'MUST' AND ITS EQUIVALENTS IN POLISH

PIOTR KAKIETEK

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

The importance of the auxiliaries in English can be hardly exaggerated. There is no doubt about the fact that the auxiliaries enjoy the highest frequency in the language. It is mainly through them that it is possible to express the most varied shades of the nature of the predication. It is quite obvious that an English-speaking person who has not sufficient knowledge of the auxiliaries will never be able to express himself freely and so will never feel 'natural' in the language. In view of all this, the auxiliaries (both primary and modal) should be introduced into the learning programme in a relatively early stage.

The present paper is a modest contribution to the analysis of the English modal auxiliaries and their equivalent constructions in Polish. It falls into two major parts: Part A concentrates solely on the description of *must*, and Part B deals with its Polish equivalents.

Part A: *MUST*

In opposition to most writers on English grammar, we assume that *must* manifests only one meaning which may be paraphrased to read: "the actualization of the predication is viewed as necessary by some aspect(s) of the world". The term 'aspect' has been borrowed here from Joos, and it may, among others, include: the will of a person other than the subject, norms or rules functioning in various spheres of social life (e.g., moral code, laws, rules of a game, etc.), the pressure of the relevant circumstances, the state of our knowledge, the will of the subject, etc.

Unlike the 'independent' *shall* (attested in examples like 'Shall I open the window?' or 'He shall not go') which explicitly indicates that the initiation of the action is dependent upon the speaker, or the addressee, *must* in this respect remains neutral. Thus in (1) 'You must do it at once' and in (2) '(Tell him) he must come earlier tomorrow' it may or may not be the speaker that requires the predication. In cases where the speaker acts as the subject it may be himself or somebody else comment-

ing upon whom the action depends. Sentences containing first-person singular subjects turn out to be ambiguous even if they are not extracted from their proper context. (3) 'I must leave now' may in fact be related to either of the following sentences: (4) 'I must leave (my sense of duty, or something of that sort) 'forces' me to leave' and (5) 'I must leave (I start work at seven)'.

(1) to (3), in one of their interpretations, carry an implication of obligation. This is confirmed by the fact that each of them is paraphrasable by the construction be obliged to. The following then are legitimate paraphrases of (1) to (3), respectively:

6. You are obliged to do it (at once)
7. He is obliged to come earlier tomorrow
8. I'm obliged to leave

Most grammarians treat the obligation implied in each of the above examples as part of the semantics of the modal. However, an explanation of this distinction in terms of the meaning of the modal (i.e., necessity) and the character of the aspect of the world involved seems to be theoretically more plausible. Notice that if we assume that the speaker himself functions as the aspect, (6) to (8) cease to qualify as possible paraphrases of (1) to (3). Under this interpretation the subject of (3), as it were exercising his own will, chooses to follow the specified course of action.

One of the differences between (1) and (3) lies in that whereas in (3) the subject and the speaker are the same person, in (1) they are two different persons. Examples like (1) are often construed as commands (In such examples we have to do with obligations imposed upon the subject by the speaker). Consider:

9. You must do it (at once)
10. ?You have to do it
11. ?You are obliged to do it
12. I (hereby) tell/order you to do it
13. ?You had to do it
14. I told/ordered you to do it

If (9) is treated as a command, (10) and (11) are very unlikely as its paraphrases. (12) seems to be the only candidate here. Notice also that a 'past time' equivalent of (9) is not (13) but (14).

In sentences implying an 'external' obligation (i.e., obligation imposed upon the subject by some aspect of the world) must may be replaced by have to, although not in all possible situations. All of the following sentences are synonymous:

15. You must go
16. You are obliged to go
17. You have to go

Under the 'non-obligative' interpretation the substitution of have to for must in (3) and similar examples is rendered impossible, hence the inadmissibility of (18) 'I have to leave'. Underlying the meaning of (3) seems something like 'I strongly insist on my leaving'. There the subject's insistence appears to be so strong as to make him view the predication necessary.

