



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Reciprocal constructions in Vedic

Kulikov, L.I.; Nedjalkov, V.P.; Geniushiene, E.Sh.; Guentchéva,

Citation

Kulikov, L. I. (2007). Reciprocal constructions in Vedic. *Reciprocal Constructions*, 709-738. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/15671>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/15671>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Reciprocal constructions in Vedic

Leonid Kulikov

Leiden University

1. Introduction
 - 1.1 Vedic Sanskrit: Corpus of texts and chronological periods
 - 1.2 Overview
2. Grammatical notes
 - 2.1 The morphological structure of the verbal form
 - 2.2 Preverbs
 - 2.3 The grammatical categories of the verb
 - 2.4 Valence-changing derivations
 - 2.4.1 The middle and its functions
 - 2.4.2 Causative oppositions
 - 2.4.3 Passive
 - 2.5 Syntactic notes
3. Morphological (synthetic) reciprocals
 - 3.1 The reciprocal meaning is expressed by the middle inflexion only
 - 3.1.1 Middle reciprocals opposed to active non-reciprocals
 - 3.1.2 Middle reciprocals without active counterparts: *Reciproca media tantum* and symmetric predicates
 - 3.2 *ví*-reciprocals: The reciprocal meaning is expressed by the preverb *ví* and middle inflexion
 - 3.2.1 General remarks
 - 3.2.2 The main syntactic types of *ví*-reciprocals
 - 3.2.2.1 “Canonical” (intransitive) reciprocals
 - 3.2.2.2 “Indirect” (transitive) reciprocals
 - 3.2.3 *ví*-reciprocals combined with other valence-changing categories
 - 3.2.3.1 Causatives derived from reciprocals
 - 3.2.3.2 Passives derived from reciprocals
 - 3.2.3.2.1 Passives derived from “indirect” reciprocals
 - 3.2.3.2.2 Passive derived from a “canonical” reciprocal
 - 3.2.4 The polysemy and etymology of *ví*
 - 3.3 Spatial reciprocals with the preverbs *ví* and *sám* and sociatives with *sám*
4. Constructions with reciprocal pronouns and adverbs
 - 4.1 Reciprocals with the adverb *mithás*
 - 4.2 Reciprocal constructions with the pronoun *anyó (a)nyá-*
 - 4.2.1 The main syntactic types of reciprocal constructions with *anyó (a)nyá-*
 - 4.2.2 The historical development of reciprocal constructions with *anyó (a)nyá-*

- 4.2.2.1 Early Vedic (the early Ṛgveda)
- 4.2.2.2 Late early Vedic (late books of the Rgveda, Atharvaveda)
- 4.2.2.3 Middle and late Vedic
- 4.2.2.4 Further grammaticalization of *anyo'nya-* in late Vedic and post-Vedic Sanskrit
- 4.3 Other polyptotic reciprocal pronouns
 - 4.3.1 The reciprocal pronoun *itaretara-*
 - 4.3.2 The reciprocal pronoun *paras-para-*
- 5. Nominal derivatives and compounds with the reciprocal meaning
- Acknowledgments
- Sources
- References

1. Introduction

1.1 Vedic Sanskrit: Corpus of texts and chronological periods

Vedic Sanskrit (dating from the 2nd millennium BC onwards) is the earliest attested language of the Indo-Aryan group of the Indo-European language family and one of the most ancient attested Indo-European languages. Chronologically, Vedic can be divided into two main periods: early Vedic (also called ‘mantra language’, i.e. the language of the hymns addressed to the Vedic gods, mantras and magic spells), and middle / late Vedic (also called ‘the language of the Vedic prose’). The oldest layer of Vedic is attested in the language of the Ṛgveda (RV), which can approximately be dated to the second half of the second millennium BC. Within the RV, we can distinguish between the early RV (‘family books’, or maṇḍalas, which include books II–VII) and the late RV (encompassing, above all, maṇḍalas I and X, as well as a part of book VIII, Vāḷakhilya). The language of the second most ancient text, the Atharvaveda (AV), resembles in many respects – and is essentially synchronic with – the language of the late RV. Early Vedic is followed by middle and late Vedic (= the language attested in the Brāhmaṇas, Āraṇyakas, the oldest Upaniṣads and Sūtras). The post-Vedic period includes the younger Upaniṣads and Sūtras, as well as Epic and Classical Sanskrit.

The absolute chronology of these periods poses serious problems (see e.g. Witzel 1995: 97f.), thus only very rough approximation can be given for various periods: the early Vedic period cannot be dated earlier than to 1500 BC (and hardly begins much later than 1200 BC); the middle Vedic period probably starts after 800 BC; and the post-Vedic period must have started somewhere in the second half of the first millennium BC, hardly much earlier than 300 BC.

The most important evidence for Indo-European comparative studies and for typological observations is furnished by early Vedic. Already by the middle Vedic period, Sanskrit was no longer a spoken language, co-existing as a sacral language alongside the Middle Indo-Aryan vernaculars. The prose texts, however, may also retain a number of archaic forms and constructions unattested in earlier texts. Of still lesser linguistic rele-

vance, in general, are Epic and Classical Sanskrit, which, however, may attest a number of interesting diachronic developments.

The term ‘Sanskrit’ is sometimes used to refer to both forms of the language, i.e. Vedic Sanskrit proper and post-Vedic (Epic, Classical) Sanskrit.

1.2 Overview

As in many other ancient Indo-European languages, the reciprocal meaning is either expressed periphrastically (by means of constructions with *anyó (a)nyám* ‘each other’ and, in post-Vedic Sanskrit, with some other reciprocal pronouns, as well as with the adverb *mithás* ‘mutually’), or morphologically, by means of (1) the middle type of inflexion (middle diathesis; see below), a morpheme which expresses a number of other intransitive derivations, such as reflexive and passive; and (2) two preverbs/prefixes (see Section 2.3) which participate in the expression of the reciprocal and sociative meanings, *ví-* (with the sandhi variant *vy-*) ‘asunder’ and *sám-* (*/sám-*) ‘together’ (free or bound in early Vedic; mostly bound prefixes from middle Vedic onwards). Cf. *dviṣ* ‘hate’ – *ví-dviṣ-ate* ‘they hate each other’; *vac* ‘speak’ – *ví ... avoca-nta* ‘they argued with each other’; the preverb *sám-* is a productive morpheme deriving spatial reciprocals, cf. *i* ‘go’ – *sám-ayanta* (RV 6.21.1) ‘they come together’, *gam* ‘go’ – *sám-gam* ‘meet together, unite’.

There are also a number of symmetric predicates (mostly *media tantum*), where the reciprocal meaning is built into the verbal semantics, such as *sṛṣṭh* ‘compete’.

2. Grammatical notes¹

2.1 The morphological structure of the verbal form

The verbal form can have the following maximal morphemic structure: (preverb(s) / prefix(es)) .../-(augment *a-*)-(reduplication syllable)-root-(derivational stem suffix)-(thematic vowel *a*²)-(mood)-inflexion. Below, a few examples are given:

- (1) *vi-jí-gī-ṣā-mahai* (cf. (8))

PREV-RED-OVERCOME-DES-1 PL.SUBJ.MED

(preverb + reduplication syllable + root + thematic suffix of desiderative + ending of the 1st person plural middle subjunctive form = 1st person plural middle subjunctive form of the desiderative of the verb *ji* ‘overcome’)

‘we desire to overcome one another, we will try to overcome one another.’

1. The best surveys of the Vedic and/or Sanskrit grammar are: Whitney (1889); Macdonell (1910) and (1916) (a shorter and very convenient version of the former); and Elizarenkova (1982) (for Vedic); Renou (1930/1960) (for post-Vedic / Classical Sanskrit). The reader is also recommended to consult the short but well-organized sketch presented in Zaliznjak (1976).

2. In the case of thematic and thematicized suffixes such as *-ya-*, *-sa-*, *-nva-*, etc., the thematic vowel (*a*) is traditionally regarded as a part of the suffix; the suffixes “properly speaking” are *-y-*, *-s-*, *-nv-*.

(2) *vy-a-di-dviṣ-a-h* (cf. (24))

PREV-AUG-RED/CAUS-hate-THEM.VOWEL-2SG.AOR.ACT

(preverb + augment + reduplication syllable + root + thematic vowel + secondary

(= aorist/imperfect) ending of the 2nd person singular active form = 2nd person singular active form of the reduplicated (causative) aorist of the verb *dviṣ* 'hate')

'you have made [them] hate each other.'

There is a rich system of both vocalic and consonant alternations (ablaut, palatalization, etc.), as well as morphophonemic changes at morphemic and word boundaries (sandhi), which often make these boundaries opaque. In the text examples below the symbol \cup indicates that a sandhi has been undone.

2.2 Preverbs

The class of semi-autonomous morphemes, traditionally called preverbs, includes *ádhi* 'above, over, on', *ánu* 'along, after', *abhí* 'to(wards), over, against', *á* 'to(wards), at', *úpa* 'to, near', *pári* '(a)round, about', *ví* 'apart, asunder', *sám* 'together' and others. The majority of them can also be used as adpositions (prepositions or postpositions). Exceptions include, in particular, *úd* 'up', *ní* 'down', *párā* 'away' and *ví* 'apart, asunder'. In early Vedic, preverbs commonly behave as free morphemes; in middle and late Vedic the autonomy of preverbs constantly decreases and tmesis (i.e., the separation of preverbs from verbal forms) becomes rare.

2.3 The grammatical categories of the verb

The Vedic verbal paradigm includes three main classes of forms, called present, aorist and perfect systems (forms of the future system are rare in early Vedic). Within each of these sub-sets, forms are built on the same stem, i.e., on present, aorist and perfect stems respectively. There are several sets of personal endings: 'primary' (used foremost in the present tense), 'secondary' (endings used in the imperfect, aorist and some non-indicative moods), perfect, imperative, and subjunctive. Each tense system includes a number of finite forms and a pair of participles, active and middle.

The inventory of the grammatical categories of the verb includes person (1st, 2nd and 3rd) and number (singular, dual and plural); diathesis, or voice³ (active and middle); tense (present, imperfect, perfect, aorist, future, periphrastic future); and mood (indicative, imperative, injunctive, subjunctive, optative, conditional). The non-finite forms include two

3. These are traditional terms used in Sanskrit and Indo-European linguistics, referring to two types of inflexion (e.g., in the present: 2sg. *-sí*, 3sg. *-tí* in the active ~ 2sg. *-se*, 3sg. *-te* in the middle; in the perfect: 3sg. *-a*, 3du. *-átur*, 3pl. *-úr* in the active ~ 3sg. *-é*, 3du. *-átur*, 3pl. *-úr* in the middle; etc.). Both have certain shortcomings: the former is not to be confused with the 'diathesis' in the sense of the Leningrad Typological Group (referring to the type of syntactic construction, or valency pattern); the latter may also refer to the opposition between the passive and non-passive (transitive) construction.

participles (active and middle) for each tense, converbs (traditionally called ‘absolutives’ or ‘gerunds’), infinitives, gerundives, and some others categories.

