A historical note on inclusive/exclusive opposition in South Asian languages -Borrowing or Retention or Innovation?-[1]

Toshiki OSADA
Kyoto University of Art and Design, Kyoto

0. Introduction

According to the most recent paper by Masica (2001:253-254), "A distinction between Inclusive and Exclusive 'we' is a fairly widespread but by no means pan-South Asian feature of clearly non-Aryan origin that has spread to some Indo-Aryan languages". Therefore, "it is clear that the distinction is an areally-influenced and an acquired one" (Masica 2001:254). In this paper, I will discuss the historical development of the distinction between first person inclusive and exclusive in South Asian languages. Most previous scholars have considered this distinction as a convergence; e.g., Masica quoted above, and I will discuss it in detail later. The problems I discuss here not only from a South Asian areal linguistic point of view but also from a cross-linguistic point of view are as following: Is convergence the only explanation for the historical development of this distinction in Indo-Aryan? Did the internal development of this distinction never happen in Indo-Aryan languages as an innovation? Generally speaking, when language X with a distinction between first person inclusive and exclusive meets with language Y without this distinction, what happens in language X or language Y? What is more typical: for language X to lose this distinction or for language Y to acquire it? Or is there no such tendency? I will try to provide some answers to these questions in this paper.

In the conclusion, I will suggest that the introduction of inclusive/exclusive distinction in some Indo-Aryan languages possibly occurred due to sales strategy and/or due to internal development.

---

[1]A portion of this paper is originated from my earlier paper "Personal pronouns and related phenomena in South Asian linguistic area: convergent features or convergence-resisting features?" in *Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics 2001*. (Sage Publications) pp.269-287. When Professor Frans Plank (Konstanz University) visited me at the cherry blossom season in Kyoto, he kindly read my paper and suggested that I rewrite my paper on the inclusive/exclusive distinction in the Indian context. I would like to express my sincere thanks to Professor Plank for his advice. I am also very much obliged to Sasha Vovin (Hawaii University), Arlo Griffith (Leiden University) and Greg Anderson (Manchester University) who read and gave an insightful comment on the earlier version of this paper. Needless to say, I alone am responsible for any errors and shortcomings in this paper.

1. Personal pronouns in the Indian languages

In this section I will present an overview of personal pronouns in Indian languages. I will just provide a brief description of personal pronouns in Indian languages based on the previous writers, especially Masica (1991) on Indo-Aryan, Steever (1998) on Dravidian, and Anderson (1999b) on Munda. I will not provide here the textual examples in all cases.

1.1 Indo-Aryan

Let me mention briefly the historical development of personal pronouns in Indo-Aryan. In Sanskrit the personal pronominal system is 3 (SG, DU, PL) X 3 (1^{st}, 2^{nd}, 3^{rd}) but Middle and Modern Indo-Aryan lack a dual form.

Personal pronouns in Indo-Aryan (sources: Campbell (1995) and Ray (1999) for Oriya, Pandharipande (1997) for Marathi, Bhatia (1993) for Panjabi, Wali and Koul (1997) for Kashmiri, Bubenik (1996) for Pali, Ardha-Magadhi, Maharashtri and Apabhramsa, Nara (1979) for Avahattha, Ucida (1991) for Saurashtra).

Table 1. Personal Pronouns in Indo-Aryan (Several Sources)

Languages	*1*	*1DL*	*1PL*	*2*	*2DL*	*2PL*	*3*	*3DL*	*3PL*
Sanskrit	aham	ãvãm	vayam	tvam	yuvãm	yũyam	saH/sã/tat	tau/te	te/täH/tãni

Languages	*1*	*1PL*	*2*	*2PL*	*3*	*3PL*
Pali	ahã	mayã	t(u)vã	tumhe	so/sã	te/tã, teyo
Ardha-Magadhi	ahã/hã	amhe	tumã/tã/ tume	tumhe/tujjhe/ tubbhe	sõ, sẽ/sã	te, se/taõ
Maharastri	ahã	amhe	tumã	tumhe	so/sã	te/tão
Apabhramsa	haũ	amhaĩ	tuhũ	tumhaĩ	so, su/sã	te/tãu
Avahattha	ho/hau	amhe/amhaĩ	tua/tuhu	tumhe	sa, se, so/se, so	te, tahi/tivi
Assamese honorific	mɔi	ami	tɔi apuni	tahãt aponasakal	i/ei/tai	
Bengali polite	ami	amra	tumi apni	tomra apnara	she tini	tãhara
Gujarati	hũ	ame *(excl)* ãpNe *(incl)*	tũ	tãme	te/ã	teo/ão

Languages	*1*	*1DL*	*1PL*	*2*	*2DL*	*2PL*	*3*	*3DL*	*3PL*
Sanskrit	aham	āvām	vayam	tvam	yuvām	yūyam	saH/sā/tat	tau/te	te/täH/tāni

