



Clusivity revisited: A parameter

Jonathan David Bobaljik
Harvard University
Joint work with Uli Sauerland

Quirk Seminar 2
QMU London 13 May 2026

- (1) All[?] languages have the three person categories: AUTHOR, ADDRESSEE, OTHER, {i,u,o} (cf. Greenberg U42)
- (2) AUTHOR, ADDRESSEE (and INCL) non-singular are associative (Lyons 1968: 277; Cysouw 2003; Bobaljik 2008; Wechsler 2010 a.o.)
- (3) Ancillary universals: (Sokolovskaja 1980)

a. Possible	b. Attested	c. Binary
1+2	“inclusive”	[+AU +AD]
1+2+3		
1	“exclusive”	[+AU, -AD]
1+3		
2	“second person”	[-AU, +AD]
2+3		
3	“third person”	[-AU, -AD]

- (4) a. U1 No language distinguishes [1+1] from [1+3].
- b. U2 No language distinguishes [2+2] from [2+3].
- c. U3 No language distinguishes among [1+1+2], [1+2+2] and [1+2+3].

Some desiderata for a theory of clusivity (person):

- (5) *I: The First person - Inclusive Generalization (FIG)* (Zwicky 1977; Harbour 2016)

If a language does not mark clusivity contrasts morphologically, then the inclusive meaning (AUTHOR + ADDRESSEE) is expressed by the first person.

= If there is no dedicated category INCLUSIVE, then AUTHOR + ADDRESSEE always resolves to AUTHOR, (essentially – see Harbour 2016) never to ADDRESSEE.

(6)

Referents	a. Clusivity Evenki	b. General we English	c. *syou *n/a*
AUTH (not ADDR)	bu	we	*swe
AUTH and ADDR	mit	we	*syou
ADDR (not AUTH)	su	you	*syou
neither	nungartyn	they	they

- (7) Qualification: true of languages/categories,
but exceptions in individual paradigms (but see (9)):

Nishnaabemwin (Algonquian, Valentine 2001: 122) Independent Pronouns (Long forms)

		SINGULAR	PLURAL
EXCL	[1,-2]	niin	niinwin
INCL	[1, 2]	–	giinwin
SECOND	[-1, 2]	giin	giinwaa
THIRD	[-1, -2]	wiin	wiinwaa

- (8) II: Sum: INCLUSIVE = [1,2] = $i \oplus u$ – no ad hoc INCLUSIVE feature (see (3))

Clusivity “Parameter”: Languages do/do not allow conjunction of [1] $\oplus$ [2]

Composed Inclusives

- (9) III: Mixed clusivity / agreement (Bobaljik & Sauerland 2023)

- Siewierska & Bakker (2005): 330 languages that have both free and bound person markers
- only 74 (22%) show the same distinctions in both
- in nearly a quarter, there is a difference in clusivity
- “[t]he vast majority of these differences involve presence of the encoding of inclusivity in free as compared to bound forms, though the reverse is also found. (p.172)”

- (10) Mixed clusivity (Daur; Siewierska & Bakker (11) “Optional” clusivity (Mandarin PL pronouns; Ross & Ma 2006: 25)

	Pronouns	Agreement		SUBJ only	elsewhere
AUTH (not ADDR)	ba:	-bəi-ba:	AUTH (not ADDR)	wǒmen	wǒmen
AUTH and ADDR	bed	-bəi-ba:	AUTH and ADDR	(% zánmen)	wǒmen
ADDR (not AUTH)	ta:	-bəi-ta:	ADDR (not AUTH)	nǐmen	nǐmen
NEITHER	a:n	-bəi-sul	NEITHER	tāmen	tāmen

- (12) **Conjecture:** In mixed clusivity systems, where there is no clusivity contrast, *inclusive* meaning is typically covered by the (otherwise) *exclusive* form.
- (13) **Leitmotif: Underspecification and competition** (Saussure 1916; Jakobson 1932)

		Evenki	Mandarin	Daur	English
[1 $\oplus$ 2]	→	mit	%zánmen	ba:	–
[1]	→	bu	wǒmen	bed	we

Competition: Use the most specific form compatible with the context

Pāṇini, Saussure, Jakobson, Grice

Elsewhere, Subset Principle, Maximize Presupposition, Lexical Complementarity, ...

