("get"), blive ("become"), and komme ("come"). These data were originally brought together and discussed in Hansen (1972), though some of them, especially the bare adverbial facts, also had been noted in earlier works (cf. the references in Hansen (1972)).

The constructions in the left column in (35) cannot occur embedded under an obligation root modal, and they are replaced by the ones on the right.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\Gamma(\Theta) & \Gamma(\Theta) & \Theta \\
(35) & a. & få NP ("get NP") by have NP ("have NP") \\
& b. & blive AP ("become AP") by være AP ("be AP") \\
& c. & komme Adv ("come Adv") by Adv \\
& & blive V-t ("become V-rm") by V-s \\
\end{array}
\]

Examples of this are

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\Gamma(\Theta) & \Gamma(\Theta) & \Theta \\
(36) & a. & Hun vil få tre biler i 1990 \\
& & Hun vil have tre biler i 1990 \\
& b. & Hun vil blive klog \\
& & Hun vil være klog \\
& c. & Hun vil komme hjem \\
& & Hun vil være hjemme \\
& d. & Hun vil blive arrestet \\
& & Hun vil være arrestet \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\Gamma(\Theta) & \Gamma(\Theta) & \Theta \\
(37) & a. & Han skal ti more sig \\
& & Han skal ti more sig \\
\end{array}
\]

As pointed out by Jane Grimshaw, this means that my analysis provides a reason for the impossibility of combining an obligation root modal with another one, but not for the impossibility of combining an epistemic modal with another one. As the restrictions seem to be the same in the two cases, cf. section 2.2.3, this is not completely satisfactory.
(37) root ville (obligation) event
a. Hun vil have tre biler i 1990
"She wants to get three cars in 1990"

b. Hun vil være klog
"She wants to become wise"

c. Hun vil hjem
"She wants to (go) home"

d. Hun vil arresteres
"She wants to become arrested"

(38) epistemic måtte event
a. Hun må få tre biler i 1990
"She must get three cars in 1990"

b. Hun må være klog
"She must become wise"

c. Hun må hjem
"She must get (go) home"

d. Hun må arresteres
"She must become arrested"

This means that for the first two constructions there will be ambiguity state/event in the obligation root construction, (37a,b) & (38a,b), as opposed to the epistemic construction with the same verb, (38a,b) & (38a,b), and the non-obligation root construction, (40a,b), in all of which there is a difference between the state and the event. For the (c,d) constructions, the state and the event are distinct throughout.

(39) root måtte (obligation) event
a. Hun må have tre biler i 1990
"She must get three cars in 1990"

b. Hun må være klog
"She must become wise"

c. Hun må hjem
"She must get (go) home"

d. Hun må arresteres
"She must become arrested"

(40) root måtte (permissive, i.e. permission) event
a. Hun må (gerne) få tre biler i 1990
"She is allowed to get three cars in 1990"

b. Hun må (gerne) blive klog
"She is allowed to become wise"

c. Hun må (gerne) komme hjem
"She is allowed to come home"

d. Hun må (gerne) blive arresteres
"She is allowed to become arrested"

The rest of this section is just going to be a list of the same constructions with the other modals. In other words, you may wish to skip to p. 19.

(41) epistemic skulle event
a. Hun skal få tre biler i 1990
"She is said to get three cars in 1990"

b. Hun skal blive klog
"She is said to become wise"

c. Hun skal komme hjem
"She is said to come home"

d. Hun skal blive arresteres
"She is said to become arrested"

(42) root skulle (obligation) event
a. Hun skal have tre biler i 1990
"She must have three cars in 1990"

b. Hun skal være klog
"She must become wise"

c. Hun skal hjem
"She must get (go) home"