Languages	*1*	*1PL*	*2*	*2PL*	*3*	*3PL*
Hindi polite	mãĩ	ham	tũ ãp	tum	yah/voh	ye/ve
Kashmiri	bɨ	əs'	tsɨ	toh'	yi/hu/sa	yim/hum/tim
Marathi	mĩ	ãmhĩ	tũ	tumhĩ	to/tĩ/te	te/tyã/tĩ
Nepali polite	ma	hãmĩ	timĩ tapaĩĩ	tapãĩĩharũ	yinĩ/unĩ yahãã/vahãã	yinĩharũ/unĩharũ yahããharũ/vahããharũ
Oriya polite	mũ	aame/aame maane	tu/tame aapaNa	tame/ tamemaane	se/sie/ye/ie	semaane/seimaane/ emaane/eimaane
Panjabi	mãi	asii	tuu	tusii	é/ó	é/ó
Sindhi	mãã	asĩĩ	tũũ	tavhĩĩ	hũ/hĩu hũa/ hĩa	hũ
Sinhalese	mama/man	api			eyã	ẽ gollo

1.2 Dravidian

Personal pronouns in Dravidian including reconstructed personal pronouns of Proto-Dravidian (according to the detailed list by Steever 1998) are as follows:

Table 2. Personal Prononus in Dravidian (Steever 1998)

Languages	*1*	*1PL*		*2*	*2PL*	*3*	*3PL*
		Incl.	*Excl.*				
Proto-Dravidian	*yān	*nām	*yām	*nīn	*nīm	*tān	*tān
Old Tamil	yāṉ, nāṉ	nām	yām	nī	nīr, nīyir	tāṉ	tām
Tamil	nāṉ	nām	nāṅkaḷ	nī	nīṅkaḷ	tāṉ	tāṅkaḷ
Kannada	nānu	nāvu	nāvu	nīnu	nīvu	tānu	tāmu
Tulu	yāṉuu	nama	eṅkulu	ī	nuwgulu	wāḍu/ atanu	waḷḷ u/ wāṇḍḷ u
Telugu	mēnu	manam (u)	mēm (u)	nīwu/ nuwwu	mīru		
Konda	nān (u)	māṭ (u)	māp (u)	nīn (u)	mīr (u)		
Gondi	nanna	mammaṭ	mammaṭ	nima	nimaṭ		
Kolami	ān	nēnḍ /nēm	ām	nīv	nīr		
Gadaba	ān	ām	ām	īn	īm	tān	tām
Malto	ēn	nām	ēm	nīn	nīm		
Brahui	ī	nan	nan	nī	num	ō (d)	ofk

1.3 Munda

Most Munda languages have a 3 (1^{st}, 2^{nd}, 3^{rd}) X 3 (SG, DU, PL) system. Sora, Gorum and Gutob lack a dual form. Juang, Sora, Gorum and Remo have no inclusive/exclusive distinction. The following table is based on several sources: Bodding (1929) for Santali, Osada (1992) for Mundari, Deeney (1975) for Ho, Drake (1903) for Korku, Biligiri (1965) for Kharia, Matson (1964) for Juang and Zide (1968) for South Munda.

Table 3. Personal Pronouns in Munda (Several Sources)

Languages	*1*	*1DL*		*1PL*		*2*	*2DL*	*2PL*	*3*	*3DL*	*3PL*
		Incl.	*Excl.*	*Incl.*	*Excl.*						
Santali	iñ	alaŋ	aliñ	abo	ale	am	aben	ape	a'j	akin	ako
Mundari	añ	alaŋ	aliŋ	abu	ale	am	aben	ape	ay	akiŋ	ako
Ho	aiŋ	alaŋ	aliŋ	abu	ale	am	aben	ape	ae	akiŋ	ako
Korku	iñ	alaŋ/ alom	aliñ	abuñ	ale	ami (ñ)	apiñ	ape	ae'j	akiñ	aku
Kharia	iñ	anaŋ	iñjar	aniŋ	ele	am	ambar	ampe	hokaR	hokiyar	hoki
Juang	añ	niñba	niñba	niñ	niñ	am	apa	ape	aro	aro-kia	aro-ki
Sora	ñɛn			anlɛn	anlɛn	amən	-	əmben	anin	-	ənin-ji
Gorum	miŋ			bileŋ	bileŋ	maŋ	-	babiŋ/mamin/ mamiŋ/maiŋ	nod	-	nod-gi
Gutob	niŋ			naj	nɛI	nɔm	-	pɛn	maj	-	maj-nɛn
Remo	niŋ	naŋ	naŋ	nai	nai	nɔm	pa	pɛ	mai	mai-pa	mai?-ɛ
Gta?	næŋ	niã	niã	nəe	nəe?	na	pa	pɛ	mə e	mə e-pa	mə e(ŋ)-niŋ

2. The inclusive/exclusive distinction in Dravidian, Munda and Indo-Aryan

As demonstrated above, it appears that personal pronouns show inconsistent development in South Asian languages. However the inclusive/exclusive distinction is widely spread beyond the Indo-Aryan, Dravidian and Munda language families. I will discuss here the historical development of this distinction first in the case of Dravidian, and then in the case of Austroasiatic, mainly involving the Munda languages.

