

**“Must” As a Concept of Obligation and its Equivalences: A
Semantic-Syntactic Study in the Performance of Iraqi
University Learners of English**

**Sana’ S. Othman
Lecturer
Dept. of English
College of Arts
University of Mosul**

Abstract

The study aims at considering the meaning of obligation expressed by the central modal 'must' and its equivalences. The study tackles the syntactic and semantic uses of 'must' and its equivalences with respect to its occurrences in four types of sentence along with tense, aspect, negation and reported speech. The study aims at analyzing the occurrence of 'must' and its equivalences according to their meaning, i.e. interpreting their functions in the performance of the Iraqi learners of English.

It is hypothesized that Iraqi university learners of English (IULE) consider the modal auxiliary 'must' as an indication of obligation only. Such learners consequently, negate this modal verb by inserting 'not' after it. They usually do not think of any equivalence might be used instead of 'must' although some learners know that 'have to' can be used as an equivalence.

The results suggest that the functions and meanings of 'must', i.e. obligation and necessity overlap and may be said to cohere rather than be distinguishable. This classification of 'must' is inefficient in practical communication, however, its use may vary according to variables such as subject matter, medium, attitude, and style.

1. Introduction:

Making out the very precise meaning of some modal verbs as well as tackling their uses in formal classes would sometimes be almost impossible and besides would also be pointless. The modal auxiliaries are so called because of their contribution in the area known as modality (including such concepts as volition, probability and obligation), but such verbs have a broader semantic role than this label suggests.

The paper aims at testing the difficulties that Iraqi learners of English have in learning the troublesome central modal auxiliary ‘must’ and its equivalences. To achieve this, a test was done to identify the students ability to recognize the syntactic and semantic uses of ‘must’ in the four types of sentences to be tackled, i.e. the statement, negative, tense/aspect and reported speech.

Biber et al. (1985: 483) state that modals and the semi-modals can be grouped into three major categories according to their main meanings (excluding ‘used to’ which relates to past time). They are:

1. Permission/ possibility/ ability: can, could, may, might.
2. Obligation/ necessity: must, should, (had)better, have(got) to, need to, ought to, be supposed to.
3. Volition/ prediction: will, would, shall, be going to.

Each modal has two different types of meaning, which can be as labeled ‘intrinsic’ and ‘extrinsic’ (also referred to as ‘deontic’ and ‘epistemic’ meanings. Intrinsic modality refers to actions and events that humans (or other agents directly control meaning relating to permission, obligation, or volition (or intention). Extrinsic modality refers to the logical status of events or states, usually relating to assessments of likelihood: possibility, necessity or prediction (see Fig. 1).

Meanings of the Modals			
Group I can/could	permission		Intrinsic
	↕		
	possibility		
	ability		Extrinsic
Group II must have (got) to need (non assertive) non committed	{ obligation ↕ Necessity }	{ should ought to non committed }	Intrinsic
			Extrinsic
Group III will/would	volition	} Shall (rare and restricted	Intrinsic
	↕		
	prediction (future)		Extrinsic

Fig. (1): Meanings of the Modals in Quirk et al. (1985: 221)

Palmer (1965: 119) states that there are two uses of ‘must’ to be recognized: (1) obligation as in sentence (1). (2) Necessity (conclusion) as in sentence (2). They are to be formally distinguished with reference to the past time analogues, and to the forms used analogously for negation, and also by the fact that only one may be used with future reference, i.e. obligation.

(1) They must start work early.

(2) There must be an error here.

Thomson and Martinet (1988: 140) emphasize that ‘have to’ is equivalent to ‘must’ in positive sentences, but in negative form, the obligation is removed, and it means ‘It isn’t necessary to ...’ ‘Must’ and ‘have to’ are often used differently although sometimes there is a subtle difference. ‘Must’ is used where the reference is personal. ‘Have to’ is used when there is an external reason or

situation which is beyond our control which obliges us to do something.

