

# The regular and the extended comitative reciprocal construction, illustrated from German

Frans Plank  
University of Konstanz

Comitative and coordinative constructions are known to often share in the expression of reciprocal situations, but the relationship between them is in need of clarification. Illustrating from German, it will be shown how regular comitative constructions with intransitive symmetric predicates can be analogically extended to transitive verbs not inherently denoting symmetric relations. Such extensions are subject to various conditions, especially those that a situation can be conceptualised as a single event or state, with the co-participants sharing the involvement, and that a reflexive or reflexive-cum-reciprocal pronoun is inactivated, hence does not require local binding. There is considerable variation among speakers in the acceptance of extended comitative constructions formed on these conditions, whereas their regular models are wholly uncontroversial.

## 1. Aim

My aim here is to clarify the relationship between comitative and coordinative constructions in the expression of reciprocal situations. Illustrating from German, it will be shown how regular comitative constructions with intransitive symmetric predicates can be analogically extended to transitive verbs not inherently denoting symmetric relations. Such extensions will be seen to be subject to various conditions, chief among which are the conventional conceptualisation of a situation as a single event or state, brought about through the shared involvement among co-participants, and the inactivation of a reflexive or reflexive-cum-reciprocal pronoun so that it does not need to be locally bound. As demonstrated by a questionnaire study, for some speakers these conditions are satisfied more easily than for others, resulting in considerable

variation in the acceptance of extended comitative constructions, whereas their regular models are wholly uncontroversial.

## 2. The regular coordinative/comitative alternation

### 2.1 Symmetry

In a symmetric relation the kind of involvement of the participants is conceived of as being (essentially) the same. When such symmetry holds for an action with an agent affecting a patient, symmetry means that participant A acts and co-participant B is acted upon, and, as integral part of what is conceived of as being the same event,<sup>1</sup> participant A is acted upon (essentially) as co-participant B is and co-participant B acts (essentially) as participant A does.

An example of such symmetric interaction is fighting, in the basic sense of a contest to be decided through the physical force or skill which the antagonists engaged in it each bring to bear on the other, in direct bodily contact or mediated through weapons. The antagonists may not in fact be doing and undergoing exactly the same: one might be the attacker and the other the defender; one might wield a sword and the other fire a pistol; one might look the winner and the other the loser; one might be the good guy the narrator empathises with and the other the villain one is to be distanced from. Nonetheless, for an interaction to be categorised as a fight it has perforce to be conceived of as one of equals with respect to the relation designated by the predicate – as distinct from kindred, but asymmetric interactions (which happen to be covered by the same verb in the same transitive construction in English) such as striving to keep someone or something at a distance or to overcome someone or something. And relational equality presupposes (essential) categorial equality. Thus, the antagonists in a fight will both have to be categorised as being capable of volitional agency, i.e., as animate: a hostile interaction between such unequals as, say, a knight-errant and a windmill will not be conceived of as a fight unless categorial equality can be established among the participants (such as through personification).

Symmetry is the very essence of concepts such as fighting (in the physical-contest sense): you can't fight with no one to fight with or against. But concepts can be more flexible. That of dancing, for example, is: it does take two to tango, but one is enough to flamenco. That is, a concept such as dancing, at any rate in a European cultural context, subsumes activities performed in pairs, with

the participants interacting symmetrically, as well as alone (or by individuals as members of a group, each doing their own thing).

## 2.2 Intransitive verbs

In German, verbs designating symmetric interactions – which are typically intransitive, with the co-participant not strictly a verb-governed argument (but see Section 2.3 for less typical symmetric transitives) – can equally occur in two constructions, one coordinative (1), the other comitative (or sociative, or cooperative) (2). To exemplify, ignoring irrelevant meanings (such as that of fighting together against a third party unspecified):<sup>2</sup>

- (1) *David und Goliath kämpften*  
'David and Goliath fought'
- (2) *David kämpfte mit Goliath*  
'David fought with Goliath'

In the coordinative construction the participant and co-participant, joined by a coordinative connector, have the same syntactic rank and together form one constituent, functioning as intransitive subject. In the comitative construction they have different syntactic status, one appearing as intransitive subject and the other, adjoined through a prepositional phrase, forming a constituent of its own at the level of the verb phrase. Verb agreement (invariably plural in (1) and singular in (2)) and all other morphosyntactic evidence also serve to clearly distinguish the two synonymous constructions. The symmetric nature of the interaction as such, fighting, remains unaffected by additional extra-constructional constituents – adverbs such as *widerwillig* 'reluctantly' or instrumental adjuncts such as *ohne Waffe* 'without a weapon' – which are oriented specifically towards subjects, hence to both co-participants in (1) and only one in (2). However distinct the syntax, what the coordinative and the comitative construction share is that each has a counterpart of its own kind: just as the linear ordering of conjuncts in (1) is reversible *salva veritate*, though perhaps not *salvo impetu dicendi*, so is the ranking of subject and adjunct in (2).

- (1') *Goliath und David kämpften*
- (2') *Goliath kämpfte mit David*

“Comitative” is here being used as a term for a syntactic construction covering a whole family of semantic relations, including the adversative one illustrated in (2). What matters for present purposes is that a comitative construction

coexists with a coordinative one, and this also applies to separative symmetric interactions, where the appropriate preposition in German is *von* or sometimes also *mit*:

- (3) *Adam und Eva schieden*  
'Adam and Eve parted'
- (4) *Adam schied von Eva*  
'Adam parted from Eve'

In recognition of such overt verb-related contrasts, and also of the fact that many verbs bar a comitative adjunct on semantic grounds, the preposition in comitative constructions can thus be seen as influenced by the verb, though probably not as strictly governed like object cases are.

