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Abstract

This paper examines the interaction between the Newār versatile verb mal ‘search, need’ and the range of epistemic, deontic, and dynamic modalities outlined in Palmer 1986. According to Givón 2001, modality codes the speaker’s attitude toward a proposition.

The attitudinal thread running through the modal uses of mal is that of necessity. With epistemic judgments, mal marks an inference as necessary, given the evidence at hand. In deontic directives, mal amounts to a command – a certain action or response on the part of the hearer is necessary. In deontic commissives the speaker finds it necessary to commit himself to a task. In volitives, the speaker’s need is to express a wish, a blessing, or a curse. In the dynamic modalities the necessity stems either from within the speaker (subject-oriented) or from external pressures that impinge upon him (circumstantial).

The evidential basis of a statement, whether eye witness or hearsay, is the modality that has the least to do with necessity, and the one to which mal has the least contribution to make. Thus mal is shown to have a wide range of interaction within the epistemic, deontic, and dynamic modalities, but in each interaction the contribution of mal highlights necessity as part of the speaker’s attitude to the proposition.

Keywords

modality, Newar, epistemic, deontic, dynamic, necessity
The Modalities of Newār ‘mal’

Austin Hale
SIL-Nepal

The Newār versatile verb *mal* ‘search, need’ can occur as the main verb with noun phrase arguments. It can also occur following infinitival clauses to express a variety of epistemic, deontic, and dynamic modalities (‘must, have to, may’). Following Palmer 1986, 2001, Hale and Shrestha (2006: 148 ff.) have analyzed it in these contexts as an auxiliary. Though further analysis of the syntax of *mal* would be desirable, the focus of the present paper is on the spectrum of semantic modalities in which *mal* participates, whether as a prime marker of modality or only as a compatible accomplice.

Judgments regarding the modality of an utterance are best made in a discourse context sufficiently rich to enable the reader to reconstruct the situation and the speaker’s intent. For this reason I have chosen to base the analysis in part upon extended stretches of discourse in the hope that it will enable an English reader to draw conclusions about modality from context in much the same way that Newars themselves do.

According to Givón (2001. I: 300), “the modality codes the speaker’s attitude toward the proposition.” It thus stands apart from what he refers to as the “propositional frame” of the clause. Palmer (1986: 16) makes a similar point: “Modality in language is, then, concerned with subjective characteristics of an utterance, and it could even be further argued that subjectivity is an essential criterion for modality. Modality could, that is to say, be defined as the grammaticalization of speaker’s (subjective) attitudes and opinions.” Distinguishing what is subjective from what might be termed ‘factive,’ however, is not not always easy. “It would, moreover, be a mistake to confine a study of modality to non-factuality, for there are good reasons for handling factual statements together with opinions and judgments. It can be argued that both are subjective, representing the speaker’s point of view.” (1986: 18)

---

1 This study is offered in gratitude to the memory of David Watters and Michael Noonan, whose works remain as inspiring examples of linguistic description. For what I present in this paper I am heavily indebted to Kedār P. Shrestha with whom I have interacted over a growing corpus of interlinearized Newār texts for many years. I am also thankful to two anonymous reviewers and to Carol Genetti for comments that have led to improvements in the paper.

2 The form, *mal*, represents the verb stem. Lower case stem finals are invariant: *mal-a* ‘need-PD’, *mal-a* ‘need-PC’, *mal-e* ‘need-INF’. Alternating stems are written with upper case finals:

   Stems in L such as *bīl* ‘give’ alternate between /l/ (bīl-a ‘give-PD’) and /y/ (bīy-a ‘give-PC’).
   Stems in T such as *yaT* ‘do’ alternate between /t/ (yat-a ‘do-PD’) and /n/ (yan-a ‘do-PC’).
   Stems in Y such as *khaY* ‘be’ alternate between /t/ (khat-a ‘be-PD’) and /y/ (khay-a ‘be-CM’).

For a fuller account see Hale and Shrestha (2006: 58–63).
1 The spectrum of semantic modalities

A search for *mal* in an interlinearized corpus of native authored Newār text turned up some 994 examples, most, but not all of which were examples of the verb under study in this paper. In consultation with Kedār P. Shrestha, I have attempted to sort these examples out under various headings in a scheme gleaned from Palmer 1986.

Epistemic Modality (speaker aims to inform the hearer.)
1. Evidentials (truth claim based on experience or hearsay)
2. Judgments (truth claim based on inference, conjecture, possibility)

Deontic Modality (speaker calls the hearer to action.)
3. Directive (speaker elicits action from the hearer.)
4. Commissive (speaker commits himself to a task, issues a threat, a challenge or a refusal)
5. Volitive (speaker utters a wish, a blessing, a curse, a prayer)
6. Evaluative (action motivated by evaluation of facts in context)

Dynamic Modality (focuses on subjects, situations, abilities, dispositions)
7. Subject oriented (focus is on the ability or disposition of the subject)
8. Circumstantial (focus is on circumstances that impact the subject)

We have extracted from the corpus candidate examples for each of these types, though in the case of the first type, 1. Epistemic–Evidential we have no examples in which *mal* serves as the primary marker of modality. Epistemic evidentials, whether eye-witness or hearsay, have to do with what *is*. The verb *mal* encodes speaker attitudes regarding what *must be*. That *mal* ‘need, must’ has a gap at this point in the spectrum of modalities should not be surprising.

2 The syntax of *mal*

An initial syntactic analysis of *mal* in the context of some 30 other Newar verbal auxiliaries can be found in Hale and Shrestha 2006: 125–171. Further work is in process. The following provides some basic syntactic background. For the purposes of this paper we view *mal* as having two roles, (1) that of a main verb and (2) that of a verbal auxiliary. The question as to whether *mal* should also be viewed as having a role as predicate-taking complement is left open for a future study.

There are many clear cases in which *mal* functions as a main verb. It can occur as a transitive verb with the sense ‘search, look for’ with an Ergative subject and an Absolutive object as in examples (1) and (2).

(1) cəkũː cãː kɛːguː ukhẽːthukhẽː
   cəkũː-ca-nə̃ː kɛːguː ukhẽː-thukẽː
   sparrow-DIM-ERG pea thither-hither

   hikkəːdəːkə mala
   hikkəːdənː-ːkə mal-ə
   swarm.in.all.directions-ID-SBD search-PD
   ‘The sparrow looked all over for the pea.’ (pea03.01)
Hale: The modalities of Newār ‘mal’

(2) \(wə: \) jukti \(malacwənə\)
wə-nə: jukti mal-a-cwən-ə
he-ERG plan search-CM-CNT-PD
‘He continued to search for a plan.’ (tigr07.04)

It can also occur as a non-transitive verb, with Dative and Absolutive arguments in the sense, ‘need’ as in examples (3) and (4)

(3) \(mekherə \) nə: 1) jimitə nhĩ: nigə: paurwəti: ma:
mee-kherə nə: 1 jipĩ-tə nhĩ: ni-gə: paurwəti: mal-:
other-way nr. 1 we.EXCL-DAT day two-CLF bread need-ID
‘On the other hand, [point] number one: we need two loaves of bread every day.’ (law02.01)

(4) \(nyagu \) jusā: imitə cwənetə bæ: \(malacwənə\)
nyagu juL-ː-sā: wə-mi-tə cwən-e-tə bæ: mal-a-cwən-ː-gu
anything be-ID-CNS he-PL-DAT stay-INF-PUR shelter need-CM-CNT-ID-NZR
‘But whatever the case might be, they were still needing a place to stay.’ (doll02.14)

It is interesting to note that as a transitive main verb with the sense ‘search, look for’, mal functions as a ‘factive’ verb. It is only when it occurs as a non-transitive main verb with the sense ‘need’ that it is used subjectively to express modal functions.

