KonDoc-Bestellschein   KOPIE

Bestellart: **Lieferweg: EMAIL**

-                                Eingang: 09.01.2015 -   Lieferung bis: **14.01.2015**
                                 12:59   **- 12:59**

Interne-BestNr.: KonDoc:2015010990272

Kundennummer: K000011867   Bestellnummer:
                                E000195067   Benutzernr.: **03/037078**

E-Mail:
Frans.Plank-konstanz.de

Prof.Dr. Franz Plank

FB Sprachw/AG Plank

78464 Konstanz   **de**

Signatur: **spr 15.95:r34/k62**

Titel: Reciprocals and reflexives : theoretical and typological
                   explorations

Jahrgang/Heft::

Erscheinungsjahr: 2008

Seiten: 347-374

Autor: Plank, Frans

Artikel: Thoughts on the origin, progress and pronominal status of
                   reciprocal forms in Germanic

Weitere Angaben:

Bemerkung zum Dokument:

Thoughts on the origin, progress, and pronominal status of reciprocal forms in Germanic, occasioned by those of Bavarian

Frans Plank

Abstract

Grammaticalised reciprocal markers in Germanic derive from combinations of a quantifier and the alterity word 'other', elaborating on a minimalist strategy of identical NP repetition suggesting rather than expressing reciprocity ('earl[s] hated earl[s]'). Subserved by quantifier floating, they develop from free to tighter syntactic combinations and eventually into morphological units, tending towards complete inflectional deactivation. Sooner or later in all Germanic languages, the quantifier part of the reciprocal gets inside prepositional phrases ('earls fought each/one with other' > 'earls fought with each/one other'). German continues this fusional theme by combining the reciprocal with prepositions in compounds; and in Bavarian it eventually gets reduced further to a bound stem limited to (partly lexicalised) combinations with a preposition, thus being barred from the direct object relation, unlike the reflexive. In tracing this overall diachronic scenario, the question is raised of the pronominality (or pro-NP-hood) of reciprocals in Germanic. It is argued that, regardless of their nominal and referential source, reciprocals here strongly incline towards becoming adverbs of attenuated, situational rather than personal reference, highlighting the relational (role reversal) rather than the (co-)referential component of reciprocity, as is common also elsewhere.

1. Where to expect pronouns

Reciprocals in Germanic languages, such as *each other/one another* in English, *einander* in German, *hvor/hver (...) annan* in Icelandic, or *anþar (...) anþar* in Gothic, are typically treated on a par with reflexives, themselves not always formally distinguished from personal pronouns. After all, reflexives often permit

reciprocal interpretations.[1] Nonetheless, there are certain subtle differences in the way they are controlled or bound which suggest that reciprocals in Germanic cannot be subsumed under exactly the same pronominal category as reflexives, sometimes summarily called "anaphors".[2] In at least one contemporary variety of Germanic, Bavarian, they also differ morphologically and syntactically, and that difference seems rather drastic: reciprocals are effectively bound up with prepositions and are thus barred from a syntactic relation which is everywhere the first to accommodate reflexives – that of direct object.

One general constraint on pro-NPs,[3] especially those that can be characterised as definite (which naturally includes reflexives), is to do with their relational range: the occurrence of pronouns in oblique or adverbial relations implies that they can also occur in the non-oblique relations of direct and indirect object, which in turn implies that they can also occur as subject – but that latter relation is typically off limits for both reflexives and reciprocals, which need a subject to bind them. Owing to the referential semantics and discourse pragmatics of these syntactic relations, it is as subject and as direct and indirect object that those referentially dependent (= pro) forms whose referential range typically includes the ontological categories of persons and other animates and perhaps also

---

1. Until the 16th and 17th century, when *-self* forms were becoming the rule as reflexives, they were also commonly found in reciprocal function in English – as in *Get thee gone: tomorrow we'll hear ourselves again*, one of the many instances in Shakespeare. Once firmly entrenched, new and purpose-built reflexives are perhaps inclined for a while to remain dedicated to just that single function.

2. See Lebeaux (1983) and Everaert (2000), among others. For instance, they do not need to be bound by a surface subject in languages such as Dutch. In German, however, this property, which is rather uncharacteristic of anaphors, is shared by reciprocals and by reflexives (see Plank 1993 on passives of reflexives):

   Wurde einander/sich gewaschen?
   'Was   RECP/REFL   washed?'

   For such purposes Everaert assumes a special "pseudo-reciprocal" reading (and analogously there would have to be a "pseudo-reflexive" as well), which he characterises as "pronominal" rather than "anaphoric". There does not seem to be anything pseudo about such readings, though: reciprocals (and reflexives) in such passives mean what they always mean – and that meaning may not be pro-ish at all, but comparable to meanings expressed in examples like this, as will be argued presently:

   Wurde hin und her gelaufen?
   'Was hither and thither run?'

3. For simplicity the term "pronoun" will be retained here for pro forms which stand for entire noun phrases rather than for nouns on their own; and self-evidently, "pro" is not to be understood in the narrow technical sense of a particular kind of an empty NP.

things (as opposed to, say, places, times, manners, reasons, purposes, qualities, kinds, degrees, quantities, numbers, rank orders, properties, events, processes, or states) and whose pragmatic force is "gnarative" (rather than "ignorative", as in the case of indefinites and interrogatives) should feel most at home. Referring to persons and things is the sort of business noun phrases specialise in; and the meaning of relevant predicates is such that their argument positions are likeliest to be filled by phrases of that type. Also, it is the core arguments of predicates where definiteness is crucially to be negotiated: sentences are typically constructed so that thematically salient, topical, hence typically definite NPs form their subjects and indirect objects, and direct object is the relation where the opposition between definite and indefinite is at full force.

It would therefore be rather odd if pronouns which refer to speaker, addressee(s), and persons and things under discussion, and which take the identifiability of their referents on the part of the addressee for granted (lacking though they are in the sort of descriptive detail that would typically be provided by nouns and their modifiers, as well as in the rigidly designating force associated with proper names) – i.e., deictic as well as phoric "personal" pronouns and those relatives of theirs that are controlled or bound in the manner of reflexives – were confined to oblique or adverbial relations. But this is what reciprocals are in Bavarian.

2.   Obliquely reciprocal in Bavarian

In the Upper German dialect of Bavarian, as on occasion spoken by myself and more regularly by others, personal pronouns (PRON) can generally be used in reflexive function, but in 3rd person there is also the special reflexive form *se* (REFL, Standard German *sich*). The reciprocal (RECP), in its basic form, is *ànand(à)* ([ɐ.ˈnɑn.d(ɐ)]) – and it is not as similar to its Standard German equivalent as it might seem.

