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1. Introduction
Many languages have so-called “inclusive/exclusive” pronouns in the first person plural, and typically the distinction is based on whether the hearer is included on or excluded from the speaker’s side. Among the languages and dialects discussed in this paper, one dialect has this typical distinction, while the other two show some deviations:

In the Cabcal third dialect of Sive\(^1\) that I have studied, the distinction is a

\(^*\) I would like to thank the language consultants of Sive and Khalkha Mongolian. I would also like to thank an anonymous reviewer of this journal and Phillip Backley for their helpful comments. All of the remaining errors are entirely my own.

This work is partly supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) of Japan Society for the Promotion of Science: “Descriptive Grammar of Manchu” (No. 15720095, Project leader: Tomoyuki Kubo).

This paper was originally written in 1997, but its publication was deferred because (i) the conclusion that the Cabcal third county dialect of Sive has the typical distinction of “inclusive/exclusive” pronoun, unlike the Hui-yuan dialect, seemed of little interest to me; (ii) I had insufficient data, especially for Khalkha Mongolian. However, I have now decided to publish the paper with some corrections and additions because (i) it is important to present data which refer to the “typical distinction” in the Cabcal third county dialect, given the argument of Fukuzawa and Hayata (2003) that the “typical distinction” of the first person plural pronouns is dubious (cf. the last section of this paper); (ii) the Khalkha Mongolian data relating to “inclusive/exclusive” distinction have not yet been published.

\(^1\) The Sive (/siwê/) language (锡伯语), i.e., Spoken Manchu, is an endangered language spoken in the Xin-jiang Uyghur Autonomous Region (新疆维吾尔自治区) of China. The dialect described by Hattori and Yamamoto (1955) is the Hui-yuan (惠远) dialect. The dialect that I have studied is the Cabcal (/cawcake/) third county (察布查尔 三乡) dialect. My consultant was born in 1936 and brought up near the Cabcal third county. My research concerning this topic was carried out in Yi-ning (伊宁) city in September 1992.
typical one, i.e., the “inclusive” pronoun includes the hearer, while the “exclusive” one does not.

In the Hui-yuan dialect of Sive, described by Hattori and Yamamoto (1955), the “exclusive” pronoun may include the hearer if there exists an opposing third party.

In Khalkha Mongolian, according to my preliminary research, the way of distinguishing between “inclusive/exclusive” is different from that of the two dialects above. That is, the “exclusive” pronoun refers to a subset of the members in question, referring to a family, company, and so on, but it can include the hearer; the “inclusive” pronoun refers to the whole set of the members in question.

2. The Two Dialects of Sive

In the examples below, HY stands for the Hui-yuan dialect described by Hattori and Yamamoto (1955). Their representations are phonemic. In this dialect, the “inclusive” pronoun has two stem allomorphs: bō in the nominative case and mōn- in all other cases. The “exclusive” pronoun is māse. C3 stands for the Cabcal third county dialect. The C3 data consist of both phonemic and phonetic representations. In this dialect also, the “exclusive” pronoun has two stem allomorphs, bō and mōn-, and the “inclusive” pronoun is mese.

2-1. Typical Distinction

In (1)-(5) below, both dialects show the typical distinction between “inclusive/exclusive” pronouns, and there is no significant difference between the two dialects.

In the examples (1)-(3), the situation is as follows: three persons, A, B, and C are going to take a seat in a restaurant. In (1) and (2), A is the speaker, and C is the hearer.

In September 2005, the data were checked again for the same language consultant.

My Khalkha Mongolian consultant was born in 1972 and brought up in Ulan Bator, Mongolia. My research concerning this topic was carried out in Japan in 1997.

The following abbreviations are used: ABL, ablative; ACC, accusative; ADN, adnominal; ADV, adverbial; COM, comitative; COP, copula; FIN, finite; CAUS, causative; COND, conditional; DAT, dative; EXCL, so-called “exclusive”; GEN, genitive; IMP, imperative; I, imperfect; INCL, so-called “inclusive”; INST, instrumental; NEG, negative; NOM, nominative; OPT, optative; PART, participle; P, perfect; PL, plural; PR, present; VOL, volutative.
(1) HY [b0] ’äva-de tä-kyä. C ’agu täva-de tä-kiny.