In examples (1), (2), (3) and (4) \(mal\) functions as the main verb. In examples (2) and (4) the main verb is participial in form and is modified by the continuous auxiliary, \(cwən\). The participial form, \(mala\), is triggered by the auxiliary, \(cwən\). We will refer to the class of auxiliaries that control the participial (-a) form of the preceding verb as AAux auxiliaries (Hale and Shrestha 2006: 125 ff.).

In example (5) we have an instance of \(mal\) which appears to function syntactically as a main verb.

(5) \(sĩkəːmiː \) dhalə ki “thwəyatə nhapalakə jiː: døyekagu
sĩkaːmi-nəː dhaL-ə ki thwə-yatə nhapalakə ji-nəː de:k-a-gu
carpenter-ERG say-PD QT this-DAT first.of.all I-ERG make-PC-NZR

\(əkĩː \) thwə jita: he ma:
\(əkĩː \) thwə ji-tə he mal-:
so this I-DAT EMP must.be-ID
‘The carpenter said, “I made this one in the first place, so this one has to be for me.”’ (doll07.07)

The way that (5) is understood, however, suggests that we have a deleted main verb and that \(mal\) may not be the main verb here at all. Kedar P. Shrestha, (p.c. 2010) suggests two variants in which the understood (missing) verb is made explicit.
Regardless of whether or not we agree that there is an understood (missing) verb in (5), examples (5a) and (5b) are certainly acceptable variants of (5) in this context in their own right, and they exemplify \textit{mal} in the role of auxiliary. We will refer to the class of auxiliaries that control the infinitival (-\textit{e}) form of the preceding verb as EAux auxiliaries (Hale and Shrestha 2006: 125 ff.).

3 \textit{Mal} interacting with the spectrum of modalities

In this section we attempt to exemplify the modalities of \textit{mal} following the outline given in section (1) above. The lexical content of \textit{mal} either interacts compatibly with or lends itself well to the expression of these various modalities.

1. Epistemic evidential modality. This type of modality aims to inform the hearer of something, the truth claim for which is either first-hand experience or hearsay. Of the eight types of modality looked at here, epistemic evidential modality is the only type for which we have not yet found an example in which \textit{mal} serves explicitly to mark the type.\footnote{This is not surprising. Speakers use epistemic evidentials to identify statements for which they either take personal responsibility as eye-witnesses or which they base on hearsay. The semantic thread has to do with truth value. By contrast, necessity, which is the prevasive thread in the modal uses of \textit{mal}, can have a judgmental epistemic function (see 2. Epistemic Judgmental Modality below), but seems to have no epistemic evidential function in statements based on eye-witness or hearsay.} We do have epistemic evidentials in which \textit{mal} occurs, but in these examples, \textit{mal} does not function as an epistemic evidential.

1.1 Eye-witness evidentials: Example (6) is an epistemic evidential. It makes a truth claim based on first-hand experience.

\begin{verbatim}
(6) dhwə̃ lə̃ː yanaː chẽː pitĩːkemalə
dhwə̃ː-ə́ yana-ː chẽ-e pitĩːk-e-mal-ə
jackal-ERG do-NF house-LOC drive.out-INF-NEED-PD
'I had to be driven out because of what the jackal did.' (knew11.10)
\end{verbatim}

However, saying that (6) is a case of an eye-witness evidential, is not to say that \textit{mal} here serves to place focus on eye-witness evidence. One can only say that \textit{mal} is compatible with that modality. One might possibly claim that epistemic evidentiality is the unmarked default which holds when not overridden by other explicit markers. In (6), however, \textit{mal} is not focusing on a truth claim. The focus is, rather, on circumstances that impacted the speaker when she was driven out of the house-
hold. Thus in (6) mal itself marks type 8. Dynamic Circumstantial modality.

In the following exchange between Punəkhũː Maĩca and her younger sister both sisters are speaking as eye-witnesses. It is interesting to note the absence of grammatical markers that uniquely identify this as an eye-witness epistemic exchange. The first person references, the realis verbal inflection and the general truth-asserting emphatic copula, he khə in (11) suffice.

(7) kehẽmhesyã: wəya: “chː chu nəyagu hː tətα?
kehẽ-mhα-si-nα: wəL-a: chː-ŋα: chu nəL-a-gu hː tətα
yr.sister-AD-SP-ERG come-NF you-ERG what eat-PC-NZR Q el.sister
'The younger sister came and said, “What have you eaten, Older Sister? (goat04.15)

(8) jiːa nα: ti re, ji nα: nαye pityaː” dhaLα
ji-tα nα: bIL-I re ji nα: nαL-e pityaI-α dhaL-α
I-DAT also give-IMP EMP I also eat-INF be.hungry-PD say-PD
Give me some too, I also want to eat, I’m hungry,” she said.’ (goat04.16)

(9) “chː maŋaya, nαyasa chːtα bi he bi: ni,
chː ma-ŋαL-a nαL-a-sa cha-yata bIL-S he bIL-e ni
anything NEG-eat-PC eat-PC-IF you-DAT give-SH EMP give-FC EMP

chːtα ma-dayeka jː jɑkα nɑi la” dhaka:
che-yata ma-dbY-e-kα jːnɑ: jɑkα nɑL-a la dhaka:
you-DAT NEG-exist-INF-ASC I-ERG only eat-PC Q QT

punakhuː maĩcɑ: hekαlα
punakhuː maĩcɑ-nα: hek-ɔ
Punakhuː Maĩca-ERG comfort-PD
“I have not eaten anything. If I had eaten I certainly would have given you something. How could I eat without there being anything for you?” So saying Punakhuː Maĩca soothed her.’ (goat04.17)

(10) tαrα kehɛmhα patyaː majuː
tαrα kehɛ-mhα patyaː ma-juL-ː
but yr.sister-AD belief NEG-happen-ID
‘But the younger sister did not believe her.’ (goat04.18)

(11) chː nαgu he khɔ: ha phwałɑ; wəyeκɑ
cha-ŋα: nαL-ː-gu he khɔYː: ha phwałɑ: wəL-e-kɑ
you-ERG eat-ID-NZR EMP be.true-ID steam billow.up come-INF-ASC

nαgu jː hʊkɔnαːnisɛː khɔː jɪtɑ: nɑː ti, nαye
nαL-ː-gu ji-ŋα: hʊkɔnα-ŋαːnisɛː khanː jɪ-tα nɑː bIL-I nαL-
eat-ID-NZR I-ERG that.far-EMP-from see-ID I-DAT also give-IMP eat-INF
You certainly have eaten, with steam billowing up you ate. I saw it from way back there. Give me [some] to eat. I am hungry,” cried the younger sister with mournful howls and eyes full of tears.’ (goat04.19)

1.2 Hearsay evidentials. Example (12) makes a truth claim based on second-hand information. As such it is an example of a hearsay evidential.

(12) əkĩː əthethəthe məsyuː təssəkə̃ː dhakwəsikwə əkĩː əthethəthe ma-siLː təssəkə̃ː dhaL-S-kwə S-kwə
so that.this.like NEG-know-ID very say.SH-much-know.SH-much

mal:
must.have-ID
‘I don’t know all the details about him (matchmaker disclaimer) but (all that I know is that) he insists on whatever he asks for.’ (knew03.16)

Here (12) makes truth claims on the basis of second-hand information. This is suggested by the clause, əkĩː əthethəthe məsyuː ‘That much this much [I] don’t know.’

