Comitative arguments in Hungarian
Rákosi, György

Discontinuous reciprocal constructions are often argued to be symmetric in the sense that both the subject and the comitative with-argument are treated as having the same semantic and thematic properties. This paper presents data from Hungarian that challenge this view. The subject argument and the comitative argument are shown to differ in their semantic and thematic properties as well as in their syntax. Reciprocal predicates are identified primarily at the level of argument structure by analysing their second argument as having a distinct thematic role of its own.

1 Introduction

In Hungarian, just like in English, Greek, Hebrew and many other languages, lexical reciprocals may appear in two different patterns: (1a) represents what is often called the simple, whereas (1b) the discontinuous reciprocal construction (Dimitriadis 2002).

(1) a. János és Kati csókol-óz-t-ak
    John and Kate kiss-Rcp-Past-3Pl
    'John and Kate were kissing (each other or each someone else than the other)'

b. János csókol-óz-ott Kati-val
    John kiss-Rcp-Past Kate-with
    'John was kissing Kate'

It is generally assumed that the comitative phrase is an argument in the discontinuous construction and its semantic and thematic properties are derivatives of those of the non-reciprocal transitive stem from which the reciprocal appears to be derived. In an event denoted by a reciprocal predicate, the individual members of the subject and the comitative reference set are said to participate both as agents and patients of the relevant activity pursued (Dimitriadis 2002). As a consequence of this, the comitative phrase is either argued to share its thematic role with the subject argument (Siloni 2002), or to have a notionally distinct thematic role which is nevertheless qualitatively non-different from that of the subject (Komlósy 1992).

This paper shows that there is no systematic way of relating reciprocals to non-reciprocal lexical entries in Hungarian and therefore it is best to treat lexical reciprocal predicates as primitives. They have two arguments on their argument list with two distinct thematic roles: the subject is an AGENT and the comitative has a special role which I will call PARTNER.

The structure of the paper is as follows. First, preliminary data are presented to show that the comitative phrase in reciprocal constructions is an argument and as such different from comitative adjuncts that can augment most agentive predicates. Second, I give a short summary of current analyses of the discontinuous reciprocal construction (Section 3). Then I present data from Hungarian that challenge some of the basic assumptions in the literature (Section 4). Finally, I introduce a novel analysis of the thematic properties of lexical reciprocals within the framework of Lexical-Functional Grammar, and show how the LFG mapping theory captures the manner in which the argument structure assigned to reciprocal predicates determines the functional structure of the sentences in which they appear.
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2 Comitative arguments versus comitative adjuncts in Hungarian

Komlósy (1992 & 1994) provides both syntactic and semantic motivation for why a comitative phrase is to be analysed as an argument of lexical reciprocal predicates, and not as an adjunct. In this section, I give a brief summary of the differences we can observe between comitative arguments and comitative adjuncts. First, and most importantly, a comitative argument can be existentially bound in Hungarian. Thus (2a) necessarily refers to an event in which at least two participants were present even if the comitative argument is not realised as an overt constituent (in which case what the sentence asserts is that John was kissing someone). Without the comitative phrase, (2b) is most compatible with a single-participant situation.

(2) a. János csókol-óz-ott (Kati-val)  
John   kiss-Rcp-Past (Kate-with)   
'John was kissing (Kate)'

b. János időnként (a kutyá-já-val) fut  
John sometimes (the dog-3Sg-with) run  
'John sometimes goes jogging (with his dog)'

What this boils down to is the recognition that the existence of a comitative partner is encoded in the denotation of lexical reciprocals, whereas non-reciprocals do not have such entailments. According to accepted wisdom, this gives strong motivation for analysing the with-phrase as an argument of the predicate.

