*On Clusivity: Typology and Case studies of the inclusive-exclusive distinction ed. by Elena Filimonova*

*Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins*

# The inclusive–exclusive distinction in Tibeto-Burman languages

Randy J. LaPolla

La Trobe University

A survey of 170 Tibeto-Burman languages showed 69 with a distinction between inclusive and exclusive first-person plural pronouns, 18 of which also show inclusive–exclusive in 1dual. Only the Kiranti languages and some Chin languages have inclusive–exclusive in the person marking. Of the forms of the pronouns involved in the inclusive–exclusive opposition, usually the exclusive form is less marked and historically prior to the inclusive form, and we find the distinction cannot be reconstructed to Proto-Tibeto-Burman or to mid level groupings. Only the Kiranti group has marking of the distinction that can be reconstructed to the proto level, and this is also reflected in the person-marking system.

## 0. Overview

Tibeto-Burman is one of the two branches of the Sino-Tibetan stock, the other being the Sinitic languages (the Chinese dialects). The Tibeto-Burman languages are found as far east as Hunan Province in central China, as far west as Kashmir, as far north as Qinghai Province in China (north of Tibet), and as far south as southern Burma. From a survey of data from 170 Tibeto-Burman languages and dialects for which there is reliable data on pronoun systems, it is found that sixty-nine of the languages and dialects in the database show a distinction between inclusive and exclusive first-person plural pronouns. The languages that have such a distinction are scattered throughout most of the branches of Tibeto-Burman except for the Karen branch and certain branches in contiguous parts of Northeastern India, Northern Burma, and Southwestern China: Bodo, Idu-Taraon, Kaman, Jinghpaw, and Tani.[1] In looking at the forms of the pronouns involved in the inclusive–exclusive opposition in those languages that have it, we find that except for in the Kiranti group, usually the exclusive form is more basic (simply based on the 1sg form plus plural marking) and historically prior to the inclusive form, and also find that the distinction cannot be reconstructed to Proto-Tibeto-Burman or even to mid level groupings; the only pronouns that can be reconstructed to Proto-Tibeto-Burman are 1sg *ŋa and 2sg *na(ŋ) (Benedict 1972).[2] There are not even plural forms that reconstruct to the earliest proto-language.[3] The inclusive–exclusive distinction is then an

innovation in each of the groups that shows it, and often within one group there are multiple innovations. Of the languages with the inclusive–exclusive distinction in 1pl, thirty-nine also have dual marking, and of these, eighteen languages show an inclusive–exclusive distinction in 1dl as well. Forty-one of the languages that have a 1pl inclusive–exclusive distinction also have pronominal marking on the verb, but only the Kiranti languages and some Chin languages show an inclusive–exclusive distinction in the person marking. Among languages with pronominal prefixes on nouns to show possession, while some make a dual and plural distinction, only a few show an inclusive–exclusive distinction (e.g. Belhare, Tiddim Chin, Caodeng rGyalrong), and a number distinction is rare.

We will take a look at the forms found in those languages that exhibit the inclusive–exclusive distinction group by group to see what generalizations we might be able to draw.

## 1. Qiangic and rGyalrong

Within the Qiangic branch, a group of languages in western Sichuan Province and Northern Yunnan Province of China, Daofu, Lyusu (both from Dai et al. 1991), Prinmi (Ding 2003), and Northern Qiang (LaPolla 2003b) do not have the inclusive–exclusive opposition, and in Taoping Qiang (a Southern dialect; H. Sun 1981) the 1de and 1pe forms are based on a form of the 1sg pronoun (which derives from the Proto-Tibeto-Burman 1sg pronoun (*$\eta a$)) plus the usual dual or plural marker for that language, whereas the 1di and 1pi forms are based on an innovative form of unknown provenience (-$\eta$ in the dual forms is said to derive from $ni^{55}$ 'two'; Liu 1987). The same is true for Guiqiong, Ersu (both from H. Sun 1985a), Tuanjie Zhaba (Lu 1985), Namuzi, Shixing, Queyu, and Muya (all four from Dai et al. 1991) as well. In Tangut (Gong 2003) there is a set of 1pl pronouns that makes the inclusive–exclusive distinction (given below), but also an alternative form, $\eta a^2 nji\ddot{i}^2$, that does not make the distinction (i.e. can be used for inclusive or exclusive). In Queyu the form of the dual is not based on a form of the word for 'two' ($ni^{55}$), as in Guiqiong and Muya, but seems to be a form very similar to the rGyalrong form of the dual (see below).[4] In Zatuo Zhaba (Dai et al. 1991) the inclusive–exclusive distinction is marked in the plural by a difference in the vowel and tone of the pronoun. The dual, which has the vowel of the inclusive plural pronoun but the tone of the exclusive plural pronoun, plus the number 'two', does not make the inclusive–exclusive distinction. The forms are given in Table 1.[5]

It can be seen from the forms in Table 1 that the innovative forms do not represent a single innovation, but represent several independent innovations within the Qiangic branch. The dual and plural markers also represent several innovations within the group (but see n. 4).

Table 1. Qiangic

|  | 1sg | 1dl-incl. | 1dl-excl. | 1pl-incl. | 1pl-excl. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Taoping Qiang | $\eta a^{55}$ | $tsu\eta^{13}$-$tf_1^{13}$ | $qa\eta^{13}$-$tf_1^{33}$ | $tsu\partial^{31}$-$thja^{55}$ | $qa^{31}$-$thja^{55}$ |
| Namuzi[a] | $\eta a^{55}$ | $a^{33}$-$ku^{31}$ | $\eta a^{55}$-$ku^{31}$ | $a^{33}$-$\chi uo^{31}$ | $\eta a^{55}$-$\chi uo^{31}$ |
| Shixing | $\eta^{55}$ | $fi\tilde{o}^{33}$-$ts\gamma^{55}$ | $\eta a^{55}$-$ts\gamma^{55}$ | $fi\tilde{o}^{33}$-$\iota\tilde{\varepsilon}^{55}$ | $\eta a^{55}$-$\iota\tilde{\varepsilon}^{55}$ |
| Guiqiong | $\eta\partial^{35}$ | $dzu^{55}$-$\eta i^{33}$-$pi^{53}$ | $\eta\partial^{35}$-$\eta i^{33}$-$pi^{53}$ | $dzu^{55}$-$zi^{55}$ | $\eta\partial^{55}$-$zi^{55}$ |
| Ersu | $a^{55}$ | $jo^{55}$-$dzi^{55}$ | $a^{55}$-$dzi^{55}$ | $jo^{55}$-$r\gamma^{55}$ | $a^{55}$-$r\gamma^{55}$ |
| Tuanjie Zhaba | $\eta a^{35}$ | $fi\tilde{a}^{35}$-$tse^{53}$ | $\eta a^{35}$-$tse^{53}$ | $fi\tilde{a}^{35}$-$\eta e^{55}$ | $\eta a^{35}$-$\eta e^{55}$ |
| Muya | $\eta\partial^{53}$ | $je^{33}$-$ni^{53}$-$n\partial^{33}$ | $\eta\partial^{33}$-$ni^{53}$-$n\partial^{33}$ | $je^{33}$-$n\partial^{53}$ | $\eta\partial^{33}$-$n\partial^{53}$ |
| Queyu | $\eta a^{13}$ | $a^{55}$-$ndze$ | $\eta a^{13}$-($\eta a^{55}$)-$ndze$ | $a^{55}$-$n\partial$ | $\eta a^{13}$-($\eta a^{55}$)-$n\partial$ |
| Tangut | $\eta a^2$ | $nja^2$ | – | $gja^2$-$mji^2$ | $gji^2$-$mji^2$ |
| Zatuo Zhaba | $\eta a^{13}$ | $\eta\varepsilon^{55}$-$\eta\varepsilon^{33}$ | – | $\eta\varepsilon^{13}$ | $\eta\varepsilon^{55}$ |

[a] All of the dual forms in Namuzi can optionally take $\eta\eta i^{55}$-$ku^{31}$ [two-classifier]. It seems the form $ku^{31}$ in the dual forms is the default noun classifier, or is at least homophonous with that classifier.

In rGyalrong, a group of related dialects just northwest of the Qiangic languages, the situation is a bit different. Unlike the Qiangic languages, Cogtse rGyalrong uses different forms for plural marking, and uses the unmarked plural form for the inclusive rather than the exclusive (the opposite of what we will generally see when we look at other language groups below). In Caodeng rGyalrong (J. Sun 1998), listed in Table 2, the inclusive forms take an extra morpheme to mark them as inclusive. These additional suffixes are not specific to the 1di and 1pi forms; they are used for all dual and plural forms (except the 1de and 1pe forms).