Stronger evidence that (12) exemplifies hearsay comes from context in which (12) is found. After years without children a couple finally gives birth to a boy. The boy remains their only son and they spoil him rotten. He grows up totally undisciplined and the parents are at wit’s end to know how to reform him. Finally they decide to get him a wise and intelligent wife, in hopes that she might reform him. They get word of an intelligent young woman from a noble family who might be up to the task and they engage a matchmaker to arrange the marriage. Example (12) is part of what the matchmaker says to the parents of the girl during the negotiations. From the context it is clear that what the matchmaker says about the young man involved is second-hand information, affirmed to be true as part of the match-making negotiation.

Again mal is compatible with a claim to truth based on hearsay, but it plays no role in identifying the evidential status of the statement. In this case mal functions as a main verb focusing on the disposition of the subject. It says, in essence, that the boy must have/insists on having whatever he asks for. The necessity involved is dynamic, owned by the subject, rather than epistemic. As such it exemplifies type 7. Dynamic Subject-Oriented modality.

On the basis of examples encountered to this point we can see that although mal is compatible with type 1. Epistemic Evidential modality, we as yet have no examples in which mal itself actually serves as the marker of either the eyewitness or the hearsay variety. Nonetheless, for the hearsay variety, Newār does have at least one such marker: the particle, hə̃ ‘RPT.SP’ as exemplified
in (13) through (16).\textsuperscript{4}

(13) \textit{thatə} \textit{he} \textit{ile:} \textit{bele:} \textit{jhiːsə̃ː} \textit{jhiːgu} \textit{bhĩːtuna:}
\textit{thatə} \textit{he} \textit{iː-e} \textit{bela-e} \textit{jhiː-nə̃ː} \textit{jhiː-ya-gu} \textit{bhĩːtuna:}
\textit{this.like} \textit{EMP} \textit{time-LOC} \textit{time-LOC} \textit{we.INCL-ERG} \textit{we.INCL-GEN-NZR} \textit{well.wishing}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dhayatətəːgu</th>
<th>gulikhe:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dhal-a-tel-ː-gu</td>
<td>kəː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>say-CM-PF-ID-NZR</td>
<td>countless matter hear-PC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Like this, from time to time we hear many messages which tell [us] things for our own good.’ (lata08.01)

(14) \textit{gətə} -- \textit{curwəʈ} \textit{twənə} \textit{ki} \textit{kyansər} \textit{jui} \textit{hə̃},
\textit{gətə} \textit{curwəʈ} \textit{twan-ə} \textit{ki} \textit{kyansər} \textit{jul-i} \underline{hə̃}
\textit{for.example} \textit{cigarette smoke-PD} \textit{if cancer happen-FD} \textit{RPT.SP}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>curwəʈ</th>
<th>twənəː</th>
<th>kyansər</th>
<th>jui</th>
<th>hə̃</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>curwəʈ</td>
<td>smoke-aː</td>
<td>kyansər</td>
<td>jul-i-mə-kəYo</td>
<td>hə̃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cigarette smoke-NF</td>
<td>cancer happen-FD-NEG be.true-ID</td>
<td>RPT.SP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘For example, \textit{it is said} that if [one] smokes [one] will get cancer. \textit{It is [also] said} that it is not true that cancer occurs because of smoking.’ (lata08.02)

(15) \textit{cinɨ} \textit{nəla} \textit{ki} \textit{kimi} \textit{dai} \underline{hə̃},
\textit{cinɨ} \textit{nəL-ə} \textit{ki} \textit{kimi} \textit{daL-i} \underline{hə̃}
\textit{sugar eat-PD} \textit{if intestinal.parasite be.infested-FD} \textit{RPT.SP}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cinɨ</th>
<th>kimi</th>
<th>daiməkhu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cinɨ-nə̃ː</td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>daL-i-mə-kəYo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sugar-ERG</td>
<td>intestinal.parasite be.infested-FD-NEG be.true-ID</td>
<td>RPT.SP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘\textit{It is said} that if [one] eats sugar, [one] will get worms. \textit{It is [also] said} that it is not true that [one] gets worm from [eating] sugar.’ (lata08.03)

(16) \textit{məca} \textit{buːmhə} \textit{misəː} \textit{phasi} \textit{naye} \textit{majyuː} \underline{hə̃},
\textit{məca} \textit{buL-ː-mhə} \textit{misa-nəː} \textit{phasi} \textit{nəL-e} \textit{mə-jilː-ː} \underline{hə̃}
\textit{child give.birth-ID-NZR woman-ERG} \textit{pumpkin eat-INF neg-OK-ID} \textit{RPT.SP}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>məca</th>
<th>buːmhə</th>
<th>misəː</th>
<th>phasi</th>
<th>naye</th>
<th>majyuː</th>
<th>hə̃</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>məca</td>
<td>buL-ː-mhə</td>
<td>misa-nəː</td>
<td>phasi</td>
<td>nəL-e</td>
<td>mə-jilː-ː</td>
<td>hə̃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child</td>
<td>give.birth-ID-NZR</td>
<td>woman-ERG</td>
<td>pumpkin</td>
<td>eat-INF-NEG</td>
<td>OK-ID</td>
<td>RPT.SP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{məkhu} \underline{hə̃}, \underline{chu} \underline{hə̃} \underline{chu} \underline{hə̃}
\textit{ma-kəYo} \underline{hə̃} \underline{chu} \underline{hə̃} \underline{chu} \underline{hə̃}
\textit{NEG be.true-ID} \textit{RPT.SP} \textit{what} \textit{RPT.SP} \textit{what} \textit{RPT.SP} \textit{what} \textit{RPT.SP} \textit{what} \textit{RPT.SP} \textit{what} \textit{RPT.SP} \textit{what} \textit{RPT.SP} \\

‘\textit{It is said} that it is not good for a woman who has just given birth to a child to eat pumpkin. \textit{It is [also] said} that no harm will come to a woman who has just given birth to a child even if she eats pumpkin. \textit{We don’t know what to believe.’} (lata08.04)

\textsuperscript{4} Hearsay can also be marked by lexical means. Consider the way \textit{dhaigu ‘it is said’ is used in example (66).}
In (14) – (16) the hearsay marker serves not so much to support the argument on the basis of an authority as it does to caution the reader that what one hears is contradictory and confusing, and, perhaps, cannot be trusted.

Another example of hə ‘RPT.SP’ used as a kind of disclaimer is found in (17) – (22), a discussion highlighting the difference between courtship and marriage.

