

Title	‘I Must Be Going’の意味
Author(s)	寺田, 正義
Citation	聖学院大学論叢, 2: 183-197
URL	http://serve.seigakuin-univ.ac.jp/repos/modules/xoonips/detail.php?item_id=1123
Rights	

聖学院学術情報発信システム : SERVE

SEigakuin Repository for academic archiVE

THE MEANING OF 'I MUST BE GOING'*

Masayoshi TERADA

'I MUST BE GOING' の意味

寺田正義

Ota (1972) および安井 (1989) によれば、法の助動詞のうち *must* と *have to* を例外として、認識様態的意味を持つもののみが進行形と共起が可能であるという。ところが、実際の用例を小説を中心にあたってみると、知的意味を持つ法の助動詞との共起とみられる例もかなりある。これらは *I must be going.* が示す意味と平行的に丁寧さを表すときに使用されることが多いように思われる。Ota が示した *You must be going.* は *must* の意味が強いため、文法的には可能であるが、容認度はかなり低いものであり、そのかわりに *You have to/should be going.* のほうが使われやすい。法の助動詞と進行形との共起の現象は、意味論を越えて語用論的視点で検討を加える必要があらう。

1. This study tries to clarify the meanings of the modals with progressive forms. This syntactic combination is, so to speak, a melting pot, because we must discuss the relationship among the modals and tense and aspect. The discussion will be focused on the meaning of *must* followed by progressive forms, as is shown in the title of this paper. I assume that the '*must*+ progressive forms' combination has a symbolic meaning of this study.

It seems that modals have not been discussed as extensively as tense and aspect. The relationship among the modals and tense and aspect, therefore, seems to have been treated only by a small number of scholars. The scarcity shows that a great difficulty is lying in wait for us. Among the few studies to which considerable labor was clearly devoted, I was greatly enlightened by the two studies: Ota (1972) and Yasui (1989). It is interesting that two distinguished Japanese scholars have directed their energies to the common topic. In my opinion, this coincidence implies that this kind of work demands exhaustiveness, which is the tradition of their

Key words; Modals, Progressive Forms, Epistemic, Cognitive, Politeness.

THE MEANING OF 'I MUST BE GOING'

alma mater, and that there are signs that more attention has come to be paid to semantics.

This study consists of three parts. In the second chapter, we will chiefly survey Ota (1972) and Yasui (1989) and make the point at issue clear. In the third chapter, the numerical distribution of the modals followed by progressive forms will be presented. For this purpose, 24 books were analyzed. The sources appear in the end of this paper. In the fourth chapter, the meaning of *must* followed by progressive forms will be discussed.

2. Both Ota (1972) and Yasui (1989) treat the subject of modals extensively. If we try to summarize the whole content, it will obscure the point at issue. Therefore, I will pick out and summarize the description which will be closely related to the possibility of the cooccurrence of modals and progressive forms.

2.1. It is generally accepted that each of the modals has two basic meanings: one epistemic and the other cognitive.¹ Ota chiefly treats five modals *will, can, may, must* and *should*. The meanings of them he shows are as follows.

Table 1: MEANINGS OF MODALS

	WILL	CAN	MAY	MUST	SHOULD
A	supposition prediction probability	possibility	possibility	certainty logical necessity	reasonable conviction
B	volition habitualness insistence	ability capability permission	permission	requirement	obligation duty

Ota also shows a sample of the paraphrases of each modal.² (E stands for 'epistemic' and C stands for 'cognitive').

- (1) WILL E I suppose that S
 I predict that S
 It is probable that S
 C agree to, be willing to, insist upon
- CAN E It is possible that S
 C be able to, be permitted to
 It is possible for...to
- MAY E It is possible that S
 C be permitted to

THE MEANING OF 'I MUST BE GOING'

- MUST E It is certain that S
 It is necessarily the case that S
 C be required to, have to
 It is necessary for...to
- SHOULD E There is enough reason to assume that S
 C be obliged to, ought to

Concerning this paraphrasing, Ota says in the footnote (p.44) :“...if the above interpretation is adopted, you will notice that the fundamental difference between the epistemic and the cognitive modals is that the paraphrases of the former contain *that-S* with finite verbs, while the paraphrases of the latter contain infinitives. This may give rise to an important problem, but I don't have enough preparation to discuss it here.” It seems to me that this remark really implies a very important problem. Here it is sufficient to say that “infinitives” are closely related to “futuraity.”