d. Hun skal arresteres
"She must become arrested"
(43) epistemic *kune*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Hun kan få tre biler i 1990</td>
<td>Hun kan have tre biler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Hun kan blive klog</td>
<td>Hun kan være klog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Hun kan komme hjem</td>
<td>Hun kan være hjemme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Hun kan blive arresteret</td>
<td>Hun kan være arresteret</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(44) root *kune* (non-obligation, i.e. permission and/or ability)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Hun kan få tre biler i 1990</td>
<td>Hun kan have tre biler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Hun kan blive klog</td>
<td>Hun kan være klog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Hun kan komme hjem</td>
<td>Hun kan være hjemme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Hun kan blive arresteret</td>
<td>Hun kan være arresteret</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(45) epistemic *burde*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Hun bør få tre biler i 1990</td>
<td>Hun bør have tre biler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Hun bør blive klog</td>
<td>Hun bør være klog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Hun bør komme hjem</td>
<td>Hun bør være hjemme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Hun bør blive arresteret</td>
<td>Hun bør være arresteret</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(46) root *burde* (obligation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Hun bør have tre biler i 1990</td>
<td>Hun bør have tre biler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Hun bør blive klog</td>
<td>Hun bør være klog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Hun bør komme hjem</td>
<td>Hun bør være hjemme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Hun bør (go) home</td>
<td>Hun bør være arresteret</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(47) root *lunde* (non-obligation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Hun tør få tre biler i 1990</td>
<td>Hun tør have tre biler i 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Hun tør blive klog</td>
<td>Hun tør være klog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Hun tør komme hjem</td>
<td>Hun tør være hjemme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Hun tør blive arresteret</td>
<td>Hun tør være arresteret</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(48) root *gide* (non-obligation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Hun gider (godt) få tre biler i 1990</td>
<td>Hun gider (godt) have tre biler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Hun gider (godt) blive klog</td>
<td>Hun gider (godt) være klog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Hun gider (godt) komme hjem</td>
<td>Hun gider (godt) være hjemme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Hun gider (godt) blive arresteret</td>
<td>Hun gider (godt) være arresteret</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. State Expressions Replace Event Expressions: få + NP, blive + AF. 
Få and blive are ungrammatical embedded under obligation root modals as would be predicted:º

(49) a. *Hvis du vil få din løn udbetalt kontant, så...*
  “If you want to get your salary paid out in cash, then...”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Han skal blive nummer et hver gang, ellers bliver han sur</td>
<td>Han skal have nummer et hver gang, ellers bliver han sur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  “He must become number one every time, otherwise he gets cross”
| c. *Han vil blive fotograferet hele tiden* (OK: g-passive, cf. 6.2) | “He wants to be photographed all the time”

Instead, it is possible to have have and være embedded under an obligation root modal:

(50) a. *Hvis du vil have din løn udbetalt kontant, så...*
  “If you want to have your salary paid out in cash, then...”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Han skal være nummer et hver gang, ellers bliver han sur</td>
<td>Han skal have nummer et hver gang, ellers bliver han sur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  “He must be number one every time, otherwise he gets cross”

º. Cf. also the appendix on p. 29 about Hansen’s (1972) so-called “interesse”-constructions.
This presents a serious conceptual problem: Not only is it possible to substitute state expressions for event expressions, but the state expressions also take on event meaning, as can be seen when comparing (50) with (49a,b). If event meaning follows from the additional $\theta$-role suggested in section 3.1, then why is it not the event meaning that is impossible with obligation root modals, but only the event expressions? I have no satisfactory answer to this question.

Note that it is not the case that the state expressions are the "unmarked" expressions that may be used both for events and continuities and that the event expressions are somehow "marked". This would predict that the state expressions could have an event interpretation in all the constructions, not only when embedded under an obligation root modal. This is not the case ((51a,b) are epistemic modals, (51c) is a deontic non-obligation one, and (51d) is a non-deontic (and therefore also non-obligation) one):

(51) a. *Hvis ikke du skriver til forlaget, vil bogen ikke være trykt

   "If you do not write to the publisher, the book will not be printed" b. *Han skal have varer millioner på bare fem år

   "She is said to have become a millionaire in only five years" c. *Hvis du er interesseret, kan du have din løn udbetalt kontant

   "If you are interested, you may have your salary paid out in cash" d. *De ejder ikke være hjem

   "They do not feel like coming (or going) home"

6. Special Constructions: Motion and Passive

6.1 Komme vs. Bare Adverbials of Direction

The situation w.r.t. komme is more complicated than the one w.r.t. følge and blive described above. It is possible to find komme embedded under obligation root modals:

(52) a. Han skal komme

   "He must come"
   b. Hun vil komme hjem hver dag

   "She wants to come home every day"
   c. Han må komme til London gjeblillkeligt

   "He has to come to London right away"

This may be a different komme, though, as it is ungrammatical with an adverbial of direction that has a figurative reading:

(53) a. *Han skal komme igang

   "He has to get started"
   b. *Hun vil komme ind i Folketinget

   "She wants to become a member of parliament"
   c. *Han må komme op på teerne

   "He must get to be on his toes"

I shall therefore suggest the following: There are two types of komme, which we might call an auxiliary komme and a main verb komme.