The use of must in sentences implying a suggestion or advice makes the suggestion more persistent, as in:

19. You must come and see us one of these days
20. You must introduce me to your new boyfriend

The circumstances accompanying the elicitation of sentences like (19) and (20) are such as to preclude an idea of obligation or compulsion as imposed upon the subject by the speaker or somebody/something else. Quite clearly, the idea of persistence conveyed in (19) and (20) is not the denotation of must but at best is connotation. In these, and similar, examples the modal is not replaceable by have to, which accounts for the ungrammaticality of (21):

21. ?You have to introduce me to your new boyfriend

Earlier it has been pointed out that must fails to explicitly indicate the character of the aspect requiring the predication. In contrast have to, at least in present tense affirmative sentences, makes it clear that the aspect involved in the matter is not either the speaker or the subject of the sentence. Let us consider:

22. You must be back in camp
23. You have to be back in camp

(22) might be produced by an officer giving the orders, whereas (23) might come from a soldier who has been told to inform his comrades of the orders. The same holds true in the case of (24) and (25). In (24) the subject is called upon to follow the action specified by the main verb because the speaker 'likes it that way'. In (25) the regulations, or something of that nature, may function as the aspect demanding the realization of the action.

24. You must call me "Sir"
25. You have to call me "Sir"

To refer an obligation, command or suggestion to some future time, we use *will plus have to*, as in:

26. You'll have to do it
27. You'll have to come and see us one of these days

The use of *will be obliged* to in place of *will have to*, although possible in the case of obligations, is regarded as a feature of formal written style.

Since *must* lacks the past tense form, past time reference is made by means of the past tense form of *have to*.

28. He had to go

Notice that when the past tense element is inserted into the VP, the restriction we have noted to exist between *must* and *have to* (Exs. 22 and 23) becomes totally obliterated. *Had to* is a 'past time' equivalent of both *must* and *have to*, regardless of the grammatical person of the subject with which these happen to combine. (31) is a 'past time' equivalent of (29) and (30).

29. I must go
30. I have to go
31. I had to go

Negation with *must* in eventual, i.e., it invariably applies to the lexical verb. (32), for instance, is synonymous with (33), (34) and (35).

32. (My doctor says) I mustn't eat meat
33. (My doctor says) I'm obliged not to eat meat
34. I'm not allowed to eat meat
35. It's necessary that I shouldn't eat meat

Mustn't cannot, however, be replaced by *don't have to*. (36) is not synonymous with (37), the latter being equivalent to (38) and (39). Consider the examples:

36. You mustn't go
37. You don't have to go
38. You needn't go
39. It isn't necessary for you to go

Consider now the sentences:

40. I'll be obliged not to eat meat
41. I won't be allowed to eat meat
42. ?I'll have not to eat meat

(40) and (41) are 'future time' equivalents of (32). Of course, (42) is impossible in English.

In order to negate the meaning of *must*, we use *need* plus *not* (*needn't*). The following are the negative counterparts of (43) and (44):

43. I must go
44. You must drink it
45. I needn't go
46. You needn't drink it

The absence of necessity in the past is signalled by *needn't* plus *have*, as in:

47. You needn't have done it
48. She needn't have read it for today

Needn't plus *have* implies that the action did actually take place although there was no necessity for it to occur. *Didn't have to* indicates that the action was not necessary so it did not (probably) happen.

In the examples that follow it is the state of our knowledge (consisting in statements accepted by us to be true) that acts as the aspect of the world requiring the occurrence of the predication (E.g., if we assume that the statements: 'X is Y' and 'Y is Z' are both true, then it necessarily follows that the statement 'X is Z' is also true):

49. It must be cold outside
50. I must be dreaming
51. He must be dying

(49) to (51) are simply logical conclusions and *must* here points to the necessary relation between the conclusions and the premises (i. e., statements recognized by the speaker as being true) from which they logically follow. Notice also that what is implicit in each of the above examples is a strong conviction on the part of the speaker as regards the truth or reality of what he is speaking about. Uttering (49), for instance, what the speaker actually says is something like: 'I am certain/sure that it is cold outside'.

