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The progress achieved in the comparative and historical Indo-European syntax opens new perspectives in the reconstruction of the syntactic features of Proto-Indo-European and in the study of the main grammaticalization paths attested in the daughter languages. A case in point is the reconstruction of the Proto-Indo-European reciprocal construction and possible scenarios of the grammaticalization of the reciprocal pronoun.

Particularly rich evidence is furnished by Vedic Sanskrit. The Vedic reciprocal pronoun \( \text{RP} \) anyó ... anyá- (anyonya-) represents the iteration of the pronominal adjective anyá- ‘(an)other’. Vedic texts attest the gradual grammaticalization of anyó ... anyá- from a sequence of two independent words to a single lexical unit. From the end of the early Vedic period onwards this construction becomes more productive than morphological reciprocals with the preverb \( \text{Yt} \) and middle inflexion and reciprocal constructions with the adverb \( \text{mithás} \) (mithó-) ‘mutually’ (see Kulikov, 2002). This historical process divides into a number of stages which I will briefly discuss in sections 1-4.

1. Early Vedic (the early Ṛgveda).

In the earliest documented period, that is, in the most ancient Vedic text, Ṛgveda (RV), anyá- ... anyá- is not yet grammaticalized as a single reciprocal marker. Its constituent parts are essentially autonomous lexical units, which could be separated by other word(s). Both parts of the ‘quasi-pronoun’ agree in number and gender with the antecedent noun. The verbal form agrees with the first part of the RP, and thus appears in the singular, cf.:

\[ \text{anyónyá- results from the sandhi } -\text{as} + \text{-a} \rightarrow \text{-o- (-o').} \]
L. KULIKOV

(1) (RV 10.97.14)
\textbf{anyá} vo \textbf{anyám} avatu$^3$
\textbf{anyá}~
other:Nom.Sg.F anyásyā upāvata
other:Dat.Sg.F stand.by:Pres:2PL.Impv.Act
‘Let one of you (medical plants) help another; stand one by another.’

The syntactic pattern attested with \textbf{anyá- ... anyá-} in early Vedic is schematically represented in (2):

(2) RM1:Nom S:Gen.non-Sg RM2:Acc V:SG$^4$

2. Late early Vedic (late books of the \Rgveda, Atharvaveda).

At the end of the early Vedic period, that is, in the late \Rgveda and Atharvaveda (AV), pattern (2) yields to the structure in (3), with the verb in the non-singular (plural or dual) form, as illustrated in (4):

(3) S:Nom.non-Sg RM1:Nom (…) RM2:Acc V:non-Sg
(4) (AV 3.30.1)
\textbf{anyó} \textbf{anyám} abhi haryata
vatsām jātām iva~ agnyā
calf:Acc.Sg-born:Acc.Sg.M like cow:Nom.Sg
‘Love each other, like a cow its new-born calf.’

The constituent parts of the RP normally occur adjacent to each other, as in (4), but they can still be separated by other word(s), as in (5). The singular form of RM1 and RM2 is not yet completely generalized; in the Paippalāda recension of the Atharvaveda we find a rare example (5), where both parts of the RP \textbf{anyó} ... \textbf{anyá-} appear in the plural:

(5) (AV-Paippalāda 5.10.7)
\textbf{hatōso} \textbf{anye} yodhayanty
\textbf{anyān}
other:Acc.Pl.M
‘Those which are hit incite one another to fighting.’ (lit. ‘make one another fight’; said of alcohol-drinkers)

---

$^3$ The symbol ~ shows that the sandhi has been undone.

$^4$ RM1 and RM2 stand for the first and second part of the reciprocal pronoun, S stands for the noun denoting the group of participants in the reciprocal situation, i.e. the antecedent of the reciprocal pronoun.
3. Middle and late Vedic.

The language of the Vedic prose displays a number of features that testify to a further grammaticalization of *anyōʾ nyā-*. (see Wackernagel, 1905: 322f.):

1) **Inseparability**

The parts of the reciprocal pronoun *anyōʾ nyā-* cannot be separated by other words, as in (7-9).