Like its equivalent *einander* in Standard German, it is related to (i) the numeral 'one' (*oàn-*), also serving as indefinite pronoun and (in the same reduced form as in the reciprocal, *àn-*) indefinite article and as identity word ('same'), and (ii) the alterity word (*ander-* 'other'). Like in Standard German, its bipartiteness is not fully transparent, though, insofar as the first syllable boundary (*à.nand(à)*) does not coincide with the original morpheme boundary (*àn-and(à)*), with the final consonant of the first morphemic part resyllabified as the onset of the second. Unlike in Standard German, the syllabic segmentation is confirmed by what seems a relic of earlier case inflection and also by a shortened form of the reciprocal's first part: in combination with most prepositions, *ànand(à)* alter-

nates with *àrànand(à)*, where *àrà-* looks like the dative singular feminine form of unstressed *à(n)* in its indefinite article use (Standard German *ein-e*, DAT.SG *ein-er*); in combination with some prepositions, *ànand(à)* has a shorter alternant *nand(à)* (e.g., *bei-nand*, *mid-nand*). In view of the close association of the reciprocal with prepositions (to be discussed presently), *àrà-* can perhaps be accounted for as a fossilised dative, since this case is governed by most prepositions; the question would remain unanswered, though, why the feminine form *àrà* should have been generalised at the expense of masculine/neuter *àm/àn*. The temporal preposition *um* 'at' has an alternant *umàrà* for giving approximate times (*um zwoà* 'at two o'clock sharp', *umàrà zwoà* 'at around two'); *-àrà* in this use presumably also derives from the indefinite article (a common source of approximatives), and it may have been an influence on the reciprocal too, where the *àrànand(à)* alternant is preferably used when semantic nuances are intended which are kindred to temporal-local approximation. At any rate, /n/ is present in all three alternants, *à.nand(à)*, *àrà.nand(à)*, and *nand(à)*, and is thus naturally associated with the second part of the reciprocal in accordance with its syllabification, as the metanalysed final segment of *àn-* (*ein-*).[4] Once again like in Standard German, differing from the independent adjectival alterity word, the reciprocal's second part is morphologically invariable; final *-à* vs. *-Ø* are free phonological variants, as is common also elsewhere in Bavarian.

The reflexive can appear as direct object (1a), indirect object (1b), or, accompanied by a preposition, as an oblique object or an adverbial (1c). The reciprocal can only appear as an oblique object or an adverbial (2b) and marginally as an indirect object (2b), but not as a direct object (2a); the corresponding meaning is either expressed by the reflexive forms (as in [1a/b], which are thus ambiguous) or paraphrastically, with the two components of the reciprocal form disassembled and coming in various number and definiteness variations [2a']).[5]

---

4. In *à.nand(à)* and *àrà.nand(à)*, /n/ could also be analysed as epenthetic to avoid hiatus. Though rather common in Bavarian, epenthetic /n/ is not really used with the dative singular feminine form *àrà* of the indefinite article. Also, epenthesis would not account for the short form *nand(à)* after prepositions with final consonant (*mid.nand(à)*). See Plank (2004) for a more serious effort to unravel the morphology of reciprocal and related forms in Bavarian.

5. As in German, definite articles inflect for number, gender, and case; but details not germane to the issue of reciprocity remain unanalyzed in glosses. Imperfect though it is in several phonological respects, the Bavarian orthography is essentially that used in Merkle (1975).

(1) a. REFLEXIVE: D.OBJ

D'Buàm(à) hàm se / eànà gwaschn.
the.boys   have REFL   PRON   washed
'The boys washed themselves/them.'

b. REFLEXIVE: I.OBJ

D'Buàm(à) hàm se / eànà d'Hend gwaschn.
the.boys   have REFL   PRON   the.hands washed
'The boys washed their hands.'

c. REFLEXIVE: OBL

D'Buàm(à) sàn mid se / eànà zfriedn gwen.
the.boys   are   with REFL   PRON   content been
'The boys were content with themselves/them.'

(2) a. *RECIPROCAL: D.OBJ

*D'Buàm(à) hàm ànand(à) gwaschn.
the.boys   have   RECP   washed

a'. *De   oànà   Buàm(à) hàm de   andàn   gwaschn.*
the.PL one.PL boy.PL   have the.PL other.PL washed

a''. *D'Buàm(à) hàm de   oàn   de   andàn   gwaschn.*
the.boys   have the.PL one.PL the.PL other.PL washed

a'''. *D'Buàm(à) hàm dà   oà   àn   andàn   gwaschn.*
the.boys   have the.SG one.SG the.SG other.SG washed

a''''. *D'Buàm(à) hàm oànà   àn   andàn   gwaschn.*
the.boys   have one.SG.INDEF the.SG other.SG washed
'The boys washed one another.'

b. RECIPROCAL: I.OBJ

D'Buàm(à) hàm ànand / se / eànà d'Hand gem.
the.boys   have RECP   REFL   PRON   the.hand given
'The boys shook hands.'

c. RECIPROCAL: OBL

D'Buàm(à) sàn bei-(à)nand(à) aufn Hof gstandn oder
the.boys   are   with-RECP   on.the yard stood   or
hàm mid-(à)nànd(à) gràffd.
have with-RECP   fought
'The boys stood with each other in the yard or fought with each other.'

The reciprocal as indirect object is marginal insofar as many speakers avoid it entirely and those who do use it do not use it in all circumstances, with a curious constraint barring it in particular from imperatives:[6]

(3)   *RECIPROCAL: I.OBJ

    Gebts   *eng*   /   **ànand* *d'Hand!*
    give.IMP PRON   RECP the.hand
    'Shake hands (with each other)!'

The reflexive does not like to remain overtly unexpressed (even with grooming verbs, well-known as universally most likely to license the omission of a reflexive marker; [4a]); the reciprocal does, with the right kind of verbs, denoting activities which are typically other-directed – though again only if an overt reciprocal would be in an oblique or adverbial relation (especially with the preposition *mid* 'with'; [4b]) rather than a direct object, in which latter case an overt reflexive does duty for the reciprocal barred from this relation (4a).

(4)   a.   *D'Buàm(à)* *håm* [*Ø] / *se*   / *eànà* *umarmd.*
      the.boys have Ø   REFL PRON embraced
      'The boys embraced (each other).'

    b.   *D'Buàm(à)* *håm* [Ø] *gràffd.*
      the.boys have Ø fought
      'The boys fought (with each other).'

The semantics (and pragmatics) of reciprocity has engendered a voluminous literature, and especially formal semanticists consider it a challenging task to sort out precisely who needs to have embraced whom, and to have been embraced by whom, for a sentence such as (4a) (suppose it is about a football team) to be asserted truthfully when a reciprocal reading is intended. Languages themselves do not seem to be overly bothered by such subtleties, and use their reciprocal forms (provided they have any, dedicated or otherwise) when a complex situation can be conceived of like this:[7] (i) a transitive (two-place) relation is instantiated at least twice (simultaneously or consecutively); (ii) in each instantiation the set

---

6. This observation is due to Walter Breu.

7. This is meant to tease apart the component parts of schoolbook definitions of reciprocity ("there are two participants, A and B, and the relation in which A stands to B is the same as that in which B stands to A", to arbitrarily quote Lichtenberk 1985: 21), and to take care of certain complications when more than two participants are involved reciprocally, including in so-called chaining relations and individually even less interactive situations.

of participants (possibly only one) in one role is different from those in the other role; (iii) either set of participants remains the same, or at least shows some overlap, for all instantiations; but (iv) the roles in which they are involved in the different instantiations of the relation are inverted. It is these four notional components – plurality of instantiations of a relation, individual non-reflexivity, set identity or overlap, and role reversal – that the overt coding of reciprocity can be inspired by, collectively or selectively, with some components perhaps emphasised over others. It is also possible, however, for reciprocity to get profiled less distinctively. For example, presenting a complex situation as one with non-reflexive interrelations among sets of referents, and overtly expressing it accordingly, can be considered sufficiently suggestive to convey an approximate idea of reciprocity.