Symmetric-interaction verbs like *kämpfen* and *scheiden* are not formally marked in any way that would overtly distinguish them from other verbs. With flexible verbs like *tanzen* 'to dance' there is no formal difference either between the symmetric (coordinative as well as comitative) and non-symmetric uses. However, there are other symmetric-interaction verbs, such as *duellieren* 'to duel' (derived from a noun, *Duell* 'duel') or *lösen* 'to disassociate' (derived from an adjective, *los(e)* 'loose', and not used transitively in German, at least not with an animate direct object, which is the prerequisite for a symmetric reading, with the subject also animate), which obligatorily combine with an extra word of the form of the reflexive pronoun; yet others, such as *streiten* 'to quarrel', take the reflexive pronoun only optionally, perhaps subject to dialectal variation. Like simple symmetric-interaction verbs, these complex verbs occur in both the coordinative (5) and the comitative construction (6), obligatorily or optionally taking the reflexive pronoun in both, as is only to be expected, since this is part of their lexical form:

- (5) a. *Crampas und Instetten duellierten sich*  
'Crampas and Instetten fought a duel with each other'
- b. *Adam und Eva lösten sich*  
'Adam and Eve severed (the ties between) themselves'
- c. *Ich und Oma stritten (uns)*  
'I and grandma quarrelled (with each other)'
- (6) a. *Crampas duellierte sich mit Instetten*  
'Crampas fought a duel with Instetten'
- b. *Adam löste sich von Eva*  
'Adam dissociated himself from Eve'

- c. *Ich stritt (mich) mit Oma*  
 'I quarrelled with grandma'

Since all such symmetric interactions are instances of reciprocal situations, whatever else reciprocity is assumed to include,<sup>3</sup> it may seem surprising that no special reciprocal marking is required here. The reciprocal marker, the invariable compound word *einander* 'one another', accompanied by the preposition that would be used in the comitative construction (typically *mit* 'with', or *von* 'from, of' when separative), can in fact be added to the coordinative renderings, but only optionally; and if there is a semantic difference at all, it consists in the added emphasis on the reciprocal reading being the only one intended (David and Goliath might have been jointly fighting with someone else unspecified, etc.):

- (7) a. *David und Goliath kämpften miteinander* (1)  
 b. *Crampas und Insetten duellierten sich miteinander* (5a)  
 c. *Ich und Oma stritten (uns) miteinander* (5c)
- (8) a. *Adam und Eva schieden voneinander* (3)  
 b. *Adam und Eva lösten sich voneinander* (5b)

On the other hand, there is no real reason to be surprised since reciprocal situations as such can also be expressed lexically, through verbs or other relation-designating words of appropriate meaning, with no special grammatical forms or constructions advertising them as reciprocal. Also, owing to their inherent dedication to symmetry of involvement among multiple participants, coordinative and comitative (or sociative, cooperative, and the like) constructions themselves are natural ways of expressing reciprocal situations, and are commonly found to subserve this function in their own right when languages lack dedicated reciprocal forms or constructions. Through adding a noun phrase as a conjunct or as a comitative adjunct, in structural symmetry or near-symmetry with a noun phrase for the participant, the co-participant needed for an interaction to count as symmetric can easily be supplied without extra grammatical machinery. Given an appropriate meaning of the predicate of clauses thus elaborated, such symmetric relations among co-participants will lend themselves to reciprocal interpretations without extra reciprocal marking. Other than attaining only near-symmetry in structural terms, comitative adjunction would generally seem to differ from coordinative conjunction (i) in forcing a single-event reading (*Smith and Jones left* can truthfully be said also when there were two independent leaving events), and (ii) in being limited to involvements in activities or experiences that can be shared (finding an answer

or dying can be, but knowing the answer or being dead can't – and such examples suggest the generalisation, variously proposed in the literature, though inaccurate, that dynamic predicates allow comitatives, but static ones don't; some of the latter do: e.g., jointly owning something with someone).

Not uncommonly reflexive markers also do reciprocal duty. In line with this crosslinguistic tendency, dedicatedly reciprocal *einander* is extremely rare in spoken German: other than in combination with prepositions, the reflexive pronoun takes care of most reciprocal situations too. The reflexive pronouns of German are identical with the personal pronouns, in the accusative, dative, or genitive, but for 3rd person there is a special form, *sich*, invariable as to number, case, and gender, and marginally also used as a default reflexive form for other persons. Now, comparing verbs like *kämpfen*, *tanzen*, or *scheiden* on the one hand and *sich duellieren*, *sich lösen*, (*sich*) *streiten* on the other, it is evident that the reflexive-like word that occurs with the latter does not have the regular FUNCTION of a genuine reflexive or reflexive-cum-reciprocal pronoun (or “anaphor”), marking coreference within a local domain, but is a mere lexical marker, semantically vacuous owing to the absence of a contrast with non-reflexive. Plain intransitive verbs, not denoting interactions among participants, can likewise take this reflexive look-alike: compare *eilen* and *sich beeilen*, the latter with a prefix *be-* (which elsewhere often has a transitivity function), but both meaning essentially the same, ‘to hurry’, or *irren* and *sich irren*, ‘to err’, here without prefixal differentiation. This is not to say such extra markers of the form of reflexives are distributed over the verbal lexicon randomly: in a crosslinguistically predictable manner (as has often been shown), there are semantic domains where they are most likely to occur – and verbs whose meaning can be construed as implying more than one semantic role, as in autolocomotion, emotion and cognition with an inner state vaguely linked with an outer correlate, or in symmetric interaction, are among them.

Other than its lexical role in certain semantic domains, the reflexive look-alike also has a productive syntactic function as a marker of intransitivisation in German (again, as elsewhere).<sup>4</sup> In the domain of symmetric interactions this can be illustrated from verbs like *paaren* ‘to pair, mate’ or *trennen* ‘to separate’. Used transitively, the symmetric relation, effectuated by the subject/causer, obtains between the object co-participants, and as with subject-centred symmetry there are coordinative and comitative (or separative) constructions available to express this (9a, b, 11a, b); intransitivisation, in order to background the causer or cause, is signalled by an added reflexive look-alike, present in both the coordinative and the comitative version (10a, b, 12a, b).<sup>5</sup>

- (9) a. *Darwin paarte Finken und Kanarienvögel (miteinander)*  
 ‘Darwin mated finches and canaries (with each other)’  
 b. *Darwin paarte Finken mit Kanarienvögeln*  
 ‘Darwin mated finches with canaries’
- (10) a. *Finken und Kanarienvögel paarten sich (miteinander)*  
 ‘Finches and canaries mated (with each other)’  
 b. *Finken paarten sich mit Kanarienvögeln*  
 ‘Finches mated with canaries’
- (11) a. *Chrysler trennte Mercedes und Benz (voneinander)*  
 ‘Chrysler separated Mercedes and Benz (from each other)’  
 b. *Chrysler trennte Mercedes von Benz*  
 ‘Chrysler separated Mercedes from Benz’
- (12) a. *Mercedes und Benz trennten sich (voneinander)*  
 ‘Mercedes and Benz separated’  
 b. *Mercedes trennte sich von Benz*  
 ‘Mercedes separated from Benz’

Although the forms employed are exactly the same, genuine reflexive, or non-distinct reflexive-cum-reciprocal pronouns, are not implicated in such lexical and syntactic uses of the reflexive look-alike. In neither of them is there a contrast with non-reflexive. (Reading constructions like (10b) or (12b) as genuine reflexivisations corresponding to constructions like (9b) and (11b), with referentially distinct subject and direct object, would be misguided, as is especially plain when subject and direct object are categorially as different as in (9b), man and bird, while the reciprocal reading, as in (10b), requires identity in this respect.) The only common ground of genuine reflexives (-cum-reciprocals) pronouns and reflexive look-alikes is the vast area of the mismatching of the number of semantic relations in a situation and the (lesser) number of distinct participants overtly expressed in the clause expressing that situation. This commonality, however abstract, is of course also the motivation for using genuine reflexive pronouns, of all forms, for such non-genuinely reflexive purposes.