2.4 Valence-changing derivations

2.4.1 *The middle and its functions*

The range of the functions rendered by the middle type of inflexion (= middle diathesis) is typical of the ancient Indo-European linguistic type as attested in “Classic” languages (Ancient Greek, Latin). Here belong the self-beneficent meaning with no valence change (‘to do sth for oneself’, as in the handbook example *yájati* ‘sacrifices’ ~ *yájate* ‘sacrifices for oneself’), as well as a number of intransitivizing derivations, such as passive, reflexive, and anticausative (decausative). The choice of the function(s) idiosyncratically depends on the base verb. However, already in the language of the earliest text, the RV, we observe the loss of several grammatical functions of the ancient Indo-European middle, and the intransitivizing functions are largely taken over by special productive markers, such as the passive suffix *-yá-* and the reflexive pronouns *tanú-* and *ātmán-* (for details, see Kulikov 2006, 2007).

2.4.2 *Causative oppositions*

The most regular and productive causative marker in the present system is the suffix *-(p)áya-*, cf. *vṛdh* ‘grow, increase’ – *vardháyati* ‘makes grow, increases’, *cit* ‘appear, perceive’ – *cetáyati* ‘shows (= makes appear), makes perceive’ (~ *citáyati* ‘appears’). In addition to *-(p)áya-*causatives, in early Vedic we find a few other (non-productive) formal types of present causative oppositions. In particular, the causative member is commonly expressed by a present with the nasal suffix *-nó-/ -nu-* (present V), *-nā-/ -nī-* (present IX) or nasal infix *-ná-/ -n-* (present VII), often opposed to an intransitive (anticausative) present with the suffix *-ya-* (present IV) or a root present with a thematic vowel (present I). Causative oppositions of other types are less common.⁴ The intransitive (anticausative) member of the opposition is typically inflected in the middle, whilst the transitive-causative is inflected in the active; cf.: *kṣi* ‘perish, destroy’: *kṣíyate* (present IV) ‘perishes’ ~ *kṣināti* (present IX) ‘destroys’; *jan* ‘be born, arise’: *jáyate* (present IV) ‘is born’ ~ *jānati* (present I), *janáyati* ‘begets’; *pū* ‘purify’: *pávate* (present I) ‘becomes clean, purifies oneself’ ~ *punāti* (present IX) ‘purifies’. With some presents, the causative opposition is only marked by the diathesis (middle/active), as in *námate* ‘bends’ (intr.) ~ *nāmati* ‘bends’ (tr.); *svádate* ‘is sweet’ ~ *svádati* ‘makes sweet’. In the aorist system, the causative meaning is typically expressed by the reduplicated aorist, cf. *vṛdh* ‘grow, increase’ – *ávīvṛdhat* ‘made grow’. There are also labile forms that can be used both transitively and intransitively, cf. 3sg.pf.med. *vāvṛdhé*, 3sg.pf.act. *vavárdha* ‘he has grown (intr.)’ ~ 3sg.pf.act. *vavárdha* ‘has increased (tr.)’ (see Kulikov 2003).

4. See e.g. Joachim (1978:21ff.).

2.4.3 *Passive*

There are several verbal formations in Vedic which can be employed in passive constructions. Non-finite passives include passive perfect participles with the suffix *-tá-/-ná-* and gerundives, or future passive participles, with the suffixes *-ya-*, *-tavyà-* and *-anīya-*. Finite passive formations include the following (for details, see Kulikov 2006):

(1) presents with the suffix *-yá-* (derived from the root by means of the suffix *-y(á)-*, which can only take middle endings; e.g. *han* ‘to kill’: 1sg. *han-yé*, 2sg. *han-yá-se*, 3sg. *han-yá-te*, etc.);

(2) medio-passive *i*-aorists (with a defective paradigm: only 3sg. in *-i*, 3pl. in *-ran/-ram* and participle; e.g. *yuj* ‘yoke, join’: 3sg. *áyoji*, 3pl. *áyujran*, part. *yujāná-*);

(3) middle perfect/statives (which supply passive perfects for some verbal roots; also with a defective paradigm: 3sg. in *-e*, 3pl. in *-re* and participle; e.g. *hi* ‘impel’: 3sg. *hinvé* ‘(it) is impelled’, 3pl. *hinviré* ‘(they) are impelled’; part. *hinvāná-*);

(4) some (isolated) middle forms.

2.5 Syntactic notes

As most other ancient Indo-European languages, Vedic is a nominative-accusative language. Normally, the subject surfaces in the nominative, the direct object in the accusative, and the second object in the accusative or dative. The instrumental case has its usual functions (comitative, instrument, passive agent). The word order is mostly free, but the neutral word order (which is prevalent, especially in prose texts) is SOV.

3. Morphological (synthetic) reciprocals

3.1 The reciprocal meaning is expressed by the middle inflexion only

3.1.1 *Middle reciprocals opposed to active non-reciprocals*

In early Vedic (particularly, in the RV), the middle inflexion (middle diathesis) still plays a rather important role as a marker of some intransitivizing derivations, thus inheriting the functions of the (Proto-)Indo-European middle. We find several verbs whose middle forms are employed in the reciprocal usage. However, there are not very many occurrences of middle forms which can be unambiguously interpreted as reciprocals (opposed to non-reciprocal active forms). A few clear instances of middle reciprocals without preverbs represent Ṛgvedic hapaxes (i.e., forms which are attested only once and only in the RV). These include, in particular:

mith ‘be inimical’ – *na methete* ‘(the day and night) are not inimical to one another’ (in RV 1.113.3; see Gotō 1987:244);

tṛ ‘surpass, overrun’ – *tarete* ‘overrun one another’ in (3):

- (3) (RV 1.140.3)
ubhá tarete abhí mātārā śśum
 both:NOM.DU overrun:PRES:3DU.MED towards mother:NOM.DU child:ACC.SG
 ‘Both parents overrun one another towards the child (sc. Agni, fire).’⁵

Quite often, a reciprocal interpretation is possible for some (but not all) middle forms, so that we are dealing with ‘weak’ morphological oppositions of the type ‘Active: non-reciprocal ~ Middle: non-reciprocal/reciprocal’, as is the case of the verb *yudh* ‘fight’. Active forms of *yudh* are employed either intransitively (‘X_{NOM} fights (for Z_{LOC})’) or, more rarely, transitively (‘X_{NOM} fights against Y_{ACC}, attacks Y_{ACC}’). Middle forms are only attested in intransitive constructions, some of which refer to reciprocal situations: ‘X^(non-SG)_{NOM} fight against each other’, as in (4):

- (4) (KSP 29.5:173.14-15 = KpSP 45.6:272.21)
yad vai putrau yudhyete pitā tābhyāṃ kalpayati
 when son:NOM.DU fight:PRES:3DU.MED father:NOM.SG them reconciles
 ‘When two sons fight against each other, the father reconciles them.’

In some cases the reciprocal interpretation is only one of possible analyses. For instance, we find examples which are ambiguous between reciprocal and anticausative and/or reflexive interpretations. This yields a ‘weak’ morphological opposition of another type: Act.: non-reciprocal ~ Med.: non-reciprocal / reciprocal / anticausative / reflexive. The choice between the different interpretations may require a special philological study. Examples of this type are attested, for instance, for some occurrences of middle forms of the verbs *bhr* ‘carry’ (cf. (5)) and *ukṣ* ‘(be)sprinkle’ (in (6)); note the difference between analyses suggested by several Sanskritists:

- (5) (RV 10.31.6)
samāná ā bhāraṇe bībhramāṇāḥ
 same:LOC in carrying:LOC carry:PRES:PART.MED:NOM.PL.M
 ‘[The gods] carrying each other (?) / being carried / moving in the same (act of) carrying.’

The passive translation of (5) suggested by most scholars⁶ is less likely for system-related reasons: passive usages are very rare for middle presents other than *-yá*-passives. More probable is a non-passive, anticausative (‘moving [repeatedly]’) or reciprocal (Gotō 1987:227: ‘sich gegenseitig tragend’) interpretation; see also Kulikov (2001:132).

5. See Gotō (1987:161); cf. also the compound *mīthas-tūr-* ‘surpassing each other’ derived from the same root (see Section 5).

6. Delbrück (1888:264); Wackernagel/Debrunner (1954:774, §619dβ); Geldner (1951:III, 178) (‘in gleicher Tragung getragen’); Renou (EVP XVI, 130).

(6) (RV 4.56.2)

devī ... *ukṣāmāṇe*

goddess:NOM.DU sprinkle:PRES:PART.MED:NOM.DU.F

‘The two goddesses sprinkling [ghee] / besprinkling each other.’⁷

We still await, among the desiderata for Vedic grammar, a comprehensive study of the Vedic middle, which would include an exhaustive catalogue of the attested functions of the middle forms.

3.1.2 Middle reciprocals without active counterparts: *Reciproca media tantum* and *symmetric predicates*

There is a group of reciprocals with the middle inflexion which are not opposed to non-reciprocal verbs with the active inflexion. This small class (mostly) consists of a few lexical reciprocals (symmetric predicates), where the reciprocal meaning is incorporated into the verbal semantics, such as *sprdh* ‘compete’ (cf. (7), (8), (15)) and *yād* ‘unite’ (attested only in the RV, in the present participle *yādamāna-* ‘uniting with sb.’) (see Gotō 1987:255f.):

(7) (RV 6.14.3)

spārdhante *rāyaḥ*

compete:PRES:3PL.MED rich:NOM.PL

‘The riches (of the Lord) compete (with each other).’