(17) 
wa-ya  kəbita  bwəːbwəː  
wa-ya  kəlaː  nəː:
he-GEN-NZR poetry  read-SH-read-SH-BG.ACT he-GEN wife  also

(18) 
ərtat  ləbhə  yaʔəwəːgu  
ərtat  ləbhə  yaT-ː-wəL-ː-gu  kʰəY-ː:
that.is.to say  love  do-PUR-get-ID-NZR  be-ID
‘That is to say, she grew to love him.’ (thrd4.05.08)

(19) 
thəũː  kəbita  wəya  kəlaːmha-si-ya
thəũː  kəbita  wə-ya  kəlaː-mha-si-ya
he-AD-SP-gen poetry  write-CM-CNT-PD QT
‘Today his wife is allergic to his poetry.’ (thrd4.05.09)

(20) 
kəbita  cwəY-a-cwən-ə  dhəkaː  daʃəwəɡu  
kəbita  cwəY-a-cwən-ə  dhəkaː  daL-ː-wəL-i-gu
he-GEN poetry  write-CM-CNT-PD QT beat-PUR-get-ID-NZR  RPT.SP

(21) 
əthəwa  bhwəː  lakaː  khunabiːgu  
əthəwa  bhwəː  laT-k-ː aː  khuT-a-biL-i-gu
or.even sheet snatch-K-NF tear-CM-BEN-FD-NZR  RPT.SP
‘Or, snatching the paper she even tears it up, it is said.’ (thrd4.05.11)

(22) 
wəya  kəlaːmha-si-ya  bhənai  du --
wə-ya  kəlaː-mha-si-ya  bhənai  doY-0
he-GEN wife-AD-SP-GEN opinion  exist-ID
So we conclude that although *mal* is compatible with hearsay, it does not mark it as such. Newar has other means for marking hearsay, including the particle, *hə̃*, as well as clues from the extended context.

2. Epistemic judgmental modality. In this type of modality the speaker aims to inform the hearer of something, the truth claim for which is based on inference, conjecture or possibility. Example (23) is an epistemic judgment. The conjecture that the mother is rich is an inference from the fact that she had given her daughter a golden dog as dowry.

(23) "lũ-ya-mhə khica he kwəsə biyahəyephumhə chimi
gold-GEN-AGR dog EMP dowry give-CM-bring-INF-able-ID-AGR you.PL-GEN
mãː la sikkə he təːmi juimaː
mother EMP very EMP rich.person be-INF-must-ID
‘Your mother, who was able to give a golden dog as dowry, must be a very rich person.’ (pups07.33)

Example (5) together with its variants (5a) and (5b) also fit here. The claim made by the carpenter in (5) that he should be the one to marry the woman rests upon the fact that he was the one who carved the wooden doll from a block of wood before she was brought to life — an epistemic judgment inferred from his role in making the doll. Within the story from which it is taken, example (24) is a response to (5). The truth of the painter’s claim that he has the right to marry the woman under discussion is a judgment based upon the fact that he was the one who opened her eyes. (i.e. the one who painted the eyes on the wooden doll before she was brought to life).

(24) "pũːnə̃ː “chu dhalə chaːsa chəː nhapalako dayekwsəː
pũː-nə̃ː chu dhaL-ə dhasa cha-nəː nhapalako de:k-w-səː
painter-ERG what say-PD topic you-ERG first.of.all make-ID-CNS
lə̃ːpuli chaL-aː mikha kə̃ːkamhə ji əkĩː jĩː he
lə̃ːpuli chaL-aː mikha kan-k-a-mhə ji əkĩː ji-nəː he
final.coat paint-NF eye open-K-PC-NZR I so I-ERG EMP
byaha yavamaː
byaha yaT-e-mal-:
marriage do-INF-must.be-ID
‘The painter said, “No matter what you say, even though you were the first to make her, I was the one who applied the final coat and opened her eyes, so I must be the one to marry her.”’ (doll07.08)
Though it seems clear that the semantic sense of *mal* in (5) and (24) is important to the interpretation of these sentences as epistemic judgments, we would not want to claim that *mal* is a grammaticalized marker of this modality. There are other lexical options available to the speaker. In (26) the tailor makes his case using, not *mal*, but the existential verb *dōi* ‘will be’.

(25) ənə-nə̃-li suikalə: nhecila: dhalə
ana-nə̃-li suika:nə: nhecil-a: dhal-a
there-ERG-after tailor-ERG go.forward-NF say-PD
‘Then the tailor stepped up and spoke,’ (doll07.09)

(26) wə-nə̃: dhaL-ə ki chipi-sə̃: dek-a: mikha kō:k-sə̃:
wa-nə̃: dhaL-a ki chipi-sə̃: dek-a: mikha kō:k:sə̃:
that-ERG say-PD QT you.FAM.PL-ERG make-NF eye open-ID-CNS

3. Deontic directive modality. In this type of modality the speaker directly elicits action from the hearer. In (27) a woman is being commanded by her father-in-law to reform her husband, and to do it quickly.

(27) yakanə̃: vayemalə
yakanə̃: yat-e-mal-a
quickly do-INF-must-PD
‘It must be done quickly.’ (knew04.23)

In (28) we have a directive which is quoted as a characterization of traditional society.

(28) “makhə halə dhayewə pikhaləkhu təya:
makha hal-a dhaL-e-wə pikhala:khu-e təL-a:
mother.hen cry.out-PD say-INF-ASA yard.entrance-LOC put-NF

pedə̃kə palema:” dhayatə̃:gu somajya
pedan-kə pal-e-mal-a dhaL-a-təL:-gu somaj-ya
one.stroke-ASC behead-INF-must-ID say-CM-PF-ID-NZR society-GEN
Example (29) recounts a step in a ceremony in which a bride garlands the groom as an indication that the groom is accepted by the family of the bride.

(29)  bhagi  yaye  maː  bhagi  yaye  maː  dhala  bhagiyanə
bhagi  yaT-e  malː  bhagi  yaT-e  malː  dhaL-ə  bhagiyaT-a
bow  do-INF  must-ID  bow  do-INF  must-ID  say-PD  bow.down-PC
'Somebody said to me, “[You] must bow down, bow down to his feet.” So I did.’
(garland02.07)

4. Deontic commissive modality. In this type of modality the speaker commits himself to something, whether it be an action he himself will pursue, an action he threatens to perform, a challenge, or a refusal. The commissive differs from the directive in that the action elicited involves the speaker and not just the hearer. In (33) the four friends commit themselves to a course of action motivated by the situation depicted in (30) through (32).

(30)  dheba  nəː  phuta  dhãk  nəː  məːsta
dheba  nəː  phuY-ə  dhãk  nəː  ma-daY-ə
money also  be.spent-PD intimidation also  NEG-exist-PD
'Their money was gone. Their power to intimidate was also gone.’ (doll01.24)

(31)  kwəmali  juyaː  cwəne  nəː  məchulə
kwəmali  juL-aː  cwən-e  nəː  mə-chuL-ə
humble  be-NF  stay-INF  also  NEG-be.inclined-PD
'They were also not inclined to stay there as low-class people.’ (doll01.25)

(32)  æthe  jugulĩː  aː  thanə  cwənəː  khəi  məkhutə
æthe  juL-ː-gulĩː  aː  thanə  cwən-aː  khəY-i  mə-khəY-0-tə
like.that  be-ID-RSN  now  here  stay-NF  good-FD  NEG-be-ID-EMP
'Since it was like that [they said] “It would not be good to stay here now.” ’ (doll01.26)

(33)  me-gu  he  deːšeː  wənemala.
me-gu  he  deː-e  wən-e-mal-ə
other-AGR  EMP  country-LOC  go-INF-must-PD
‘ “[We] must go to another country.” ’ (doll01.27)
In (34) the carpenter commits himself to making a doll.

(34) “thukiya kətāmɔhri chəmḥə jusā: dɛkemala” dhəka:
thwɔ-ki-ya kətāmɔhri cha-mhə juL-ː-sā: de:k-e-mal-ɔ dhəka:
this-1NAN-GEN doll one-CLF be-1D-CNS make-INF-must-PD QT

*thw-ki-yə kət-mh-ri chə-mh juL-s-ā de:k-e-mal dhəka*

*bica: yana: sîtwa: kalo.*

bica: yan-ː a: sîtwa: kǝL-ː a
thought do-1NF piece.of.wood take-PD

“[I] must make [something] from this even if it is only a doll,” thinking thus, he took a piece of wood.’ (doll04.10)

In (35) a father resolves to go look for his children.