Second, a reciprocal pronoun can only appear as a comitative argument, but not as an adjunct:

(3) a. János és Kati csókol-óz-t-ak egymás-sal  
John and Kate kiss-Rcp-Past-3Pl each.other-with  
'John and Kate were kissing each other'

b. *János és Kati egymás-sal fut-ott-ak  
John and Kate each.other-with run-Past-3Pl  
'John and Kate went jogging with each other'

The existence of this constraint is somewhat mysterious and is left unaccounted for in Komlósy (1992 & 1994). While no explanation is provided here either, it should be noted that a comitative reciprocal pronoun is only acceptable with non-canonically reciprocal predicates if the event denoted by the sentence as a whole is one where the participants act somehow as true partners in the sense that they have an effect on the others by taking on some kind of a social interactional role. That is why (4a), denoting a social drinking event, is perfectly acceptable, whereas (4b) is ungrammatical:

(4) a. Az alkoholistá-k szívesen isz-nak egymás-sal  
the alcoholic-Pl readily drink-3Pl each.other-with  
'Alcoholics readily drink with each other'

b. *Az alkoholistá-k viz-et it-t-ak egymás-sal  
the alcoholic-Pl water-Acc drink-Past-3Pl each.other-with  
'The alcoholics drank water with each other'

By lexical reciprocal predicates I understand inherent reciprocals, as opposed to predicates in reciprocal constructions (They saw each other), where reciprocity is primarily denoted by the anaphor or some other syntactic marker. In doing so, I diverge from Reinhart & Reuland's (1993) analysis of reflexives.

Komlósy makes the suggestion that the two readings of the plural reciprocal construction without an overt comitative in (1a) can both be accounted for by the existential binding analysis and therefore reciprocals are uniformly dyadic. In Rákosi (2003) I argue that (1a) represents a case of genuine ambiguity and the two readings correspond to a dyadic and a monadic structure, respectively.

Note that (3a) is in fact a disambiguated version of (1a), as the latter can also mean that John and Kate were each kissing someone but not the other, a reading which (3a) does not have.
As I will argue in Section 5, it is an essential semantic feature of comitative arguments that they denote participants that are causally affected, which is not part of the interpretation of comitative adjuncts. A comitative adjunct in general denotes an additional participant who performed an activity which does not presuppose the presence of partnership in the sense to be explained below and in which the participants do not affect each other. This seems to underlie the fact that only comitative adjuncts can be paraphrased with *együtt* 'together', which is the third test Komlósy uses to distinguish between comitative arguments and adjuncts.

This distinction is further motivated by the following observations, not mentioned in Komlósy (1992 & 1994). A comitative argument and a comitative adjunct may co-occur in the same clause, whereas two comitative adjuncts cannot:

(5) a. Péter-rel *együtt* ritkán veszeked-t-em Kati-val
Peter-with together rarely quarrel-Past-1Sg Kate-with
'I rarely quarrelled with Kate together with Peter'
b. *Péter-rel *együtt* ritkán fut-ott-am Kati-val
Peter-with together rarely run-Past-1Sg Kate-with
'I rarely ran with Kate together with Peter'

Besides, shared-constituent co-ordination is only acceptable if both predicates are reciprocal and select for a comitative argument (6a) or they are non-reciprocal and share a comitative adjunct (6b). If one of the predicates is reciprocal and the other is not (6c), the construction is much less acceptable because the *with*-phrase bears no uniform functional relation towards the two predicates:

(6) a. János-sal általában vagy csókol-óz-ok vagy veszeked-ek
John-with in.general or kiss-Rcp-1Sg or quarrel-1Sg
'In general, I either kiss or quarrel with John'
b. János-sal általában vagy fut-ok vagy horgász-ok
John-with in.general or run-1Sg or fish-1Sg
'In general, I either go jogging or fishing with John'
c. *?*János-sal általában vagy csókol-óz-ok vagy fut-ok
John-with in.general or kiss-Rcp-1Sg or run-1Sg
'In general, I either kiss or go jogging with John'

Finally, the semantics of comitative adjuncts is much less restricted than that of comitative arguments, as it is pointed out in Dimitriadis (2002) in connection with the sentence *John rode to the store with Mary*, which has an interpretation in which Mary was given a lift rather than herself riding a separate bike. We may add to this that the referent of a comitative adjunct need not even be [+human/animate], as opposed to comitative arguments:

(7) a. #János öröm-é-ben csókol-óz-ott a levél-lel
John joy-3Sg-in kiss-Rcp-Past the letter-with
'In his joy, John was reciprocally kissing the letter'
b. János öröm-é-ben el-fut-ott Péter-hez a levél-lel
John joy-3Sg-in away-run-Past Peter-to the letter-with
'In his joy, John ran to Peter with the letter'

(7b) does not lend itself easily to a *together*-paraphrase (just like Dimitriadis’ example sentence in the above-mentioned interpretation), which shows that the two notions of accompaniment and togetherness are not equivalent. A comitative adjunct can express both categories and in an appropriate context (unlike in (7b)) it may be ambiguous between the two relevant readings. No such ambiguity is present in the case of comitative arguments as they have significantly different semantic content.

---

5 In this respect, comitative adjuncts are different from temporal or locative adjuncts, of which more than one can occur in the same clause. However, these multiple adjuncts of the same semantic type are hierarchically ordered wrt each other, *c.f.* *Put the book on the table in the room in the attic*. Multiple comitative adjuncts are unacceptable, possibly because the resulting hierarchical structure would be semantically deviant.
3 Current analyses

Syntactic analyses generally focus on the argument structure of lexical reciprocal predicates and tend to have an approach to this class that treats it in practice as a category at the syntax-semantics interface. The basic problem is that it is difficult to reconcile the general assumption (shared by Komlósy 1992 & 1994, Siloni 2001 & especially 2002, and Dimitriadis 2002) that the subject and the comitative argument have identical participation in the situation denoted by the reciprocal predicate with the other general assumption that each argument of a predicate has a unique thematic role and each role is unique to an argument.6

As noted by Siloni (2001), the set of lexical reciprocal predicates is a proper subset of agentive verbs and is roughly the same across languages but its defining properties remain largely unexplored. Their morphology does not provide us with an adequate base for categorisation. In Hungarian, for example, there are two reflexive-reciprocal morphemes but, on the one hand, almost half of the reciprocal predicates have neither of these suffixes and, on the other, this morphology appears on a number of predicates that are neither reflexive nor reciprocal (Rákosi 2002).7

The semantic definition of reciprocity (c.f., for example, Langendoen & Magloire 2003) is not sensitive to agentivity and places agentive predicates in the same reciprocal class as non-agentives, such as be the same weight (as) or be similar (to). From a syntactic perspective the disadvantage of such categorisation is the lack of uniform syntactic behaviour within the thus defined set: most non-agentive reciprocals do not select for a with-phrase argument and even if they do (e.g. be on friendly terms with, get on well with, etc.), then this argument does not have the same set of syntactic and semantic properties as a true comitative. For example, non-comitative with-arguments cannot be existentially bound in Hungarian. So while semanticists focus solely on the presence of a reciprocal relation in their analyses, syntacticians would like to consider the syntactically relevant set of lexical reciprocals as more restricted than that.

The general approach to characterise the class of lexical reciprocals involves two basic assumptions: (i) reciprocals denote symmetric events in the sense that the subject and the comitative referents have identical participation (ii) (at least the core set of) reciprocals can be systematically related to the corresponding non-reciprocal transitive entries and the semantic content of the subject argument (and, by transitivity, that of the comitative) is derivative of the semantics of the AGENT and PATIENT arguments of the transitive stem.

For semanticists, reciprocal predicates are not necessarily symmetric (Langendoen & Magloire 2003). In analyses that are more sensitive to syntactic problems, reciprocals (both simple and discontinuous reciprocals, as in (1a) and (1b), respectively), tend to be understood to be symmetric in the sense as is proposed by Dimitriadis (2002):

\[ \text{Symm}(V) (x,y) \iff \exists e (V(e,x,y) \& V(e,y,x)) \]

(E.g., x symmetrically-kisses y if there exists an event e which is an event of x kissing y and of y kissing x).

