

UC Santa Barbara

Himalayan Linguistics

Title

The modalities of Newār mal

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1z88v68x>

Journal

Himalayan Linguistics, 10(1)

Author

Hale, Austin

Publication Date

2011

DOI

10.5070/H910123571

Copyright Information

Copyright 2011 by the author(s). This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

himalayan linguistics

A free refereed web journal and archive devoted to the study of the
languages of the Himalayas

Himalayan Linguistics

The modalities of Newār ‘mal’

Austin Hale
SIL Nepal

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

This is a contribution from *Himalayan Linguistics*, Vol. 10(1): 127–150.

ISSN 1544-7502

© 2011. All rights reserved.

This Portable Document Format (PDF) file may not be altered in any way.

Tables of contents, abstracts, and submission guidelines are available at
www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/HimalayanLinguistics

The Modalities of Newār ‘mal’¹

Austin Hale
SIL-Nepal

The Newār versatile verb *mal*² ‘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-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 *khəY* ‘be’ alternate between /t/ (*khət-ə* ‘be-PD’) and /y/ (*khəy-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) *cəkū:cā:* *kɛ:gu:* *ukhē:thukhē:*
 cəkū:-ca-nē: *kɛ:gu:* *ukhē:-thukē:*
 sparrow-DIM-ERG pea thither-hither

<i>hikkə:dəkə</i>	<u><i>malə</i></u>
<i>hikkə:dən-:kə</i>	mal-ə
swarm.in.all.directions-ID-SBD	search-PD
‘The sparrow <u>looked</u> all over for the pea.’ (pea03.01)	

- (2) *wā:* *jukti* *malacwənə*
wə-nā: *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* *nā:* 1) *jimitə* *nhī:* *nigə:* *paurwəti:* *ma:*
 mee-kherə *nā:* 1 *jiṗi:-tə* *nhī:* *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) *nhyagu* *ju:sā:* *imitə* *cwənətə* *bə:* *malacwā:gu*
 nhyagu *juL-:-sā:* *wə-mi-tə* *cwən-e-tə* *bə:* *mal-a-cwən-:-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) *sīkə:mī:* *dhalə* *ki* “*thwəyatə* *nhapalakə* *jī:* *dəyekagu*
sīka:mi-nā: *dhaL-ə* *ki* *thwə-yatə* *nhapalakə* *ji-nā:* *dε:k-a-gu*
 carpenter-ERG say-PD QT this-DAT first.of.all I-ERG make-PC-NZR

əkī: *thwə* *jitə:* *he* *ma:*
əkī: *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.

(5a) *əkī: thwə jītə: he dəye ma:*
əkī: thwə ji-tə he dəY-e mal-:
 so this I-DAT EMP be-INF must.be-ID
 ‘... so this one has to be for me.’

(5b) *əkī: thwə jigu he jui: ma:*
əkī: thwə ji-gu he juL-e mal-:
 so this I.GEN-AGR EMP be-INF must.be-ID
 ‘... so this one has to be mine.’

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) *dhwā lā: yana: chē: pitī:kemalə*
dhwā:-nā: yaT-a: chē-e pitī:k-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)

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 pervasive 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 Punəkhū: Māī:ca 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) *kehē:mhesyā:* *wəya:* “*chā:* *chu* *nəyagu* *hā:* *təta?*
 kehē:~mhə-si-nā: wəL-a: chə-nā: chu nəL-a-gu hā: təta
 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) *jitə:* *nā:* *ti* *re,* *ji* *nā:* *nəye* *pityatə*” *dhalə*
 ji-tə nā: biL-I re ji nā: nəL-e pityaT-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) “*chū:* *mənəya,* *nəyasa* *chā:tə* *bi* *he* *bū:* *nī,*
 chū: mə-nəL-a nəL-a-sa chə-yatə biL-S he biL-e nī
 anything NEG-eat-PC eat-PC-IF you-DAT give-SH EMP give-FC EMP

chā:tə *mədəyekə* *jī:* *jəkə* *nəi* *la*” *dhəka:*
 chə-yatə mə-dəY-e-kə jī-nā: jəkə nəL-a la dhəka:
 you-DAT NEG-exist-INF-ASC I-ERG only eat-PC Q QT

punəkhū: *māī:cā:* *həkələ*
 punəkhū: māīcā:nā: hək-ə
 Punəkhū: Māīca-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 Punəkhū: Māī:ca soothed her.’ (goat04.17)