2. Syntactic and Semantic Study of the Sentences:

2.1 Statement:

The syntactic and semantic equivalence of ‘must’ are tackled in the statement type of sentences:

2.1.1 Syntactic Aspect of “Must” and its Equivalences:

Quirk et al. (1985: 137), Eastwood (1994: 116) and Biber et al. (1999: 484) express that the meaning of obligation can be expressed syntactically by the central modals ‘must’ and ‘should’ plus an infinitive. The marginal modals ‘need’ and ‘ought to’, the modal idioms ‘had better’, ‘would rather’, ‘be to’, ‘have got to’, and the semi-auxiliaries ‘have to’, ‘be obliged to’, ‘be supposed to’, the semi-modals/quasi-modals and periphrastic modals are unlike the central modal verbs in that many of them can be marked for tense and person, and can occur as non-finite forms. In the infinitive; they can sometimes co-occur with a central verb or another semi-modal, as in:

(1) You must have to pay again.

Quirk et al. (ibid.: 144) mention that the semi-auxiliaries ‘be obliged to’, ‘be to’, ‘be supposed to’, ‘be meant to’, ‘be bound to’ can be described as auxiliaries-like. These constructions are, however, in one respect much closer to main verbs than are the modal idioms and can therefore occur in combination with preceding auxiliaries, as in:

(2) James will be obliged to resign.

2.1.2 Semantic Aspect of 'Must' and its Equivalences:

Huddleston (1986: 331) states that 'must' expressing "obligation" or "compulsion" which involves some kind of human control over events. The speaker here, to a greater or lesser extent, is advocating a certain form of behaviour in spite of the fact that 'obligation' can be subdivided into various semantic implications under different meanings:

(I) Root or Strong Obligation:

Eastwood (1994: 116) identifies that 'must or 'have (got) to' are used to express strong obligation, where 'must' can be glossed as [You are {obliged to/required to}] which are more formal, as in sentence:

(3) *You must/have (got) to pay your debts soon.*

Greenbaum and Quirk (1990: 62) state that though 'have (got) to' has the same meanings of "obligation" and "logical necessity" as are expressed by 'have to', 'have got to' which tends not to have habitual meaning. 'Have to' has a directive meaning when 'have got to' combined with a verb of dynamic meaning, it tends to refer to the future as in:

(4) *Jim's got to check the temperature every 12 hours.*

(5) *Jim has to check the temperature every 12 hours.*

Quirk et al. *ibid* and Greenbaum and Quirk (1990: 40) state that 'have (got) to' can also be substituted for 'must' with little or no difference in meaning. In the obligation sense, 'have (got) to' is felt to be more impersonal than 'must', i.e. the speaker lacks authority. This is particularly noticeable with a first person subject. 'Must' implies self-obligation, while 'have (got) to' implies obligation by external forces as in:

(6) *I'm afraid I have (got) to go now.*

Quirk et al. (ibid) notice that some native speakers do not recognize the distinction between ‘self-obligation’ as in sentence (7) and obligation by external forces as in sentence (8):

(7) *I/we must share our skills and knowledge.*

(8) *I/we have to share our skills and knowledge.*

(II) Mild Obligation/ Advice/ Suggestions and Recommendation

Thomson and Martinet (1988: 137) state that ‘should’ or ‘ought to’ is used to express mild obligation when giving advice and making suggestions and recommendations. These verbs are especially useful when talking about health and advising on the best course of action to take. Any hint of obligation is mild, allowing the other person the freedom to choose as in sentence (9). Like ‘must’ obligation, ‘should’ and ‘ought to’ which generally imply the speaker’s authority, but unlike ‘must’, they do not imply the speaker’s confidence in that the recommendation will be carried out. ‘Had better’ as a modal idiom can be used to express advisability and the obligation meaning of ‘ought to/should’, as in sentence (10):

(9) You { *should* } *do as he says.*
 { *ought to* }

(10) *You’d/had better take another decision.*

Eastwood (1994: 119) highlights that ‘had better’ is stronger than ‘should’ or ‘ought to’, but ‘must’ is stronger.

