**Overview**

An open question in the study of modality is how context and grammar interact to produce different flavors of possibilities and necessity. Here, we examine two thematic necessity modals, English need and Tagalog kailangan, and show that when they establish a thematic dependency with a subject, they express necessities in light of this subject’s priorities, and in the absence of an overt subject, they express necessities in light of priorities that the speaker endorses. To account for this syntax-flavor mapping, we propose that these verbs always have a speaker argument, which can be either the overt one in thematic constructions, or a speaker-bound implicit pronoun in impersonal constructions.

**Empirical Generalizations: Kailangan**

Kailangan enters two structures, distinguished by case marking.

1. **Structure 1: Impersonal**
   - [kailangan]-ng ma-nalug si Juan]
   - MOD-COMP AV-work SUBJ-Juan OBJ-need
   - ‘It is required that Juan set aside food’

2. **Structure 2: Thematic**
   - [kailangan ni Juan]-ng ma-nalug]
   - MOD GEN-Juan-COMP AV-work
   - ‘The car feels a need to work’

**Empirical Generalizations: Need**

Need also enters an impersonal and a thematic construction, and the thematic one displays an animacy restriction (9-12); the impersonal/thematic structural distinction is obscured in (13-14).

1. **Structure 1: Impersonal**
   - [need]_ng ma-nalug si Juan]
   - MOD-COMP AV-work SUBJ-Juan OBJ-need
   - ‘It is required that Juan set aside food’

2. **Structure 2: Thematic**
   - [need] ni Juan]-ng ma-nalug]
   - MOD GEN-Juan-COMP AV-work
   - ‘The car feels a need to work’

**Syntax-Flavor Mapping**

Impersonal constructions express speaker-oriented necessities but not purely subject-oriented necessities, thematic constructions express subject-oriented necessities but not purely speaker-oriented necessities.

**The Proposal**

1. **Kailangan/need’s modal flavor is lexically-specified, and it selects an expericent (“neece”):**
   - argument in all constructions it enters

2. **In the thematic construction, the overt experiencer DP is the neecer, while in the impersonal construction, an implicit speaker-bound variable is**
   - Context provides Kratzerian modal base and ordering source functions (f_s, e, x, y, z)
   - We treat kailangan/need as having two presuppositions: (i) the extension of the ordering source function must contain a desire of the speaker’s thematic argument and (ii) the prejcacent proposition must not be settled in the modal base (like with want, e.g. Heim 1992)

3. **(9) [kailangan/needF] (s, x, y, z) is defined only if \( f_s, e, x, y, z \) \( \in \) D isl(s, x, y, z) and \( g(e) = \{y\} \) and \( T(y)(b) \) \( \not\in \) and \( T(y)(a) \) \( \not\in \) \( \not\in \).

4. **For any set of worlds (s, w) and propositions (A, B), a possible world w’ and individual x:**
   - \( M_x(\langle A, s, w, w’, x \rangle) = \{s, b, e\} \)
   - \( D isl(s, x, y, z) \)
   - \( D isl(s, x, y, z) \)

5. **Impersonal: [kailangan]-ng ma-nalug si Juan]
   - MOD-COMP AV-smoke SUBJ-Juan
   - ‘It is required that Juan smoke’

6. **Thematic: [kailangan ni Juan]-ng ma-nalug]
   - MOD GEN-Juan-COMP AV-smoke
   - ‘Juan feels a need to smoke’

**Deriving the Mapping: Thematic LFs**

Thematic constructions have LFs where the experiencer is base-generated in its surface position in the matrix clause and optionally controls an embedded PRO.

1. **(20) LF:**
   - \{experiencer [kailang-an] \{PRO \} PRO\}

2. **Context:** Juan is hungry. His mother gave him a plate of food, and although she knows he intends to eat it all, she told him to set some food aside for his brother. She tells her friend:

3. **(21) Thematic:** \# [kailangan ni Juan]-ng mag-tulog ng-pagkain]
   - MOD GEN-Juan-COMP AV-set aside OBJ-food
   - ‘Juan feels a need to set aside food’

4. \( F(1, 2) \) is defined only if the ideals in the context include a desire of Juan’s, and within the set of relevant possibilities, it’s unsettled whether Juan will set aside food.

5. \( F(2, 3) \) = 1 iff the desire of Juan’s necessitates that he set aside food (false in context)

**Deriving the Mapping: Impersonal LFs**

Impersonal constructions have LFs where noo experiencer is an implicit variable, “wrapped” in a group-formation function; in matrix clauses, the variable is bound by an Assert operator (cf. Pearson 2013 on implici experience arguments of predicates of taste like easy and fast food).

1. **(22) LF:**
   - \{Experient [\{\} PRO]\}
   - \{\} PRO\}

2. **Context:** John has a paper due and wants to work late. John calls a friend annoyed and says

3. **(23) Impersonal:** [kailangan]-ng ma-nalug ni Juan]
   - MOD-COMP AV-smoke SUBJ-Juan
   - ‘It is required that Juan smoke’

4. **Context:** John has allowed junk, but now he’s sick. The doctor ordered him to quit, but Juan cannot resist, and he told his doctor that he will not quit. The doctor says to Juan’s wife:

5. **(24) A human sacrifice needed to be performed every spring**

6. **(25) It was mandatory that a human sacrifice be performed every spring**

**Conclusion**

The structures that lexical modals enter systematically correlate with different modal flavors; similar findings have also been reported for functional modals (Cinque 1999, Hauck 2010).

- Our analysis leads to a grammatical split among root modal flavors expressed by lexical modal, dividing them according to whether they are speaker- or subject-oriented.
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