The auxiliary komme does not occur on its own (as in (52a)), it only occurs with adverbials of direction, both "literal", as in (52b,c) and figurative ones, as in (53). It assigns an additional $\theta$-role to its subject. It may not occur embedded under obligation root modals, cf. that (52b,c) and (53) are grammatical without komme (though with a slightly different interpretation for (52b,c), which may be due to deixis, cf. the discussion of (56) below).

The main verb komme does not occur with figurative adverbials of direction, but only on its own or with "literal" adverbials, as in (52). It assigns an ordinary $\theta$-role to its surface subject. The main verb komme may occur embedded under obligation root modals, cf. (52).

That komme also exists as an auxiliary may be seen as supported by two sets of facts of a more morphological nature. One is that it turns up as a "real" auxiliary in some languages: Italian has a passive formed with venire, French has a past tense formed with venir, and Swedish forms future with komma att.

---

10 From a comparative point of view, it is interesting to note the following in Swedish: Although the event constructions themselves are not impossible in the way they are in Danish (cf. (49)), the state expressions may take on event interpretation in exactly the same cases as in Danish: if and only if embedded under obligation root modals. The same goes for the construction with the bare adverbial of direction, it is also possible in exactly the same contexts as in Danish. (As for the $g$-passive, it is much more widespread in Swedish anyway and is therefore possible not only in the same contexts as in Danish but also e.g. after epistemic modals). This seems rather difficult to account for, but perhaps a possible analysis could be to simply say that the event expressions are not analysed as assigning an additional $\theta$-role in Swedish. The question of why the state expressions may take on event interpretation in certain cases and not in others is left unanswered as before, but is now even more of a mystery.

11 The surface subject of komme (which is an ergative verb) is basegenerated as an object, whereas the surface subject of an intransitive verb like gøre ("sleep") is basegenerated as a subject (cf. Vikler & Sproose (1988) and the references cited there). This distinction is not crucial for the present analysis.
The above analysis with its suggestion that two kinds of *kome* exist, an auxiliary and a main verb, makes the prediction that (main V) *kome* should be possible embedded under an obligation root modal whenever a bare place adverbial is possible there. There are many exceptions from this, but they may presumably all be accounted for by the well-known deictic requirements on *kome*, i.e. the movement described by *kome* must be towards a place where either the speaker or the hearer is (or may be) situated, cf. e.g. Fillmore (1975:50ff). This means that either the hearer or the speaker must be in London (56a) to be acceptable, whereas there is no such requirements on (56b): Although *a* assigns a 9-role to its complement, the role of "what is seen", this role is assigned to the whole constituent *dem him*, cf. that in (57b) is ungrammatical for a parallel reason, *dem* receives no 9-role. Nonetheless, the a-passive is ungrammatical with epistemic modals: The potential embedding of the a-passive under non-obligation modals may present more of a problem. These facts are rather different from the bare adverbial case in that the a-passive may occur on its own, and therefore cannot be assumed to be "9-deficient" in the way assumed for the bare adverbial of direction in the previous section:

6.2 Blive-passive vs. a-passive

As far as embedding under root obligation modals are concerned, the a-passive is parallel to the bare adverbial case: it is grammatical as predicted, as it does not assign any additional 9-role. The potential embedding of the a-passive under non-obligation modals may present more of a problem. These facts are rather different from the bare adverbial case in that the a-passive may occur on its own, and therefore cannot be assumed to be "9-deficient" in the way assumed for the bare adverbial of direction in the previous section:

(57) a. *Du kan hjem med det carne
"You may home right away"
(OK: *a him/kome him)

b. *Jeg så *dem him
"I saw (=watched) them home"
(OK: *a him/kome him)

