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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.
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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 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-ə ‘need-PD’, mal-a ‘need-PC’, mal-e ‘need-INF’. Alternating stems are written with upper case finals:

Stems in L such as bil ‘give’ alternate between /l/ (bil-ə ‘give-PD’) and /y/ (biy-a ‘give-PC’).
Stems in T such as yAT ‘do’ alternate between /t/ (yat-ə ‘do-PD’) and /n/ (yan-a ‘do-PC’).
Stems in Y such as khaY ‘be’ alternate between /t/ (khat-ə ‘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) cəkũːcãː kɛːguː  ukhẽːthukhẽː
cəkũː-ca-nə̃ː	 kɛːguː	 ukhẽː-thukẽː
sparrow-DIM-ERG pea thither-hither
hikkəːdəːkə
hikkəːdən-ː-kə
swarm.in.all.directions-ID-SBD search-PD
‘The sparrow looked all over for the pea.’ (pea03.01)
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 nā: 1) jimitə nhĩː nigaː paurwətəi: maː
mee-kherə nā: 1 jipĩ-tə nhĩː ni-gaː paurwətəi: malaː
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) nhyagu jusāː imitə cwənetə bæː malacwənːgu
nyagu juL-ː-sāː wə-mi-tə cwən-e-tə bæː mal-a-cwənː-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) sīkəːmĩː dhalə ki “thwəyatə nhapalakə jiː: dəyekagu
sīkəmi-nāː dhaL-ə ki thwə-yaːtə nhapalakə ji-nāː de:k-a-gu
carpenter-ERG say-PD QT this-DAT first.of.all I-ERG make-PC-NZR

akī: thwə jitaː he maː
akī: thwə ji-tə he malaː
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 mal in the role of auxiliary. We will refer to the class of auxiliaries that control the infinitival (-e) form of the preceding verb as EAux auxiliaries (Hale and Shrestha 2006: 125 ff.).

3 Mal interacting with the spectrum of modalities

In this section we attempt to exemplify the modalities of mal following the outline given in section (1) above. The lexical content of 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 mal serves explicitly to mark the type.3 We do have epistemic evidentials in which mal occurs, but in these examples, 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.

(6) dhwä lƏ: yana: chē: pitikemalə
dhwä:nä: yaT–aː chē–e pitiːk-e-mal–ə
do-NF house-LOC drive.out-INF-NEED-PD
'I had to be driven out because of what the jackal did.' (knew11.10)

However, saying that (6) is a case of an eye-witness evidential, is not to say that mal here serves to place focus on eye-witness evidence. One can only say that 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, 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—

---

3 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 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.
hold. Thus in (6) *mal* itself marks type 8. **Dynamic Circumstantial** modality.

In the following exchange between Punēkhũː Məĩːca 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) *kehẽmhesyãː* | *wayaː* | “*chãː* | *chu* | *nayagu* | *hãː* | *tãː*?
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
*kehẽ*-mhə-si-nãː | *waL-aː* | *chɑ-nãː* | *chu* | *nãL-a-gu* | *hãː* | *tãː*
year.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) *jitːaː* | *nãː* | *ti* | *re*, | *ji nãː* | *naye* | *pityato”* | *dhalɔ*
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
*ji-tɔ* | *nãː* | *biL-I* | *re* | *ji nãː* | *nãL-e* | *pityaI-ə* | *dhaL-ə*
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) “*chːuː* | *manaya*, | *nayasa* | *chːtɔ* | *bi* | *he* | *biː* | *ni*,
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
*chː* | *ma-naL-a* | *naL-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

you-DAT NEG-exist-INF-ASC I-ERG only eat-PC Q QT

Punékhuː: *maicãː* | *heikala*
Punékhuː: Maicã-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 Punēkhũː: Maicã soothed her.’ (goat04.17)

(10) *tãː* | *kehẽ-mhɔ* | *patyaː* | *majuː*
---|---|---|---
*tãː* | *kehẽ*-mhə | *patyaː* | *ma-juLː*
but year.sister-AD belief NEG-happen-ID