No meaning of this sort, elaborate or merely suggestive, is expressed in Bavarian in the frequent occurrences of $(\grave{a}(r\grave{a}))nand(\grave{a})$ in combination with prepositions. In (5), some such uses are illustrated,[8] and it should be noted that the essential quantitative requirement for even rather indistinctive reciprocity, namely that at least two participants are involved, is easily flouted (5b–d), sometimes with some subtle sort of reflexivity implied (5b/c).[9]

(5) a. *D'Buàm(à) rennàn aufn Hof um-à(rà)nand(à).*
the.boys   run   on.the yard around-RECP

'The boys run aimlessly hither and thither in the yard.' (not '... the ones around the others')

b. *Dà Buà rennd / schded / schaud aufn Hof.*
the boy runs   stands   looks   on.the yard
um-à(rà)nand(à).
around-RECP

'The boy (SG!) runs/stands/looks hither and thither/around/about in the yard.'

c. *Dà Buà is guàd / ned rechd bei-(à)nand(à).*
the boy is well   not quite at-RECP

'The boy (SG!) is (not) in good order/state/shape'.

---

8. See Merkle (1975: 136–137) for more. The long *àrà-* forms seem particularly apt to emphasise the disorderliness of situations and especially of local relationships (Plank 2004).

9. In Standard German, *einander* can occur with the generic pronoun *man* and perhaps also certain collective nouns (such as *Mannschaft* 'team', *Paar* 'pair') as subject even though these are formally singular (witness verb agreement). Notionally, however, such subjects are plural, unlike those in (4b–d).

d. *Dà Buà is no ganz durch-à(rà)nand(à).*
the boy is still quite through-RECP
'The boy is still quite confused.'

Thus, although *(à(rà))nand(à)* is glossed as RECP, it evidently is not a dedicated reciprocal marker that would perform just this one function in Bavarian, subject to the relational constraint that the participant to be reciprocally related to the subject is not a direct object: in productive, though sometimes idiomatic combinations with prepositions, *(à(rà))nand(à)* can express a range of meanings which are not easily related to reciprocity, at least synchronically. The uniform glossing is inspired by the hope that, if one tried hard, they could nonetheless be proven to be derivative of each other – or, more likely, to be variations on a wider theme of which reciprocity itself is but one variation.[10]

Bavarian is not alone, especially in the south of the German-speaking area, in using *einander* in combination with appropriate prepositions for meanings such as those illustrated in (5). Standard German, one the other hand, often avoids it for such non-reciprocal meanings and employs more specialised forms here – such as directional deictics (*um-her* in [5a/b]) or adverbs from suitable semantic spheres (such as collective: *zu-sammen* 'together' in [5c]). Now, while Bavarian is categorical about banning reciprocals as direct object, confining them to oblique/adverbial relations and perhaps marginally admitting them as indirect objects, Standard German and those varieties which share the non-reciprocal semantics of *einander* are not particularly comfortable with what is outlawed or dispreferred in Bavarian, either. While perfectly happy with dedicatedly reciprocal *einander* in prepositional constructions, especially in its informal spoken form Standard German is very reluctant to actually use *einander* as direct and also indirect object (I can't remember having ever heard one) and resorts to the reflexive as an ersatz reciprocal in these relations.[11]

---

10. In grammaticalisation scenarios for reciprocals, these would sometimes be derived from expressions for meanings like those illustrated in (5) (e.g., dispersive) rather than the other way round. In Bavarian and elsewhere in Germanic some such meanings are clearly secondary, but, as will be argued presently, this is not to say that strict reciprocity was the original semantic source.

11. This limitation goes unnoticed in König and Vezzosi's (2004) detailed recent analysis of the syntax and (perhaps somewhat too strictly defined) semantics of reciprocity in Standard German. Owing to the rather limited exploitation of the relevant formal contrast, it is a somewhat academic question whether (spoken) German, in any of its varieties, is a "two-form reciprocal language" in the sense of Kemmer (1993: 109–119, building on Haiman 1983), where a "light" reciprocal (coinciding with the reflexive) expresses simultaneous instantiations of a relation (e.g., washing, embrac-

Where *einander* is prohibited everywhere, and the reflexive does duty for it (perhaps accompanied by an adjectival intensive element, to rule out non-reflexive/reciprocal readings), is in yet another relation where one would expect pro-NPs to be accommodable, that of attributives:

(6) a. *Die Buben zerrissen ihre (eigenen) / *einanders*
     the boys tore their (own) RECP's
     Schulhefte.
     exercise.books

   b. *Die Buben zerrissen die Schulhefte von einander.*
     the boys tore the exercise.books of RECP
     'The boys tore each other's exercise books.'

As seen from the translation, in English the reciprocal does occur as a genitive (not so the reflexive, though, for whatever reason).[12] In German, standard and regional and register varieties, it is again only in combination with a preposition that reciprocal *einander* can become an attributive (6b). As to the question of the word or phrase class of the reciprocal, it is worth noting that prepositions like *von* do not only take NPs as complements but also adverbs (e.g., *von oben/überall/weither/gestern* 'from above/everywhere/afar/yesterday'), including ones of a pronominal sort (*da-von* 'about [it]').

Given the diachronic background of reciprocals in Germanic, going the way as far as Bavarian does, or at any rate moving in that sort of direction, as German in general does, too, is perhaps not entirely unexpected, regardless of where other languages such as English seem to be headed. The question is whether the way

---

ing, fighting) in what is conceptualised as essentially one single event, and a "heavy" reciprocal (*einander*) is temporally indifferent, thus also allowing a consecutive, multiple-event reading. The question would rather be whether verbs in construction with direct objects, disfavouring "heavy" *einander*, force simultaneous-instantiation reciprocal readings, and verbs in construction with obliques or adverbials, favouring *einander*, are less resistant to consecutive-instantiation readings.

12. The other Germanic languages tend to side with English in this respect, including East-Germanic, long-dead Gothic (Wright 1954: 189–190):

unté sijum anþar anþaris liþus
for we.are other other's limb
'for we are members of one another'

Of course, prenominal genitives (other than those of proper names) are unusal in German anyhow; also, the genitival form of *ander* in the supposed source construction would be *ander-en* rather than *ander-s* (as observed by Florian Haas and Volker Gast).

that is being taken is a grammaticalisation path of pronouns (or "anaphors") –
a path that pronouns have come or are going.

3.   How reciprocals came to be bipartite in Germanic

Reciprocal markers, or at any rate those considered most dedicated and most
strongly grammaticalised, are generally bipartite in Germanic: their first con-
stituent is a quantifier (existential, dual, mid-scale, or universal: there is hardly
one missing in Germanic as a whole; [7a]) or the alterity word (7b), and their
second constituent is invariably the alterity word (to terminologically simplify
its identity/alterity dialectics).