The intuition is that as the bare adverbial assigns no 9-role, the subject of (57a) receives no 9-role at all, hence the ungrammaticality. This implies, however, that in the cases of obligation root modals with bare adverbials (e.g. (56b)), it is possible for an argument to survive even though it is only being assigned an additional 9-role and no normal one. Although *a* assigns a 9-role to its complement, the role of "what is seen", this role is assigned to the whole constituent *dem him*, cf. that in (58) *dem* has the role of dancer(s), and *den dansa* the role of what is seen. In (58) *dem* thus receives a 9-role from *dansa*, but *dem* in (57b) can get no 9-role from *hjem*, as the bare adverbial assigns no 9-role:

6.2 Blive-passive vs. a-passive

As far as embedding under root obligation modals are concerned, the a-passive is parallel to the bare adverbial case: it is grammatical as predicted, as it does not assign any additional 9-role. The potential embedding of the a-passive under non-obligation modals may present more of a problem. These facts are rather different from the bare adverbial case in that the a-passive may occur on its own, and therefore cannot be assumed to be "9-deficient" in the way assumed for the bare adverbial of direction in the previous section:
(cf. that Skyum-Nielsen (1971:73) in his corpus has found two examples which he qualifies as peculiar ("ejendommelige").

Furthermore the a-passive breaks the pattern completely, as it may occur embedded under two non-obligation root modals, kunne and måtte (permission): 13

(61a) Pakken _kan_ hentes efter klokken tre
"The parcel can be picked up after three o’clock"

b. Pakken _ikke_ åbnes før juleaften
"The present may not be opened before Christmas eve"

It may be interesting that these two non-obligation root modals are the two deontic non-obligation ones, whereas the two non-obligation root modals which do not seem to allow the a-passive, burde and side, are not deontic but what has been called "dynamic" (cf. e.g. Davideen-Nielsen (1988:ch. 3, p. 2):

(62a) "Han _tør_ ikke hejse op i flagstangen
"She dare not be hoisted up on the flagpole"

b. "Han gider ikke klippes hver måned
"He doesn’t feel like having his hair cut every month"

Both of these are fine with the blive-passive.

Summing up this section, we might say that the questions of why the embeddings that were possible under obligation root modals are not possible under other modals remain less than satisfactorily answered as regards the a-passive facts, which do not follow the lines that have emerged so far, i.e. the partition between the obligation root modals on one side, and all the other modals on the other.

6.3 Perfect Infinitives

When placed in a context that requires a perfect infinitive of the other embedded verbs, the bare adverbial of direction and the a-passive are ungrammatical:

(63a) *Han _skulle_ have _lång_ for længe siden
"He should have got started long ago"

b. *Han _ville_ have _ind_ i Folketinget
"She wanted to have become a member of parliament"

c. *Han _skulle_ have _arresterede
"He should have been arrested"

This may be because the bare adverbial and the a-passive have no past participle. Cf. the present tense version of (63), where a past participle is not necessary:

(64a) a. Han _skulle_ _lægge_ nu
"He must get started now"

b. Hun _vil_ _have_ _ind_ i Folketinget
"She wants to become a member of parliament"

c. Han_ _skulle_ _have_ _arresterede
"He must be arrested"

In the cases where a past participle is necessary, the bare adverbial of direction and the a-passive are then replaced with constructions with være ("been"), as appears when comparing (63) with the following (I believe that this observation was first made by Jespersen (1932:206)):

(65a) a. Han _skulle have _været_ igang for længe siden
"He should have got started long ago"

b. Hun _ville_ have _være_ ind i Folketinget
"She wanted to have become a member of parliament"

c. Han _skulle_ have _være_ arrestered
"He should have been arrested"

Even if the ungrammaticality of (63) is accounted for by the (morphological) unavailability of a past participle, another question remains: Given that være may occur in the cases where a perfect infinitive (of the bare adverbial or of the a-passive) is called for, why can være not also appear in the present tense: 14

(66a) *Han _skulle_ have _være_ igang nu
"He must get started now"

b. *Hun _ville_ have _være_ ind i Folketinget
"She wants to become a member of parliament"

c. *Han _skulle_ have _være_ arrestered
"He must be arrested"

I have no answer to this, but it is interesting to note the following: The event interpretation of the state expression (i.e. the one with have ("have") or være ("be")) is possible in all cases but the two where there is an alternative way (of expressing an event) which is not also interpretable as a state: the movement construction in present tense, as in (66a,b) where the unambiguous

13. In (61) the blive-passive is not very good at all, cf. also (40d) and (44d). With blive _hentes_ and blive _åbnes_ the examples seem to only really have an epistemic interpretation.