(III) Self-admonishment

Quirk et al. (1985: 225) express that the speaker here exercises authority over himself, appealing to his own sense of duty, expediency, as in:

(11) *I must remember to write to Aunt Ann.*

(IV) Asking about Future Obligation

Thomson and Martinet (1988: 137) state that 'haven't got to' is used for this function, as in:

(12) *You haven't got to be there by 7.00.*

Eastwood (1994: 113) mentions that 'be to' is used for an order by a person in authority, 'have to' is used more than 'be to' as in:

(13) *The doctor says I'm to go on a diet.*

(V) Assumption/Expectation and Probability

Thomson and Martinet (1976: 146) state that 'ought to' and 'should' are used with the fact that 'should'/'ought to' is not strong as 'must'. 'Should' is more polite and less emphatic alternative than 'must'.

Eastwood (1994: 119) adds that 'be supposed to' is used for what people expect to happen because it is the normal way of doing something or because it is ordered or arranged as in:

(14) *You ought to/should/are supposed to receive the package by now.*

2.2 Negation:

This part concerning the syntactic and semantic aspects of 'must' and its equivalences in negative sentences. Greenbaum and Quirk (1990:228) state that the negation of modal auxiliaries require some attention, in that the scope of negation may or may not include the auxiliary itself. There is therefore a need to distinguish between auxiliary negation and main verb negation.

2.2.1 Negated Sentences: Syntactic and Semantic Aspects of “Must” and its Equivalences:

Quirk et al. (1985: 787) identify that the scope of negation may or may not include the meaning of the modal auxiliaries. Therefore, it is important to distinguish between auxiliary negation and main verb negation. ‘Must not’ in the sense of obligation, has a main verb negation, as in:

(15) ***You mustn’t keep us all waiting.***

Quirk and Greenbaum (1973: 190) identify that a common auxiliary negation of ‘must’ is ‘needn’t’ or ‘don’t have to’ in the obligation sense. The speaker here wants somebody not to do something, i.e. “lack of obligation”.

(16) ***Must we pack now?***

No, we { needn’t } pack till tomorrow.
{ don’t have to }

The sentence can be glossed as: It is not necessary for us to pack till tomorrow [We are not obliged to pack till tomorrow]. Because of the diametric opposition of meaning between ‘permission’ and ‘obligation’, an odd-seeming equivalence between ‘may not [not permitted to]’ and ‘mustn’t [obliged not to]’, as in:

(17) ***You mustn’t go swimming today.***

(18) ***You may not go swimming today.***

Greenbaum and Quirk (1990: 229) state that ‘ought not to’ is used as the negative form of ‘ought to’ in mild obligation sense or advise not to do something or recommend, as in sentence (19). ‘Ought not to’ is used to express negative recommendation as in sentence (20):

(19) ***You oughtn’t to keep us waiting.***

(20) ***Margret ought not to exercise too much.***

'Needn't' and 'don't have to' are used as the negative forms of 'must' in obligation sense in an auxiliary negation, as in sentence (21) which can be glossed as [You are not obliged to...]. 'Need' as a modal verb construction is restricted to nonassertive contexts. 'Need to' as a lexical verb is more common and always used.

(21) *You needn't pay that fine.*

Don't have to

Greenbaum and Quirk (Ibid.: 230) identify that 'shouldn't' is used as the negative form of 'should' in the sense of advising or recommending, assumption, expectation and probability not to do something as in sentence (22). 'Should' in the sense of 'obligation' has no negative form in the past, present and future. 'Should' can express something between recommendation and obligation. 'Be supposed to' expresses a similar idea and can easily be used in the past or negative forms as in sentence (23).

(22) *You shouldn't say anything.*

(23) *You aren't supposed to be at work by 9.00.*

Quirk and Greenbaum (1973: 53) pinpoint that 'mustn't' is often used in the negative to express prohibition. It is used instead of 'may not' because the use of 'mustn't' is stronger which refers to near future, as in sentence (24). 'Do not have to' suggests that someone is not required to do something. 'Must not' suggests that you are prohibited from doing something as in :

(24) *You mustn't borrow my car.*

Quirk et al. (1985: 141) state that 'had better' has two kinds of negation. First, there is a negation in which 'not' follows the whole expression as in sentence (25) below. A second type of negation in which 'not' follows the first word as in sentence (26). The two kinds of negation are sometimes associated with different meanings, the former being an instance of predication negation.