3.2 *vī*-reciprocals: The reciprocal meaning is expressed by the preverb *vī* and middle inflexion⁸

3.2.1 General remarks

More commonly (particularly in early Vedic), morphological reciprocals are derived by means of the preverb/prefix *vī* (with the sandhi variant *vy-*) added to forms with middle inflexion. This type seems to represent a new model, rather than the vestige of an old, formerly (in the proto-language?) productive, formation. *vī*-reciprocals are attested for some 20 verbs, mostly for the verbs of (i) hostile activities and (ii) communication/speech. Verbs which do not belong to these classes are listed under (iii):

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| (i) <i>dviṣ</i> ‘hate’ | – | <i>vī-dviṣ</i> _{MED} ‘hate each other, be inimical’ (RV+) |
| <i>ji</i> ‘win, overcome’ | – | <i>vī-ji</i> _{MED} ‘overcome each other’ (ŚB) |
| <i>han</i> ‘kill, destroy’ | – | <i>vī-han</i> _{MED} ‘kill, destroy each other’ (AV+) |
| <i>tṛh</i> ‘crush, destroy’ | – | <i>vī-tṛh</i> _{MED} ‘crush, shatter, destroy each other’ (AV, TS) |
| <i>abhi-car</i> ‘bewitch’ | – | <i>vy-abhi-car</i> _{MED} ‘bewitch each other’ (YV) |
| <i>śap</i> ‘curse’ | – | <i>vī-śap</i> _{MED} ‘curse each other, quarrel’ (or ‘swear?’). |

7. As in the case of (5), the passive interpretation as suggested for this passage by Haudry (1977:395) (‘arrosé’) is unlikely. The sentence should rather be translated either as an absolute transitive (‘the two goddesses ... sprinkling [ghee]’; thus Grassmann (1873:244), Geldner (1951:I, 486); cf. also Geldner’s (1951:I, 474) note ad 4.42.4a) or as a reciprocal construction (‘besprinkling each other’; cf. Gotō 1993:122f.). See also Kulikov (2001:346).

8. See, in particular, Delbrück (1888: 243; 1897: 431f.); Gotō (1987:134, 294 et passim; 1989:283; 1996:7); Kulikov (2002).

- (ii) *vac* ‘speak’ – *vi-vac*_{MED} ‘discuss with each other, contest on sth, argue for sth (LOC)’
brū ‘speak’ – *vi-brū*_{MED} ‘discuss with each other, contest, argue’
vad ‘speak’ – (*vi-*)*vad*_{MED} ‘discuss with each other, contest, argue’
bhaj ‘make share, distribute, give sth (ACC) to sb (DAT) as a share’ –
*vi-bhaj*_{MED} ‘distribute sth (ACC) among each other, share with each other’.
- (iii) *añj* ‘anoint’ – *vy-añj*_{MED} ‘anoint each other’ (?) (RV)
dīv ‘play’ – *vi-dīv*_{MED} ‘play for sth with each other’ (YV+)
mi ‘(ex)change, alternate’ – *vi-mi*_{MED} ‘alternate with each other’ (?) (RV).

Next to these three small groups of reciprocals proper, *vi* is employed as a marker of spatial reciprocals of disjoining. This productive class will be briefly discussed in 3.3.

3.2.2 The main syntactic types of *vi*-reciprocals

3.2.2.1 “Canonical” (intransitive) reciprocals. These suggest a symmetric relation between the subject and direct object. Usually, this type is constructed with the non-singular (dual or plural) verbal form, as in (8)–(14):

- (8) (ŚB 1.5.4.6)
devās ca vā āsurās ca ... paspṛdhire. té
 god:NOM.PL and verily Asura:NOM.PL and compete:PERF:3PL.MED they:NOM.PL
daṇḍāir dhānubhir ná vy-ājayanta. té ha
 stave:INST.PL bow:INST.PL not *vi*-overcome:IMPF:3PL.MED they:NOM.PL PRTL
á-vi-jaya-mānā ūcur. hānta vācy
 not-*vi*-overcome:PRES-PART.MED:NOM.PL.M say:PERF:3PL.ACT well speech:LOC.SG
èvá brāhman vi-jīgīṣāmahai
 PRTL sacred.formula:LOC.SG *vi*-overcome:DES:PRES:1PL.SUBJ.MED
 ‘The gods and the Asuras (demons) . . . were [once] competing. With staves and bows they did not overcome one another. [Neither of] them gaining victory over one another, they (the Asuras) said: “Well, we will try to overcome one another by means of speech, by means of sacred formula!”’
- (9) (TS 5.2.4.1)
vi vā etáu dviṣ-āte yás ca purā
vi PRTL this:NOM.DU.M hate:PRES-3DU.MED which:NOM.SG.M and earlier
agnír yás ca ukhāyām
 fire:NOM.SG which:NOM.SG.M and vessel:LOC.SG
 ‘The fire which [was] earlier and the one which is in the vessel are enemies (lit. hate each other).’
- (10) (TS 2.2.6.2)
 ... *yó vi-dviṣ-ānāyor ānam ātti*
 who *vi*-hate:PRES-PART.MED:GEN.DU.M food:ACC.SG eats
 ‘... who eats the food of two enemies.’⁹

9. Note that the lexicalized participle of the reciprocal *vi-dviṣ*_{MED} functions here as a substantive meaning ‘enemy’.

- (11) (KS 10.7:131.19)
abhicára-n *vā* *abhicar-yá-māṇo* *vā*
 bewitch:PRES-PART.ACT:NOM.SG.M or bewitch-PRES.PASS-PART.MED.NOM.SG.M or
devás ca vā ásurās ca vy-abhyácara-nta
 god:NOM.PL and ASURA:NOM.PL and vi-bewitch:IMPF-3PL.MED
 ‘Bewitching or being bewitched, the gods and the Asuras (demons) bewitched each other.’
- (12) (RV 9.86.43)
añj-áte vy añj-ate sám añj-ate
 anoint:PRES-3PL.MED vi anoint:PRES-3PL.MED together anoint:PRES-3PL.MED
krátum rih-anti mádhunā abhy añj-ate
 mental.power:ACC.SG lick:PRES-3PL.MED sweetness:INST.SG on anoint:PRES-3PL.MED
 ‘They (= waters) anoint themselves (with Soma), anoint each other (?), mix together with each other (?), lick (Soma’s) mental power, anoint themselves with (his) sweetness.’¹⁰

In some cases the reciprocal meaning is expressed both morphologically (with the preverb *ví* + middle inflexion) and periphrastically, by means of the adverb *mithás* ‘mutually’ (see Section 4.1):

- (13) (AV 3.30.4)
yéna devá ná vi-y-ánti ná u ca vi-dviṣ-áte
 which:INST.SG god:NOM.PL not vi-go:PRES-3PL.ACT not and vi-hate:PRES-3PL.MED
mitháh / tát kṛṇ-mo bráhma vo gḥé
 mutually that make:PRES-1PL.ACT incantation:ACC.SG your house:LOC.SG
 ‘We perform in your house that incantation by virtue of which the gods do not go apart, do not hate one another (mutually).’
- (14) (AV 6.32.3 = 8.8.21)
mithó vi-ghn-āná úpa y-antu mṛtyúm
 mutually vi-kill:PRES-PART.MED:NOM.PL.M to go:PRES-3PL.IMP.ACT death:ACC.SG
 ‘Mutually crushing each other, let them (sc. our enemies) go to their death.’

Alongside ‘symmetric’ constructions with non-singular verbal forms we also find a ‘non-symmetric’ pattern with the verb in the singular constructed with the subject in the nominative and an oblique object in the instrumental referring to another participant of the reciprocal situation (cf. Russian *Ivan celuetsja s Annoj*, German *Hans küsst sich mit Anna*), as in (15):

- (15) (MS 1.5.11:80.7–8)
yéna spárdha-te yéna vā vy-abhicára-te ...
 who:INST.SG compete:PRES-3SG.MED who:INST.SG or vi-bewitch-PRES:3SG.MED

10. Example (12) is taken from a hymn describing the process of mixing Soma (sacral sap) with waters. Although most translators do not interpret *ví* as a reciprocal marker (Grassmann (1873: 24f.): ‘durchsalben’; Geldner (1951: III, 83–4): ‘sie salben sich, sie salben sich *bunt*, sie salben sich gleich ...’; explaining further: ‘*añj*, *vi-añj* und *sam-añj* wohl drei verschiedene Arten der Salbung’; Renou (EVP IX, 36): ‘(Les eaux) s’oignent, s’oignent *d’outré en outré* ...’; likewise Elizarenkova (1999: 81): ‘Oni umaščajutsja, umaščajutsja *naskvoz*’, umaščajutsja osnovatel’no ...’), the meaning ‘mutually, each other’ seems quite appropriate in the context.

‘With whom he competes or (lit.) with whom he bewitches [i.e. with whom he brings about the mutual bewitching], (that one ...).’

3.2.2.2 “Indirect” (transitive) reciprocals. These denote a symmetric relation between the subject and non-direct (typically, indirect) object, which surfaces either as a second accusative argument, or as a dative argument. Here belong a number of reciprocals derived from verbs of speech. Compare the non-reciprocal construction with the verb *vac* ‘speak’ constructed with the accusative of speech and the dative of the addressee (16) and the reciprocal construction (17):

(16) (RV 1.129.3)

indra⊃ *utá túbhyaṃ tád ... voc-a-m*
 Indra:VOC and you:DAT that:ACC speak:AOR-SUBJ-1SG.ACT
 ‘And I will tell it to you, oh Indra ...’

(17) (RV 6.31.1)

ví toké apsú tánaye ca sūre⊃ *ávoc-anta*
vi seed:LOC.SG water:LOC.PL offspring:LOC.SG and sun.LOC.SG speak:AOR-3PL.MED
carṣañāyo vívāc-aḥ
 tribe:NOM.PL contest-ACC.PL
 ‘The tribes contested (lit. contested contests) on seed, waters and offspring, on the sun.’¹¹

The middle forms with the preverb *ví* of two other verbs of speech, *brū* and *vad*, are employed in similar usages (the latter ousts *ví-vac*_{MED} in late Vedic texts, from the Brāhmaṇas onwards), cf.:

(18) (RV 6.25.4cd)

toké vā gōṣu tánaye yád apsú ví krāndas-ī
 seed:LOC.SG or cow:LOC.PL offspring:LOC.SG when water:LOC.PL *vi* army-NOM.DU
urvārāsu brāv-aīte
 field:LOC.PL speak:PRES-3DU.SUBJ.MED
 ‘... or when two armies contest on seed, on cows, on offspring, on waters, on fields.’

(19) (ŚĀ 4.14 = KauṣU 2.14)

etā ha vai devatā ahaṃ-śreyase ví-vada-mānā
 this:NOM.PL.F deity:NOM.PL I-superior:LOC *vi*-speak:PRES-PART.MED:NOM.PL.M
asmāc charīrād uc-cakram-uḥ
 this:ABL body:ABL out-go:PERF-3PL.ACT
 ‘Once these deities, each arguing for its own preeminence, departed from this body.’

Note that the middle forms without the preverb *ví* are attested in the same usage (see Delbrück 1888: 246), which must be due to the symmetric character of the verb, as in (20):

(20) (MS 4.4.1:41.19)

tásmīn vā avadetām
 that:LOC speak:IMPF:3DU.MED
 ‘They both discussed / argued for that.’