There is a concise description of the historical development of Dravidian personal pronouns by Steever (1998), which I cite below:

"The personal pronouns of Proto-Dravidian are reconstructed in Table 1.7. Note that the oblique forms of the pronouns have short vowels while the corresponding nominative forms have long vowels. Note also the first person plural distinguishes between an inclusive plural 'we and you' and an exclusive plural 'we but not you'. The exact shape of the reconstructed first person plural inclusive pronoun is uncertain; some scholars have proposed the reconstructed form as **ñām*. In the dissolution of Proto-Dravidian into the various daughter languages, the shape of several personal pronouns has naturally changed. In several South Dravidian and South-Central languages, for example, the first person singular and first person plural inclusive now begin with an initial *n*, due to analogic restructuring with the first person plural inclusive and the second person pronouns so that all non-third person pronouns begin with *n*. This would have rendered the two first person plural pronouns homophonous; in fact the standard Modern Kannada pronoun *nāvu* 'we' does not distinguish between inclusive and exclusive forms of the pronoun, even though the Havyaka dialect preserves reflexes of this distinction with exclusive *yɛŋgḷu* and inclusive *nāvu*. In other languages, however, the first person inclusive plural was restructured in response to the potential loss of this distinction. In the development of Middle and Modern Tamil, a 'double plural' was formed by adding the plural marker *-kaḷ* to the plural pronoun *nām* 'we' pronoun or, perhaps, the singular pronoun *nāṉ* 'I', giving *nānkaḷ* 'we, not you'. The formation of double plurals in the second person is well attested in the history of Tamil: the modern second person plural pronoun *ninkaḷ* 'you' historically derives from *nīr* 'you' and plural marker *-kaḷ*. In the northwestern dialects of Gondi, the inclusive plural, with forms such as *āplo* and *āpaṇ*, has been borrowed from neighboring Indo-Aryan languages to maintain the inclusive-exclusive distinction." (pp. 21-22)

It is quite clear that the first person inclusive plural and exclusive plural can be reconstructed in Proto-Dravidian. In this paper I focus on the relationship between the historical development of inclusive/exclusive distinction and language contact. From the Dravidian perspective, we can observe the following points: first, Steever has correctly pointed out that this distinction was lost by analogic restructuring in modern Kannada without

distinction was lost by analogic restructuring in modern Kannada without being influenced by language contact. Thus language contact is not a necessary precondition for the loss of the inclusive/exclusive distinction. Second, in the northwestern dialects of Gondi, the inclusive plural forms have been borrowed from neighboring Indo-Aryan to maintain this distinction. In this case while neighboring Indo-Aryan languages have no such distinction, the language under discussion maintains this distinction although the inclusive plural form in the northwestern dialects of Gondi has been borrowed from neighboring Indo-Aryan languages. Third, it is interesting that Gadaba lacks this distinction. Actually the ethnonym 'Gadaba' corresponds linguistically to two groups; i.e., the Dravidian speaking Gadaba, called Konekor Gadaba (Bhaskararao 1980, 1998) or Ollari Gadaba (Bhattacharya 1957)[3] and the Munda speaking Gadaba, called Gutob. As was demonstrated above Gutob has the inclusive/exclusive distinction. We do not have any information on the historical development of this distinction in Gadaba. But it is very difficult to say that Gadaba lost this distinction due to language contact. In this case with Oriya which has no such distinction because the adjoining languages around Gadaba are not limited to Oriya but also include Telugu and Gutob (both have the inclusive/exclusive distinction). Furthermore, although Gutob is in the same linguistic environment as Gadaba, Gutob maintains this distinction. It seems to me that language contact does not play a crucial role in retention or loss of this distinction in Gutob and Gadaba.

In the Austroasiatic languages the distinction between inclusive and exclusive forms of pronouns is a common phenomenon. Pinnow (1965) summarized it as follows:

> "(c) Exclusive and inclusive forms of the 1st pers. pl. (and dl.). This distinction occurs in MU.(Munda), NIC.(Nicobarese), PW.(Palaung-Wa), MK.(Mon-Khmer), and ML.(Malacca languages=Aslian languages), but not in KHS.(Khasi). In the case of NAH (Nahali). There are certain indications that the categories in question were formerly present. It must be pointed out, however, that most languages of the groups MK. and ML. possess no separate forms for incl. and excl. But the distinction exists in e.g. Bahnar, which in this respect also proves close, because specially conservative, to MU. and NIC." (p.6)

Pinnow suggested that Munda retained the archaic system of personal pronouns of the Austroasiatic languages. Let me note that Juang, Sora, Gorum and Remo have no such a distinction. Among those, Juang belongs to Central Munda group together with Kharia which has this distinction. According to the Census of India 1971, Juang speakers only numbered 18,469 and they are

[3] According to Burrow and Bhattacharya (1962-63), Ollari and Konekor Gadaba are two local variants of the same language.

