Inclusive-Exclusive Distinction in the Kirati Languages: Evidence from Dungmali, Khaling, Koyee, and Wambule

Tara Mani Rai, PhD
Central Department of Linguistics, Tribhuvan University
tara.rai@cdl.tu.edu.np

ABSTRACT

This study conducts a comparative analysis of the inclusive and exclusive distinctions among the Kirati languages, specifically Dungmali, Khaling, Koyee, and Wambule. Data were collected through direct elicitation from native speakers, revealing the presence of inclusive and exclusive distinctions in both non past intransitive and transitive verb paradigms. Among the languages examined, Wambule, Koyee, and Khaling exhibit a closer affinity in terms of the first person dual inclusive and exclusive distinctions. For first person plural inclusive and exclusive, Koyee, and Khaling share common markers, suggesting a linguistic proximity between them. In contrast, Wambule and Dungmali display similarities, particularly in their utilization of the nasal marker <-n> for first person plural inclusive, although Dungmali employs nasals more extensively than Wambule, particularly for first person plural exclusive marking. In the non past transitive paradigm, Khaling, Koyee, and Wambule demonstrate greater similarity, employing the first person dual-inclusive marker <tsi> and exclusive marker <-tsu> in pronoun form, albeit with nuanced variations in predicates. For first person plural inclusive and exclusive, Khaling and Koyee utilize the marker <-ki> and its reverse form <ik>, respectively. In contrast, Dungmali stands out by incorporating nasals alongside the marker <n~ŋa> to denote first person plural inclusive and exclusive, distinguishing it from the other languages under examination.

Keywords: Dungmali, inclusive and exclusive, Khaling, Koyee, Wambule.

Introduction

The inclusive and exclusive concept in the language pertains to how the addresser includes or excludes the addressee. The inclusive and exclusive distinction represents a binary opposition that delineates two distinct forms, both of which are translated into English as 'we'. Notably, English lacks a direct equivalent of this distinction, employing only the pronoun 'we'. The inclusive 'we' is employed when the addressee is included, as in 'you and I (and possibly others)'. Conversely, the exclusive 'we' is utilized when the addressee is not included in the reference. This form of 'we' means something like 'I and others (not you)' (Cynew, 2013). The term 'clusivity' is also used to denote the inclusive and exclusive as the grammatical distinction of the first person pronouns (Filimonova, 2005 p.119).   Further Daniel (2005) states:

"...the inclusive is traditionally explained as an elaboration of the meaning of the first person plural pronoun 'we', when present in a language (inclusive languages below), the opposition of 'we' inclusive and 'we' exclusive, it is said, is intended to specify whether the reference of 'we' includes (inclusive) or excludes (exclusive) the addressee(p.16)".

In linguistics, the inclusive and exclusive variation refers to a grammatical difference observed in first person pronouns. While it is relatively straightforward to make similar distinctions in other persons, especially the second person, the presence of second person inclusivity (differentiating between "you" and "you and they") in natural languages is a topic of debate and lacks strong evidence (Filimonova, 2005 p.119). Clusivity, a relatively recent phenomenon, has been the focus of research in various linguistic fields such as morphology, syntax, and semantics, with some attention also given to its implications in pragmatics and cognitive studies (Cysouw, 2003; Filimonowa, 2005, Wieczorek, 2009). The inclusive and exclusive distinction can vary significantly between languages. What applies to Indo-European languages may not necessarily apply to Tibeto-Burman languages. Even within the Tibeto-Burman language family, there are disparities. For example, languages such as Tamang (Mazaudon, 2003), Gurung (Glover, 1974), Dolakha Newar (Genetti, 1994), and Nar-Phu (Noonan, 2003a, as cited in Lapolla, 2005) lack the inclusive and exclusive distinction based-on the first person dual number. On the other hand, Bhujel (Regmi, 2007) and Chhantyal (Noonan, 2003b) show markers for first person dual inclusive and first person plural inclusive but do not mark for exclusive distinctions.

