

Towards a constructionist account of Old Catalan *la un a l'altre*

Mikołaj Nkollo (Poznań)

■ 1 Introduction

For the adherents of Construction Grammar the basic unit of analysis is unanimously equated with conventional linkages between a particular form and a particular meaning or discourse function. Therefore, in the growing body of work stemming from this epistemological stance, grammar is conceived of as a hierarchized set of such ‘form-meaning pairings’. It encompasses both individually specified expressions, including idiomatic ones, and highly productive abstract schemas, constantly recurrent in a given language. Special emphasis is laid in this theoretical framework on the fact that numerous constructions cannot be felicitously explained as a sum of the meanings of their parts and the way these parts are put together. The lack of compositionality coerces scholars into accepting that some lexical items are themselves constructions. For instance, since in no way can the meaning ‘to track and kill animals illegally’ be associated with the sequence /pəʊtʃ/, the problem can be overcome only if one admits that *poach* itself is a conventional association of a given phonetic shape and a given meaning (Waltereit, 2012: 6–7). Therefore, the grammar at each stage of its history can be thought of as a fluctuating network of interwoven constructions with various degrees of generality. In this way, not only does this framework provide a tool for capturing the underlying principles of grammar and lexicon in a holistic way, but it also adequately circumscribes speakers’ knowledge. Rather than bringing together forms one by one to eventually derive a global meaning, speakers tend to rely on larger constructions. Instead of being processed on the basis of the individual properties of their parts, constructions are stored in memory as such and can be readily accessed each time they are needed in an utterance (Gras, 2011: 167–168). It follows from the foregoing that lexicon and grammar are not separate components of a linguistic system. Therefore, instead of being distributed

over different modules, they can be more adequately approached as overlapping levels of analysis sharing essentially the same nature.

Yet, lexical / grammatical dichotomy has not been done away with altogether in the constructionist approach. The difference between them lies in the fact that they are placed at various points along the directional cline extending from the substantive to the schematic pole (Gisborne & Patten, 2011: 96–98).¹ Whereas grammatical structures are usually highly schematic and recurrent, form-meaning correspondences traditionally assumed to belong to lexicon have a more individuated and substantive nature. In order for a given form-meaning pair to count as an utterance token (or as a meaningful part thereof), schemata and substances are in a constant interplay. ‘More lexical’ and ‘more grammatical’ are overlaid by another distinction: atomic vs. complex. Atomic constructions are not made of many elements, i.e. are syntactically simple. Accordingly, complex constructions necessarily involve more than one meaningful part (Croft, 2001: 14–17).

	Substantive	Schematic
Atomic	<i>poach</i>	Verb
Complex	<i>He made them feel bored.</i>	Resultative construction

Table 1. Constructional dimensions (based on Trousdale, 2012: 172).

In this paper, Old Catalan reciprocal strings with *la un a l'altre* (most documented spelling variant for the period under discussion; see Moll, 2006: 286–287) are going to be examined from an evolutionary perspective. There is a wide quantitative and qualitative disjunction between Latin and modern Romance reciprocal constructions. Thus, it comes as no surprise that it is medieval texts that are supposed to offer most clues on how the crucial changes came about. The sequence *la un a l'altre* will be demon-

1 Being schematic implies not having phonological substance. Conversely, being substantive requires an item to surface as phonetic material. The semantic feature [+ introduces what is going to be said or done] found in the procedural *Let me give you an example* or *Let me just finish this and then I'll come* (Fraugott & Dasher, 2005: 176–177) has no phonological substance on its own. This feature manifests itself with no identifiable sound material. In this respect it differs radically from the way the sound material in *poach* identifies this item. The formal side of *let somebody / something do something* boils down to no more than providing syntactic slots for a proposition and a pronoun syntactically subordinate to *let*. Nevertheless, this schema is obviously meaningful in much the same way as a substantive item *poach* is.

strated to exhibit several peculiar variants, which makes it strikingly different from its predecessors in classical Latin. Indeed, it is going to be hypothesized here that medieval *la un a l'altre*, in spite of its apparent unity, should rather be seen as a generic term for different, albeit related, constructions (with reciprocity as their general semantic value). The mechanisms underlying this change can be conveniently accounted for within the constructionist framework. The motivation for the upcoming analysis comes from the fact that as many as three lexically different bipartite constructions used to be active in classical Latin. Hence, one might wonder why they became lexically homogenous. Another question that calls for an urgent answer is in what respects Old Catalan patterns are different from each other. As their semantic diversity will be revealed, it will become obvious what problems are most difficult to deal with. The point is that in Old Catalan semantic variants of *la un a l'altre* are not systematically paired with particular mutual alignments of *un* and of *altre* or with their being able to appear alongside *se*. Therefore, a more fine-tuned conceptual apparatus will be needed. Presumably, necessary analytic tools can be found in the inferential theory of semantic change (ITSC; Traugott and Dasher, 2005: 93–96) and in Lexical Functional Grammar (Dalrymple, 2001: 45–52). From the perspective adopted in this paper, the gradual development of sentences with *la un a l'altre* represents a case of ‘constructionalization’. That is to say, its increasing productivity makes it become more schematic in both form and meaning (Traugott, 2008: 28).