To our knowledge none of the available handbooks of English mentions the possibility of substituting *have to* for *must* in sentences bearing the character of inferences. However, sentences like the following do occur in English:

52. You have to be crazy (to do that)
53. It has to be somewhere here

The following two examples are taken from Hammond Innes' The Strange Land, and here they are provided together with their surrounding contexts:

54. There was something odd about the man, of course. There had to be for him to come a thousand miles to a remonte hill village for next to no money. '(p. 20).

55. I sat down, feeling dazed, thinking how senseless it was. There were hundreds of square miles of mountains. Why did it have to be here, in this exact spot?' (p. 100).

Have to may be regarded as a stylistic variant of *must* appearing in 'inferential' statements containing verbs which do not admit of an 'obligative' interpretation. It is evident that none of the (52) - (55) Examples allows for an 'obligative' interpretation. (53) to (55) contain 'impersonal' subjects. (52) contains a verb that is not subject to human control, and here the speaker seems to imply that he cannot see any other interpretation on the subject's behaviour. It seems that *have to* in this function is more emphatic than *must*. This may be due to the fact that *have to* is much rarer than *must*.

Let us now consider:

56. They must be married

In (56) the possibility of replacing *must* by *have to* is ruled out, since the verb (and of course, the subject) here is subject to an 'obligative' as well as an 'inferential' interpretation. Thus, (56) is ambiguous between the following two interpretations: 'They have to be married (=They are obliged to be married)' and 'It is necessarily the case that they are married'. (56) becomes disambiguated when the perfect aspect is added to the VP, as in (57) 'They must have been married' which may only mean 'It is necessarily the case that they have been married'. As it stands, (57) turns out to be also ambiguous between a 'past' and a 'perfect' interpretation.

A negative inference is expressed by means of *can plus not*. Examples:

58. It can't be cold outside
59. I can't be dreaming
60. He can't be dying

'Past time' equivalents of (58) to (60) are:

61. It can't have been cold outside
62. I can't have been dreaming
63. He can't have been dying

To conclude this part of our paper, it may be pointed out that the use of the 'inferential' *must* is by no means limited to its colligation with *be*. In actual fact, the 'inferential' *must* may freely combine with any lexical verb, provided the verb is explicitly marked as 'plus habitual' (Boyd and Thorne: 21). To give an example, (64) may be interpreted as an obligation as well as an inference:

64. He must come here regularly

Part B: POLISH EQUIVALENTS OF *MUST*

The Polish lexical equivalent of *must* is *musieć*. It is used to translate *must* in all the types of sentences we have distinguished in the first part of this paper. For instance, the following sentences are translation equivalents of (1), (2), (19), and (49), respectively:

65. Musisz to zrobić (natychmiast)
66. (Powiedz mu), że jutro musi przyjść wcześniej
67. Musisz nas któregoś dnia odwiedzić
68. Musi być zimno (na dworze)

In Part A it has been said that in cases where the subject or the speaker acts the aspect *must* is, in principle, irreplaceable, by *have to* (Exs. 4 and 9). Since Polish has no correspondent of *have to*, it employs *musieć* to translate both *must* and *have to*. Thus the following example is semantically equivalent to both (22) and (23):

69. Musicie wracać do obozu

In translation from Polish into English the learner will often show a tendency to employ *must* even in cases where the usage quite clearly calls for the use of *have to*.

It will be recalled that the meaning of *must* plus *not* is: "the non-occurrence of the predication is viewed as necessary". (70) 'You mustn't do that' implies "a positive obligation not to do that". To convey the meaning of *must* plus *not*, Polish may use either *nie wolno mi* or *nie mogę*. Thus, (71 will be synonymous with (34).

(71) (Lekarz mówi), że nie wolno mi/nie mogę jeść mięsa

Due to the formal likeness of *must* plus *not* and *nie muszę*, the Polish learner will often make the mistake of translating the latter by the former (and vice versa, in translation from English into Polish).