11. For the corresponding root noun *vívāc*- ‘(verbal) contest, competition’, see Section 5.

“Indirect” reciprocals can also be made from the verb *bhaj* ‘make share, distribute’. The base (non-reciprocal) construction of *bhaj* ‘make share, distribute, give sth (ACC) to sb (DAT) as a share’ is attested with the active forms (usually with the preverb *vi*), with the accusative or genitive of shared goods and with the dative of the recipient of distribution (see Jamison 1983: 129, Gotō 1987: 221f.): ‘X_{NOM} apportions Y^{goods}_{ACC/GEN} to Z^{recipient}_{DAT}’, as in (21). Accordingly, the corresponding reciprocal, *vi-bhaj*_{MED}, means ‘distribute sth (ACC) among each other, share with each other’, as in (22):

(21) (RV 10.48.1)

ahám dāśús-e ví bhajāmi bhójanam
 I:NOM worshipper-DAT.SG *vi* distribute:PRES:1SG.ACT food:ACC.SG
 ‘I (= Indra) apportion food to the one who worships [me].’

(22) (RV 10.108.8)

tá etám ūrvám ví bhajanta gónām
 they:NOM.PL this herd:ACC.SG *vi* distribute:PRES:3PL.MED.SUBJ cow:GEN.PL
 ‘They will share with each other this herd of cows.’

Another verb which forms non-direct object reciprocals is *dīv* ‘play’. Middle forms with the preverb *vi* are employed in constructions where the stake (i.e. that which is played/gambled for) is expressed by an accusative direct object, meaning ‘X^(non-SG)_{NOM} play for Y_{ACC} with each other’,¹² as in (23); some late texts also attest active forms with the preverb *vi* in the same usage:¹³

(23) (MS 4.4.6:57.10 ~ ĀpŚS 18.19.2 ~ VārŚS 3.3.3.24 ~ HirŚS 13.6.29)

tátra paṣṭhauhīm ví dīvya-nte [HirŚS *dīvya-nti*]
 there young.cow:ACC.SG *vi* play:PRES-3PL.MED play:PRES-3PL.ACT
 ‘There they play for a young cow.’

3.2.3 *vi*-reciprocals combined with other valence-changing categories

Unlike many Western Indo-European languages, Indo-Aryan has developed productive morphological causatives (present with the suffix *-āya-* and reduplicated aorist) and passives (present with the suffix *-yá-*); see Sections 2.4.2–3. All these derivatives can be made from *vi*-reciprocals.

3.2.3.1 Causatives derived from reciprocals. They are attested for the verb *dviṣ* ‘hate’. It is important to note that causatives are normally inflected in the active, and thus the causative derivation “absorbs” the middle diathesis, so that the preverb *vi* remains the only reciprocal marker:

12. The translation ‘verspielen’ (Böhtlingk & Roth, PW III, 617) is erroneous. For a comprehensive description of the play, see Falk (1986: 134ff. et passim).

13. The active inflexion attested in the HirŚS (23) must be secondary; see Schroeder (1883–84:7); Oertel (1934:66f.) [= Kl. Schr. I, 697f.].

- (24) (AVP 2.58.1)
vi-dveṣ-anaṃ *kila*ᵁ *āsitha* ⁺*yathā*ᵁ *enau*
vi-hate-NR:NOM.SG verily be:PERF:2SG.ACT since he:ACC.DU
vy-adidviṣaḥ
vi-hate:CAUS.AOR:2SG.ACT
 ‘Verily, you are causing (mutual) hostility, for you have made them (both) inimical to each other (lit. made hate each other).’ (a verse addressed to a magic amulet)¹⁴

Note that the *nomen actionis vi-dveṣaṇa-* is derived from the causative reciprocal (‘causing (mutual) hostility’), not from the reciprocal proper (‘(mutual) hostility’).

3.2.3.2 Passives derived from reciprocals

3.2.3.2.1 *Passives derived from “indirect” reciprocals* are attested for *vi-bhaj*_{MED} ‘share sth (ACC) with each other’ (cf. (21)–(22)). The main problem is distinguishing between reciprocal passives and passives of the non-reciprocal verbs, which are also quite common with the preverb *vi*: since the *-yá*-passive is always inflected in the middle, the morphological opposition ‘Active ~ Middle’ is neutralized, so that the passive *vi-bhājyāte* may represent either a non-reciprocal passive (‘be shared, be distributed’) or a reciprocal passive (‘be distributed [by sb. among each other], be shared [by sb. with each other]’). By definition, the subject of a reciprocal construction can only be non-singular (plural or dual): ‘X’s / X and Y share sth. with each other’. Accordingly, the presence of a non-singular agent makes possible a reciprocal interpretation.

Thus, for instance, in the context of the plural subject *sátvāno* ‘the warriors’, a reciprocal interpretation is very likely:

- (25) (MS 2.2.13:25.13)
sátvāno *gā* *ichanti* *yád* *eté* *taṇḍulá*
 warrior:NOM.PL cow:ACC.PL seek:PRES:3PL.ACT when this:NOM.PL.M grain:NOM.PL
vi-bhāj-yá-nte
vi-distribute-PRES.PASS-3PL.MED
 ‘The warriors seek for cows, when these grains are distributed [by warriors among each other (?)] ...’

In (26), the reciprocal interpretation of *vi* is supported by the reciprocal adverb *mithas* ‘mutually’ (see Section 4.1) and by the commentator’s gloss *parasparam* ‘each other’:

- (26) (HirŚS 3.8.66)
adhīśrayaṇa-kāle *mitho* *vi-bhaj-yeran*
 putting.on.fire-time:LOC.SG mutually *vi-distribute-PRES.PASS:3PL.OPT.MED*
 ‘When one puts [the oblation] on [fire], [the rice grains] should be (mutually) distributed (among each other).’

14. Cf. Hoffmann’s (1976:567) translation: ‘weil du die beiden hast sich verfeinden lassen’.

3.2.3.2.2 *Passive derived from a “canonical” reciprocal* is attested for at least one Vedic verb, *tr̥h* ‘crush, destroy’. An example of the reciprocal of this verb occurs in the TS:

- (27) (TS 2.2.11.2)
vi-tr̥h-ānās *tiṣṭhanti*
vi-crush:PRES-PART.MED:NOM.SG.M stand:PRES:3PL.ACT
 ‘[They] keep crushing each other.’

The passive *tr̥hyá-^{te}* occurs 3 times, only in the AV. Two of these attestations instantiate a reciprocal construction, as in (28):

- (28) (AV 1.28.4)
ádhā mithó vikeśyò ví ghn-atām yātudhānyò
 then mutually hairless *vi* kill:PRES-3PL.IMP.MED sorceress:NOM.PL
vi tr̥h-ya-ntām arāyyàḥ
vi crush-PRES.PASS-3PL.IMP hag:NOM.PL
 ‘... then let the hairless sorceresses (mutually) kill each other; let the hags be crushed (killed) by each other.’

This translation seems more adequate than the non-reciprocal one suggested by Whitney & Lanman (1905:I, 29): ‘... then let the horrid-haired sorceresses mutually crush one another; let the hags *be shattered asunder*.’ The reciprocal interpretation (‘let the hags be shattered (killed) by each other’) is supported (i) by the reciprocal construction (*vi ghnatām* ‘let (them) kill each other’) in the preceding clause, and (ii) by another attestation of the passive *tr̥hyá-^{te}* (29), where the reciprocal meaning is expressed by the reciprocal adverb *mithás* ‘mutually’:

- (29) (AVŚ 5.17.7 ~ AVP 9.15.7)
vīrā yé tr̥h-yá-nte (AVŚ) / han-ya-nte (AVP) mithó
 hero:NOM.PL who:NOM.PL.M crush-PRES.PASS-3PL kill-PRES.PASS-3PL mutually
brahmajāyā hinas-ti tām
 Brahman’s.wife:NOM.SG hurt:PRES-3SG.ACT they:ACC.PL.M
 ‘When heroes are mutually crushed it is the Brahman’s wife who hurts them.’

Passives of “canonical” reciprocals, albeit very rare, are worthy of special discussion. From the typological point of view, this syntactic type is extremely rare. While the indirect reciprocal derivation retains the initial direct object, so that passivization remains possible, a canonical reciprocal must be intransitive by definition, which, at first glance, rules out passivization. In the case of the periphrastic reciprocal construction (cf. English *each other*, German *einander*), at least a formal possibility of passivization exists due to the presence of a pronominal direct object (*each other*, *einander*) in the syntactic structure (*they crush each other* → *they are crushed by each other*). In the case of a morphological reciprocal (as in Vedic), the syntactic aspects of this derivation remain unclear. It may be the case that this peculiar construction was brought to life by some particular stylistic technique found in poetic texts.

3.2.4 *The polysemy and etymology of ví*

The range of meanings expressed by *ví* includes:

(i) splitting into parts, transformation of one single object into a group of objects or change of state resulting in certain autonomy of the parts of the object (cf. the case of the open gate¹⁵), cf. *bhid* ‘break, split’ – *ví-bhid* ‘break, split (asunder)’, *jñā* ‘know’ – *ví-jñā* ‘discern’, *śri* ‘adhere’ – *ví-śri* ‘open’;

(ii) spreading, expanding, cf. *bhr̥* ‘bring’ – *ví-bhr̥* ‘spread’, *sṛ̥* ‘run’ – *ví-sṛ̥* ‘run in several directions’;

(iii) distributive, cf. *dhā* ‘put, place’ – *ví-dhā* ‘distribute, arrange’;

(iv) reversive, cf. *vṛ̥* ‘close’ – *ví-vṛ̥* ‘open (doors)’, *sā* ‘tie’ – *ví-śā* ‘untie’;

(v) removing, leaving some space, cf. *nī* ‘carry’ – *ví-nī* ‘take away’, *tṛ̥* ‘(over)pass; bring, carry over’ – *ví-tṛ̥* ‘bring away, carry off’, *tap* ‘warm’ – *ví-tap* ‘give out heat’;

(vi) change, cf. *kṛ̥* ‘make’ – *ví-kṛ̥* ‘shape (up), change, disfigure’;¹⁶ cf. also *rūpā-* ‘form, appearance’ – *ví-rūpā-* ‘variegated, multiform’.