All the examples have been retrieved from the *Corpus Informatitzat del Català Antic* – CICA (<<http://www.cica.cat>>, 8,656,847 word-tokens; 414 texts, spanning eight centuries, from 11th to 18th c., eleven text types, e.g. ‘epistolaris i dietaris’ or ‘textos administratius’). The search was launched for the item ‘altre’ (defined as a lemma, not as a form, thus encompassing all inflectional and spelling variants). The query extended over 13th and 14th centuries. All geographical varieties (e.g. *Costums de Tortosa* are annotated for their origin as representing a ‘Nord Occidental’ dialect) and genres documented for that period were taken into account. After 4329 occurrences of ‘altre’ had been recorded, further query required manual extraction of reciprocal constructions. Each example was looked over for the presence of one of the forms of ‘un’ (frequently spelled as ‘U’, e.g. ... *fabia axí los sarrahins esparpaylar que no se n tenia Uab altre, et fabien-ne tanta de mortel-dat que fareba seria de dir*, Crònica [R. Muntaner], Fol. 32vb, linia: 21 ‘... he scattered the Saracens, so that not two remained together, and so many were massacred that it would be horrible to relate’). In sum, 240 examples

were retrieved with ‘un’ and ‘altre’ used in combination. The final result includes sentences where other indefinite elements happen to co-occur with ‘altre’ to convey reciprocity.

■ 2 Reciprocal constructions in classical and late Latin: evolutionary mechanisms

Before embarking upon major theoretical issues, an overview of Latin reciprocity is going to be presented first. Although classical Latin does not offer an impeccable series of one-to-one form-meaning correspondences, its markers exhibit a high degree of semantic specialization. Compared to their modern descendants, some of them look as if they were earmarked for expressing a particular semantic type of reciprocity exclusive of others. An important structural mechanism enabling speakers to map particular meanings onto particular sequences relies on reiterations. They involve two different and contiguous forms of the same element, either *alter* or *alius*, or two adjacent forms of the same noun, each being assigned a different case. The selection of a particular kind of repetition varies according to a number of semantic criteria. They can be represented in terms of the following set of binary functional features: 1) binary vs. multiple quantification, 2) specific vs. non-specific participant NPs, and 3) time-specific vs. timeless character of the state of affairs being communicated. Sequences based on contiguous forms *alter* or *alius* are designed to report on the exact number of parties involved. As a result, the two following constructions need to be distinguished first:

- time-specific relations involving exactly two possibly collective participants subject to existential quantification (*alter alterum*)
- (1) Atque etiam ipsi inter se censores sua iudicia tanti esse arbitrantur ut **alter alterius** iudicium non modo reprehendat, sed etiam rescindat (Cic., *Pro Aulo Cluentio* XLIII, 122)
‘And even the censors themselves consider their own decisions to be of only so much weight, that one is not afraid to find fault with, or even to rescind, the sentence of the other’
 - (2) Sic fortuna in contentione et certamine utrumque versavit, ut **alter alteri** inimicus auxilio salutique esset (Cæs., *BG* 5, 44, 13)
‘Fortune so dealt with both in this rivalry and conflict, that the one competitor was a rescuer and a safeguard to the other’

- (3) ... deinde aequitate iustitiae gaudebunt, omniaque **alter pro altero** suscipiet, neque quicquam unquam nisi honestum et rectum **alter ab altero** postulabit (Cic., *Læ* 82)
 'they will delight in what is equitable and accords with law, and will go to all lengths for each other; they will not demand from each other anything unless it is honourable and just'
- time-specific relations involving more than two participants subject to existential quantification (*alius alium*)
- (4) **Alius ex alio** causam tumultus quaerit (Cæs., *BG* 6, 37, 6)
 'one inquires of another the cause of the confusion'
- (5) ... atque **alios alii** deinceps exciperent, integri et recentes defetigatis succederent (Cæs., *BG* 5, 16, 4)
 '... and then the one relieved the other, and the vigorous and fresh succeeded the wearied'

Thus, all retrieved examples of both *alter alterum* and *alius alium* look as if they were intrinsically unlikely to overlap with the lack of time reference. Conversely, clusters juxtaposing two forms of the same noun are incompatible with temporal interpretation. Therefore, they communicate states of affairs as taking place at no specific moment or time interval. Instead, they convey universal deontic judgements, or evoke habits and general or potential truths that do not require any factual basis. Likewise, such sequences signal that no real exchange of roles whatsoever takes place. Each participant is merely required to be able to represent both the starting point and the endpoint of a relation, but not necessarily towards the same individual nor on the same occasion (see Dalrymple et al., 1998: 186). For this reason, it is not infrequent that time non-specific constructions go hand in hand with non-specific NPs. By no means is the existence of participants in such cases presupposed. To put it differently, speakers do not commit themselves as to whether any identifiable and reciprocally related individuals actually exist. It is rather their properties that are asserted. A curious morphological property of nouns in such sentences is the systematic alternation of singular and plural forms with no observable semantic difference. Number values are neutralized here due to a merely potential temporal status of the states of affairs communicated. If no specific participants are involved, it no longer matters how many they can be (Rusiec-

ki, 1991: 364–366). Such relations are required to hold for any couple of individuals (or any couple of sets thereof) who happen to have properties signified by NPs (e.g. the property of being a citizen, of being a human).