This kind of symmetricity manifests itself in practice at the level of argument structure rather than at the level of semantics and crucially, it rests upon the two above-mentioned assumptions.

So does the proposal made in Siloni (2002). She argues that in what she calls Lexicon languages, reciprocal predicates are created through the lexical operation of θ-unification:8

\[ \theta\text{-unification: } V [\text{Agent}, \text{Theme}] \to V_R[\text{Agent Theme}] \]

6 In LFG, this requirement is built into the architecture in an indirect way through the principle of function-argument biuniqueness: In every lexical form, every expressed lexical role must have a unique syntactic function, and every syntactic function must have a unique lexical role (Bresnan and Kanerva 1989: 28). This, coupled with the assumption that there can be at most one unexpressed thematic role on an argument list (c.f. Komlósy 1992), ensures that no two arguments can have the same thematic role.

7 This seems to be a general feature of languages in which there is reciprocal morphology. In Hebrew, for example, not all lexical reciprocals appear in the same template (Siloni 2002).

8 In Lexicon languages, reciprocal (and reflexive) predicates are created in the lexicon, as opposed to Syntax languages (e.g. French, Italian), in which reciprocal formation is supposed to be a syntactic process.
As is clear, this operation takes transitive verbs as its input. Reciprocals that do not have a transitive stem may have an abstract transitive alternate (Siloni, p.c.). Reciprocal formation (i.e., 0-unification) is not productive in the sense that the set of lexical reciprocals is limited, but within this set the operation is argued to work in a uniform manner. As for the discontinuous pattern, the preposition with establishes a symmetric relation between the subject set and the comitative set and this way acts as a sort of thematic role transmitter: both the subject and the comitative will have the same complex thematic role [Agent Theme] (Siloni, p.c.).9 The process of 0-unification is concomitant with the loss of the Acc feature assumed to be carried by the transitive stem (c.f. Reinhart 2002 for details), which is the reason why there cannot appear an accusative-marked constituent even if the dative argument is targeted during reciprocal formation, as in the following Hebrew example (adopted from Siloni 2002):

(10) dan ve-ron hitkatvu (*mixtavim)10

Dan and-Ron wrote.Rcp letters
'Dan and Ron corresponded'

In theory, nothing rules out the possibility that the Acc feature on the verb can be "regained" if the predicate undergoes additional arity increasing operations.

Though Komlósy's (1992 & 1994) proposal is less comprehensive than that of Siloni, it includes two interesting suggestions generally not considered elsewhere. First, he argues that the core set of reciprocal predicates in fact shows the very same syntactic behaviour and has the same argument structure as what he calls the set of verbs of mutual social activity, such as játsszik 'play', kártyázik 'play cards', táncol 'dance', beszélget 'speak with', etc.11 In fact, there is no reason not to collapse the two and talk about a broader joint set of verbs of mutual social activity. Second, he argues that the comitative argument in the discontinuous construction has a distinct thematic role which is referred to in Komlósy (1992) as ANTI-AGENT. The referent of this argument acts as the "antagonist" of the subject referent in the sense that he carries out the same action toward the subject as that one does toward him. Thus Komlósy takes reciprocals to be symmetric in much the same way as Dimitriadis (2002) does. Further, he derives the semantics of the core set of reciprocals from that of the transitive stem: "Usually, these sentences [i.e. sentences with reciprocal predicates] are interpreted as denoting events in which every individual in the set denoted by the subject is both an actor of an activity denoted by the input verb and a patient of the same kind of activity of other individual(s) in the set at the same time". By doing so, he complies with general assumptions, even though he notices that many Hungarian reciprocals are in fact frozen lexical entries.

4. Reciprocal predicates in Hungarian: some more (revealing) data

In this section I present empirical data from Hungarian that pose problems for the analyses summarised in Section 3. Having considered these data, I propose a novel, LFG-theoretic analysis in Section 5.