- (14) Three (families of) accounts:
- a. $[\pm\text{AUTHOR}, \pm\text{ADDRESSEE}]$ Zwicky (1977) etc.
characterizes inclusive (as conjunction)
needs additional hierarchy 1>2 for FIG
 - b. $[\pm\text{AUTHOR}, \pm\text{PARTICIPANT}]$ Sauerland (2008) etc.
characterizes FIG (no ADDRESSEE)
needs additional feature for inclusive (conjunction is redundant)
 - c. Harbour (2016)
purports to allow all and only Evenki-types and English-types
novel semantic assumptions
today: empirical problem (Mandarin)
- (15) Today: Proposed fix for (14b) (Bobaljik & Sauerland 2023)
Combine (from Harbour) non-Boolean conjunction (of features)
with $[\pm\text{AUTHOR}, \pm\text{PARTICIPANT}]$
Along with Exhaustification (Chierchia et al. 2012), derives all and only attested patterns
But... may have an issue with composed inclusives
An alternative? Holladay (2023)

1 The Classic approach: $[\pm 1, \pm 2]$

- (16) a. $[[(+1)]] = [[\text{AUTHOR}]]^c = \lambda x . \text{author}(c) \sqsubseteq x$
b. $[[(+2)]] = [[\text{ADDRESSEE}]]^c = \lambda x . \text{addressee}(c) \sqsubseteq x$
(or corresponding presuppositions, see Bobaljik & Sauerland 2023)
- (17) Implicit: feature combinations are coordination ($\wedge, \oplus$)
- (18) Evenki (clusivity)
- | | PERSON | SG | PL |
|--|--------|---------------|------------------|
| a. $[+\text{AUTHOR}, +\text{ADDRESSEE}]$ | – | <i>mit</i> | |
| b. $[+\text{AUTHOR}]$ | | <i>bi</i> | <i>bu</i> |
| c. $[+\text{ADDRESSEE}]$ | | <i>si</i> | <i>su</i> |
| d. $[\]$ | | <i>nungan</i> | <i>nungartyn</i> |
- (19) **Pro** Derives (3)
Pro Easy to model mixed clusivity via **competition**
Con Does not explain Zwicky’s puzzle
Con Does not treat $[\text{PARTICIPANT}]$ as a natural class
e.g., *b-i, b-u, s-i, s-u* : $-\text{u} \Leftrightarrow \text{PL} / [1 \text{ or } 2]$ __
- (20) **Supplemental assumption:** Person Hierarchy (Egocentricity)
 $1 > 2 > 3$ $[(+)\text{AUTHOR}] > [(+)\text{ADDRESSEE}]$

Silverstein (1976); Zwicky (1977); Noyer (1997); McGinnis (2005); Bobaljik (2008); Wechsler (2010); Zaslavsky et al. (2021) among many others

McGinnis (2005): is only one of the two features in (16) is active, it is universally AUTHOR;
 Zaslavsky et al. (2021): information-theoretic account with relative weighting 16:1:0.1 of the features AUTHOR:ADDRESSEE:OTHER.

2 The other PARTICIPANT

- (21) a. $[[\text{AUTHOR}]]^c = \lambda x . \text{author}(c) \sqsubseteq x$
 b. $[[\text{PARTICIPANT}]]^c = \lambda x . \text{author}(c) \sqsubseteq x \vee \text{addressee}(c) \sqsubseteq x$

(Sauerland 2003, 2008; McGinnis 2005; Singh 2011)

Builds person hierarchy into definition of features (+ Competition)

- (22) CONTEXT FORM
 a. [AUTHOR] we
 b. [PARTICIPANT] you (by competition with a.)
 c. [] they (by competition with a.,b.)

- (23) **Pro** Explains Zwicky's puzzle without extrinsic hierarchy

Pro Does treat [PARTICIPANT] as a natural class

Con $[1 \oplus 2] \neq [\text{INCL}]$

Con $*[\text{Whichever of us}]_i \dots \text{your}_i \dots$

- (24) Inclusive is not (normal) conjunction of $[1 \oplus 2]$:

$[[\text{AUTHOR}]] \wedge [[\text{PARTICIPANT}]] = [[\text{AUTHOR}]]$

Any group the contains the author is a group that contains the author and contains the author or the addressee.