(35) ipĩː chu julə thẽː, siTə la ki mwaːni chəkəː

wɔ-piː chu juL-ː a thẽː siT-ː a la ki mwaT-ː-ni chə-kəː

that-PL what happen-PD like die-PD Q or alive-1D-still one-time

swəwane mala la dhəyagu jəkə mənɛː

swɔY-ː-wən-e mal-ː a la dhəyagu jəkə mən-e

look-PUR-go-INF must-PD EMP CTZR just mind-LOC

*luyawayacəwəniːgu*
lul-a-wəL-a-cwən-i-gu
rise-CM-come-CM-stay-FD-NZR

‘The thought just kept on welling up in his mind, “What happened to them? Did they die or are they still alive? I must go look for them once.”’ (strn08.05)

Refusals like the one illustrated in (36) are also considered type 4 Deontic Commissives, along with threats and challenges. A refusal such as (36) is a negative commissive. The speaker disowns the necessity to commit to a certain course of action. The negative force of the refusal is supplied by the question word *chæː* ‘why’. The sense of obligation that falls within the scope of that negation is expressed by *mal* ‘must’.

(36) jiː dhaːthe wəː məyasə wəː dhaːthe

ji-ː dhaL-ː-the wə-ː-nəː mə-yaT-ː-sa wə-ː-nəː dhaL-ː-the
I-ERG say-1D-like he-ERG NEG-do-1D-if he-ERG say-1D-like

*jìː yaye magu he chæː*
jì-ː yaye magu he chæː
I-ERG do-INF must-1D-NZR EMP why

‘If he does not do whatever I say, why should I do whatever he says?’ (makh1.024.015)

In the story, ‘The Sparrow’s Lost Pea,’ a sparrow lost a pea and after long searching had not been able either to find it herself or to get help from anyone else in finding it. An ant, hearing her story vowed to pursue the search until the pea was found. Seeing the King approaching, riding on
an elephant, the ant went up into the elephant’s ear. In (38) we see that tel ‘be about to/be time to’, another EAux, can also be used to give threats as a type 4 Deontic Commissive. In (39) the type 3 Deontic Directive is done with an imperative.

Examples (37)-(45) are cited in narrative sequence and provide the context for the type 3 Deontic Directive in (44) and the type 4 Deontic Commissive (a threat) in (45), both of which are expressed with mal.

(37) . . . “he kisi hùː cəkhũː meju-yatə guhali ya dhakaː
. . . he kisi hùː cəkhũː meju-yatə guhali yaT-I dhakaː
. . . Oh! elephant yonder sparrow lady-DAT help do-IMP QT

chimi jujuyata dhəibyu
chipi-ya jju-ya-tə dhaL-a-biL-I
you-GEN king-DAT say-CM-BEN-IMP
‘...Oh Elephant! Tell your King to help that sparrow over yonder!’ (pea10.04-5)

(38) məkhusa chə̃ːgu nhæːpənɛː duhãː wənaː nyayetelə.
məkhusa cha-ya-gu nhæp-e du-haː wən-aː nyaT-e-teL-ə
otherwise you-GEN-AGR ear-LOC in-DIR go-NF bite-INF-be.time-PD
‘Otherwise it will be time for me to go into your ear and bite you.’ (pea10.06)

(39) chũː juyaː jujũː wə cəkhũː meju-yatə guhali
chũː juL-aː juju-nə̃ː wə cəkhũː meju-yatə guhali
anything happen-NF king-ERG that sparrow lady-DAT help

məyatə dhasə wətə kurkabyu”
məyaT-ə dhasə wə-yatə kurka-biL-I
NEG-do-PD if that-DAT drop-CM-BEN-IMP
‘And should it happen that the King is not helping that sparrow then drop him!’ (pea10.07)

(40) juju-yatə thəːgu mheː təyedəyaː kisiya nhæːtəpu:
juju-ya-tə thə-gu mha-e təL-e-dəY-aː kisi-ya nhæT-əpu:
king-DAT own-AGR body-LOC put-INF-get.to-NF elephant-GEN be.proud-ID
‘Having gotten to put the King on his own body, the elephant was proud.’ (pea11.01)

(41) wəya phəphũi sunā swəl!
wə-ya phəp-hũi su-nəː swə-Y-i
he-GEN pride any-ERG see-FD
‘Anyone could see his pride.’ (pea11.02)

(42) tərə imuyagu khyacwaː nenaː wə gyatə
tərə imu-ya-gu khyacwəː nen-aː wə gyaT-ə
but ant-GEN-AGR threat hear-NF he fear-PD
‘But because he had heard the threat of the ant he was afraid.’ (pea11.03)
Thinking that the ant would actually cause him to fall, he was frightened out of his wits. (pea11.04)

He said softly to the King, “Your Majesty!” (pea11.05)

That sparrow over yonder – you have to go help her! (pea11.06)

Otherwise it might be that I will have to drop you off from my body. (pea11.07)

5. Deontic volitive modality. In this type the speaker expresses a wish, a blessing, a curse, or a prayer. A key element here is the speaker’s desire. The need expressed is rooted in will of the speaker. It is interesting to note that examples such as (63) which have a strong imperative sense, or (46) which are strong exhortations are not imperative forms. The form used is not the morphological imperative form but rather the imperfective disjunct (ID) form:

We have said that the voice of the language groups which Prithwi Narayen suppressed must resound. (pkd04.12)
When the imperative form of mal is used, however, the sense is type 5 Deontic Volitive, not type 3 Deontic Directive. Example (47) expresses the sparrow’s wish for compensation for having her request for help in finding the lost pea ignored. This wish is expressed by ma, the imperative form of mal, and is clearly volitive.

(47) jigu binti manyəmə wə kaptanyatə yekhaye
ji-gu binti mə-nen-ː-mə wə kaptan-yatə yekhəT-e
I.GEN-AGR request NEG-listen-ID-AGR that captain-DAT hang-INF

he ma
he mal-I
EMP may-IMP
‘May that captain who ignored my request be hanged.’ (pea06.05)

Consider another story and another deontic volitive. In the story ‘The Lady who Understood the Language of the Animals’ we have an example of a curse. The lady (the same one who had been given the task of reforming her husband in [27]) was on the roof washing the dishes and pondering what to do. A jackal appeared having found the dead body of a person wearing a diamond necklace on the bank of a near-by river. The jackal was afraid to eat the body until someone else removed the necklace. In (48) – (50) the jackal is speaking.