The negative correlates of *must*, that is, *needn't* and *don't have to*, have the following equivalents in Polish: *nie muszę* and *nie potrzebuję*, both followed by an infinitival from. Consider:

72. Nie muszę robić tego (w tej chwili)
    (I needn't do it now)

73. Nie potrzebuję przychodzić tu tak wcześnie
    (I needn't come here so early)

Needn't plus *have* may by rendered in Polish either by *nie musiał* (the past tense form of *musieć*) or by the modal adverb *niepotrzebnie* followed by the past tense of the main verb. It should be pointed out that *nie musiał* is, as a rule, followed by an 'imperfective' verb (Ex. 74), whereas *niepotrzebnie* takes a 'perfective' verb (Ex. 75). Examples:

74. (Ostatecznie) nie musiałem tu przychodzić
    (After all) I needn't have come here
75. Niepotrzebnie to zrobił
    He needn't have done it

The past tense of *musieć* is used to cover the meanings of *had to* as well as *must* plus *have*. Examples:

76. Musiał wrócić przed zapadnięciem zmroku
    (He had to come back before nightfall)
77. Musiało być bardzo późno kiedy wyszliśmy
    (It must have been very late when we left)

Can't plus *have*, i.e., the negative correlate of *must* plus *have*, is expressed in Polish by the modal adverb *niemożliwe* and the main verb in the past tense. Consider:

78. (To) niemożliwe, że Jan ożenił się z Marią
    (John can't have married Maria)

Will have to, replacing must in 'future' obligations and suggestions, is expressed in Polish by the future tense of the auxiliary *być* and the past tense of *musieć*. Thus (79) and (80) are the Polish translations of (1) and (19), respectively:

79. Będziesz musiał to zrobić
80. Będziesz musiał któregoś dnia nas odwiedzić

The 'future' counterparts of *must* plus *not* correspond with the Polish *nie będzie mi/tobie/mu* etc. *wolno* and *nie będę/będziesz*, etc. *mógł*, both followed by an infinitival form. Examples:

81. Nie będzie mi wolno palić
    (I won't be allowed to smoke)
82. Nie będzie mogła przychodzić tutaj
    (She won't be allowed to come here any more)

There are some formal differences between *must* and *musieć* which are likely to create some serious learning problems for the English student of Polish.

One of the distinguishing features of the English modal auxiliaries is that they cannot be preceded by a 'primary' auxiliary (i.e., be, have, do). This explains the ungrammaticality of (83) 'He is must going'. In Polish however, the occurrence of the auxiliary before the modal is quite normal, as exemplified in: (84) 'Będziesz musiał przyjść tutaj jutro przed szóstą' (You'll have to come here before 6 o'clock tomorrow).

Furthermore, unlike its English counterpart, *musieć* is inflected for tense (present and past) and person. Consider the following paradigms:

Present Tense

English	Polish
I must go	(Ja) muszę iść
You must go	(Ty) musisz iść
He/she/it must go	(On/ona/ono) musi iść
We must go	(My) musimy iść
You must go	(Wy) musicie iść
They must go	(Oni/one) muszą iść

In English the elements that can occur in the position between *must* and the main verb are, in principle, restricted to adverbs of frequency and time (e.g., 'John must *always* get up at 7'). But consider the Polish sentences:

85. Nie musimy tam jutro jechać
    (We needn't go there tomorrow)
86. Minister musiał to samo mieć na myśli
    (The Minister must have had the same in mind)'
87. Musicie tam iść natychmiast
    (You must go there at once)

(85) to (87) show that *musieć* may be separated from the main verb by: a. an adverb of time (Ex. 85 *jutro*); b. an adverb of place (Ex. 87 *tam jutro*); c. both an adverb of time and an adverb of place (Ex. 85 *tam jutro*); d. an objective NP (Ex. 86 *to samo*). Finally, in Polish the negative particle *nie* (*not*) always precedes the modal, as in: (88) 'Nie musisz przebierać się do obiadu' (You needn't change for lunch).

REFERENCES

Boyd, J. and J.P. Thorne. 1969. "The deep grammar of modal verbs". *Journal of Linguistics* 5.

Joos, M. 1964. *The English verb.* Madison and Milwaukee: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Palmer, F. R. 1966. *A linguistic study of the English verb.* London: Longmans.

Innes, H. 1966. *The strange land.* London and Glasgow: Collins Clear-Type Press.