- (25) $[[\text{INCLUSIVE}]]^c = \lambda x . \text{author}(c) \sqsubseteq x \wedge \text{addressee}(c) \sqsubseteq x$

3 A step further: the exhaust(ifi)ed author

For technical semantic details, see Bobaljik & Sauerland (2023): <https://tinyurl.com/yprcrnwu>

- Assume that strengthening happens via an operator **EXH**. This operator, when applied to a sentential expression ϕ in a context c has access to the set $\mathcal{A}_c(\phi)$ of alternatives to ϕ , a subset of the set of ϕ 's focus alternatives $F(\phi)$. The operator will conjoin $[[\phi]]^c$ with the negations of as many alternatives from $\mathcal{A}_c(\phi)$ as possible without creating a contradiction (Fox 2007; Chierchia et al. 2012), as in (26). (Bobaljik & Schmitt 2026)

- (26) For $p \in D_{\langle s, t \rangle}$, $A \subseteq D_{\langle s, t \rangle}$: $\text{exh}_w(p, A) = [p(w) = 1 \wedge \forall q \in A [p \not\sqsubseteq q \rightarrow q(w) = 0]]$

tl;dr For P with a constituent **exh**(X):

Assert P ,

Assert not Q , where Q is derived from P but substituting alternatives to X with the exception of predicates Q that are fully entailed by P .

- (27) a. Ada owns some of the stuffed animals.
 b. $\approx$ Ada owns some but not all of the stuffed animals.
- (28) $\mathcal{A}_c(\text{some}, \text{all})$
- (29) Ada owns $\text{exh}_{\{\text{all}\}}$ (some) of the stuffed animals.
- (30) a. first person: $\text{exh}_{\{\}}(\text{AUTHOR})$
 b. second person: $\text{exh}_{\{\text{AUTHOR}\}}(\text{PARTICIPANT})$
 c. third person: $\text{exh}_{\{\text{AUTHOR}, \text{PARTICIPANT}\}}(\text{NULL})$
- (31) $\text{exh}_{\{\text{AUTHOR}, \text{PARTICIPANT}\}}(\text{PARTICIPANT})(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in \{u, uo\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
- (32) A new problem:
 $\text{AUTHOR} \wedge \text{exh}_{\{\text{AUTHOR}\}}(\text{PARTICIPANT})(x) =$
 A group that **contains the author** and contains a participant but **does not contain the author**.
 Oops.
- (33) Non-Boolean conjunction: $\sqcup$
 corresponds to forming a group $a \sqcup b$ out of two distinct objects a and b (Link 1983).
 Haslinger & Schmitt (2018) and Schmitt (2013, 2019) argue that non-Boolean conjunction is generally available as the meaning of the coordinator *and* across different categories:
- (34) $P \sqcup Q = \lambda x \exists y, z \in D_e [y \sqcup z = x \wedge P(y) \wedge Q(z)]$ (Schmitt 2019: 12)
- (35) Abe and Bert danced and smoked. (Schmitt 2019: p. 32)
- (36) $[d \sqcup s](a \oplus b) = \{d(a) \oplus s(b), d(b) \oplus s(a), d(a) \oplus d(b) \oplus s(b), \dots, d(a) \oplus d(b) \oplus s(a) \oplus s(b)\}$
 The truth-conditions of (36) are given by the condition that there must be at least one element of (36) such that all elementary propositions that are part of that element are true. This accounts for the observation that (35) is judged true, for example, if Abe danced and Bert smoked, but also if Abe smoked and Bert danced.
- (37) $\text{AUTHOR} \sqcup \text{exh}_{\{\text{AUTHOR}\}}(\text{PARTICIPANT})(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in \{iu, iuo\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
 Without exhaustification, conjunction (whether Boolean or cumulative) of **AUTHOR** and **PARTICIPANT** is vacuous. It is exhaustification (and non-Boolean conjunction) that allows us to import into the author-participant account the idea from the classic account that the inclusive is the coordination of the first and second persons.
 Competition: If there is an inclusive alternative to first person, then first person will be exclusive, else general.
- (38) $\text{exh}_{\{\text{AUTHOR} \sqcup \text{exh}_{\{\text{AUTHOR}\}}(\text{PARTICIPANT})\}}(\text{AUTHOR})(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in \{i, io\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

- (39) a. inclusive: $\mathbf{exh}_{\{\}}(\text{AUTHOR})$
 b. first person: $\mathbf{exh}_{\{\text{AUTHOR} \sqcup \mathbf{exh}_{\{\text{AUTHOR}\}}(\text{PARTICIPANT})\}}(\text{AUTHOR})$
 c. second person: $\mathbf{exh}_{\{\text{AUTHOR}, \text{INCLUSIVE}\}}(\text{PARTICIPANT})$
 d. third person: $\mathbf{exh}_{\{\text{AUTHOR}, \text{PARTICIPANT}, \text{INCLUSIVE}\}}(\text{NULL})$

4 Mixed Clusivity

- For Bobaljik & Sauerland (2023), mixed clusivity is just a special case of Zwicky’s puzzle.
- But possibly different ramifications for Harbour (2016) – (un)markedness of exclusive?