(7)   a.   *one ... other* (or also: *the ones ... the others*), *both ... other,*
          either ... other, several ... other, few ... other, many ... other,
          each ... other, every ... other

      b.   *other... other*

This is not too different from what grammaticalised reciprocals commonly look
like also elsewhere in not-too-ancient Indo-European, and to a certain extent the
basic model would seem to have gotten around through borrowing, especially
from Latin *alius... alius, alter... alterum* etc. (or also Greek ἀλλήλους < ἄλλοι
... ἄλλους, presumably the direct inspiration behind 'other other' in Ulfila's
Gothic), rather than multiple independent inventions. But then, being formally
composite – consisting of two (often identical) affixes, words, phrases, or indeed
clauses – is a frequent design feature of reciprocal marking in general.[13]

Such reciprocals thus consist of words which existed, and continue(d) to ex-
ist, independently and with meanings of their own. These could be pressed into
service as reciprocal markers because, owing to their primary functions (quan-
tification, identity/alterity), they naturally lent themselves to efforts towards the
referential elaboration of NPs when reciprocity, with its four semantic com-
ponents as distinguished above, was felt to be in need of greater expressive
distinctiveness. In a nutshell, omitting nearly all descriptive detail and some
intra-Germanic difference, the developmental scenario is as follows.

Originally, there was nothing remotely like a dedicated reciprocal "pronoun"
in Germanic, nor anywhere else in earliest Indo-European. Indeed, no matter
how culturally salient, Germanic GRAMMAR hardly recognised the notion of

---

13. This is confirmed by Lichtenberk (1985, 1994), Kemmer (1993: 95–127), Frajzyn-
    gier and Curl (2000), and most comprehensively by Nedjalkov, Geniušienė and
    Guentchéva (2007), superseding Potter (1953).

reciprocity at all, however conceptually inelaborate. Capitalising on the common themes of role reversal, and set co-reference/overlap (and abstracting away from what was different: those involved in opposite roles individually being the same referents or different ones; a transitive [two-place] relation instantiated only once or more than once), reciprocity could be expressed like another kind of relationship, reflexivity, which already had its own, though not necessarily distinctive grammar, viz. personal pronouns, specialised reflexive pronouns, or originally special verbal inflections (the middle voice of Indo-European, essentially obsolete already in earliest Germanic). Otherwise reciprocity fell to the responsibility of the lexicon rather than of grammar.

It could be expressed, first, through verbs of inherently reciprocal meaning (i.e., symmetric predicates such as 'meet', 'wrestle', 'agree', with or without a reflexive marker).[14] Second, it could be implied through verbs of appropriate relational meaning used with non-singular subject and with no object specified ('they greeted [each other or someone else, depending on context]'). Third, notions more or less closely approximating that of reciprocity, in the four components of its elaborate conceptualisation, could be conveyed through adverbs or verbal particles (i) for collective action or cooperative or competitive interaction (such as 'together', 'in common', 'between', 'inter-'), without further relational or referential elaboration of the theme of role reversals, or (ii) for role reversal (such as 'mutually', 'reciprocally', 'by turns', 'alternately', 'vice versa'), often derivative of notions of change, exchange, or back-and-forth movement (thus, e.g. Latin *reciproc-us* 'returning, going backwards and forwards, as typically the ebbs and floods of the sea' < *re-co+pro-co-* 'back-wards+fore-wards';[15] *mūtuō* 'mutually', related to *mūtāre* 'move, shift, exchange'). If there was anything grammatically peculiar about such adverbs conveying reciprocal-like meanings, then it was that they could not only be used in addition to a pronominal object (8a), but also without one (8b).

(8)   a.   *They hated them*[*selves*] *together/mutually.*
      b.   *They hated together/mutually.*

Usually the relevant verbs would license object omission for reciprocal or reflexive readings even without a clarifying adverb; but on the face of it it could

---

14. The related theme of comitatives accompanying symmetric predicates, or predicates conceptualised as symmetric, to express reciprocal situations has been developed elsewhere (Plank 2005).

15. Which is rather reminiscent of the Mandarin way of expressing reciprocity through the deictic verbs 'to come' and 'to go' in combination (Liu 2000).

seem as if in (8b) the adverb was not used without, but instead of, a pronoun, performing a referential function as well as its inherent relational one.

The closest and most explicit rendering of the notion of reciprocity is through conjoined sentences of identical lexical content and parallel structure, only with the roles of the participants inverted, and perhaps with the corresponding NPs contrastively emphasised, with referential-relational identity or similarity underlined by an appropriate adverb, and with the full NPs replaced by anaphoric pronouns in the second conjunct:[16]

(9)   *The earl hated the queen, and the queen/the latter/she hated the earl/ the former/him (likewise).*

Along these lines, with coordinate constructions and anaphoric pronouns available anyhow, no special grammatical (or lexical) means are in fact required for this new purpose. When the referents in a reciprocal relationship are identically categorised, it would be advisable to make clear that the referents are nonetheless distinct; but for this, too, existing words for identity and alterity can conveniently be drawn on:

(10)   *The (one) earl hated the (other) earl, and the other/latter (earl) hated the one/former (earl).*

However, although recourse can always be had to such a conjoining strategy, and presumably always was, it is as cumbersome as it is explicit. Everything lexical in the second conjunct, both referential expressions (their descriptive content reduced through pronominalisation) as well as the designation of the relation between them through the verb, is redundant. Special expressive effort would only need to be expended on stating or implying that the relationship is duplicated, with the same referents but with their roles reversed. The grammar of reciprocity in Germanic, taking off from a state where there was none, can indeed be made sense of diachronically as attempts to negotiate some middle ground between the ever-pressing and forever-irreconcilable demands of clarity, exemplarily met by (9) and (10), and simplicity.

The most drastic simplification of whole-sentence repetition is to drop the second sentential conjunct entirely:

---

16. Though clearly covering reciprocity in general, including its weakest version (technically known as "inclusive alternative ordering": e.g., *The earls gave the measles to each other*), this rendering is especially apposite for consecutive-instantiation, separate-event readings ('and then') and with the "chaining" subtype of reciprocal situations – e.g., *The earls followed each other*: A followed B, B followed C, C followed D, etc. (Langendoen 1978, Lichtenberk 1985).

(11)   *Earl(s) hated earl(s).*

This minimalist strategy of identical NP repetition is attested at the oldest stages of all Germanic languages (and elsewhere, within Indo-European and outside),[17] and has everywhere remained an option until today. It was most effective before articles became obligatory in Germanic. With no such determiners around, singular and plural NPs could easily get generic or all-quantified readings – and these subsume reciprocal readings: for if all earls, or earls in general, hate all earls, then earl *A* will hate earls *B, C, D*, and the whole rest, and among those in turn hated by earl *B* will inevitably also be earl *A*, and so forth for all others in relation to each other. A reflexive reading is ruled out by the subject NP being repeated in full rather than being pronominalised. However, precluding the reading that has some earl(s) hate some other earl(s), without this feeling being reciprocated, would have to be left to the context. A more general drawback of the strategy of identical NP repetition is that it does not work when the participants in a reciprocal relation are differently categorised: from 'earl(s) hated queen(s)', it is asking for too much to infer that the same relation also obtained in reverse between the same referents (unless specially pointed this way by adverbs for collective action or role reversal).

The loss in expressive power and context-independence vis-à-vis the maximalist strategy could, however, be compensated by adding quantifiers and/or identity and alterity words to the NPs judiciously, so as to get across as much as possible of the force of the second sentential conjunct in (9) or (10).