‘But the younger sister did not believe her.’ (goat04.18)

(11) *chː* | *naxgu* | *he* | *kʰɔː* | *ha* | *phwaLaː* | *wayekɔ*
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
*cha-nãː* | *nãL-ː-gu* | *he* | *kʰYː* | *ha* | *phwaL-aː* | *waL-e-ka*
you-ERG eat-ID-NZR EMP be.true-ID steam billow.up come-INF-ASC

*naL-ː-gu* | *ji-nãː* | *hũkɔnãː-nisɛː* | *khɔː* | *jitːaː* | *nãː* | *ti*, | *naye*
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
nal-ː-gu | ji-nãː | hũkɔnãː-nisėː | khɔː | jitaː | nãː | ti | naye
you-ERG eat-ID-NZR I-ERG that.far-EMP-from see-ID I-DAT also give-IMP eat-INF
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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.

Here (12) makes truth claims on the basis of second-hand information. This is suggested by the clause, akī: athethathe masyu: ‘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, hō ‘RPT.SP’ as exemplified
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in (13) through (16).⁴

(13) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>thəthe</th>
<th>he</th>
<th>iele:</th>
<th>bele:</th>
<th>jhīsā:</th>
<th>jhigu</th>
<th>bhītuna:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>this.</td>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>time-LOC</td>
<td>time-LOC</td>
<td>we.INCL-ERG</td>
<td>we.INCL-GEN-NZR</td>
<td>well.wishing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dhāyatātāgū</th>
<th>gulikhe:</th>
<th>khā:</th>
<th>nena</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>say-CM-PF-ID-NZR</td>
<td>countless matter</td>
<td>hear-PC</td>
<td></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) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gathē</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>curwāt</th>
<th>twānā</th>
<th>ki</th>
<th>kyansār</th>
<th>juī</th>
<th>hā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for.example</td>
<td>cigarette</td>
<td>smoke-PD</td>
<td>if</td>
<td>cancer</td>
<td>happen-FD</td>
<td>RPT.SP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>curwāt</th>
<th>twānā:</th>
<th>kyansār</th>
<th>juīma̱khu</th>
<th>hā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cigarette</td>
<td>smoke-NA:</td>
<td>kyansār</td>
<td>juī-\text{i-mā-κhydration-Y-0}</td>
<td>hā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(15) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cinĩ</th>
<th>nālā</th>
<th>ki</th>
<th>kimi</th>
<th>dai</th>
<th>hā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sugar</td>
<td>eat-PD</td>
<td>if</td>
<td>intestinal.parasite</td>
<td>be.infested-FD</td>
<td>RPT.SP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cinĩ-\ñ</th>
<th>kimi</th>
<th>daimakhu</th>
<th>hā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sugar-ERG</td>
<td>intestinal.parasite</td>
<td>be.infested-FD-NEG-be.true-ID</td>
<td>RPT.SP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(16) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mācā</th>
<th>bu̱mha</th>
<th>misā:</th>
<th>phasi</th>
<th>naye</th>
<th>majyu:</th>
<th>hā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>child</td>
<td>give.birth-ID-NZR</td>
<td>woman-ERG</td>
<td>pumpkin</td>
<td>eat-INF</td>
<td>neg-\text{OK-ID-1}$D</td>
<td>RPT.SP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mācā</th>
<th>bu̱mha</th>
<th>misa-\ñ</th>
<th>phasi</th>
<th>nayā:</th>
<th>chū:</th>
<th>seni:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>child</td>
<td>give.birth-ID-NZR</td>
<td>woman-ERG</td>
<td>pumpkin</td>
<td>eat-NF-CNS</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>harm-FD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>makhu</th>
<th>hā,</th>
<th>chū</th>
<th>hā</th>
<th>chū</th>
<th>hā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEG-be.true-ID</td>
<td>RPT.SP</td>
<td>what</td>
<td>RPT.SP</td>
<td>what</td>
<td>RPT.SP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘It is said that it is not good for a woman who has just given birth to a child to eat pumpkin. 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. We don’t know what to believe.’ (lata08.04)

⁴ Hearsay can also be marked by lexical means. Consider the way 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 ʰ故乡∅ ‘RPT.SP’ used as a kind of disclaimer is found in (17) – (22), a discussion highlighting the difference between courtship and marriage.