The set of functions attested for *ví* is quite unusual for the reciprocal morphemes in Indo-European languages, but is in line with its etymology. Already in the early Indo-European studies *ví* is traced back to the PIE adverb **dvis* ‘in two’ (**dvi-* in compounds) derived from the numeral ‘two’ (see, e.g., Pott 1859:705ff.), thus being genetically related to Ancient Greek *δια-*, Lat. *dis-*, Old High German *ze(r)-*, for which similar meanings are attested. Although Mayrhofer (EWAia II, 550) evaluates this etymology with skepticism, it is convincing both from the phonological¹⁷ and semantic point of view. The most remarkable parallel to the Vedic *ví* is the Ancient Greek prefix *δια-*, which also may render the reciprocal meaning; to mention just a few examples taken from Pott’s study (Pott 1859:733): *διά-λογος* ‘Unterredung’, *δια-ειπεῖν* ‘mit einander sprechen’ (the exact etymological cognate of Ved. *ví-vaC_{MED}*), *δια-κυνέω* ‘sich gegenseitig küssen’, *δια-κυρίττομαι* ‘sich unter einander stoßen’, *δια-πειλέω* ‘sich gegenseitig bedrohen’, *δια-μάχομαι* ‘fight against each other’. Note that, in some of these Greek examples, the reciprocal meaning is expressed by forms with the active inflexion.

3.3 Spatial reciprocals with the preverbs *ví* and *sám* and sociatives with *sám*

Spatial reciprocals with the preverbs *ví* ‘apart’ and *sám* ‘together’ denoting separating and joining, respectively, are much more productive than reciprocals proper with the middle inflexion and preverb *ví*. Unlike reciprocals proper, they can take both middle and active endings. Middle forms are typically employed as subject-oriented reciprocals (i.e. refer to separating/joining of the participants denoted by the subject: ‘come together’, etc.), while active forms can be employed either as subject-oriented reciprocals (cf. *ví-yánti* ‘(they)

15. For this meaning, see, in particular, Elizarenkova (2001:120ff.).

16. This semantics may result from the development of the following implicatures: ‘make in parts, asunder’ → ‘disintegrate’ → ‘disfigure’ → ‘change’.

17. See especially the convincing argumentation in Lubotsky (1994:202ff.).

Table 1.

	ACTIVE	MIDDLE
(Ø)	transitives (e.g. <i>bharati</i> 'X brings Y'); intransitives (e.g. <i>gacchati</i> 'X goes'); etc.	many symmetric predicates (including some lexical reciprocals), reflexives, ... (<i>bharate</i> 'Y brings oneself, moves' (ref.); 'X brings Y for oneself' (self-benef.))
<i>sám</i>	object-oriented spatial reciprocals of joining (e.g. <i>sám bharati</i> 'X brings Ys together'); (sociatives)	subject-oriented spatial reciprocals of joining (e.g. <i>sám gacchante</i> 'Xs come together'); sociatives (e.g. <i>sám pibante</i> 'Xs drink together')
<i>ví</i>	object-oriented spatial reciprocals of separating (e.g. <i>ví bharati</i> 'X spreads Ys asunder, distributes Ys'); (subject-oriented spatial reciprocals of separating [e.g. <i>ví-yánti</i> '(they) go apart'])	subject-oriented spatial reciprocals of separating (e.g. <i>ví gacchante</i> 'Xs go asunder, separate'); reciprocals proper (e.g. <i>ví jayante</i> 'Xs overcome each other')

go apart' in (13)), or, more commonly, as object-oriented reciprocals (i.e. referring to separating/joining of the participants denoted by the object: 'bring together', etc.). Some of the middle (and, more rarely, active) forms with *sám* should be qualified as sociatives, meaning 'perform the activity expressed by the base verb together', rather than spatial reciprocals (e.g. 'come together'). In some cases, the distinction between these two types cannot be drawn with accuracy.

The system of meanings expressed by the preverbs *ví* and *sám* is schematically represented in Table 1.

A detailed study of spatial reciprocals and sociatives remains a desideratum; below I confine myself to a few examples:

(i) (spatial) reciprocals:

- i* 'go' – *sám-i*_{MED} 'come together' – *ví-i* 'go apart', cf. (13)
- kram* 'step' – *sám-kram*_{MED} 'come together, meet' (AV, ŚB)
- gam* 'go' – *sám-gam*_{MED} 'meet together, unite; meet for fighting, fight with each other', cf. (30)
- car* 'move, walk' – *sám-car*_{MED} 'meet' (RV+)
- jñā* 'know' – *sám-jñā*_{MED} 'agree (with each other)' (cf. (49)) – *ví-jñā* 'distinguish (from each other)'
- dā* 'tie' – *sám-dā* 'tie together' – *ví-dā* 'untie', cf. (34)
- dhr̥* 'keep, hold' – *sám-dhr̥* 'keep together' – *ví-dhr̥* 'keep apart', cf. (31, 49)
- bhāṣ* 'talk, speak' – *sám-bhāṣ*_{MED} 'converse (with each other)', cf. (54).

(ii) sociatives:

- kamp* 'tremble' – *sám-kamp* 'tremble together', cf. (31)
- kruś* 'shout' – *sám-kruś* 'shout together'
- tr̥p* 'rejoice' – *sám-tr̥p* 'rejoice together', cf. (32).

Examples of constructions with spatial reciprocals and *sám* sociatives are:

- (30) (ŚBM 1.8.3.6 ~ ŚBK 2.8.1.5)
caturthé púruṣe tṛtīye sám gacchāmahe
 fourth:LOC generation:LOC.SG third:LOC together go:PRES:3PL.SUBJ.MED
 ‘In the fourth, in the third generation we will meet together [as enemies].’¹⁸
- (31) (KS 25.6:110.18f. ~ KpS 39.4:253.14f.)
ime vai lokā a-vi-dhṛtā āsāms.
 this:NOM.PL.M verily world:NOM.PL not-apart-kept:NOM.PL.M be:IMPF:3PL.ACT
te sam-prākampanta. tān devā etair
 they:NOM.PL together-tremble:IMPF:3PL.MED they:ACC.PL god:NOM.PL these:INST
yajurbhir vy-aṣṭabhnuvan
 sacrificial.formula:INST.PL apart-set:IMPF:3PL.ACT
 ‘Verily, these worlds were not kept apart. They were trembling together.’¹⁹ The gods set them apart by means of these sacrificial formulae.’
- (32) (KB 12.5 [ed. Sarma 12.6.16])
*prātaḥ sarvā devatāḥ sam tṛpyante*²⁰
 in.the.morning all:NOM.PL.F deity:NOM.PL together rejoice:PRES:3PL.MED
 ‘In the morning all deities rejoice together.’
- (33) (JB 1.155:8–10)
ta ime lokā vy-avrhyanta, vi yajño
 this:NOM.PL.M world:NOM.PL apart-break:PASS.IMPF:3PL apart sacrifice:NOM.SG
 ‘vrhyata. te devā akāmayanta: sam imān
 break:PASS.IMPF:3SG those god:NOM.PL wished together this:ACC.PL.M
lokān dadhyāma, sam yajñam dadhyāma
 world:ACC.PL put:PRES:1PL.OPT.ACT together sacrifice:ACC.SG put:PRES:1PL.OPT.ACT
iti
 thus
 ‘These worlds broke apart, the sacrifice broke apart. The gods wished: “Let us put together these worlds, let us put together the sacrifice”’
- (34) (TB 3.10.9.1–3)
prajāpatir devān asṛjata. té pāpmānā
 Prajāpati:NOM god:ACC.PL created they:NOM.PL.M evil:INST.SG
sām-ditā ajāyanta. tān vy ādyat
 together-tied:NOM.PL.M were.born they:ACC.PL.M apart tie:IMPF:3SG.ACT
 ‘Prajāpati created the gods. When they were born, they were tied together with evil. He untied them.’

18. Geldner (1889:281): ‘... im vierten, im dritten Gliede (der Verwandtschaft) dürfen wir uns geschlechtlich vereinigen.’ Explaining this passage, Weber-Brosamer (1988:86f., with fn. 195) rightly points out that *sám gacchāmahe* refers to fighting, not to sexual intercourse (as Geldner, and, subsequently, Rau (1957:40), understood it).

19. Gotō (1987:110) erroneously translates this form as a non-sociative, taking *sam-* as the marker of completive actionality: ‘Sie waren in völlig (*sam*) erregter Bewegung.’

20. Some manuscripts attest variant readings with the active inflexion: *tṛpyanti*.

By the end of the Vedic period, (spatial) reciprocals/sociatives with *sám* and reciprocals of separating with *ví* reach an absolute productivity and cover the major part of the verbal dictionary (cf. the situation with the Latin prefixes *con-* and *dis-* of similar semantics).

4. Constructions with reciprocal pronouns and adverbs

Analytic markers of reciprocity show higher degree of productivity and regularity than morphological reciprocals with *ví* (which can only be made from a rather limited class of verbs) and *sám* (which cover only a part of the semantic domain of reciprocals). A more common reciprocal marker is the adverb *mithás* ‘mutually’; from middle Vedic onwards, it cedes to the polyptotic reciprocal pronoun *anyó (a)nyá-*.²¹

4.1 Reciprocals with the adverb *mithás*

The reciprocal adverb *mithás* (with the sandhi variants *mitháh*, *mithó*) ‘mutually’ is almost exclusively used with middle verbal forms. In the RV, *mithás*-reciprocals are attested with some 15 verbs and can form reciprocals of different syntactic types.

(i) “Canonical” reciprocals:

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| <i>vap</i> ‘scatter, (be)sprinkle’ | – | <i>mithó vapanta</i> ‘they (= the Maruts) besprinkle each other’ |
| <i>hi</i> ‘urge, impel’ | – | <i>mithó hinváná</i> ‘impelling each other’ (cf. (35)) |
| <i>pū</i> ‘purify’ | – | <i>punāné mitháh</i> ‘purifying each other [of earth and heaven]’. |

(ii) “Possessive” reciprocals:

- | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|
| <i>rih</i> ‘lick’ | – | <i>rihaté kakúbho mitháh</i> ‘they lick each other’s backs’ (as bulls do) (cf. (36)). |
|-------------------|---|---|

(iii) It can also be (pleonastically) used with symmetric predicates and morphological middle reciprocals (including reciprocals with *sám*):

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <i>nas</i> ‘(happily) unite, approach’ | – | <i>sám ... mithó nasanta</i> ‘they mutually happily unite (with their relatives)’ (RV 8.72.14; see Gotō 1987:200) |
| <i>yat</i> ‘be in place, arranged’ | – | <i>ná yatante mithás</i> ‘they are not in competition with each other’ |
| <i>spṛdh</i> ‘compete’ | – | <i>sám ... mitháh pasṛdhānsaḥ</i> ‘competing with each other’. |

21. For a general survey of the reciprocal pronouns and constructions in Indo-European, see, in particular, Krisch (1999).

Note that *mithás* does not occur in constructions with “indirect” reciprocals.

Examples are:

- (35) (RV 10.65.2)
indrāgní... mithó hinv-āná tanvā
 Indra-Agni:NOM.DU mutually impel:PRES-PART.MED:NOM-ACC.DU.M REFL:NOM-ACC.DU
sámokasā
 having.same.abode:NOM-ACC.DU.M
 ‘Indra and Agni, ... mutually impelling each other themselves, having same abode ...’