- (10) *tərə* *kehē:mhə* *pətya:* *məju:*
 tərə kehē:~mhə pətya: mə-juL-:
 but yr.sister-AD belief NEG-happen-ID
 ‘But the younger sister did not believe her.’ (goat04.18)

- (11) *chā:* *nə:gu* *he* *khə:* *ha* *phwalā:* *wəyekə*
 chə-nā: nəL-:gu he khəY-: ha phwalā: wəL-e-kə
 you-ERG eat-ID-NZR EMP be.true-ID steam billow.up come-INF-ASC

nə:gu *jī:* *hū:kənā:nisē:* *khā:* *jitə:* *nā:* *ti,* *nəye*
 nəL-:gu jī-nā: hū:kənā-nā:~nisē: khən-: ji-tə nā: biL-I nəL-
 eat-ID-NZR I-ERG that.far-EMP-from see-ID I-DAT also give-IMP eat-INF

pityatə” *dhəka:* *kehē:mhesyā:* *mikhæ:* *dā:kə*
pityaT-ə *dhəka:* *kehē:-mhə-si-nā:* *mikha-e* *dən:-kə*
 be.hungry-PD QT yr.sister-AD-SP-ERG eye-LOC be.full-ID-ASC

khwəbi *təya:* *khwəkhəna* *sə:* *pikəyahələ*
khwəbi *təl-a:* *khwəkhəna* *sə:* *pikaL-a-həl-ə*
 tears put-NF mournful voice emit-CM-DIR-PD

“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) *əkī:* *əthethəthe* *məsyu:* *təssəkā:* *dhakwəsikwə*
əkī: *əthethəthe* *mə-siL-:* *təssəkā:* *dhaL-S-kwə-siL-S-kwə*
 so that.this.like NEG-know-ID very say.SH-much-know.SH-much

ma:
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, *əkī: əthethəthe məsyu:* ‘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, *hā* ‘RPT.SP’ as exemplified

in (13) through (16).⁴

- (13) *thəthe he ilɛ: belɛ: jhɪsā: jhɪ:gu bhĩ:tuna:*
 thəthe he i:-e belə-e jhi:-nā: jhi:-ya-gu bhĩ:tuna:
 this.like EMP time-LOC time-LOC we.INCL-ERG we.INCL-GEN-NZR well.wishing

dhəyatə:tə:gu gulikhe: khā: nena
 dhəL-a-təL-:-gu gulikhe: khā: nen-a
 say-CM-PF-ID-NZR countless matter hear-PC

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

- (14) *gəthe -- curwəʃ twənə ki kyansər juɪ hā,*
 gəthe curwəʃ twən-ə ki kyansər juL-i hā
 for.example cigarette smoke-PD if cancer happen-FD RPT.SP

curwəʃ twənā: kyansər juiməkhɪ hā
 curwəʃ smoke-a: kyansər juL-i-mə-khəY-0 hā
 cigarette smoke-NF cancer happen-FD-NEG-be.true-ID RPT.SP

‘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) *cini nələ ki kimi dai hā,*
 cini nəL-ə ki kimi dəL-i hā
 sugar eat-PD if intestinal.parasite be.infested-FD RPT.SP

cini: kimi daiməkhɪ hā
 cini-nā: kimi dəL-i-mə-khəY-0 hā
 sugar-ERG intestinal.parasite be.infested-FD-NEG-be.true-ID RPT.SP