The languages in Qiangic and rGyalrong have person-marking systems (affixes on the verb that index participants) and many also have possessive prefixes on nouns, both of which derive from the free pronouns, and some maintain the dual and plural marking in the person marking, but the inclusive–exclusive distinction is not maintained (e.g. Cogtse rGyalrong (Nagano 2003) verb suffixes: 1dl-$tfh$, 1pl-$j$; noun prefixes: dual (of all numbers) $Nd3\partial$-, 1pl $j\partial$-). Caodeng rGyalrong (J. Sun 1998) also has possessive pronouns derived from the free pronouns, and with these the distinction is maintained: 1di $ts\partial$-$gj\partial nu$, 1de $ts\partial$-$gju$, 1pi $j\partial$-$gj\partial ro$, 1pe $j\partial$-$gju$.

Table 2. rGyalrong

|  | 1sg | 1dl-incl. | 1dl-excl. | 1pl-incl. | 1pl-excl. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cogtse rGyalrong | $\eta a$ | $tfhi$-$gyo$ | $ji$-$Nd3o$ | $ji$-$gjo$ | $ji$-$\eta o$ ~ $jo^a$ |
| Maerkang rGyalrong | $\eta a$ | $nd3o$ | $\eta\partial$-$nd3E$ | $jo$ | $\eta\partial$-$\eta E$ |
| Caodeng rGyalrong | $e$-$gji\mathfrak{?}$ | $tse$-$gj\partial$-$ni\mathfrak{?}$ | $ts\partial$-$gj\partial$ | $j\partial$-$gj\partial$-$re\mathfrak{?}$ | $j\partial$-$gj\partial$ |

[a] The form $jo$ for the 1pi in rGyalrong is used only by older people (Nagano 2003). Nagano also notes that a new form, $na$-$\eta a$ [2sg-1sg] is sometimes used for the 1dl exclusive.

## 2. Lolo-Burmese

Within Lolo-Burmese, a large group of languages spread throughout Southwestern China, Northern Thailand, and Burma, there are two large groups, Loloish and Burmish, and within those groups there are identifiable subgroups, Northern and Southern Burmish, and Northern, Central, and Southern Loloish. Among the Northern Burmish languages, Achang (Dai 1985) and Leqi (Dai et al. 1991) do not show an inclusive–exclusive opposition (and no dual pronouns), though in Bola, Langsu (both from Dai et al. 1991), and Zaiwa (Xu & Xu 1984) we find paired sets of dual and plural inclusive and exclusive pronouns, as presented in Table 3. In Bola and Langsu the exclusive pronouns are based on the 1sg pronoun plus a dual or plural marker, while the inclusive forms involve an innovative pronoun. In Bola the dual marker *nak* is used only for the 1dl inclusive form; 1dl exclusive, 2dl and 3dl all take the dual marker $ne^{55}$. The 1pl inclusive in Bola also does not take the usual plural marker $ma?^{31}$. In Langsu and Zaiwa cognates of Bola *nak* are used for duals in all persons, and in Langsu the same plural marker ($naun^{55}$) is used in both inclusive and exclusive forms. In Zaiwa the cognate of Bola $ma?^{31}$ (the exclusive plural) is also used for the exclusive plural (as well as second- and third-person plurals), and the cognate of Langsu $naun^{55}$ is used for the inclusive plural.

In Southern Burmish, represented by Rangoon Burmese (Wheatley 2003), there are many different forms for the 1sg pronoun depending on the sex and status of the speaker, but no obligatory dual or plural marking. (There is an optional marker -*tó* which can be used as a in-group and plural marker.)

A majority of the Loloish languages, except for Gazhuo (Dai, Liu & Fu 1987), Bisu, Gong, Phunoi (all in Bradley 1993), and Nuosu Yi (Chen & Wu 1998) among others, show the inclusive-exclusive opposition. See Table 4. Akha (Hansson 2003), Nusu (Sun & Liu 1986), Xide Yi (Chen, Bian & Li 1985), and Rouruo (Sun 1985b; Sun, Huang & Zhou 2002) show the opposition in the dual. In the Rouruo dual forms, -$pe^{55}$ is the plural marker, $ne^{53}$ is the word for 'two', and -$ia^{53}$ is the noun classifier for humans. In Xide Yi the inclusive forms are the same as the exclusive forms except that the 2sg pronoun $ni^{55}$ is added before the form. In Nasu (Gao 1958) and Sani Yi (Ma 1951) the three relevant forms are simply different pronouns, with no isolatable plural marker. In Akha, Nusu, Rouruo, and a Black Lahu dialect of China described by Chang (1986) the marking of the opposition takes the form of different base pronouns with the same dual or plural marker, again with the exclusive

Table 3.  Northern Burmish

|  | 1sg | 1dl-incl. | 1dl-excl. | 1pl-incl. | 1pl-excl. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bola | $\eta a^{55}$ | $nja^{31}$-*nak* | $n\check{a}^{55/31}$-$ne^{55}$ | $ni\underline{\eta}^{35}$ | $\eta a^{55/31}$-$ma?^{31/55}$ |
| Langsu | $\eta\mathfrak{I}^{31}$ | $nj\underline{\mathfrak{I}}^{32}$-$nak^{55}$ | $\eta\mathfrak{I}^{31}$-$nak^{55}$ | $nj\underline{\mathfrak{I}}^{35}$-$naun^{55}$ | $\eta\mathfrak{I}^{31}$-$naun^{55}$ |
| Zaiwa | $\eta o^{51}$ | $i^{55}$-$ni\underline{k}^{55}$ | $\eta a^{55}$-$ni\underline{k}^{55}$ | $i^{55}$-$nu\underline{\eta}^{55}$/$\eta a^{55}$-$nu\underline{\eta}^{55}$ | $\eta a^{55}$-$mo?$ |

form being the descendent of Proto-Tibeto-Burman *$\eta a$. Red Lahu, Lahu Shehleh and Yellow Lahu also have inclusive forms based on a cognate of $ni^{31}$- in the Black Lahu described by Chang 1986 (see Bradley 1979, 1993), but in the Black Lahu dialect of Thailand described by Matisoff (1973, 2003) the opposition is marked by the addition of the 2sg pronoun to the normal 1pl form, i.e. $\eta\grave{a}$-$n\grave{\mathfrak{I}}$-$h\dot{i}$ [1sg-2sg-pl]. Lisu (Mu & Duan 1983) and Lipo (Bradley 1993) also have an extension of the 1sg form as the exclusive form, but the plural marker in the Lisu exclusive form only appears in the 1pl exclusive form; 2pl and 3pl have -$ua^{31}$. According to Bradley (1993: 182), the inclusive form in Lisu can take the noun plural marker $bu^{33}$. Bradley argues that this is evidence of a nominal origin for the inclusive form. The inclusive pronoun in Lipo might be related to that of Lahu. Among three different dialects of Hani (Li & Wang 1986) we see differences in how the distinction is marked. In Haya Hani the distinction is marked by a difference in the plural marker; in Biyue Hani and closely related Akha[6] the distinction is marked by a difference in pronoun, with the pronoun used in the exclusive forms being the same as that for 1sg in Akha, and in Haobai Hani the distinction is marked by a difference in both pronoun and plural marker. Again we see a variety of plural markers used in the forms. In the Haya Hani and Haobai Hani forms the plural marker used is the same as that used for 2pl.