4.1 Harbour 2016

- (40) Main claims
- Feature definitions allow only the two attested inventories
 - Requires alternative approach to features as lattice-theoretic operations on an atomic lattice $\mathcal{L}$ with join operation $\sqcup$ that contains at least three atoms i, u, o , and the null element $\emptyset$ (cf. Ackema & Neeleman 2013)
- (41) Three semi-lattices for person distinctions:

$$\text{person:} \quad \mathcal{L}_{\pi} = \{i, u, o, iu, io, uo, iuo\} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{participant:} \quad \mathcal{L}_{iu} = \{i, u, iu\} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{author:} \quad \mathcal{L}_i = \{i\} \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{M} \oplus \mathcal{N} = \{m \sqcup n \mid m \in \mathcal{M} \wedge n \in \mathcal{N}\} \quad (4)$$

$$\mathcal{M} \ominus \mathcal{N} = \{\sqcup(\text{atoms}(m) \setminus \text{atoms}(\sqcup(\mathcal{N}))) \mid m \in \mathcal{M}\} \quad (5)$$

- (42) Parameters of crosslinguistic variation:
- selection of one or both of the features **AUTHOR** and **PARTICIPANT**
 - their order of application

Interpretation of possible feature specifications within a language:

$$\pm_{F_1}, \pm_{F_2} \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad [\mathcal{L}_{\pi} \odot \mathcal{L}(F_1)] \odot \mathcal{L}(F_2) \quad (6)$$

The right side of (6) denotes for each feature specification a subset of $\mathcal{L}$, the possible referents of a pronoun with that feature specification.

⁰Here and in the following, we adopt Harbour’s practice to omit the join $\sqcup$ when it applies between atoms of $\mathcal{L}$. We also apply $\sqcup$ as a unary operator that maps a subset of $\mathcal{L}$ to the join of all its elements.

(43) **Generalized *we* – AUTHOR-before-PARTICIPANT order:**

- a. +AUTHOR, +PARTICIPANT: $[\mathcal{L}_\pi \oplus \mathcal{L}_i] \oplus \mathcal{L}_{iu} = \{i, iu, io, iuo\}$
 - b. –AUTHOR, +PARTICIPANT: $[\mathcal{L}_\pi \ominus \mathcal{L}_i] \oplus \mathcal{L}_{iu} = \{i, u, iu, io, uo, iuo\}$
 $\xrightarrow{a.} \{u, uo\}$ (via lexical complementarity with a., see below)
 - c. +AUTHOR, –PARTICIPANT: $[\mathcal{L}_\pi \oplus \mathcal{L}_i] \ominus \mathcal{L}_{iu} = \{o, \emptyset\}$
 - d. –AUTHOR, –PARTICIPANT: $[\mathcal{L}_\pi \ominus \mathcal{L}_i] \ominus \mathcal{L}_{iu} = \{o, \emptyset\}$
- This is in essence the standard AUTHOR-PARTICIPANT system.

(44) **Clusivity: PARTICIPANT applying before AUTHOR:**

- a. +PARTICIPANT, +AUTHOR: $\mathcal{L}_\pi \oplus \mathcal{L}_{iu} \oplus \mathcal{L}_i = \{i, iu, io, iou\}$
 $\xrightarrow{b.} \{iu, iou\}$
- b. –PARTICIPANT, +AUTHOR: $\mathcal{L}_\pi \ominus \mathcal{L}_{iu} \oplus \mathcal{L}_i = \{i, io\}$
- c. +PARTICIPANT, –AUTHOR: $\mathcal{L}_\pi \oplus \mathcal{L}_{iu} \ominus \mathcal{L}_i = \{u, uo, o, \emptyset\}$
 $\xrightarrow{d.} \{u, uo\}$
- d. –PARTICIPANT, –AUTHOR: $\mathcal{L}_\pi \ominus \mathcal{L}_{iu} \ominus \mathcal{L}_i = \{o, \emptyset\}$

(45) **Lexical Complementarity Principle** (indicated by $\rightsquigarrow$) = Competition:

If one feature combination derives a proper superset of possible referents of another feature combination, the former is restricted to those possible referents unique to it.