‘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) *məca bu:mhə misā: phəsi nəye məjyɪ: hā*
 məca buL-:-mhə misa-nā: phəsi nəL-e mə-jɪL-: hā
 child give.birth-ID-NZR woman-ERG pumpkin eat-INF neg-OK-ID RPT.SP

məca bu:mhə misā: phəsi nəyā: chũ: seni:
 məca buL-:-mhə misa-nā: phəsi nəL-a:-nā: chũ: sen-i
 child give.birth-ID-NZR woman-ERG pumpkin eat-NF-CNS any harm-FD

məkhɪ hā, chu hā chu hā
 mə-khəY-0 hā chu hā chu hā
 NEG-be.true-ID RPT.SP what RPT.SP what RPT.SP

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

- (17) *wāya* *kābita* *bwā:bwā:* *wāya* *kāla:* *nā:*
 wə-ya-gu kəbita bwən-S-bwən-S-nā: wə-ya kəla: nā:
 he-GEN-NZR poetry read-SH-read-SH-BG.ACT he-GEN wife also
- wāyatə* *yɛ:ku:gu* *khə:*
 wə-yatə yɛL-k-i-gu khəY-:
 he-DAT like-K-ID-NZR be-ID
 ‘Reading his poems his wife was [along with other women] also attracted to him.’ (thrd4.05.07)
- (18) *ərtat* *ləbhə* *ya:wə:gu* *khə:*
 artat ləbhə yaT-i-wəL-i-gu khəY-:
 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) *thāū:* *kābita* *wāya* *kāla:mhāsya* *lagi* *elərji:* *juidhū:kələ*
 thāū: kəbita wə-ya kəla:-mhə-si-ya lagi elərji: juL-e-dhū:k-ə
 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) *kābita* *cwāyacwəne* *dhəka:* *da:wəigu* *hā*
 kəbita cwəY-a-cwən-ə dhəka: daL-i-wəL-i-gu hā
 poetry write-CM-CNT-PD QT beat-PUR-come.to-FD-NZR RPT.SP
- thāū:kənhe:*, *kāla:mhə:*
 thāū:kənhe: kəla:-mhə-nā:
 nowadays wife-AD-ERG
 ‘Nowdays it is said his wife comes to beat him, accusing him of writing poetry.’ (thrd4.05.10)
- (21) *əthəwa* *bhwā:* *laka:* *khunabi:gu* *hā*
 əthəwa bhwā: laT-k-a: khūT-a-biL-i-gu hā
 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) *wāya* *kāla:mhəsiya* *bhənai* *du --*
 wə-ya kəla:-mhə-si-ya bhənai dəY-0
 he-GEN wife-AD-SP-GEN opinion exist-ID

kəbitā: *pwa:* *jæ:ke* *məjju:*
kəbita-nē: *pwa:* *jaL-k-e* *mə-juL-:*
 poetry-ERG stomach be.full-K-INF NEG-be.OK-ID

‘His wife was of the opinion, “Poetry is no good for filling [one’s] stomach.” ’ (thrd4.05.12)

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, *hā*, 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 conjuncture that the mother is rich is an inference from the fact that she had given her daughter a golden dog as dowry.

(23) *lūyamhə* *khica* *he* *kwəsə* *biyahəyephumhə* *chimi*
lū-ya-mhə *khica* *he* *kwəsə* *biL-a-həL-e-phəY-0-mhə* *chipī:ya*
 gold-GEN-AGR dog EMP dowry give-CM-bring-INF-able-ID-AGR you.PL-GEN

mā: *la* *sikkə* *he* *tə:mi* *juima:*
mā: *la* *sikkə* *he* *tə:mi* *juL-e-mal-:*
 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) *pū:nā:* “*chu* *dhalə* *cha:sa* *chā:* *nhapalakə* *dəyeku:sā:*
pū:nā: *chu* *dhaL-ə* *dha:sa* *chə-nā:* *nhapalakə* *də:k-:sā:*
 painter-ERG what say-PD topic you-ERG first.of.all make-ID-CNS