Table 4.  Loloish

|  | 1sg | 1dl-incl. | 1dl-excl. | 1pl-incl. | 1pl-excl. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Xide Yi | $\eta a^{33}$ | $ni^{55}$-$\eta a^{21}$-$n\underline{i}^{55}$ | $\eta a^{21}$-$n\underline{i}^{55}$ | $ni^{55}$-$\eta o^{21}$ | $\eta o^{21}$-$yo^{44}$ |
| Nasu Yi | $\eta u^{31}$ | – | – | $a^{31}$-$se^{55}$ | $\eta e^{55}$ |
| Sani Yi | $\eta a^{33}$ | – | – | $a^{11}s z^{55}$ | $\eta a^{11}$ |
| Lampang Akha | $\eta\acute{a} \sim \eta\grave{a}(q)$ | $\grave{a}dy$-$nj\grave{a}q$ | $\eta\acute{a}$-$nj\grave{a}q$ | $\grave{a}dy$-$m\grave{a}q$ | $\eta\acute{a}$-$m\grave{a}q$ |
| Nusu | $\eta a^{35}$ | $?a$-$ku^{31}$ | $\eta a^{35}$-$ku^{31}$ | $?a$-$dur^{31}$ | $\eta a^{35}$-$dur^{31}$ |
| Rouruo | $\eta u^{55}$/$\eta o^{55}$ | $?a^{31}$-$pe^{55}$-$ne^{53}$-$ia^{53}$ | $\eta o^{55}$-$pe^{55}$-$ne^{53}$-$ia^{53}$ | $?a^{31}$-$pe^{55}$ | $\eta o^{55}$-$pe^{55}$ |
| Lahu (Chang) | $\eta a^{31}$ | $ni^{31}$-$xur^{33}$-$ne^{31}$ [a] | $\eta a^{31}$-$xur^{33}$-$ne^{31}$ | $ni^{31}$-$xur^{33}$ | $\eta a^{31}$-$xur^{33}$ |
| Lahu (Matisoff) | $\eta\grave{a}$ | $\eta\grave{a}$-$h\acute{i}$-$ma$/$\eta\grave{a}$-$h\acute{i}$-$n\grave{e}$ | – | $\eta\grave{a}$-$n\grave{\mathfrak{I}}$-$h\dot{i}$ | $\eta\grave{a}$-$h\dot{i}$ |
| Lisu | $\eta wa^{33}$ | _ [b] | – | $\mathfrak{z}o^{21}$ | $\eta wa^{33}$-$nu^{21}$ |
| Lipo | $\eta\mathfrak{I}^{33}$ | – | – | $?a^{21}$-$ni^{55}$ | $\eta\mathfrak{I}^{33}$-$ve^{33}$ |
| Haya Hani | $\eta a^{55}$ | – | – | $\eta a^{55}$-$du^{33}$ | $\eta a^{55}$-$ja^{33}$ |
| Biyue Hani | $\eta a^{55}$ | – | – | $a^{55}$-$\gamma^{33}$ | $\eta\mathfrak{I}^{31}$-$\gamma^{33}$ |
| Haoni Hani | $\eta\mathfrak{I}^{55}$ | – | – | $\mathfrak{I}^{33}$-$tur^{33}$ | $\eta\mathfrak{I}^{33}$-$th\dot{i}^{55}$ |
| Sangkong | $\eta a^{55}$/$\eta a^{33}$ | $a^{55}$-$n\underline{i}^{31}$ | – | $ho^{33}$-$\eta a\eta^{31}$ | $a^{55}$-$\eta a\eta^{31}$ |
| Jinuo | $\eta\mathfrak{I}^{42}$ | $a^{33}$-$\underline{n}^{55}$ | – | $\eta u^{55}vu^{33}$ | $\eta a^{55}vu^{33}$ |

[a]  An additional suffix, -$ma^{33}$, can be added to both the dual forms.

[b]  David Bradley (1993: 181) points out that duals can be formed in Lisu and Lipo by adding the word for 'two' plus the classifier for humans after the singular or plural forms. He also reports (personal communication, November 2002) that in the Lisu song language there is an inclusive dual marker, $a^{33}nu^{21}$, containing the same second syllable as in the exclusive form (different from 2nd person $nu^{33}$), and argues that this suggests the distinction is likely to have arisen recently.

In Biyue Hani, Sangkong (Li 1992), and Jinuo the plural markers are the same for both inclusive and exclusive while the pronouns differ, but the pronoun used in the exclusive form is not exactly the same as the 1sg form.

In Rouruo (Sun, Huang & Zhou 2002: 71–2), aside from singular, dual, and plural, there is a set of 'collective' pronouns, where the collective referred to is the family, and these also show an inclusive–exclusive contrast in the first person: first person collective inclusive $\textit{?a}^{31}$-$(\textit{pe}^{55})$-$i\varepsilon^{55}$, first person collective exclusive $\eta o^{55}$-$(\textit{pe}^{55})$-$i\varepsilon^{55}$. In these forms the syllable $-i\varepsilon^{55}$ derives from $i\varepsilon^{33}$, which as a noun means 'home, family' and is also a noun classifier for families. The plural marker $-\textit{pe}^{55}$ is optional in the dual and collective forms.

Within this one group then we see four of the five main ways of marking the distinction found in Tibeto-Burman: having the same dual/plural marker but different pronouns, having the same pronoun but different dual/plural markers, having completely different forms, having a form which is a coalescence of the first person and second-person forms. The fifth type, which we will see is the main type in the Kiranti languages (below), is adding a special marker to the dual/plural form for inclusive or exclusive. We can see that while a large number of the Lolo-Burmese languages have the inclusive–exclusive distinction, it cannot be reconstructed to Proto-Lolo-Burmese. In fact Bradley (1993: 197) reconstructs only general person forms, without reference to number or inclusiveness.

The position of the Naxi language (He & Jiang 1985) has not been clearly established, but one opinion that is widely held is that it is a link language between the Qiangic languages and the Lolo-Burmese languages (e.g. H. Sun 2001). It may not be a coincidence, then, that Western Naxi follows a pattern similar to that found in both the Qiangic and the Loloish languages, that is, having different pronoun forms with the same plural marker, though in Western Naxi the only difference between the two pronouns is the tone.[7] See Table 5. The position of Bai (Xu & Zhao 1984, Wang 2001, Wiersma 2003) is also controversial, though I personally feel it is a Lolo-Burmese language (like Naxi, possibly not within Loloish, but closely related). In Xishan Bai (Wang 2001: 74) we find no dual, and no separate plural marker, simply different forms for the inclusive and exclusive, but again, the exclusive form seems historically prior, particularly as the exclusive form fits the pattern of the overall paradigm (singular forms end in -$\textit{u}$, plural forms have the same initial but end in

-$a$: 2sg $\textit{nu}^{31}$, 3sg $\textit{pu}^{31}$; 2pl $\textit{na}^{55}$, 3pl $\textit{pa}^{55}$), whereas the inclusive form does not. Jianchuan and Dali Bai (Xu & Zhao 1984: 175) follow a similar pattern, but with -$o$ for the singular pronouns, -$a$ for the plural pronouns, and a marked initial for the inclusive form, whereas Bijiang Bai (Xu & Zhao 1984: 175) has three different forms for the relevant pronouns, with the plural used for the exclusive form being the unmarked one (it is also used in the second- and third-person forms simply added to the 2sg and 3sg pronouns).

The Tujia language (Tian & He 1986), which we may include with the Loloish languages, does not show the inclusive–exclusive distinction (see Tian & He 1986: 49).[8]

## 3. Bodish

The Bodish languages, which include the Tibetan dialects, the Monpa dialects, and the Tamangic languages, are spread throughout Western China (particularly Tibet), Nepal, Bhutan, and Sikkim. Of these languages, only Lhasa Tibetan (Jin 1983, De-Lancey 2003) and Baima (Sun 1985a), presented in Table 6, show a dual, $\eta a^{12}\textit{ni?}^{54}$ and $\eta e^{35}\textit{ni}^{341}$ respectively (the latter transparently derived from the number 'two'), but neither shows the inclusive–exclusive distinction in the dual. The pronoun used for the dual in Baima is the same form as that used in the plural exclusive form. In Lhasa Tibetan, the inclusive is formed by adding the word $\textit{ra}\eta^{14}$ 'self' between the 1sg pronoun and the plural marker. In Balti (Rangan 1979), Ladakhi (Koshal 1979), and nTsho sNa Monpa (Sun et al. 1980)[9] the inclusive–exclusive distinction is not marked by the pronoun, but by the form of the plural marker (-$\textit{ta}\eta$/-$\textit{ta}\eta$/ -$\textit{tA}\eta^{53}$ vs. -$\check{c}al$/-$\check{z}al$/-$\textit{rA?}^{53}$ respectively). Except for 2pl in Purki Balti, which has the -$\textit{ta}\eta$ form, the plural used for the exclusive form is the more general plural marker. In Ladakhi it is also possible to add a second plural marker (-$\textit{kun}$ ~ -$\textit{gun}$ or -$\textit{sak}$) to the forms. Among the Tamangic languages, Chantyal (Noonan 2003a) does not show the forms.

Table 6.  Bodish

| | 1sg | 1pl-incl. | 1pl-excl. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lhasa Tibetan (Central Tibetan) | $\eta a^{12}$ | $\eta a^{12}$-$\textit{ra}\eta^{14}$-$\textit{tsho}^{54}$ | $\eta\bar{a}^{12}$-$\textit{tsho}^{54}$ |
| Baima (Eastern Tibetan) | $\eta a^{35}$ | $zo^{13}$-$ko^{53}$ | $\eta e^{35}$-$ko^{53}$ |
| Balti (Western Tibetan) | $\eta a$ | $\eta a$-$\textit{ta}\eta$ | $\eta a$-$\textit{tʃa}$ |
| Ladakhi (Western Tibetan) | $\eta\partial$ | $\eta\partial$-$\textit{tə}\eta$ | $\eta\partial$-$z\partial$ |
| nTsho-sna (Cuona) Monpa | $\eta e^{13}$/$\eta Ai^{13}$ [a] | $\eta A^{35}$-$\textit{tA}\eta^{53}$ | $\eta A^{35}$-$\textit{rA?}^{53}$ |
| Tamang (Tamangic) | $\eta\acute{a}$ | $\textit{jà}\eta$ | ín |
| Gurung (Tamangic) | $\eta a$ | $\eta^{h}\textit{jŏ}^{h}$ | $\eta i$ |
| Nar-Phu (Tamangic) | $\eta\grave{æ}$/$\eta\hbar æ$ [b] | $\eta\hbar i$-(tɕuke) | $\eta\hbar\textit{yâ}\eta$-(tɕuke) |

[a] This form of the pronoun is used to emphasize agentivity, and appears with the agentive marker.
[b] This is an emphatic form (Noonan 2003b).