---

9 The Hungarian equivalent of the English preposition with is the instrumental/comitative suffix -vVl.
10 Notice that with most reciprocals it is very difficult to construe ungrammatical examples containing object constituents because the intended construction is usually conceptually deviant, and not just simply ungrammatical. And though the Hungarian equivalent of (10) is also ungrammatical:

(i) *János és Kati hosszú level-ek-et level-ez-t-ek.

John and Kate long letter-Pl-Acc letter(N)-Rcp-Past-3Pl

'John and Kate corresponded long letters'

it might just be ungrammatical for the same reason why *John buttered the bread with butter is ungrammatical. As I will argue in 4.2., if these conceptual problems are overcome by other factors, accusative-marked objects can appear with reciprocal predicates in Hungarian.
11 What he fails to notice is that many of these predicates are in fact underspecified for reciprocity. You can, for example, play alone or with someone else. I discuss this issue in Rákosi (2003).
4.1. Lexical reciprocals as conceptual primitives

The fact that many reciprocal predicates do not have a transitive alternate cannot be handled in LFG by assuming the existence of abstract transitive stems, for the simple reason that the generally accepted ontology does not include such abstract predicates. The number of such reciprocals is quite high in Hungarian, the stem is often a noun (e.g.: level-ezik 'correspond', lit. letter(N)-Rcp) or an adjective (e.g. szerelmes-kedik 'make love with', lit. in.love(Adj)-Rcp). This is a problem for the θ-unification analysis as even if these adjectives and (non-deverbal) nouns may be used predicatively, they do not have an argument list containing both an AGENT and a THEME.

But even if the stem is an existing transitive verb, it is not as straightforward to derive the semantics and the argument structure of the reciprocal from that of the transitive predicate as it might seem. Consider the following two sentences:

(11) a. János és Péter ver-t-ék egymás-t
    'John and Peter were beating each other'
   b. János és Péter ver-eked-t-ek
    'John and Peter were fighting/wrestling'

(11a) does not entail (11b), as the former can be true if, say, John and Peter were taking a turn in beating each other and John was hitting Peter in the leg and Peter was hitting John in the arm. In such a situation, (11b) cannot be used, as the reciprocal predicate denotes an activity in which the hits cannot be seriated or even individuated in any meaningful way. In other words, it is not immediately obvious how (8) accounts for the semantics of (11b) and especially, how (9) for the argument structure of the reciprocal. This problem is even more apparent in the case of the Hungarian kiss pair. The transitive stem can denote any kind of an intensive kissing activity, as in (12a). The reciprocal kiss, however, can only denote the sexual type of kissing where the two tongues are involved, hence the oddity of (12b), as opposed to (12c):

(12) a. Én és a báty-ám meg-csókol-t-uk egymás-t
    'I and my brother kissed each other'
   b. #A bátyá-m csókol-óz-ott vel-em
    'My brother was involved in a mutual sexual type of kissing activity with me'
   c. János csókol-óz-ott Kati-val
    'John was involved in a mutual sexual type of kissing activity with Kate'

Thus it seems very problematic to try to argue for the existence of a semantic motivation behind treating the subject and the comitative argument in (12c) as somehow both having the properties of both the AGENT and THEME arguments of the transitive predicate in (12a). Besides, many reciprocal predicates with a transitive stem have no compositional semantics and in these cases such an exercise is completely futile. This goes, for example, for szeret-kezik 'make love with' (lit.: love-Rcp), talál-kozik 'meet' (lit.: find-Rcp) or vesz-ekedik 'quarrel' (lit.: take-Rcp).

Considering then the reciprocal set as a whole, it is clear that there is no systematic way of relating reciprocals to non-reciprocal entries without doing it with a great degree of arbitrariness. Therefore I do not assume the existence of a reciprocating lexical rule which relates reciprocals to non-reciprocals in a uniform manner. In those cases when reciprocal morphology is present and the semantics of the predicate is more or less compositional, as in (11b), such a correspondence is to be

---

12 This fact, though in a different context, is pointed out by Dimitriadis (2002) and Langendoen and Magloire (2003), among others.