The Kirati languages have been noted to exhibit the inclusive and exclusive distinction across dual and plural number contexts, as highlighted by Lapolla (2005). While individual research endeavors have extensively explored various aspects of Kirati languages, particularly focusing on grammatical descriptions, direct comparative analyses concerning the inclusive and exclusive distinction among these languages have been scarce. Although mentions of this distinction have arisen within grammatical analyses, there remains a notable absence of direct comparisons across Kirati languages. Hence, this study seeks to address this gap by conducting a comparative examination of the inclusive and exclusive distinction within selected Kirati languages, namely Dungmali, Khaling, Koyee, and Wambule. These languages represent distinct geographical regions within the Kirati linguistic landscape, with Dungmali representing the western region, Khaling the easternmost, Koyee the northern, and Wambule the western from the

core point of the Majh Kirat, the historical administrative land. This selection aims to provide a comprehensive overview while also considering constraints such as time limitations and the extensive number of Kirati languages, estimated to exceed two dozen, with the 2021 Census already enumerating 25 Rai Kirati languages. The languages examined in this paper belong to the Kirati Rai group, a subset of the Tibeto-Burman language family. These languages are primarily spoken in the eastern region of Nepal. According to the most recent census data from 2021, the respective number of speakers for each language is as follows: Dungmali (5,403), Khaling (16,514), Koyee (4,152), and Wambule (15,285). The article is structured into four main sections. Section 2 outlines the materials and methods utilized in this study. Section 3 encompasses the results and discussions derived from the findings of the study. The findings themselves are presented in section 4 whereas the section 5 draws the concluding remarks of the study.

Methods and Materials

For this study, data were obtained from individuals representing each respective language community: Keshab Rai (40) from Pouwadungma Rural Municipality in Bhojpur district for Dungmali; Arjun Rai (36) from Mapyadudhkoshi Rural Municipality in Solukhumbu district for Khaling; Yubaraj Rai (39) from Kepilashgadhi Rural Municipality in Khotang for Koyee; and Bikash Rai (34) from Manebhnajyang Rural Municipality in Okhaldhung district for Wambule. Data collection involved direct elicitation from native speakers who completed the questionnaire. Additionally, secondary sources were consulted for cross-linguistic references, and prior studies related to the subject matter were reviewed to ensure accuracy and consistency.

Results and Discussion

The Kirati languages, including Dungmali, Khaling, Koyee, and Wambule, exhibit the inclusive and exclusive distinction concerning both the first person dual and plural number. This distinction is evident in both the non past intransitive, and non past transitive verb paradigms.

Dungmali

(1)   Non past Intransitive verb

    a. *ankatse kʰatsjoni*

       anka-tse   kʰa-tse

       1DU.INCLV   go-1DU.INCLV.NPT

       'We go.'

    b. *ɯŋkatseʔga kʰatseʔgane*

       ɯŋka-tseʔga kʰa-tseʔga-ne

       1DU.EXCLV   go-1DU.EXCLV-NPT

       'We go.'

    c. *ɯŋkan kʰaḍinne*

       ɯŋka-n   kʰaḍi-n-ne

       1PL.INCLV   go-1PL.INCLV-NPT

       'We go.'

    d. *ɯŋkaŋa kʰaḍiŋa*

       ɯŋka-ŋa   kʰaḍi-ŋa

       1PL.EXCLV   go-1PL.EXCLV.

       'We go.'

As demonstrated in (1a), within the Dungmali language, the morpheme *<-tse>* signifies the dual person inclusive, while *<-tseʔga>* is employed as the marker for the first person dual exclusive. The first person plural inclusive is indicated by the marker *<-n>*, whereas *<-ŋa>* is utilized for marking first person plural exclusive. It is worth noting that the non past tense marker remains consistent solely within the first person dual exclusive and first person plural inclusive categories, remaining unmarked in the first person dual inclusive and first person plural exclusive forms.