lā:puli *chaya:* *mikha* *kā:kamhə* *ji* *əkī:* *jī:* *he*
lā:puli *chaL-a:* *mikha* *kən-k-a-mhə* *ji* *əkī:* *ji-nā:* *he*
 final.coat paint-NF eye open-K-PC-NZR I so I-ERG EMP

byaha *yayama:*
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)

pərəmpərə: *misaya* *widrwəh* *lenawənacwəna,*
pərəmpərə-e *misa-ya* *bidrwəh* *len-a-wən-a-cwən-ə*
 tradition-LOC woman-GEN revolt lag.behind-CM-PROG-CM-CNT-PD

swəbyanacwəna
swəbyaT-a-cwən-ə
 become.undone-CM-PROG-PD

‘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 un-
 done.’ (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 ma: bhagi yaye ma: dhalə bhagiyana*
bhagi yaT-e mal: bhagi yaT-e mal: 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 nā: phutə dhāk nā: mā:tə*
dheba nā: phuY-ə dhāk nā: mə-dəY-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) *kwəmalī juyā: cwəne nā: məchulə*
kwəmalī juL-a: cwən-e nā: 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) *əthe jugulī: a: thənə cwənā: khəi məkhutə*
əthe juL-:gulī: a: thənə cwən-a: 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) *megu he deśe: wənemalə.*
me-gu he de: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 kətā:məhri chəmhə ju:sā: dɛ:kemalə” dhəka:*
thwə-ki-ya kətā:məhri chə-mhə juL-:sā: dɛ:k-e-mal-ə dhəka:
 this-INAN-GEN doll one-CLF be-ID-CNS make-INF-must-PD QT

bica: yana: sītwa: kalə.
bica: yan-a: sītwa: kaL-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) *ipī: chu julə thē:, sitə la ki mwa:ni chəkə:*
wə-pī: chu juL-ə thē: siT-ə la ki mwaT-:ni chə-kə:
 that-PL what happen-PD like die-PD Q or alive-ID-still one-time

swə:wəne malə la dhəyagu jəkə mənɛ:
swəY-:wən-e mal-ə la dhəyagu jəkə mən-e
 look-PUR-go-INF must-PD EMP CTZR just mind-LOC

luyawəyəcwəni:gu

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 *chæ:* ‘why’. The sense of obligation that falls within the scope of that negation is expressed by *mal* ‘must’.

- (36) *jū: dha:the wə̃: məya:sa wə̃: dha:the*
ji-nə̃: dhaL-:the wə-nə̃: mə-yaT-:sa wə-nə̃: dhaL-:the
 I-ERG say-ID-like he-ERG NEG-do-ID-if he-ERG say-ID-like

jū: yaye ma:gu he chæ:?
ji-nə̃: yaT-e mal-:i-gu he chæ:
 I-ERG do-INF must-ID-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 hū: cəkhū: mə:juyatə guhali ya dhəka:
 ... he kisi hū: cəkhū: mə:ju-yatə guhali yaT-I dhəka:
 ... Oh! elephant yonder sparrow lady-DAT help do-IMP QT
- chimi jujuyatə dhəibyū*
chipī:ya juju-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 chə:gu nhə:pəne: duhā: wəna: nyayetelə.*
məkhusa chə-ya-gu nhə:pən-e du-hā: wən-a: 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) *chū: juya: jujū: wə cəkhū: mə:juyatə guhali*
chū: juL-a: juju-nə: wə cəkhū: mə:ju-yatə guhali
 anything happen-NF king-ERG that sparrow lady-DAT help
- məyatə dha:sa wəitə kurkabyu”*
mə-yaT-ə dha:sa 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) *jujuyatə thə:gu mhə: təyedəya: kisiya nhə:təpu:*
juju-yatə thə:gu mhə-e təL-e-dəY-a: kisi-ya nhə:təpu-:
 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 phə phūi sunā swəi!*
wə-ya phə phūi su-nə: swəY-i
 he-GEN pride any-ERG see-FD
 ‘Anyone could see his pride.’ (pea11.02)
- (42) *tərə imu:ragu khyacwə: nena: wə gyatə*
tərə 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) *dhatthē: imulī: wəyatə kwə:thəlabi: la chu thē:*
dhatthē: imu:-nā: wə-yatə kwə:thəl-a-biL-I la chu thē:
 really ant-ERG he-DAT cause.to.fall-CM-BEN-FD EMP what like