(48) sunanəː wə heramaː phenabilə dhasa
su-nəː-nəː wə hera-maː phen-a-biL-ə dhasa
anyone-ERG-INDEF that diamond-garland untie-CM-BEN-PD if

wə wə-yata he dəi, wəya dhanəː peripurnə jui,
that that-DAT EMP be-FD that-GEN wealth-ERG brimful be-FD

ji la nəyədəi.
ji la nəL-e-daY-i
I meat eat-INF-get.to-FD
‘Whoever removes the diamond necklace, to that one it will belong and he will be full of wealth. As for me, I will get to eat the meat.’ (knew05.08)

(49) jigu bhæː mathupintə chūː khə maru.
ji-gu bhæː mə-thul-ː-pit-tə chūː khə ma-daY-0
I.GEN-AGR language NEG-understand-ID-PL-DAT any matter NEG-be-ID
‘For those who do not understand my language there is no message.’ (knew05.09)

(50) thuL-aː nəː phenaməbiyumə həxə canhəː he
thuL-aː nəː phen-a-mə-biL-ː-mə həxə canhə-e he
understand-NF CNS untie-CM-NEG-BEN-ID-NZR tonight night-LOC EMP
For the one who has understood but still does not untie it [for me], may that one die this very night by having [his/her] head broken in seven pieces.’ (knew05.10)

Terrified by this curse, the lady found the corpse and removed the necklace. Her husband, who had not understood the jackal’s message, saw this, and persuaded his mother that his wife was a monster in human form and should be sent back to her parental home. The father was not convinced. However, sensing that she was no longer welcome, she decided to leave on her own accord. The family was relieved. Example (51) expresses this with an example of a negated mal (an instance of type 8. Dynamic Circumstantial).

(51)  
\begin{align*}
\text{maj}_u, & \quad \text{ba}_j_u \quad \text{w}_a \quad \text{bha}_t_{\text{a}} \quad \text{swomh} _{\text{e}y}{\text{a}}: \\
\text{maj}_u & \quad \text{ba}_j_u \quad \text{w}_a \quad \text{bha}_t_{\text{e}} \quad \text{swomh} _{\text{e}y}{\text{a}}: \\
\text{husband’s.mother} & \quad \text{husband’s.father} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{husband} \quad \text{three-CLF-SP-GEN-EMP}
\end{align*}

“tuphi-nə̃ː \quad \text{puL-e} \quad \text{mə-mal-e-kə} \quad \text{phe}-nə̃ː \quad \text{puik-e}

broom-\text{ERG} \quad \text{sweep-\text{INF}} \quad \text{NEG-need-\text{INF-ASC}} \quad \text{wind-\text{ERG}} \quad \text{blow-\text{INF}}

\begin{align*}
yẽːk-i-na & \quad \text{dhəka} \quad \text{letala} \\
yẽːk-i-na & \quad \text{dhəka} \quad \text{letala}
\end{align*}

take.away-\text{FD-EMP} \quad \text{QT} \quad \text{rejoice-PD}

‘All three of them, the father-in-law, the mother-in-law and the husband rejoiced saying “Without needing to sweep with a broom, the wind blew [her] away.’’ (knew10.07)

However, in order to make it look nice in the eyes of society, it was decided that the father-in-law would accompany her on the long journey home. Early on the second day a crow landed on the roof of the shelter where they were staying and announced that in the forest he had found a water pot full of jewels with a clay pot full of curds on top of it. He wanted to eat the curds, but first someone would have to put the curd pot down where he could get at it. To motivate the necessary help he uttered the curse in (52).

(52)  
\begin{align*}
\text{thw}_a \quad \text{jigu} \quad \text{bha}_e: \quad \text{thumh} _{\text{e}y}{\text{a}}: \quad \text{w}_a _{\text{ya}} \quad \text{dhəub}_{\text{a}j} _{\text{i}} \\
\text{thw}_a \quad \text{ji-gu} \quad \text{bha}_e: \quad \text{thul}-_{\text{mə-hə-si-}} _{\text{nə}} \quad \text{wəL-a}: \quad \text{dhəub}_{\text{a}j} _{\text{i}}
\end{align*}

this \quad \text{I-GEN-AGR} \quad \text{language} \quad \text{understand-ID-NZR-SP-ERG} \quad \text{come-NF} \quad \text{rice.curds}

\begin{align*}
kwe: & \quad \text{təyaməbiu} \quad \text{sa} \quad \text{w}_a _{\text{ya}} \quad \text{ch}y_{\text{ə}}: \quad \text{ta}_j _{\text{ya}} _{\text{a}} \quad \text{si}T _{\text{e-mal}} _{\text{i}} \\
kwe: & \quad \text{tal-a-mə-biL-} \quad \text{sa} \quad \text{w}_a _{\text{ya}} \quad \text{ch}y_{\text{ə}}: \quad \text{ta}_j _{\text{ya}} _{\text{a}} \quad \text{si}T _{\text{e-mal}} _{\text{i}}
\end{align*}

down \quad \text{put-CM-NEG-BEN-ID} \quad \text{if} \quad \text{that-GEN} \quad \text{head} \quad \text{smash-NF} \quad \text{die-\text{INF-may-IMP}}

‘If the one who understands this language of mine does not come and put the rice curds down, may she die by having her head smashed.’ (knew11.10)

Not all volitives are curses. There are blessings and wishes as well. Consider the tale, “Wisdom for the Blind,” a story of a poor, childless blind man to whom Ganesh had offered the fulfill-
ment of any single wish he might make. What should that wish be? His mother insisted that he ask for a son. His wife insisted that he ask for wealth. But his own wish was to be able to see. In example (53) we see the one wish that he came up with.

(53)  
\[ \text{ale thukəthə̃ː bərdan phwənə, “jì: thəxgu he læku:yə} \]
\[ \text{ale thukəthə̃ː bərdan phwən-ə ji-nə̃ː thəx-gu he læku:-yə} \]
then like.this favour beg-PD I-ERG own-AGR EMP palace-GEN

\[ \text{lũ-nə̃ː səL-a-təL-ː-gu cukə-e thəx-mə̃ he kəx-nə̃ː} \]
gold-ERG pave-CM-PF-ID-NZR courtyard-LOC own-AGR EMP son-ERG

\[ \text{lũyagu thæːbhu-e ja nəL-a-cwən-ː-gu swəL-e-daY-e-mal-I} \]
\[ \text{gold-GEN-NZR plate-LOC rice eat-CM-CNT-ID-NZR see-INF-get.to-INF-may-IMP} \]
‘Then he asked for the gift in this way! “May I get the chance to see my own son eating rice from a golden plate in the gold-plated courtyard of my own palace!” ’ (wsdm09.05)

6. Deontic evaluative modality. In this type of modality the need for action is motivated by an evaluation of the facts in the context as illustrated in examples (54) through (63).

(54)  
\[ \text{rajəkumarya nə̃ː wə misa khənaː lwəːwə} \]
\[ \text{rajkumar-ya nə̃ː wə misa khan-a lwəwən} \]
prince-GEN also that woman see-NF be.attracted-ID
‘As for the prince, he also fell deeply in love with that woman.’ (doll07.19)

(55)  
\[ \text{tərə wəya chu dhaye chu dhaye juyacwənə} \]
\[ \text{tərə wə-ya chu dhala-ə chu dhala-e julu-cwən-ə} \]
but that-GEN what say-INF what say-INF become-CM-CNT-PD
‘But he fell into a quandry as to what to say.’ (doll07.20)

(56)  
\[ \text{khuːb gəur yanaː wəː dhala swə pasapî} \]
\[ \text{khuːb gəur yaT-a wə-nəː dhala-ə swəY-I pasa-pî} \]
very ponder do-NF that-ERG say-PD look-IMP friend-PL
‘By thinking deeply he said, “Look friends!” ’ (doll07.21)

(57)  
\[ \text{chipĩː aməthe lwayekhyaye mate} \]
\[ \text{chipĩː amathə lwaT-e-rdp-e mate} \]
you.PL.FAM like.this quarrel-INF-RDP-INF PROH
‘Don’t you quarrel like this!’ (doll07.22)

