Grammaticalization of a reciprocal pronoun in a diachronic typological perspective: Evidence from Vedic and Indo-European

Kulikov, L.I.; Härmä, J.; Havu, E.; Helkkula, M.; Larjavaara, M.; Lehtinen, M.; Tuomarla, U.

SILF 2005

Härmä, J. - Havu, E. - Helkkula, M. - Larjavaara, M. - Lehtinen, M. - Tuomarla, U. (éds.)

Actes du XXIXème Colloque International de Linguistique Fonctionnelle, Helsinki 2005

Actes du XXIXème Colloque International

de Linguistique Fonctionnelle, Helsinki 2005

édités par Juhani Härmä, Eva Havu, Mervi Helkkula, Meri Larjavaara,
Mari Lehtinen et Ulla Tuomarla

GRAMMATICALIZATION OF A RECIPROCAL PRONOUN IN A DIACHRONIC TYPOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE: EVIDENCE FROM VEDIC AND INDO-EUROPEAN

Leonid KULIKOV
Leiden University

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.[1] The Vedic reciprocal pronoun (RP) *anyó ... anyá-* (*anyonya-*)[2] 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 *ví-* and middle inflexion and reciprocal constructions with the adverb *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 R̥gveda).

In the earliest documented period, that is, in the most ancient Vedic text, R̥gveda (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.:

---

[1] Vedic Sanskrit is one of the most ancient attested Indo-European languages. The oldest layer of Vedic (early Vedic) is attested in the language of the R̥gveda (RV), which can approximately be dated to the 2nd 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, books I and X). 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, attested in the Vedic prose (Brāhmaṇas, Āraṇyakas, oldest Upaniṣads, and Sūtras). The post-Vedic period encompasses younger Upaniṣads and Sūtras, as well as Epic and Classical Sanskrit.

[2] *anyonya-* results from the sandhi *-as + a- → -o- (-o'-)*: *anyás + anyá- → anyònyá- (anyò'nyá-)*.

(1)   (RV 10.97.14)
anyā́   *vo*   **anyā́m**   *avatu⌣* ³
other:NOM.SG.F   you:GEN.PL   other:ACC.SG.F   help:PRES:3SG.IMPV.ACT

anyā́⌣   *anyásyā*   *úpāvata*
other:NOM.SG.F   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 *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 Ṛgveda, Atharvaveda).

At the end of the early Vedic period, that is, in the late Ṛgveda 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)
anyó   *ᵃnyám*   *abhí haryata*
other:NOM.SG.M   other:ACC.SG.M   love:PRES:2PL.IMPV.ACT

vatsáṃ   *jātám*   *iva⌣ aghnₐyā́*
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 *anyó ... anyá-* appear in the plural:

(5)   (AV-Paippalāda 5.10.7)
hatāso   **anye**   *yodhayantₐy*
hit:PART.PF.PASS:NOM.PL.M   other:NOM.PL.M   fight:CAUS:3PL.ACT

⁺**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 *anyò'nyá-* (see Wackernagel, 1905 : 322f.):

1) *Inseparability*

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

2) *Accentuation*

In most accentuated texts (Taittirīya-Saṃhitā, Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, and Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, for example), both parts of the RP bear accents (*anyò-ᵃnyá-*; 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)
          té   **anyò-nyasmai**   *ná⌣   atiṣṭhanta*
          that: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 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) *anyá-*[M/N/F]-*anyá-*[M/N/F], or (ii) *anyó*[M]-*anyá-*[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 *prajā*[ḥ] 'creatures' triggers the feminine gender on both RM1 (*anyā*) and RM2 (*anyām*):

(7)   (JB 1.117:1-2)
          prajāpatiḥ   *prajā*   *asṛjata.* [...]   *tā*
          Prajāpati:NOM.SG   creature:ACC.PL   create:IMPF:3SG.MED   that:NOM.PL.F

          aśanāyantīr   **anyā-nyām**   *ādan*
          being.hungry:NOM.PL.F   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 RP (*anyo-*) 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 (*anyo-*, not **anyā-*). In (9) the masculine (*anyo-*) is used instead of the neuter form **anyad-* (which might be triggered by the neuter substantive *chándas-* '(poetic) metre') according to the same pattern:

(8) (Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa 24.11.2)
prajāpatiḥ prajā *asṛjata.* *tā*
P.:NOM.SG creature:ACC.PL create:IMPF:3SG.MED that:NOM.PL.F

a-vidhṛtā *a-sañjānānā*
not-kept.apart:NOM.PL.F not-agree:PART.PRES.MED:NOM.PL.F

anyo-nyām *ādan*
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.'