- (6) **Cives civibus** prodesse oportet
‘It behoves citizens to be helpful to each other’ (my own example)
- (7) ... placet Stoicis, quae in terris gignantur, ad usum hominum omnia creari, **homines** autem **hominum** causa esse generatos, ut ipsi inter se aliis alii prodesse possent (Cic., *Off* 1, 7, 22)
‘the Stoics believe that everything that the earth produces is created for man’s use; and as men, too, are born for the sake of men, that they may be able mutually to help one another’
- (8) **milites militibus, centurionibus centuriones, tribuni tribunis** compares collegaeque iisdem {in} praesidiis, saepe iisdem manipulis permixti fuerant (Livy, *UC* 8, 6, 15)
‘They had been colleagues and comrades, as soldiers, centurions, and tribunes, often stationed together in the same posts and side by side in the same maniples’
- (9) **Vir viro, armis arma** conserta sunt (Q. Curtius *Hist* 3, 2, 13)
‘(in a phalanx), people and pieces of weapon are placed very close together’

Now, if *schematic* is intended to mean ‘having no sound substance’, bipartite clusters of all kinds might easily be seen to meet this criterion. Indeed, neither the very fact of two nouns or of two pronouns being contiguous, nor their particular linear ordering inside such configurations (note *armis arma* and *centurionibus centuriones* in the examples above, instead of normally expected and by far more frequent *arma armis, centuriones centurionibus*) can reliably qualify as phonological material for the semantic features [+/- reciprocity], [+/- having time reference] or [+/- exactly two]. As these form-meaning pairings are matched by no substantive element, it is impossible for them not to be stored as such by language-speakers. They are, then, full-fledged schemata available each time speakers are in the need of conveying the idea of a relation held reciprocally for any couple of objects. Be that as it may, the fact remains that nouns and pronouns in such sequences appear as atomic NPs, thereby contributing to the syntactic viability of sentences. That is how a highly schematic construction is overlaid by more substantive elements.

It is going to be demonstrated now how these three complementary models came to be subsumed under one sequence. Indeed, from the very outset of Romance languages, the marker originating from *unus alterum* outnumbers by far any other form that could hypothetically have dated back to classical bipartite sequences. The following two points show how Latin repetitions are reanalysed: (1) the definite collapse of the relics of morphologically expressed binary quantification and (2) the advent of articles.

The classical distinction between *alter alterum* and *alius alium* takes advantage of affixally, i.e. word-internally, expressed, yet only peripheral (limited to some pronouns, prepositions and adjectives), opposition between the binary plural (exactly two) and the ordinary plural (two or more). The first of these values is systematically paired with the suffix *-t(e)r*; e.g. *alter*. The latter can be historically traced back to *aut* ('either ... or', 'one of the two, but not both'), which is distinct from *uel* ('or' in 'one of the two, or both' whose origin has much in common with *volo, volui* 'to want'). In this way, speakers of Latin are able to draw the distinction between free-choice quantification and inclusive disjunction, on the one hand, and binary quantification and exclusive disjunction, on the other (Traina & Bertotti, 1985: 180–181).² This distinction fails to be maintained. In the course of history, generalized plural becomes the only retained solution, leaving binary quantification to be expressed with more lexical means (e.g. Port. *ambos*, Old Fr. *ambedui*; Old Cat. *abdós, abdosos, abdux*).

Curiously enough, the form that is maintained is *alter*, the erstwhile binary pronoun, whereas *alius*, associated with the generalized plural, is doomed to disappear. The fact of *alius* (likewise *alius alium*) being overridden by *alter* is, judging by frequencies, thought to have occurred first within the scope of negation. It is in this setting that innovations must have been most conspicuous. The change in this direction has already been reported

2 Morphologically expressed binary quantification is found in *alteruter* ('the other one / one out of two'), in *uteruis* ('the one of the two at your will'), as witnessed by *breuis morbus [...] alterutrum faciet : aut extinguetur aut extinguet* (Sen., *epist.* 78, 17) 'a short sickness has one of the effects : either it ends up being extinguished, or ends up extinguishing [someone]'; ... *rem publicam alterutro exercitu privare voluisse* (Caes., *C* 3, 90, 2) 'to have been willing to deprive the state of one of its two armies'. The distinction 'exactly two' vs. 'no matter how many, short of one' can also be observed in comparative and superlative forms of certain adjectives (*dexter – sinister* 'right-hand side' vs. 'left-hand side' as distinct from superlative forms without *-ter*, i.e. *dextimus* and *sinistimus* 'rightmost' vs. 'leftmost', whose semantics implies that more than two objects are involved), as well as in the pair *neuter – nullus* ('none of the two' vs 'neither'), etc.

by Meillet (1948: 133), who quotes Ovid's sentence *Neque enim altera spes restat* ('Hence, there is no second hope' vs. 'Hence, no other hope is left') to corroborate his observations. His line of argument is that this sentence refers to an instance of hope that has failed to materialize. As it is definitely gone and is known to appear no more, it no longer matters how many other chances would have been available. The reanalysis consists, then, in progressing from a pragmatically inferred meaning to a semantically encoded and conventionalized one.

