

## Number-Bound Nonreciprocity in Dative and Middle Constructions

Patrick Brandt, University of Cologne    pbrandt@uni-koeln.de

Construed with a [plural] grammatical subject (as in *Otto und Anna küssten sich* ‘Otto and Anna kissed’) or a [PLURAL] logical SUBJECT (as in one construal of *Sich zu hassen ist schrecklich* ‘hating each other is terrible’), German *sich* and Romance *se* regularly give rise to a reciprocal interpretation at the individual level.

No reciprocal interpretation is available when *sich/se* are construed with dative or middle subject antecedents, however, and a reflexive interpretation is hard in the dative case and impossible in the middle case:

- (1) #Der Ede zeigte der Anna und dem Otto sich.  
the Ede showed [the Anna and the Otto]<sub>DAT</sub> SE  
**not:** Ede showed Anna to Otto and Otto to Anna  
**hard:** Ede showed Anna and Otto to themselves (separately or as a group)
- (2) a. Die Pferde reiten sich gut.  
the horses ride SE well  
b. Los crios se educan facilmente.  
the kids SE educate easily  
**neither:** members of the.horses/the.kids ride/educate each other  
**nor:** (members of) the.horses/the.kids ride/educate themselves

I argue that the absence of reciprocal (reflexive) readings of *sich/se* in these constructions can be explained as follows:

While the dative argument qualifies as a logical SUBJECT antecedent, it gives rise to a [SINGULAR] (=individual) representation in the semantics (since it denotes in the locative domain). For reciprocity, a [PLURAL] (= set) representation of the antecedent is required, however. A [SINGULAR] antecedent may bind reflexively, but use of an unambiguously [SINGULAR] anaphor (*sich selbst*) is preferred for this construal.

In middle constructions, binding is not by the grammatical subject (the logical OBJECT), but by the logical SUBJECT. The logical SUBJECT in middle constructions is the [SINGULAR] kind that is exemplified well or badly by the referents of the grammatical subject expression. A reciprocal interpretation is therefore excluded. I propose that the absence of a reflexive interpretation in middles follows from the nonidentity in type of the positions in the binding relation: For a reflexive interpretation, strict identity of antecedent and dependent is required; in middles, however, the antecedent (logical SUBJECT) corresponds to a kind, while the dependent (logical OBJECT) position is restricted to (sets of) atoms.