‘Had better’ expresses desperate hopes and warnings usually refer to the near future. In spoken English ‘had better’ is pronounced as ‘better’ only.

(25) *I’d better not stay here alone.*

(26) *I hadn’t better stay here alone.*

Quirk et al. (ibid) add that ‘have to’ is used more common in negative and interrogative clauses which are constructed with ‘Do’, as in:

(27) *I don’t have to walk more than a mile.*

(28) { *Do I have to walk more than a mile?*
Had I to walk more than a mile?

2.3.1 Reported Speech: Syntactic Aspect of “Must” and its Equivalences:

Greenbaum and Quirk (1990: 65) identify that ‘must’ together with ‘need’ as an auxiliary, ‘ought to’ and ‘had better’, has no present/past distinction. These verbs are therefore unchanged in indirect speech constructions, even where they refer to past time, as in the sentences (29) and (30). In its obligation sense, however, the past of ‘must’ may be replaced by ‘had to’ in indirect speech, as in sentence (31):

(29) *"You must be hungr" he said.*

~ *He said that you must be hungry.*

(30) *"You had better not say anything about this" he warned me.*

~ *He warned me that I had better not say anything about that.*

(31) *"You must be in by ten tonight" his parents told him.*

~ *His parents told him that he { must } be in by*
{ had to }

(Ibid.: 301)

2.3.2. Reported Speech: Semantic Aspect of “Must” and its Equivalences:

Thomson and Martinet(1988:286) clarify that 'must' used for obligation can remain unchanged. In addition, it can be reported by 'would have to' or 'had to'.

1. I/ we/ must is reported by '**would have to**'

'Would have to' is used when the obligation depends on some future action, or the fulfilment of the obligation appears remote or uncertain, as in sentence (32). 'Had to' would be more usual if the action is demanded to be done at once as in sentence(33).

(32) "If the floods get worse, we must/will have to leave the house," he said.

~ **He said that if the floods got worse, they would have to leave the house.**

(33) "I have just received a letter," he said. "I must go home"

~ **He said that he had just received a letter and he had to go home now.**

2. I/ we must is reported by '**had to**'

'Had to' is the usual form for obligations where times for fulfilment have been fixed, or the obligation is fulfilled by the time the speech is reported, as in sentence (34). 'Had to' could express outside authority or a self-imposed obligation. All difficulties about 'had to' and 'would have to' can be avoided by keeping 'must' unchanged. 'Would have to' would be possible also but would imply that the obligation was self-imposed.

(34) He said, "I must wash my hands"

~ **He said that he had to/would have to wash his hands."**

3. You/he/they must is reported by **had to/ would have to**

'Would have to' removes the idea of the speaker's authority while 'Must' implies the speaker's authority, as in sentence (35).

(35) Tom said, " If you want to stay on here ,you must work hard."

~ Tom said that if she wanted to stay on she must / would have to work hard.

4. Must I/ you/ he? is reported by '**had to**'.

As must in the interrogative usually concerns the present or immediate future, it usually becomes 'had to', as in sentence (36).

(36) " Must you go so soon?" I said

~ I asked him if he had to go so soon.

5. Must not

I must not usually remains unchanged. **You/ he must not** remains

unchanged or is expressed as a negative command, as in sentence(37)

(37) He said, "You mustn't tell anyone"

~ He said that she must not tell/ wasn't to tell anyone.

Or He told her not to tell anyone.

6. Needn't

'Needn't' can remain unchanged and it usually does.

'**didn't have to**' or '**would have to**' can be used also, as in sentence (38).

(38) "He said, " You needn't wait".

~ He said that I needn't/didn't have to/would have to wait.

7. Need I/ you/ he? is reported as '**had to**'

It behaves exactly in the same way as must I/you/he? i.e. it normally becomes 'had to', as in sentence (39).

(39) " Need I finish my pudding?" asked the small boy.

The small boy asked if he had to finish his pudding.

8. **Ought to/should** for obligation remained unchanged, as in sentence (40)

(40) *They ought to/ should widen this road, I said*

~ *I said that they ought to / should widen the road.*

9. **I/ he /she/ we/ they had better** remains unchanged.