EXCL here-DAT sit-VOL C Mr. there-DAT sit-OPT

“We (A and B) will sit here. Mr.C, please sit there.”

In this case, b0 is the “exclusive” pronoun which refers to A and B, as in Figure 1.

Figure 1 for (1) (and (2)).

```
   C
  /   \
 A - bo - B
   \   /
    \ /
     C: hearer
```

The same use of b0 is observed in the Cabcal third county dialect, as seen in (2).

(2) C3 [b0] ewa-de te-ki. agé tewa-de te.²

EXCL here-DAT sit-VOL Sir there-DAT sit(IMP)

[bo: təuaŋ təkj. agə: təuaŋ təx.]

“We (A and B) will sit here. Please sit there, Sir.”

Here also, b0 refers to A and B “exclusively”, i.e., it excludes the hearer C, also as in Figure 1.

If B is the hearer instead of C, [A and B] are referred to by the “inclusive” pronoun mese, and C is referred to by the demonstrative pronoun tere “that”³, as seen in (3) (no Hui-yuan data corresponding to this sentence).

---

² The same speaker acted as a language consultant for Hattori and Yamamoto (1955) and Yamamoto (1969). The dialect (the Hui-yuan dialect) and the dialect of my consultant (Cabcal third county dialect) show some phonological differences:

a. The former has the six-vowel system /a, o, i, u, i, e/ while the latter has the five-vowel system /a, e, u, i/.
b. Fricative voicing between sonorants is very rare in the former but very common in the latter.

³ The Sive language has a binary distinction in the demonstratives which roughly corresponds to “this” and “that”, the latter being used as a third person pronoun. Hereafter, I will not mention the use of third person pronouns, which is not relevant here.
(3) C3 mese ewa-de te-ki. tere tewa-de te-kini.
INCL here-DAT sit-VOL he there-DAT sit-OPT
[mɔs ɔwɔd tɔk. tɔr ɔwɔd tɔkɪŋ.]
“We (A and B) will sit here. Let him (C) sit there.”

Figure 2 for (3).

C
A → B
mese
A: speaker
B: hearer

In the examples (4)-(8) below, the situation is as follows: Three persons A, B and C are climbing a mountain, and another group of people come and overtake them. In (4) and (5), A is the speaker, B and C are the hearers. In both sentences, A, B, and C are referred to by the “inclusive” pronoun māse (HY) or mese (C3), including the hearers.

(4) HY ’alin tavene-re-de davele ’āxeše-cye, bāye-ve
mountain climb-PART(1)-DAT too hurry-COND health-ACC

qokyra-me; māse ’ālexeken-ye tavene-kyää.
suffer-FIN(PR) INCL slow-INST climb-VOL

“It’s harmful for your health to climb a mountain too fast. Let us (A, B, and C) climb slowly.”

Figure 3 for (4) and (5)).

māse (HY), mese (C3)
A: speaker
B and C: hearers

The same use of mese is observed in the Cabcal third county dialect, as seen in (5).
(5) C3  alín  tawene-re-de  dawele  exse-me,  beye-de
mountain  climb-ADN(I)-DAT  too  much  hurry-ADV(I)  health-DAT
[alíː  tawναʁødə  dawəl  ǝxǝsǝmː  bǝɾdə]
χɔkirɑn  o-me.  [mese]  elké  elké  tawene-ki.
harmful  become-FIN(PR)  INCL  slowly  slowly  climb-VOL
[χɔkirɑː  om.  mɔs  ǝk3ː  ǝk3ː  tawǝŋkj.]

The English translation and the figure are the same as (4).

If A says this to the overtaking group, the “exclusive” b0 should be substituted for the “inclusive” mese, as seen in (6) and Figure 4.

(6) C3  alín  tawene-re-de  dawele  exse-me,  beye-de
[alíː  tawναʁødə  dawəl  ǝxǝsǝmː,  bǝɾdə]
χɔkirɑn  o-me.  [b0]  elké  elké  tawene-ki.
[χɔkirɑː  om.  b0ː  ǝk3ː  ǝk3ː  tawǝŋkj.]