14. (66a,c) are fine with state interpretation, but it is the event interpretation that we are concerned with here. (66b) cannot be interpreted as a state because of the directional adverbial, _ind_ i ("into"), cf. section 7.5, on p. 28.
alternative is a bare adverbial of direction, (64a,b); and the passive construction in present tense, as in (66c) where the unambiguous alternative is the passive, (64c). The same constructions with a perfect infinitive, (65) and (63), are fine with the state expression having event interpretation, and so are the two other constructions (with have + NP replacing få + NP, and with være + AP replacing blive + AP) with a preent as well as with a perfect infinitive.

7. Some Other Consequences.

Below will be listed six properties that have (or være) show when embedded under an obligation root modal, the (c) examples, but not elsewhere, the (a) examples. As the same properties are regular properties of få (or blive, come), cf. the (b) examples, they are accounted for by the analysis presented so far. It is also correctly predicted that the have (or være) examples with these properties only have event interpretation.

7.1 Idioms. (Hansen (1972:26))

Have may not normally replace få in idioms (67a,b), but embedded under an obligation root modal it not only may, (67c), it actually must, (67d). The analysis predicts that få is out in combination with obligation root modals, and must be replaced by have.

(67) a. *Han har altid sin vilje
   "He always has his way"
   b. Han fåer altid sin vilje
   "He always gets his way"
   c. Han vil altid have sin vilje
   "He always wants to have his way"
   d. *Han vil altid få sin vilje
   "He always wants to get his way"

Other expressions: få uav ("get beaten up"), få gremi ("obtain silence so that one may be heard"). få en overraskelse ("have a surprise"), etc.

7.2 Source phrases.

Have does not normally allow a phrase (outside the object NP) that gives the source of the object, (68a), whereas få does (68b). Embedded under an obligation root modal, however, have does allow a source phrase, (68c). This is as predicted by the analysis, få is out in combination with obligation root modals, (68d), and must be replaced by have, and only in these circumstances does have behave exactly as få, e.g. it allows source phrases.

(68) a. *Hun havde ingen penge af sine forældre
   "She had no money of her parents"
   b. Hun fik ingen penge af sine forældre
   "She got no money of her parents"
   c. Hun ville ingen penge have af sine forældre
   "She wanted to have no money of her parents"
   d. *Hun ville ingen penge få af sine forældre
   "She wanted to get no money of her parents"

7.3 Agent Ambiguity. (Hansen (1972:27), Wiwel (1901:180))

(69) a. Vi havde aflivet hunden
   "We had killed the dog"
   b. Vi fik aflivet hunden
   "We got killed the dog"
   c. Vi burde have aflivet hunden
   "We ought (to) have killed the dog"
   d. *Vi burde have fået hunden
   (OK without source phrase)

(69b) can either have the interpretation "We put the dog to sleep" or "We had the dog put to sleep (by someone else)", i.e. the agent of the participle that follows få may or may not be the same as the subject of få itself. This is not the case with have, the agent of the following participle must be that same as the subject of have, and therefore (69a) only has the interpretation "We had put the dog to sleep", and cannot have the interpretation "We had the dog put to sleep (by someone else)". However, in just those cases where have is embedded under an obligation root modal, it is nevertheless possible to have both interpretations, and therefore (68c) may mean either 'We ought to have put the dog to sleep' or 'We ought to have the dog put to sleep (by someone else)'.

7.4 Preposed Objects. (Hansen (1972:28))

Have does not normally allow the object NP to occur before the participle, (70a), whereas få does (70b). Embedded under an obligation root modal, however, have does allow a preposed object, (70c). This is as predicted by the analysis, få is out in combination with obligation root modals, (70d), and must be replaced by have, and only in these circumstances does have behave exactly as få, e.g. it allows preposed objects.
7.5 Adverbials of Direction. 