(41) *"The children had better go to bed early," said Tom*

~*Tom said that the children had better go to bed early.*

2.4 Tense/Aspect: Syntactic and Semantic Criteria:

2.4.1 The Modals with the Perfect and Progressive Aspects:

Quirk et al. (1985: 235) state that the perfective and progressive aspects are normally excluded when the modals express 'ability' or 'permission' and also when 'shall' or 'will' express volition.

'Obligation' can be expressed with the perfective or progressive when combined with 'should' or 'ought to' as in sentence (32) which can be glossed to indicate that these modals in contrast to 'must' often imply non fulfillment of the obligation.

(42) *I ought to be working now [... but I'm not]*

You should have finished it... [... but you haven't]

She shouldn't have left him... [... but she did]

(Ibid.: 68)

As a modal auxiliary 'need' has no tense contrast, to express past time, however, we can place 'need' before the perfective aspect, as in:

(43) *You need not have done it... [You did not need to have...]*

(Ibid.: 139)

Quirk et al. (1985: 145) identify that 'have to' can occur in modal, perfective and progressive constructions so it would be

impossible to substitute ‘have got to’ for ‘have to’ in these cases, as in:

(44) *I may have to leave early.*

(45)* *I may have got to leave early.*

(46) *People are having to leave now.*

(47) *The administration has had to make unpopular decisions.*

‘Had to’ can stand in for ‘must’ in past construction where ‘must’ cannot occur, as in:

(48) *In those days you had to work hard if you wanted.* (obligation)

3. The Test:

A four- part test was carried out in the second term of the academic year 2009-2010. The sample of the study was restricted to fourth-year students in the Department of English, College of Arts, University of Mosul. The total number of the students was 50. The test has four parts. Each part of the test has its own aim. **Part 1** is confirmed to test the learner’s ability to identify the suitable syntactic equivalences to ‘must’ in the statement type and then to choose their semantic interpretations through a multiple-choice test (see Appendix A). **Part 2** comprises the negative communicative type of sentences to choose correctly the syntactic and semantic equivalences of ‘must not’. **Part 3** tackles past forms of ‘must’ in the reported speech sentences and the students are asked to tick their syntactic and semantic equivalences. In **Part 4** the students are required to identify the obligation meaning of ‘must’ with perfective and progressive meanings and to choose the correct semantic indications of ‘must’ in a tense/ aspect communicative type of sentences. (i.e. to make the right choice syntactically and semantically in a tense/aspect communicative type of sentences.). The learner’s responses for each part has been tabulated. The following statistical means are used to treat the data:

1. Stating the percentages to know the rates of the correct and incorrect responses.
2. Stating the frequencies to know the exact number of both right and wrong responses.

4. Results and Discussion of Findings:

In considering table (1) of analyzing the data and as for the statement part, the results exemplify the following:

Table (1): Responses of the Students: Statement Type

Statement	Syntactic								Semantic							
	have to		be obliged to		should		ought to		strong obligation		mild obligation		certainty		assumption/ Expectation and probability	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	20	40	12	24	10	20	8	16	30	60	2	4	16	32	2	4

1. 'Must' syntactically is equal to 'be obliged to' in the mentioned sentence which expresses an obligation imposed by the speaker. 24% (i.e. 12) of the learners have chosen 'be obliged to'. 40% (i.e. 20) of them used 'have to' as a syntactic equivalence to 'must'. 20% (i.e. 10) of the learners have chosen "should" and 16% (i.e. 8) of them have chosen 'ought to' as a syntactic equivalence to "must". 'Should/ought to' is used to express the subject's obligation or duty to indicate a correct or sensible action where there is neither the speaker's authority as with 'must' or external authority, as with 'have to'. There is normally the impression that the obligation is not being fulfilled. Ought to/should can express advice but for more emphatic advice 'must' is better. In information sheets and formal notices 'should' but not 'ought to' can be used for 'should' can express the obligation more gently.

‘Must’ in the previous sentence semantically means strong obligation. ‘Must’ and ‘have to’ are used to express strong obligation, though there is a subtle difference. ‘Must’ is often used when the reference is personal. ‘Have to’ is used when there is an external reason which obliges us to do something. ‘Should’ and ‘ought to’ are used to express mild obligation and to give advice.