(9) (Taittirīya-Saṃhitā 7.2.8.6)
chándāṁsy ***anyò-'nyásya***
metre:NOM.PL other:NOM.SG.M-other:GEN.SG.M/N

(*anyád-anyásya) *lokám* *abhy àdhyāyan*
(other:NOM.SG.N-other:GEN.SG.M/N) place:ACC.SG be.eager:IMPF:3PL.ACT
'The (poetic) metres were eager for each other's place.'

4. Further grammaticalization of *anyo'nya-* in late Vedic and post-Vedic Sanskrit.

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-nyam *(*anyānyām = anyā-anyām)*
other:NOM.SG.M-other:ACC.SG.M other:NOM.SG.F-other:ACC.SG.F

abhivīkṣante ... *ārtatarāḥ* *striyaḥ*
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 *gharmáu* 'gharma-oblations':

(11) (Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa 11.6.2.2)
gharmā́v *...* ***anyò-'nyásmin***
gharma:ACC.DU other:NOM.SG.M-other:LOC.SG.M

>   (*anyám-anyásmin)   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 *saṃ-bhāṣ* 'converse (with smb.)':

(12)   (Rāmāyaṇa 6.11.8)
>   teṣāṃ   saṃbhāṣa-māṇānām
>   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-śreṣṭhyāya* (Kapiṣṭhala-Kaṭha-Saṃhitā 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 *anyònyá-* (i.e. representing the iteration of the indefinite pronoun meaning '(an)other') are also attested in several other Indo-European languages, cf. Avestan *ańiiō ainīm*, Greek ἀλλήλων, Latin *alius alium* (see Krisch, 1999), Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian *drugъ druga*. 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 onother's** *clothes*; see Sheen, 1988; Raumolin-Brunberg, 1997) or Slavic *drugъ druga* '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 Saṃhitās of the Yajurveda have reciprocal constructions with the reciprocal pronoun used as a free form in the genetive (*anyònyásya* in Kāṭhaka 24.9:100.3 and Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā 3.7.10:90.1), or dative (*anyònyásmai* in Taittirīya-Saṃhitā 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 ... aliā̆m* (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.

References

DEBRUNNER, A. (1957), *Nachträge zu* WACKERNAGEL 1905, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

HEINE, B. & KUTEVA, T. (2002), *World lexicon of grammaticalization*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

KRISCH, TH. (1999), Zur Reziprozität in altindogermanischen Sprachen, in Eichner, H. et al. (eds), *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*, Praha, Enigma corporation, 275-297.

KULIKOV, L. (2002), Tipologičeskie zametki o morfologičeskom reciproke v vedijskom sanskrite [Typological remarks on reciprocal verbs in Vedic Sanskrit], in Plungian, V., Urmančieva, A. (eds), *Jazyki mira. Tipologija. Uralistika. Pamjati T. Ždanovoj* [*Languages of the world. Typology. Uralic studies. Memorial volume for T. Ždanova*], Moscow, Indrik, 276-299.

RAUMOLIN-BRUNBERG, H. (1997), Reciprocal pronouns: from discontinuity to unity, *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 31, 227-236.

SHEEN, D.T. (1988), *The historical development of reciprocal pronouns in Middle English with selected early Modern English comparisons*. Diss. Ball State University, Muncie, Ind.

WACKERNAGEL, J. (1905), *Altindische Grammatik*. Bd. II, 1. *Einleitung zur Wortlehre. Nominalkomposition*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.