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The phenomenon of modal subordination (Roberts 1989) is illustrated in (1).

(1)  
a. A thief, might have broken into the house. #He, took the silver.  
b. A thief, might have broken into the house. He, might have taken the silver.  
c. A thief, might have broken into the house. If one did, he, might have taken the silver.

In (1) the indefinite NP *a thief* is in the scope of *might*. It cannot serve as the antecedent for an anaphor in a subsequent non-modal sentence, (1a), but it is accessible to an anaphor that is itself in the scope of a modal, *might* in (1b). The second modal is *subordinate* in that it is evaluated against the hypothetical assumption that the proposition in the first sentence is true, i.e., only worlds in which the thief exists are considered, cf. the paraphrase of (1b) in (1c).

If evidentials are epistemic modals (Ehrich 2001, Izvorski 1997, McCready & Ogata 2007, Matthewson et al. 2006), we expect them to participate in modal subordination as well. This paper discusses the modal subordination behaviour of the German modal verb *sollen* in its reportative use. As shown in (3), an indefinite introduced in its scope, can only serve as an antecedent to an anaphor that is itself in the scope of a modal (*könnten* in (3b)).

(3)  
a. Ein Dieb soll im Museum eingebrochen haben. #Er hat das Silber mitgenommen.  
   *A thief allegedly broke into the museum. He took the silver.*  
b. Ein Dieb soll im Museum eingebrochen haben. Er könnte das Silber mitgenommen haben.  
   *A thief allegedly broke into the museum. He might have taken the silver.*

This therefore suggests that reportative *sollen* is a modal operator which licenses modal subordination when occurring in first position. However, *sollen* does not seem to be able to be subordinated itself. While the sequence in (4a) is possible, it is not a subordination construction, as shown by the impossibility of the conditional paraphrase (4b).

(4)  
a. Ein Dieb soll im Museum eingebrochen haben. Er soll das Silber mitgenommen haben.  
   *A thief allegedly broke into the museum. He allegedly took the silver.*  
b. A thief allegedly broke into the museum. #If one did, he allegedly took the silver.

Instead, (4a) appears to be a case of co-ordination in the sense that the second *sollen* simply continues with the same type of source of information. The paper will show that reportative *sollen* can also not be subordinated to other types of modals.

The infelicity of certain types of subordination sequences has been explained in the literature by appealing to the restrictions modals impose on their modal bases (Roberts 1996, Geurts 1999). This paper follows this approach and argues that the subordination facts regarding *sollen* are explained if we assume that it selects an informational modal base (Kratzer 2012) which contains the contents of reports by others. As we cannot simply add propositions that are hypothetically assumed to be true to such a modal base, subordinating *sollen* is ruled out.