Title: The Grammar of Slavic Honorifics
Author: Gilbert C. Rappaport, University of Texas at Austin

Agreement is the morphosyntactic process by which an inherent property of one syntactic element (the *controller*) affects the grammatical form of another element (the *target*). The well-documented phenomenon of *mixed agreement* results when a single controller gives contradictory results in two targets. An example is the well-known Russian *наш врач Вера Ивановна пришла* 'our$_{Masc}$ doctor Vera Ivanovna arrived$_{Fem}$', or in British English *the committee$_{Sg}$ have$_{Pl}$ decided.* Mixed agreement almost invariably entails one of the controller values being semantically transparent (the feminine and plural predicates above, respectively). In Slavic, mixed agreement can involve gender, number, or person.

The author has been developing a theory of mixed agreement in Slavic based on the distinction between a lexical Noun Phrase (NP), where lexically-determined grammatical features reside, and a functional Determiner Phrase (DP) containing the NP, where referential features reside. Consistent with the Agreement Hierarchy (Corbett 1979), in cases of mixed agreement the form of the predicate is more semantically transparent than is the form of an attributive, because the predicate 'sees' the DP, but not the NP inside the DP.

The present paper looks at Slavic honorific constructions in which a conflict between form and content can be observed, possibly giving mixed agreement, but not necessarily. In Russian *Доктор, что Вы советуете*? 'Doctor, what do you advise$_{Pl}$', the plural verb form stands in conflict with the singular reference of the pronoun. Mixed agreement is seen in *Где Ваше благородие были*? 'Where was$_{Pl}$ your$_{Sg}$ honor?' Such examples indicate that the honorific plural (*pluralis maestaticus*) applies at the DP level, not the NP level. Therefore we should broaden our earlier conception of DP-level morphosyntax so that it is not limited to referential properties. This is not a major change, as the honorific plural can be seen as an iconic grammatical metaphor: augmentation in number represents augmentation in status.

Polish, both standard language and dialects, offers a contrasting scenario. In the standard language the honorific is expressed by using the third person, not plural number: *Pan przyszedł* 'you arrived$_{3rd}$'. However, certain dialects have developed different systems. One resembles Russian in using number, except that it employs the masculine personal plural form even for feminine nouns: *Byliście chorzy, matulu* '(You) were$_{Masc.Pl.}$ sick, Mom'. The masculine personal honorific is also possible with reference to the third person (*Nasi dziadek byli* 'Our$_{Masc.Pers}$ uncle was$_{3rd.Masc.Pl}$'), even for feminine nouns (*Nasi babcia poszli* 'Our$_{Masc.Pl}$ grandma went$_{3rd.Masc.Pl}$'). Such constructions do not involve mixed agreement, which in fact represents a problem for the DP versus NP theory: why does the possessive modifier (Concord agreement) reflect the same non-lexical feature as predicate agreement? It is especially curious that the possessive takes the plural, while the noun it modifies is in the singular! The resolution is that the Honorific is actually a gender, an addition to the historical inventory of gender values, which is spelled out syncretically with existing categories (here, the masculine personal plural form; compare the uncontroversial existence of Animacy as a category in Slavic, despite the absence of a dedicated morphological form for its expression). Additionally, gender is often a social construct rather than a strictly biological notion, so that 'repurposing' its formal category is not implausible.