

## Symmetric and non-symmetric reciprocals in Serbo-Croatian

The inventory of reciprocal markers of Serbo-Croatian (SC) is superficially similar to those of many Germanic and Romance languages: A dedicated reciprocal marker with visibly quantificational binominal structure (*jedan drugog* in SC), which occupies an argument position; and a phonologically weak, reflexive-reciprocal-middle marker (*se* in SC) that can be shown to be a verbal argument structure operator rather than a nominal argument. Like the aforementioned languages, Serbian also occasionally relies on adverbial expressions such as the adjunct *medjusobno* ‘among [them]selves’ to describe reciprocal situations. There are, however, important systematic differences among these languages in the conditions that govern the use of each marker, and among the markers themselves. While the syntactic properties of *jedan drugog* and (especially) *se* have been the subject of a number of studies (among others Franks 1995; Moskovljevic 1997; Progovac 1997; Marelj 2004), we focus on a comparative characterization of their reciprocal uses and especially on the role of a semantic factor, symmetry, in their distribution.

Cross-linguistically, a number of distributional properties of reciprocals have been shown to depend on the symmetry, or lack thereof, of the events described by reciprocal predicates (Dimitriadis 2004). This is also the case in SC; the so-called “discontinuous reciprocal” construction is only possible with *se* reciprocals, and only with verbs whose reciprocal form has an “irreducibly symmetric” meaning:

- (1) a. Jovan se čuje s Marijom  
John se hears with Maria  
‘John and Mary talk’  
b. \*Jovan se udara s Petrom  
John se kicks with Peter  
‘John is kicking with Peter’

On the other hand, asymmetric predicates like *follow* can be used with *jedan drugog*, but not with *se*:

- (2) a. Slonovi su mirno pratili jedan drugog  
elephants aux quietly followed one other  
‘The elephants quietly followed each other (in a line)’  
b. \*Slonovi su se mirno pratili  
elephants aux SE quietly followed

It can be shown that it is the situation, not the predicate, that is incompatible with *se*: If we imagine a situation where the elephants are walking behind one another in a circle, its use becomes grammatical.

In the above respects the reciprocals of SC resemble those of, e.g., German, which show essentially the same distribution. But *jedan drugog* has another, more unusual characteristic: It is incompatible with predicates such as *sresti* ‘meet’, which by their semantics are irreducibly symmetric even as non-reciprocals. Example (3) is ungrammatical, while (4b) is only possible with a non-symmetric, agentive meaning: It suggests that the table reaches out to touch the wall, and vice versa. The symmetric meaning paraphrasable as “be in physical contact” is ruled out when *jedan drugog* is used.

- (3) \*Sreli su jedan drugog na ulici  
pro met Aux one other on street  
‘They met each other on the street’

- (4) a. Sto i zid se dodiruju  
 table and wall SE touch  
 ‘The table and the wall are touching (each other)’  
 b. # Sto i zid dodiruju jedan drugog/drugi  
 table and wall touch each other  
 ‘The table and the wall touch each other’

While we know of no Germanic or Romance language that shares this restriction, it is found in other Slavic languages, including Polish, Czech, and Slovenian.

- (5) a. ?? Spotkali jeden drugiego na ulicy (Polish)  
 b. ?? Oni spotkali sebe (Czech)  
 c. ?? Peter in Tone sta srečala drug drugega (Slovenian)  
 They/Peter and Tone met each other (on the street)

Reciprocal *se* can also be used in “depatientive”, or arbitrary object, constructions; here too symmetry is involved: Only symmetric predicates can be so used.

- (6) a. On se tuče  
 he SE fights  
 ‘He fights with other people’  
 b. \*On se udara  
 he SE hits  
 ‘He kicks other people’

Another noteworthy property of *se* is its inability to license an accusative object in ditransitive or pleonastic (double) reciprocal constructions (contrary to the predictions of Reinhart and Siloni (2005) for this type of language).

It can be seen that the two reciprocals are subject to a complex interaction of semantic and syntactic constraints, and are, variously, similar or different to equivalent reciprocals in other languages.

## References

- Dimitriadis, Alexis. 2004. Discontinuous reciprocals. Ms., Utrecht institute of Linguistics OTS. Submitted for publication.
- Franks, Steven. 1995. *Parameters of Slavic morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Marelj, Marijana. 2004. Middles and argument structure across languages. Doctoral Dissertation, Utrecht University.
- Moskovičević, J. 1997. Leksicka detranzitivizacija i analiza pravih povratnih glagola u srpskom jeziku. *Juznoslovenski filolog* 53:107–114.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 1997. Events in Serbian. *University of Trondheim Working Papers in Linguistics* 31:79–116.
- Reinhart, Tanya, and Tal Siloni. 2005. The lexicon-syntax parameter: Reflexivization and other arity operations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36.