### 2.3 Transitive verbs

Symmetric relations do not lend themselves naturally to being expressed through transitive clauses: this syntactic format is destined for participants which are opposites rather than equals. Nonetheless, there are a number of predicates, verbal and other, which, at least in some of their uses, connect a subject with an object interrelated as participant and co-participant in an arguably

symmetrical manner. More commonly their governed object is in the dative, which in German is the case specialising in relationships of less than diametrical opposition, with the object often animate or human just like the subject. Diametrical opposition of agent and patient is the domain of the accusative; nonetheless, there are a few symmetric verbs governing this case too. Transitive symmetric predicates now show a few variations on the by now familiar theme of the coordinative/comitative alternation.

Alongside adjectival predicates of identity or similarity (*gleich/ähnlich sein* 'to be identical/similar'), German also has equivalent derived verbs (*gleichen/ähneln*), likewise governing the dative. Roughly equivalent to the transitive construction (13), whose alternative with subject and object reversed is omitted here, there is a coordinative construction with the verb now accompanied by a reciprocal or reflexive-cum-reciprocal marker (14), just as any non-symmetric transitive verb in a situation of reciprocal interrelations (15).

- (13) *Ein Alligator gleicht einem Krokodil*  
'An alligator resembles a crocodile'
- (14) *Ein Alligator und ein Krokodil gleichen sich/einander*  
'An alligator and a crocodile resemble one another'
- (15) *Ein Alligator und ein Krokodil bissen sich/einander*  
An alligator and a crocodile bit one another'

What is missing is a comitative analogue to (14), so far seen to be a possible alternative to every coordinative construction with symmetric predicates:<sup>6</sup>

- (16) \**Ein Alligator gleicht sich/einander mit einem Krokodil*

In the pair (14) and (16) the transitive, dative-governing verb *gleichen* combines with a genuine reflexive-cum-reciprocal pronoun as its object, whereas intransitive symmetric predicates licensing a comitative construction were not accompanied by a genuine reflexive or reflexive-cum-reciprocal pronoun, but only by a reflexive look-alike, as a purely lexical marker (6) or an intransitiviser (10b, 12b); and in the coordinative construction dedicatedly reciprocal *einander* plus the comitative preposition could only be added to this reflexive look-alike (7, 8, 10a, 12a), but could not replace it, as it does in (14) and (15). A genuine reciprocal anaphor, as in (14), just as in (15), wants to be locally bound, and the participant and co-participant intended to bind it together form the subject only in the case of coordination (14), but not when they are syntactically split up as in the comitative construction (16).



Apart from governing the accusative, *heiraten* ‘to marry’ differs from *gleichen* and its kind in taking an reflexive-cum-reciprocal or dedicatedly reciprocal in the coordinative construction only optionally, for special disambiguating emphasis, if at all:

- (17) *Die Prinzessin heiratet den Grafen*  
‘The princess marries the earl’
- (18) *Die Prinzessin und der Graf heiraten (sich/einander)*  
‘The princess and the earl marry (one another)’

All the same, the comitative construction is out, even with no overt reflexive-cum-reciprocal present:<sup>7</sup>

- (19) \**Die Prinzessin heiratet (sich/einander) mit dem Grafen*  
‘The princess marries (REFL/RECIP) with the earl’

For one thing, without the reflexive-cum-reciprocal or dedicated reciprocal the syntax is off: being a transitive, accusative-governing object, *heiraten* resists being in construction with a comitative adjunct but no accusative object, even though the relationship between subject and either comitative or accusative could equally be construed as symmetric. With the reflexive-cum-reciprocal pronoun present, this would get bound by the subject, which does not yield the right reciprocal semantics. That it is the presence of an overt (reflexive-cum-) reciprocal marker, or the equivalent meaning component of the verb *heiraten* on its own, that matters in ruling out (19) is seen when comparing *heiraten* to *sich verloben* ‘to become engaged to’, which is intransitively symmetrical and takes the reflexive look-alike as a lexical marker, or to *sich verheiraten* ‘to marry’, which is basically transitive, ‘to give away one’s child in marriage’, and takes the reflexive look-alike when intransitivised. In both cases, a comitative construction coexists with a coordinative one:

- (20) a. *Die Prinzessin und der Graf verloben sich (miteinander)*  
‘The princess and the earl are getting engaged (with each other)’  
b. *Die Prinzessin und der Graf verheiraten sich (miteinander)*  
‘The princess and the earl marry (each other)’
- (21) a. *Die Prinzessin verlobt sich mit dem Grafen*  
‘The princess is getting engaged with the earl’  
b. *Die Prinzessin verheiratet sich mit dem Grafen*  
‘The princess marries with the earl’

There are several further transitive verbs which unlike *gleichen* and *heiraten* are not inherently symmetric, but which can be understood as symmetric de-

pending on appropriate categorisations of the participants. They fall among the cases where a comitative alternative to coordination needs special licensing, which is the subject of the next section.