Already in a variation of the minimalist strategy, instead of the subject NP being repeated in full, the alterity word could step in – as in this characteristic example from Old English, suggesting that initially contextual support from identical NP repetition was appreciated (Visser 1963: 443, Mitchell 1985: 117, neither noting the reciprocal force of NP repetition itself):

(12)   *Ne   bearh   nu   foroft   gesib   gesibban*
         not   protects now   often   kinsman.NOM.SG   kinsman.DAT.SG
         ... ne   broðor   oðrum.
         ... nor   brother.NOM.SG   other.DAT.SG

         'Neither kinsmen nor brothers protect each other now.'

To strengthen the reciprocity components of referential distinctness and plurality of instantiations, quantifiers were added to subjects, in the standard ways

---

17. In historical handbooks it goes often unnoticed, presumably because it is syntactically so inconspicuous. Proper documentation would be desirable, also for other parts of the diachronic story told here, but is beyond the modest limits of the present paper.

for quantified NPs (without or with determiners; with nouns as heads or with quantifiers themselves as heads in partitive constructions).

(13)   *One/either/each/... earl hated (the/an) other*

Unless an appropriate adverb was added, it was left to inference that roles were supposed to be reversed in the multiple interrelations; but that inference was strongly invited through "definite" quantifiers (like 'one', 'either', 'each', or 'all', but not 'some'), rendering reference exhaustive for a given domain: when every relevant referent falling under a categorisation given through a noun is in a given relation to every other referent so categorised, each relationship contracted between any partners will perforce have its inverse for the same partners.

Differently categorised referents ('earls hated queen') remained a problem. What helped to solve it without much ado was an option Germanic grammar provided for quantifiers anyhow, independently of reciprocity: they could move after their NPs (14a) or float away from them rightwards (14b).[18]

(14)   a.   *The earls one/either/each/... hated (the/an) other.*
        b.   *The earls hated one/either/each/... (the/an) other.*

With the quantifier sufficiently far away to take scope over them both, differently categorised referents could now conveniently partake in this mode of half-way explicit reciprocal expression when they were joined in coordination to form one set, having plural reference like a simple NP:[19]

(15)   *The earl and the queen hated one/either/each/... (the/an) other.*

Quantifier floating is here invoked as one episode in the history of reciprocals in Germanic – a rather incidental one at first, though not without its immediate benefits (see [14]). A rule of this kind has variously (from Dougherty 1970/71, 1974 and Fiengo and Lasnik 1973 to Heim, Lasnik and May 1994, and later) been assumed to be still active in the synchronic grammar of Modern English. However well motivated it may be syntactically to derive structures like those

---

18. The equivalent of (14b) with partitive quantification has a resumptive pronoun; to illustrate from Old English (Visser 1963: 444):

    ða   leorning-cnihtas   beheoldon   hyra   ælc   oðerne
    the apostles.NOM.PL   beheld   they.GEN.PL each.NOM.SG other.ACC.SG
    'The apostles beheld each of them the other.'

19. The same effect could have been produced without coordination, though at the expense of an unusual accumulation of quantifiying and similar words at the end of a sentence: *The earl hated the queen one/either/each (the) other.*

of (14b) from ones like (13), the argument that these latter yield a plausible compositional semantics of reciprocity is not the strongest point of such an analysis, neither synchronically[20] nor diachronically. Assuming that the semantics of reciprocity is to do with the four components identified above, then it is questionable whether they were all overtly expressed, compositionally or otherwise, when quantifier-*other* combinations were first formed, elaborating on the identical NP repetition strategy. Especially role reversal was only implied, at least initially: this component could be contributed by adverbs such as 'mutually' or 'reciprocally'. That eventually these came to be omitted, as a rule if not obligatorily, may suggest that the quantifier-*other* combination itself had taken responsibility for this part of reciprocal meaning. On the other hand, since the adverbs which could initially supplement quantifier-*other* were not only ones for role reversal but also for collective action and interaction ('together', 'between', etc.), it is plausible to assume that the reciprocalish meaning that indeed was expressed by these means – adverbial alone, quantifier-*other* with optional adverbial, then without – was a rather inelaborate one of non-reflexive interrelations among subsets of the referents identified by the subject.

There remains the question of the pro status of these newly formed bipartite reciprocals. Their constituents are not personal pronouns or ones with similar referential functions, such as reflexives or possessives. At least, quantifiers and the alterity word are of a nominal rather than, say, of an adverbial kind – although there is a grey area, illustrated by (8b) above, where role-reversing and common-action/interaction adverbs and subject-bound pronouns for set identity/overlap are in ostensibly free variation. And since referentially and syntactically they share more with pronouns than with nouns, it would not seem inappropriate to characterise them as referentially dependent, in line with the macroclass of pronouns, with individual non-reflexivity and set identity or overlap as their referential specialisation. (Perhaps equivalently, floated quantifiers as well as the alterity word could be analysed as being accompanied by a pro element establishing some sort of set reference: 'earl[s] hated [other PRO]' [11], 'the earls hated [one/either/each PRO] [(the/an) other PRO]' [14b].) If, however, the meaning of role reversal is also to be attributed to these reciprocal markers, presumably in combination rather than individually, they would then have a relational, hence verb-related function on top of a (co-)referential one – which is more than what is usually expected of pro-NPs.

As to the morphosyntactic status of composite reciprocals, both the quantifier after flotation and the alterity word were each a phrase of their own to begin with – that is, NPs. Everywhere in Germanic, their early phrasal independence

---

20. See Dalrymple, Mchombo and Peters (1994) for such criticism.

from each other got curtailed, sometimes completely. Once able to combine with determiners just like quantifiers and the alterity word would do on their own, their determiners got either omitted or became invariable and were reanalysed as part of the reciprocal (as in English *an-other*). Either phrase had been assigned its own case externally: the quantifier phrase used to be in the nominative in agreement with the subject NP it had floated away from, and the *other* phrase was accusative, dative, or genitive, depending on the verb it was governed by. Where the nominative was morphologically unmarked, or case inflection on quantifiers was lost anyhow, such independent case assignment was not such a conspicuous obstacle when quantifier and alterity word headed towards univerbation, as they everywhere seemed destined to. Whatever overt inflection quantifiers possessed, it got reduced or eliminated on their way towards losing their independence as words and being downgraded to first constituents of compounds – or indeed prefixes, to judge by the main stress, which goes on the alterity part (*each Other*, *eiN-ANder*, *hver ANnan*, etc.) as per Germanic stem stress, rather than on the quantifier part, as it ought to if the compound stress rule were operative. Word-final constituents of compounds in general are not immune to inflection in right-headed words, and even less so stems in prefix-stem constructions; still, the alterity word, once regularly inflecting for number and gender as well as (verb-governed) case, would not hesitate long to surrender inflection, too.[21] Occasionally, slight losses in phonological substance were incurred as quantifiers and alterity word were univerbated. And their increasingly close cohesion is also unmistakable from syllabifications in languages otherwise reluctant to resyllabify final consonants across morpheme, let alone word boundaries (such as German: *ei.N-AN.der*, but *ein . ANder Mal* 'an other time').