(2) Non past transitive verb

    a.   *ɯŋkatse kok tsatse*

        ɯŋka-tse   kok   tsa-tse

        1DU.INCLV   rice   eat-1DU.INCLV.NPT

        'We eat rice.'

    b.   *ɯŋkatseʔga kok tsatseʔga*

        ɯŋka-tseʔga   kok   tsa-tseʔga

        1DU.EXCLV   rice   eat-1DU.EXCLV.NPT

        'We eat rice.'

    c.   *ɯŋkan kok tsanne*

        ɯŋka-n   kok   tsa-n-ne

        1PL.EXCLV   rice   eat-1PL.EXCLV-NPT

        'We eat rice.'

    d.   *ɯŋkaŋa kok tsŋaane*

        ɯŋka-ŋa   kok   tsa-ŋa-ne

        1PL.EXCLV   rice   eat-1PL.EXCLV-NPT

        'We eat rice.'

In example (3a), the morpheme *<-tse>* appears to indicate the indicator for the first person dual inclusive, while the first person dual exclusive is denoted by *<-tseʔga>*. For first person plural inclusive, the marker *<-n>* is employed, while *<-ŋa>* signifies the first person plural exclusive marker.

 Khaling

 (3) Non past intransitive verb

a.   *itsikʰɵtsi*

    i-tsi   kʰɵ-tsi

    1DU.INCLV   go-1DU.INCLV.NPT

    'We go.'

b.   *o:tsu kʰɵtsu*

    o:-tsu   kʰɵ-tsu

    1DU.EXCLV   go-1DU.EXCLV.NPT

    'We go.'

c.   *ikkʰoɔiʔ-ki*

    ik   kʰoɔiʔ-ki

    1PL.INCLV   go-1PL.INCLV.NPT

    'We go.'

d.   *ok kʰoɔiʔkə*

    ok   kʰo-ɔiʔkə

    1PL.EXCLV   go-1PL.EXCLV.NPT

    'We go.'

In example (3a), the morpheme *<-tsi>* serves as the first person inclusive dual marker, while *<-tsu>* functions as the first person dual exclusive marker in the Khaling language[1]. The marker *<-ki>* is used for the first person plural inclusive, and *<-kə>* is employed for the first person plural exclusive marker.

(4)   Non past transitive verb

    a.   *itsiʔɛ judzɵji*

        i-tsi-ɛ   ju   dzɵ-ji

    1DU.INCLV-ERG rice eat-1DU.INCLV.NPT

        'We eat rice.'

    b.   *o:tsu ʔɛ ju dzɵju*

        o:-tsu-ɛ   ju   dzɵ-ju

    1DU.EXCLV-ERG   rice eat-1DU.EXCLV.NPT

        'We eat rice.'

---

[1] Jacques et al. (2016) identified that the first person dual inclusive marker as *<i>* and exclusive as *<-u>* in the non past tense intransitive verb 'to have enough' paradigm as ' *sɵp-i'* where there is no to indicate the dual marker in the Khaling language. But my data exhibits the *<-ts>* to denote the dual marker. It needs to be further investigated.

c. *ikɛju dzɵki*

ik-ɛ   ju   dzɵ-ki

1PL.EXCLV-ERG   rice   eat-1PL.EXCLV.NPT

'We eat rice.'

d. *okɛ judzɵkʌ*

ok-ɛ   ju   dzɵ-kʌ

1PL.EXCLV rice   eat-1PL.EXCLV.NPT

'We eat rice.'

In example (4a), the moempheme *<-ji>* functions as the first person inclusive dual marker, while the marker *<-ju>* serves as the first person dual exclusive marker in the Khaling language. For the first person plural inclusive, the mormpheme *<-ki>* is used, whereas *<-kə>* is employed for the first person plural exclusive marker.

Koyee

(5) Non past intransitive verb

a. *intsi kʰutsisi*

in-tsi   kʰu-tsisi

1DU.INCLV   go-1DU.INCLV.NPT

'We go.'

b. *ʌntsu kʰutsisu*

ʌn-tsu   kʰu-tsisu

1DU.EXCL   go-1DU.EXCLV.NPT

'We go.'

c. *iŋ-ki kʰutsi-ki*

iŋ-ki   kʰu-tsiki

1PL.INCLV   go-1PL.INCLV.NPT

'We go.'

d.   *ʌŋkʌ kʰutsekʌ*

ʌŋ-kʌ   kʰu-tsekʌ

1PL.EXCL   go-1PL.EXCLV.NPT

'We go.'