13 Note that the Greek or the Hebrew counterpart of (12b) is perfectly acceptable. This suggests that we cannot simply argue the oddity of (12b) away by referring to universal pragmatic factors. The difference between the Hungarian transitive kiss and the reciprocal one is semantic and has to be stored in the lexicon.
captured on an individual basis. But as a class, lexical reciprocals are best treated as conceptual primitives.

4.2. Accusative case can be assigned

Though the comitative argument of a reciprocal cannot be mapped onto the object function, it is not the case that accusative-marked elements cannot appear in reciprocal constructions (contra Siloni 2002). Lexical reciprocals can be idiom.atic complexes containing accusative-marked elements: *vitat-kozik* 'to argue' (lit.: discuss/doubt-Rcp), and the two appear in the very same syntactic patterns, which we have seen in Section 2. Besides, reciprocals that do not have the reciprocal morphology may take accusative-marked arguments:

(13) János meg-vitat-t-a Péter-rel a terve-t  
John Prt-discuss-Past-Def.Obj  Peter-with the plan-Acc  
'John discussed the plan with Peter'

It is an intriguing question why only those lexical reciprocals can have accusative-marked complements that lack the reflexive-reciprocal morphology.

Nevertheless there are two good reasons not to regard the reflexive-reciprocal morpheme as a definitive case-absorber. First, some of the predicates that have this morphology but are neither reflexive nor reciprocal, have accusative-marked THEME arguments (e.g. *lop-kod* 'steals sth(Acc) regularly, usu. smaller things', lit. steal-Rcp; or *ajándék-oz* 'give sth(Acc) to sb(Dat) as a present, lit.: present(N)-Rcp). Second, even the morphologically marked reciprocal predicates can realise accusative arguments if they undergo complex predicate formation processes. One very productive such process is the formation of *végig*-complexes. Literally meaning 'through, along', the particle *végig* can be added productively to agentive intransitive verbal predicates and it has the effect of increasing the arity of the input predicate by one. This new argument is obligatorily accusative marked, generally denotes a spatial or a temporal domain and the particle acts as a kind of quantifier over the whole of this domain, as in (14):

(14) János végig-csókol-óz-t-a *(a délután-t) Kati-val  
John through-kiss-Rcp-Past-Def.Obj the afternoon-Acc Kate-with  
'John was kissing Kate all through the afternoon'

In its basic postpositional use, *végig* obligatorily requires its noun phrase complement to be marked for supreessive case (≈'on') and not for accusative. The fact that an accusative object is grammatical and indeed obligatory in (14) supports an analysis where the accusative case marking potential of a predicate is in general a matter of the quality of its argument structure. Simple reciprocals do not assign accusative case simply because they do not have the right type of argument. I discuss this issue in more detail in Section 5.

4.3. Reciprocal predicates are not necessarily symmetric

As we have seen, it is often assumed that the two referent sets of the arguments of a (discontinuous) reciprocal contain participants whose role is identical. In this sense, the event denoted by the predicate is symmetric. However, at closer inspection it becomes evident that this type of symmetricity is a special semantic property of many but not all predicates that are considered to be reciprocal in the literature on grounds that they show identical syntactic behaviour. It is difficult to imagine an event denoted by the Hungarian reciprocal *kiss* (12), for example, in which the two participants are not both acting the same way towards each other. However, the set of those lexical reciprocals which encode the notion of some kind of an enmity or conflict among the participants as part of their lexical semantic specification, appear to behave in a different way. Cross-linguistically, this set includes predicates such as the English *argue, disagree, compete, fight, vie*, etc. Consider the following, completely well-formed, English conversation:

---

14 In earlier work (Rákosí 2002), I also made this assumption.
(15) -Why are you always competing with John at work?
- I am not competing with him, he is competing with me.