Hansen (1972:29) makes an account possible of the intriguing facts concerning certain Vs with event interpretation embedded under obligation root modals.

There are four potential sets of cases, as there are four different passives. There are four potential sets of cases, as there are four different passives.

I have tried to show that the analysis of so-called "additional" vs. makes an account possible of the intriguing facts concerning certain Vs with event interpretation embedded under obligation root modals.

I have also been lead to assume that there are two verbs kome ("come"), an auxiliary and a main verb. Certain questions have been left unanswered, notably ones concerning the distribution of the two different passives. On the other hand a series of properties of the state expressions which are normally associated exclusively with event expressions have been accounted for.

Appendix: The "Interesseer"-Construction.

Hansen (1972) suggests what he calls an "interesseer"-construction (Da. "interesseer-konstruktion") to account for cases where obligation root modals occur with the event expressions having event interpretations (i.e. with fa, bleve, and kome). According to him, this construction has a different interpretation from the event interpretations of the state expressions, not w.r.t. the event/state (in both cases the interpretation is one of event), but w.r.t. where the obligation comes from.

I disagree with this suggestion, as I do not think this kind of construction really exists. There are four potential sets of cases, as there are four obligation root modals, and below I will go through them one by one.

7.6 Adverbials of Duration.

Hansen (1972) suggests what he calls an "interesseer"-construction (Da. "interesseer-konstruktion") to account for cases where obligation root modals occur with the event expressions having event interpretations (i.e. with fa, bleve, and kome). According to him, this construction has a different interpretation from the event interpretations of the state expressions, not w.r.t. the event/state (in both cases the interpretation is one of event), but w.r.t. where the obligation comes from.

I disagree with this suggestion, as I do not think this kind of construction really exists. There are four potential sets of cases, as there are four obligation root modals, and below I will go through them one by one.

7.6 Adverbials of Duration.

Hansen (1972) suggests what he calls an "interesseer"-construction (Da. "interesseer-konstruktion") to account for cases where obligation root modals occur with the event expressions having event interpretations (i.e. with fa, bleve, and kome). According to him, this construction has a different interpretation from the event interpretations of the state expressions, not w.r.t. the event/state (in both cases the interpretation is one of event), but w.r.t. where the obligation comes from.

I disagree with this suggestion, as I do not think this kind of construction really exists. There are four potential sets of cases, as there are four obligation root modals, and below I will go through them one by one.

Hansen (1972) suggests what he calls an "interesseer"-construction (Da. "interesseer-konstruktion") to account for cases where obligation root modals occur with the event expressions having event interpretations (i.e. with fa, bleve, and kome). According to him, this construction has a different interpretation from the event interpretations of the state expressions, not w.r.t. the event/state (in both cases the interpretation is one of event), but w.r.t. where the obligation comes from.

I disagree with this suggestion, as I do not think this kind of construction really exists. There are four potential sets of cases, as there are four obligation root modals, and below I will go through them one by one.
A.1 Ville.

Hansen (1972:11) gives the following examples, all of which he finds grammatical (every time I cite an example from Hansen, the judgments and the underlinings are mine, not his):

(75) a. *Jeg vil gerne få at vide
   "I would like to get it to know = I would like to be told"

b. *Jeg vil gerne blive formand for Studienævnet
   "I would like to become chairman of the Board of Studies"

c. Jeg vil gerne hjem
   "I would like to come home"

d. *Jeg vil gerne blive undersøgt
   "I would like to be examined"

As indicated by the stars, I find all these examples rather unacceptable (Hansen admits that they are “realised very rarely”), with the exception of the one involving kommen, (75c). This was discussed in connection with (52), where I argued that there are two types of kommen, and only the auxiliary one is ungrammatical under obligation root modale. As (75c) is interpretable as a main V occurrence of kommen, it is thus not ruled out. If replaced by a kommen which must be an auxiliary occurrence, such as one with a figurative adverbial of direction, cf. (53), the example becomes just as unacceptable as (75a,b,d):

(76) *Jeg vil gerne kommen i Studienævnet
   "I would like to get onto the Board of Studies"

Gerne locks ville into its root interpretation, as it is an adverbial meaning roughly “voluntarily” or “with pleasure”. I thus see adverbials as requiring a particular thematic structure rather than adding to it (as opposed to Zubizarreta (1982)).

