FEATURES AND MARKEDNESS: PERSON

1. PERSON – THE TRADITIONAL VIEW

(1) PERSON: Values

[1] = Speaker / Author
[2] = Hearer / Addressee

Speech Act
         Participants

“4th person” Inuit: 3rd person coreferential with subject
Sayula Popoluca: 4th psn has less focus in discourse than 3rd person
Sierra Popoluca: 4th person – inclusive (see below)
Algonquian: 3 – proximate; 4 – obviative (less topical)
Ahabaskan: multiple functions

(2) Greenberg’s Universal 42. All languages have pronominal categories involving at least three persons and two numbers.

2. THE PLURAL PROBLEM

(3) “dog” =

“dog-s” =

(4) “I” = SPEAKER

“we” = SPEAKER, SPEAKER, SPEAKER FALSE (or too restrictive)

(5) Four meanings of “we” (Boas 1911)

inclusive [1+2]
Why don’t we go see a movie?
(Just the two of us)
exclusive [1+3]
(To babysitter): We will be home at 10.

Why don’t we meet at the Brattle?
We are all individuals (Life of Brian)
We are the Champions

• Only the groupspeak meaning is a “true” 1pl, in the sense of dog:dogs
• No (known) language has a pronoun used exclusively for this function — the one used is always the same as the exclusive, at least.

(6) Plural (for personal pronouns) means “group” (Cysouw 2003, Kratzer 2006)

1 means “includes the speaker”
2 means “includes the hearer”

3 would appear to mean “includes an other person” (to be rejected below)

3. “CLUSIVITY”

(7) Kayardild (S. Wellesley Islands, Northern Australia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>dual</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “inclusive” | 1 + 2 | * | nakura
| “exclusive” | 1 | nàda | nàra | nàulta
| 2 | nĩkka | kira | kita |
| 3 | nja | pira | píta |

Some morphological analysis (segmentation): identify dual and plural affixes.

(8) Mandara (Chadic, Cameroon Cysouw 2003:141)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“inclusive”</td>
<td>1 + 2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“exclusive”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>kà</td>
<td>kwá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ã</td>
<td>tã</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9) We’ve introduced a new formal element into the system: “+” (Kratzer 2006: sum)

Without this element, the system undergenerates: it fails the criterion of “descriptive adequacy”, it does not serve to describe all the attested data (in this case, person systems).

(10) Overgeneration (Greenberg)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 + 2;</th>
<th>1 + 5;</th>
<th>3 + 3</th>
<th>3 + 3 + 3 …</th>
<th>vs. number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 + 2 + 2;</td>
<td>1 + 2 + 2 + 2;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assume: “no repetition” [includes a hearer] = [includes a hearer and a hearer & …]

There may be a very “deep” explanation for this, but we’ll set discussion aside.
11. Still left with seven possibilities (for plural):
   a. 1 groupspeak “we” / true 1st person
   b. 1 + 2 inclusive “we”
   c. 1 + 3 exclusive “we”
   d. 1 + 2 + 3 complete “we”
   e. 2 exclusive “you”
   f. 2 + 3 inclusive “you”
   g. 3 “they”

12. inclusive admitted max. attested
    1+2 1+2 vs. 1+2+3 never distinguished
    1+2+3 1+2 vs. 1+2+3 never distinguished
  1 (excl.) 1 vs. 1+3 never distinguished
    1 1
    1+3 1+3
    2 2
    2+3 2 vs. 2+3 never distinguished (ASL?)
    3 3

Remarks concern monomorphic pronoun/agreement systems; number factored out.
Major surveys, 400-500 langs: (Forchheimer 1953, Cysouw 2003)

13. [1,2,3] undergenerates
   {1,2,3, *} overgenerates

14. a. [+ speaker, + hearer] = “first person inclusive”
   b. [+ speaker, - hearer] = “first person exclusive”
   c. [- speaker, + hearer] = “second person”
   d. [- speaker, - hearer] = “third person”

15. a. 3 features
    inclusive 1+2 1+2+3
    1 (excl.) 1
    1+3
    2 2+3
    3

b. 2 binary features
   +sp +hr
   +sp “we”
   -sp +hr
   -sp

16. a. Each of us has done his homework.
   → I have done my homework; ~/~/ I have done his homework.

   b. Each of us has done his homework.
   → X has done my homework.

   How is it that “his” can (apparently) refer to the speaker? Digression: one conception of markedness.