- An interesting quirk of this system is that this reverses the intuitive competition:
- it is the *exclusive* (44b) that is lexically defined, and narrower [cf. Wang (2023) on imperatives h/t Nina Haslinger]
- the *inclusive* is (44a) underlyingly general *i*, but narrowed/strengthened by competition with the exclusive
- **Open Question:** how general is the ‘unmarked exclusive’ effect in Mandarin, Daur etc.’?

(46) **Guaraní plurals** (Siewierska & Bakker 2005; Eestigarribia 2020: 168)

	PRON	A-	P-	P-)
			(acc. S&B)	(acc. Estigarribia))
1	oré	ro-	yane-	ore-
1+2	yané	ya-	yane-	ñane-
2	peē	pe-	pene-	pene-
3		o-	i(y)-	iñ-

- Exclusive or inclusive extends in mixed patterns (both?)
- Exclusive or inclusive < 1.SINGULAR (Moskal v. Pertsova)
- Exclusive or inclusive derived from other (Harbour 2016)

5 An alternative: Holladay (2023)

A new take on the Classic account [?]

(47) Centered Contexts

Only the $[a] = \text{AUTHOR}$ variable is represented in the context:

$$\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^{c,j,g}; c = \langle a, s \rangle$$

(48) $\llbracket \text{AUTH} \rrbracket^c = a$

(49) $\llbracket \text{ADDR} \rrbracket^c = a$ *distinct center*, i.e., interlocutor (choice function) [open: whose interlocutor?]

(50) $\left[\begin{array}{c} \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \text{ADDR} \quad \text{AUTH} \end{array} \right]^c = \llbracket \text{ADDR} \rrbracket^c (\llbracket \text{AUTH} \rrbracket^c) = \text{choice function picking out a } \textit{distinct center} \text{ of AUTH, i.e., one of AUTH's interlocutors}$

- Like Classic theory, AUTH and ADDR both defined (no PARTICIPANT)
- Both compatible with inclusive referent [1,2]
- Novel suggestion for competition without ad hoc hierarchy:

(51) Minimize Definite Descriptions!

Let α and β be any syntactic constituents. β is a deviant way of referring to what α refers to at c, j if all three of the following hold:

- α and β can both be spelled out morphophonologically, and the morphophonological reflexes of these expressions are non-identical
- α can be derived from β by a finite number of deletions within β of referentially relevant expressions
- The set of possible referents for $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{c,j}$ is not a proper subset of the set of possible referents for $\llbracket \beta \rrbracket^{c,j}$ when both are well-defined

- (52) a. # Your brown dog is so well-behaved.
b. Your dog is so well behaved.

6 Conclusions

- Composed inclusive (imperatives) suggest clusivity is a parameter of categories.
- Some (not all) languages allow $[1] \oplus / \sqcup / \dots [2]$
- Still leaves us a range of options for feature systems
- All describe the core facts, differ in desiderata/priorities/“naturalness”
- Suggestions here
 - Using EXH and $\sqcup$ resolves an issue with AUTH, PARTICIPANT

- Account extends to Mixed systems
- Still need a representation of ADDR for IMPERATIVE

Data sources:

Daur (Mongolic, Siewierska & Bakker 2005: 162)
 Evenki (Tungusic, Nedjalkov (1997))
 Itelmen (Chukotko-Kamchatkan, fieldwork; Volodin (1976); Bogoras 1901 = Bobaljik et al. (2023))
 Mandarin (Ross & Ma 2006: 25))
 Nishnaabemwin (Algonquian, Valentine 2001: 122)

This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 856421, Sauerland).