(17) ʰ故乡∅  kəbita  ʰ故乡∅ŋ:  ʰ故乡∅ŋ:
ʰ故乡∅ŋ-ŋ  kəbita  ʰ故乡∅ŋ-ŋŋ  ʰ故乡∅ŋ:
he-GEN-NZR poetry read-SH-read-SH-BG.ACT he-GEN wife also

‘Reading his poems his wife was [along with other women] also attracted to him.’ (thrd4.05.07)

(18) ʰ故乡∅ŋ  ləbho  ʰ故乡∅ŋ:
ʰ故乡∅ŋ-ŋ  yaTː-wəLː-ŋ  ʰ故乡∅ŋ:
that.is.to say  love  do-PUR-come-ID-NZR be-ID
‘That is to say, she grew to love him.’ (thrd4.05.08)

(19) ʰ故乡∅ŋ  kəbita  ʰ故乡∅ŋ:
ʰ故乡∅ŋ-ŋ  wə-ya  ʰ故乡∅ŋ-ŋŋ  ʰ故乡∅ŋ:
thəũː  kəbita  wə-ya  ʰ故乡∅ŋ-ŋŋ  ʰ故乡∅ŋ:
today poetry he-GEN wife-AD-SP-GEN for allergy be-INF-finish-PD
‘Today his wife is allergic to his poetry.’ (thrd4.05.09)

(20) ʰ故乡∅ŋ  cwəyacwəne  ʰ故乡∅ŋ:
ʰ故乡∅ŋ-ŋ  dhəkaː  ʰ故乡∅ŋ:
kəbita  cwəY-a-cwən-ə  dhəkaː  ʰ故乡∅ŋ-ŋŋ  ʰ故乡∅ŋ:
poetry write-CM-CNT-PD QT beat-PUR-come.to-FD-NZR RPT.SP

‘Nowadays it is said his wife comes to beat him, accusing him of writing poetry.’ (thrd4.05.10)

(21) ʰ故乡∅ŋ  bhwāː  ləkːaː  ʰ故乡∅ŋ:
ʰ故乡∅ŋ-ŋ  laTː-k-ːaː  ʰ故乡∅ŋ-ŋŋ  ʰ故乡∅ŋ:
ʰ故乡∅ŋ-ŋ 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) ʰ故乡∅ŋː  kəlamhsiyːa  ʰ故乡∅ŋ:
ʰ故乡∅ŋ-ŋ  bhanai  ʰ故乡∅ŋ:
ʰ故乡∅ŋ-ŋ wə-ya  ʰ故乡∅ŋ-ŋŋ  ʰ故乡∅ŋ:
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.

_example (23)_

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{lũyamhə} & \text{khica} & \text{he} & \text{kwəsə} & \text{biyahayephumhə} & \text{chimi} \\
\text{lũ}-\text{ya-mhə} & \text{khica} & \text{he} & \text{kwəsə} & \text{biL-a-həL-e-phəY-0-mhə} & \text{chipi-yə} \\
\text{gold-GEN-AGR} & \text{dog} & \text{EMP} & \text{dowry} & \text{give-CM-bring-INF-able-ID-AGR} & \text{you.PL-GEN} \\
\text{mãː} & \text{la} & \text{sikkə} & \text{he} & \text{təːmi} & \text{juimaː} \\
\text{mãː} & \text{la} & \text{sikkə} & \text{he} & \text{təːmi} & \text{juL-e-mal-ː} \\
\text{mother} & \text{EMP} & \text{very} & \text{EMP} & \text{rich.person} & \text{be-INF-must-ID} \\
\text{‘Your mother, who was able to give a golden dog as dowry, must be a very rich person.’} \\
\text{(pups07.33)}
\end{array}
\]

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).