Sora is spoken in the border area between Telugu and Oriya. Further Gorum, Remo, Gta? and Gutob are located in the Koraput district of Orissa, where Desia, an Indo-Aryan language, is mainly spoken. According to Khageshwar Mahapatra (1986), there is no inclusive/exclusive distinction in Desia. While Gta? and Gutob have the inclusive/exclusive distinction, Gorum and Remo do not have it. Thus we cannot reach the conclusion that the retention or borrowing of this distinction is due to language contact. This is the same conclusion that can be reached in the Dravidian case, as outlined above.

It seems that a consensus has been reached about the order of settlers in the Indian subcontinent; i.e. Munda speakers first, then Dravidian speakers, and finally Indo-Aryan speakers. If it is so, there might be another question: is the Dravidian distinction of inclusive and exclusive influenced by Munda? If the genetic relationship between Dravidian and Elamite, with the latter lacking this distinction (Reiner 1969), is true (McAlpine1981), there is a possibility that Dravidian borrowed this distinction from Munda. But this is still problematic, because one can speculate that Elamite lost this distinction under the influence of neighboring languages. Of course, these speculations cannot be proved easily. I think that there might be a misconception that language Y without inclusive/exclusive distinction could acquire it only due to the contact with language X that has this distinction.

As far as Indo-Aryan is concerned, the inclusive/exclusive distinction is also found in some Indo-Aryan languages[3]; e.g., Marathi, Gujarati, and some forms of Rajasthani (Marwari, Harauti) although Old and Middle Indo-Aryan lack it. According to Masica (1991:251), these languages "conform to a Dravidian pattern in distinguishing 1st person *exclusive* vs. *inclusive* pronouns: Marathi *aamhii/aapaN*, Gujarati *ame/aapaN*, Marwari *mhe~/aapaa~*." In his recent paper, Masica still maintains the same view: "Nevertheless, in the limited set of Indo-Aryan languages in the sub-area delineated here, it is clear that the distinction is an areally-influenced and acquired one. It is also a classic illustration of how such distinctions are acquired: by reshaping the functions of elements already existing in a language, in this case the reflexive" (Masica 2001:254)

Furthermore, Emeneau (1980:59) demonstrated that the Brahui language has "loss of the Dravidian distinction between exclusive and inclusive in the first plural pronoun and the corresponding verbal forms (no Iranian language has this distinction, but Sindhi, like some other modern Indo-Aryan languages, has acquired it)".

[3] I do not discuss here the exclusive/inclusive distinction of personal marking in Oriya (B. P. Mahapatra 2000); e.g. ame asilu 'we (excl) came' vs. ame asile 'we (incl) came', or of possessive in Hindi (Hook:p.c.); e.g. hamara hindustan 'our (incl) Hindustan' vs. apna hindustan 'our(excl) Hindustan'.

Moreover, Gumperz and Wilson (1971) have also pointed out that the development of an inclusive/exclusive 'we' distinction occurs in all three of the Kupuwar languages: i.e., Marathi, Kannada and Urdu.

Did these languages borrow this distinction from Dravidian? And is it possible that loss of the Dravidian distinction in the Brahui language is due to a convergence with adjacent Iranian languages? Although the second question is out of the scope of this paper, the second solution seems more likely than the first one. Regarding the first question, Masica (1991, 2001) did not mention explicitly the donor of this distinction in Marathi, Gujarati, Marwari and Harauti. Emeneau (1980) pointed out simply that "Sindhi, like some other modern Indo-Aryan languages, has acquired it". From where? He also did not specify it to the best of my knowledge. If this distinction was borrowed from Dravidian I wonder which language is the donor. From a geographical point of view, Kannada is the most likely candidate. However, such a distinction is not found in Kannada, as I mentioned in 1.2. I should note here that Gujarati, Marwari and Sindhi are even not directly adjacent to any Dravidian languages according to the modern languages' position on the map. According to Gumperz and Wilson (1971), Kupwar Kannada has this distinction. But 'we do not know whether its presence in the Kupwar dialect is due to retention or to borrowing from Marathi' as Thomason and Kaufman (1988:349) stated correctly in the notes. Furthermore, Southworth (1974:209) provided the example of Marathi and Gujarati inclusive/exclusive distinction of first person plural pronouns as a semantic convergence. He just mentioned that "this is a pan-Dravidian feature, but is not found in early IA". He has also never specified the donor of this distinction. Although the previous researchers do not specify the donor of this distinction in some Indo-Aryan languages, they consider this distinction as the result of convergence.