References

- Ackema, Peter & Ad Neeleman (2013) Person features and syncretism. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 31: 901–950.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David (2008) Missing Persons: A case study in morphological universals. *The Linguistic Review* 25(1-2): 203–230.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David, Maria Pupynina, & Arzhaana Syuryun, eds. (2023) *Bogoras’s 1901 Itelmen Notebooks*. Fürstenberg/Havel: Kulturstiftung Sibirien.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David & Uli Sauerland (2023) About ‘Us’: Clusivity $\sqcup$ exh. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 27, Maria Onoeva, Anna Staňková, & Radek Šimík, eds., Prague: Charles University, 81–95.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David & Viola Schmitt (2026) Strengthening lions: a role for syntactic locality in excluded alternatives. Paper presented at Phi and Markedness Workshop, Leibniz-ZAS, Berlin.
- Chierchia, Gennaro, Danny Fox, & Benjamin Spector (2012) Scalar implicature as a grammatical phenomenon. In *Handbook of semantics*, vol. 3, Klaus von Stechow, Claudia Maienborn, & Paul Portner, eds., Mouton de Gruyter, 2297–2331.
- Cysouw, Michael (2003) *The Paradigmatic Structure of Person Marking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eestigarribia, Bruno (2020) *A grammar of Paraguayan Guaraní*. London: UCL Press.
- Filimonova, Elena, ed. (2005) *Clusivity: Typology and case studies of the inclusive-exclusive distinction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fox, Danny (2007) Free choice and the theory of scalar implicatures. In *Presupposition and implicature in compositional semantics*, Uli Sauerland & Penka Stateva, eds., London: Palgrave Macmillan, 71–120.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. (1966) *Language Universals*. Mouton.
- Harbour, Daniel (2016) *Impossible Persons*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Haslinger, Nina & Viola Schmitt (2018) Scope-related cumulativity asymmetries and cumulative composition. In *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, vol. 28, 197–216.
- Holladay, Kaden (2023) *You Will Always Have Me: A Compositional Theory of Person*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.
- Jakobson, Roman (1932) Zur Struktur des russischen Verbums. In *Charisteria Gvilelmo Mathesio qvinqvagenario a discipulis et Circuli Lingvistici Pragensis soladibus oblata*, Prague.
- Link, Godehard (1983) The logical analysis of plurals and mass terms: A lattice theoretical approach. In *Meaning, Use, and the Interpretation of Language*, R. Bäuerle, C. Schwarz, & Arnim von Stechow, eds., Berlin: de Gruyter, 302–323.
- Lyons, John (1968) *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- McGinnis, Martha (2005) On markedness asymmetries in person and number. *Language* 81(3): 699–718.
- Nedjalkov, Igor (1997) *Evenki*. London: Routledge.
- Noyer, Rolf (1997) *Features, positions and affixes in autonomous morphological structure*. New York: Garland.
- Ross, Claudia & Jing-heng Sheng Ma (2006) *Modern Mandarin Chinese grammar: a practical guide*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Sauerland, Uli (2003) A new semantics for number. In *The Proceedings of SALT 13*, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.: CLC-Publications, 258–275.
- Sauerland, Uli (2008) On the semantic markedness of Φ -features. In *Phi theory: Phi features across interfaces and modules*, David Adger, Susana Béjar, & Daniel Harbour, eds., Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de (1916) *Cours de linguistique générale*. Lausanne and Paris: Payot.
- Schmitt, Viola (2013) *More pluralities*. Phd dissertation, Universität Wien, Vienna, Austria.
- Schmitt, Viola (2019) Pluralities across categories and plural projection. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 12: 17.
- Siewierska, Anna & Dik Bakker (2005) Inclusive and exclusive in free and bound person forms. In Filimonova (2005), 151–178.
- Silverstein, Michael (1976) Feature hierarchies and Ergativity. In *Grammatical categories in Australian languages*, Richard M.W. Dixon, ed., Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, 112–171.
- Singh, Raj (2011) Maximize Presupposition! and local contexts. *Natural Language Semantics* 19: 149–168.
- Sokolovskaja, N. K. (1980) Nekotorye semantičeskie universalii v sisteme ličnyx mestoimenij. In *Teorija i tipologija mestoimenij*, I. F. Vardul', ed., Moscow: Nauka, 84–102.
- Valentine, Randy (2001) *Nishnaabemwin reference grammar*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Volodin, Alexander P. (1976) *Ительменский язык*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Wang, Ruonan (2023) Honorifics without [HON]. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 41: 1287–1347.
- Wechsler, Stephen (2010) What ‘you’ and ‘I’ mean to each other: Person indexicals, self-ascription, and theory of mind. *Language* 86(2): 332–365.
- Zaslavsky, Noga, Mora Maldonado, & Jennifer Culbertson (2021) Let’s talk (efficiently) about us: Person systems achieve near-optimal compression, unpublished manuscript MIT and Universitat Pompeu Fabra and University of Edinburgh.
- Zwicky, Arnold (1977) Hierarchies of Person. In *Proceedings of*, Chicago Linguistics Society, 714–733.