As depicted in example (5a), the Koyee language employs the marker *<-tsisi>* to denote the first person inclusive dual, whereas *<-tsisu>* signifies the first person dual exclusive within the verb structure. Regarding the first person plural, the inclusive marker is represented by *<-tsiki>,* while the exclusive marker is denoted by *<-tsekʌ>* in the intransitive verb paradigm. Although the non-tense marker may vary, it is reflected as the underlying form.

(6) Non past transitive verb

a. *intsi dza: dzjasi*

in-tsi   dza: dzja-si

1DU.INCLV   rice   eat-1DU.INCLV.NPT

'We eat rice.'

b. *ʌntsudza: dzjasu*

ʌn-tsu   dza: dzja-su

1DU.EXCL   rice   eat-1DU.EXCL.NPT

'We eat rice.'

c. *iŋki dza: dzjaki*

iŋ-ki   dza: dzja-ki

1PL.EXCL   rice   eat-1PL.IXCL.NPT

'We eat rice.'

d. *ʌŋkʌdza: dzjakʌ*

ʌŋ-kʌ   dza: dzja-kʌ

1PL.EXCL   rice   eat-1PL.EXCL.NPT

'We eat rice.'

Certainly! Here's a further refined version:

In example (6a), the morpheme <*-si*> functions as the first person inclusive dual marker in the Koyee language, whereas <-su> is employed as the first person dual exclusive marker. The morpheme <*-ki*> is used to indicate the first person plural inclusive, while <*-kʌ*> serves as the first person plural exclusive marker[2]. Clusivity markers in the Koyee language are not uniformly treated across intransitive and transitive verb conjugations. These markers are fully replicated in conjugated verbs, akin to pronouns. However, in other instances, they are only partially copied, resulting in marked forms.

Wambule

(7) Non past Intransitive verb

    a.   *uŋtsi lwaŋtsim*

        uŋ-tsi   lwaŋ-tsi-m

        1-DU.INCLV   go-1DU.INCLV.NPT

        'We go.'

    b.   *uŋtsu lwaŋtsukum*

        uŋ-tsu   lwaŋ-tsuku-m

        1DU.EXCLV   go-1DU.EXCLV.NPT

        'We go.'

    c.   *untitso lwanim*

        un-titso   lwa-ni-m

        1PL.INCLV   go-1PL.INCLV.NPT

        'We go.'

    d.   *uŋtitso lwakim*

        uŋ-titso   lwa-ki-m

        1PL.EXCLV   go-1PL.EXCLV.NPT

        'We go.'

---

[2] Rai (2022), Rai (2008) and Rai (Rai 2011) are also insights to analyze the data of this study in which the inclusive and exclusive are substantially discussed.

The Wambule language does not have a straightforward morpheme that consistently differentiates number and person markings between conjugated verbs and pronouns. In example (7a), the morpheme <*-tsi*> is realized on the pronoun and reflected similarly as <*-tsi*> in the predicate. If we observe, (7b) lacks a clear dual person marker but can manifest as <tsuku> in the conjugated verb. Example (7c) illustrates <*-titso*> as a first person dual inclusive marker, with <*-ni*> often appearing in the conjugated verb. Conversely, <*-titso*> functions as a first person dual exclusive marker, also accompanied by <*-ni*> in the conjugated verb.

(8) Non past transitive verb

    a.   *uŋtsi ɦepa dzutsim*

        uŋ-tsi   ɦepa dzu-tsi-m

        1DU.INCLV rice   eat-1DU.INCL-NPT

        'We eat rice.'

    b.   *uŋtsu ɦepa dzutsukum*

        uŋ-tsu   ɦepa   dzu-tsuku-m

        1DU.EXCLV rice   eat-1DU.EXCLV-NPT

        'We eat rice.'

    c.   *uŋ-titso ɦepa dzaim*

        uŋ-titso   ɦepa dza-i-m

        1PL. EXCLV   rice   eat-1PL.EIXCLV-NPT

        'We eat rice.'

    d.   *uŋtitso ɦepa dzukum*

        uŋ-titso   ɦepa   dzu-ku-m

        1-PL.EXCLV rice   eat-1PL.EXCLV-NPT

        'We eat rice.'