The English translation is the same as (4).

Figure 4 for (6).

A  B  overtaking group  A: speaker
C
D, …  D, …: hearer

2-2. Extension of “Exclusiveness” in the Hui-yuan Dialect
As seen above, the Hui-yuan dialect and the Cabcal third county dialect show typical distinction in the use of the first person plural pronouns: the crucial factor is whether the hearer is included on the speaker’s side or not.

As seen from (7) below, however, in the Hui-yuan dialect the “exclusive” form b0 can be used to refer to the group including the speaker (A) and the hearers (B and C), as opposed to the overtaking group.
(7) HY mäse gäle horedun tavene-fye, täse-de ’ätä-fye,
INCL also fast climb-ADV(P) they-DAT win-ADV(P)

mon-y fükesi-me tavene-me mute-re-ve
EXCL-GEN run-ADV(I) climb-ADV(I) can do-ADN(I)-ACC
ta-ve-kyä.
see-CAUS-VOL

“We (A, B, and C) will also climb faster, beat them (the overtaking group),
and show them that we can climb faster.”

In (7), both “inclusive” mäse and “exclusive” bo, which in this case appears in the
genitive form mon-y, can be used to refer to A, B, and C.

Figure 5 for (7).

```
A ——— mäse ~ bo ——— B
     |                  |
     v                  v
    C                overtaking group
                     A: speaker
                     B and C: hearers
```

The present author assumes that this demonstrates the option of extending
“exclusiveness” to include the hearer(s), subject to the condition that there exists
an opposing third party, as schematized in Figure 6, from 6a to 6b.

Figure 6. The optional extension of “exclusiveness” in the Hui-yuan dialect.
S = speaker, H = hearer(s), X = the other(s), Y = the other(s)

6a.  

```
S ——— H ——— X
  
V
mäse

bo

```

6b.  

```
S ——— H ——— Y

V
mäse

bo

```
In the Cabcal third county dialect, however, such an extension is not permitted, as (8) shows.

(8) C3 [mese] gele χοδυν tawene-maq, tese-we ete-maq,
    INCL also fast climb-ADV(P) they-ACC win-ADV(P)
    [məs gəl χοδυν tawənmaq təziv ətəmaq]

[mese-i/*mon-i] feksi-maq tawene-me mute-re-we
INCL-GEN/EXCL-GEN run-ADV(P) climb-ADV(I) can do-ADN(I)-ACC
[məzət fəxʃimaq tawənəm mutəɾəɾə]

ta-we-ki.
see-CAUS-VOL
[təfkİg]

The English translation is the same as (7).

Figure 7 for (8).

In the examples (9)-(10) below, the situation is as follows: A, B, and C are friends. When A is not present, B speaks to C. In the Hui-yuan dialect, the “inclusive” pronoun is used to refer to A, B, and C, while the “exclusive” pronoun is used to refer to B and C, as seen in (9).

(9) HY A-‘i banin ’umäs haten, ’äre-cy ’amesy
    A-GEN personality very impatient this-ABL after

[mäse-] baite-ve ’icyxya-re-de
INCL-GEN matter-ACC deal with-ADN(I)-DAT

A-de xiřeše-re-ve naqe-fye, [mon-y] junofι täile
A-DAT consult-ADN(I)-ACC quit-ADV(P) EXCL-GEN two person only
"A is a very impatient person. So hereafter, when we deal with our (A, B, and C’s) matter, how about not consulting with him (A), and dealing with it between the two of us (A and B)?"

Figure 8 for (9).

Here also, the extension of “exclusiveness” is observed: the hearer C is included on the speaker’s side, subject to the condition that there exists an opposing third party, A.

As seen from (10) below, however, in the Cabcal third county dialect, such an extension is not allowed, as is the case in (8) above: the “inclusive” mese should be used.