### 3. The coordinative/comitative alternation analogically extended

#### 3.1 Transitive verbs asymmetric on their own

The cardinal syntactic format for verbs designating non-symmetric interactions is the transitive clause, with one participant as subject and the other as direct object. To exemplify with an action verb (and *bekämpfen*, mentioned above as an equivalent of transitive uses of *to fight*, would have served equally well):

- (22) *David verletzte Goliath*  
 'David injured Goliath'

David injuring Goliath does not perforce mean that Goliath also injured David. However, it is possible that in the course of a fight the victim reciprocates, so that there are two injuring events, which may even be simultaneous, where both participants are involved in opposite roles. This can be expressed through coordinative constructions, either of two full clauses (23a), of a full clause and an expression for role reversal (23b), or of only the subjects, with an overt reciprocal (or reflexive-cum-reciprocal) form added (23c):

- (23) a. *David verletzte Goliath und Goliath (seinerseits) verletzte David*  
 'David injured Goliath and Goliath (in turn) injured David'  
 b. *David verletzte Goliath und andersrum*  
 'David injured Goliath and the other way round'  
 c. *David und Goliath verletzten sich/einander*  
 'David and Goliath injured each other'

Although noun phrase coordination in such cases superficially resembles that seen above for symmetric-interaction verbs with a lexical reflexive ((5a), *David und Goliath duellierten sich*; but notice the impossibility of the reciprocal marker in that case: *\*duellierten einander*), it is clear that reflexive and reciprocal forms here are not semantically vacuous, but have their regular function and conform to the regular rule for the local binding of anaphors through subjects.

The fundamental difference is also underlined by the impossibility of a comitative construction, analogous to (6) above, with such transitive verbs:

- (24) \**David verletzte sich mit Goliath*

Despite the complexity of the role structure of such events, the comitative construction for symmetric-interaction verbs still denotes a SINGLE event or state, of the type designated by the verb – one fight, one duel, one quarrel, one separation, one marriage, one resemblance. By contrast, mutual injurings represent more than one event – one with X as agent and Y as corresponding patient, the other with Y as agent and X as corresponding patient –, irrespective of whether they are comprehended within a single overall event, such as a fight.

To beat or strike or, to also have a separative example, to bid farewell are activities in relevant respects comparable to injurings rather than to fights or to partings. They are non-symmetric, hence the transitive uses of the corresponding verbs with referentially distinct subjects and object:

- (25) *David schlug Goliath*  
'David beat/struck Goliath'
- (26) *Der Präsident verabschiedete den Botschafter*  
'The president bade the ambassador farewell'

Naturally, the patient participant can reciprocate, which is expressed through the regular coordinative reciprocal (or reflexive-cum-reciprocal) construction:

- (27) *David und Goliath schlugen sich/einander*  
'David and Goliath beat/struck each other'
- (28) *Der Präsident und der Botschafter verabschiedeten sich/einander*  
'The president and the ambassador bade each other farewell'

However, differing from mutual injurings, mutual beatings and farewell-biddings can also be expressed through what looks like the comitative reciprocal construction:

- (29) *David schlug sich mit Goliath*  
'David beat/struck REFL with Goliath'  
(i.e., 'David and Goliath beat/struck each other')
- (30) *Der Präsident verabschiedete sich vom Botschafter*  
'The president bade REFL farewell from the ambassador'  
(i.e., 'The president and the ambassador bade each other farewell')

In the comitative reciprocal construction as illustrated above for inherent symmetric-interaction verbs, the reflexive was only a look-alike, present as a lexical marker of the verbs concerned or as an intransitiver. Upon a little reflection, the reflexive with non-symmetric-interaction verbs like those in

(29) and (30) is seen not to be the regular reflexive(-cum-reciprocal) pronoun either, for a compositional construal of these constructions would only link it with the subject – which would leave the essence of the reciprocal situation unaccounted for. Also, dedicatedly reciprocal *einander*, though possible in coordination, is no option in such cases either:

(31) \**David schlug einander mit Goliath*

(32) \**Der Präsident verabschiedete einander vom Botschafter*

I would therefore like to suggest that what I call the EXTENDED comitative reciprocal construction, as exemplified in (29) and (30), is not really constructed compositionally in the first place, but is a derivative or analogical construction modelled on the REGULAR comitative reciprocal construction with those symmetric-interaction verbs that take a reflexive look-alike.

The analogy is inspired by the coordinative reciprocal construction that is shared by both verb types. Naturally, further properties of the copy will in essence also be inherited from the model.

Thus extending the regular comitative reciprocal construction to verbs with which it is not original needs an additional license, and herein lies the subtle difference in meaning between extended-comitative (29) and (30), and coordinative (27) and (28), which is not subject to this condition:<sup>8</sup> the reciprocal interaction associated with basically non-symmetric verbs must be able to be conceptualised as a SINGLE event, which is the only reading with symmetric-interaction verbs in the model construction, owing to their inherent meaning. Two instances of one combatant injuring the other and vice versa will not, in the German worldview as reflected in the German verbal lexicon, make up a single event, even when simultaneous; two instances of one combatant striking the other and vice versa, or of one companion bidding the other farewell and vice versa, will (assuming a uniform German worldview in these matters at least; but see further Section 3.3). Even the nouns derived from these latter verbs, *Schlacht* ‘battle’ and *Abschied* ‘farewell’, encode the essential mutuality. This justifies using verbs like *schlagen* and *verabschieden*, which are basically transitive and non-symmetric and can take genuine reflexive pronouns as direct objects (although they will not specially encourage them, since they denote actions, beating and bidding farewell, which are typically outer-directed), as intransitive symmetric verbs, analogically accompanied with the reflexive look-alike, which as a mere look-alike does not need to be locally bound by the subject and does not enter into the compositional construal of a reciprocal situation. The contrast between a reflexive and a non-reflexive object, in principle

admitted by the basic asymmetric transitive verbs, is suspended through the single-event conceptualisation of the interaction and the concomitant formal marking of the verb.

The additional single-event condition is nothing special: as suggested earlier, it generally obtains for comitative constructions in contradistinction to coordination. As also mentioned earlier, comitative constructions are limited to predicates designating involvements that can be shared, which condition likewise carries over from regular to extended constructions.

When comitative reciprocal constructions with *sich schlagen mit* or *sich verabschieden von* etc. are analysed as analogically formed on the model of intransitive symmetric verbs such as *sich duellieren mit* or *sich lösen von*, the assumption still is that they are SYNTACTIC constructions, though with the reflexive word not interpreted as a genuine reflexive(-cum-reciprocal) pronoun that would need local binding. With the verbs used for illustration this would not seem the whole story, however, insofar as the extended comitative reciprocal construction, in addition to being subject to the single-event condition, also shows some semantic specialisation. As a transitive verb, *schlagen* literally means 'to beat, to strike', with the agent's hand(s) or a stick-like weapon as an extension of her/his arm making the forcible contact with the body of the patient; *sich schlagen*, on the other hand, essentially only means 'to fight', and although the fights thus described could be boxing or fencing matches, the precise nature of the instrument is considerably backgrounded (it might even be firearms). Similarly, while transitive *verabschieden* means 'to ceremonially send away, formally discharge from a duty', *sich verabschieden* largely drops the formal or ceremonious connotations and simply means 'to leave the company, say good-bye'. Owing to such semantic differences, one could consider the formation of symmetric intransitive predicates, overtly marked by a reflexive look-alike, a LEXICAL process.