dhəka: wəya satu wənə.
dhəka: 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) *wā: tijəkə jujuyatə dhalə "məharajə!*
wə-nā: ti:jəkə juju-yatə dhaL-ə meharajə
 he-ERG carefully king-DAT say-PD "Your Majesty!"
 'He said softly to the King, "Your Majesty!"' (pea11.05)

hū: cəkhū:yatə guhali yanabijyayemalə
hū: cəkhū: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) *məkhusa chə:pintə jigu mhā:*
məkhusa chə:-pī:-tə ji-gu mhə-nā:
 otherwise you.H.HON-PL-DAT I.GEN-AGR body-ERG

kurkachwəyemali:gu julə."
kurk-a-chwəY-ə-mal-i-gu jul-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) *prithwi: narayenā: dəmənə ya:pī: bhaṣa jatiya sə:*
prithwi: narayen-nā: dəmən yaT-i-pī: bhaṣa jati-ya sə:
 Prithwi: Narayen-ERG suppression do-ID-PL language group-GEN voice

parṭi: thwəyekema: dhəka: jimisā: dhəyagu khə:
parṭi: thwəl-k-e-mal-i: dhəka: jipī-sā: dhaL-a-gu khəY-:
 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 mənə:mhə wə kəptanyatə yekhaye*
ji-gu binti mə-nen-:-mhə wə kəptan-yatə 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) *sunanā: wə herama: phenabilə dha:sa*
su-nā:-nā: wə hera-ma: phen-a-biL-ə dha:sa
 anyone-ERG-INDEF that diamond-garland untie-CM-BEN-PD if

wə wəyatə he dāi, wəya dhənā: peripuruṇə jui,
wə wə-yatə he dāY-i wə-ya dhən-nā: pəripuruṇə juL-i
 that that-DAT EMP be-FD that-GEN wealth-ERG brimful be-FD

ji la nayedāi.

ji la nəl-e-dāY-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 bhæ: məthu:pintə chū: khā məru.*
ji-gu bhæ: mə-thuL-:-pī:-tə chū: khā mə-dāY-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) *thuya: nā: phenaməbiumhə hā:ca canhe: he*
thuL-a: nā: phen-a-mə-biL-:-mhə hā:ca canhə-e he
 understand-NF CNS untie-CM-NEG-BEN-ID-NZR tonight night-LOC EMP

chyā: nhe:ku: dāla: si:ma!
 chyā: nhe:ku: dāL-a: siT-e-mal-I
 head seven-piece be.broken-NF die-INF-may-IMP
 ‘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) maju, ba:ju wə bha:tə swəmhesyā:
 maju ba:ju wə bha:te swə-mhə-si-ya-nā:
 husband’s.mother husband’s.father and husband three-CLF-SP-GEN-EMP

“tuphī: puī mwayekə phāsā: puike
 tuphi-nā: puL-e mā-mal-e-kə phe:-nā: puik-e
 broom-ERG sweep-INF NEG-need-INF-ASC wind-ERG blow-INF

yā:ki:nā” dhāka: lē:talə
 yē:k-i-nā dhāka: lē:taL-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)

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) thwə jigu bhæ: thu:mhesyā: wəya: dhəubəji
 thwə ji-gu bhæ: thuL-:-mhə-si-nā: wəL-a: dhəubəji
 this I.GEN-AGR language understand-ID-NZR-SP-ERG come-NF rice.curds