2) **Accentuation**

In most accentuated texts (Taittirīya-Saṁhitā, Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā, and Saṭapatha-Brāhmaṇa, for example), both parts of the RP bear accents (*anyōʾ nyā-]]; see Wackernagel, 1905: 322f.), as, for instance, in (9). However, we also find an example of a single accent (on the first component of the pronoun), attested in the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa (see Debrunner, 1957: 89):

(6) (Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa 1.3.2.1)

\[
\text{tē anyō-nyasmāi nā- atiśthanta}
\]

\[
\text{that: NOM.PL.M other: NOM.PL.M-not stand: IMPF: 3PL.MED}
\]

‘They (the gods) did not adhere to each other.’

Unfortunately, this is the only example of *anyōʾ nyā-* found in the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa, so that we cannot be sure whether this was a feature of the dialect attested in this text, or just a minor lapsus of the scribe.

3) **Number and gender agreement**

The RM generalizes the singular form for both of its parts, so that examples such as (5) become impossible. The gender agreement of the constituent parts of the RP follows one of the following two patterns: (i) *anyā-[M/N/F]-* *anyā-[M/N/F]*, or (ii) *anyō-[M]-* *anyā-[M/N/F]*. In constructions of the type (i), both parts of the RP agree in gender with the nominal antecedent. This pattern is attested only in very few texts, in particular, in the relatively late Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa (JB). Cf. (7), where the feminine substantive *praṇāḥ* ‘creatures’ triggers the feminine gender on both RM1 (*anyā*) and RM2 (*anyām*):

(7) (JB 1.117:1-2)

\[
\text{praṇāpātiḥ praṇā asṛjata. [...] īā}
\]

\[
\text{Prajāpati: NOM.SG creature: ACC.PL create: IMPF: 3SG.MED that: NOM.PL.F}
\]

\[
aṃśāṇāyaṃ ādyānyāṃ ādān
\]

\[
\text{being-hungry: NOM.PL.F other: NOM.PL.F other: ACC.PL.F eat: IMPF: 3PL.ACT}
\]

‘Prajāpati created the creatures. [...] Being hungry, they ate each other.’

Most texts have generalized the masculine form of the first part of the RP (*anyō-*) and thus follow the agreement pattern in (ii). Consequently, we observe in (8) (a passage from the Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, parallel to (7)) that the feminine gender is only marked on the second element of the reciprocal pronoun, whereas the first component is in the masculine form (*anyō-*, not **anyā-**). In (9) the masculine (*anyō-*) is used instead of the neuter form **anyād-** (which might be triggered by the neuter substantive *chāndas-* ‘(poetic) metre’) according to the same pattern:

In late Vedic and post-Vedic Sanskrit we observe further grammaticalization of anyo’nya-. The following phenomena clearly show that its constituent parts, RM1 and RM2, lose the last features of independent forms, and the reciprocal pronoun becomes completely fossilized as a single lexical unit (see Wackernagel, 1905 : 323):

1) Agreement

Neither part of the RP agrees in gender or number with the antecedent. The masculine singular form (nominative anyo-, accusative anyam, etc.) is generalised, cf. (10):

(10) (Rāmāyaṇa 2.53.10)

anyo-nyaṃ (*anyānyām = anyā-anyaṃ)
other: NOM.SG.M-other: ACC.SG.M other: NOM.SG.F-other: ACC.SG.F

abhivikṣante ... ārtatarāḥ striyāḥ
look.at: PRES:3PL.MED confused: NOM.PL.F woman: NOM.PL

‘The confused women look at each other.’

2) anyo’nya- with non-subject antecedents

anyo’nya- can be used with non-subject antecedents, in particular, in object-oriented reciprocal constructions. Thus, in (11), RM2 receives the locative case as the oblique argument of the verb juhomi ‘(I) pour into’, but RM1 does not agree in case with its accusative antecedent gharmāṇa ‘gharma-oblations’.