But then, if these examples are representative, it is not really the symmetric intransitives that are semantically more specialised than the basic transitives: it is rather the other way round. What is more specific on the symmetric intransitive side is the single-event reading, but this is to be attributed to this construction, or ultimately its model, rather than to particular verbs instantiating it. There is, however, something particular to verbs as such, or rather the ways interactions are conceptualised through them, that could give the impression of a kind of semantic specialisation that ought to be accounted for lexically: transitive verbs will only allow the comitative reciprocal construction if the conceptualisation of the interaction concerned as symmetrical is CONVENTIONAL. Fighting with each other, with whatever weapons, and taking leave

of each other, in whatever circumstances, are culturally salient symmetric interactions; they are not conceptualised as such at the momentary whim of an individual speaker.

### 3.2 Transitive verbs potentially symmetric on their own

Though atypical, we have seen above (Section 2.3) that there are some transitive verbs which inherently designate symmetric interactions (such as *gleichen* and *heiraten*). Several further transitive verbs, though ostensibly inherently asymmetric like those used for illustration in the preceding section, may in fact shade into designating symmetric relations without extra formal marking, given the right circumstances. These circumstances have to do with the kinds of subjects and objects they occur with.

Two relevant examples are *widersprechen* ‘to deny, contradict’ (governing the dative; *ergänzen* ‘to complement’, governing the accusative, works analogously) and *schneiden* ‘to cut, intersect’ (governing the accusative, and also admitting an external possessor in the dative). They can be used with animate, or in fact human, subjects acting on inanimates – and there is no question of such interactions being symmetric:

- (33) a. *Der Angeklagte widersprach der Beschuldigung*  
 ‘The defendant denied the accusation’  
 b. *Der Friseur schnitt (dem Kunden) die Haare*  
 ‘The barber cut the (customer’s) hair’

When the objects of such verbs are also animate/human, the interactions designated remain asymmetric:

- (34) a. *Der Angeklagte widersprach dem Zeugen*  
 ‘The defendant contradicted the witness’  
 b. *Der Friseur schnitt den Kunden*  
 ‘The barber cut the customer’

Should the object participants reciprocate, in events separate from those initiated by the subject, an overt reflexive-cum-reciprocal pronoun or reciprocal *einander* are called for, bound by the coordinate subject:

- (35) a. *Der Angeklagte und der Zeuge widersprachen sich/einander*  
 ‘The defendant and the witness contradicted each other’  
 b. *Der Friseur und der Kunde schnitten sich/einander*  
 ‘The barber and the customer cut each other’

Comitative alternatives are ruled out again because the local binding of a genuine reciprocal anaphor by the subject alone would leave the co-participant, essential for a reciprocal situation, unaccounted for:<sup>9</sup>

- (36) a. *\*Der Angeklagte widersprach sich/einander mit dem Zeugen*  
 ‘The defendant contradicted REFL/RECIP with the witness’  
 b. *\*Der Friseur schnitt sich/einander mit dem Kunden*  
 ‘The barber cut REFL/RECIP with the customer’

Now, when the same transitive verbs are used with both subject and object inanimate, as in (37), the relationships designated are to all intents and purposes symmetric: subject and object can be reversed *salva veritate*, and the reversals represent the same instantiations of the relationships concerned (not two separate contradicting or cutting events as in (35)).

- (37) a. *Die Aussage des Zeugen widersprach der Behauptung des Angeklagten*  
 ‘The statement of the witness contradicted the claim of the defendant’  
 b. *Linie a schneidet Linie b in Punkt P*  
 ‘Line a crosses line b in point P’

As with the symmetric transitive verbs above (*gleichen, heiraten*), there is a coordinative reciprocal construction (38); but unlike with these, there is now also a comitative equivalent (39).

- (38) a. *Die Aussage des Zeugen und die Behauptung des Angeklagten widersprachen sich/einander*  
 ‘The statement of the witness and the claim of the defendant contradicted each other’  
 b. *Linie a und Linie b schneiden sich/einander in Punkt P*  
 ‘Line a and line b intersect in point P’  
 (39) a. *Die Aussage des Zeugen widersprach sich (\*einander) mit der Behauptung des Angeklagten*  
 ‘The statement of the witness contradicted REFL (\*RECIP) with the claim of the defendant’  
 b. *Linie a schneidet sich (\*einander) mit Linie b in Punkt P*  
 ‘Line a crosses REFL (\*RECIP) line b in point P’

The comitative construction excludes the dedicated reciprocal marker *einander*, which was interpreted above as one of the indicators that the word accompanying the verb is not the reflexive-cum-reciprocal pronoun, requiring to be bound by the subject, but the reflexive look-alike. Arguably, then, this is another subtype of the extended comitative reciprocal construction, modelled

on the regular comitative reciprocal construction with inherently symmetric intransitive verbs. Again, the situation denoted by these transitive verbs is conventionally conceptualised as a single event or state (one contradiction of statements, one intersection of lines), rather than as two analogous ones, only with the roles reversed. However, unlike with transitive verbs such as *schlagen* and *verabschieden*, this condition on analogical extensions is here already satisfied by the basic transitive construction as such, given that the co-participants are both inanimate (37). Thus, nothing is really added in expressive power when transitive *widersprechen*, *schneiden* et al. in the symmetric reading are used intransitively, accompanied by the reflexive look-alike. Unlike with animate subjects and objects, there is no question of independent volition in the case of inanimates, with the co-participant intentionally not doing/being what the participant does/is; thus, given suitable transitive verb meanings, inanimacy will be particularly favourable to letting interactions be conceptualised as symmetric. Further, inanimate subjects are liable to curtail the potential for contrast in object position. With animate subjects, the contrast between non-reflexive and genuinely reflexive objects is a vital one for verbs such as *widersprechen* and *schneiden*; with inanimate subjects it is certainly less salient, if present at all (e.g., can lines intersect themselves?). Inanimates being perforce 3rd person, reflexives – should any appear – will be limited to just one person too with such subjects: the relevant form in German is *sich*, not distinguishing number or gender.