The clear trend in Germanic, thus, was towards an inflectionally deactivated, invariable reciprocal word (if a bipartite one, with both parts still recognisable), as had been the role-reversal and common-action/interaction adverbs of old. Ending up uninflecting like this, eventually to be reduced to mere affixhood, is a common fate in grammaticalisation – though not really for pronouns, usually the most highly inflected words of a language. Reflexives of sufficiently long standing to have generalised one single form (the unmarked: 3rd singular neuter) are the most obvious exception among grammaticalised pronouns in lacking inflection. But then, it is not uncommon for such invariable reflexive pronouns (or "anaphors") to be about to turn into verbal markers, and perhaps shed their referential function.

---

21. As mentioned earlier, reciprocals can be in the genitive (except in German); but the question is whether this is an inflection retained or rather innovated.

4.   How quantifiers got past prepositions

In this thumbnail sketch of the genesis of bipartite reciprocals in Germanic, 'to hate' and 'to protect' were used as examples of multiply instantiated relations. But it is not only subjects and (accusative, dative, genitive) objects in direct construction with a transitive verb that can be reciprocally interrelated: subjects and oblique objects or adverbials can be, too, with a preposition supplementing the verb in specifying the relation between them. However, although such circumstances are slightly more complex, they do not interfere with the development of quantifier-*other* reciprocals – up to a point:

(10')   *The (one) earl fought with the (other) earl, and the other/latter (earl) fought with the one/former (earl).*

(11')   *Earl(s) fought with earl(s).*

(12')   *Earl(s) fought with other(s).*

(13')   *One/either/each/... earl fought with (the/an) other.*

(14')   a.   *The earls one/either/each/... fought with (the/an) other.*
          b.   *The earls fought one/either/each/ ... with (the/an) other.*

That crucial point comes when the quantifier is to float away from its NP to team up with the alterity word. Although quantifiers can float off as far as into sentence-final position ('both earls talked with the queen' → 'the earls both talked with the queen' → 'the earls talked with the queen both'), just floating past a preposition and no further, thus intervening between a case governor and its governed NP, has never been an option in Germanic (*'the earls talked with both the queen'). But precisely this is destined to be the quantifier's landing site when the preposition governs the alterity word in reciprocal constructions:[22]

(14')   c.   *The earls fought with one/either/each/... (the/an) other.*

The Germanic languages differ greatly among each other, not in letting or not letting the quantifier get past prepositions, but in how early or late this feat was accomplished. Reciprocal constructions like (14'c) are attested earliest in

---

22. Jacob Grimm was perhaps the first to be amazed at such an unorthodox ordering: "und, was das sonderbarste ist, die *andern* oder *anderm* regierende praeposition kommt vor *ein* zu stehen, z.b. *sie [...] reden mit einander* f[ür] [...] *einer [...] redet mit dem andern*" (1831: 82). If it is the quantifier that is seen as (diachronically) moving, as it ought to be, then the marvel of course is the other way round: "*ein* kommt nach der praeposition zu stehen".

German (as early as Old High German), quite some time later in English (since the mid-17th century at the earliest),[23] and in Icelandic it is only recently that internalising the quantifier is becoming more popular than keeping it external to the prepositional phrase (as in [16b] vis-à-vis [16a]; Thráinsson 1994: 172–173).

(16) a. *Strákarnir   tala aldrei hvor   við   annan.*
          the.boys.NOM talk never each.of.two.NOM with other.ACC

          'The boys never talk to each other.' (*hvor* is nominative, in agreement with the subject; *annan* is accusative)

      b. *Strákarnir   tala aldrei við   hvorn   annan.*
          the.boys.NOM talk never with each.of.two.ACC other.ACC

          'The boys never talk to each other.' (with *hvorn* now also accusative)

The later the internalisation, the more a language still vacillates between the old and the new order. It can be confidently predicted that Gothic would have gone the same way with its *anþar-anþar* reciprocal, given a little more time to find it.

What it is harder to be confident about is the reasons or conditions why some Germanic languages were so much faster than others in this rather extraordinary flotation.

As is illustrated with the Icelandic examples in (16), an inflectional dilemma is created when the quantifier unorthodoxically gets into a prepositional phrase: outside its case is determined by agreement with the subject, but inside it is in the domain of prepositional case government, just like the alterity word always was. As seen in (16b), the latter is winning out in contemporary Icelandic. In Old High German, on the other hand, this same pattern (17a) was from early on in competition with another, simpler one (17b; both examples from Notker the German), with the quantifier uninflected in its bare stem form and with only the alterity word overtly showing the case governed by the preposition (Behaghel 1923: 409–410).

---

23. On the evidence in Mitchell (1985), Mustanoja (1960), and Visser (1963). At about the same time, reflexives were discontinued in reciprocal function – which perhaps suggests that it was only then, when both their parts were included in a prepositional phrase, that *each other* and *one another* were recognised as sufficiently grammaticalised reciprocals in their own right. Supporting evidence comes from restrictions on number and definiteness, which are only enforced when the reciprocal as a whole is after the preposition:

    The earls fought one/the one(s) with another/the other(s)
    The earls fought with one/*the one(s) another/*the other(s)

(17) a. ... *wie sehont siu zu ein-em ander-n*
　　　　　 ... how look they at one-DAT.SG other-DAT.SG
　　　　 '... how they look at each other.'

　　　b. *sie ligen obe ein ander-en*
　　　　　 they lie above one other-DAT.SG
　　　　 'They lie on top of each other.'

Even when outside the prepositional phrase with *ander-*, as was also common in Old High German, *ein* had early shown an especially strong inclination to shed its inflection:

(18) *daz ein vome ander-n was geborn*
　　　 that one from other-DAT.SG was born
　　　 'that one was born from the other' (instead of regular *ein-er*)

Thus, irrespective of the continuing availability of nominal inflections for both its chosen quantifier (*ein-*) and the alterity word – a trait shared with even more conservative Icelandic, whereas English could have gotten out of the dilemma far more easily, owing to the earlier loss of subject vs. object case inflections – German seemed plainly determined to get itself a close-knit, one-word reciprocal fast, with its first part inflectionally deactivated right from the start and with the second part attaining invariability soon after.

So far as the relative chronology of events in the respective Germanic languages can be reliably determined, two trains of morphosyntactic developments appear to coincide or to be overlapping, both occurring early in German and later elsewhere: (i) quantifier and alterity word behave more and more as a unit, as one phrase and eventually one word, even if sometimes still discontinuous (as when interrupted by a preposition); (ii) this unit can form the complement of a preposition. The preferable interpretation would seem to be that unit-formation got underway first, and then licensed the inclusion of the whole unit into a prepositional phrase – with its parts at first still sufficiently autonomous to each inflect for the case governed by the preposition (as in Modern Icelandic and as one possibility in Old High German). That is, quantifier floating, up to that point instrumental in getting the two parts of the reciprocal into close contact, would not have to be invoked to also, in a rather extravagant move, get the quantifier inside a prepositional phrase, for it to begin to coalesce with the alterity word in this environment.

5. How reciprocals got attracted to prepositions

The first Germanic language to unite both parts of the reciprocal after prepositions, German was poised to take matters further. Other Germanic languages so far show no inclination to follow its example; but then they were lagging behind in the prepositional episode, too.