kwe: təyaməbiu sa wəya chyā: təjyana: si:ma!
 kwe: təL-a-mə-biL-: sa wə-ya chyā: təjyaT-a: siT-e-mal-I
 down put-CM-NEG-BEN-ID if that-GEN head smash-NF die-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) *ale thukəthā: bārdan phwəna, “jū: thə:gu he læ:ku:ya*
ale thukəthā: bārdan phwən-ə ji-nā: thə:gu he læ:ku:ya
 then like.this favour beg-PD I-ERG own-AGR EMP palace-GEN
- lū: siyatə:gu cuke: thə:mhə he kayā:*
lū-nā: siL-a-təL-:-gu cukə-e thə:-mhə he kə:-nā:
 gold-ERG pave-CM-PF-ID-NZR courtyard-LOC own-AGR EMP son-ERG
- lūyagu thə:bhui ja nəyacwā:gu swəyedəyema!”*
lū-ya-gu thə:bhu-e ja nəL-a-cwən-:-gu swəL-e-dəY-e-mal-I
 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) *rajəkumarya nā: wə misa khəna: lwə:wā:*
rajkumar-ya nā: wə misa khən-a: lwə:wən-:
 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) *tərə wəya chu dhaye chu dhaye juyacwəna*
tərə wə-ya chu dhaL-e chu dhaL-e juL-a-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) *khu:b gəur yana: wā: dhalə swə pasapī:*
khu:b gəur yaT-a: wə-nā: dhaL-ə swəY-I pasa-pī:
 very ponder do-NF that-ERG say-PD look-IMP friend-PL
 ‘By thinking deeply he said, “Look friends!’ (doll07.21)
- (57) *chipī: aməthe lwayekhyaye məte*
chipī: aməthe lwaT-e-rdp-e məte
 you.PL.FAM like.this quarrel-INF-RDP-INF PROH
 ‘Don’t you quarrel like this!’ (doll07.22)
- (58) *chimisā: thē: thwə misayatə də:ketə khənedəyekə*
chipī:-sā: thē: thwə misa-yatə də:k-e-tə khənedəyekə
 you.PL.FAM-ERG like this woman-DAT make-INF-PUR noticeably

- jū: chū: yanagu la məru*
ji-nə̃ chū: yaT-a-gu la mə-dəY-0
 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)

əthe ju:sā: təbi nhine:nhine: jū: pa: cwəna: canhə:
əthe juL-ɪ-sā: təbi nhine:nhine: ji-nə̃: pa: cwən-a: canhə-e
 like.that be-ID-CNS however every.day I-ERG watch stay-NF night-LOC

chimitə palə:pa: pa: cwənetə jū: gugu māuka biya
chipī-tə palə:pa: pa: cwən-e-tə ji-nə̃: gugu māuka biL-a
 you.PL.FAM-DAT by.turns watch stay-INF-PUR I-ERG which chance give-PC

ukī: yana: he thwə misa sriṣṭi julə
wə-ki-nə̃: yaT-a: he thwə misa sriṣṭi juL-ə
 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)

əkī: misayətə də:keguli: jigu nə̃: lha: məru
əkī: misa-yətə də:k-e-guli: ji-ya-gu nə̃: lha: mə-dəY-0
 so woman-DAT make-INF-in I-GEN-NZR also hand NEG-exist-ID

dhayephəi məkhu
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)

sītwa: həya: kətā:məhri də:ketə ma:gu jwəlā:
sītwa: həL-a: kətā:məhri də:k-e-tə mal-ɪ-gu jwəlā:
 piece.of.wood bring-NF doll make-INF-PUR need-ID-NZR materials

ta:lakamhə nə̃: la ji he khə:
ta:lak-a-mhə nə̃: la ji he khəY-:
 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)

hanə̃: megu chəta khə̃ ji julə chipī: səkəsinə̃:
hanə̃: me-gu chə-ta khə̃ ji julə chipī: səkələ-si-nə̃:
 again other-AGR one-CLF matter I TOPIC you.PL every-SP-ERG

hənebənema:mhə rajkumar.
hənebən-e-mal-ɪ-mhə 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)

- (63) *əkī: thwə misayatə chimisə: jītə: he bi:ma:*
əkī: thwə misa-yatə chipī:-sə: jī-tə he biL-e-mal:
 so this woman-DAT you.PL.FAM-ERG I-DAT EMP give-INF-must-ID
 ‘So you must give me this woman.’ (doll07.28)