_example (24)_

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllll}
\text{pũː-nā} & \text{“chu} & \text{dhaL-ə} & \text{chasa} & \text{chəː} & \text{nhapalaka} & \text{dayekwsəː} \\
\text{pũː-nā} & \text{chu} & \text{dhaL-ə} & \text{dhasa} & \text{chə-nəː} & \text{nhapalaka} & \text{de:k-səː} \\
\text{painter-ERG} & \text{what} & \text{say-PD} & \text{topic} & \text{you-ERG} & \text{first.of.all} & \text{make-ID-CNS} \\
\text{lə̃ːpuli} & \text{chayaː} & \text{mikha} & \text{kə̃ːkamhə} & \text{ji} & \text{akiː} & \text{jiː} & \text{he} \\
\text{lə̃ːpuli} & \text{chə-nəː} & \text{mikha} & \text{kan-k-a-mhə} & \text{ji} & \text{akiː} & \text{ji-nəː} & \text{he} \\
\text{final.coat} & \text{paint-NF} & \text{eye} & \text{open-K-PC-NZR} & \text{I} & \text{so} & \text{I-ERG} & \text{EMP} \\
\text{byaha} & \text{yaT-e-mal-ː} \\
\text{byaha} & \text{yaT-e-mal-ː} \\
\text{marriage} & \text{do-INF-must.be-ID} \\
\text{‘The painter said, “No matter what you say, even though you were the first to make her, I was the one who applied the final coat and opened her eyes, so I must be the one to marry her.”’} \\
\text{(doll07.08)}
\end{array}
\]
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 *dai* 'will be'.

(25) `mə̃ːli suikaləː nhecilaː dhalə
ana-nə̃ː-li suikə:nə̃ː nhecil-aː dhal-a
there-ERG-after tailor-ERG go.forward-NF say-PD
‘Then the tailor stepped up and spoke,’ (doll07.09)

(26) wə̃ː dhalə ki chimisə̃ː dəyekaː mikhə kə̃kwsə̃ː
wə-nə̃ː dhal-a ki chipi:sə̃ː dek-aː mikh-a kə:k-wəsə:
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) yakənə̃ː yayemalə
yakənəː yəT-e-mal-ə
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) “makha halə dhayewə pikhaləkhu təya:
makha hal-a dhaL-e-wə pikhaləkhu-e təL-a:
mother.hen cry.out-PD say-INF-ASA yard.entrance-LOC put-NF

pedə̃ːkə pal-e-mal-ː dhaL-a-təL-ː-gu samaj-ya
one.stroke-ASC behead-INF-must-ID say-CM-PF-ID-NZR society-GEN
Hale: The modalities of Newār ‘mal’

‘In a society where it is a tradition to say, “When a mother hen crows she must be slaughtered outside the compound gate,” the women’s revolution lags behind, becomes undone.’ (makh1.000.006)

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 bhagiyaTana
bhagi yaT-e malː bhagi yaT-e malː dhal-a bhagiyaTa
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 phutə dhāk nəː máːtə
dheba nəː phuY-a dhāk nəː ma-daY-a
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 məchuə
kwəmali juL-aː cwən-e nəː ma-chuL-a
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) athe jugulĩː aː thənə cwənãː khəi məkhuta
athe juL-ː-gulĩː aː thən-a cwən-aː khəY-i ma-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) megu he deːʃə wənemalo.
me-gu he de-e wən-e-mal-a
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 kətáməhri chəmhə jusāː dɛkemala” dhəka:
thwə-ki-ya kətáməhri cha-mhə juL-ː-sāː de:k-e-mal-ə dhəka:
this-INAN-GEN doll one-CLF be-1D-CNS make-INF-must-PD QT