My predecessors have never taken into consideration other Indo-Aryan languages; i.e., Saurashtra spoken in the Dravidian dominant area, Madurai in the state of Tamil Nadu (Tamil speaking area) and Tirupati in the state of Andhra Pradesh (Telugu speaking area). According to Uchida (1991:53), the Tirupati dialect of Saurashtra has the following distinction: e.g. *ami* 'we (exclusive)' and *abulu* 'we (inclusive)'. Uchida (1991:46) pointed out that the suffix *–lu* is borrowed from Telugu plural suffix *-lu*. It seems that in the case of Saurashtra this can be simply perceived as a borrowing from adjoining Dravidian. However, Marathi, Gujarati and Marwari cases are quite different from Saurashtra. In those languages this distinction was acquired (or introduced as an innovation) "by reshaping the functions of elements already existing in a language, in this case the reflexive" (Masica 2001:254). I will discuss these cases in the following section.

3. A possible internal development of inclusive / exclusive distinction in some Indo-Aryan languages

Now I would like to suggest an alternative interpretation of the development of inclusive/exclusive distinction in some Indo-Aryan languages. I believe that two new solutions can be proposed.

(1) A situation requires the distinction between speakers including addressees and speakers excluding the addressees. Such a situation occurs not only due to the language contact but also due to the sociolinguistic situation, in particular, the business setting. The latter case is the object of the study here.

I would like to approach this issue from a cross-linguistic point of view. We can find a similar distinction in Japanese, which is not outlined in traditional Japanese grammar. Japanese has a special exclusive form for first person plural; *temae-domo* (*watakushi-tachi* or *watashi-tachi* is a general form). The word *temae-domo* can be analysed as *temae* 'I' (which is further etymologically analysed into *te* 'hand' and *mae* 'front') and *-domo* 'plural suffix'. This pronoun is used only by the sales-persons in the following way:

A: *shinju-no nekkuresu-o kudasai.*
pearl-GEN necklace-ACC please give me
'Please give me a pearl necklace'
B: *zannen-nagara, temae-domo de-wa go-yooi-shite-orimasen.*
regret-although we(excl) LOC-TOP PFX-prepare-do-NEG
'To our regret, we (excl) don't have it'

According to the examples above, business people need to express the distinction of 'we including the customers' and 'we excluding the customers' at the sales scene. This is a common sales strategy in Japan. The salespersons use this distinction for expressing their polite attitude towards customers, but they did not borrow it from other languages. Besides the sale scene, the following caution notice is very common in hotels and restaurants;

temae-domo-wa issai sekinin-o oi-masen.
We (excl)-TOP entirely responsibility-ACC take-NEG
'We (excl) do not take any responsibility (for something bad occurring to customers)'

One could consider this distinction as a contact-induced change because the Ainu language has this distinction. However, in this case one should explain why this distinction is limited to the usage by salespersons only[4]. I presume that the origin of this distinction in Japanese due to the contact with the Ainu language is less likely than salesperson's strategy. This

[4]Apart from this, Sasha Vovin (p.c.) pointed out that *temae* as first person pronoun is not attested before 16th century. It is too late for Ainu-induced influence.

sociolinguistic interpretation may be applied to the Indo-Aryan cases as well. It is well known that the Marwari and Sindhi speaking peoples are dominated by the business class.

Apart from the business setting, one should take the Indian social situation into consideration. Needless to say, India has a caste society. In this society it is necessary to make a distinction between the speakers including speaker's caste or ethnic member and the speakers excluding speaker's caste or ethnicity. For example, Mundari has this distinction: *ale* 'we (excl)' and *abu* 'we (incl)'. Mundari speakers normally distinguish between *abu-a? dukan* (we-GEN shop) 'our (incl) shop=the shop owner is belonging to Munda' and *ako-a? dukan* (they-GEN shop) 'their shop= the shop owner is not belonging to Munda'. Even more interestingly, the non-Mundari speaking businessmen at the weekly market in the Mundari-speaking area usually pick up the Mundari first person plural as *ale* 'we (excl)' instead of *abu* 'we (incl)'. However, some more sophisticated businessmen manage to learn this distinction. When they use *abu-a? dukan* instead of *ale-a? dukan*, Munda tends to feel a more close relationship to such businessmen. Although in this case the businessmen apparently learned this distinction from Mundari speakers, no scholars ever thought that the business strategies: politeness towards customers, friendliness towards customers etc., could be reflected to some extent by this distinction. I believe that business persons can create this distinction for business strategy even without any language contact-induced influence.

(2) The distinction of first person inclusive and exclusive forms can be due to internal development from the distinction between a reflexive pronoun and a first person plural pronoun.

Here I intend to discuss the inclusive form *āpaṇ* in Marathi and Gujarati, and *āpā* in Marwari. First, as mentioned above, Gujarati and Marwari have no direct contact with Dravidian languages in the present. Second, these forms are obviously derived from the reflexive pronoun as Southworth (1974:210) and Masica (2001:254) have pointed out. Is it possible that the internal development from the reflexive pronoun to the first person plural inclusive pronoun occurred in Marathi and/or Gujarati, as well as in Marwari?