These several factors are presumably conducive to extending a reflexive look-alike into a comitative construction with verbs which, per se, could take a genuine reflexive (-cum-reciprocal) pronoun to be bound by the subject. With this sort of reasoning the question remains why *gleichen*, *heiraten* and their kind do not also take regular comitative reciprocal constructions as their model (*\*sich gleichen mit* (16), *\*sich heiraten mit* (19) in Section 2.3). Arguably, although the inspiration for analogising is there in the form of the shared coordinative reciprocal construction, these verbs are too determinately symmetric to fit the bill for an extension of the comitative construction meant for verbs which are at heart asymmetric and only lend themselves to symmetric conceptualisations on certain conditions.

### 3.3 Where judgments differ

The analysis suggested here, distinguishing a regular comitative reciprocal construction from one analogically formed on its model and potentially lex-



icalised, is supported by a pattern of variation in acceptability judgments that would otherwise seem peculiar.

The appendix to this paper presents the results of a questionnaire study which was intended to determine whether German has or does not have what is in the literature sometimes referred to as “discontinuous” reciprocals.

As it turned out, there can be no doubt that German does have the REGULAR comitative reciprocal construction with inherently symmetric intransitive verbs. The results of these parts of the questionnaire are not reproduced in the appendix because they are too boring: speakers unanimously accept examples of the regular construction (such as (2), (6), (10b), (12b) above) as perfectly well-formed.

More interestingly, massive variation – across both speakers and verbs – was found for the EXTENDED comitative reciprocal construction, exemplified above by *sich schlagen mit* (29) and *sich verabschieden von* (30). (Unfortunately verbs like those discussed in Section 3.2, *sich widersprechen mit* or *sich schneiden mit*, open to symmetric readings even in their basic transitive use, were not tested, but informal enquiries suggest they are among the top candidates for widespread acceptance.) On the present evidence, it would be wrong to conclude that German has or does not have this construction: almost all speakers (at least those fifty consulted, plus myself) have it; but only a few have a lot of it, while most have more or less strong reservations.

With the exception of the bottom examples (*sich meiden mit*, *sich misstrauen mit*, *sich bewundern mit*), the average grades for the examples tested (righthand column of the table in the appendix) are not the result of speakers generally agreeing among each other in their evaluations. It is to some extent extremes that are being averaged out here. The average grades awarded by speakers (bottom line), ranging from 3.9 to 2.3, show at a glance or two the full gamut of interindividual variation. At the righthand side a small group emerges of productive extenders, who are happy with many verbs tested in the construction, with one in fifty (or two in fifty-one, with myself included) standing out as showing almost no restraint. Moving left, the reluctance is increasing with verb after verb, but only a very small minority (extreme left) reject the construction more or less wholesale.

There are no obvious reasons why speakers should differ so markedly in their like or dislike of the extended comitative reciprocal construction. It is not a matter of recognised dialects or dialect clusters differing on this particular point. Knowing the regional backgrounds of the participants in the questionnaire study, one could suspect some rough areal distribution, with easterners (both north and south) tending to be more prone than westerners to employ

reflexive look-alikes in all sorts of constructions including the one at issue; the explanation would be that this is one of the few respects where a Slavonic substratum continues to make itself felt. If there are other grammatical differences correlated with this one, they remain to be identified; probably there are none (other than perhaps a few random Slavicisms). Arguably, it is simply that the variation encountered within the speech community is of precisely the kind to be expected for analogical formations that need special conceptual licensing, as opposed to constructions formed by regular rules of grammar and interpreted compositionally: off and on, daring innovators will stretch today's rules, and thereby perhaps lay down tomorrow's.

Here are the verbs tested in the extended comitative reciprocal construction, in order of decreasing average acceptance (as also in the table in the appendix: in the questionnaire, these sentences were ordered randomly and were interspersed with examples of regular comitative reciprocal constructions):

- (40) *Effi duzte sich mit Roswitha*  
 'Effi thou-ed REFL with Roswitha'  
 (i.e., Effi and Roswitha addressed each other with the familiar pronoun *du*)
- (41) *Effi schrieb sich lange Briefe mit Mama*  
 'Effi wrote REFL long letters with mama'  
 (Effi and mama wrote long letters to each other)
- (42) *Effi sah sich jeden Nachmittag mit Crampas*  
 'Effi saw REFL every afternoon with Crampas'  
 (Effi and Crampas saw/met each other every afternoon)
- (43) *Effi gefiel sich mit Crampas immer mehr*  
 'Effi liked REFL with Crampas'  
 (Effi and Crampas liked each other more and more)
- (44) *Effi umarmte sich mit Crampas*  
 'Effi embraced REFL with Crampas'  
 (Effi and Crampas embraced each other)
- (45) *Crampas kannte sich mit Buddenbrook von früher*  
 'Crampas knew REFL with Buddenbrook before'  
 (Crampas and Buddenbrook knew each other before)
- (46) *Rummschüttel ging sich mit Wüllersdorf aus dem Weg*  
 'Rummschüttel went REFL out of the way with Wüllersdorf'  
 (Rummschüttel and Wüllersdorf went out of each other's way)

- (47) *Rummschüttel mied sich mit Wüllersdorf*  
 ‘Rummschüttel avoided REFL with Wüllersdorf’  
 (Rummschüttel and Wüllersdorf avoided each other)
- (48) *Innstetten misstraute sich mit Crampas*  
 ‘Innstetten mistrusted REFL with Crampas’  
 (Innstetten and Crampas mistrusted each other)
- (49) *Hitler bewunderte sich mit Stalin*  
 ‘Hitler admired REFL with Stalin’  
 (Hitler and Stalin admired each other)

All of the verbs tested are basically transitive (or ditransitive: *schreiben* ‘to write’), and none is inherently symmetric. All permit coordinative reciprocal constructions along the lines of the English versions in parentheses. Their different ratings in the comitative reciprocal construction reflect the different cultural entrenchments of the concepts associated with these verbs as symmetric single events or states.

*Sich duzen mit* (40) is top of the table; if tested, *sich schlagen mit* and *sich verabschieden von* would have done equally well. In principle thou-ing is not in fact symmetrical: one interlocutor may use the formal pronoun of address towards another, who in turn feels entitled to use the informal one (though such asymmetry is not now common practice). Moreover, when one person addresses another, this does not mean that (s)he is thereby being addressed as well: you may address someone who never speaks a word in reply, and still an addressing event has occurred. So, there is no question of addressing as such being a single event when two people, as is not uncommon, address each other. On the other hand, in addition to having the literal sense of addressing, mutual or otherwise, *sich duzen* also means ‘to be on familiar terms with each other’. With this conceptualisation of the interaction, it is harder to split up the relationship in two, where one participant could in principle not be involved or be involved otherwise. And being on familiar terms is such a salient conventional concept that just about everybody feels free to use this verb in the construction tailor-made for the purpose: the comitative reciprocal one.