- (10) ... **neque** Capuae **neque ullius alterius** rei memor (Livy, *UC* 26, 8, 2)
 'regardless of Capua or any other object they had in view'
- (11) Cum autem virtutibus inter se sit concordia **nec ulla altera** melior aut honestior sit, quaedam tamen quibusdam personis aptior est (Sen., *Clem* 1, 5, 3)
 'Though, moreover, the virtues are at harmony with each other, and no one of them is better or more noble than another, yet to certain people a certain virtue will be more suited'

The question arises why it was *alter* that gained ground against *alius* (and not the other way round) to express the idea of otherness irrespective of context. Following Tekavčić (1980: 159–160), contrasts involving two things are perceived as sharper by language users than an opposition among many similar objects. Hence, they are processed with more speed and tend to represent the default option in various elicited tasks aimed at recognizing an object. The same line of reasoning applies in the domain of reciprocity. Rather than being divided according to the accurate number of their subparts, reciprocal relations are essentially viewed as consisting of two parts.

It remains to be seen how specific and non-specific reciprocity cease to be systematically paired with distinct reiterated clusters and become replaced with *unus alterum*. The shift under discussion is triggered by intense Greek-Latin bilingualism. According to Heine and Kuteva, one of the varieties of contact-induced grammatical change comprises what they call 'gap-filling', which is given the following definition:

with the replication of a category on the model of another language, the replica language may acquire a new category for which previously there was no or no appropriate equivalent. (Heine & Kuteva, 2005: 124)

Frequent contacts with the Greek language (Bruno, 2012: 360) prompt Latin-speakers to feel a compelling need to regularize the expression of NP referential status along the same principles as in the model language.³ The case will be viewed here as part of the more general reanalysis leading from cumulative exponence to biuniqueness (one-meaning–one-form). With the advent of articles, it becomes possible not only to represent NPs as definite or indefinite, but also to report on their being specific or non-specific (Moll, 2006: 180–181). After cumulative exponence is eliminated, a new ‘catch-all’ exponent takes charge of all classical types of reciprocity.

Indeed, a new model, where many functional features are no longer present, is attested in late Latin. One of the innovative reciprocal markers abundantly documented in the texts from this period comprises the sequence *unus alterum*. Some of its occurrences look as if its original semantic value consisted not in expressing reciprocity, but in referring to situations in which two parts of a larger whole were matched against each other (see example 12 below). Nonetheless, *unus alterum* appears with an increasing frequency in purely reciprocal and non-cumulative constructions, i.e. irrespective of further semantic characteristics of the communicated state of affairs. It should be noted that, amid the number of occurrences of *alter alterum* (which sometimes continues to express the binary plural) and *alterutrum*, in the original text of the Vulgate, the presence of *unus alterum* is fairly rare. Yet, with the passing of time it must have gained more ground, thus attaining enough generality to pave its way to the emergent Romance languages.

3 One of the most spectacular and most quoted examples of how the shift under discussion paved its way comes from the prologue of *Miles Gloriosus* by Plautus (second century B.C.), a play construed as an imitation of a well-known Greek comedy of the time. As usual in Greek dramas, instead of being referred to by their names, the characters are rather evoked by means of the name of their function or their individual characteristic, i.e. by a common noun preceded by the definite article (e.g. not ‘Pyrgopolynices’, but ‘the soldier’ in its stead). In Attic Greek, the definite article shows a strong etymological link with its original use as demonstrative pronoun, for it agrees in number, gender and case with the following noun. Plautus appears to have chosen exactly the same solution (e.g., v. 88 *illest miles*; v. 105 *illam amicam*; v. 109 *militi huic*; v. 110 *illi lenae*; v. 111–12 *is ... miles*; v. 120 *huic ... militia*; v. 127 *illum ... meum rerum*; v. 128 *istum militem*; v. 136 *illi amanti suo hospitii*). As a result, the frequency of demonstratives in his text highly exceeds what might have been reasonable in normal communicative circumstances. The result is that the demonstratives do not serve a contrastive function any longer (the nouns themselves would have expressed who was who on their own; Adams, 2003: 518–519).

