Person and Number: 3rd Person vs. Plural

The Literature on Person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>1+3</td>
<td>tₜ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>₂</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>2+3</td>
<td>u₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>3+3</td>
<td>oₜ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Common analysis: PLURAL ≠ 3rd PERSON

Claim

PLURAL ≠ 3rd PERSON

• PL = a associates
• 3rd = o other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>he, she, it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Morphological Differences

Possible Person Paradigms:
• Suppletive paradigm
• Regular person stem + number affix
• Suppletive person stem + number affix
• Suppletive paradigm (Guaraní):
  Gregores & Suárez 1987
  SG  PL
  iu  yané
  i  šé  oré
  u  né  peé
  o  (demonstr)

• Suppletive paradigm (Guaraní):
  Regular person stem + number affix (Quechua):
  Adelaar 1977
  SG  PL
  iu    nuxañič(k)
  i    nuxa    nuxa-guna
  u    xam    xam-guna
  o    pay    pay-guna

• Suppletive paradigm (Guaraní):
  Regular person stem + number affix (Quechua)
  • Suppletive person stem + number affix:
    (Kayardild):
  Evans 1995
  SG  PL
  iu    nga-ku-l-da
  i    nga-da    nga-l-da
  u    nyingka    ki-l-da
  o    nilya    bi-l-da

→ Compositional paradigms

1. Morphology

Expectation
Compositional paradigms:
One morpheme for 3rd & plural

\[
\begin{array}{c|cc}
  & sg & pl \\
  iu & \alpha & \delta \\
i   & \beta & \beta & \delta \\
u   & \gamma & \gamma & \delta \\
o   & \delta & \delta \\
\end{array}
\]

Claim
Unattested
• Sample (30 lgs)
  • Typological literature, a.o. (330 lgs)
    – Forchheimer 1953
    – Harley & Ritter 2003
    – Daniel 2005
    – Baerman et al. 2005
    – Bobaljik 2008
    – Cysouw 2009
    – Harbour To Appear
    – Ackema & Neeleman
    To Appear
Composite Forms in Forchheimer 1953

‘Composite Forms’: +3 pl
- Pama-Nyungan:
  - Kalaw Lagaw Ya
  - Arrernte
- Penutian:
  - Coastal Oregon Penutian
  - Coos
  - Siuslaw
- Chinook
- Ancient Middle-East, Mesopotamia
  - Hurrian
  - Sumerian

1. Morphology

Arrernte

- Independent subject pronouns
(Wilkins 1989, p. 124)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>DU</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| i     | aye| we| (a)nwe|e
| u     | un| nge| mpwele|arrantherre
| o     | b| e| re-therre| ilne

- Phonemic length of /r/
- Syllables never consonant final

1. Morphology

1. Morphology

1. Morphology

Summary

There are no convincing examples of languages that use the same morpheme for

- PL ➔ PL ≠ 3rd
- 3rd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sg</th>
<th>pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β-δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>γ</td>
<td>γ-δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>δ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Morphology
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1. Morphology

2. Semantic differences

Reference: (Ackema & Neeleman to appear, pp. 70-73)

“An o ... cannot be included in the reference of a first or second plural pronoun without first being turned into an associate in some way.”
Peter: Do you know whether George Clooney likes good coffee?

- Ad: #Yes, we both drink Illy.
- Ad: Yes, he drinks Illy, just like me.

**Survey**

- Dutch: Flemish speakers
  - sg
  - pl
  - iu
  - i
  - u
  - o
  - wij
  - ik
  - j
  - hij, zij, het
  - wij
  - jullie
  - o
  - zij
  - zij
- 32 participants included

**Results**

Reference: (Ackema & Neeleman to appear, pp. 70-73)

"An o… cannot be included in the reference of a first or second plural pronoun without first being turned into an associate in some way."

- Plural pronoun: NO third person
- Plural pronoun: associates

"Yesterday I saw my granny and tomorrow I am visiting my parents. She wishes you the best."