(11) (Śatapatha-Bṛhāmaṇa 11.6.2.2)

gharmāṇa ... anyo’-nyāsmin
gharma: ACC.DU other: NOM.SG.M-other: LOC.SG.M
Grammaticalization of a reciprocal pronoun in Vedic

(*anyām-anyāsmin) juhomi
other:ACC.SG.M-other:LOC.SG.M pour:PRES:1SG.ACT
‘I pour both gharma-oblations, one into another.’

3) **Adverbial usages**

In post-Vedic texts (in Epic Sanskrit in particular), we also find the fossilized (adverbial) form *anyonyam* employed in constructions where the grammatical case of the second constituent of the reciprocal pronoun (i.e. accusative) does not correspond to the case pattern of the verb. Cf. (12), where we might expect RM2 to appear in the instrumental case, in accordance with the case frame of the verb *sam-bhās* ‘converse (with smb.)’:

(12) (Rāmāyaṇa 6.11.8)

*teṣāṃ sambhāsā-māṇāṃ*

that:GEN.PL.M converse:PRES-PART.MED:GEN.PL

*anyo-nyam ... (*anyasyānyena = anyasya-anyena)*
other:NOM.SG.M-other:ACC.SG.M other:GEN.SG.M-other:INS.SG.M
‘... of them, conversing with each other ...’

4) **Nominal composition**

In late Vedic and post-Vedic Sanskrit, where the nominal composition becomes very productive, the stem *anyonya-* can also appear as the first member of a compound (meaning ‘mutual, reciprocal’), as in *anyonya-sreṣṭhyāya* (Kapiṣṭhalā-Katha-Saṁhitā 38.2:206.1)5 ‘to one another’s superiority’; *anyonya-yoga* (Manu-Smṛti 3.32) ‘mutual union (of a girl and her lover)’; *anyonya-sakta-* (Praśna-Upaniṣad 5.6) ‘connected with each other’; *anyonya-tyāgin-* (Yājñavalkya-Smṛti 2.237) ‘abandoning each other’, etc.

5. **Concluding remarks: evidence from other Indo-European languages**

Polyptotic reciprocal pronouns of the same type as Vedic *anyonyā-* (i.e. representing the iteration of the indefinite pronoun meaning ‘(an)other’) are also attested in several other Indo-European languages, cf. Avestan *aiyāi aityān*, Greek ἀλλὲς ἄλλῳ, Latin alius aliūm (see Krisch, 1999), Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian *drugъ, drugъ*. We can observe similar (albeit not identical) developments in languages with a well-documented history, cf. the grammaticalization of English *each other* and *one another* (which could still be discontinuous in Middle English, cf. *ech help other, oon oof another’s clothes*; see Sheen, 1988; Raumolin-Brunberg, 1997) or Slavic *drugъ, drugъ* ‘other (nom.) other (acc.)’6 (which could still agree in gender with the antecedent in the early period). On the basis of the above analysis of Vedic data, compared to evidence from other Indo-European languages, we are able to reconstruct some features of the Proto-Indo-European reciprocal constructions. In particular, there are

---

5 This is the only Vedic example of a compound built with *anyonya-* (see Debrunner, 1957: 89). The parallel passages of the other Saṁhitās of the Yajurveda have reciprocal constructions with the reciprocal pronoun used as a free form in the genitive (*anyonyāsya* in Kāthaka 24.9:100.3 and Maitrīya Saṁhitā 3.7.10:90.1), or dative (*anyonyāsmai* in Taittiriya-Saṁhitā 6.2.2.1).

6 Erroneously explained by Heine and Kuteva (2002: 92) as the iteration of the word for ‘comrade, friend’.
good reasons to restore for the proto-language the construction with the polyptotic reciprocal pronoun *alios ... aliom (masculine) / *aliā ... aliām (feminine). This collocation was not yet grammaticalized as one single lexical unit in the proto-language: both of its parts agree with the antecedent and could be separated by other word(s). However, evidence available from various Indo-European languages reveals the general tendency to grammaticalize this quasi-pronoun as early as in Proto-Indo-European.
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