60% (i.e. 30) of the learners have chosen strong obligation, 4% (i.e. 2) have chosen mild obligation, 32% (i.e. 16) have chosen certainty and 4% (i.e. 2) have chosen assumption, expectation and probability.

In discussing the results, it is noted that the majority of the learners used ‘have to’ as a syntactic equivalence of ‘must’ in the statement without any notice to the difference in use. ‘Must’ and ‘have to’ differ in the statement when we use the second person, for it expresses the speaker’s authority with the first and external authority with the latter. The first person obligation ‘must’ is used when the obligation is urgent or very important, while ‘have to’ is better for habits. In third persons’ examples, ‘must’ is used in written orders or instructions, ‘have to’ is used to state or comment on another persons’ obligations. The learners are more acquainted with ‘have to’ than ‘be obliged to’.

The learners use ‘should’ more than ‘ought to’ for the reason that ‘should’ is used more frequently than ‘ought to’ in formal notices and on information sheets, etc. ‘should’ is more common than ‘ought to’.. The learners face difficulties in substituting those equivalences and connecting their semantic meaning. Through their study, they were taught that the fuzzy categories must/have to, should/ought to are used to express obligation and logical necessity without any reference to the subdivisions of the degree of necessity or obligation.

‘Must’ when it is used to express obligation is not the same for all persons.

2. In the second part concerning negation, ‘must’ in the mentioned sentence has the syntactic equivalences as follows: 40% (i.e. 20) have chosen ‘don’t have to’, 16% (i.e. 8) have chosen ‘be obliged not to’, 12% (i.e. 6) have chosen ‘need not’ and 32% (i.e. 16) have chosen ‘should not’.

Table (2): Responses of the Students: Negation Type

Negation	Syntactic								Semantic							
	don’t have to		be obliged not to		need not		should not		absence of obligation		uncertainty		negative obligation		Negative expectation	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	26	52	18	36	10	20	22	44	14	28	10	20	16	32	10	20

‘Must not’ here is equal to ‘be obliged not to’ which expresses a main verb negation. The distinction here between auxiliary negation and main verb negation, is very important. ‘Don’t have to’ and ‘need not’ are used as auxiliary verb negation of the sentence which can be glossed as [You are not obliged to]. ‘Be obliged not to’ expresses the main verb negation of the sentence.

As for the semantic equivalences of ‘must not’, 28% (i.e. 14) of the learners have chosen ‘absence of obligation’, 20% (i.e. 10) have chosen ‘uncertainty’ and ‘negative expectation’ and 32% (i.e. 16) have chosen ‘negative obligation’ which is the highest rate.

‘Must not’ semantically expresses a negative obligation imposed by the speaker or very emphatic advice.

The highest rate of the learners have chosen ‘don’t have to’ which expresses external authority though ‘need not’ can be used for external authority also which is common in the first person. The lowest rate of them have chosen ‘needn’t’ which expresses absence

or 'lack of obligation'. 'Needn't' and 'don't have to' are used to express the state of absence of negation in auxiliary verb negation of 'must' in its both senses.

The second highest rate have chosen 'should not' which is used by the learners to be equal to 'must not'. It seems that they were unaware that 'should' has no negative form when expresses obligation, 'be supposed to' can be used here.

The negation of 'must' needs a full understanding of the scope of negation for the distinction between main verb negation and auxiliary negation is not neutralized for 'must' in its both senses.

The students are somehow aware of the syntactic and semantic use of 'must' in the first part (i.e. statement type) in comparison with its use of the second part (i.e. negation type).

3. In the reported speech part 'must' in the sentence can be used for it has no present/past distinction. So it is unchanged in reported speech constructions even when it refers to past time since that, 'had to' and 'must' can be used in this context (See table 3).

Table (3): Responses of the Students: Reported Speech Type

Reported Speech	Syntactic								Semantic							
	had to		must		must have		was obliged to		obligation		certainty		assumption		mild obligation	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	13	26	12	24	19	38	6	12	18	36	20	40	3	6	9	18

26% (i.e. 13) of the learners have chosen 'had to', 24% (i.e. 12) have chosen 'must', 38% (i.e. 19) have chosen 'must have' and 12% (i.e. 6) have chosen 'was obliged to' as the correct form of 'must' in the previous sentence.