To give an answer to this question, one should consult with Turner's *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. According to Turner (1966), there are the following examples:

Sanskrit *ātmán* 'self', Nepali *āphu* 'self, respectful second sg. pronoun'; Assamese *āpon* 'respectful second sg. pronoun'; Bengali *āpani*, *āpuni* 'respectful second sg. pronoun'; Oriya *āpaṇ* 'you (respectful)'; Old Marwari *āpa* 'self, you (honorific), we (inclusive)'; Gujarati *āp* 'self, you (respectful)', *āpaṇ* 'we (inclusive)'; Hindi *āp* 'you (polite)'

On the basis of these examples, it is quite easy to suggest the internal development in Indo-Aryan languages: reflexive pronoun > second singular honorific pronoun > first plural inclusive pronoun.

The historical development is fairly clear. However, the following question may arise. Is it necessary that this development occurred due to language contact? The answer is in the negative. For the first change, we have an interesting example in the Osaka dialect of Japanese. *Jibun* is the reflexive pronoun 'self' in Tokyo Japanese, but it is used for the second person pronoun 'you' in Osaka Japanese. I believe that the reflexive pronoun could develop into the second person pronoun in Japanese in the same way as in Indo-Aryan. It seems to me that this change is simply due to the internal development without any contact situation. We can explain the second change in the following way: the first plural inclusive pronoun involves the inclusion of the second person in the deictic situation. Although I cannot present examples of cross-linguistic data, I think that this change can also occur without any situation of language contact.

Alternative interpretations are also possible. The distinction between first person plural inclusive/exclusive forms in Modern Indo-Aryan can be considered as a result of internal development without any influence of language contact or of sociolinguistic factors; e.g., business settings.

4. Conclusion

Since Emeneau (1956) defined India (i.e., South Asia) as a linguistic area, the convergence is the most commonly discussed topic among the linguists working on South Asian languages. It seems to me that not everything could be explained through convergence. Nevertheless, scholars tend to take for granted that the common features among the South Asian languages, which are not found in other branches of Indo-European, are due to contact-induced change. I have so far studied the uncommon elements between the Munda languages and the other South Asian languages; e.g., experiential constructions (Osada 1999), pronominal personal marking (Osada 2001) and reciprocal constructions (Osada Forthcoming). I have provided a list of convergence-resisting features from a Mundaist's point of view (Osada 2001:283-284).

As far as the distinction between inclusive form and exclusive form in first person non-singular is concerned, the distribution of this distinction is not restricted to Indo-Aryan, Dravidian and Munda. The following languages in South Asia have this distinction as well: Andamanese (Manoharan 1989), several Tibeto-Burman languages: Ladakhi (Koshal 1979) and Limbu (van Driem 1987): (Garo (Burling 2003), Dumi (van Driem 1993), Hayu (Michailovsky 1974), Bahing (Michailovsky 1975), Khaling (Toba & Toba 1975), Athpare (Ebert 1997a), Camling (Ebert 1997b), Belhare (Bickel 1996), Yamphu (Rutgers 1998), Thulung (Allen 1975). Under these circumstances, it is very difficult to point out the origin of this distinction in the South Asian linguistic area.

In conclusion, I again reiterate my points here:

(1) In the case of a language island, which means a language entirely surrounded by the neighboring language, e.g. Brahui (Dravidian), Juang (Munda) and Saurashtra (Indo-Aryan), it is easy for such a language to acquire or lose the distinction of inclusive/exclusive 'we' due to contact-induced change.

(2) In the situation of partial contact between language X with an inclusive/exclusive distinction and language Y without this distinction, there are no rules or even any tendencies for the language X to retain or lose this distinction; e.g. while the northwestern dialects of Gondi (Dravidian) retain it, Sora, Gorum, and Remo (Munda) lose it.

(3) Language X with the inclusive/exclusive distinction can lose it not due to contact-induced change but due to an internal development; e.g. Kannada (Dravidian).

(4) Some Indo-Aryan languages; i.e., Marathi, Gujarati, Marwari, etc., are in partial contact with Dravidian or even in no direct contact with Dravidian. As all the previous researchers have pointed out, it is possible that a distinction of inclusive/exclusive in the first person plural in these languages was acquired due to contact-induced change from a language X with this distinction, which is most likely a Dravidian language.

(5) However, it is not so obvious for two reasons: first, the contact situation is not clear; e.g. Gujarati has no immediate contact with a language X with this distinction, since it is not adjacent to any Dravidian language at the moment. Second, alternative interpretations are also possible.

(6) The alternative interpretations include two possibilities. First, the business strategy involving the situation where this distinction would become necessary; cf. *temae-domo* in Japanese discussed above. Second, this distinction may be viewed as an innovation due to an internal development: reflexive pronoun > second person pronoun > first person plural inclusive pronoun.

REFERENCES

Allen, Nicholas. 1975. *Sketch of Thulung Grammar*. Cornell University, Ithaca.

Anderson, Gregory D.S. 1999a. "A new classification of the Munda language family: evidence from comparative verb morphology." Paper presented at *the 209th Meeting of the American Oriental Society*.

Anderson, Gregory D.S. 1999b. "Referent indexing in the Munda verb." MS.