- (12) ... et adiunge illa **unum ad alterum** tibi in lignum unum et erunt in unionem in manu tua (Vulg., *Ezek.* 37, 17)
‘And join them one to the other into one stick, and they shall become one in thy hand’
- (13) ... ne (...) **unus adversus alterum** inpletur pro alio (Vulg., *1 Cor* 4, 6)
‘... that in us you may learn that one be not puffed up against the other for another’
- (14) ... dicunt **unus ad alterum**, vir ad proximum suum, loquentes ... (Vulg., *Ezek.* 33, 30)
‘... and speak one to another each man to his neighbour, saying’
- (15) ... et cadens pronus in terram adoravit tertio et osculantes **alterutrum** flevit pariter David autem amplius (Vulg., *1 Samuel* 20, 41)
‘and falling on his face to the ground, adored thrice: and kissing one another, they wept together; but David more’
- (16) ... opus grande est et latum et nos separati sumus in muro procul **alter ab altero** (Vulg., *Nehemiah* 4, 19)
‘The work is great and wide, and we are separated on the wall one far from another’
- (17) Dixeruntque **alter ad alterum** constituamus nobis ducem et revertamur in Ægyptum (Vulg., *Numbers* 14, 4)
‘And they said one to another: Let us appoint a captain, and let us return into Egypt’

■ 3 Old Catalan *la un a l'altre* – linear varieties with c-structure consequences

The bipartite sequence *la un a l'altre* appears to be a unique correlated reciprocal marker in texts written in Catalan. As it continues to exhibit various meaningful parts and allows, albeit to a limited extent, a series of internal modifications, it cannot be said to have reached the status of a straightforwardly atomic and substantive construction at that stage. Indeed, its first element remains likely to be substituted by other, predominantly indefinite, items (in 18 below *negun*).

- (18) Cert, ús és de dreta conversació que **negun** no gós ésser sobre altre qui no ha après ésser soztz més (Diàlegs [St. Gregori], Fol. 2v, línia 5)

'Surely, it is an accepted way of honest conversation that no one dares be superior to another if they did not learn to become subdued'

Putting aside minor lexical substitutions of *un*, the marker under discussion owes its formal status mainly to different linear arrangements of its parts. Yet, before embarking upon the demonstration of how the two linear variants are different, two evolutionary characteristics of *la un a l'altre* are going to be highlighted first. They revolve around two parameters recurrently discussed in diachronic linguistics: paradigmatic variability and syntagmatic variability. With respect to the first of them, it has already been showed how three reiterated clusters were subsumed under one lexically more homogeneous string likely to be associated with all of the former semantic variants. Such a shift is in keeping with the direction of diachronic changes, as described by Lehmann (1995/1982: 123) and other proponents of grammaticalization theory. In their historical development, former lexical items are reported to tend to undergo the so-called obligatorification (the drift from optional to obligatory element in syntactic constructions). Indeed, speakers' choices are virtually reduced to zero, as *la un a l'altre* becomes mandatory irrespective of further characteristics of communicated states of affairs. By contrast, with respect to syntagmatic variability the construction becomes more flexible in Old Catalan. This property is easily viewed through the multiplicity of alignments of its parts. By and large, the sequence either appears as a split string or, otherwise, *un* and *altre* are used contiguously, i.e. directly next to each other (aside from prepositions, fairly frequent in classical Latin, even in spite of its nominal inflection). Contrary to what is frequently the case in papers devoted to grammaticalization phenomena (the claim to the effect that, with the passing of time, an item loses its faculty of being moved around freely), in Old Catalan texts *un* can be positioned in numerous ways in relation to *altre*. Below are some examples illustrating a wide choice of items that are inserted in between (notice the agreement in number, highlighted by underlined elements, between the form taken on by *un* and the predicate).

- (19) ... e trobaren-lo molt brau e molt esquiú de ço que li dixerén, sí que s partiren los uns no bé dels altres; e tornaren a nós, a Algezire (Llibre dels fets del rei en Jaume, Fol. 187v, línia 21)
 'They found him very fierce, and very averse from what they said to him, so that they did not part one from another kindly. The barons came back to me at Alcira'

- (20) E tenia-lo Fferran Sanxes de Castre per raó de les jures que havien feytes los richs hòmens d’Aragó que **los uns liuraven castells als altres**. E pregà ns que volguésem que n gitàs hòmens que y havia seus, car Don Fferriç de Liçana lo volia establir de sos hòmens (Llibre dels fets del rei en Jaume, Fol. 173r, línia 2)
 ‘Don Ferran Sanchez de Castro held the castle in pursuance of certain obligations and oaths taken by the Aragonese barons to exchange castles one with another and hold against me. He begged me to consent to his sending out of it his men who were there, because, said he, Don Ferris de Liçana wished to garrison the castle with his own men’
- (21) ... e tota ora que **dels uns sia feta demanda contra los altres**, poden-se n defendre per excepció que per mal o per lègia cosa fo promés o donat ... (Costums de Tortosa, Pàg. 188, línia 18)
 ‘and each time a claim is staked out against one another, either of two parties can take defensive measures except for cases where a given thing was promised or transmitted by foul means’

Be that as it may, the fact remains that different linear models do not make up, not even in part, for the loss of the former paradigmatic variants. Semantically, there is no strict division of labour between the two configurations, the continuous and the split one.