The typical distinction between an epistemic modal and a cognitive modal is that the former can be followed both by a perfect infinitive and by a progressive form, while the latter is not followed by either of them.

Ota says that epistemic modals can be followed by a perfect infinitive with the full range of tense possibilities.

- (2) a . He may/cannot/must/will have come by now.
 b . He may/cannot/must/will have come yesterday.
 c . He may/cannot/must/will have come by then.

Ota gives some exceptional examples of cognitive *must* (and *have to*) followed by a perfect infinitive, saying that they are either generic statements where no specific time elements are involved or in the case of specific statements they refer to potential, future events, and not to some specific past events. Two examples from Ota will suffice for the present.

- (3) a . In order to use a word properly, one must have acquired the underlying concepts.
 b . You must/have to have completed the work by next April.

Ota says progressive forms following modals eliminate the potential cognitive meanings of the modals.

- (4) a . He may/must/can't/won't travel now. (cognitive)
 b . He may/must/can't/won't be traveling now. (epistemic)

Here again, Ota adds that cognitive *must/have to* can behave differently from the other modals. And his remarks have much to do with the following discussion. He says as follows.

Cognitive *must* and *have to* can be used with progressive forms, and in these cases time

THE MEANING OF 'I MUST BE GOING'

factor is the center of attention; that is, attention is focused upon the necessity of the immediacy of the action rather than upon the necessity of the action itself. This can be deduced from the meaning of the progressive form, which is, according to Joos (1964a), 'temporary validity of the predication'.

Ota says that the following sentences have different meanings.

- (5) a. You must/have to be going. (= Your going is required to take place immediately or very soon.)
 b. You must/have to go. (= Your going is required, but the time of going can be any time.)

Here Ota only gives the examples with the second person *you* as subject. He says without any explanation that 'He must be going' is ambiguous. More importantly, he gives no examples with the first person *I* as subject; that is,

- (6) a. I must/have to be going.
 b. I must/have to go.

These will be discussed at greater length in Chapter 3.

According to Ota, epistemic *will* can express supposition about an event irrespective of its time of occurrence, but *be going to* can refer only to a future event. Therefore, he adds, *be going to* coincides with *will* only when the latter indicates prediction or supposition about a future event.

As a result of the summarization, we can get a picture of the relationship between the modals, including semi-auxiliaries, and the progressive forms. See Table 2.

Table 2: SUMMARY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE MODALS AND THE PROGRESSIVE FORMS

	will		can		must		may		should		be able to	have to
	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	C	C
progressive	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+

be going to
E
+

- N.B. 1. In the case of cognitive *must/have to*, attention is focused upon the necessity of the immediacy of the action.
 2. In the case of *be going to*, it indicates prediction or supposition about a future event.

2.2. Yasui (1989) includes two theses concerning the modals: 'Eigo ni okeru modaritii' (Modality in English), which first appeared in 1977, and 'Hô no jodôshi ni okeru jisei' (Tense in the modals), which first appeared in 1978. The latter will be chiefly discussed since it gives a

THE MEANING OF 'I MUST BE GOING'

detailed description about the combination of the modals and the progressive forms.

Yasui first proposes that an epistemic modal should always show the speaker's present and that the propositional content should be able to take any tense theoretically. He says that this relation is as follows.

(8) $S = M + [NP + VP]_{prop}$ (M = modality; $([NP + VP]_{prop})$ = propositional content)

Therefore, the past *might* (9b) is related to the speaker's present. The difference of the meaning between *might* and *may* is that *might* shows lower probability according to the speaker's judgement.