4.1 Jakobson on Markedness

17. a. lion – lioness
tiger – tigress
actor – actress
waiter – waitress

   b. levi – I’veca ‘lion – lioness’ (Russian)
osil – osilca ‘donkey, mare/hen’
ùčitel’ – ùčitel’ica ‘teacher, female teacher’

   c. Löwe – Löwin ‘lion – lioness’ (German)
Esel – Eselin ‘donkey – mare/hen’
Student – Studentin ‘student – (female)’
Österreicher – österreicherin ‘Austrian (person)’

18. Marked; (Morphology)
   X is marked_{ab} with respect to Y iff
   X properly contains Y:
   X = { Y + μ } μ some morph; order irrel.

19. Morphology (for these Ns): Masculine : Feminine ; Unmarked : Marked

20. A: Is that a lion?
    B: Yes, it’s a lioness.
    A: Is that a lioness?
    B: Yes, it’s a lion.
    B: No, it’s a lion.

21. Plurals:
    Feminine plural = all females
    Masculine plural = all masc or mixed
    NB. Not universal
(see Corbett 1991)
"The general meaning of a marked category states the presence of a certain (whether positive or negative) property A; the general meaning of the corresponding unmarked category states nothing about the presence of A, and is used chiefly, but not exclusively, to indicate the absence of A. The unmarked term is always the negative of the marked term, but on the level of general meaning the opposition of the contradictories may be interpreted as 'statement of A vs. 'no statement of A'..." (Jakobson)

Marked; (Semantics)

A binary feature F has two values: Marked [+F] and Unmarked [-F].

See work by Nevins on necessity of full specification (presence of [-] values)

Jakobson’s (implicit) claim: Marked1 = Marked2

Not always true, even for binary gender oppositions in these langs (§ 7)

Ellipsis contexts, (German), (cf. C. L. Zocca)

a. Maria ist ein Student / √ eine Student-in.
   Maria is a.m student / a.f student-FEM
   ‘Maria is a student’

b. Hans ist ein Student, und Maria [...] auch.
   Hans is (a.m) student and Maria too.
   ‘Hans is a student, and Maria is too.’

c. #Maria ist ein Student-in, und Hans [...] auch.
   Maria is (a.f) student-FEM and Hans too.
   ‘Maria is a student, and Hans is too.’

Gricean Maxims (Scalar Implicatures)

Make the strongest statement consistent with the facts (cf. Subset Principle)

I have $7. implicature: I don’t have $n; n > 7

a. Maria is an actor. Maria ist ein Student. ⇐ True
b. Maria is an actress. Maria ist eine Studentin. ⇐ Stronger.

The small one is a lioness, and the big one is a lion. impl: big = male

Why: if lion is the strongest true statement, it follows that [fem] = false

Return below to qualifications.

4.2 The semantics of Person (Schlenker 1999, Sauerland 2004, Kratzer 2006)

a. [+ speaker, + hearer] = includes speaker and hearer
b. [+ speaker, - hearer] = includes speaker

c. [- speaker, + hearer] =

d. [- speaker, - hearer] =

For vocabulary items; the ordering (except b-c) is regulated by Subset Principle
For interpretation, the ordering (except b-c) is regulated by Gricean Implicature

English ‘we’ is the absence of the first line. Filter: * [+speaker, +hearer]

This interpretation has no consequences for morphology (vocab. insertion), but it makes a set of semantic predictions:

Just as masculine [-FEM] doesn’t exclude feminine, [-SPK] doesn’t exclude speaker.

a. Why can’t I say: He left. (meaning me)?
   b. Stronger assertion: I left.

   [+ SPK] > [-SPK]

c. I have done his homework. (# I did my homework) my > his

[Each one of us] has done his homework. (also OK: our /their) (Heim, Kratzer)

⇒ John has done his homework.
⇒ I have done my homework. NOT: I have done his homework.

“his homework”

traditional view: “some (male) non-speaker’s homework”

current hypoth: “some (male) person’s homework” not asserted to be the speaker (or hearer).

[Each of us] P, P = “did x’s homework”

John P
Peter P did [-spk, -hear]’s homework: OK
I P... did [+spk]’s homework: stronger, but false

Each one of us have done my homework.
⇒ John has done my homework. [+SPKR] = false.

Whichever of us finishes his part of the course first should... [2 men]

⇒ I finish my part
or you finish your part.

There are no relevant non-participants in the referents of “his”
but # I finish my part and you finish my part
# I finish your part and you finish your part.

Both “I” and “you” are too strong – they lead to false entailments.