An interesting confirmation of the fact that neither of the two models is paired exclusively with any particular semantic value whatsoever comes from the analysis of sentences where reciprocity is combined with possession (possessive reciprocals; cf. Nkollo & Wielgosz, 2014: 350–351). E.g. in Old Spanish, there is a clear-cut tendency to convey this meaning via split reciprocal sequences, as evidenced by: ... *dixen que nosotros eramos inclinados a mal fazer y muy cobdiciosos los vnos delos bienes delos otros* (Juan de Mandevilla; *Libro de las maravillas del mundo*; Anónimo tr., 14th century), ... *por causa de luxuria furtamos los vnos las mugeres alos otros* (ibid.), ... *ellos fazen la concordia entre si en tal manera que el vno beuera la sangre del otro* (Juan de Mandevilla; *Libro de las maravillas del mundo*; Anónimo tr., 14th). By contrast, both Old Catalan structures, split sequences (see 22, 23), as well as sequences with adjacent elements (24, 25), can be successfully applied to signal that some kind of entity (including feelings, attitudes, everything that can be pragmatically controlled by participants) is subject to exchange.

- (22) Enaxí nostra Dona e son fill perseveren ensems per amor, concebent amor la un **en amar** l'altre e aquella amor és enaxí gran que no pot ésser major (Llibre de Sancta Maria, Pàg. 52, línia 14)
 'Accordingly, Our Lady and her Son are perseveringly united in love; each of them conceives of love as being mutual and this love is such that no other thing can match it'
- (23) Car en les mies coses no par ver que les unes **dégien servitut** a les altres, con totes sien mies (Costums de Tortosa, Pàg. 169, línia 10)
 'Because, as far as my things are concerned, it does not seem true that some of them owe servitude to others, when they are all mine'
- (24) «Sapiats, seynors, que nosaltres, jueus, enfre les altres coses per què duptam que la fe dels crestians sia vera, és per raó de la **discòrdia, que àn** los uns ab los altres ...»
 (Disputació dels cinc savis, Pàg. 100, línia 1)
 'Oh, Lords! Be aware of the fact that among other reasons for why we, the other Hebrews, are in doubt as to whether the Christian faith is true is that Christians are discordant with each other'
- (25) E sobre demanda que Bernat de Gardiola proposava fer de la soldada del di Fferrandellot e sobre **totes demandes** que la un a l'altre pugués fer
 (Llibre de Cort de Justícia Cocentina (1269–1290) 1, Pàg. 74, línia 24)
 'And with respect to the demand that Bernat de Gardiola wanted to be done with the salary of the afore-mentioned Fferrandellot and with respect to all demands that they would formulate towards each other'

Rather than conveying particular meanings, these structural models illustrate how, through a series of incremental steps, the syntactic status of the medieval reciprocal sequence moves aside from its classical forerunners. The point is that in classical Latin, the parts of the cluster, either pronouns or common nouns, apart from expressing reciprocity, used, each on their own, to identify participants. As for *alius alium* and *alter alterum*, they represent anaphorically bound elements, thus possibly referring to the same entities as items present in the preceding portions of the same text. By contrast, binominal reciprocal clusters are unlikely to be coreferential with any other element, on account of their non-specific character. Therefore, common nouns do nothing but represent conceptually potential participants. This functional pattern is maintained in Old Catalan, as well. Moreover, the quantitative analysis of the data in CICA suggests that split

sequences provide a more favourable locus for this model to take place. If used discontinuously, *un* and *altre* frequently serve both as substitutes of verbal arguments and as reciprocal markers, for they appear in correlation. The examples below illustrate the case in point (the following coreference links might be identified: *Perseval ... Galeàs – la I ... l'altre*; *ls sarrajyns – los uns ... ls altres*; *monsènyer Lohís ... l'imffiant En Phelip – la I ... l'altre*):

- (26) E com vanch e l'antrant de la forest, sí dix Perseval: – Senyor Galeàs [...] E mantinent se levaren lus elmes e bayasren-se en plorant abdós, cor esats visché poch **la I pus que sebé de la mort de l'altre** (Questa del sant grasal, Fol. 116rb, línia 6)
 'And when Perceval came to the entrance of the forest, he thus spoke: [...] And then they took off their helmets, exchanging kisses mournfully, because the one was to live shortly after finding out that the other would die'
- (27) ... sí que ls sarrajyns se desbarataren e comensaren a fugir, en tal guysa que **los uns quaïyen morts sobre ls altres** (Crònica [B. Desclot], Pàg. II.144, línia 24)
 'to such an extent that the Saracens were disbanded and rushed into escape falling down slain over one another'
- (28) Et dins aquells VIII jorns intrà tanta de privadea entre monsènyer Lohís, fill del rey Karles, et l'imffiant En Phelip, fill mayor del senyor rey de Mallorcha, que diu-se que entre ells se prometeren que **la I fes ço que l'altre** faria (Crònica [R. Muntaner], Fol. 100vb, línia 3)
 'And in those eight days monsenyer Louis, son of King Charles, and the infant En Jaime, eldest son of the King of Mallorca, became such intimate friends that it is said that they promised each other that, what one did the other would do'

As said before, coreference is ruled out in sentences dealing with timeless and/or universal states of affairs. Since in such contexts there are no specific participants to be referred to, *un* and *altre* appear frequently with no overt antecedents (see, for instance, *los uns no poden forsar los altres* in 29 below). Such a model is particularly well documented in legal texts. Rather than circumscribing individual situations of a given kind that take place at a specified moment or time interval, it is rather the whole classes thereof which are codified, irrespective of when they might come about. Potential addressees of these norms are identified simply as *un / alcun* and *altre*, with

no special antecedent. As these elements are used non-referentially, it comes as no surprise that they take indiscriminately either morphological singular or morphological plural. The choice of either of the numbers has no semantic effect whatsoever. Again, given that there are no specific addressees, it no longer matters how many participants there can be (Bhat, 2004: 87). This is how Old Catalan *la un a l'altre* produces exactly the same effect as binominal reiterated clusters in classical Latin.