Itself the result of univerbation, the bipartite reciprocal *einander* felt so at home in this environment of prepositions that it fused with them to form what to all intents and purposes are compounds. Their word class, on distributional grounds, is clearly that of adverbs, whatever kind of word *einander* used to be on its own (recall that prepositions are not limited to NPs as their complements, but take adverbs as well). Stress is perhaps not such a reliable indicator of compound status because it is variable (*GE.gen.ei.nan.der* vs. *ge.gen.ei.NAN.der* 'against each other'); nonetheless, main stress on the preposition, as per compound stress rule, would seem to be the unmarked alternative, unlike in prepositional phrases (*ge.gen an.DRE.as/IHN/SICH* 'against Andreas/him/himself'). More tellingly, unlike prepositional phrases (**das Gegen-Andreas/ihn/sich* 'the [state of being] against Andreas/him/himself') and like words of a similarly adverbial nature (*das dauernde Vorwärts und Rückwärts, Hin und Her* 'the constant back and forth, hither and thither'), combinations of prepositions and *einander* can be productively converted to nouns (*das Miteinander und Gegeneinander* 'the [state of being] with each other and against each other').[24] As *ein* in reciprocal constructions had long been inflectionally deactivated, there was no obstacle to fusion from internal inflection under outside influence (agreement with subject). Instead, special encouragement for such univerbation may have come from a model: "pronominal" *da* and *wo* are likewise joined with prepositions in compounds, though these morphological constructions differ, also from the corresponding syntactic ones, in that the prepositions come last (*da-mit, wo-mit* 'there-with, where-with'[25] vs. *mit ihm, mit wem* 'with him, with whom').

The univerbation of *einander* with prepositions has apparently happened quite early. In Middle and Early Modern High German *ein* in *einander* was occasionally misanalysed as the preposition *an* with which it had become near-homophonous in southern varieties (19a); and that same preposition could also

----

24. These conversions are to be distinguished from nominal compounds with prepositions as first members (like *Gegen-gift* 'antidote'); personal pronouns look like they can be second members of such compounds (*Über-ich* 'super-ego'), but arguably they need to be converted to nouns first.

25. These translations are misleading in their localist implications, as will be clarified presently.

be vacuously added where no preposition was called for, as with verbs taking direct objects (19b) (Behaghel 1923: 410).

(19) a. *an ander ruorten sich diu knie*
          at other touched REFL the knees

          'They touched each other's knees.' (*an-ander* 'at-other' for *an-einander* 'at-one.another')

      b. *offt be-scheisz   wir beide an-einander*
          often *be*-shit (= cheat) we both at-one.another

          'We often cheat each other.'

Such misanalyses are evidence that already at this stage *einander* was felt to be an adverbial sort of word, with a preposition as a more natural component than a quantifier or pronoun.

In Bavarian, as seen above, the reciprocal component of such compounds eventually ceased to be able to occur independently, except for those speakers who marginally accept the reciprocal as an indirect object. Arguably, *-(à(rà))nand(à)* is still a stem rather than an affix; but it has become (or is on its way to become) a bound stem, requiring the stem of a preposition to support it. Tied up that closely, such combinations were prone to be lexicalised and to acquire semantic nuances and specialisations which could no longer be compositionally derived from the meanings of their components, conceived of however loosely.

At the latest when they were fused with prepositions, as inextricably as in Bavarian or slightly less dependently as elsewhere in German, reciprocals thus ended up as (parts of) adverbs – that is, in the same word class as adverbs for common action or interaction ('together' etc.) and for role reversal ('mutually' etc.), whose rationale is to highlight the relational rather than the referential components of reciprocity. Now, what adverbs or adverbial phrases do (or of course rather what speakers do with them) certainly is not to refer to persons and things, either: this is the business in which NPs specialise, hence also pro-NPs. Associated with the verb phrase, what reciprocal adverbs could naturally be construed as referring to are ontological entities in a class with places, times, or manners. This raises the question whether the *einander* or *-à(rà)nand(à)* part of these adverbs can really be expected to perform the referential functions which an elaborate rendering of reciprocity would require, namely to express individual non-reflexivity and set identity or overlap.

It is instructive in this respect to compare prepositional reciprocals with forms alluded to above as their possible model. In German, like elsewhere, prepositions of all kinds, including those for local, temporal, causal, modal, or

other semantic relations, do combine syntactically with pronouns referring to persons and things – and being included in such a prepositional phrase does not affect the referential force of these pronouns, otherwise most at home in the syntactic relations of subject and direct/indirect object. However, German also provides an alternative to such syntactic constructions, namely compounds with the preposition as the second member and the pronouns represented by what look like local adverbs, *da* 'there' and *wo* 'where' (the latter interrogative and relative):

(20)   a.   *Die   Buben   sind   bei   ihm   gestanden.*
           the   boys   are   by   him   stood

        'The boys stood next to him.'

    b.   *Die   Buben   sind   da-bei   gestanden.*
           the   boys   are   there-by   stood

        'The boys stood nearby.'

In (20a), the 3rd person singular masculine pronoun in construction with the local preposition would typically be construed as referring to a person or thing already mentioned, by means of a noun of masculine gender and in the singular. This, however, would not be an adequate interpretation of (20b). In a way, *da* is a referring expression, too, since the boys' position is being localised in relation to something. But this reference is more comprehensive, pointing to a whole situation or event, regardless of the participants and props involved in it.[26] Along such lines, *da* and *wo* can be characterised as pronouns, or rather pro-adverbs, of situational rather than personal reference. Though semantically and syntactically distinct from nominal pro forms for persons and things, such situational pro forms are not entirely on a par with dedicatedly adverbial pro forms for places (such as 'here', 'there'), times ('now', 'then'), manner ('thus'), reasons ('therefore'), and other circumstantial relations, either: they are not inherently relational in this particular function, but require the company of an adposition, i.e., of a relational marker prototypically (though not exclusively) relating NPs to verbs or other NPs. Given the generality of their referential function, situational pro forms should be able to afford being inflectionally not nearly as active as pronouns for persons and things are. They might even be wholly disembodied – which in a way is what they are when adpositions do duty

---

26. This, at any rate, is the gist of alternations like that in (20), the intricacies of which would be a subject in their own right.

as adverbs[27] and are unaccompanied by an overt complement (e.g., 'The boys stood near Ø').

The referentiality of reciprocals, especially in prepositional combinations, is of essentially the same kind: like *da-bei*, and also like 'mutually' and similar adverbs, *bei-einander* etc. focus on the relational nature of the situation as a whole, of roles being reversed in multiple instantiations of a relation, leaving its complex (co-)referential specifics uncoded.[28]

Given that reciprocals of such form and meaning are, for the time being, the end-point of a chain of developments which were set in motion once new bipartite reciprocal markers had been created from (pro-)nominal sources, this would seem to attest to a conceptualisation of reciprocity in Germanic which does not give equal weight to its relational and referential semantic components. On formal evidence, what has constantly been reasserting itself is a not very distinctive elaboration of reciprocity as non-reflexive interrelations among sets of referents. The difference to reflexive interrelations was not of the highest priority, or else an overt contrast would hardly have gotten confined to oblique and adverbial relations, as in German, being typically glossed over in purely verbal relations between subject and direct object. Had the specifically reciprocal sort of (co-)referentiality been considered worth special coding ever since, forms potentially able to take care of it owing to their (pro-)nominal nature, such as quantifiers and a word for identity and alterity, would hardly have been allowed to go all the way towards adverbialisation and attenuation of personal to situational reference.