In examples (8a-d), distinct markers are not explicitly distinguishable when comparing the intransitive and transitive patterns. In example (8a), the morpheme <*-ni*> is visible in the pronoun, whereas the morpheme <*-tsi*> appears in the predicate. Similarly, (8b) contrasts with (8a) by showing <*-ni*> in the former and

<tsuku> as the first person dual exclusive morpheme in the latter. Example (8c) illustrates that *<-titso>* does not directly copy to the transitive form, changing instead to *<-i>*. Conversely, in example (8d), *<-titso>* functions as the first person plural exclusive morpheme in the pronoun but switches into *<-dzuku>* in the transitive form.

Findings

The crux ideas have been drawn in this section after the analysis and discussion on the results of the study. We have observed the clusivity in terms of the pronouns and predicate first and then compared them in terms of the intransitive and transitive paradigms. Then, we have compared the four languages in terms of the clusivity and tried to find out their closeness each other.

Table 1 displays the clusivity patterns of the Kirati languages such as Dungmali, Khaling, Koyee, and Wambule in the non past intransitive verb paradigm for 'go'.

Table 1:

Inclusive and exclusive distinction in non past intransitive verb paradigm

	First person dual inclusive	First person dual exclusive	First person plural inclusive	First person plural exclusive
Dungmali	Pron. = Predt. (v) *<-tse>* ~ *<-tse>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<tseʔga>*~ *<-tseʔga>*	Pron. = Predt. (v) *<-n>*~ *<-n>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-ŋa>* ~ *<-ŋa>*
Khaling	. =Predt. (v) *<-tsi>* ~ *<-tsi>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-tsu>*~ *<-tsu>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-ik>*~ *<-ki>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-k>* ~ *<-kə>*
Koyee	Pron. = Predt. (v) *<-tsi>* ~ *<-tsisi>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-tsu>*~ *<-tsisu>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-ki>*~ *<-tsiki>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-kʌ>* ~ *<-kʌ>*
Wambule	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-tsi>* ~ *<-tsi>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-tsu>*~ *<-tsuku>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-tsitsi>*~ *<-ni>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-tsitso>* ~ *<-ki>*

As shown in Table 1, Dungmali exhibits the clusivity in both the pronouns and predicate that is the same morpheme copied from the pronoun to the predicate. Khaling is not as much explicit as Dungmali is. There is partial copy morpheme in the predicate or verb conjugation from the pronoun. Although the first person dual inclusive and exclusive markers are reflected in both the pronouns and predicates that are not reflected in the first person plural inclusive and exclusive. In the first person plural exclusive, the marker *<-ik>* appears in the pronoun form whereas it is reflected as *<ki>* as the metathesis property. Similarly, the marker *<-k~ kʌ>*.

In Koyee, there is no direct alignment between clusivity markers in the pronoun form and those in the predicate, except for the first person plural exclusive marker *<kʌ>,* which consistently appears in both. The first person dual inclusive is marked by *<-tsi>* in the pronoun but shows up as *<tsisi>* in the predicate. Similarly, the first person plural inclusive is indicated by *<-ki>* in the pronoun but manifests as *<-tsiki>* in the predicate. In Wambule, the morpheme *<-tsi>* typically represents the first person dual inclusive and remains unchanged in the predicate. However, the marker *<-tsu>,* indicating first person dual exclusive in the pronoun, does not appear in the predicate in the same form. The first person plural inclusive is realized as *<-tsitsi>* in the pronoun but is realized as *<-ni>* in verb conjugations. Regarding the first person plural exclusive, the form in the pronoun, such as *<tsitso~ki>,* may differ from its form in the predicate.

While comparing the four languages, Khaling, Koyee, and Wambule share almost the same morpheme *<-tsi>* and *<-tsu>* to denote the first person dual inclusive and exclusive while the Dungmali does *<-tse>* and *<-tseʔga>.* It shows that the Wambule, Koyee and Khaling seem to be closer each other in terms of the first person dual inclusive and excluive distinction. In the case of the first person plural inclusive and exclusive, Koyee and Khaling seem to be very closer as they share the markers almost the same. In this case, the Wambule and Dungmali appear to be neighboring each other in that they share nasal *<-n>* at least to indicate the first person plural inclusive. But the Dungmali yields to nasal more than the Wambule in terms of the first person plural exclusive.