Bauman, Jim. 1974. "Pronominal verb morphology in Tibeto-Burman." *LTBA* 1(1):108-155.

Bhaskararao, Peri. 1980. *Konekor Gadaba: A Dravidian language*. Deccan College, Poona

Bhaskararao, Peri. 1998. *Gadaba*. In Steever, ed., pp. 328-355.

Bhaskararao, Peri. and K. V. Subbarao 2001. (eds) *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics 2001*. pp. 205-267, Sage Publication, New Delhi.

Bhatia, Tej. 1993. *Punjabi: A Cognitive-Descriptive Grammar*. Routledge, London.

Bhattacharya, Sudhibhushan. 1957. *Ollari: A Dravidian speech*. Department of Anthropology, Government of India.

Bhattacharya, Sudhibhushan. 1965. "Glottal stop and checked consonants in Bonda." *IIJ* 9:69-77.

Bhattacharya, Sudhibhushan. 1975. *Studies in Comparative Munda Linguistics*. Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Simla.

Bickel, B. 1996. *Aspect, Mood, and Time in Belhare*. ASAS Press, Zuerich.

Biligiri, H.S. 1965. *Kharia: Phonology, Grammar and Vocabulary*. Deccan College, Poona.

Bodding, P. O. 1929. *Materials for a Santali Grammar*. The Santal Mission of the Northern Church, Dumka.

Bubenik, Vit. 1996. *The Structure and Development of Middle Indo-Aryan Dialects*. Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi.

Burling, Robbins. 2003. *The Language of the Modhupur Mandi (Garo)*. Scholarly Publishing Office, Ann Arbor.

Burrow, Thomas and S. Bhattacharya. 1962-63. "Gadaba supplement." *IIJ* 6:45-51.

Campbell, George (ed) 1995. *Concise Compendium of the World's Languages*. Routledge, London.

Deeney, John. 1975. *Ho Grammar and Vocabulary*. Xavier Ho Publication, Chaibasa.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1979. "Ergativity." *Language* 55:59-138.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Donegan, Patricia Jane. 1993. "Rhythm and vocalic drift in Munda and Mon-Khmer." *LTBA* 16(1):1-43.

Drake, John. 1903. *A Grammar of the Kurku Language*. Baptist Mission Press, Calcutta.

Ebert, Karen. 1997a. *A Grammar of Athpare*. Lincom Europa, Muenchen.

Ebert, Karen. 1997b. *Camling*. Lincom Europe, Munich.

Emeneau, Murray B. 1956. "India as a linguistic area." *Language* 32:3-16.

Emeneau, Murray B. 1980. *Language and Linguistic Area. Essays by Murray B. Emeneau.* Selected and introduced by Anwar S. Dil. Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Gruessner, Karl-Heinz. 1978. *Arleng Alam: Die Sprache der Mikir Grammatik und Texte*. Franz Steiner, Wiesbaden.

Gumperz, John & R.Wilson. 1971. "Convergence and creolization: a case from the Indo-Arayn/ Dravidian border." In Dell Hymes, ed., *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*, 151-168. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Hodgson, Brian H. 1856. "Aborgines of the Niligiris with remarks on their affinities." *JASB* 25:498-522.

Konow, Sten. 1909. *Linguistic Survey of India* Vol. 3. Superintendent of Government Printing, Calcutta.

Koshal, Sanyukta. 1979. *Ladakhi Grammar*. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.

Mahapatra, Bijay Prasad. 1976. "Comparative notes on Juang and Kharia finite verbs." *AS* II:801-814.

Mahapatra, Bijay Prasad. 2000. "The hypothesis of Dravidian sub-stratum for Magadhan languages." *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 29(1):1-8.

Mahapatra, Khageshwar. 1986. *Desia: A Tribal Dialect of Koraput, Orissa.* Academy of Tribal Dialects and Cultures, Government of Orissa, Bhubaneshwar.

Manoharan, S. 1989. *A Descriptive and Comparative Study of Andamanese Language*. Anthropological Survey of India, Calcutta.

Masica, Colin P. 1976. *Defining a linguistic area: South Asia*. Chicago University Press, Chicago

Masica, Colin P. 1991. *The Indo-Aryan languages*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Masica, Colin P. 2001. "The definition and significance of linguistic areas: methods, pitfalls, and possibilities (with special reference to the validity of South Asia as a linguistic area)." Peri Bhaskararao and K. V. Subbarao (eds) *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics 2001*. 205-267. Sage Publication, New Delhi.

Matson, D.M. 1964. "A Grammatical Sketch of Juang, a Munda Language." Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin.

McAlpine, Divide. 1981. *Proto-Elamo-Dravidian*. America Philosophical Society, Philadelphia.

Michailovsky, Boyd. 1974. "Hayu typology and verbal morphology." *LTBA* 1(1):1-26.

Michailovsky, Boyd. 1975. "Notes on the Kiranti Verb <East Nepal>." *LTBA* 2(2):183.