- (9) a. It may rain tomorrow.
b. It might rain tomorrow.

As has been said above, the propositional content following an epistemic modal can show any tense. Therefore, the perfect infinitives represent the past tense, the present perfect and the past perfect, which is guaranteed or regulated by the time adverbials. (10 a, b, c) correspond to (11 a, b, c) respectively.

- (10) a. He must have left yesterday.
b. He must have left already.
c. He must have left before you came.
- (11) a. Surely he left yesterday.
b. Surely he has left already.
c. Surely he had left before you came.

Yasui concludes concerning epistemic modals that if the modal + the verb phrase has an epistemic meaning, the verb phrase can be changed into an independent sentence with tense, which is grammatical. Then, the following sentences cannot be interpreted as epistemic.

- (12) a. *He must sing now. (not E)
b. *He must be knowing several languages. (not E)

Referring to Ota (1972) and Hofmann (1976), Yasui suggests the possibility of the cooccurrence of the cognitive *must* and the progressive form.

- (13) a. Well, I must be going now.
b. You must be going. (=5a)
c. You must be singing when my mother arrives.

—Hofmann 1976, p.100.

Concerning (13a, b), Yasui sides with Ota, saying that the progressive form shows the necessity of the immediacy of the action. (See 2.1.) Interestingly, Yasui adds the example (13a),

THE MEANING OF 'I MUST BE GOING'

though Ota (1972) does not give an example with the first person *I* as subject.

It may be worth while to quote Hofmann's remark.

Actually, there are counterexamples where Prog occurs with such a root modal, e.g., *You must be singing when my mother arrives*. But these are cases of the Prog that can appear only with a *when*-clause.—Hofmann 1976, p.100

Basing his inference chiefly on Ota and Hofmann, Yasui concludes that the form 'must be doing it' demands a special context in order for the form to be interpreted as cognitive; that is, the function of the progressive form must be at least other than the use of the present action.

3. As has been shown in Table 2, epistemic modals can be freely followed by progressive forms, while progressive forms are not normal after cognitive modals except *must* and *have to*. This inference of Ota's can be finely evidenced by the following data. These data are gathered from 19 novels, 1 children's book and 4 textbooks. *Would* is included on the list of *will/shall*, because *would* has the whole meaning range of will. (See Ota 1972, p.54) No examples of *have to, be going to* + progressive forms could be found. Some seemingly exceptional examples, which were checked by several native speakers of English, will be examined later. See Table 3.

3.1. Let's examine the *will/shall* + progressive forms first. Leech (1987, p.68) says that the possibility of volitional colouring is avoided in (14b), which is understood simply as a statement that 'such-and-such is going to happen'.

(14) a. I'll drive into London next week ('I've made up my mind').

b. I'll be driving into London next week ('as a matter of course').

Leech's view coincides with that of Ota (1972, p.47)³. Ota says that progressive forms following modals eliminate the potential cognitive meanings of the modals. However, the following examples seem to show that all of them are cognitive.

(15) a. Bobby informed his father that he would be going up to town on Monday week to take up a job.—Christie (2), p.32

b. If the ladies want to go upstairs first, they know the way. Meanwhile I shall be bringing in the soup.—Murdoch (1), p.29

c. They would not sit down for long, but soon would be roaming about, opening cases and fingering objects.—Murdoch (1), p.60

d. I shall just be getting the coffee quite quietly.—Murdoch (1), p.74

e. So—if you're secure, stay where you are—if you're not, drop on to the ladder. We'll just be waiting here.—Murdoch (1), p.266

THE MEANING OF 'I MUST BE GOING'

Table 3: DISTRIBUTION OF MODALS+ PROGRESSIVE FORMS⁴

		WILL/SHALL		CAN		MAY		MUST		SHOULD	
		E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C
Christie	1	5				1			1		
	2	4	1			2		1	2		
	3	1				2			1		
	4	2				2		1			
	5			2				1		1	
	6	5				2		1			
Murdoch	1	10	4			1		5		1	
	2	10	1	2		1		1	2	1	
	3	5	1			1		4	2		3
	4	7						3		1	
	5	8		2		4		2	1		1
Steinbeck		1				1					
Drabble		4				2		1			
Greene		5	1			2				1	
Way	1	1									
	2	1	1	1				1			
Survival		1						1			1
Hemingway	1							1			
	2							2			
Fitzgerald											
White		1							1		
Anderson		3				1			2		
Salinger		6				1					
Milestone											1
		80	9	7	0	23	0	25	12	5	6

N.B. The blanks mean no instances.