It is clear that the highest rate of the students chose 'must have' instead of 'must' and 'had to' as correct forms which suggests the disability of the learners to distinguish between the two meanings of 'must', i.e. obligation and logical necessity. It is also clear that there is a little difference between the two rates concerning 'must' and 'had to' which suggests that most of the students use 'must/have to' as a paradigm to express the basic meaning of obligation without any thinking of the subtle difference between them.

Semantically speaking, 'must' and 'had to' express obligation. The rates recorded were 36% (i.e. 18) have chosen 'obligation', 40% (i.e. 20) have chosen necessity, 6% (i.e. 3) have chosen 'assumption' and 18% (i.e. 9) have chosen 'mild obligation'.

The idea of distinction between the two meanings of 'must' is not mastered by the students also.

4. The tense/aspect part, 'must' can be syntactically corrected to 'should have' in the sentence to express the semantic meaning to notice the combination of perfective and progressive aspects to mean non-fulfillment of the action. The highest rate of the learners was 40% (i.e. 20) have chosen 'had to', , 24% (i.e. 12) have chosen 'must have' and 20% (i.e. 10) have chosen 'should have', 16% (i.e. 8) 'shall'. The choices concerning the semantic aspect comprises the following choices: 38% (i.e. 19) have chosen 'past obligation', 34% (i.e. 17) have chosen 'necessity in the past', 16% (i.e. 8) have chosen 'non-fulfillment of the action' and 12% (i.e. 6) have chosen expectation.(See table 4).

Table (4): Responses of the Students: Tense/Aspect Type

Tense/Aspect	Syntactic								Semantic							
	had to		should have		must have		shall		past obligation		necessity in the past		Non-fulfillment of the action		expectation	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	20	40	10	20	12	24	8	16	19	38	17	34	8	16	6	12

'Should have done ' shows that obligation can be expressed with the perfect and progressive when combined with 'should do' and 'have to do' to express non-fulfillment of the obligation. The forms used to refer to past time that corresponds to the modals carrying the meaning of obligation is 'should' and the distinction between past form of the obligation and the necessity meaning of 'must', need to be considered. Most of the learners make the right choices syntactically and semantically.

The second rate concerning the choice of 'had to' suggests the ability of the students to gloss the past form of 'must' in its obligation meaning in the main sentence. The lowest rate recorded which is 'shall' suggests the need to differentiate between the obligation and necessity sense of 'must'. As for the semantic meaning of 'must' in the previous sentence, the majority of the students chose 'past obligation' which shows their ability to identify the correct meaning.

5. Conclusion:

1. Although the syntactic and semantic aspects of any grammatical category can be distinguished clearly, such distinction seems difficult with the modal auxiliaries in general and of those of

‘must’ in particular. This is because of the meaning of ‘must’ in contexts can indicate its structural equivalence and sometimes the syntactic aspect of this verb can determine its meaning such as ‘have to’.

2. The students should be aware of the use of ‘must’ and its equivalences and the syntactic and semantic differences among them. Nevertheless, the majority of the students consider the equivalences all to be alternatives to ‘must’ in expressing the meaning of obligation without clear distinctions to the "degree of obligation".
3. Negating both the lexical verb only on one hand and negating both the modal and the lexical verbs are also important in identifying the syntactic aspect of negative sentences.
4. In the part concerning 'reported speech' the present/past distinction is important in order to replace ‘must’ correctly with its equivalences.
5. Finally, the distinction between the intrinsic and extrinsic meanings of the modals is very important in the perfective and progressive aspects whether syntactically or semantically although the modal ‘must’ can not be used with the progressive aspect.