- You and partner + my parents 3%
- Only you and partner 88%
- Both options are possible 9%

Peter: “Do you know if George Clooney likes to drink coffee?”

- Ad: “Yes, we both like to drink Nespresso.” 2.40/5
- Ad: “Yes, he likes to drink Nespresso, just like I do.”

SD: 1.58 & 0.95

(Ackema & Neeleman, To Appear)
Peter: “Do you know if George Clooney likes to drink coffee?”

- Ad: “Yes, we both like to drink Nespresso.”
- Ad: “Yes, he likes to drink Nespresso, just like I do.”

SD: 1.44 & 0.74

Peter: “Don’t you think Julia Roberts and George Clooney act so well together? … By the way, do you know if George Clooney likes to drink coffee?”

- Ad: “Yes, they both like to drink Nespresso.”
- Ad: “Yes, he likes to drink Nespresso, just like she does.”

SD: 1.40 & 1.33

Summary

- A plural pronoun
  - Does NOT include reference to a third person
  - Includes reference to associates
  - Speakers differ in whether or not they consider a third person as an associate
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3. Theoretical Consequences

Ackema & Neeleman

- Input set:
  - \( S_{i} a u a \)
  - \( S_{i+u} o a o \)

- Features:
  - [prox]: discard outer layer
  - [dist]: select outer layer

• we: \( i_u a \) [prox (pers)]
  - Discard outer layer

- \( S_{i} a u a \)
- \( S_{i+u} o a o \)
  - \( S, S_{i} \{i, ia, iaa, ..., iu, iua, iuua, ...\} \)
  - \( \{i, iu, a\} \)

3. Theoretical Consequences

Harbour

- Lattices:
  - Person: \( \{i_p, u_p, iu_p, o_p\} \)
  - Author: \( \{i\} \)
  - Participant: \( \{i, iu, u\} \)

- Features:
  - [auth]: + / - author lattice
  - [part]: + / - participant lattice
3. Theoretical Consequences

• 3 person atoms:
  - L_{pers} + L_{auth} - \{i, u, o\} + \{\}
  - \{i\}, \{u\}, \{o\}

• Plural: + a

• 8 possible persons
  - Ø expletive
  - i first
  - u second
  - o third
  - iu inclusive
  - io non-hearer
  -uo non-speaker
  - iuo generic

3. Theoretical Consequences

The Kite Framework

Predicted by the Concept Formation Constraint in the kite framework:
  - "io non-hearer
  - "uo non-speaker

3. Theoretical Consequences

Ambiguity of “some”

Jacoby, Sesmat, Blanché 1952

- Some, possibly all:
  "If some students pass the test, I’ll treat them to chocolates"
  → "If all students pass the test, I’ll treat them to chocolates"
- Some but not all:
  "Some people are allergic to chocolate"
  ≠
  "All people are allergic to chocolate"
Lexicalisation in certain closed lexical fields is restricted by a concept formation constraint (Jaspers 2012, Seuren & Jaspers 2014):

- Logical hexagon: two corners are never lexicalised
- Result: kite structure

### Person deixis: corresponding limitations on concept formation

- 1st person
- Inclusive
- 2nd person
- 3rd person

### Tümpisa Shoshone

(Demonstratives)

- SG
- PL

### English

- Plural ≠ 3rd Person
- Different
- Morphologically
- Semantically

- I, we
- He, she, it, they
- We
- You
The Concept Formation Constraint in the kite framework allows for all the lexicalisable person distinctions attested in natural languages.
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**Conclusion**
- Morphology: Different morphemes for 3rd person and plural
- Semantics: Reference

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{3rd person:} & \quad o \\
\neq & \\
\text{Plural:} & \quad a
\end{align*}
\]

• This is a necessary distinction if analyses of person aim to make the correct predictions on person lexicalisation

Questions?
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