bicaː yanaː sɨtwaː kalo.
bicaː yan-aː sɨtwaː kəL-ə
thought do-NF 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 juL-ə thẽː, siT-ə la ki mwaŋi chəkəː
wə-pĩː chu juL-ə thẽː siT-ə la ki mwaTː-ni chə-kəː
that-PL what happen-PD like die-PD Q or alive-1D-still one-time

swəwəne malə la dhəyagu jəkə mənɛː
swəY-ː-wən-e mal-ə la dhəyagu jəkə mən-e
look-PUR-go-INF must-PD EMP CTZR just mind-LOC

luyawayacwənįgu
lul-a-wəL-a-cwən-i-gu
rise-CM-com-e-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 məyaːsa wəː dhaːthe
ji-nəː dhaLː-the wə-nəː mə-yaTː-sə wə-nəː dhaLː-the
I-ERG say-1D-like he-ERG NEG-do-1D-if he-ERG say-1D-like

jiː yaye magu he chæː?
ji-nəː yaT-e mal:i-gu he chæː
I-ERG do-1INF 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 hũː cəkhũː mejuyatə guhali ya dhəkaː
. . . he kisi hũː cəkhũː meju-yatə guhali yaT-I dhəkaː
. . . Oh! elephant yonder sparrow lady-DAT help do-IMP QT

chimi juyuyata dhəibyuu
chipi-ya juyu yatə 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 ch̖̃ːgu nhæːpənɛː duhãː wənaː nyayetelə.
məkhusa cha-ya-gu nhæp-en-e du-hãː wən-aː nyəT-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 mejuyatə guhali
chũː jL-aː jju-nə̃ː wə cəkhũː meju-yatə guhali
anything happen-NF king-ERG that sparrow lady-DAT help

məyatə dhasa wəi̇ta kurkabyu
ma-yaT-ə dhasa wə-yatə kurk-a-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) juyuyata thəːgu mheː tayeyayə: kisiya nhætəpu:
juyu-yatə thə-gu mha-e tL-e-daY-a: kisi-ya nhætəpu:
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) waYa pĥ̃̕ phũi sunũ swəi!
wə-ya phϕ phuí su-nũ: swəY-i
he-GEN pride any-ERG see-FD
‘Anyone could see his pride.’ (pea11.02)

(42) təɾə imuyagu khyacwaː nenaː wə gyatə
təɾə imu-ya-gu khyacwə: nen-a: 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)
(43) dhatthẽː imulĩː wəyatə kwəːthəlabiː la chu thẽː
dhatthẽː imuː-ŋ∅ wə-ya-tə kwəː-thəl-a-biL-I la chu thẽː
really ant-ERG he-DAT cause.to.fall-CM-BEN-FD EMP what like

dhokaː woya satu wənə.
dhokaː wə-ya satu wən-ə
QT he-GEN one’s.wits go-PD
‘Thinking that the ant would actually cause him to fall, he was frightened out of his wits.’
(pea11.04)

(44) wəː tiʃəkə jjujuyatə dhalə “məharajə!”
wə-nəː tiʃəkə juju-yatə dhaL-ə meharajə
he-ERG carefully king-DAT say-PD “Your Majesty!”
‘He said softly to the King, “Your Majesty!” ’ (pea11.05)

hũː cəkhũːyatə guhali yanabijyayemalə
hũː cəkhũː-yatə guhali yaT-a-bijyaT-e-mal-ə
yonder sparrow-DAT help do-CM-go.H.HON-INF-must-PD
‘That sparrow over yonder – you have to go help her!’ (pea11.06)

(45) makhusa chəːpintə jigu mhō:
makhusa chaː-piː-tə ji-gu mhə-nəː
otherwise you.H.HON-PL-DAT I.GEN-AGR body-ERG

kurkachwayemaliːgu jula.”
kurk-a-chwaY-ə-mal-i-gu juli-ə
drop-CM-send-INF-have.to-FD-NZR might.be-PD
‘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:

(46) prithwiː narayeŋəː damana yapũ bhaṣa jatiya ss:
prithwiː narayeŋ-nəː daman yaT-ː-pũ bhaṣa jati-ya ss:
Prithwi: Narayen-ERG suppression do-ID-PL language group-GEN voice

parṭiː thwɔyekemaː dhokaː jimisũː dhayagu khɔ:
parṭiː thwɔl-k-e-malː dhokaː jipisũː dhal-a-gu khɔYa:
party resound-K-INF-need-ID QT we.EXCL-ERG say-PC-NZR be-ID
‘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 manytmbha wo kaptanyata yekhay
ji-gu binti ma-nen-mhə wo kaptan-yata yekhaT-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) sunanə̃ː wə heramaː phenabilə dhasa
su-nə̃ː-nə̃ː wə hera-maː phen-a-bIL-ə dhasa
anyone-ERG-INDEF that diamond-garland untie-CM-BEN-PD if

wo wayata he dəi, wəya dhanəː peripurnə jui,
wo wə-yata he dəY-i wo-ya dhan-nəː periμu̇nə Giul-i
that that-DAT EMP be-FD that-GEN wealth-ERG brimful be-FD

ji la nøyedəi.
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 bhaː mathiupinta chū: khō maru.
ji-gu bhaː ma-thuL-ː-piː-tə chū: khō 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) thuyaː nōː phenaməbiunmtə hōxa canheː he
thuL-aː nōː phen-a-ma-bIL-ː-mhə hōxa canho-e he
understand-NF CNS untie-CM-NEG-BEN-ID-NZR tonight night-LOC EMP
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) *maju, baːju wə bhaːte swə-mhə-si-ya-nəː*  
*husband’s.mother husband’s.father and husband three-CLF-SP-GEN-EMP*  
“tuphi-nəː puL-e mə-mal-e-kə phɛː-nəː puik-e*  
broom-ERG sweep-INF NEG-need-INF-ASC wind-ERG blow-INF  
yẽːk-i-nə dhəkaː leːtaL-ə*  
take.away-FD-EMP QT 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)
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)  

\[ \text{Hale: The modalities of Newār ‘mal’} \]

\[ \text{ale thukathō: bardan phwōna, “jī: thāxgu he lækw:ya} \]

then like.this favour beg-\text{PD} \ I-\text{ERG own-\text{AGR} EMP palace-\text{GEN}}

\[ \text{lū: siyatxgu cuke: thəmho he kāyō:} \]

\[ \text{lū-nō: siL-a-tōL:-gu cuk-a-e thā:-mhə he kə:-nō:} \]

gold-\text{ERG pave-\text{CM-PF-ID-NZR courtyard-\text{LOC} own-\text{AGR} EMP son-\text{ERG}}}

\[ \text{lūyagu thāxbhui ja nayacwōgu sẘyedəyemal!”} \]

\[ \text{lū-ya-gu thāx-bhu-e ja nəL-a-cwən-ː-gu swəL-e-daL-e-mal-I} \]

‘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)  

\[ \text{rajkumaryə nō: wə misa khōna: lwəwō:} \]

\[ \text{rajkumar-ya nō: wə misa khan-a: lwəwən-ː} \]

prince-\text{GEN} also that woman see-\text{NF be.attracted-ID}

‘As for the prince, he also fell deeply in love with that woman.’ (doll07.19)

(55)  

\[ \text{tərə wəya chu dhyəe chu dhyəe juyacwənə} \]

\[ \text{tərə wə-ya chu dhaL-e chu dhaL-e juL-a-cwən-ə} \]

but that-\text{GEN what say-\text{INF what say-\text{INF become-CM-CNT-PD}}}

‘But he fell into a quandry as to what to say.’ (doll07.20)