Table 2 presents the clusivity demonstrated by the four Kirati langauges like Dungmali, Khaling, Koyee and Wambule in terms of the non past transitive verb 'eat' paradigm.

Table 2:

Inclusive and exclusive distinction in the non past transitive paradigm

	First person dual inclusive	First person dual exclusive	First person plural inclusive	First person plural exclusive
Dung mali	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-tse>* ~ *<-tse>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-tseʔga>*~ *<-tseʔga>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-n>*~ *<-n>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-ŋa>* ~ *<-ŋa>*
Khali ng	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<- tsi>* ~ *<-ji>*	Pron. = pre (v) *<- tsu >*~ *<-ju>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-ik>*~ *<-ki>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-ok>* ~ *<-kə>*

Koyee	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-tsi> ~* *<-si>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-tsu>~* *<-su>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-ki>~* *<-ki>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-kʌ>* *~ <-kʌ>*
Wam bule	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-tsi> ~* *<-tsi>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-tsu>~* *<-tsuku>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-tsitsi>~* *<-i>*	Pron. =Predt. (v) *<-tsitso>* *~ <-ku>*

Table 2 shows how the clusivity is realized in the pronouns and reflected in the transitive verb conjugation. Dungmali exhibits as exactly as it is in the intransitive paradigm. To be precise, it has a complete copy morpheme from the pronouns to the predicates in both the first person dual inclusive and exclusive.

There is uneven treatment of the clusivity in the intransitive and transitive paradigms in the Khaling language. There is ample disparities on how clusivity is identified in the pronouns and its reflexes in the case of the predicates, that is; the first person dual inclusive is realized as *<-tsi>*, and *< -ji>*. The first person dual exclusive marker also does not match between the pronouns and the predicates as realized by *<-tsu>* and *<-ju>* respectively. In the first person plural exclusive, the morpheme *<-ik>* appears in the pronoun form whereas it is reflected as *<ki>* in the reverse form. Similarly, the morpheme *<-ok~ kə>*.

Unlike the intransitive paradigm, Koyee exhibits quite different first person dual inclusive pronouns into the predicates in transitive paradigms as *<-tsi ~si>*. This is even in the case of the first person dual exclusive where *<-tsu>* is reflected in the predicate as *<-su>*.

In Wambule, the morpheme *<-tsi>* functions as the first person dual inclusive marker in both the pronoun and predicate. However, for first person dual exclusive, the marker *<-tsu>* appears in the pronoun and reflects as *<-tsuku>* in the predicate. Unlike the intransitive verb patterns, the first person plural inclusive morpheme *<-tsisi>* in the pronoun form is realized as *<-i>* in the predicate form. Conversely, the morpheme *<-tsiso>* in the pronoun form corresponds to *<-ku>* in verb conjugations for clusivity markers. Therefore, clusivity markers in Wambule do not consistently follow the same pattern between intransitive and transitive verb conjugations.

There is a partial copy morpheme in the predicate or verb conjugation from the pronouns. Although the first person dual inclusive and exclusive markers are reflected in both the pronouns and predicates that are not reflected in the first person plural inclusive and exclusive.

Among the four Kirati languages, Khaling, Koyee, and Wambule yield to the closer where they share the first person dual inclusive marker as *<tsi>*and exclusive marker as*<-tsu>* in the pronoun form but slightly distinct in the predicate. In the first person plural inclusive and exclusive, the Khaling and Koyee render to the marker as *<-ki>* and reverse form *<ik>*. Unlike others, Dungmali shares the nasals to denote the first person plural inclusive and exclusive with *<n~ŋa>*. The clusivity observed in the non past intransitive and transitive, there is a complete copy in the Dungmali not only in both but also in the pronouns and the predicates, too. But in other rest languages, there is a partial copy of the morphemes that could denote the inclusive and exclusive distinction.