- (29) Sl:3.13.15 Les sobredites acions e demandes se prescriben per espay de XXX anys cum sint mixte; on si alcuna cosa és comuna e per XXX anys estarà en comú pacíficament, de XXX anys a enant **los uns no poden forsar les altres** que vengen d'aquela cosa a partió ... (Costums de Tortosa, Pàg. 178, línia 15)

'The afore-mentioned deeds and assets should be extended over the period of thirty years if they are shared; or if a thing is owned in common for thirty years, from this period forward it should be used on amicable terms, and after that period of thirty years the two parties cannot force each other to sell this thing piece by piece'

Still, in view of the data available in CICA, split reciprocal markers are significantly less numerous than their continuous counterparts (apart from prepositions). Leaving aside the alignment of the elements inside the respective clusters, they are different in several important aspects. First of all, in sentences with the continuous sequence, *la un a l'altre* is less consistently paired with antecedents. Therefore, seldom can the examples be found where morphosyntactic features of the elements of the marker (number and gender) are dependent on (or complying with) the characteristics of one of the preceding segments of the same text. Such is the case in:

- (30) E anaven **abdós** (...). E mentra anaven axí parlant **la un ab l'altre** venc Jesucrist e saludà ls, e anave ab éls e no l conegen, e dix-los Jesucrist ... (Les edats i l'epístola de Jesucrist, Fol. 281c, línia 9)
'The two were walking together. And while they were walking talking to each other, Jesus drew near to them, but they did not recognize him, and Jesus said to them'
- (31) Ab tant les **galees** se foren acostades molt prop **les unes de les altres**, e l almirayl del rey d'Aragó e de Sicília féu levar remes a les sues

gales, per tal que ls balestés de les sues galees los pogessen colpegar de la longa, abans que ab eyls fossen ajustats

(Crònica [B. Desclot], Pàg. IV.52, línia 23)

‘Then, the galleys drew very near to each other and the admiral of the King of Aragon and Sicily issued to his galleys the order of weighing oars, so that his crossbowmen can shoot at them from a long distance, before launching a direct assault’

- (32) ... e auhí los dits **Tona e Prats** novajar e desonrant-sa e tantost anà-se n ves eyls e víu que n Tona sí tania l’espase del tot treta, e l dit Prats tania puyal tret, molts [sic] irats e furoses **la I en contre l’altre...**
(Un llibre reial mallorquí del segle XIV, Pàg. 224, línia 21)

‘and he had a look at the above-mentioned Tona and Prats exchanging insults in a childish pose, red with anger and fury at each other, and as he drew near, he saw Tona holding a naked sword and Prats having his dagger already drawn’

The following correspondences can be found here: *Tona* (singular) e *Prats* (singular) – *la I* (singular) *en contre l’altre* (singular); *les galees* (feminine plural) – *les unes de les altres* (feminine plural); *abdós* (plural ‘exactly two’) – *la un ab l’altre* (two occurrences of the masculine singular). Still, in other cases hardly any dependencies can be discovered. For example, in 33 below, the link between *lombarts* and *los uns als altres* is purely hypothetical. In fact, the authors of the chronicles and the victims of the outbreak need not necessarily be the same individuals, or even belong to the same ethnic group. In the two remaining examples there is simply no antecedent at all. Thus, formal dependencies under discussion are frequently not rigorous enough to lend support to the existence of co-indexation.

- (33) Lig-se en los registres dels **lombarts** que, en lo temps d’En Gombert, rey, tota Lombardia fo ferida de tan gran pestilència que a penes abastaven a sebelir **los uns als altres**

(Vides de Sants Rosselloneses, Pàg. 172, línia 10)

‘You can read in Lombard chronicles that under the reign of the King Godepert, the entire Lombardy was ravaged by such pestilence, that people were at a loss burying each other’

- (34) E ajuda aytanbé a tot açò l’ayre quant se corromp per vesinetat del mesell car la malaltia passa **de la un a l’altre**
(Cànon d’Avicenna XIVb, Fol. 160r, línia 2)

‘And all these things can be strengthened if air becomes infectious by contact with leper and the disease spreads from one person to another’

- (35) E si algú me demane quals són les malalties que s peguen **d’ú en altre**, dich que aquelles són axí com lebrostat hó mesleria e roynna e tisigüea e lagaynna, febre pestilencial, pigota e sarampió e tiynna (Regiment de preservació de la pestilència 58a, línia 22)

‘And if someone asks me what are the diseases that are transmitted from one person to another, I would say that they are the following: leprosy, or leprosy and scabies and tuberculosis and smallpox, pestilential fever and measles and scabies’