(56)  

\[ \text{khuːb gōur yana: wō: dhaɿə swə pasapí:} \]

\[ \text{khuːb gōur yaɿ-a: wə-nō: dhaL-ə swə\text{Y}-I pasa-pī} \]

very ponder do-\text{NF that-\text{ERG say-\text{PD look-\text{IMP friend-\text{PL}}}}}

‘By thinking deeply he said, “Look friends!” ’ (doll07.21)

(57)  

\[ \text{chipiː amlə the lwayekhyaye mate} \]

\[ \text{chipiː amlə lwaɿ-t-e-rdp-e mate} \]

you.PL.FAM like.this quarrel-\text{INF-RDP-INF PROH}

‘Don’t you quarrel like this!’ (doll07.22)

(58)  

\[ \text{chimisō: thē: thwə misayata deketa khōnedəyekə} \]

\[ \text{chipiː-sō: thē: thwə misa-yata dek-e-tə khōnedəyekə} \]

you.PL.FAM-\text{ERG like this woman-DAT make-\text{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 tabi nhinə̃nhecnyː jĩː paː cwənəː canhec
athe jilː-ːsāː tabi nhinə̃nhecnyː ji-nōː paː cwən-ːa canhə-ː
like.that be-ID-CNS however every.day I-ERG watch stay-NF night-LOC

chimite połaːpaː paː cwəneta jĩː gugu məuka biyə
chipiːtə połaːpaː paː cwn-e-tə ji-nōː gugu məuka bIL-ːa
you.PL.FAM-DAT by.turns watch stay-INF-PUR I-ERG which chance give-PC

u:kīː yanəː thwa misa sriʃti jula
wə-ki-nōː yaT-ːaː thwə misa sriʃti jilː-ː
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 misa-yaːtə dek-e-guliː jiga nōː l̕aː məru
skīː misa-yatə dek-e-guliː ji-ya-gu nōː l̕aː mə-doY-ː0
so woman-DAT make-INF-in I-GEN-NZR also hand NEG-exist-ID

dhayep̕hai məku
dhaL-e-phəY-i mə-kəY-ː0
say-INF-able-FD NEG-be-ID
‘So it cannot be said that I had no hand in making this woman.’ (doll07.25)

(61) sîtwəː həyaː kətāːməhrə dekəta magu jwələː
sitwaː həL-ːaː kətāːməhrə dek-e-tə mal-ː-gu jwəlːəː
piece.of.wood bring-NF doll make-INF-PUR need-ID-NZR materials

taːlakamha nōː la ji he khaː
taːlak-a-mhə nōː la ji he khaY-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 chaːta kəː ji jula chipiː səkəsənōː
canone meg-ːu cha-ta kəː ji jula chipiː səkəla-ːsi-nōː
again other-AGR one-CLF matter I TOPIC you.PL every-SP-ERG

honebəneməm̑ɛnəː 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)
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’s speech, urging the blind man to ask for a son.

(64)  
\[ \text{kæːməca mədəyekə̃ː jhiːpĩː siːbəlɛː tərejui məkhu.} \]  
\[ \text{kæː-məca mə-dəY-e-kə jhiː-pĩː siT-i-bəlɛː tərejuL-i mə-khəY-0} \]  
son-child \(\text{NEG-be-INF-ASC}\) 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)  
\[ \text{thugu jənmɛː duːkhə juːsãː pərəlwəkɛː bhiniːgu} \]  
\[ \text{thu-gu jənmə-e duːkhə jul-ː-sãː pərəlwək-e bhin-i-gu} \]  
this-AGR birth-LOC trouble happen-ID-CNS next.world-LOC good-FD-NZR  
\[ \text{mən-nə̃ː tun-e-mal-ː} \]  
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)  
\[ \text{kæːməcãː tutĩː jəkə thwaːsãː swərgə wəniː dhaigu.} \]  
\[ \text{kæː-məca-nə̃ː tuti-nə̃ː jəkə thwaT-ː-sãː swərgə wən-i dhaL-i-gu} \]  
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)  
\[ \text{əkĩː kæːməca he swərgəya lə̃ pu khəː.} \]  
\[ \text{əkĩː kæː-məca he swərgə-ya lə̃pu khəY-ː} \]  
so son-child EMP heaven-GEN route be-ID  
‘So a male child is the way to heaven.’ (wsdm05.06)  