THE MEANING OF 'I MUST BE GOING'

f. 'Will you be coming to Millie's, Francis?'

'No, thanks.'—Murdoch (3), p.32

g. OK. I'll be leaving in about five minutes.—Way (2), p.30

All the examples except (15c), which has the meaning of habitualness, seem to have the meaning of volition. Each example seems to be difficult to be understood simply as a statement that 'such-and-such is going to happen'. How can we use such an adverbial as 'quite quietly' in the situation other than a volitional act?(15b) And when can we say 'No, thanks' as an answer to a question except in the case of request?(15f)

Leech (1987, p.69) says that the 'matter of course' connotation helps to account for a temporal restriction which commentators have noted in the *will/shall*+ progressive construction: viz., that it generally refers to the near, but not too immediate future. However, (15e) and (15g) seem to be counterexample. (15e) shows that 'waiting' has already begun or will begin immediately. 'In about five minutes' in (15g) may belong to the span of immediacy.

According to Leech (*ibid.*, p.69), one reason why the *will/shall*+ progressive usage has become quite common in everyday speech is that it is often a more polite and tactful alternative to the non-progressive form. In my opinion, when the cognitive non-progressive form is changed into the cognitive progressive form, the construction often comes to bear the meaning of politeness. This seems to be closely related to the meaning of 'I must be going.' See Chapter 4.

The following examples are some of the epistemic use.

(16) a. 'I suppose Sir Oswald will be buying a place of his own one of these days,' suggested Jimmy. 'And then you can have it just as you like.'—Christie (1), p.170 (supposition about a future event)

b. 'The poor old gov'nor,' thought Bobby. 'He'll be ramping up and down.'—Christie (2), p.12 (supposition about a present event)

c. 'You'll be hearing all sorts of stories, but you are not to believe what you hear,' she said to her son.—Anderson, p.129 (probability)

d. 'It's not wrong to fight to free your country.'

'But you won't be doing that. You'll just be killing people pointlessly....'—Murdoch (3), p.200 (prediction)

3.2.1. Ota (1972) refers to nothing particular concerning *should*+ progressive forms, so Table 2 is made according to the judgement that *should* behaves parallel with the rest of the modals; that is, epistemic *should* can be freely followed by progressive forms, while the progressive form is not normal after cognitive *should*. The materials, however, show a little different data. There

THE MEANING OF 'I MUST BE GOING'

are 5 cases of epistemic use and 6 cases of cognitive use.

The following are some of them.

(17) epistemic:

a. 'Aren't you feeling well, Mr Lawson?'

'Well? How should I be feeling well? I've had a shock—a terrible shock.'—Christie

(5), p.71

b. The fire-brigade should be arriving now very soon.—Murdoch (1), p.259

c. Why should the poor Minotaur be suffering in hell?—Murdoch (2), p.7

(18) cognitive:

a. You haven't trained her properly. You should be getting after her with a stick.—Murdoch (3), p.138

b. 'I should be saying sorry,' said Charlotte. 'What's all this in aid of?'—Murdoch (5), p.216

c. But Dad, I should be working full time at my age. I'm nearly seventeen.—Survival, p.62

d. Now, if you will help me find a taxi, I probably should be getting on home.—Milestone, p.161

3.2.2. Epistemic *should* and *will* often share the same meaning. Both can be used for assumptions. Thomson/Martinet (1986, p.148) says that assumptions with *should* are less confident than assumptions with *will*. Therefore, (17b), for example, can be interpreted as follows.