Table 5.  Naxi and Bai

| | 1sg | 1pl-incl. | 1pl-excl. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Western Naxi | $\eta\partial^{31}$/$\eta a^{13}$ | $\eta\partial^{55}$-$\eta\textit{gu}^{31}$ | $\eta\partial^{33}$-$\eta\textit{gu}^{31}$ |
| Xishan Bai | $\eta\textit{u}^{31}$ | $\textit{nia}^{55}$ | $\eta a^{55}$ |
| Jianchuan Bai | $\eta o^{31}$ | $\textit{jã}^{55}$ | $\eta a^{55}$ |
| Dali Bai | $\eta o^{31}$ | $\textit{na}^{55}$ | $\eta a^{55}$ |
| Bijiang Bai | $\eta\underline{o}^{42}$ | $\textit{n}\underline{o}^{21}$-$\textit{n}\underline{o}^{21}$ | $\eta a^{55}$-$\textit{γo}^{55}$ |

show the inclusive–exclusive distinction in the plural, but has a unique dual inclusive form made up of the 1sg and 2sg pronouns (*nagi* < *na* '1sg' + *kâi* '2sg'). There is no dual exclusive form. Tamang (Mauzadon 2003), Nar-Phu (Noonan 2003b), and Gurung (Glover 1974) all mark the distinction in the plural with different pronoun forms (though the two forms may be historically related in Nar-Phu and possibly Gurung).

## 4. Mizo-Kuki-Chin

Most languages within the Mizo-Kuki-Chin group, which is spread across both sides of the India-Burma border, do not show the inclusive–exclusive distinction (e.g. Mizo (Lushai), Lai, Lepcha, Thado, Anal, Chiru, Rangkhol, Kabui, Khoirao, Hyow, Meitei, Mru, Tangkhul Naga, Lotha, Rengma, and Sema). Among those languages that show the inclusive–exclusive distinction, presented in Table 7, Cho Chin (Jordan 1969) and Karbi (Jeyapaul 1987) follow the pattern seen above, i.e. the exclusive form is composed of the 1sg pronoun plus the plural marker, while the inclusive form involves an innovative pronoun (the same plural marker is used for all forms). Cho Chin also follows that pattern in the dual as well.[10] In Tiddim (Henderson 1957, 1965), both of the plural pronouns differ from the singular form, though the exclusive has the same velar initial as the 1sg form. In Sizang Chin (Stern 1963), -*te*[13] is the usual plural marker. Stern (1963: 236) seemed unsure of the difference between $ei^{55}$-$te^{13}$/$i$:$^{55}$ and $ko$:$^{55}$-($te^{13}$), as he says the former are "probably inclusive forms", but as they are so similar to the Tiddim forms, I will assume the former are inclusive forms. Sizang also has person marking prefixes and suffixes on the verb, but they do not distinguish inclusiveness. In Angami (Giridhar 1980), we have different forms for inclusive and exclusive dual and plural, though the additional plural marker -*kô* can be added to both plural forms. The position of Ao (Gurubasave 1980) as Mizo-Kuki-Chin or Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw is as still unresolved. Because the 1sg pronoun (which also has a possessive prefix form *ke-*) seems to pattern more closely with the languages discussed here, we will include it here. In Ao

**Table 7.** Mizo-Kuki-Chin

|  | 1sg | 1dl-incl. | 1dl-excl. | 1pl-incl. | 1pl-excl. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cho (Hko) Chin | kei | niʔ-ni | kei-ni | miʔ-mi | kei-mi |
| Karbi (Mikir) | ne | – | – | e-tum ~ i-tum | ne-tum |
| Tiddim Chin | kei-(maʔ) | – | – | ei-(tɛ/maʔ/ma:u) | kou-(tɛ/ma:u) |
| Sizang (Siyin) Chin | ke:i$^{55}$-(ma:) | – | – | ei$^{55}$-te$^{13}$/i:$^{55}$ | ko:$^{55}$-(te$^{13}$) |
| Angami Naga, Kohima | ā | âvū | hiê-niê | ú-(kô)/wé | hiê-(kô) |
| Ao | ní | – | – | ase-nok | o-nok |

**Table 8.** Mikir and Chin verb affixes

|  | 1sg | 1dl-incl. | 1dl-excl. | 1pl-incl. | 1pl-excl. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mikir (Hills-Karbi) | ne- | – | – | e- ~ i- | ne- |
| Cho (Hko) Chin | kaʔ- | ni- | kaʔ-ni- | mi- | kaʔ-mi- |
| Tiddim Chin (narrative) | kă- | – | – | i- | kă-VERB-uʔ |
| Tiddim Chin (colloquial) | -iŋ | – | – | -ha-ŋ | -uŋ |

the two plural pronouns have the same plural marker, and the inclusive–exclusive distinction is marked by a difference in the pronoun, which in both cases is unrelated to the 1sg form.

In Mikir there is a set of obligatory (hierarchical) person-marking prefixes which is a transparent recent grammaticalization where the free pronouns became prefixed to the verb. See Table 8. Cho Chin also has a set of verb prefixes (which Jordan (1969: 30) says are "contracted forms" of the free pronouns). Both of these languages maintain the inclusive–exclusive distinction. The development of verbal affixes based on the free pronouns is a common sort of grammaticalization in Tibeto-Burman (see LaPolla 1992, 1994, 2001, 2003a). In these cases the free pronouns had an inclusive–exclusive distinction, and the verb prefixes maintain the distinction. In Tiddim there are two sets of pronominal affixes, one prefixal, associated with the narrative style, and one suffixal, associated with the colloquial style. These two sets possibly reflect layering, that is, two different grammaticalizations of pronominal affixes, though the same plural marker (-*uʔ*) appears in both sets. The narrative set may be the newer of the two, as the forms more closely reflect the current free pronouns, essentially being short forms of the free pronouns. The colloquial set seems older, as the forms have no obvious provenience (see also Peterson 2000).[11] We can clearly see that the colloquial forms involve a velar nasal marking first person, plus the usual -*uʔ* plural marker in the 1pl exclusive form, and a different plural marker for the inclusive form.

In Tiddim Chin the pronominal prefixes associated with the narrative style can also appear on nouns in both styles: 1sg *kă-*, 1pi *i-*, 1pe *kă-*NOUN-*uʔ*, 2sg *nă-*, 2pl *nă-*NOUN-*uʔ*, 3sg -*ă*, 3pl *ă-*NOUN-*uʔ*.

## 5. Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw

The Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw languages[12] are mainly spoken in northeastern India and Bangladesh, but Jinghpaw is also spoken in Northern Burma and Yunnan Province, China. Within this group, Jinghpaw and the Bodo languages Kachari and Kokborok do not show the inclusive–exclusive distinction, and within the Konyak languages Nocte does not show the distinction, while Tangsa (Das Gupta 1980)

Table 9. Bodo-Konyak

|  | 1sg | 1dl-incl. | 1dl-excl. | 1pl-incl. | 1pl-excl. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Garo | aŋ-(a) | – | – | an'-tʃiŋ | tʃiŋ-(a) |
| Chang | ŋo/ka- | sa-ti ~ sa-ji | ka-si | sa-nn | ka-nn |
| Mosang Tangsa | ŋa | – | – | nei-he | ni-ʃi |
| Jogli Tangsa | ŋa | – | – | naŋ-taŋ | ni-taŋ |
| Kimsing Tangsa | ŋi | – | – | na-ʃi | nai-ʃi |
| Longcang Tangsa | ŋa | – | – | naŋ | ni |
| Moklum Tangsa | ŋa | – | – | hi-taŋ | i: |

and Chang (Hutton 1987) do, as does Garo (Burling 1963, 2003b). See Table 9. In Chang the 1sg pronoun has the form *ŋo* when it does not take any postposition, but has the base form *ka-* when it takes a postposition, is used as a possessive prefix on a noun, or is used in the emphatic pronoun construction: *kabu* (also *ŋebu*) 1sg genitive, *kaka* 1sg ablative, *kala* 1sg dative, *kato* 1sg accusative, *ka-matpan* 1sg emphatic pronoun. This form (*ka-*) is also used in the exclusive forms, as opposed to *sa-* (provenience unknown) used in the inclusive forms. Only Chang has dual marking, and the forms follow the same *sa-/ka-* pattern as the plural forms in distinguishing inclusive and exclusive. In the different Tangsa dialects we find a variety of patterns with often the pronoun and the plural marker differing between inclusive and exclusive forms. In general, *-ʃi* is the more common plural marker, although the Jogli and Moklum dialects have *-taŋ* (it is unclear whether this *-taŋ* has any relationship to the similar form found in some of the Bodish languages used for inclusive plurals). In Moklum *-taŋ* is used only for the inclusive form, and in Mosang there is a unique inclusive plural *-he*. No generalization seems possible about the relationship between the 1sg pronoun and the plural forms, as the former are all based on *\*ŋa*, while the latter seem to be based on *\*na* or *\*ni*. These languages do not have person marking on the verb.