(68)  
\[ \text{kæːməca he mədəyekãː thəːgu kul nəː thame} \]  
\[ \text{kæː-məca he mə-dəY-e-kãː thəː-gu kul nəː thame} \]  
son-child EMP NEG-be-INF-ASC own-AGR lineage also remain  
\[ \text{juiməkhu} \]  
\[ \text{juL-i-mə-khəY-0} \]  
might-FD-NEG-be-ID  
‘Without a male child our clan will not remain (will die out)’ (wsdm05.07)
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) mekherə nā: 1) jimitə nhũː nigaː paurwətīː maː;
  mee-kherə nā: 1 jipī-tə nhũː ni-gaː paurwətī: maː-
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 tətãː gugu məjiu mətyəː
  kehẽː-mhə dhasa təta-nãː gugu mə-jiL-ː ma-teL-ː
yr.sister-AD TOPIC el.sister-ERG which NEG-be.OK-ID NEG-right-ID
  dhaL-ə wə he yaT-e mal-ː-mhə;
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 jusāː iimitə cwnetə bəː malacwə̃ːgu
  nhyagu juL-ː-sāː wə-mi-tə cwn-e-tə bəː mal-a-cwn-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) punākhuː maǐcaya suthēː bəhəniː chēː makwə
  punākhũ: maǐca-ya suthē: bəhəni: chē-e mal-S-kwə
Punakhũ: Maǐca-GEN morning evening house-LOC need-SH-much
  jya yanaː nāː nhineː dhwəcwəleca jəwənemaː;
  jya yaT-aː nāː nhineː dhwəcwəleca jəL-ː-wən-e-mal-ː;
work do-INF also afternoon Great.Goat graze-PUR-go-INF-have.to.ID
‘Morning and evening Punakhu: Maǐca, 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 Punəkhũ: Məi: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) əkũː punəkhũː məĩːcãː kehẽ mhë-ši-tə bwayneỹːke
akũː punəkhũː məĩːca-nôː kehẽ-mhə-si-tə bwayne-a-yãːk-e
so Punəkhũ: Məi:ca-ERG yr.sister-AD-SP-DAT take.along-CM-DIR-INF

he malə.
he mal-ə
EMP have.to-PD
‘So Punəkhũ: Məi: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 grammaticalized 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 inferences 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) (“[We] 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 Punokhū: Maishi ca had 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>Meaning</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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>future conjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEWAR TEXTS

knew “kīːciː toxː buː miːsə,” [The woman who knew the language of the animals], In P. B. Kasā, VS 2023: 12–21.
lata “khō syuːsə: lata məsYuːsə: lata!” [Whether you know anything or not, you are a fool], In B. P. Shrestha NS 1101: 15–18.
makh makha, [Mother hen], D. Sāymi, VS 2026.
pea “cəkhuːcayagu təː gu kɛːgu,” [The sparrow’s lost pea], In P. B. Kasā, VS 2023: 89–93.
pkd “newaːteː swayettə gəːntərə məwəːtə məwəːtə newaːteː mukti juiməkhu” [Until the autonomous republic of Newars comes, Newars will not be free], K. Prəcəɳɖə, 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 abu chəːtĩː məru,” [Catch water in the strainer, father is nowhere], In P. B. Kasā, VS 2023: 66–73.
thrd swəməməhə mənuː, [The third person], K. Situ, NS 1112.
watr “ləː məwəːthæː mhyæːca biːməkhu,” [Daughters are not given to places without running water], In B. P. Shreṣṭha NS 1101: 46–48.
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