Note that in (35) the reciprocal adverb *mithás* co-occurs with the emphatic reflexive pronoun *tanú-* ‘(one)self’ (on which see Kulikov 2007).

- (36) (RV 8.20.21)
rihaté kakúbho mitháh
 lick:PRES:3PL.MED back:ACC.PL mutually
 ‘They lick each other’s backs.’
- (37) (RV 10.68.10)
yát sūryā-māsā mithá uccārātaḥ
 while sun-moon:NOM.DU mutually rise:PRES:2.DU.SUBJ.ACT
 ‘... while the sun and moon will rise one after another.’

mithás can also be employed with nominal forms, adjectives (as in (38)) and substantives:

- (38) (RV 7.38.5)
yé mithó vanúṣaḥ sápane
 who:NOM.PL.M mutually competing:NOM.PL take.care:PRES:3PL.MED
 ‘... who, competing with each other, take care ...’ (see Gotō 1987: 323, fn. 783)

Furthermore, *mithás-* appears as the first element of some compounds (see Section 5).

The adverb *mithás* becomes less frequent after the RV. It is interesting to note that all its attestations in the AV occur in pleonastic usages, in the compound *mitho-yodhá-* ‘battle, fight’ in AV 12.5.24 (see Section 5), i.e., with a verbal noun derived from a symmetric predicate, and in constructions with *ví-*reciprocals, cf. (13, 14, 28). Likewise, in later texts (in particular, in post-Vedic), it is often (mostly?), used pleonastically, as in (39), where it co-occurs with the reciprocal pronoun *anyonyam* ‘each other’:

- (39) (ManuSmṛ. 7.89)
āhaveṣu mitho anyonyam jighāmsanto mahikṣitaḥ
 battle:LOC.PL mutually each.other kill:DES:PART.ACT:NOM.PL.M king:NOM.PL
 ‘The kings who, seeking to kill each other in battles ...’

4.2 Reciprocal constructions with the pronoun *anyó (a)nyá-*

Reciprocal constructions with the reciprocal pronoun *anyó (a)nyá-* represent the most frequent type of the Sanskrit reciprocals. The polyptotic reciprocal marker (RM) *anyó ... anyá-* (*anyò’nyá-*, *anyonya-*) represents the iteration of the pronominal adjective *anyá-* ‘another, one of a number, the other’ (for its usages, see, in particular, Jamison 1997), thus literally meaning ‘another ... another’; cf. English reciprocal *one another*, Latvian *cits*

citu lit. ‘another (NOM) another (ACC)’. The first component (*anyó-*) is the sandhi form of the singular masculine nominative *anyás* (*anyáh*) before voiced consonants and *a*; the accent on *-ò-* and the loss of the following *a* also result from the sandhi. In contrast to the reciprocal adverb *mithás*, which occurs with middle verbal forms, *anyó (a)nyá-* typically combines with active forms.

4.2.1 The main syntactic types of reciprocal constructions with *anyó (a)nyá-*

The pronoun *anyó (a)nyá-* can express reciprocal relations between the subject and any other argument, including the direct object, indirect object, possessor noun, etc. Accordingly, the second part may appear in different case forms: accusative (= “canonical” reciprocals, cf. (40, 42, 44–5, 49)), dative (= “indirect” reciprocals, cf. (47)), genitive (= “possessive” reciprocals, cf. (50–51)), locative (cf. (53)), or instrumental (cf. (46)).

4.2.2 The historical development of reciprocal constructions with *anyó (a)nyá-*

From the early Vedic period onwards, we observe both an increase of productivity of *anyó (a)nyá-* and its morphological evolution from a free combination of words into a grammaticalized pronoun (see, in particular, Wackernagel 1905:322f.). This section offers a brief survey of the history of constructions with *anyó (a)nyá-*.

4.2.2.1 *Early Vedic (the early R̥gveda)*. In the earliest documented period, i.e. in the RV, reciprocal constructions with *anyó ... anyá-* are still rare. As mentioned above, reciprocity is more often expressed by other markers: middle endings, the preverbs *ví* and *sám*, and the adverb *mithás*. In the RV, we find as few as five attestations of the reciprocal proto-pronoun *anyó(-)(a)nyá-*. It is not yet grammaticalized as a single reciprocal marker, its constituent parts being essentially autonomous lexical units, which can 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 reciprocal pronoun, and thus appears in the singular, as in (40):

- (40) (RV 7.103.3–4)
- | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| <i>anyó</i> | <i>anyám</i> | <i>úpa vādantam</i> | <i>eti</i> |
| other:NOM.SG.M | other:ACC.SG.M | to call:PRES:PART.ACT:ACC.SG.M | go:PRES:3SG.ACT |
| <i>anyó</i> | <i>anyám</i> | <i>ánu gr̥bhñāty</i> | <i>enor</i> |
| other:NOM.SG.M | other:ACC.SG.M | support:PRES:3SG.ACT | they:GEN.DU |
- ‘One (frog) goes to the call of another; one of the two supports another.’

The syntactic pattern attested with *anyá- ... anyá-* in early Vedic is schematically represented in (41):

- (41) RM1:NOM S:GEN.non-SG RM2:ACC V:SG
 (RM1 and RM2 stand for the first and second part of the reciprocal pronoun, S stands for the noun denoting the group of participants of the reciprocal situation, i.e. the antecedent of the reciprocal pronoun).

- (46) (ŚB 14.4.3.30 = BĀUK 1.5.23)
*tāni sṛṣṭāny anyò-nyéna*_U
 that:NOM.PL.N created:NOM.PL.N other:NOM.SG.M-other:INST.SG.M/N
asparḥanta
 compete:IMPF:3PL.MED
 ‘Those created (active functions) competed with each other.’
- (47) (TB 1.3.2.1)
té anyò-nyasmai ná *atiṣṭhanta*
 they:NOM.PL.M other:NOM.SG.M-other:DAT.SG.M not stand:IMPF:3PL.MED
 ‘They (the gods) did not adhere to each other.’

Unfortunately, this is the only example of *anyò-nya-* found in the TB, so that we cannot be sure whether this was a feature of the dialect of the TB, or just a minor lapsus of the scribe.

(iii) *Number and gender agreement.*

The reciprocal pronoun generalizes the singular form for both of its parts, so that examples such as (45) become impossible. The gender agreement of the constituent parts of the reciprocal pronoun follows one of the following two patterns: (a) *anya*-[M/N/F]-*anya*-[M/N/F] or (b) *anyó*[M]-*anyá*-[M/N/F]. In constructions of type (a), both parts of the reciprocal pronoun agree in gender with the nominal antecedent. This pattern is attested only in very few texts, in particular, in the relatively late Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa. Cf. (48), where the feminine substantive *prajā*[ḥ] ‘creatures’ triggers the feminine gender on both RM1 (*anyā*) and RM2 (*anyām*):

- (48) (JB 1.117:1–2)
prajāpatiḥ prajā asṛjata. ... tā aśanāyantīr
 P. creature:ACC.PL created they:NOM.PL.F being.hungry:NOM.PL.F
anyā-nyām ādan
 other:NOM.SG.F-other:ACC.SG.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 reciprocal pronoun (*anyo-*) and thus follow the agreement pattern (b). Consequently, we observe in (49) (a passage from the Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa parallel to (48)) and in (50) that the feminine gender is only marked on the second element of the reciprocal pronoun, whereas the first component is in the masculine (*anyo-*, not ***anyā-*). In (51), the masculine (*anyo-*) is used instead of the neuter form (***anyad-*) according to the same pattern:

- (49) (PB 24.11.2)
prajāpatiḥ prajā asṛjata. tā a-vidhr̥tā
 P.:NOM creature:ACC.PL created they:NOM.PL.F not-kept.apart:NOM.PL.F
a-sañjānānā anyo-nyām ādan
 not-agree:PRES:PART.MED:NOM.PL.F other:NOM.SG.M-other:ACC.SG.F eat:IMPF:3PL.ACT
 ‘Prajāpati created the creatures. They, not being kept apart, not agreeing (with each other), ate each other.’

- (50) (ŚB 5.3.4.21)
anyò-nyásyā (**anyānyásyā*) *evàitác chriyā-*
 other:NOM.SG.M-other:GEN.SG.F (other:NOM.SG.F-...) PRTL superiority
á-tiṣṭhamānā ... yanti
 not-standing:NOM.PL.F go:PRES:3PL.ACT
 ‘... (The waters [F.]) are flowing ..., not yielding to one another’s superiority.’
- (51) (TS 7.2.8.6)
chándāṃsy anyò-nyásya
 metre:NOM.PL [N.] other:NOM.SG.M-other:GEN.SG.M/N
 (**anyád-anyásya*) *lokám abhy ádhyāyan*
 other:NOM.SG.M-other:GEN.SG.M/N place:ACC.SG be.eager:IMPF:3PL.ACT
 ‘The (poetic) metres were eager for each other’s place.’

4.2.2.4 *Further grammaticalization of anyo’nya- in late Vedic and post-Vedic Sanskrit.* In late Vedic and post-Vedic Sanskrit *anyo’nya-* is further grammaticalized. 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:

(i) Neither part of the reciprocal pronoun agrees in gender or number with the antecedent; the masculine singular form (nominative *anyo-*, accusative *anyam*, etc.) becomes generalized, cf. (52):

- (52) (Rām. 2.53.10)
anyo-nyam (**anyānyām = anyā-anyām*) *abhivikṣante ...*
 other:NOM.SG.M-other:ACC.SG.M other:NOM.SG.F-other:ACC.SG.F look.at:PRES:3PL.MED
ārtatarāḥ striyaḥ
 confused:NOM.PL.F woman:NOM.PL
 ‘The confused women look at each other.’

(ii) *anyo’nya-* can be used with non-subject antecedents, in particular, in object-oriented reciprocal constructions. Thus, in (53), 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 *gharmāu* ‘oblations’:

- (53) (ŚB 11.6.2.2)
gharmāv evá ... anyò-nyásmin
 gharma:ACC.DU PRTL other:NOM.SG.M-other:LOC.SG.M
 (**anyām-anyásmin*) *juhomi*
 other:ACC.SG.M-other:LOC.SG.M pour:PRES:1SG.ACT
 ‘I pour both gharma-oblations, one into another.’

(iii) In the post-Vedic period (in particular, in Epic Sanskrit), 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. (54), where we might expect RM2 to appear in the instrumental case, in accordance with the case pattern of the verb *saṃ-bhāṣ* ‘converse’:

- (54) (Rām. 5.89.52)
teṣāṃ saṃbhāṣa-māṇānām anyo-nyam ...
 they:GEN.PL.M converse:PRES-PART.MED:GEN.PL other:NOM.SG.M-other:ACC.SG.M
 (**anyasyānyena* = *anyasya-anyena*)
 other:GEN.SG.M-other:INST.SG.M
 ‘... of them, conversing with each other ...’