For *Briefe schreiben* ‘to write letters’ (41), the corresponding symmetric-interaction concept is ‘to correspond’, and it is (still) sufficiently conventional and salient to license the comitative reciprocal construction for most.

Personally I would have thought that this is also true for ‘to meet’, corresponding to transitive ‘to see’ (42) (in the sense ‘to perceive visually’ probably nobody would accept the comitative reciprocal construction); for ‘to be attracted, be agreeable to each other’, corresponding to transitive ‘to please’

(43);<sup>10</sup> for ‘to be lovingly interlocked in an embrace’, corresponding to transitive ‘to take into one’s arms’ (44); and for ‘to be acquainted’, corresponding to transitive ‘to know’ (45). But on current evidence, many speakers seem to be drawing a line between being on familiar terms and corresponding on the one hand and this group of concepts on the other.

The contrast between *sich aus dem Weg gehen mit* (46) and *sich meiden* (47) is instructive: especially among those not strongly averse to extended comitative reciprocals, the former is consistently rated better, even though the meaning would seem to be essentially the same, ‘to avoid each other’. The first is conceived of as more active and positive, however: to go out of each other’s way one has to do something, specifically directing one’s movements so as to prevent crossing the paths of the other. Therefore, in a conceptualisation of this interaction as symmetric, in order to be successful this intentional avoidance behaviour has got to be engaged in jointly. *Meiden*, though also intentional, is only negative, ‘to avoid meeting’, without specifying anything that is done towards this end and the doing of which could be shared between the (non-) interactors.<sup>11</sup>

Although mistrust (48) and admiration (49) are often experienced as being mutual, there do not seem to be cultural conceptions of corresponding symmetric interactions among two equally sharing the involvement.

In between being on familiar terms and admiring there is a wide range of interactions where the members of a culture can (tacitly) differ in conceptualising them as symmetric single-event/state or symmetric multiple-event/state, and in particular in recognising these conceptualisations as conventional or as merely occasional, and where the members of the speech community can accordingly differ in expressing these conceptualisations through the comitative or, which is always an option, through the coordinative reciprocal construction. This is, perhaps, the source of most of the variation documented in the questionnaire study.

#### 4. Beyond German

The regular comitative reciprocal construction and its extension to non-symmetric transitives was illustrated from German, but obviously German is not the only language to have constructions of that kind. In conclusion I would therefore like to at least broach the question what it would need to be like German in having an extended in addition to a regular comitative reciprocal

construction. Having the regular construction would not seem very unusual: extending it is what makes German remarkable.

First of all, for an analogical formation you need a model – intransitive or intransitivised verbs with a reflexive look-alike, used in particular for symmetric interactions. Such verbal marking is not universal, but common. Among the languages that have it, some use it far less productively than others (English, for example, in comparison to German or Slavonic).

Other necessary conditions are (i) regular comitative constructions, typically limited to single-event, shared-involvement (or dynamic) interactions; (ii) regular coordinative constructions; (iii) comitative and coordinative constructions involved in the coding of reciprocal situations; (iv) reflexive pronouns (or other markers) also used for reciprocal situations. Comitative constructions, if not universal, are more widespread than coordinative ones, especially noun-phrase coordination, which is definitely not universal. Coding reciprocal situations through structural symmetry among co-participants should be very common, if it is not universal. Reflexives-cum-reciprocals, though common, are definitely not universal.

A factor that would seem conducive to having a comitative reciprocal construction alongside a coordinative one is some flexibility in the speech community's worldview as to event individuation and their conventionalisation.

It is a question for future typological research whether the variables among these conditions correlate with anything else, as *implicantia* or *implicata*, and if so, why.

### Acknowledgments

I am sure what is being said in this paper about symmetric predicates has, in one form(alism) or another, been said a hundred times before, which exempts me from adducing hundreds of references. And it's not for the first time either that comitatives have been linked with reciprocals. For what I got wrong I alone am to blame. My only, and perhaps ill-founded, aspiration to originality lies in distinguishing the extended from the regular comitative reciprocal construction and in interpreting the relation between them as in essence an analogical extension.

Long interested in reciprocals, my inspiration for taking a closer look at these constructions has been work by Alexis Dimitriadis, Tal Siloni, and Tanya Reinhart, as presented at the Utrecht Anaphora Typology workshop (1–2 November 2002, and partly become available since, see Siloni 2001, 2002;

Dimitriadis & Seidl 2003), causing some agitation among native speakers of languages supposedly “having” or “not having” comitative (or, as they call them, “discontinuous”) reciprocals. The Berlin workshop on Reciprocity and Reflexivity (1–2 October 2004), where a version of this paper was presented, provided an opportunity to continue the discontinuous reciprocals debate with the Utrecht group and others. Perhaps the approach I take is not as different from theirs as it may seem, although I think I have a more plausible explanation for the puzzlement of natives when asked whether they have or don’t have (extended) discontinuous reciprocals. Also, other than identifying some prerequisites specifically for (adventurously) extending discontinuous reciprocals beyond the regular cases, I am in no position to judge the merits of the construal of discontinuous reciprocals as one of the several correlates of “lexical” (as opposed to “syntactic”) reflexivisation, which Dimitriadis, Siloni, and Reinhart consider a major typological parameter.

I am grateful to numerous colleagues and students, mostly at Konstanz, for helping me with a questionnaire which turned out to elicit exuberant disagreement of grammaticality judgments of extended comitative reciprocal constructions, although just about everybody filling it in was under the assumption of being in basic agreement with everybody else. And thanks to the editors of this volume for a careful reading of the (almost) end product. Enjoy, Matt-san.