As mentioned above, generally the Idu-Taraon and Kaman languages do not show an inclusive–exclusive distinction, but Sun (1983) gives forms for dual (where the word for 'two' is added to the 1sg pronoun), and for inclusive and exclusive plurals in the Chayu dialect of southern Tibet. See Table 10. These forms differ only in the initial consonant of the middle syllable, and Sun does not mention the origin of this difference. The dialect of Ceta village in Lohit District of Arunachal Pradesh, described by Pulu (1978) does not show the same forms. The Lohit dialect word *alombrō* 'many' can be added to nouns to form plurals, and it seems a cognate of this word is the source of the plural marking on the pronouns of the Chayu dialect (in Chayu the form $lon^{35}$-$bɹo^{31}$ can also be added to nouns to form plurals). The inclusive form then may have developed from a fusion of the 1sg and 2sg ($no^{35}$) pronouns (as in Lahu and Newar), plus the plural marker.

Table 10. Idu

|  | 1sg | 1dl | 1pl-incl. | 1pl-excl. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Idu (Sun 1983) | $ŋa^{35}$ | $ŋa^{35}ka^{31}$-$ni^{55}$ | $ŋa^{35}$-$na^{31}$-$lon^{35}$-($bɹo^{31}$) | $ŋa^{35}$-$a^{31}$-$lon^{35}$-($bɹo^{31}$) |
| Idu (Pulu 1978) | ŋá | – | iɲí | – |

## 6. Western Himalayan

Within Western Himalayan, a group of languages spoken in Uttar Pradesh and Himachal Pradesh in northwestern India, Byangsi, Johari, and Rongpo do not show the inclusive–exclusive distinction. In Raji (Krishan 2001a) and Chaudangsi (Krishan 2001b) the use of an Indo-Aryan loanword meaning 'all', *-dzəmməl* and *-dzəmma* or *ləiri* respectively, with the 1pl form gives an inclusive sense. See Table 11. In Darma (Krishan 2001c: 140), the same pattern is followed, though with a native word *bir-mi* [all-person]. The dual marker in Raji, Chaudangsi, and Darma (e.g. Darma *ni-mi*), is transparently 'two people'. In Bunan (Grierson 1909: Vol. III.1, 469–78) and Manchad (S. R. Sharma 1996) the form of the dual and plural is the same for inclusive and exclusive, but the pronoun differs. There is also an emphatic form of the 1sg pronoun in Bunan, *iŋgi,* and from this we might suggest that at least the Bunan forms follow the pattern seen above, that the exclusive form has the more basic pronoun. According to D. D. Sharma (1982: 127) Pattani does not have an inclusive–exclusive distinction, and has *ɲe-* as the base form for all non-singular forms (e.g. 1dl *ɲe-ku,* 1pl *ɲe-re*), but Saxena (1977: 79) gives inclusive and exclusive forms, with the differences based on the pronoun used, making the pattern and forms very similar to that found in Manchad (S. R. Sharma 1996). In Kinnauri also (D. D. Sharma 1988) the distinction is marked in the plural by the form of the basic pronoun, not by the plural marker, while in the dual the two forms are totally unrelated. Saxena (1997: 77) also gives a slightly different paradigm for Kinnauri, with an inclusive–exclusive distinction in the dual but not in the plural, and the form *kiɕaŋ* used for both 1pl and 1di (*niɕi* is used for 1de). In Tinani (S. R. Sharma 1996) there is both a difference in the form of the dual and plural markers and the form of the pronoun used for the plural. The plural form *-ne* is used for second-person plural as well (third person takes *-re,* as in Manchad); *-naŋ* is used only in the 1pi form. The 1di form also seems to have a relic of the dual marker found in Manchad and Pattani. D. D. Sharma (1989: 145–6, cited in Saxena 1997) gives a somewhat different paradigm for Tinani. In the paradigm he gives, the plural inclusive and exclusive differ not in the plural marker, but in the pronoun, as in Manchad and Pattani. In these languages there is person marking on the verb, including dual and plural marking in most languages, but no inclusive–exclusive distinction is made.[13] From the form of the plural person marking reconstructable for this group, *\*ɲi* (Saxena 1997: 89), it would seem the exclusive forms in those languages that show a distinction in the pronouns used are the more basic and historically prior forms.

Table 11.  Western Himalayan

|  | 1sg | 1dl-incl. | 1dl-excl. | 1pl-incl. | 1pl-excl. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Raji | na | na-dzi ~ nhi-mi | – | na-ni-dzəmməl | na-ni |
| Chaudangsi | dzi ~ dze | in-ni-mi | – | in-dzəmma/in-ləiri | in |
| Darma | dzi ~ dze | niŋ-ni-mi | – | niŋ-bir-mi | niŋ |
| Bunan (Gahri) | gji | eraŋ-(njispi) | hiŋ-(njispi) | eraŋ-ɉi/eraŋ-zi | hiŋ-ɉi/hiŋ-zi |
| Manchad | gje | hen-gu | nje-ku | hena-re | nje-re ~ ɲe-re |
| Pattani | gè | héŋ-gù | nè-kù | hénə-rè | nè-rè |
| Lower Kinnauri | gə ~ əŋ | kasaŋ | ni-ɕi | kasaŋ-a | niŋ-a |
| Tinani (S. R. Sharma) | gje | i-ɕa-g | ɲji-ɕ | nje-naŋ | nje-ne |
| Tinani (D. D. Sharma) | gje | i-ɕa | ɲi-ɕi | ɲe-na | e-na |

## 7.  Eastern Himalayan

The Eastern Himalayan languages (all in Nepal) include the Kiranti/Rai group (broadly defined), Kham, Magar, and Sunwar, and Newar. Kham, Magar, and Sunwar do not show the inclusive–exclusive distinction. The Kiranti languages do show the distinction, as shown in Table 12, and in both the dual and the plural, generally using the same mechanism for marking the distinction in both the dual and plural. Within this group, only Khaling (Toba 1984), Dumi (van Driem 1993), and Hayu (Michailovsky 1988: 124–5; 2003) follow the pattern we've seen in much of the rest of the family: the forms take the same dual or plural markers (allowing for vowel harmony) but differ in the form of the pronoun, with the exclusive pronoun being the same as the 1sg pronoun (in Dumi). In Hayu it isn't necessary to mark number in first- and third-person forms in the absolutive, though dual and plural can be marked by suffixing -nak-pu 'two people' and -khata respectively. Inclusive and exclusive can't be marked. But in the possessive form of the pronouns, first person distinguishes five forms, including inclusive and exclusive forms. In the rest of the Kiranti languages, there is a very different pattern: the pronouns are the same for inclusive and exclusive, but the exclusive takes a velar-initial suffix while the inclusive is unmarked. The exclusive is then the more formally marked member of the pair. In Thulung (Ebert 2003) and Bahing (Hodgson 1858) the exclusive marker replaces the plural marker, but not the dual marker.[14]

These languages also differ from most of the rest of the family (except Cho Chin and Karbi) in that they retain the inclusive–exclusive distinction in their person marking systems, given in Table 13. Even Chepang, which does not show the distinction in the free pronouns (1sg ŋa, 1dl ɲi-ci ~ ni-ci, 1pl ɲi), does show the distinction in the person marking. Looking at the forms of the suffixes (below), it would

Table 12.  Kiranti/Rai

|  | 1sg | 1dl-incl. | 1dl-excl. | 1pl-incl. | 1pl-excl. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Khaling | uŋ | i-tsi | o-tsu | i-k | o-k |
| Dumi | aŋ | in-tsi | an-tsi | iŋ-ki | aŋ-ki |
| Hayu (absolutive) | gu ~ gu: | gu-(nakpu) | – | gu-(khata) | – |
| Hayu (possessive) | aŋ | uŋ-tshe | aŋ-tshe | ū:-ki | ã:-ki |
| Camling | kaŋa ~ kã | kai-tsi | kɯ-ts-ka | kai-(ni) | kai-ka |
| Athpare | aŋa | an-tsi | an-tsi-ga | an-i | an-i-ga |
| Bantawa | uŋka | uŋka-tsi | uŋka-tsa | uŋka-n-(tsi) | uŋka-n-ka-(tsi) |
| Thulung | go | gu-tsi | gu-tsu-ku | gu-i | gu-ku |
| Bahing | go | gó-sì | gó-sú-kú | gó-i | go-ku |
| Phedappe Limbu | aŋga | an-tshi | an-tshi-ge | an-i | an-i-ge |
| Belhare | ŋka | ŋke-tshi | ŋke-ŋ-tshi-ŋ | ŋke | ŋke-ŋ |

seem that in all but Khaling and Dumi a velar suffix marks the exclusive forms, as in the free pronouns. Here Hayu differs from Khaling and Dumi in that it still has the velar suffix for the exclusive plural in the person marking system. Lohorung person marking data has been added from van Driem (1992); no data on the free pronouns is given in that article.

