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Introduction
Person in Indo-European languages: 3 atoms: 1st, 2nd and 3rd person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>INCL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1st speaker</td>
<td>1st speaker + associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2nd hearer</td>
<td>2nd hearer + associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>they non-participant + associates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other languages may add an inclusive pronoun, e.g. Marquesan (Cablitz 2006):

INCL (Level 2) = speaker + hearer

Questions & Hypotheses
What is the inclusive?

- INCL = 1st SP + 2nd HR
- HR = 2nd you

Why is only the combination of speaker and hearer lexicalised (INCL) and the other combinations of the atoms unlexicalised?

- SP + NON-SP = 1st
- HR + NON-HR = 3rd
- INCL + others = non-participants

Extension: Number

- Person and number:
  - Two distinct features
  - Belonging to two distinct categories

- This distinction is confirmed by:
  - Semantics: person is deictic vs. plural is never defined as such (e.g. Beijer 2003)
  - Ackema and Neeleman To Appear, p. 72

- Morphology: no languages have the same morpheme for 1st and 3rd

For number, 1 propose the following extension:

- Bittar: to calculate further relations, such as the proper parthood relations between the singular and plural versions of the same person
- is: Languages have no simplex lexicalisations for an extra number distinction in inclusive, which is why the is corner is shared by both kites.

Conclusion
A kite analysis of person sheds light on person distinctions in personal pronouns:

- Captures the complexity of the inclusive person
- Predicts other combinations to be unlexicalised.
- The systems can be extended to add number in order to account for the basic personal pronoun distinctions.
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