(iv) In post-Vedic Sanskrit, where nominal composition becomes very productive, the stem *anyonya-* can also appear as the first member of a compound (meaning ‘mutual, reciprocal’); see Section 5.

4.3 Other polyptotic reciprocal pronouns

Alongside *anyó (a)nyá-*, there exist two other reciprocal pronouns with a similar structure (and probably built on its model), namely *itaretara-* and *paras-para-*. They are first attested at the end of the Vedic period and, consequently, should be qualified as essentially post-Vedic forms.

4.3.1 The reciprocal pronoun *itaretara-*

The form *itaretara-* is derived from the pronominal adjective *itara-* ‘(an)other’. It appears at the very end of the Vedic period and remains less common than *anyonya-*. Its inner structure is less clear than that of *anyonya-*. It might be based either on the bare stem (*itara-itara-*), or on the nom.sg.f. form (*itarā-itara-*). The only example of the first component in the masculine form (and one of the earliest attestations of this reciprocal pronoun) is found in a late Vedic text, Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka-Upaniṣad:

- (55) (ŚB 14.5.4.15 = BĀU 2.4.15)
yātra hí dvaitām iva bhāvati, tād itara
 where since duality:NOM.SG as become:PRES:3SG.ACT then other:NOM.SG.M
itaram paśyati
 other:ACC.SG.M look:PRES:3SG.ACT
 ‘For where there is a duality, there one sees another ...’

4.3.2 The reciprocal pronoun *paras-para-*

Like *itaretara-*, the pronoun *paras-para-* is a post-Vedic form (one of its earliest occurrences being found in the Śrauta-Sūtras, VaikhŚS 8.7:84.12). It represents the iteration of the pronominal adjective *para-* ‘far, other, different, alien, foreign’. Cf. (56):

- (56) (KA 1.13.18)
paras-parād vā bhedayed enān
 other:NOM.SG.M-other:ABL.SG.M or split:PRES.CAUS:3SG.OPT.ACT they:ACC.PL.M
 ‘Or, he should divide them from each other ...’

As in the case of *anyonyam*, the accusative form *paras-param* can be used adverbially, as in (57):

- (57) (MBh. 1.194.6)
paras-pareṇa *bhedaś ca na ādhātum teṣu*
 other:NOM.SG.M-other:INST.SG.M split:NOM.SG and not establish:INF they:LOC.PL
śakyate ekasyāṃ ye ratāḥ patnyāṃ
 be.able:PASS:3SG one:LOC.SG.F who:NOM.PL.M being.in.love:NOM.PL.M wife:LOC.SG
na bhidyante paras-param
 not split:PRES:3PL.MED other:NOM.SG.M-other:ACC.SG.M
 ‘And they cannot be alienated from one another (lit. ‘for them, the split from one another cannot be established’). [Men] who are in love with the same wife are not split (mutually).’

Generally, no difference in meaning between reciprocals with *anyonya-* and *paraspara-* can be observed. Neither European nor Indian grammarians make a distinction between them.²² However, at least in one Classical Sanskrit text, Kauṭīliya’s “Arthaśāstra” [KA] (a treatise on governing the state, written between the 4th and 2nd centuries BC), *anyonya-* and *paraspara-* seem to be semantically distinguished. *paraspara-* is used in contexts dealing with reciprocal hostile activities, while *anyonya-* is employed in other contexts, dealing with friendly or neutral activities. Cf. a few contexts and compounds which clearly demonstrate this semantic opposition:

anyonya-:

- na ... anyonyam ... vidyuh* (KA 1.12.12) ‘they should not know each other’
vāsāyeyuh ... anyonyam (KA 2.36.6) ‘they should lodge each other’ (lit. ‘make live, stay’)
adoṣas tyaktum anyonyam (KA 3.14.38) ‘[in these cases] there is no harm in abandoning each other’
anyonyārakṣa- (KA 2.1.2) ‘mutual protection’

paraspara-:

- parasparam abādhamānā vāseyuḥ* (KA 3.16.33) ‘may they live without troubling each other’
parasparam ... tyajataḥ (KA 3.20.18) ‘abandoning each other’
parasparād ... bhedayet (KA 1.13.18) ‘he should divide them from each other’ (see (56))
parasparasyāveśānikān (KA 5.1.47) ‘guests of each other’ (said of secret agents, spies)
parasparadveṣa- (KA 9.6.26) ‘mutual hatred’
parasparahimsā- (KA 3.9.28) ‘mutual damage’
parasparam ... vikramayet (KA 5.6.25) ‘(he) should make (them) fight against each other’; cf. (58):

- (58) (KA 5.6.25)
amātyaḥ kulya-kumāra-mukhyān
 minister:NOM.SG royal.family-prince-principal.officer:ACC.PL
paras-param mukhyeṣu vā
 other:NOM.SG.M-other:ACC.SG.M principal.officer:LOC.PL or
vikramayet
 fight:PRES.CAUS:3SG.OPT.ACT

22. According to Richter (1898: 49), *parasparam* is mostly used with two reciprocants. Textual evidence does not support his assumption, however.

‘The minister should make the members of the royal family, princes and principal officers fight against each other or against (other) principal officers.’

I have not come across this opposition elsewhere, although it cannot be ruled out that some other texts make a similar distinction. It may be an invention of Kauṭīliya, the author of the text, probably based on the above-mentioned semantic difference between *anya-* ‘(an)other’ and *para-* ‘other, foreign, alien’.

5. Nominal derivatives and compounds with the reciprocal meaning

All reciprocal markers discussed in Sections 3–4, including both the preverbs/prefixes *vi* and *sám* and free forms (the adverb *mithás* and the polyptotic reciprocal pronouns *anyonya-*, *itaretara-* and *paraspara-*), can be employed to form nominal derivatives with a reciprocal meaning.

Reciprocal nouns with the prefixes *vi-* and *sám-* and compounds with the first element *mithás-* are attested from early Vedic onwards; cf. the two nouns derived from the verb *dviṣ* ‘hate’: action nominals in *-ana-* *vi-dvéšana-* (RV 8.1.2) and in *-as-* *vi-dveṣas-* (RV 8.22.2), both meaning ‘(mutual) hate, hostility’; and the root noun *vi-vāc-* ‘(verbal) contest, competition’ derived from the verbal root *vac* ‘speak’.²³

Compounds with *mithás-* as the first element are derived from the following verbal roots and nominal stems:

<i>tṛ</i> (<i>tūr</i>) ‘surpass’	– <i>mithas-túr-</i> (e.g. in RV 6.49.3 <i>mithas-tūrā</i> ‘(day and night), surpassing each other’)
<i>pā</i> ‘protect’	– <i>mithó-avadya-pa-</i> (in RV 10.67.8 <i>mithó-avadya-pebhiḥ</i>) ‘those who protect each other from blame’
<i>yudh</i> ‘fight’	– <i>mitho-yodhá-</i> (AV 12.5.24) ‘battle, fight’.

Compounds with *anyonya-* become productive in the post-Vedic period. These include, for instance:

<i>yoga-</i> ‘union’	– <i>anyonya-yoga</i> (ManuSmṛ. 3.32) ‘mutual union (of a girl and her lover)’
<i>śreṣṭhya-</i> ‘superiority’	– <i>anyonya-śreṣṭhyāya</i> (KpS 38.2:206.1) ²⁴ ‘for superiority to each other’
<i>sakta-</i> ‘connected’	– <i>anyonya-sakta-</i> (Prašna-Upaniṣad 5.6) ‘connected with each other’
<i>anna-bhojana-</i> ‘food-eating’	– <i>anyonyānna-bhojana-</i> (= <i>anyonya-anna-</i>) (Āgñiveśya-Gṛhya-Sūtra 3.10.3:4) ‘eating each other’s food’
<i>tyāgin-</i> ‘abandoning’	– <i>anyonya-tyāgin-</i> (YājñSmṛ. 2.237) ‘abandoning each other’.

23. See Kuiper (1960: 268–273).

24. This is the earliest and the only Vedic example of a compound built with *anyonya-* (see Debrunner 1957: 89); the parallel passages of the other Saṃhitās of the Yajurveda (MS, KS, TS) have reciprocal constructions with the reciprocal pronoun used as a free form in the genitive (*anyònyásya* in KS 24.9:100.3 and MS 3.7.10:90.1), or the dative (*anyònyásmai* in TS 6.2.2.1).

Examples of compounds made with the two other reciprocal pronouns, *itaretara-* and *paraspara-*, also first appear in post-Vedic texts:

- (i) *itaretara-*
yājaka- ‘sacrificer’ – *itaretara-yājaka-* (ĀpDhS 1.29.8) ‘officiating at each other’s sacrifices’
adhyāpaka- ‘teacher’ – *itaretarādhyāpaka-* (ĀpDhS 1.29.8) ‘teaching each other’
janman- ‘birth, origin’ – *itaretara-janman-* (Vārtt. on Pāṇ.) ‘originating from each other’
āśraya- ‘attachment’ – *itaretarāśraya-* (Vārtt. on Pāṇ.) ‘attachment to each other’.
- (ii) *paraspara-*
vyapekṣā- ‘relation’ – *paraspara-vyapekṣā-* (Vārtt. on Pāṇ. 2.1.1) ‘mutual relation’ (gramm. term)
adin- ‘consuming, eating’ – *parasparādin-* (= *paras-para-adin-*) (ManuSmṛ. 12.59) ‘consuming, eating one another’
jighāmsu- ‘desiring to kill’ (nominal derivative of the desiderative of the verb *han* ‘kill’) – *paraspara-jighāmsavaḥ* (Atharvaveda-Pariśiṣṭa 61.1.23) ‘desiring to kill each other’.

From the early Vedic period onwards, spatial reciprocals (and sociatives) can also be easily derived from nominal stems by means of the prefixes *sam-* (mostly in action nominals), *sa-*, which represents the zero grade allomorph of *sam-* (in adjectives), and *vi-*. The prefixes can be added to various nominal stems. Many of these formations show different degrees of lexicalization. Note the following examples, mostly from early Vedic (RV):

<i>sad</i> ‘sit’	<i>sam-sād-</i> ‘sitting together, assembly’
<i>dhā</i> ‘put’	<i>sam-dhā-</i> ‘union, agreement’
	<i>sam-dhi-</i> ‘junction, connection, combination, sandhi’
	<i>vi-dhā-</i> ‘division, part’
<i>dṛś-</i> ‘view, look’	<i>sa-dṛś-</i> ‘looking alike, of the same form’
<i>yuj</i> ‘yoke, join’	<i>sam-yúj-</i> ‘joining together’
	<i>sa-yúj-</i> ‘yoked together; companion’ (cf. (59))
	<i>vi-yoga-</i> (post-Vedic) ‘disjunction’
<i>ókas-</i> ‘abode’	<i>sám-okas-</i> ‘having same abode’ (cf. (35))
<i>rátha-</i> ‘chariot’	<i>sa-rátha-</i> ‘on the same chariot’ (cf. (59)).