APPENDIX (A)

I. Statement: You must pay the mount in advance.

(A) Syntactic Aspect: must is equal to (tick ✓)

- | | |
|------------------|--------------------------|
| a. have to | ☐ |
| b. be obliged to | ☐ |
| c. should | ☐ |
| d. ought to | ☐ |

(B) Semantic Aspect: must means

- a. strong obligation ☐
- b. mild obligation ☐
- c. certainty ☐
- d. assumption, expectation ☐

II. Negation: You must not be at home before 8.30 p.m.

(A) Syntactic Aspect: must not is equal to

- a. don't have to ☐
- b. be obliged not to ☐
- c. need not ☐
- d. should not ☐

(B) Semantic Aspect: must not means

- a. obligation not to ☐
- b. uncertainty ☐
- c. negative assumption ☐
- d. negative expectation ☐

III. Reported Speech: He said that you must clean it.

(A) Syntactic Aspect:

- a. had to ☐
- b. must ☐
- c. should ☐
- d. be obliged to ☐

(B) Semantic Aspect:

- a. obligation ☐
- b. certainty ☐
- c. assumption ☐
- d. mild obligation ☐

IV. Tense/Aspect: You must do it yesterday.

(A) Syntactic Aspect:

- a. had to ☐
- b. should have ☐
- c. must have ☐
- d. shall ☐

(B) Semantic Aspect: the past of ‘must’ means

- a. past obligation ☐
- b. certainty in the past ☐
- c. non-fulfillment ☐
- d. expectation in the past ☐

REFERENCES

- Biber et al. (1999). **Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English**. China: Pearson Education Limited.
- Broughton, G. (1990). **The Penguin English Grammar A-Z for Advanced Students**. London: BPCC Hazell Books Ltd.
- Eastwood, J. (1994). **Oxford Guide to English Grammar**. London: Oxford University Press.
- Greenbaum, S. and R. Quirk (1990). **A Students Grammar of the English Language**. Hong Kong: Longman.
- Huddleston, R. (1976). “Some Theoretical Issues in the Description of the English Verb”. Lingua, Vol.39-40, pp.331-383.
- Palmer, F. R. (1965). **The English Verb**. Great Britain: Longman Group Limited.
- Quirk, R. and S. Greenbaum (1973). **A University Grammar of English**. London: Longman.

-
- Quirk, R.; Greenbaum, S.; Leech, G. and J. Svartvik (1985). **A Comprehensive Grammar of English Language**. London: Longman.
- Thomson, A. and A. Martinet (1988). **A Practical English Grammar**. London: Oxford University Press.

ملخص البحث

تهدف الدراسة الى تناول مفهوم معنى الإلزام باستخدام الفعل المساعد "يجب" ومكافأته في اداء طلبة الجامعة العراقيين المتعلمين للغة الانكليزية. أخذت الدراسة بنظر الاعتبار الاستخدامات النحوية والدلالية للفعل المساعد "يجب" وذلك باعتبار حصولها في أربعة أنماط من الجمل لتشمل الزمن، وجهة الحدث، والكلام الغير المباشر وأسلوب النفي. تضمنت الدراسة تحليلاً لكيفية حدوث الفعل المساعد "يجب" ومكافأته ودلالاته في انماط الجمل المذكورة، وهذا يعني تفسير وظائفهم اللغوية في أداء عينات البحث. و تم افتراض ان الطلبة العراقيين المتعلمين للإنكليزية يميلون إلى اعتبار الفعل المساعد "يجب" على انه مؤشر لمعنى الإلزام فقط. وبالتالي يدرج هؤلاء الطلبة أداة النفي "not" بعد الفعل المساعد "يجب" لنفيه، كما انهم لا يفكرون عادة بأي مكافئ اخر يمكن ان يستخدم بدلا عن الفعل المساعد "يجب" علما بان بعض المتعلمين يدركون بأن صيغة الإلزام بواسطة التركيب "have to" يمكن ان تستخدم كمكافئ للفعل المساعد "يجب". وتشير النتائج الى ان وظائف ومعاني الفعل المساعد "يجب" ومنها الإلزام والتعبير عن الضرورة يتداخلون مع بعضهم البعض، ويمكن القول بأنهما قد يترابطا بشكل اكبر مما يمكن التمييز بينهما. ويعد هذا التصنيف للفعل المساعد "يجب" غير فعال في عملية التواصل الفعلية، ومع ذلك فقد يتباين استخدامه طبقا للمتغيرات كموضوع البحث والوسط والتوجه والاسلوب.