(10) C3 tere jaqe-i banin ursun χaten. e-deri sirame
     that guy-GEN personality very impatient this-ABL after
     [tɔr dɔʔəri bənɪɾ ursu: ɣaten. ɔɗari ʃiɾaməɾ]

\[mese-i\] baite icixya-re-de, tere-maqe xefse-re-qu-ye,
INCL-GEN matter deal with-ADN(1)-DAT he-COM consult-ADN(1)-NEG-INST
\[məzəɾ baɪt iʃxarədo təɾəmaq xəʃəɾəqprüjə\]

\[mese\] ju nane-li icixya-ci afsi.
INCL two person-only deal with-COND how about
\[məɾ dʒuː nəɾəli iʃxatʃiɾ afʃi.\]

The English translation is the same as (9).
So far I have shown that (i) in both dialects the typical distinction of the first person plural “inclusive/exclusive” pronouns is made, based on whether the hearer is included on or excluded from the speaker’s side; (ii) in the Hui-yuan dialect an optional extension of “exclusiveness” is observed. That is, the hearer is optionally included on the speaker’s side, subject to the condition that there exists an opposing third party.

3. Khalkha Mongolian

Hattori (1941) points out that in Khalkha Mongolian two series of pronouns are both used confusingly. Poppe (1955: 71) says that in this language the inclusive series is used to cover the exclusive meaning.

Khalkha Mongolian has basically two series of first person plural pronouns, i.e.,

(11)  

a. “inclusive” pronouns: bid⁴ (NOM), bidn-ij (GEN), bidn-ijg (ACC), 
     biden-d (DAT),  

b. “exclusive” pronouns: manaj (GEN) — no other cases.

Besides these, the language has the following series of first person plural pronominals combined with bid:

(12)  

a. bid nar “we (NOM)”, bid nar-yn (GEN), bid nar-yg (ACC), … 

b. bid xojr “we two”, bid gurav “we three”, bid döröv “we four”, …

Comparing the forms in (11) and (12), the bid series in (11a) is stylistically formal. However, apart from their stylistic differences, the bid series in (11a) and the bid nar series in (12a) have much in common.

---

⁴ The Khalkha Mongolian data are given via transliteration of the Cyrillic alphabet, with morpheme boundaries hyphenated.
The examples (13)-(21) below assume the same situation shown in figure 10: there are five persons A, B, C, D, and E (Bat = E’s name) and nobody else. A speaks to B.

Figure 10.

```
  B
 / \
A C D E(Bat)    A: speaker
    |
    B: hearer
```

Manaj and bidn-ij cannot refer to a single person, i.e., the speaker, as seen in (13) and (14), and min-ij “my” should be used as in (15).

(13) *Ene [manaj] nom.
    this EXCL+GEN book  “This is our (A’s) book.”
    *manaj = A’s

(14) *Ene [bidn-ij] nom.
    this EXCL-GEN book  “This is our (A’s) book.”
    *bidn-ij = A’s

(15) Ene [min-ij] nom.
    this I-GEN book     “This is my (A’s) book.”
    min-ij = A’s

Manaj and bidn-ij can refer to a subset of the members in question, as (16)-(18) show.

    this Bat-GEN book NEG.COP EXCL+GEN book
    “This is not Bat’s book, but our (A, B, C, and D’s) book.”
    manaj = A, B, C, and D’s
In this case, A, B, C, and D are regarded as belonging to the same group, e.g., a family, class, company, and so on, which does not include E (Bat).

(17) Ene Bat-yn nom biš, [bidn-ij] nom.
    this Bat-GEN book NEG.COP INCL+GEN book
    “This is not Bat’s book, but our (A, B, C, and D’s) book.”
    bidnij = A, B, C, and D’s

In this case, A, B, C, and D are not necessarily regarded as belonging to the same group. A, B, C, and D are using the same book together, or they paid for it together, and so on.

(18) Ene čin-ij nom biš, [manaj] nom.
    this you-GEN book NEG.COP EXCL+GEN book
    “This is not your book, but our (A, C, D, and E’s) book.”
    manaj = A, C, D, and E’s
In this case, A, C, D, and E (Bat) belong to the same group, which does not include B.

If A, C, D, and E are referred to by the “inclusive” pronoun, excluding the hearer B, the grammaticality becomes questionable, as (19) shows.

(19) ??Ene čin-ij nom biš, \[\text{bidn-ij} \] nom.
this you-GEN book NEG.COP INCL-GEN book
“This is not your book, but our (A, C, D, and E’s) book.”
bidn-ij = A, C, D, and E’s

Figure 14 for (19).