Dumi, Khaling, Hayu, and Lohorung have -k in both their inclusive and exclusive pronoun forms, but this -k seems to be independent of the exclusive marking velar suffix, as in Hayu and Lohorung a second velar suffix is added to the exclusive form. Given the data here, and the fact that the rest of the paradigm (all but the velar suffix) matches the Dulong-Rawang person-marking paradigm and to a lesser extent matches the

Table 13.  Kiranti/Rai person marking

|  | 1sg | 1dl-incl. | 1dl-excl. | 1pl-incl. | 1pl-excl. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Khaling (Toba 1988: 202) | -ŋa: | -ji | -ju[a] | -ki | -kaa |
| Dumi (van Driem 1993: 96) | -tə | -ti | – | -ki-ti | -ki-ta |
| Hayu (Michailovsky 1974) | -ŋo | -tshi-k | -tsho-k | -ke | -ko-k |
| Lohorung | -ʔŋa | -tɕi | -tɕi-ga | -ki | -ki-ŋ-ka |
| Camling | -uŋa | -tsi | -tsi-ka | -i | -i-(m)-ka |
| Kulung (Tolsma 1999) | -o: | -tsi | -tsi-ka | -ja | -ja-ka |
| Thulung (Allen 1975) | -ŋ | -tsi | -tsu-ku | -i | -ku |
| Bahing | -ŋa | -sa | -su-ku | -ja | -ka |
| Limbu (van Driem 1999) | -ʔe | -si | -si-ge | a- | -i-ge |
| Belhare | -ŋa | -tsi | -tsi-ŋa | -i | -i-ŋa |
| Chepang | -ŋa | -təjh-tse | -ŋə-tse | -təjh-ʔi | -ŋi ~ ŋ-se |

[a] Khaling has a different set of suffixes for 1st person dual transitive agents, and these forms correspond more closely to the forms in the other languages: 1di -si, 1de -su.

Table 14. Newar

| 1sg | 1pl-incl. | 1pl-excl. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Dolakha Newar | dzi | thi-dzi/tɕhi-dzi | isi |
| Kathmandu Newar | dzi | dzhi:-(pī:) | dzi-pī: |

tent the Western Himalayan paradigm (see LaPolla 2000), the likely development of this paradigm is that the original 1pl marker was *-i, and then an exclusive-marking velar suffix developed before the split-up of the Kiranti group.

Belhare also has an inclusive–exclusive distinction in its possessive noun prefixes: 1sg *a-*, 1di *ŋketshi-*, 1de *ŋkeŋtshiŋ-*, 1pi *ŋke-*, 1pe *ŋkeŋ-*. These forms are transparently copies of the free pronouns which have become affixes on nouns, and, except for the 1sg form, have the same forms as the free pronouns.

The ancient Tibeto-Burman language of the Kathmandu Valley, Classical Newar (Jørgensen 1941), has a rather complicated pronominal system. There are three semantically equivalent forms for 1sg (*dze, dzi, dza*),[15] exclusive plurals formed by adding *-pani* to these forms, a historically later and less common exclusive plural *dzi-mi*, and a large number of inclusive plural forms which form two groups, one group of forms which is not clearly analyzable into morphemes (*dzhadze, dzhedze, dzhidzi, dzhedzhe, dzhidzhi, dzedzhe*), and one group that is clearly 'you and I' (*tɕha-dze, tɕhe-dze, tɕhi-dzi, dze-tɕhe, dzi-tɕhi*; the 2sg pronoun is *tɕhe, tɕhi, or tɕha*). The inclusive plural forms in the Dolakha dialect (Genetti 1994: 60–1, Genetti 2003) clearly reflect this latter pattern. See Table 14. The Kathmandu dialect (Hargreaves 2003) marks the inclusive–exclusive distinction only in the aspiration of the initial of the pronoun and the vowel length. The plural marking is also optional in the inclusive.

## 8. Dulong-Rawang

Dulong (LaPolla 2003c, personal fieldwork), Rawang (personal fieldwork), and Anong (H. Sun 2000) are relatively closely related dialects spoken in Northwestern Yunnan and Northern Burma. Of these three, Rawang does not mark the distinction at all.[16] Dulong marks it using a form cognate to Tibetan *raŋ* 'self' for the inclusive (adding the word for 'two' in the dual in Dizhengdang Dulong), possibly due to Tibetan influence. See Table 15. Anong marks the distinction in the dual and plural, with the dual forms taking an old pronominal dual marker (< *tsi). The inclusive-exclusive distinction is marked in the dual by a difference of pronoun, but in the plural by a difference of plural marker.

These languages also have person marking on the verb, but the inclusive–exclusive distinction is not reflected in the person marking. H. Sun (1981: 86) gives dif-

Table 15. Dulong-Rawang

| | 1sg | 1di-incl. | 1dl-excl. | 1pl-incl. | 1pl-excl. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rawang | ŋà | ŋà-n | – | ŋ̀ùŋ-ma? | ŋà-ma? |
| Kongmudang Dulong | ŋà | īŋ-nɛ̄ | – | ɹā̀ŋ | īŋ |
| Dizhengdang Dulong | əgɔ̀ | rə̄ŋ-ɲī | əjùŋ-ɲī | ɹə̄ŋ | əjùŋ-(ma?) |
| Anong | ŋa$^{55}$ ~ a$^{31}$ -io$^{31}$ | ŋa$^{55}$-iɯŋ$^{55}$ -si$^{31}$ | a$^{31}$-iɯŋ$^{55}$-si$^{31}$ | a$^{31}$-ɲi$^{35}$ | a$^{31}$-iɯŋ$^{55}$ |

ferent forms for dual exclusive and dual inclusive for the person marking in Kongmudang Dulong, but this seems to be a mistake, as I have not found this distinction in my own fieldwork on the language, and it would mean there was a distinction in the dual not found in the plural.

## 9. Summary and conclusion

We have seen that the inclusive–exclusive distinction, when it is found in Tibeto-Burman, is often an innovation within a single low level grouping, or even of single languages within a group. Often even closely related languages or different dialects of a single language differ in terms of whether or not they mark the distinction. Only one group, the Kiranti group, has marking of the distinction that can be reconstructed to the proto level. Kiranti is also the only group as a whole that marks the inclusive–exclusive distinction in its person marking system (verbal suffixes) as well.

We have also seen that there are five main ways of marking the distinction found in Tibeto-Burman:

1. having the same dual/plural marker but different pronouns,
2. having the same pronoun but different dual/plural markers,
3. having completely different forms,
4. having a form which is a coalescence of the first person and second-person forms,
5. adding a special marker to the dual/plural form for inclusive or exclusive.

In the case of (1) and (3), we find that of the two pronouns, generally the pronoun used in the exclusive form is the historically prior and less marked form. In the case of (2), generally the plural marker used in the exclusive form is the historically prior and less marked form.

We can therefore conclude, at least in Tibeto-Burman, the inclusive form is a late development, and generally involves a more marked form. Only in the Kiranti languages is the exclusive the more marked form.

## Notes

1. The name Tani for this group (formerly known as Mirish or Abor-Miri-Dafla) is from Sun 1993a, 1993b, 2003. The group includes Adi, Apatani, Bengni, Bokar, Gallong, Hill Miri, Miji, Mising, Nishi, and Tagin.

2. Abbreviations used: 1 first person, 2 second person, 3 third person, sg singular, dl dual, pl plural, di dual inclusive, de dual exclusive, pi plural inclusive, pe plural exclusive.

3. The lack of third person marking and plural marking makes Proto-Tibeto-Burman (as well as Old Chinese, which also had no plural marking) an exception to Greenberg's (1963) Universal 42: "All languages have pronominal categories involving at least three persons and two numbers".

4. In several languages of the Qiangic, Eastern Himalayan, Western Himalayan, and Dulong-Rawang groups we find a dual marker with a dental or palatal affricate initial. If these languages are more closely related to each other than to the other branches of Tibeto-Burman, as I have suggested (LaPolla 2000, 2003a), then we could reconstruct *tsi as a dual marker for the pronoun paradigm in the proto-language of this group. The Queyu and rGyalrong forms might then be similar because they are shared retentions.

5. The forms given for the pronouns will be the nominative/absolutive forms unless otherwise marked. Forms for person marking (verbal affixes) given in the discussion below will generally be those of the intransitive non-past forms.

6. Akha is said to be part of the Haya dialect (Li & Wang 1986), and more remote from the Bika dialect (of which Biyue is a part), but in terms of the inclusive–exclusive opposition it patterns more like Biyue than Haya Hani.