But “he” is weak; it is normally blocked by a stronger form, but not in this special case.

Conclusion: Precisely where the stronger presuppositions fail, the unmarked form appears.

If “3” meant “other”, these would be problematic data.

4.3 Agreement (an aside)

(38) a. Each of us must do his best.
   b. #We (each) must do his best. We each must do our best.
      * … my best

(39) “fake indexicals” and Bound Variable Pronouns (Kratzer 2006, and refs, esp. Heim)

a. John finished his homework, and Peter did [\$ O] too.
   b. Only John finished his homework.
   c. \( \lambda x [ x \text{ finished } \text{John’s homework} ] \)

(40) a. I finished my homework, and you did [\$ O] too. [\$ finished your homework]
   b. Only I finished my homework. [=she did not finish her homework]
   c. \( \lambda x [ x \text{ finished } \text{my homework} ] \)

also: Only I got a question I understood (Heim).

(41) Semantics: \([x]\) minimal pronoun, no presuppositions ([-spk, -he])
   Morphology: [my] Agreement with antecedent
   Sauerland: “uninterpreted interpretable features”

(42) Two models of agreement:

Narrow Syntax

Add features here
Delete features here

PF
LF

(43) Agreement: requires c-command (for true bnd vbl)

(44) a. [ Each of us ] must do his best. No c-command, therefore no agreement.
   b. [ We (each) ] must do our best. C-command, therefore agreement.

(45) Note: one could treat “his” as showing agreement with “each of us” but the problem of reference (third person to include speaker/hearer) doesn’t go away, just shifts.

(46) Additional prediction: retreats from [1+2] to [1] (or [2]) in similar contexts.

Anecdotal evidence: optionality of inclusive (cf. dual).

[+1,+2] Inclusive necessarily includes hearer.
[+1,-2] Exclusive doesn’t always exclude hearer. (cf. Grice)

5. FOR THE RECORD: PERSON-NUMBER & MINIMAL V. AUGMENTED

Is there a 5-way non-singular contrast in some languages?


\begin{tabular}{c|c|c}
   & a. minimal & b. augmented \\
   & 1+2 & 1+2 & Sg. Pl. \\
\hline
+1,+2 & ta & tayo & 1+2 & ta \\
+1 & co & mi & 1 & co mi \\
+2 & mao & yo & 2 & mao yo \\
-1,-2 & na & da & 3 & na da \\
\end{tabular}

’real minimal = minimal number of referents to satisfy the denotation of the pronoun [\$ dual for [+1,+2], singular otherwise]; augmented = \(’\) minimal’

(48) Eva and her husband Phil have three kids. One evening, Eva and the kids are in the kitchen; Phil is on his way home from work. The kids are asking Eva if they can eat, and Eva says:

a. (Not yet kids.) We will wait for (your) father to come home. \([\text{we } = 1+2+2; \text{ not } 3]\)
   b. Then we will (all) eat together. \([\text{we } = 1+2+3]\)
   a’. … Urayin \text{ tayo} ni daddy yo nga agawid. \([\text{tayo } = 1+2+2; \text{ not } 3]\)
   b’. Sa \text{ tayo} ko mängan \([\text{tayo} = 1+2+3]\)

NB. Ilocano has no dual, and nominal number is sg. vs. plural.

Number in pronouns may be: [sg. vs. group] or [minimal vs. group] < parameter ?
6. GEOMETRIES, HIERARCHIES AND [+PARTICIPANT]

(49) | he & & r | + & -
|---|---|---|---|
| s & e & a | - & +

(50) a. [+ speaker, + hearer] = “first person inclusive” a > b, c > d
b. [+ speaker, - hearer] = “first person exclusive”
c. [- speaker, + hearer] = “second person”
d. [- speaker, - hearer] = “third person”

(51) speaker, hearer = [+participant in speech act]

a. [+ speaker, + participant] = “first person” a > b > c
b. [- speaker, + participant] = “second person”
c. [- speaker, - participant] = “third person”

(+speaker, -participant: contradiction)

?? inclusive?; lay aside

If we continue to use presuppositional interpretation of [+] vs. [-], predictions are slightly different than with [+speaker, +hearer] system.

(52) [Each one of us] has done his homework.

Strongest form consistent with context: [-speaker, -participant] OK

(53) Whichever of us finishes ___ part of the course first should...

1. I finish my part
2. or you finish your part.

• There are no relevant non-participants in the referents of the bind. vbl.