(58)  
\[ \text{chimisə̃ː thə; thwə misayətə dekətə khənedayekə} \]
\[ \text{chipĩ-sə̃ː thə; thwə misa-yatə dek-e-tə khənedayekə} \]
you.PL.FAM-ERG like this woman-DAT make-INF-PUR noticeably
I-ERG anything do-PC-NZR EMP NEG-exist-ID

‘As for me I may not have done anything significant to create this woman like you did.’ (doll07.23)

(59) athe jusāː tābī nhine nhineː jīː paː cworːaː canheː
the juL-sāː tābī nhine nhineː ji-nōː paː cwor-ːaː canhə-e
like.that be-ID-CNS however every.day I-ERG watch stay-NF night-LOC

chimitə palə̃ːpaː paː cwornte jīː gugu məuka biya
chipi-tə palə̃ːpaː paː cwornt-e jī-nōː gugu məuka biL-a
you.PL.FAM-DAT by.turns watch stay-INF-PUR I-ERG which chance give-PC

uːkīː yanaː thwə misa sriʃtī jula
wə-ki-nōː yaL-aː thwə misa sriʃtī jula
he-INAN-ERG do-NF EMP this woman creation happen-PD

‘Nonetheless by standing guard every day I gave you the opportunity to stand guard at night, and because of that this woman was created.’ (doll07.24)

(60) skīː misayata dekseguliː jigu nōː lhaː məru
skīː misa-yata dek-e-guliː ji-ya-gu nōː lhaː mə-doY-0
so woman-DAT make-INF-in I-GEN-NZR also hand NEG-exist-ID

dhayephai məku
dhaL-e-phəY-i mə-khəY-0
say-INF-able-FD NEG-be-ID

‘So it cannot be said that I had no hand in making this woman.’ (doll07.25)

(61) sītwːaː heyaː kətəməhri dektaː magu jwəlːa:
sītwːaː həL-aː kətəməhri dek-e-tə mal-ː-gu jwəlːa:
piece.of.wood bring-NF doll make-INF-PUR need-ID-NZR materials

talakamhə nōː la ji he khəː
talak-a-mhə nōː la ji he khəY-ː:
prepare-PC-NZR also EMP I EMP be-ID

‘By bringing the piece of wood (mns), I was also the one who prepared the materials needed for making the doll.’ (doll07.26)

(62) hanōː megu chata khōː ji jula chipiː sakəsināː
hanōː me-gu cha-ta khōː ji jula chipiː sakə-si-nōː:
again other-AGR one-CLF matter I TOPIC you.PL every-SP-ERG

honebəneməməhə rajkumar.
honebən-e-malː-ːmhə rajkumar
honor-INF-need-ID-AGR prince

‘Again, one other consideration: as for me, I happen to be a prince whom each of you must honor.’ (doll07.27)
Hale: The modalities of Newār ‘mal’

This type is related to type 2. Epistemic Judgments in that the response elicited is based on a judgment. Examples (64) - (69) taken from “Wisdom for the Blind” is the mother’ speech, urging the blind man to ask for a son.

(64)  kæːməca mədəyekə́ː jhiːpĩː siboleː tarejui məkhu.
  kæː·məca mə-dəY-e-kə jhiː-pĩː sɨT-i-baleː tarejuli mə·khu
  son-child NEG-be-INF-ASC we.INCL-PL die-FD-when be.saved-FD NEG-be-ID
‘Unless there is a son, when we die we will not be saved.’ (wsdm05.03)

(65)  thugu jənmɛː duːkhə juːsãː pərəlwəkɛː bhiniːgu
  thu·gu jənmə-e duːkhə juL-ː-sãː pərəlwək-e bhin-i-gu
  this-AGR birth-LOC trouble happen-ID-CNS next.world-LOC good-FD-NZR

  mənə̃ː tunemaː.
  mən-nə̃ː tun-e-malː:
  mind-ERG wish-INF-need-ID
‘Though we experience the trouble of this birth, we need to concern ourselves with bettering our lot in the world beyond.’ (wsdm05.04)

(66)  kæːməcaː tutiː jəkə thwaːsãː swərgə wəniː dhaigu.
  kæː·məca-nə̃ː tuti-nə̃ː jəkə thwaT-ː-sãː swərgə wən-i dhaL-i-gu
  son-child-ERG foot-ERG only kick-ID-CNS heaven go-FD say-FD-NZR
‘Even if a son only kicks with his foot, it is said that you go to heaven.’ (wsdm05.05)

(67)  akː kæːməca he swərgəya lə̃ pu khəY-ː.
  akː kæː·məca he swərgə-ya lə̃pu khəYː
  so son-child EMP heaven-GEN route be-ID
‘So a male child is the way to heaven.’ (wsdm05.06)

(68)  kæːməca he mədəyekə́ː thəːgu kul nə̃ː thame
  kæː·məca he mə-dəY-e-kə thəː·gu kul nə̃ː thame
  son-child EMP NEG-be-INF-ASC own-AGR lineage also remain

  juiməkhu
  juL-i-mə-khuY-0
  might-FD-NEG-be-ID
‘Without a male child our clan will not remain (will die out)’ (wsdm05.07)
(69) əkĩː kæːməca he phwənemaː
   əkĩː kæːməca he phwən-e-malː
   so son-child EMP beg-INF-must-ID
   ‘Therefore you must request a son.’ (wsdm05.08)

7. Dynamic subject-oriented modality. In this type of modality the focus is on the subject’s internal needs, desires, or dispositions. Example (3) illustrates this type of modality.

(3) mekerə nāː 1 jimitə nhũː nigəː paurlwətːiː maː
    mee-kherə nāː 1 jipĩː-ː nhũː ni-gaː paurwətiː malː-
    other-way nr. 1 we.EXCL-DAT day two-CLF bread need-ID
    ‘On the other hand, [point] number one: we need two loaves of bread every day.’ (law02.01)

An especially good example of this is found in example (70) from “The Great Goat” where mal is used to highlight the younger sister’s inner urge to rebel.

(70) kehẽːmhə dhasa tɔːtː gugu məjiu mətyəː
    kehẽː-mhə dhaːsa təta-nãː gugu mə-jiL-ː mə-teL-ː
    yr.sister-AD TOPIC el.sister-ERG which NEG-be.OK-ID NEG-right-ID
    dhalə wə he yaye mamhoː.
    dhaL-ə wə he yaT-e mal-ː-mhɔ
    say-PD that EMP do-INF have.to-ID-NZR
    ‘Regarding the younger sister, whatever the older sister says is not allowed, not right, the younger sister is one who has to do that very thing.’ (goat04.05)

8. Dynamic circumstantial modality. The focus here is on external circumstances which impact the subject. Example (4) is of this type.

(4) nhyagu jusǎː imitə cwənetə bəː malacwə̃ːgu
    nhyagu juL-ː-sǎː wə-mi-tə cwən-e-tə bəː mal-a-cwən-ː-gu
    anything be-ID-CNS he-PL-DAT stay-INF-PUR shelter need-CM-CNT-ID-NZR
    ‘But whatever the case might be, they were still needing a place to stay.’ (doll2.14)

In (71) we have a situation in which the reported behavior clearly stems from external circumstances and not from internal urges or desires.