7. Eastern Naxi is also discussed in He & Jiang (1985), and it is claimed (p. 114) that the Eastern dialect does not show an inclusive–exclusive distinction; it is said that $\textit{n}a^{33}$-$tsu^{31}$-$kv^{31}$ covers both meanings. It is also said that -$tsu^{31}$-$kv^{31}$ is the plural marker for the second- and third-person forms as well. In the lexical list on p. 171, though, the forms $\textit{n}a^{33}$, $yo^{33}$-$tsu^{33}$-$kv^{21}$, and $\textit{n}a^{33}$-$za^{21}$ are given for 1sg, 1pi, and 1pe respectively for the Eastern dialect, and the plural forms for second and third person have the plural marker -$za^{21}$, not -$tsu^{31}$-$kv^{31}$. It may be that though both sets of pronouns are called "Eastern dialect" in the book, they represent different sub-varieties, and one of the two employs the two different plural markers and a different pronoun base to create an inclusive–exclusive distinction.

8. On p. 207 Tian & He (1986) give inclusive and exclusive forms, but the inclusive forms are simply the exclusive forms plus the word for 'all'. This can be done in just about any language.

9. Tshangla (Central Monpa, Sharchhokpa-lo; Andvik 2003) and Motuo Menba (Sun et al. 1980) do not show the inclusive–exclusive distinction.

10. I should note here that the 1pl form in Tangkhul Naga (ithum, which does not distinguish inclusive and exclusive; Arokianathan 1987) is cognate with one form of the inclusive pronoun in Mikir (I would have expected the single form in those languages that don't have the inclusive–exclusive distinction to be cognate with the exclusive form).

11. More work needs to be done to determine if either of these sets can be reconstructed to some deeper level of the family. Even if one or both of the sets are reconstructable, a separate question is whether the inclusive–exclusive distinction holds for the proto-level, as

some languages that have a cognate system, such as Hyow (Peterson 2000), do not have the distinction.

12. The name of the group and its composition is from Burling (2003a), except for the placement of Ao in Mizo-Kiki-Chin (based on information from Alec Coupe, personal communication, December 2002). See also Benedict (1976).

13. Though Takahashi (2001), in reporting on Pangi Kinnauri, lists a verb suffix identical to the 2dl/2pl form as a 1dl/1pl exclusive form, e.g. $\textit{dza:tf}$'ate (it)' (1de/1pe/2dl/2pl)' vs. $\textit{dza:}$ $\textit{fe:}$'ate (it) (1di/1pi)'.

14. The sources for the other data are Ebert (2003) (Camling, Athpare and Bantawa), van Driem (1987, 1999) (Limbu), and Bickel (2003) (Belhare).

15. Jørgensen (1941) is not clear on the nature of the sounds he writes as "c", "ch", "j", and "jh". He says they are palatals, but does not say if they are stops or affricates. As the modern languages have affricates in corresponding forms, I assume these symbols represent palatal affricates, and have regularized the transcription to "tɕ", "tɕh", "dz", and "dzh" respectively.

16. Rawang has the same plural marker $\textit{ma}?$ as the optional exclusive marker in Dizheng-dang Dulong, but the dual and plural are all based on the 1sg pronoun: 1sg $\textit{ŋà}$, 1dl $\textit{ŋà-ní}$ [1sg + 'two'], 1pl $\textit{ŋà-ma}?$. We have seen plural markers in Lolo-Burmese with a form similar to $\textit{ma}?$, and this may be one reason some scholars have suggested a close relationship among these languages. The form is a general plural marker for animate nouns in many of the languages. There is also another form for 1pl, $\textit{ŋùŋ-ma}?$, and this is given as 1pl inclusive in Bradley (1993), but my informants say there is no difference between the two pronouns in terms of inclusiveness. The difference is just that $\textit{ŋùŋ-ma}?$ is a bit more polite. I don't know if this reflects a loss of the distinction or some other factor.

## References

Allen, N. J. 1975. *Sketch of Thulung grammar, with three texts and a glossary*. Ithaca NY: Cornell University China-Japan Program [*Cornell University East Asia Papers* 6].

Andvik, E. 2003. Tshangla. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 439–55.

Arokianathan, S. 1987. *Tangkhul Naga grammar*. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

Benedict, P. K. 1972. *Sino-Tibetan: A conspectus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [*Princeton-Cambridge Studies in Chinese Linguistics* II].

Benedict, P. K. 1976. Sino-Tibetan: Another look. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 96(2): 167–97.

Bickel, B. 2003. Belhare. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 546–70.

Bradley, D. 1979. *Lahu dialects*. Canberra: Australian National University Press [*Oriental Monograph Series* 23]

Bradley, D. 1993. Pronouns in Burmese-Lolo. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 16(1): 157–209.

Burling, R. 1961. *A Garo grammar*. Poona: Linguistic Society of India [*Indian Linguistics Monograph Series* 21].

Burling, R. 2003a. The Tibeto-Burman languages of Northeast India. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 167–92.

Burling, R. 2003b. Garo. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 387–400.

Chang Hongen. 1986. *Lahuyu jianzhi* (A brief description of the Lahu language). Beijing: Nationalities Press.

Chen Kang & Wu Da. 1998. *Yiyu yufa (Nuosu hua)* (Yi grammar (Nuosu dialect)). Beijing: Central University of Nationalities Press.

Chen Shilin, Bian Shiming & Li Xiuqing (eds). 1985. *Yiyu jianzhi* (A brief description of the Yi language). Beijing: Nationalities Press.

Dai Qingxia. 1985. *Achangyu jianzhi* (A brief description of the Achang language). Beijing: Nationalities Press.

Dai Qingxia, Huang Bufan, Fu Ailan, Renzengwangmu & Liu Juhuang. 1991. *Zang-Mianyu shiwu zhong* (Fifteen Tibeto-Burman languages). Beijing: Yanshan Chubanshe.

Dai Qingxia, Liu Juhuang & Fu Ailan. 1987. On the Gazhuo language of the Mongolian people of Yunnan Province. *Yuyan Yanjiu* 1987(1): 141.

Das Gupta, K. 1980. *The Tangsa language: A synopsis*. Shillong: The Philology Section, Research Department, North-East Frontier Agency.

DeLancey, S. 2003. Lhasa Tibetan. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 270–88.

Ding, P. S. 2003. Prinmi. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 588–601.

Ebert, K. H. 2003. The Kiranti languages. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 505–17.

Gai Xingzhi. 1986. *Jinuoyu jianzhi* (A brief description of the Jinuo language). Beijing: Nationalities Press.

Gao Huanian. 1958. *Yiyu yufa yanjiu* (A study on Yi grammar). Beijing: Kexue Chubanshe.

Genetti, C. E. 1994. *A descriptive and historical account of the Dolakha Newari dialect*. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of the Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa [*Monumenta Serindica* 24].

Genetti, C. E. 2003. Dolakha Newar. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 355–70.

Giridhar, P. P. 1980. *Angami grammar*. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages [*CIIL Grammar Series* 6].

Glover, W. W. 1974. *Sememic and grammatical structures in Gurung (Nepal)*. Norman OK: SIL.

Gong Hwang-cherng. 2003. Tangut. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 602–20.

Greenberg, J. H. 1963. Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In J. H. Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of language*, 73–113. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Grierson, Sir G. A. (ed.). 1903–28. *Linguistic survey of India, III, Parts 1–3, Tibeto-Burman Family*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Gurubasave Gowda, K. S. 1980. *Ao grammar*. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

Hansson, I.-L. 2003. Akha. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 236–52.

Hargreaves, D. J. 2003. Kathmandu Newar (Nepāl Bhāśā). In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 371–84.

He Jiren & Jiang Zhuyi. 1985. *Naxiyu jianzhi* (Brief description of the Naxi language). Beijing: Nationalities Press.

Henderson, E. J. A. 1957. Colloquial Chin as a pronominalized language. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 20: 323–7.

Henderson, E. J. A. 1965. *Tiddim Chin: A descriptive analysis of two texts*. London: Oxford University Press [*London Oriental Series* 15].

Hodgson, B. H. 1858. Comparative vocabulary of the languages of the broken tribes of Nepal. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 27: 393–456.

Hope, E. R. 1974. *The deep syntax of Lisu sentences: A transformational case grammar*. Canberra: Australian National University [*Pacific Linguistics* B 34].

Hutton, J. H. 1987. *Chang language: Grammar and vocabulary of the language of the Chang Nagas*. Delhi: Gian Publishing House.

Jeyapaul, V. Y. 1987. *Karbi grammar*. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

Jin Peng. 1983. *Zangyu jianzhi* (A brief description of Tibetan). Beijing: Nationalities Press.

Jordan, Father M. M.E. P. 1969. *Chin dictionary and grammar. Southern Chin Hills People's language, Mindat District, Burma*. Paris: Mimeo.

Jørgensen, H. 1941. *A grammar of the Classical Newari*. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard.

Koshal, S. 1979. *Ladakhi grammar*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Krishan, S. 2001a. Sketch of Raji grammar. In R. J. LaPolla (ed.), 449–501.