A C D E(Bat)

In this case, A, C, D and E are not necessarily regarded as belonging to the same group.

By comparing (17) and (19), we can say that the “inclusive” pronoun bidn-ij can refer to a subset of the members in question (Figure 12), but it cannot exclude the hearer (Figure 14).

As seen from (20)-(21) below, manaj cannot refer to the whole set of members in question, whereas bidn-ij can.

(20) *Ene \[\text{manaj} \] nom.
“This is our (A, B, C, D, and E’s) book.”
*manaj = A, B, C, D, and E’s

(21) Ene \[\text{bidn-ij} \] nom.
“This is our (A, B, C, D, and E’s) book.”
bidn-ij = A, B, C, D, and E’s
Figure 15 for (20) and (21).

In the case of (21), they are not necessarily regarded as belonging to the same group.

So far I have shown that in Khalkha Mongolian, (i) both manaj and bidn-ij can refer to a subset of the members in question, including the speaker, where manaj refers to a group, e.g., a family, class, company, and so on, whereas bidn-ij does not necessarily refer to such a group, as seen in Figure 16a, (ii) manaj cannot refer to the whole set of members in question, including the hearer, whereas bidn-ij can; as seen in Figure 16b.

Figure 16. manaj and bidn-ij

\[ S = \text{Speaker}, \ X = \text{the other(s)}, \ Y = \text{the other(s)} \]

4. Concluding Remarks

In this paper, I have shown that the Hui-yuan dialect of Sive and Khalkha Mongolian show an untypical distinction of “inclusive/exclusive” first person

---

5 The following example apparently shows that bidn-ij can exclude the hearer:

\[
\text{bidn-ij} \quad \text{xereg-t} \quad \text{biū} \quad \text{orolc.} \\
\text{INCL-GEN} \quad \text{problem-DAT} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{bother(IMP)} \\
\quad \text{“Don’t bother our problem.”}
\]

In this case, however, the speaker is ironically showing that the hearer is the ‘odd man out’ by using bidn-ij.
plural pronouns, whereas the Cabcal third county dialect of Sive shows the typical distinction.

In Manchu, according to Fukuzawa and Hayata (2003), the “inclusive” pronoun refers to \{speaker + α\}, and the “exclusive” pronoun refers to \{speaker + α\} as opposed to \{non-speaker (+ α)\}, where α stands for any person(s). That is, in Manchu, it is not crucial whether the hearer is included on the speaker’s side or not. They argue that the “exclusive” pronoun refers to the group including the speaker, as opposed to the other group. This distinction is very similar to those of the Hui-yuan dialect of Sive and Khalkha Mongolian.

Fukuzawa and Hayata (2003) further argue, based on Manchu data, that the so-called distinction of “inclusive/exclusive” pronouns is dubious, and that the “exclusive” pronoun refers to a subset of the entire set, not necessarily including the hearer. Further study will be necessary in order to establish whether this is the case in Sive or not. It will also be necessary to investigate the variations between the dialects of Sive.

A significant number of languages, such as Amerindian languages, have the “inclusive/exclusive” distinction in the first person non-singular. It is now clear that the details of this distinction must be re-examined, a point which has already been made in the final paragraph of Hattori and Yamamoto (1955).
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シベ語（満洲語口語）とハルハ・モンゴル語における「包括形/除外形」の区別

久保智之
（九州大学 人文科学研究院）

一人称複数代名詞に所謂「包括形」と「除外形」の 2 系列を持つ 3 つの言語・方言を観察した。服部・山本（□□□□）のデータによれば、シベ語恵遠方言では、話し手と対立するグループが存在する場合、「除外形」が聞き手を含むことが、随意的に可能である。一方、筆者が調査したシベ語チャプチャル 3 郷方言では、聞き手を含むか否かという点だけが両系列の区別に関与的であり、「包括形」と「除外形」の典型的な区別を示す。同じく筆者の調査になるハルハ・モンゴル語では、「除外形」は、話し手は含むが聞き手は必ずしも含まず、且つある既成の集団（家族、会社など）を指す。