(71) punəkhũː məĩːcaya suthɛː bɔhəniː chẽː makwɔ
    punəkhũː maĩːca-ya suthɛː bɔhəniː chẽ-e mal-S-kwɔ
    Punəkhuː Maĩːca-GEN morning evening house-LOC need-SH-much
    jya yanaː nũː nhinɛː dhwɔcwɔleca jəwənemaː
    jya yaT-aː nũː nhinɛː dhwɔcwɔleca jəL-ː-wən-e-malː
    work do-NF also afternoon Great.Goat graze-PUR-go-INF-have.to.ID
    ‘Morning and evening Punəkhuː Maĩːca, having done as much work as was needed in the house, also had to go to take the goat to pasture in the afternoon.’ (goat02.02)
In (70) we got a glimpse of the kind of relationship Punăkhũ: Məĩ:ca had with her younger sister. From that it is clear that the task she had been given of taking the younger sister along when she took the goat to pasture was dictated by external circumstance (type 8 Dynamic Circumstantial), not by internal desire (type 7 Dynamic Subject-Oriented). Thus it is clear that (72) is also a Dynamic Circumstantial.

(72) əkĩː punăkhũː maĩ:caː kehẽ:mhesito bwənayũːke
    əkĩː punăkhũː maĩ:ca-nõː kehẽ:-mho-si-tə bwən-a-yũːk-e
    so Punăkhũː Məĩ:ca-ERG yr.sister-AD-SP-DAT take.along-CM-DIR-INF

he malə.
he mal-ə
EMP  have.to-PD
‘So Punăkhũː Məĩ:ca had to take her younger sister along.’ (goat03.14)

4 Summing up

The semantic contribution that mal makes throughout this entire spectrum of modalities is the sense of necessity. This sense of necessity is compatible with each of the modalities but is not a specific gramaticalized marker of any of them. The form of mal that comes closest to being a specific marker of modality is the imperative form ma which marks the volitive (examples (29), (47), (50), (52) and (53).

For the Epistemic Evidential modalities it is difficult to find instances in which mal is used to focus either on truth claims supported either by eye-witness or by hearsay. Example (6) “I had to be drive out because of what the jackal did” is certainly an eye-witness account, but the reader infer-ences this from context (via a first person subject of a past event). Necessity relates here to the event rather than to the truth claim. Here mal is compatible with eye-witness epistemic modality but it does not mark it as such.

In the hearsay example (12), necessity relates not to truth claims, but to the need the spoiled son has to possess whatever he sets his heart upon. The parenthetical disclaimer (“... all that I know is...”) is what actually identifies this as hearsay. From the examples we have found, mal plays only a marginal role, if any, in marking epistemic evidentials.

For the Epistemic Judgmentals, such as are exemplified in (23) the concept of necessity does play a semantic role. There mal marks an inference as necessary within the context. From the nature of the dowry given in (23) it is necessary to conclude that the giver was rich: “Your mother, who was able to give a golden dog as dowry, must be a very rich person.” The necessity is indeed an epistemic necessity.

For the Deontic Directives, necessity is also central to the role of mal. The transparent case of mal in the role of a direct command is seen in (27) “It must be done quickly.” The father-in-law’s command defines a necessary course of action for the young woman.

For the Deontic Commissives we have a clear instance of the role of necessity in (33) (“[W]e must go to another country.”) The four friends commit themselves to going. Taken in isolation this is a simple commissive. In the context of the discussion in which the facts underlying the necessity are listed, this should also be viewed as a deontic evaluative The friends agree that it is necessary for a number of different reasons. In (46) we have another type of commissive (“Otherwise it might be
that I will have to drop you...”) -- a threat whispered to the king by an elephant for whom necessity was dictated by the desire to avoid being bitten by an ant. In (36) (“If he does not do whatever I say, why should I do whatever he says?”) we have the third type of commissive – a refusal in which the imputation of necessity is rejected.

For the Deontic Volitives necessity is something the subject owns and to which he makes an aggressive response of one sort or another. In (47) it surfaces as a wish (“May that captain ... be hanged”), or in (50) as a curse (“... may that one die this very night ...”).

For Dynamic Subject Oriented modality, necessity describes the subject. In (70) the need is a character trait of the subject (“... whatever the older sister says is not allowed, not right, the younger sister is one who has to do that very thing”).

For Dynamic Circumstantial modality, necessity describes the situation that impinges upon the subject, external circumstances that dictate the subject’s response as in (72) (“So Punokhë: Moï:ca bad to take her younger sister along.”)

This study has attempted to show that mal ‘need, must’ either has or is compatible with a range of modal interpretations nearly spanning the range of modalities outlined in Palmer 1986. It has also highlighted the importance of the surrounding discourse for the interpretation of these modalities. We look forward to parallel studies of other infinitivally linked Newār auxiliaries that have a similar range of modal interpretations such as phay, ‘able, possible’; biL, ‘permit, allow’; and tel, ‘be ready to, be time to’. Among the thirty-odd EAux auxiliaries, there may well be many others which interact with the various modalities in similar ways. The foundations laid by Palmer and Givón have proven very helpful in our interactions with the texts of our Newar corpus.

**Abbreviations used in glossing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>anti-deictic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASA</td>
<td>as soon as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC</td>
<td>associative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>benefactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG.ACT</td>
<td>background activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLF</td>
<td>numeral classifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>concatenation marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNT</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNS</td>
<td>concessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTZR</td>
<td>complementizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>diminutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR</td>
<td>directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTZR</td>
<td>complementizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>emphatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCL</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAM</td>
<td>familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>future conjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD</td>
<td>future disjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>finite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.HON</td>
<td>high honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>imperfective disjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INAN</td>
<td>inanimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCL</td>
<td>inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEF</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF</td>
<td>non-final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRDP</td>
<td>nasalized reduplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZR</td>
<td>nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>past conjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>past disjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROH</td>
<td>prohibitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUR</td>
<td>purposive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>quote complementizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDP</td>
<td>reduplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPT.SP</td>
<td>reported speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSN</td>
<td>reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBD</td>
<td>subordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>short stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>sociative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>specifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOPIC</td>
<td>topic marker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEWAR TEXTS

knew  “kīcito bāe: syu:mha misa,” [The woman who knew the language of the animals], In P. B. Kasā, VS 2023: 12–21.
lata  “khō syu:sā: lata məsyu:sā: lata!” [Whether you know anything or not, you are a fool], In B. P. Shreshța NS 1101: 15–18.
makh makha, [Mother hen], D. Sāymi, VS 2026.
pkd  “newata: swayettə gəntəntə məwəːtə newata: mukti juiməkhu” [Until the autonomous republic of Newars comes, Newars will not be free], K. Prəcəṇɖə, Jhii Swənigəː NS 1123 Gũːlathwə 12 (7 August 2006) page 2.
pups  “khicaya məcatə,” [Children of the dog], In P. B. Kasā, VS 2023: 45–54
strn  “hwəːgə twaːcæː ləː phəyãː əbu chəttĩː məru,” [Catch water in the strainer, father is nowhere], In P. B. Kasā, VS 2023: 66–73.
thrd  swəmhəmhə mənuː, [The third person], K. Situ, NS 1112.
wattr  “lə: məwəːtə: mhyə:ca bi:makhu,” [Daughters are not given to places without running wa-
ter], In B. P. Shreșța NS 1101: 46–48.

References

Hale, Austin and Kedār P. Shrestha. 2006. Newār (Nepal Bhāsā). [Languages of the World/Mater-
ials 256] Muenchen: LINCOM.EUROPA.
Palmer, F. R. 1986. Mood and modality. [Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics] Cambridge: Cam-
bridge University Press.


Austin Hale
austin_hale@sall.com