(17b') I expect the fire-brigade is arriving now very soon.

3.2.3. Concerning cognitive *should* (and also *ought to*), Thomson/Martinet (*ibid.*, p.139) says that the modal expresses the idea that the subject is not fulfilling his obligations or that he is acting foolishly, rashly etc. or not acting sensibly, prudently etc.

(19) We should be wearing seat belts. (but we are not wearing them.) —Thomson/Martinet 1986, p.139

Therefore, (18a) can be interpreted as follows.

(18a') You should be getting after her with a stick. (But you are not getting after her with a stick.)

When cognitive *should* is used with the first person as subject, it often implies that the obligation is not necessarily being or will not necessarily be fulfilled. Quite often, the reverse is the case. (See Thomson/Martinet *ibid.*, p.138) Thus, (18b) can be interpreted as follows.

(18b') I should be saying sorry. (But I'm not going to say sorry.)

THE MEANING OF 'I MUST BE GOING'

(18d), for example, should be interpreted a little differently. In this case, it seems that the subject is not willing to do an act, so the sentence may be interpreted as follows.

(18d') I probably should be getting on home ('though I don't want to').

This again seems to be a case of polite expression. See 3.1.

3.2.4. *Ought to* occurs as an equivalent of *should* in both senses: epistemic and cognitive.

- (20) a. Our guests ought to be home by now. (epistemic)
b. Our guests should be home by now. (epistemic)
c. He ought to pay for the broken window. (cognitive)
d. He should pay for the broken window. (cognitive) —Leech 1987, p.100

As was said above, epistemic *ought to/should* can express assumptions. In other words, *ought to/should* can be regarded as weaker equivalents of *must*. See Leech/Svartvik 1975, p.131. Therefore, (20a, b) can be interpreted as follows.

(20a', b') Our guests ought to/should be home by now. ('They probably are, but I'm not certain.')

In the same manner, cognitive *ought to/should* express an obligation which may not be fulfilled. See Leech/Svartvik *ibid.*, p.144.

(20c', d') He ought to/should pay for the broken window ('but he probably won't pay for it').

In the materials, there are only 1 case of epistemic *ought to* and 6 cases of cognitive use. The following are some of them, all of which seem to correspond to the above interpretation.

(21) epistemic:

- a. 'Why isn't Austin here?' said Charlotte.
'Austin?'
'He ought to be visiting Miss Ricardo.'
'Oh, Miss Ricardo, yes....'—Murdoch (5), p.344

(22) cognitive:

- a. 'We ought to be doing something, but I suppose it's better to wait until Dr Graham comes—Oh, I think I hear them.'—Christie (6), p.123
b. '... I ought to be working, but I really must have some air....'—Murdoch (1), p.81
c. As he spoke he knew still that he ought to be saying something very different to her, he ought to be using all the intelligence he could command to make her, at this last minute, feel utterly free of him....—Murdoch (3), p.124

Interestingly, but as a matter of course, (22b) shows that *must* is stronger than *ought to*.

3.2.5. According to Ota (1972), the progressive form is not normal after cognitive *can*. In fact,

THE MEANING OF 'I MUST BE GOING'

of all the few examples, 6 cases are clearly epistemic, but 1 case looks dubious. Two out of three native speakers of English judged the following example cognitive. This seems to be another case of politeness.

- (23) 'Oh yes, I know,' said Miss Marple. 'So difficult, isn't it? To be clear about anything, I mean. Because if you're looking at one thing, you can't be looking at another....'——
Christie (5), p.98 (ambiguous)

4. We have so far seen the behavior of *will/shall*, *can* and *should/ought to*, especially these cognitive modals + progressive forms. The total of the seemingly exceptional examples came to 20 cases except one dubious case with *can*. As a result, only *may* seems to give us a clear-cut image though only the data were given and no special comment has been given on *may*. I have suggested that cognitive *will/shall* and *should/ought to* + progressive forms often bear the meaning of politeness.