6. Changeable reciprocals, but not vice versa

At the highest level in a plausible overall taxonomy of grammaticalised reciprocal markers, forms of a (pro-)nominal nature would have to be distinguished from forms of an adverbial (or, more generally, an ad-verbal) nature; and there would have to be a parallel distinction on the functional side, depending on whether it is the (co-)referential or the relational components of reciprocity that receive more salient overt recognition.[29] Reciprocals of the second type would seem to

---

27. Or, diachronically speaking, also the other way round, adverbs becoming adpositions.
28. The general theme of such phenomena of attenuated referentiality is presumably that of the relative elaboration of events, a notion which Kemmer (1993) makes much of in her approach to middles, reflexives, and also reciprocals.
29. Some such bifurcation is commonly suggested in the typological literature, regardless of the syntactic-semantic particulars on which it is based. There are other taxonomies (even in this very volume) where the free or bound status of markers is considered a

be crosslinguistically far more common. Genuine reciprocal "pronouns" are not encountered in the table of contents of many grammars; and in some grammars where they are, they had better been dealt with under a different rubric (as arguably in German). There is a difference here from reflexives, which have also been distinguished as (pro-)nominal and ad-verbal, but where there is apparently no comparable preponderance of the ad-verbal type.

While there is no dearth of examples of grammaticalisation pathways and extensions of patterns of polysemies of reciprocals staying within either a broadly verbal or a broadly nominal domain,[30] the history of Germanic is of considerable typological interest for it shows that even the highest-level type of a reciprocal is not immutable. What we have traced in Germanic is how nominal, referential reciprocals have developed into adverbial, relational (or situation-referential) ones. What it would be interesting to see is whether reverse developments can occur, too. The odds would seem heavily against it.

There is such an air of inevitability about what happened to quantifier-*other* combinations in Germanic that one is tempted to conclude that nominal, referential reciprocals, wherever and for whatever reason they happen to be innovated, are doomed right from the beginning, with their reanalysis as a reciprocal of the majority type being (i) only a question of time and (ii) independent of other typological revolutions.[31] Probably English *each other/one another* is the dedicated reciprocal pronoun of longest standing worldwide – and it is not quite as impeccable an "anaphor" as the English reflexive is, either.

To go by crosslinguistic frequencies of the kinds of grammatical forms that code it and by the preferred direction of changes among them, the linguistic fascination of the notion of reciprocity would universally seem to lie in capturing its characteristic relational structure rather than in the veritable challenges it poses to reference tracking.

---

major parameter; it remains to be seen how such a formal distinction relates to deeper conceptual ones.

30. A typical generalisation (explicitly made by Kemmer 1993: 98, 255) would be that the polysemy of reciprocal and collective implies that the reciprocal marker is ad-verbal.

31. Lehmann (1974: 102–103, 126) is not on very firm empirical ground when he sees pronominal reciprocals and reflexives as a correlate of SVO (which is a rather common basic word order), with SOV/VSO allegedly going for verbal marking. It seems somewhat implausible to assume that therefore, since German retained OV more so than did English, it was keener to revert to an adverbal mode of reciprocal marking, while English, changing to SVO, did less to change the pronominal nature of the reciprocal it had innovated in the same way as German had.

Acknowledgements

References

Behaghel, Otto
   1923   *Deutsche Syntax. Eine geschichtliche Darstellung. Band 1: Die Wort-klassen und Wortformen. A. Nomen, Pronomen.* Heidelberg: Winter.

Dalrymple, Mary, Sam A. Mchombo and Stanley Peters
   1994   Semantic similarities and syntactic contrasts between Chichewa and English reciprocals. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25: 124–141.

Dougherty, Ray C.
   1970–71   A grammar of coördinate conjoined structures. *Language* 46: 850–898, 47: 298–339.

   1974   The syntax and semantics of *each other* constructions. *Foundations of Language* 12: 1–47.

Everaert, Martin
   2000   Types of anaphoric expressions: Reflexives and reciprocals. In: Frajzyngier, Z. and T. Curl (eds.), 63–83.

Fiengo, Robert and Howard Lasnik
   1973   The logical structure of reciprocal sentences in English. *Foundations of Language* 9: 447–468.

Frajzyngier, Zygmunt and Traci S. Curl (eds.)
   2000   *Reciprocals: Forms and Functions.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Grimm, Jacob
   1831   *Deutsche Grammatik. Dritter Theil.* Göttingen: Dieterich.

Haiman, John
   1983   Iconic and economic motivation. *Language* 59: 781–819.

Heim, Irene, Howard Lasnik and Robert May
   1991   Reciprocity and plurality. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 63–101.

Kemmer, Suzanne
   1993   *The Middle Voice.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.
König, Ekkehard and Letizia Vezzosi
   2002   Reziproke Konstruktionen im Deutschen. In: Yoshida, M. (ed.), *Grammatische Kategorien in sprachhistorischer und typologischer Perspektive*, 205–219. München: iudicium.
Langendoen, D. Terence
   1978   The logic of reciprocity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9: 177–198.
Lebeaux, David
   1983   A distributional difference between reciprocals and reflexives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14: 723–730.
Lehmann, Winfred P.
   1974   *Proto-Indo-European Syntax.* Austin: University of Texas Press.
Lichtenberk, Frantisek
   1985   Multiple uses of reciprocal constructions. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 5: 19–41.
   1994   Reflexives and reciprocals. In: Asher, R.E. and J.M.Y. Simpson (eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, vol. 7, 3504–3509. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
Liu, Meichun
   2000   Reciprocal marking with deictic verbs 'come' and 'go' in Mandarin. In: Frajzyngier, Z. and T. Curl (eds.), 123–132.
Merkle, Ludwig
   1975   *Bairische Grammatik.* München: Heimeran.
Mitchell, Bruce
   1985   *Old English Syntax. Vol. 1: Concord, the Parts of Speech, and the Sentence.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Mustanoja, Tauno F.
   1960   *A Middle English Syntax. Part 1: Parts of Speech.* Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
Nedjalkov, Vladimir P., Emma Š. Geniušiene and Zlatka Guentchéva (eds.)
   2007   *Reciprocal Constructions.* 5 vols. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Plank, Frans
   1993   Peculiarities of passives of reflexives in German. *Studies in Language* 17: 135–167.
   2004   Oneness > indefiniteness > impreciseness in numbers and clock time > reciprocal disorder in Bavarian, where else. Ms., University of Konstanz.
   2005   The regular and the extended comitative reciprocal construction, illustrated from German. In: Tsunoda, Tasaku and T. Kageyama (eds.), *Voice and Grammatical Relations: Festschrift for Masayoshi Shibatani*, 247–270. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Potter, Simeon
    1953   The expression of reciprocity. *English Studies* 34: 252–257.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur
    1994   Icelandic. In: König, Ekkehard and Johan van der Auwera (eds.), *The Germanic Languages*, 142–189. London: Routledge.

Visser, Fredericus Th.
    1963   *An Historical Syntax of the English Language. Part 1: Syntactical Units with One Verb.* Leiden: Brill.

Wright, Joseph
    1954   *Grammar of the Gothic Language.* (2nd edition with a supplement to the grammar by O.L. Sayce.) Oxford: Clarendon.