## Notes

1. The significance of this one-event condition will be highlighted later (Section 3).
2. The German verb used for illustration differs from its closest English equivalent insofar as it is dedicatedly intransitive: it lacks the non-symmetric transitive use of *to fight*, whose German equivalents are a prefixal combination of the same stem, *bekämpfen*, or the simplex intransitive verb with the specifically adversative preposition *gegen* ‘against’ rather than more versatile *mit* ‘with’ as a marker for the oblique.
3. There is no symmetry, for example, in *Henry VII and Henry VIII followed each other* – unless the notional predicate is taken to subsume lexical converses, *follow* and *precede*.
4. Not all intransitivised verbs receive such marking, however; and there are also reverse derivations of transitives, causative and other, from intransitives, often marked by prefixes or suffixes. For a verb such as *scheiden* ‘to part’, as in (3) and (4) above, it is hard to determine whether the intransitive or transitive use is more basic. The transitive use is essentially like that of *trennen* in (11) and (12), though there are added semantic complications.
5. In a slightly more complex variation on this theme, when *verabreden* is used transitively, the object can only be the joint action that is being agreed on:

*Gott und Satan verabredeten ein Treffen*

‘God and Satan agreed on (the time and place for) a meeting’

*Gott verabredete mit Satan ein Treffen*

‘God agreed with Satan on (the time and place for) a meeting’

Used intransitively, the verb is again accompanied by the reflexive:

*Gott und Satan verabredeten sich (zu einem Treffen)*

‘God and Satan made an appointment with each other (for a meeting)’

*Gott verabredete sich mit Satan (zu einem Treffen)*

‘God made an appointment with Satan (for a meeting)’

6. I do not pursue here the possibility of a more abstract analysis which has the dative as a comitative marker. The basic transitive construction itself (13) would then be the comitative counterpart to coordinative (14). In equative constructions of corresponding adjectival predicates we do find the familiar *mit* (as an alternative to equative *wie*) instead of the verbal dative:

*Ein Alligator ist gleich groß mit einem Krokodil (or ... wie ein Krokodil)*

‘An alligator is equally big with a crocodile’ (or: ‘... as a crocodile’)

Also, there are symmetric predicates, especially of an adjectival or participial kind, where dative is in essentially free variation with *mit*, e.g. *benachbart* or *vertraut sein* ‘to be next-door neighbour, familiar to/with’.

7. The corresponding nominalisation, with the object not case-governed, does permit a comitative construction:

*die Heirat der Prinzessin mit dem Grafen*

‘the marriage of the princess with the earl’

8. Differences ensuing from adding subject-oriented constituents (such as adverbs like *widerwillig* ‘reluctantly’) again do not pertain to conceptualisations of the interactions as such: fighting or leave-taking can well be reciprocal with one participant eager and the other reluctant to act.

9. Informal enquiries suggest that there are speakers who accept examples like (36a), though not (36b). Although such examples were not included in the questionnaire study reported in Section 3.3, the motives for liberality here are the same as those to be explained presently.

10. Some informants interpreted sentence (43) differently, namely as containing a genuine reflexive (‘Effi was pleased with herself in the company of Crampas’), hence the relatively good grades from some not really going in for extended comitative reciprocals. This interpretation was also offered by some who had mixed feelings about (49), with ‘Hitler admired himself in the company of Stalin’ as a possible reading, but with ‘Hitler and Stalin admired each other’ as categorically out.

11. Dynamic vs. static, the aspectual distinction sometimes invoked to constrain comitatives in general, is not exactly what makes the difference here. An analogous difference would be obtained, I believe, between *sich treffen mit* and <sup>??</sup>*sich begegnen mit* ‘to meet REFL with’, *treffen* being the potentially more active verb of meeting.

## References

- Dimitriadis, Alexis & Amanda Seidl (2003). "Statives and reciprocal morphology in Swahili". In Patrick Sauzet & Anne Zribi-Hertz (Eds.), *Typologie des langues d'Afrique et universaux de la grammaire*, Vol. 1. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Siloni, Tal (2001). "Reciprocal verbs". Paper from the *Proceedings of the Israel Association of Theoretical Linguistics*, available online at <http://www.tau.ac.il/~siloni/>
- Siloni, Tal (2002). "Active lexicon". *Theoretical Linguistics*, 28, 383–400.

## Appendix: Questionnaire study on the acceptability of extended comitative reciprocal constructions

Number of respondents: 50 (numbered in italics, top of each column, arranged in order of decreasing rigidity of judgment), all native speakers of German, with a wide range of regional backgrounds, and all linguists or students of linguistics, though with one exception (No. 47, Ekkehard K.) professionally unconcerned with reciprocals.

My own (Bavarian-tinged) judgments, not included here, are avant-garde *extrême-droite* like those of No. 50 (Carsten E., a native Berliner).

The sentences graded are given in full in Section 3.3, (40)–(49).

- Grades:
- 1 grammatical
  - 2 in between, but closer to 1
  - 3 in between, but closer to 4
  - 4 ungrammatical



## The regular and the extended comitative reciprocal construction 295

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	
informants	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	
examples graded																													
<i>sich duzen</i>	4	4	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
<i>mit</i>																													
<i>sich Briefe</i>	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	4	3	2	3	2	
<i>schreiben mit</i>																													
<i>sich sehen</i>	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	1	2	3	4	4	
<i>mit</i>																													
<i>sich gefallen</i>	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	
<i>mit</i>																													
<i>sich umarmen</i>	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4
<i>mit</i>																													
<i>sich kennen</i>	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
<i>mit</i>																													
<i>sich aus dem</i>	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
<i>Weg gehen mit</i>																													
<i>sich meiden</i>	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
<i>mit</i>																													
<i>sich misstrauen</i>	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
<i>mit</i>																													
<i>sich bewundern</i>	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
<i>mit</i>																													
average grade for informant	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4

informants	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	average grade for example
examples graded																							
<i>sich duzen</i>	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.28
<i>mit</i>																							
<i>sich Briefe</i>																							
<i>schreiben mit</i>	2	3	1	1	3	2	2	4	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	2.62
<i>sich sehen</i>	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	1	3	2	4	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	3.22
<i>mit</i>																							
<i>sich gefallen</i>	3	4	4	4	1	1	1	2	3	4	4	2	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	3.46
<i>mit</i>																							
<i>sich umarmen</i>	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	2	4	3	3	3	2	2	4	1	1	3.56
<i>mit</i>																							
<i>sich kennen</i>	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	1	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	4	2	3	2	3.68
<i>mit</i>																							
<i>sich aus dem</i>	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	2	3	4	4	3	3	1	3.68
<i>Weg gehen mit</i>																							
<i>sich meiden</i>	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3.92
<i>mit</i>																							
<i>sich misstrauen</i>	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.96
<i>mit</i>																							
<i>sich bewundern</i>	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.00
<i>mit</i>																							
average grade for informant	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.5	2.3	