Like their verbal counterparts, reciprocal/sociative nouns with *sam-* and *sa-* are commonly constructed with the instrumental of the second reciprocant, as in (59):

- (59) (RV 10.168.2)
tábhiḥ *sa-yúk* *sa-rátham* *devá*
 that:INST.PL.F SOC-join:NOM.SG.M SOC-chariot:ACC.SG.M god:NOM.SG
ṛyate
 drive:PRES:3SG.MED
 ‘United with those [young women], the god drives on the same chariot (with them).’

Acknowledgments

I am deeply grateful to Vladimir Nedjalkov and Emma Geniušienė for their patience, remarks, criticism and comments on earlier versions of this paper. I am much indebted to Robert Ryan and Carlotta Viti for valuable comments on my paper. I acknowledge grant 275-70-009 (VENI-project) received from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO), and financial support from the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung.

Sources

ĀpDhS	Āpastamba-Dharma-Sūtra	Pāṇ.	Pāṇini (Aṣṭādhyāyī)
ĀpŚS	Āpastamba-Śrauta-Sūtra	PB	Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa
AV(Ś)	Atharvaveda (Śaunakīya recension)	Rām. RV	Rāmāyaṇa Ṛgveda
AVP	AV, Paippalāda recension	ŚĀ	Śāṅkhāyana-Āraṇyaka
BĀU(K)	Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka-Upaniṣad (Kāṇva recension)	ŚBK	Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, Kāṇva recension
HirŚS	Hiraṇyakeśi-Śrauta-Sūtra	ŚB(M)	Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (Mādhyandina recension)
JB	Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa		
KA	Kauṭīliya's Arthaśāstra	TB	Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa
KauṣU	Kauṣītaki-Upaniṣad	TS	Taittirīya-Saṃhitā
KB	Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa	VaikhŚS	Vaikhānasa-Śrauta-Sūtra
KpS	Kapiṣṭhala-Kaṭha-Saṃhitā	VārŚS	Vārāha-Śrauta-Sūtra
KS	Kāṭhaka(-Saṃhitā)	Vārtt. on Pāṇ.	Vārttika (commentary) on Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī
MaitrU	Maitrāyaṇa-Upaniṣad		
ManuSmṛ.	Manu-Smṛti	YājñSmṛ.	Yājñavalkya-Smṛti
MBh.	Mahā-Bhārata	YV	Yajurveda(-Saṃhitā)
MS	Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā		

^P after the abbreviation of a Vedic text (e.g. YV^P) indicates that the passage in question occurs in the prose portion of this text.

References

- Böhrtlingk, Otto & Roth, Rudolf. 1855–75. [PW] *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Debrunner, Albert. 1957. *Nachträge zu* [Wackernagel 1896] *Bd. I*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1888. *Altindische Syntax*. Halle a.S.: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Elizarenkova, Tat'jana Ja. 1982. *Grammatika vedijskogo jazyka* [A Grammar of Vedic]. Moskva: Nauka.
- Elizarenkova, Tat'jana Ja. 1989–1999. *Rigveda. Mandaly I–IV* (1989); *Mandaly V–VIII* (1995); *Mandaly IX–X* (1999). *Perevod i komentarii* T.Ja. Elizarenkovej [Ṛgveda. Maṇḍalas I–IV; Maṇḍalas V–VIII; Maṇḍalas IX–X. Translation and commentaries by T.Ja. Elizarenkova]. Moskva: Nauka.

- Elizarenkova, Tat'jana Ja. 2001. "Contribution to the Functioning of *dvar-/dur-* in the Rgveda." In: Klaus Karttunen & Petteri Koskikallio (eds). *Vidyarnavavandanam. Essays in Honour of Asko Parpola*. Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 119–30.
- Falk, Harry. 1986. *Bruderschaft und Würfelspiel. Untersuchungen zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des vedischen Opfers*. Freiburg: Falk.
- Geldner, Karl Friedrich. 1889. "Purúravas und Urvaçî." In: Richard Pischel & Karl F. Geldner. *Vedische Studien*. Bd. I. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 243–95.
- Geldner, Karl Friedrich. 1951. *Der Rig-Veda aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt...* Bd. 1–3. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gotō, Toshifumi. 1987. *Die "I. Präsensklasse" im Vedischen: Untersuchung der vollstufigen thematischen Wurzelpräsentia*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Gotō, Toshifumi. 1989. "R̥gvedisch *vipanyá-*, *vipanyú* und *vipanyámahe*." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 32/4: 281–84.
- Gotō, Toshifumi. 1993. "Materialien zu einer Liste altindischer Verbalformen: 8. *ard/rd*, 9. *īṣ*, 10. *ukṣ*, 11. *eṣ/īṣ*, 12. *eṣi/īṣi*, 13. *ok/oc/uc*, 14. *kaṇ*, 15. *vakṣ/ukṣ*." *Bulletin of the National Museum of Ethnology (Osaka)* 18/1: 119–141.
- Gotō, Toshifumi. 1996. *Verbesserungen und Nachträge zu: Die "I. Präsensklasse" im Vedischen*. 2. Aufl. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Grassmann, Hermann. 1873. *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Haudry, Jean. 1977. *L'emploi des cas en védique. Introduction à l'étude des cas en indo-européen*. Lyon: Édition l'Hermès. (Collection "Les hommes et les lettres", 5).
- Hoffmann, Karl. 1976. "Die Aoristbildungen von ved. *vṛt*." In: K. Hoffmann. *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*. Bd. 2. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 562–569.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. 1983. *Function and form in the -áya-formations of the Rig Veda and Atharva Veda*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (KZ; Ergänzungsheft 31).
- Jamison, Stephanie W. 1997. "Vedic *anyá-* 'another, the other': syntactic disambiguation." In: A. Lubotsky (ed.). *Sound law and analogy. Papers in honor of Robert S.P. Beekes on the occasion of his 60th birthday*. (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 9). Amsterdam: Rodopi, 111–18.
- Joachim, Ulrike. 1978. *Mehrfachpräsentien im R̥gveda*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
- Krisch, Thomas. 1999. "Zur Reziprozität in altindogermanischen Sprachen." In: H. Eichner et al. (eds). *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*. Praha: Enigma corporation, 275–297.
- Kuiper, Franciscus B.J. 1960. "The ancient Aryan verbal contest." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 4: 217–281.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2001. *The Vedic -ya-presents*. PhD thesis. Leiden University.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2002. "Tipologičeskie zametki o morfoložičeskom reciproke v vedijskom sanskrite" [Typological remarks on reciprocal verbs in Vedic Sanskrit]. In: V.A. Plungian & A.Ju. Urmanchieva (eds). *Jazyki mira. Tipologija. Uralistika. Pamjati T. Zhdanovoj. Stat' i i vospominanija*. Moskva: Indrik, 276–99.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2003. "The labile syntactic type in a diachronic perspective: The case of Vedic." *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 16: 93–112.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2006. "Passive and middle in Indo-European: Reconstructing the early Vedic passive paradigm." In: W. Abraham & L. Leisiö (eds). *Passivization and typology: form and function*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 62–81.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2007. "The reflexive pronouns in Vedic: A diachronic and typological perspective." *Lingua* 117/8: 1412–1433.
- Lubotsky, Alexander M. 1994. "RV. *ávidhat*." In: George Dunkel et al. (eds). *Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch. Akten der IX. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 5. bis 9. Oktober 1992 in Zürich*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 201–206.
- Macdonell, Arthur Anthony. 1910. *Vedic grammar*. Strassburg: Trübner.

- Macdonell, Arthur Anthony. 1916. *A Vedic grammar for students*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1986–96. [EWAia] *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Bd. I–II. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Oertel, Hanns. 1934. *Zur Kapiṣṭhala-Kaṭha-Saṃhitā*. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. [= H. Oertel. *Kleine Schriften* I. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1994, 633–772].
- Pott, August F. 1859. *Etymologische Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der Indo-Germanischen Sprachen. Präpositionen*. Detmold: Meyer.
- Rau, Wilhelm. 1957. *Staat und Gesellschaft im alten Indien nach den Brāhmaṇa-Texten dargestellt*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Renou, Louis. 1930. *Grammaire sanscrite*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve. (2^{me} éd. revue, corrigée et augmentée: 1960).
- Renou, Louis. 1955–69. [EVP] *Études védiques et pāṇiniennes*. Vols. 1–17. Paris: Boccard.
- Richter, Oswald. 1898. “Die unechten Nominalkomposita des Altindischen und Altiranischen.” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 9: 1–62.
- Schroeder, Leopold von. 1883–84. “Besprechung von: ĀpŚŚ, ed. Garbe.” *Literatur-Blatt für orientalische Philologie* 1: 2–11.
- Wackernagel, Jacob / Debrunner, Albert. 1896–1957. *Altindische Grammatik*. (1896: J. Wackernagel. Bd. I. *Lautlehre*; 1905: J. Wackernagel. Bd. II/1. *Einleitung zur Wortlehre. Nominalkomposition*; 1930: J. Wackernagel. Bd. III. *Nominalflexion – Zahlwort – Pronomen*; 1954: A. Debrunner. Bd. II/2. *Die Nominalsuffixe*; 1957: A. Debrunner. *Nachträge zu Bd. I.*) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Weber-Brosamer, Bernhard. 1988. *Annam: Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung des Essens und der Speise im vedischen Ritual*. Rheinfelden: Schäuble.
- Whitney, William Dwight. 1889. *Sanskrit grammar*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Whitney, William Dwight & Lanman, Charles Rockwell. 1905. *Atharva-Veda Saṃhitā*. Translated into English with critical notes and exegetical commentary by William Dwight Whitney ... Revised and edited by Charles Rockwell Lanman. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Witzel, Michael. 1995. “Early Indian history: linguistic and textual parameters.” In: G. Erdosy (ed.). *The Indo-Aryans of ancient South Asia: Language, material culture and ethnicity*. Berlin / New York: de Gruyter, 85–125.
- Zaliznjak, Andrej A. 1976. “Grammaticheskij ocherk sanskrita” [A grammatical sketch of Sanskrit]. In: V.A. Kochergina. *Sanskritsko-russkij slovar’* (2nd ed., 1987). Moskva: Russkij jazyk, 785–895.