Now let's examine the cases of *must*, which is widely accepted as the only cognitive modal that can be followed by progressive forms.

4.1. The cognitive *must* + progressive construction seems to have something to do with the subject. Of 11 instances, 10 cases are with the first person *I* and 1 case with the third person *he*, which appears in indirect speech. The latter case (24) would also take the first person *I* if the sentence were written in direct speech.

- (24) Millie once more galloped up and there was another confused conversation in the factor's hearing, with Millie saying she wanted to talk to Christopher and Christopher saying he must be going.——Murdoch (3), p.259

There were no instances with the second person. Ota (1972, p.47), giving an example sentence with the second person as subject, says that the sentence implies the necessity of the immediacy of the action. Although Ota adds that 'He must be going', therefore, is ambiguous, it is not clear whether he refers to the subject or not.

- (25) You must/have to be going. (= (5a))

It seems that the meanings and acceptability change according to the subject when we limit the construction to 'subject + must be going'. Briefly speaking, the sentence with the first person *I* is what is called a set phrase (Yasui 1989, p.210) and is very naturally accepted, while the sentence with the second person used as an order sounds too strong and has lower acceptability. The sentence with the third person is certainly ambiguous; that is, it can be taken either as cognitive or as epistemic.

THE MEANING OF 'I MUST BE GOING'

Leech (1987, p.99) says that 'I must be going soon' spoken by a guest to a host or hostess, seems to place the choice of whether to go or stay outside the speaker's control, and is to that extent more polite than 'I must go soon'. As a conclusion, we can obtain the following interpretation.

- (26) a. I must be going. (cognitive; polite)
b. You must be going.⁵ (cognitive; too strong an order)
c. He must be going. (ambiguous: cognitive or epistemic)

If we use the sign of inequality (>), the order of acceptability may be shown as follows.

- (27) I > YOU > HE

4.2. We have thus far discussed the subject concerning the 'must be going' construction. In this section, time adverbials will be discussed.

As has been said in 2.2., Yasui (1989) suggests that 'You must be ~ing' appears in a limited condition, basing his inference upon Ota (1972) and Hofmann (1976). The condition is that 'You must be ~ing' can appear only with a *when*-clause.

In this discussion we must exclude the 'I must be going' construction, because it is a prompt exception. This construction can be used either without any adverbials or with *now* or *soon* as is suggested in Yasui (1989, p.202) and in Leech (1987, p.99).

Yasui infers that since (28a) is acceptable, (28b) is acceptable. He says that (28a) is usually used as stage direction.

- (28) a. Be singing when my mother arrives.
b. You must be singing when my mother arrives.

Ota (1980, p.646) says that the progressive imperative can be acceptable if future-referential adverbials are added.

- (29) a. ?Be shelling these peas.
b. Be shelling these peas when I return.
c. ?Be reading the newspaper.
d. Be reading the newspaper this evening.

Ota suggests that this phenomenon is compatible with cognitive *must*+ progressive forms.

Thinking along these lines we can infer that (30) is acceptable.

- (30) a. You must be shelling these peas when I return.
b. You must be reading the newspaper this evening.

Here we meet with a problem. What kind of time adverbials are acceptable? It seems that there are two different cases: one case is when the immediate future is meant, and the other case is

THE MEANING OF 'I MUST BE GOING'

when the near future, though not immediate, is meant. In the former case, such as *now* and *soon* will be used. In the latter case, any time adverbials which mean the near future will be used. Therefore, it seems necessary to revise Yasui's inference. We can say that only the time adverbials, which have the meanings of the near futurity, can be compatible with *must*+ progressive forms. A *when*-clause is acceptable if only it implies the near future. Then, a new problem arises. Why is it impossible to interpret (31) as cognitive?

(31) He must be singing now. (*cognitive/epistemic)⁶

Time adverbials such as *now* and *soon* seem to cooccur only with the verb phrases which indicate leaving the place one is visiting. And in this case, time adverbials are very often omitted.