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) *kæ:māca mādāyekā: jhi:pī: si:bāle: tærejuī mākhū.*
kæ:māca mādāY-e-kā jhi:pī: siT-i-bāle: tærejuL-i mākHāY-0
 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 jənmə: dukhə jusā: pəralwəkə: bhini:gu*
thu-gu jənmā-e dukhə juL-i-sā: pəralwək-e bhin-i-gu
 this-AGR birth-LOC trouble happen-ID-CNS next.world-LOC good-FD-NZR

mənā: tunema:
mən-nā: tun-e-mal:
 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) *kæ:mācā: tutī: jəkə thwasā: swərgə wəni: dhaigu.*
kæ:māca-nā: tuti-nā: jəkə thwaT-i-sā: 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) *əkī: kæ:māca he swərgəya lāpu khə:*
əkī: kæ:māca he swərgə-ya lāpu khāY:
 so son-child EMP heaven-GEN route be-ID
 ‘So a male child is the way to heaven.’ (wsdm05.06)

- (68) *kæ:māca he mādāyekā: thəgu kul nā: thame*
kæ:māca he mādāY-e-kā: thə:gu kul nā: thame
 son-child EMP NEG-be-INF-ASC own-AGR lineage also remain

juimākhu
juL-i-mākHāY-0
 might-FD-NEG-be-ID

‘Without a male child our clan will not remain (will die out)’ (wsdm05.07)

- (69) *əkī: kə:məca he phwənema:*
əkī: kə:məca he phwən-e-mal-:
 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) *mekherə nā: 1 jimitə nhī: nigə: paurwəʃi: mā:*
mee-kherə nā: 1 jipī:-tə nhī: ni-gə: paurwəʃi: 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)

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) *kehēmhə dha:sa tətā: gugū mājū mətyə:*
kehē:-mhə dha:sa təta-nā: gugū mə-jil-: mə-teL-:
 yr.sister-AD TOPIC el.sister-ERG which NEG-be.OK-ID NEG-right-ID

dhalə wə he yaye mā:mhə.
dhaL-ə wə he yaT-e mal-:-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 ju:sā: imitə cwənətə bæ: malacwə:gu*
nhyagu juL-:-sā: wə-mi-tə cwən-e-tə bæ: mal-a-cwən-:-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) *punəkhū: mǎ:caya suthə: bəhəni: chē: makwə*
punəkhū: mǎ:ca-ya suthə: bəhəni: chē-e mal-S-kwə
 Punəkhū: Mǎ:ca-GEN morning evening house-LOC need-SH-much

jya yana: nā: nhine: dhwəcwəleca jə:wənema:
jya yaT-a: nā: nhine: dhwəcwəleca jəL-:-wən-e-mal-:
 work do-NF also afternoon Great.Goat graze-PUR-go-INF-have.to.ID
 ‘Morning and evening Punəkhū: Mǎ:ca, 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 Punəkhū: 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) *əkī: punəkhū: məi:cā: kehē:mhesitə bwənyā:ke*
 əkī: punəkhū: məi:ca-nə: kehē:mhə-si-tə bwən-a-yā:k-e
 so Punəkhū: Məi:ca-ERG yr.sister-AD-SP-DAT take.along-CM-DIR-INF

he malə.

he mal-ə

EMP have.to-PD

‘So Punəkhū: 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 infers 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 Commissive** 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 Punākḥū: Māĩ.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

