Allosemy and Atavism in the Hindi-Urdu Honorific System
Rajesh Bhatt (UMass) & Chris Davis (University of the Ryukyus)

Honorification and Plural Agreement   In Hindi-Urdu, the honorific marker *ji:* can be added to a third person nominal to signal honorification of the nominal referent. As shown in (1/2), the use of *ji:* triggers plural agreement, despite the nominal itself being singular.

(1)   Ra:m   lamba: hɛ
      Ram.M tall.M.SG be.PRS.3SG
      'Ram is tall.'

(2)   Ra:m-ji: lambe   hɛ̃
      Ram.M-HON tall.M.PL be.PRS.3PL
      'Ram, who I respect, is tall.'

ji: expresses the morpheme HON, attaching to an NP and signaling the speaker's respect toward the NP referent. HON brings in a PL feature which triggers PL agreement. This PL feature does not signal semantic plurality, but instead marks subject honorification. The interpretation of PL is subject to contextual allosemy (Wood 2016). We show that despite surface counterexamples, HON selects for a singular NP complement. Our analysis is schematized in (3). Number agreement is driven by T, which probes for the closest [PL] feature. The [PL] feature itself can be born under the HON head or the NUM head. HON, when present, selects for a singular NumP, reflecting its semantics (which requires a singular complement). The interpretation of [PL], meanwhile, is subject to contextual allosemy: (i) NUM-[PL] contributes plural meaning, while (ii) HON-[PL] contributes the semantics of honorification.

(3)   a.   "Regular" PL under NUM: DEM[uPL] [A[uPL,uGen] [Num[**PL**] [N[Gen$_1$]]]]
           →   DEM[u̶PL] [A[u̶PL,u̶Gen] [Num[**PL**] [N[Gen$_1$]]]]

      b.   Honorific PL under HON: DEM[uPL] [A[uPL,uGen] [Hon[**PL**] [[Num[**SG**] [N[Gen$_1$]]]]
           →   DEM[**PL**] [A[u̶PL,u̶Gen$_1$] [Hon[**PL**] [[Num[**SG**] [N[Gen$_1$]]]]

Second person pronouns   Hindi has three pronominal forms used for second person reference. The formal features of these pronouns (inferred from the agreement patterns they trigger) and their semantics (as inferred from their referential possibilities) are summarized in Table 1. The three second person singular pronouns are honorifically distinguished: (i) *tu:* is rude/familiar, (ii) *tum* is neutral, and (iii) *a:p* is honorific. Along with these pragmatic differences, the three pronouns are distinguished in their formal features (as evidenced by agreement). Both

Table 1: 2nd person pronouns

	SEMANTICS	FEATURES
tu:	2.SG.RUDE	2.SG
tum	2.SG	2.PL
a:p	2.SG.HON	3.PL

tu: and *tum* are formally second person, but differ in their formal number features: *tu:* is formally singular, while *tum* is formally plural. *a:p*, meanwhile, is formally a third person plural. None of these pronouns on their own can be used with plural reference; for the formally plural pronouns *tum* and *a:p*, plural reference requires an additional marker of plurality such as *sab* 'all', *log* 'people', or a plural NP. These pluralization strategies are unavailable for *tu:*, which is strictly singular, both semantically and formally.

There is thus a divergence in formal and interpreted features on two dimensions. The plural feature on the 2nd person pronoun *tum* is an 'atavistic' feature: it is singular and it also does not mark honorification; instead, the lack of the plural feature on *tu:* marks anti-honorification (along with semantic singularity). In order to get an honorific interpretation similar to that signaled by *ji:*, one must use *a:p*, which is formally third person and plural. PL agreement with *a:p* can thus be attributed to a lexically-bundled HON-[PL], as with honored third person subjects. But what about PL agreement with *tum*? We show that the non-number PL feature on *tum* (which signals neither number nor honorification) is morphosyntactically distinct from that on *a:p* (which signals honorification). Our evidence for this claim comes from cases where *tum*, but not *a:p*, fails to trigger plural agreement (Bhatt & Keine 2018, Sinha to appear); this happens when the exponent of plural agreement is a non-portmanteau nasal segment, as seen in (4) (cf. (5), where *a:p* triggers PL agreement):

(4)   tum khush thi:/*thĩ:
      2.SG happy be.PST.F.SG/PST.F.PL
      'You were tall.'

(5)   a:p   khush thĩ:/*thi:
      2.SG.HON happy be.PST.F.PL/PST.F.SG
      'You were tall.'