Prediction: [+SPKR, +PARTIC] too strong
[-SPKR, +PARTIC] correct presuppositions: [Me or you]
-SPKR, -PARTIC] default, weakest

#Whichever of us finishes your part of the course first should...

(54) The binary system makes the correct prediction about “retreats” 1+2 \rightarrow \{1,2\} \rightarrow 3

The [+participant] system (i) predicts 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3
(ii) “misses” inclusive / exclusive?
(iii) hierarchy variance? 1+2<3 vs. 2+1<3 ?

(55) Harley / Ritter (2001) < Noyer and others:

\[ \text{X} \]
\[ \text{[participant]} \]
\[ \text{[speaker] [hearer]} \]

\[ \text{[participant]} \]
\[ \text{[speaker] [hearer]} \]

• Allows reference to [+participant] as a “grouping” node = [+spkr] ∨ [+hr]
• [+participant] redundant; not needed for above results

7. ASIDE: NON-UNIFORMITY OF [-FEM] (SEE ALSO ZOCCA)

7.1 Marking the unmarked?

(56) Brazilian Portuguese (from Zocca)

a. O João é cantor e a Maria também é. [cântora]
The Joao is singer-m and the Maria also is singer-f

b. ?Vela Maria é cantora e o João também é. [cântor]
The Maria is singer-f and the John also is singer-m

‘Maria is a singer, and John is too.’

(57) Portuguese (Italian, Spanish...)

tio – tia ‘uncle, aunt’
menino – menina ‘boy, girl’
medico – medica ‘doctor(m), doctor(f)’

\[ \sqrt{o} = \text{Masc} \]
\[ a = \text{Fem} \]

(58) a. O João é médico e a Maria também é. [médica]
The Joao is doctor-m and the Maria also is doctor-f

b. ?Vela Maria é médica e o João também é. [médico]
The Maria is doctor-f and the John also is doctor-m

‘Maria is a doctor, and John is too.’

For profession nouns:

\[ \text{meaning} = \text{unmarked} : \text{marked} \]
\[ \text{à la Jakobson} \]
\[ \text{form} = \text{-o} \]
\[ a \]

Both are “marked”

Semantic markedness is not a function of a morphological Ø – marked alternation.

(59) a. a = Fem
b. Gender = a \[ \text{Fem} \]
\[ -o \]
\[ \text{Elsewhere} \]

Readily accommodated.
Grammatically conditioned allomorphy: competition

c. medic-a (feminine) ti-a (feminine)
    medic-o (unspeficied) ti-o (masculine)

(60) Allomorphy: Condition / Context must be independently determined!

Realization / “Late Insertion”

(61) a. morpho syntactic representation: ∵medic – [GNDR]
    =syntax
    vocabulary-insertion: -a ⇔ Fem
                          -o ⇔ Elsewhere
        -a -o

(62) a. SynSem: make the strongest statement possible. (marked > unmarked)
    b. Morph: insert the vocabulary item (allomorph) that matches the most features
       of the context.

7.2 Morph Unmarked # Semantically Unmarked

(63) a. prince – princess -ess
count – countess
b. tsar – tsarica -ica
c. König – Königin king – queen -in
   Herzog – Herzogin duke - duchess

(64) a. A: Is that person a prince?
    B: #Yes, a princess.
    B’: No, a princess.
    b. # Rainier was a prince, and so was Grace Kelly.
       # Grace Kelly was a princess, and so was Rainier.
    c. This is a list of princes. # if includes Diana, Grace Kelly, etc.

(65) For these nouns, there is no Fem – Masc asymmetry.
    Both genders behave as marked, despite morphology.

Conclusions:

Semantics: Three-way distinction ? FEM vs MASC vs Ø

Neutralized in morphology: -in ⇔ Fem
                          -Ø elsewhere (masc or Ø)

Facts are partially consistent with Jakobson (FEM vs. Ø)
But not for all (semantic) classes of nouns.

(66) Contra Jakobson: [-FEM] not always “unmarked”
    Morphological markedness ≠ semantic markedness.

8. SUMMARY

Person:
Convergence of evidence from
   (i) Large scale cross-linguistic studies
   (ii) presuppositional semantics for person
Convergence relies on (thus points to)
   (i) 2 binary features: [speaker, hearer]
   (ii) neo-Jakobsonian view of [...](Grice)

Important: person results rely on interpretation of minus, not necessarily unmarked (Ø)
    gender results (König-in) suggest, contra Jakobson, [+] not always “unmarked”

Open question: [participant] evidence for, and nature of, such a feature?
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