Nara Tsuyoshi. 1978. *Avahattha and Comparative Vocabulary of New Indo-Aryan Languages*. ILCAA, Tokyo.

Osada Toshiki. 1992. *A Reference Grammar of Mundari*. ILCAA, Tokyo.

Osada Toshiki. 1999. "Experiential constructions in Mundari." *Journal of the Linguistic Society of Japan* 115:51-76.

Osada Toshiki (2001. "Personal pronouns related phenomena in South Asian linguistic area: Convergent features or convergence-resisting features?." In Peri Bhaskararao and K.V. Subbarao, eds., *Yearbook of the South Asian Languages and Linguistics 2001*. pp 269-287, Sage Publications, Delhi.

Osada Toshiki. Forthcoming. "Reciprocals in Mundari." Vladimir Nedjalkov and Z. Guentcheva (eds) *Typology of the Reciprocal Constructions*. Lincom Europa, Muenchen.

Pandharipande, Rajeshwari. 1997. *Marathi*. Routledge, London.

Pinnow, Heinz=Jürgen. 1965. "Personal pronouns in the Austroasiatic languages: a historical study", *Lingua* 14:3-42.

Pinnow, Heinz=Jürgen. 1966. "A comparative study of the verb in the Munda languages." In Norman H. Zide, ed., *SCAL* 96-193. Mouton.

Ray, Tapas S. 1999. "Lexical anaphoras and pronouns in Oriya", B.C.Lust, K. Wali, J.W. Gair and K.V. Subbarao (eds) *Lexical Anaphora and Pronouns in Selected South Asian Languages: A Principled Typology*. pp. 575-636. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin

Reiner, Erica. 1969. "The Elamite language." In B. Spuler, ed., *Handbuch der Orientalistik*. E. J. Brill, Leiden.

Rutgers, Roland. 1998. *Yamphu: Grammar, Texts and Lexicon*. Research School, Leiden.

Southworth, Franklin C. (1974. "Linguistic stratigraphy of North India." *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 3(1):201-223.

Steever, Sanford B. 1986. "Morphological convergence in the Khondmals: (pro)-nominal incorporation." In Bh. Krishnamurti, ed., *South Asian Languages: Structure, Convergence, and Diglossia*. pp. 270-285. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.

Steever, Sanford B. 1993. *Analysis to Synthesis: The Development of Complex Verb Morphology in the Dravidian Languages*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Steever, Sanford B. (ed) 1998. *The Dravidian Languages*. Routledge, London and New York.

Thomason, Sarah Grey and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Toba Sueyoshi and Ingrid Toba. 1975. *A Khaling-English Dictionary*. Summer Institute of Linguistics, Kirtipur.

Turner, R. L. 1966. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Ucida Norihiko. 1991. *The Language of the Saurashtrans in Tirupati*. Mahalaxmi Enterprises, Bangalore.

van Driem, George. 1987. *A Grammar of Limbu*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

van Driem, George. 1993. *A Grammar of Dumi*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

Wali, Kashi and Omkar N. Koul. 1997. Kashmiri-A Cognitive-descriptive Grammar. Routledge, London.

Zide, Arlene R.K. 1976. "Nominal combing forms in Sora and Gorum." In Phillip N. Jenner, Lawrence C. Thompson & Stanley Starosta, eds., *AS* 1251-1294. Hawaii University Press, Honolulu.

Zide, Arlene R.K. 1978. "A note on glottalization and release in Munda." *IL* 39:70-75.

Zide, Arlene R.K. and Norman H. Zide. 1987. "A KM laryngeal as a conditional factor for s-loss in Sora-Juray-Gorum." In George Cardona and Norman H. Zide, ed., *Festscrift for Henry Hoenigswald: On the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, pp 417-431. Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen.

Zide, Norman H. 1965. "Gutob-Remo vocalism and glottalized vowels." *Lingua* 14.

Zide, Norman H. 1966. "Korku low tone and the Proto-Korku-Kherwarian vowel system." In Norman Zide, ed., *SCAL* 214-229, Mouton, The Hague.

Zide, Norman H. 1968. "Some comparative notes on Gata? Pronouns." In J.C. Heesterman, ed., *Pratidanam: Indian, Iranian and Indo-european Studies Present to F.B.J.Kuiper on his Sixtieth Birthday*, pp.348-358. Mouton, The Hague.

Zide, Norman H. 1997. "Gutob pronominal clitics and related phenomena elsewhere in Gutob-Remo-Gta?" In Anvita Abbi, ed., *Languages of Tribal and Indigenous Peoples of India*, pp. 307-334. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.

Zide, Norman H. and Gregory D.S. Anderson. Forthcoming. "Towards an analysis of the South Munda verbal system." In F.K. Lehman, ed., *Southeast Asian Linguistics* VII. Southeast Asian Linguistic Society

Zide, Norman H. and Khageswar Mahapatra. 1972. "Gta? nominal combing forms." *IL* 33(3):179-202.

Received: 1 October 2003

Kyoto University of Art and Design,
Kyoto
JAPAN