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

NEWAR TEXTS

- doll** “kātā:məhri napə byaha,” [Marriage to a doll], In P.B. Kasā, VS 2023: 22–34.
- frog** *bhaktəprədad byā:ya nepa: ca:hila* [Bhakta Prasād Frog’s Nepal tour], K. M. Dixit 1996, translated by Ukesh Bhugu 1999.
- garland** “swəyembərya swā:ma.” [Garland of acceptance]. In Chittadhar Hridaya NS 1090: 45–46.
- goat** “dhō:coleca,” [The Great Goat], In P. B. Kasā, VS 2023: 1–11.
- knew** “kī:citə bhæ: syu:mhə misa,” [The woman who knew the language of the animals], In P. B. Kasā, VS 2023: 12–21.
- lady** “sinhə:pəta mē:ju,” [Tika lady], In P. B. Kasā, VS 2023: 35–39.
- lata** “khə syu:sā: lata məsyu:sā: lata!” [Whether you know anything or not, you are a fool], In B. P. Shrestha NS 1101: 15–18.
- law** “mwayegu lāpu guli nəmbərə:!” [Which section of the law tells how to survive?], In B. P. Shrestha, NS 1101: 51–52.
- makh** *makha*, [Mother hen], D. Sāymi, VS 2026.
- pea** “cəkhū:cayagu tǎgu kə:gu,” [The sparrow’s lost pea], In P. B. Kasā, VS 2023: 89–93.
- pkd** “newa:te: swayettə gəṇətəntərə məwə:təle newa:te: mukti juiməkhū” [Until the autonomous republic of Newars comes, Newars will not be free], K. Prəcəṇḍə, *Jhii Swəniḡə*: NS 1123 Gū:lathwə 12 (7 August 2006) page 2.
- pups** “khicaya məcatə,” [Children of the dog], In P. B. Kasā, VS 2023: 45–54
- strn** “hwə:gā twa:cə: lə: phəyā: əbu chəttī: mərəu,” [Catch water in the strainer, father is nowhere], In P. B. Kasā, VS 2023: 66–73.
- thrd** *swəmhəmhə mānu:*, [The third person], K. Situ, NS 1112.
- tigr** “chūya məca dhū,” [Tiger, child of the mouse], In P. B. Kasā, VS 2023: 100–105.
- watr** “lə: məwə:thæ: mhyæ:ca bi:məkhū,” [Daughters are not given to places without running water], In B. P. Shrestha NS 1101: 46–48.
- wsdm** “kā:yatə gyā:,” [Wisdom for the blind], P. B. Kasā, VS 2023: 61–65.

REFERENCES

- Dixit, Kanak Mani, 1999. *bhaktəprədad byā:ya nepa: ca:hila* [Bhakta Prasād Frog’s Nepal Tour], translated by Ukesh Bhugu. Lalitpur: Rāto Banglā Kitāb
- Givón, T. 1990. *Syntax: A functional-typological introduction*. Volume II. Philadelphia, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Givón, T. 2001. *Syntax: An introduction*. Volumes I-II. Philadelphia, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hale, Austin and Kedār P. Shrestha. 2006. *Newār (Nepal Bhāsā)*. [Languages of the World/Materials 256] Muenchen: LINCOM.EUROPA.
- Hridaya, Chittadhar. NS 1090 *dayəri: bakhā*: [Diary Stories] Kathmandu: Nepal Press.
- Kasā, Premhahādur. VS 2023 [AD 1966–7] *nyākhā bakhā* [Stories Told], Kathmandu: Himañcal Pustak Bhavan.
- Noonan, Michael. 1985. “Complementation”. In: Shopen, Timothy (ed), *Language typology and syntactic description* Vol. 2. 42–140. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Palmer, F. R. 1986. *Mood and modality*. [Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics] Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Palmer, F. R. 2001 (2nd edition). *Mood and modality*. [Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics] Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sāyṃi, Dhūsṃvāṃ. VS 2026 [AD 1969–70] *makba (uṃnyas)* [Mother Hen (a novel)], Kantipur: Ratna Pustak Bhaṅḡhār.

Shreṣṡa, Bhūṣaṅ Prasād, NS 1101 [AD 1980–81] *kukulyā: ku:* [Cock-a-doodle-doo], [Kathmandu] Jya:bəha: Lyæ:mhə Pucə:

Situ, Kedār. NS 1112 [AD 2000–2001] *swəmbəmbə mənū:* [The Third Person] Patan: Kīrti Saphū Kuthi.

Austin Hale
austin_hale@sall.com