Whether such non-symmetric construals are available or not, is language and predicate specific. Hungarian seems to be more generous in this respect than, for example, English. English native speakers tend to reject a non-symmetric interpretation of the English version of the following Hungarian sentence:

(16) János veszeked-ett Kati-val
   John quarrel-Past Kate-with
   'John quarrelled with Kate'

But in Hungarian, (16) can denote an event in which Kate did not even say a word or act in any obvious ways as equal to John. One could argue that veszekedik 'quarrel' is ambiguous between a symmetric and a non-symmetric reading. The problem with that is that then we would expect such an ambiguity to have syntactic consequences, which is not the case: the discontinuous construction licenses both readings. Therefore I regard (16) as underspecified for symmetry. Crucially, this means that the comitative referent, by default, does not necessarily have the same kind of participation in the event as the subject referent. He has to act as a partner, in the sense that he is conscious of and accepts the state of being in a social situation where interaction of at least a minimal degree is required, but he need not be doing the same thing as the subject referent.

Generalising this to the whole class, the basic semantic content of all comitative arguments can be viewed as different from that of the subject argument in this sense. If the event denoted by the predicate cannot naturally be understood to be non-symmetric (e.g. the reciprocal kiss), then it is a special aspect of the lexical semantics of the predicate itself which should be dissociated from what we understand by reciprocity and how we treat the comitative argument.

There are two caveats to this. First, the symmetric - non-symmetric distinction in this domain may be grammaticalised by associating non-symmetry with a different preposition, such as against in English or be 'in, against' in Hebrew (Siloni 2001). The correct generalisation seems to be that at least if only a with-argument is subcategorised for by a predicate, then non-symmetric interpretation is possible. This holds for the Hebrew counterpart of (16):

(17) dan rav im dina/*be dina
    Dan quarrelled with Dina/ against Dina
    'Dan was involved in a possibly non-symmetric quarrel with Dina'

Second, what we are discussing here as a case of underspecification is to be distinguished from pragmatic effects discussed by Gleitman et al (1996) that we can observe in (18), which I adopt from them:

(18)a. North Korea is similar to Red China
    b. Red China is similar to North Korea

It is world knowledge and the topic-comment structure of the sentence which makes (18a) sound more natural in an unmarked context. The phenomenon we have observed in connection with (15), (16) and (17) is not dependent on such pragmatic factors but is semantic in nature.

5. The argument structure of reciprocal predicates

5.1. The thematic roles of the arguments

It has been shown that the comitative phrase is an argument and its default semantic content is not identical to that of the subject argument. Let us consider the thematic role of the subject first. Siloni (2002) argues that it has a complex theta-role [AGENT THEME]. The empirical problem with such an approach is that the subject can only be shown to be an AGENT by traditional agentivity tests:
(19)a. James Bond made love with the secretary to get closer to the documents  
b. James Bond made love with the secretary on purpose  
c. James bond had to make love with the secretary

While not being able to show that the subject is not a THEME does not mean that it might not be a THEME, this lack of direct evidence makes the complex theta-role analysis less plausible. Besides, it has been argued that the semantic motivation behind such an approach is dubious. Therefore, I regard the subject argument of lexical reciprocal predicates as a simplex AGENT. In fact, this is what Siloni assumes in earlier work (2001) and it also coincides with the analysis Reinhart (2002) provides for reflexive predicates.