The following are the whole data I have so far gathered.

- (32) a. 'Well,' said Jimmy. 'I must be getting on with my task.'—Christie (1), p.88
b. Anyway, I must be going now.—Christie (2), p.125
c. I must be going. Believe me, all my sympathies are with you and Mrs Bassington-ffrench.—Christie (2), p.172
d. 'Well,' said Sir Henry. 'I must be going.'—Christie (3), p.212
e. 'Really,' said Miss Foy, 'I think I must be getting on....'—Murdoch (2), p.152
f. 'Oh, did you?' said Rosa. 'Good! Well, now I must be getting along.'—Murdoch (2), p.237
g. I must be getting along.—Murdoch (3), p.88
h. Millie once more galloped up and there was another confused conversation in the factor's hearing, with Millie saying she wanted to talk to Christopher and Christopher saying he must be going.—Murdoch (3), p.259
i. 'I think I must be going,' said Mavis.—Murdoch (5), p.237
j. 'I must be getting along home. I can talk no more with you,' he said nervously.—Anderson, p.30
k. 'I must be going,' she said. 'In a moment, if I stay, I'll be wanting to kiss you.'—Anderson, p.164

4.3. As has been shown, we have obtained some evidence to infer that not only cognitive *must* but also cognitive *will/shall* and *should/ought to* can be used with progressive forms. Every case seems to relate to the necessity of the immediacy of the action. Therefore, time adverbials are limited to those which have the meanings of the near future. We must admit that the idea of the near futurity cannot be defined objectively, so sometimes 'on Monday week' may be interpreted as the near future.

THE MEANING OF 'I MUST BE GOING'

- (33) Boby informed his father that he would be going up to town on Monday week to take up a job. (= (15a))

Very often time adverbials are omitted. When the time adverbial is omitted, the necessity of the immediacy of the action seems to be intensified.

- (34) I ought to be working, but I really must have some air. (= (22b))

Last but not least, we may be able to say that the modal (especially the cognitive modal) + progressive construction very often implies politeness. Ota (1972, p.64) says in the final paragraph, 'the problem of epistemic modals is a part of the broader problem of 'modality'. 'Modality' is related to the 'pragmatic' aspect of language, which is not the same thing as the cognitive aspect....At present pragmatics is not well developed. Modals are half pragmatic and half cognitive, and this makes the problem the more complicated and challenging.' It seems that the problem of the cooccurrence of the modals and the progressive forms demands more careful treatment in terms of pragmatics, partly because of the delicacy of modality and partly because of the ever-extending meaning range of the progressive forms (Comrie 1976, p.39). In this respect, the idea of politeness should be more extensively studied.

NOTES

* I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Randolph Thrasher Jr. in ICU, who gave me valuable comments.

1 Originally, Hofmann drew the two-way distinction. (See McCawley 1976, p.85) The term 'epistemic' has been generally accepted, but the term 'cognitive' has often been called 'root' or 'deontic'. In this paper, 'cognitive' is adopted according to Ota (1972).

2 Robin Lacoff (c.1972) gives the similar paraphrasing.

WILL	E	be certain that/tend to/be going to
	C	be willing to/persist in/intend to
CAN	E	be possible that
	C	be able to/be capable of/be allowed to
MAY	E	be possible that
	C	be allowed to
MUST	E	be necessary that/be probable that
	C	be required to/have to
SHOULD	E	be probable that
	C	be supposed to/be obliged to

It is interesting that Lacoff places *be going to* in epistemic *will* and *have to* in cognitive *must*.

3 I must admit that almost all the scholars have so far rejected the cooccurrence of cognitive *will/shall* and progressive forms. (See Quirk et al. 1985, p.235; Palmer 1979, pp.133-4; Thomson/Martinet 1986, p.191)

4 I found only three examples in Hemingway, two in Steinbeck, nine in Greene and no examples in Fitzgerald. This fact leads to an interesting surmise; that is, this way of expression seems to be fairly British and, moreover, women writers seem to like using it more often.