Krishan, S. 2001b. Sketch of Chaudangsi grammar. In R. J. LaPolla (ed.), 401–48.

Krishan, S. 2001c. Sketch of Darma grammar. In R. J. LaPolla (ed.), 347–400.

LaPolla, R. J. 1992. On the dating and nature of verb agreement in Tibeto-Burman. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 55(2): 298–315.

LaPolla, R. J. 1994. Parallel grammaticalizations in Tibeto-Burman: Evidence of Sapir's 'drift'. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 17(1): 61–80.

LaPolla, R. J. 2000. Subgrouping in Tibeto-Burman: Can an individual-identifying standard be developed? How do we factor in the history of migrations and language contact? The 33rd International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Bangkok and Trang, October 2–6, 2000.

LaPolla, R. J. 2001. The role of migration and language contact in the development of the Sino-Tibetan language family. In R. M.W. Dixon & A. Y. Aikhenvald (eds), *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance: Case studies in language change*, 225–54. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LaPolla, R. J. (ed.) 2001. *The Tibeto-Burman languages of Uttar Pradesh*. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.

LaPolla, R. J. 2003a. An overview of Sino-Tibetan morphosyntax. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 22–42.

LaPolla, R. J. 2003b. Qiang. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 573–87.

LaPolla, R. J. 2003c. Dulong. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 674–82.

Li Yongsui. 1992. Sangkongyu chutan (A preliminary discussion on the Sangkong language). *Yuyan Yanjiu* 1992(1): 137–60.

Li Yongsui & Wang Ersong. 1986. *Haniyu jianzhi* (A brief description of the Hani language). Beijing: Nationalities Press.

Liu Guangkun. 1987. Lun Qiangyu daici de "ge" (On the "cases" of Qiang pronouns). *Minzu Yuwen* 1987(4): 50–8.

Lu Shaozun. 1985. Zhabayu gaikuang (Overview of the Zhaba language). *Minzu Yuwen* 1985(2): 67–76.

Ma Xueliang. 1951. *Sani Yiyu yanjiu* (A study on the Sani Yi language). Beijing: Shangwu Yinshuguan.

Matisoff, J. A. 1973. *The grammar of Lahu*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press [*University of California Publications in Linguistics* 75].

Matisoff, J. A. 2003. Lahu. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 208–21.

Mazaudon, M. 2003. Tamang. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 291–314.

Michailovsky, B. 1974. Hayu typology and verbal morphology. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 1(1): 1–26.

Michailovsky, B. 1988. *La langue hayu*. Paris: Centre National pour la Recherche Scientifique.

Michailovsky, B. 2003. Hayu. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 518–32.

Mu Yuzhang & Duan Liang. 1983. Lisuyu gaikuang (An overview of the Lisu Language). *Minzu Yuwen* 1983.4.

Nagano Yasuhiko. 2003. Cotse rGyalrong. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 469–89.

Noonan, M. 2003a. Chantyal. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 315–35.

Noonan, M. 2003b. Nar-phu. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 336–52.

Peterson, D. A. 2000. On the status of the Southern Chin subgroup. Paper presented to the 33rd International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Bangkok and Trang, October 2–6, 2000.

Pulu, J. 1978. *Idu phrase book.* Shillong: Directorate of Research, Goverment of Arunachal Pradesh.

Rangan, K. 1979. *Purki grammar.* Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

Saxena, A. 1997. Towards a reconstruction of the proto-West Himalayish agreement system. In D. Bradley (ed.), *Tibeto-Burman Languages of the Himalayas*, 73–94. Canberra: Australian National University [*Pacific Linguistics* A 86].

Sharma, D. D. 1982. *Studies in Tibeto-Himalayan linguistics: A descriptive analysis of Pattani (a dialect of Lahaul).* Vishveshvaranand Vishva Bandhu Institute of Sanskrit and Indological Studies, Panjab University. Hoshiarpur.

Sharma, D. D. 1988. *A descriptive grammar of Kinnauri.* Delhi: Mittal Publications.

Sharma, D. D. 1989. *Tribal languages of Himachal Pradesh.* Delhi: Mittal Publications [*Studies in Tibeto-Himalayan Languages* 2].

Sharma, S. R. 1996. Pronouns and agreement in Western Himalayan Tibeto-Burman languages. *Indian Linguistics (Journal of the Linguistic Society of India)* 57(1–4): 81–102.

Stern, T. 1963. A provisional sketch of Sizang (Siyin) Chin. *Asia Major,* n. s., 10(2): 22–78.

Sun Hongkai. 1981. *Qiangyu jianzhi* (A brief description of the Qiang language). Beijing: Nationalities Press.

Sun Hongkai. 1983. Yidu Luobayu gaiyao (A brief description of the Idu Lhoba language). *Minzu Yuwen* 1983(6): 63–79.

Sun Hongkai. 1984. Woguo bufen Zang-Mianyu zhong mingci de rencheng lingshu fanchou (The category of genitive person marking on nouns of some Tibeto-Burman languages of China). *Zhongyang Minzu Xuebao* 1984(1): 78–84.

Sun Hongkai. 1985a. Liujiang liuyu de minzu yuyan ji qi xishu fen lei (The ethnic languages of the Six Rivers area and their genetic affiliations). *Minzu Xuebao* 3: 99–274.

Sun Hongkai. 1985b. Nuzu Rouruoyu gaikuang. *Minzu Yuwen* 1985(4): 63–78.

Sun Hongkai. 2000. Anongyu gaikuang (A brief introduction to the Anong language). *Minzu Yuwen* 2000(4): 68–80.

Sun Hongkai. 2001. Naxiyu zai Zang-Mianyuzu yuyan zhong de lishi diwei (The historical position of Naxi among Tibeto-Burman languages). *Yuyan Yanjiu* 2001(1): 90–9.

Sun Hongkai, Huang Chenglong & Zhou Maocao. 2002. *Rouruoyu yanjiu* (Studies on the Ruoruo language). Beijing: Zhongyang Minzu Daxue Chubanshe.

Sun Hongkai & Liu Lu (eds). 1986. *Nuzu yuyan jianzhi (Nusuyu)* (A brief description of the language of the Nu people (Nusu language)). Beijing: Nationalities Press.

Sun Hongkai, Lu Shaozun, Zhang Jichuan & Ouyang Jueya (eds). 1980. *Menba, Luoba, Dengren de yuyan* (The languages of the Menba, Luoba and Deng peoples). Beijing: Social Sciences Press.

Sun, J.T-S. 1993a. A historical-comparative study of the Tani (Mirish) branch. Ph. D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Sun, J.T-S. 1993b. The linguistic position of Tani (Mirish) in Tibeto-Burman: A lexical assessment. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 16(2): 143–88.

Sun, J. T.-S. 1998. Nominal morphology in Caodeng rGyalrong. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica* 69(1): 103–49.

Sun, J.T-S. 2003. Tani languages. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 456–66.

Takahashi, Y. 2001. A descriptive study of Kinnauri (Pangi dialect): A preliminary report. In Y. Nagano (ed.), *New research on Zhangzhung,* 97–120. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.

Thurgood, G. & R. J. LaPolla (eds). 2003. *The Sino-Tibetan languages.* London: Routledge.

Tian Desheng & He Tianzhen. 1986. *Tujiayu jianzhi* (A brief description of the Tujia language). Beijing: Nationalities Press.

Toba, S. 1984. *Khaling.* Tokyo: ILCAA [*Asian & African grammatical manual* No. 13d, second edition].

Toba S. 1988. The pronominal affixation system in Khaling. In D. Bradley, E. J. A. Henderson & M. Mazaudon (eds), *Prosodic analysis and Asian linguistics: to honour R. K. Sprigg,* 201–4. Canberra: Australian National University [*Pacific Linguistics* C 104].

Tolsma, G. 1999. A grammar of Kulung. Ph. D. dissertation, Leiden University.

van Driem, G. 1987. *A grammar of Limbu.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

van Driem, G. 1992. Le proto-kiranti revisité: Morphologie verbale du lohorung. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 24: 33–75.

van Driem, G. 1993. *A grammar of Dumi.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

van Driem, G. 1999. The Limbu verb revisited. In Y. P. Yadava & W. Glover (eds), *Topics in Nepalese linguistics,* 209–30. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academy.

Wang Feng. 2001. Xishan Baiyu gaikuang (An overview of the Xishan Bai language). *Minzu Yuwen* 2001(5): 70–80.

Wheatley, J. 2003. Burmese. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 195–207.

Wiersma, G. 2003. Bai. In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (eds), 651–73.

Xu Lin & Zhao Yansun. 1984. *Baiyu jianzhi* (A brief description of the Bai language). Beijing: Nationalities Press.

Xu Xijian & Xu Guizhen. 1984. *Jingpozu yuyan jianzhi (Zaiwa)* (A brief description of the Zaiwa language of the Jingpo people). Beijing: Nationalities Press.