The comitative argument is assumed to have its own, distinct thematic role which I call PARTNER. In this step, I follow Komlósy (1992&1994) but crucially, I do not assume that this thematic role has the same semantic/featural content as the subject argument. PARTNER is not an initiator of an action (c.f. 19), he does not necessarily have control over the situation, and the level of volitional involvement on the PARTNER's side can be much lower than on the side of the subject argument (c.f. 15, 16 & 17). In other words, a PARTNER has a limited amount of patientlike properties in the sense of Dowty (1991), to the extent that it is less agentlike than the subject. From a theoretical perspective, PARTNER might present two problems: (i) it appears to be more specific than is desirable and it is heavily restricted in its semantics (ii) we have introduced something new which looks as a prima facie thematic role. However, given the fact that argument structure is regarded in LFG as a fundamentally lexical syntactic construct and not a semantic one (Bresnan 2001), we can regard PARTNER as a descriptive label that plays its part in partitioning the semantic space that a syntactically relevant category of a thematic role corresponds to. The featural makeup that I propose for PARTNER is most compatible with what is usually referred to as the EXPERIENCER thematic role. These two are the different semantic manifestations of the same thematic role, in the same way as THEME in the narrow sense and PATIENT are often regarded as being different realisations of a THEME proper. Thus we can modify the common LFG Thematic Hierarchy (Bresnan 2001) in the following way:

(20) \[ \text{agent} \rightarrow \text{beneficiary} \rightarrow \text{experiencer/partner/goal} \rightarrow \text{instrument} \rightarrow \text{patient/theme} \rightarrow \text{locative} \]

Lexical reciprocals in Hungarian have the following general lexical form:

(21) \[ \text{V}_{\text{RECIP}}: (\uparrow \text{PRED})=\text{V-RECIP} <(\text{AGENT})(\text{PARTNER})> \]

It is the semantic difference between an EXPERIENCER and a PARTNER which determines that the former has dative case in Hungarian, whereas the latter bears comitative case.

5.2. Mapping to functional structure

Finally, I briefly show how the LFG mapping theory (as proposed originally by Bresnan & Kanerva 1989) provides for the right mapping from the a(rgument)-structure in (21) to the f(unctional)-structure of clauses lexical reciprocals occur in. Subcategorisable syntactic functions are classified with respect to two features: semantically unrestricted or not [+/r], and objective or non-objective [+/o]. The feature decomposition of argument functions is as in (22).

(22) \[
\begin{array}{ll}
[-o \cdot -r]: \text{SUBJ} & [-o +r]: \text{OBL}_0 \\
[+o \cdot -r]: \text{OBJ} & [+o +r]: \text{OBJ}_0
\end{array}
\]

15 This possibility has been pointed out to me by Martin Everaert.
16 It is clear that in this view AGENT and PARTNER do not have the same ontological status, but for convenience sake I simply refer to PARTNER as a thematic role. In Reinhart's (2002) Theta System such problems are less acute. Arguments are primarily characterised by the features [+/c] (cause change) and [+/m] (mental state), and not by thematic role labels. EXPERIENCER corresponds to [-c+m], but according to the discussion above, we can regard PARTNER as a unary cluster [+m] underspecified for the c-feature. In this case it is also secured in the Reinhartian framework that dyadic reciprocals cannot have accusative arguments.
The following two principles determine how thematic roles are associated with the features that decompose syntactic functions. First, thematic roles are assigned valued features on the basis of their intrinsic properties: patientlike roles are [-r], secondary patientlike roles are [+o], and other thematic roles are [-o]. Second, a default assignment applies on the basis of the thematic hierarchy in (20) (except when either a conflict with or a repetition of the intrinsic classification would result): the highest ranking argument receives the [-r] feature, the rest will be [+r].

Let us see how it works with the kiss pair. The mapping is straightforward in the case of the transitive csókol 'kiss someone':

(23) csókol < AGENT PATIENT>
    intrinsic           [-o] [-r]
    default [-r]
    SUBJ SUBJ/OBJ
    SUBJ OBJ

The reciprocal csókolózik 'kiss' is also dyadic, but its second argument is assigned the same thematic properties as experiencers or goals, so it will not be treated as a patientlike role:

(24) csókolózik < AGENT PARTNER>
    intrinsic [-o] [-o]
    default [-r] [+r]
    SUBJ OBL

The comitative argument is mapped onto a semantically restricted oblique function, the one which is associated with comitative case. If a reciprocal predicate is triadic and thus has an additional patientlike argument, as in (13) and (14), then that argument will be mapped onto the object function, and receives accusative case as is usual in Hungarian.
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