A.2 Skulle.

Hansen (1972:16-17) gives the following examples:

(77) a. Han skal få det at vide
   "He will get it to know = He will be told"

b. Han skal blive student til sommer
   "He will become a student this summer = He will graduate this summer"

c. Han skal komme ud
   "He will come out"

d. Han skal blive hentet
   "He will be picked up"

(78) Han skal kommer i Studienævnet
   "He will get onto the Board of Studies"

However, in none of these examples does skuelle have an interpretation of obligation, but instead one of promise (by the speaker). I think that here we have a variant of epistemic skuelle (as indicated by my listing in (23d)), and this is supported by the following syntactic properties:

i) They are unacceptable in perfect (or past perfect) (cf. section 2.2.1):

(79) a. *Han har skullet få det at vide
   "He has been going to be told"

b. *Han har skullet blive student til sommer
   "He has been going to graduate this summer"

c. Han skal komme i Studienævnet
   "He has been going to get onto the Board of Studies"

d. *Han skal blive hentet
   "He has been going to be picked up"

ii) They cannot have PRO as a subject (cf. section 2.2.2):

(80) a. *Det er ubehageligt at PRO skal få det at vide
   "It is unpleasant to be going to be told"

b. *Det er ubehageligt at PRO skal blive student til sommer
   "It is unpleasant to be going to graduate this summer"

c. *Det er ubehageligt at PRO skal komme i Studienævnet
   "It is unpleasant to be going to get onto the Board of Studies"

d. *Det er ubehageligt at PRO skal blive hentet
   "It is unpleasant to be going to be picked up"

The PRO has arbitrary reference here, but the judgments are the same if the subject is a PRO that does not have arbitrary reference, i.e. if det er ubehageligt is replaced by han drømte om (cf. (18) and (19)).

iii) They do not allow the pseudo-cleft construction (cf. section 2.2.5):

(81) a. *Hvad han skal er at få det at vide
   "What he is going is to be told"

b. *Hvad han skal er at blive student til sommer
   "What he is going is to graduate this summer"

c. *Hvad han skal er at komme i Studienævnet
   "What he is going is to get onto the Board of Studies"

d. *Hvad han skal er at blive hentet
   "What he is going is to be picked up"
Cf. also that Davidsen-Nielsen (1988: ch. 2, p. 15-16) says that this kind of ekleie behaves syntactically like an epistemic modal (though he finds it "semantically non-epistemic").

Taking this ekleie (of promise) to be epistemic also accounts for its difference in interpretation from the ekleie of obligation: There is no additional G-role assigned to the subject, and therefore the subject cannot be the origin of an obligation.

A 3 Måtte

Hansen (1972: 20-21) gives the following examples, all of which he finds grammatical, but again I disagree:

(52) a. *Han må få en reprimande
   "He must be reprimanded"
   b. *Han må blive medlem snarest
   "He must become (a) member very soon"
   c. *Han må komme af med mindst 10 kg
   "He must get rid of at least 22 pounds"
   d. *Han må blive opstillet til formandsposten
   "He must become a candidate for the chair"

Hansen (1972: 21) himself calls them "very rare". According to Østkjær Jensen (1987: 23) such examples are rare, and also grammatical but unacceptable ("...sind grammatisch korrekt aber scheinen vom Sprachusus abzuweichen").

A 4 Burde

Hansen (1972: 23) gives no examples, but says that "the facts ... seem to be rather unclear". Skyum-Nielsen (1971: 200) has in his corpus found no examples at all of burde being followed by a passive with blive.

References

Davidsen-Nielsen, Niels (1988): "On Tense and Mood in English and Danish". Ms, Copenhagen School of Economics, Business Administration, and Modern Languages.


Skyum-Nielsen, Peder (1971): "Modalverberne i Nederlag". Ms, University of Copenhagen.