THE MEANING OF 'I MUST BE GOING'

- 5 Acceptability seems to increase when *must* is changed into *have to*. *Should* sounds more polite in the second person.
- 6 Yasui (1989) seems to be dubious in this respect.

REFERENCES

- (1) Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- (2) Hofmann, T.R. 1976. Past tense replacement and the modal system. In McCawley (ed.), *Syntax and semantics* Vol.7. New York: Academic Press. pp.85-100.
- (3) Lakoff, Robin. c1972. *English as a language*. Unpublished.
- (4) Leech, Geoffrey and Svartvik, Jan. 1975. *A communicative grammar of English*. London: Longman.
- (5) Leech, Geoffrey. 1987. *Meaning and the English verb*. second edition. London: Longman.
- (6) Ota, Akira. 1972. Modal and semi-auxiliaries in English. *The ELEC Publications*. Vol.9, pp.42-68.
- (7) Ota, Akira. 1980. *Hitei no imi*. Tokyo: Taishukan.
- (8) Palmer, F.R. 1979. *Modality and the English modals*. London: Longman.
- (9) Quirk, Randolph, Greenbaum, Sidney, Leech, Geoffrey and Svartvik, Jan. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- (10) Thomson, A.J. and Martinet, A.V. 1986. *A practical English grammar*. fourth edition. London: Oxford Univ. Press.
- (11) Yasui, Minoru. 1989. *Eibunpou wo arau*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.

Data

The description is based upon the following data:

- (1) Christie (1): Christie, Agatha. *The seven dials mystery*. Fontana. 1954.
- (2) Christie (2): Christie, Agatha. *Why didn't they ask Evans?* Fontana. 1956.
- (3) Christie (3): Christie, Agatha. *The thirteen problems*. Fontana. 1965.
- (4) Christie (4): Christie, Agatha. *Three-act tragedy*. Fontana. 1957.
- (5) Christie (5): Christie, Agatha. *They do it with mirrors*. Fontana. 1955.
- (6) Christie (6): Christie, Agatha. *A Caribbean mystery*. Fontana. 1964.
- (7) Murdoch (1): Murdoch, Iris. *The sandcastle*. Penguin Books. 1957.
- (8) Murdoch (2): Murdoch, Iris. *The flight from the enchanter*. Penguin Books. 1956.
- (9) Murdoch (3): Murdoch, Iris. *The red and the green*. Penguin Books. 1965.
- (10) Murdoch (4): Murdoch, Iris. *The severed head*. Penguin Books. 1961.
- (11) Murdoch (5): Murdoch, Iris. *An accidental man*. Penguin Books. 1971.
- (12) Drabble : Drabble, Margaret. *A summer bird-cage*. Penguin Books. 1963.
- (13) Greene : Greene, Graham. *Twenty-one stories*. Penguin Books. 1981.
- (14) Steinbeck : Steinbeck, John. *Of mice and men/ Cannery Row*. Penguin Books. 1949.
- (15) Hemingway (1): Hemingway, Ernest. *A farewell to arms*. Penguin Books. 1935.
- (16) Hemingway (2): Hemingway, Ernest. *The old man and the sea*. Penguin Books. 1966.
- (17) Fitzgerald : Fitzgerald, F.Scott. *The great Gatsby*. Penguin Books. 1950.
- (18) Anderson : Anderson, Sherwood. *Winesburg, Ohio*. Penguin Books. 1947.
- (19) Salinger : Salinger, J.D. *The catcher in the rye*. Penguin Books. 1958.
- (20) White : White, E.B. *Charlotte's Web*. Harper & Row. 1980.
- (21) Way (1): *The American way*. [Intermediate] part 1. Sony. 1985.
- (22) Way (2): *The American way*. [Intermediate] part 2. Sony. 1985.
- (23) Survival : de Freitas, J.F. *Survival English*. London: Macmillan. 1978.
- (24) Milestone : Terada, Masayoshi et al. *Milestone English readings IIB*. Keirinkan. 1989.