Conclusion

The Kirati languages, Dungmali, Khaling, Koyee, and Wambule, exhibit inclusive and exclusive distinctions in the first person dual and plural numbers. However, the treatment of these distinctions varies among the languages discussed in this paper.

For instance, in Dungmali, the full copy morpheme is present both in the pronoun form and the reflex in the predicate. The morpheme *<-tse>* is typically used as the inclusive dual person marker, while *<-tseʔga>* is used for the exclusive dual marker. For the first person plural inclusive, the morpheme *<-n>* is employed, whereas *<-ŋa>* exhibit the first person plural exclusive marker. On the other hand, the other languages examined in this paper display partial copy morphemes in pronouns and verb conjugation. When comparing these languages in non past intransitive and transitive forms, Dungmali stands out due to its complete copy morphemes, not only in pronouns but also in verb conjugation. Conversely, the other languages exhibit partial copies of the morphemes.

List of abbreviations

1 = first person pronoun; 1DU=first person dual; 1PL = first person plural; 1SG=first person singular; 2 = second person pronoun; 2DU = second person dual; 2PL = second person plural; 2SG = second person singular; 3 = third person pronoun; DU= dual; ERG = ergative, EXCLV= exclusive; INCLV= inclusive; pron. = pronoun; predt.= predicate

References

Cysouw, M. (2003). Inclusive/exclusive distinction in independent pronouns. In Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (Eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online.* Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.http://wals.info/ chapter/39 (accessed 8 Ferbruary 2024).

Cysouw, M. (2013). Inclusive/Exclusive Distinction in Verbal Inflection. In: Dryer, Matthew S. & Haspelmath, Martin (eds.) *WALS Online* (v2020.3) [Data set]. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7385533 (Available online at http://wals.info/chapter/40, Accessed on 2024-03-13.)

Daniel, M. (2005). Understanding inclusives. In Elina Filmoniva (Ed.) *Clusivity: typology and case studies of the inclusive and exclusive distinction.*p.4-48.

Filimonova, E. (2005). *Clusivity: Typology and Case studies of the inclusive and exclusive distinction.* John Benjamins Publishing.

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

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

Jacques, G., Lahussois, A, Michailovsky, B., Rai, D.B. An Overview of Khaling Verbal Morphology. *Language and Linguistics*, 2012,13 (6), pp.1095-1170.ffhal-01361190f

Lapolla, R.(2005).The inclusive-exclusive distinction in Tibeto-Burman languages. In Filimonova, E. (Ed.). *Clusivity: Typology and case studies of the inclusive-exclusive distinction.* John Benjamins.

Mazaudon, M. (2003). Tamang. In G. Thurgood & R.J. LaPolla (Eds). *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*. pp.291–314.

National Statistical Office. (2021). *Population Census 2023*: National Report. NSO.

Noonan, M. (2003a). Chantyal. In G. Thurgood & R.J. LaPolla (Eds). *The Sino-Tibetan languages*. pp.315–3.

Noonan, M. (2003b). Nar-phu. In G. Thurgood & R.J. LaPolla (Eds). *The Sino-Tibetan Languages.* pp.336–52.

Opgenort, J. R. (2004). *A Grammar of Wambule. Grammar, Lexicon, Texts and Cultural Survey of a Kiranti Tribe of Eastern Nepal*. Brill's Tibetan Studies Library, Languages of the Greater Himalayan Region, 5/2. Koninklijke Brill.

Rai, T. M. & Budhthoki, M. (2008). *A Documentation of the Koyee Langauge.* A Research Report submitted to NFDIN under the Central Department of Linguistics, TU.

Rai, T. M. (2009). *Koyee verb morphology.* M.A. Thesis, Central Department of Linguistics, TU.

Rai, T. M. (2022). *A Grammar of Koyee*. LINCOM EUROPA.

Regmi, D.R. (2007). *The Bhujel Language.* A PhD Dissertation, Central Department of Linguistics, TU.

Wieczorek, A. (2009). This is to Say You're Either In or Out: Some Remarks on Clusivity. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*. Vol 3 (2): p.118 - 129.