The second difference is more obvious. Whereas a morphosyntactic relation between the first element of a split sequence and the predicate triggers the agreement in number (subject–verb), the number of the predicate is selected independently in sentences with clusters combining two

Split sequences		Continuous clusters	
sentence	agreement	sentence	no agreement
<i>Ne si <u>los uns veïen</u> <u>auciure los altres</u>, que no planguessen lur mort</i> (Crònica [B. Desclot], Pàg. II.131, línia 8)	<i>los uns</i> .PLURAL – <i>veïen</i> .PLURAL	<i>... e tantost ells <u>ssa</u> <u>aramiran la I a l'altre</u></i> (Un llibre reial mallorquí del segle XIV, Pàg. 272, línia 13)	<i>ssa aramiran</i> . PLURAL <i>la I</i> .SINGULAR <i>a l'altre</i>
<i>... e car <u>lo un requer</u> <u>l'altre</u> cové que natura faça ésser la obra de cascú</i> (Llibre de Sancta Maria, Pàg. 266, línia 29)	<i>lo un</i> .SINGULAR – <i>requer</i> . SINGULAR	<i>e ploraren amdós molt fort e <u>demandaren-se</u> <u>perdó la I al altre</u></i> (Crònica [B. Desclot], Pàg. II.157, línia 15)	<i>demandaren-se</i> .PLURAL <i>la I</i> .SINGULAR <i>al altre</i>
<i>... s partiren <u>los uns</u> <u>no bé dels altres</u></i> (Llibre dels fets del rei en Jaume, Fol. 187v, línia 21)	<i>los uns</i> .PLURAL – <i>s partiren</i> . PLURAL	<i>E <u>ssalavòs van-ssa</u> <u>acostar la I a l'altre</u></i> (Un llibre reial mallorquí del segle XIV, Pàg. 270, línia 8, Fol. 54v)	<i>van-ssa</i> .PLURAL <i>acostar la I</i> .SINGULAR <i>a l'altre</i>

Table 2. Agreement triggered by split *la un ... al altre* and lack of agreement with continuous clusters.

contiguous parts (see Table 2). This combinatory difference has far-reaching consequences with regard to the functional status of medieval reciprocal markers. Without going as far as to claim that *un* and *altre* in split sequences represent a fortuitous assemblage of casually used items, it should be stressed that they maintain some degree of autonomy, both on the syntactic level (lexical substitutions of *un*, agreement of *un* with a neighbouring predicate) and on the semantic level (freely established anaphoric links). By contrast, continuous sequences are significantly more constrained. Neither of their parts is ever likely to be substituted. In addition, they need not be bound by remaining segments of the same text. Their only role is to express reciprocity. Unlike their split counterparts, they are not concerned with nominal reference. Syntactically, instead of representing two distinct nodes in the c-structure,⁴ they represent a unique constituent that is hierarchically subordinate to the predicate. The relation between the two involves determination: continuous *la un a l'altre* does nothing but restrict the set of referents of the predicate (e.g. 'beat each other' is only a subset of 'beat someone', or, to put it differently, every reciprocal beating is a beating, but not all instances of beating are reciprocal).

The difference between the two linear models can also be characterized along the lines of grammaticalization theory. Two parameters seem particularly well suited to account for the continuous sequences: 1) desemantization, i.e. an increasing abstraction of meaning: *un* and *altre* undergo a shift from a joint function of bound items and of reciprocal markers to the

4 Although Construction Grammar is essentially an anti-modular perspective on the structure of the language, it does not imply that discourse is not divided into hierarchically relevant and meaningful segments. That is why some theoretical assumptions of Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG) highlighting this aspect of linguistic analysis are going to be evoked here, even if LFG's architecture is not consonant with an anti-modular view. LFG presumes the existence of co-present and autonomous structures, each of which obeys specific well-formedness conditions and accounts for a different aspect of linguistic structure (e.g., phrase structure, grammatical relations, semantic relations, etc.; cf. Luís & Otoguro, 2011: 106–111). Particularly relevant here are two structures, c-structure (constituent-structure) and f-structure (functional-structure). They are linked by rules of correspondence. The c-structure, which is represented by conventional phrase structure trees (with no particular features associated to them), depicts the hierarchical organization (dominance, subordination) of sentences and the linear ordering of their constituents. The f-structure, in its turn, models grammatical relations (i.e. encodes syntactic properties such as tense, or number, as well as grammatical functions like subject or adjunct) and defines slots for arguments. Principles of correspondence are modelled via functions which map a c-structure node onto an f-structure string.

rank of reciprocal markers exclusively; 2) condensation: their syntactic scope is reduced (two syntactic nodes > one node). Thus, the continuous *la un a l'altre* is a single, partially petrified, expression.

■ 4 VERB *se* ... *la un a l'altre*

Numerous Old Catalan sentences with continuous *la un a l'altre*, accompanying a verbal plural, contain one more element, the pronoun *se*. The latter contributes significantly to the expression of reciprocity. Such constructions are peculiar in that they bring together two etymologically and conceptually distinct markers. As for the origin of the pronoun, contrary to bipartite sequences, *se* used to represent in classical Latin one of the inflectional forms of the lexeme having reflexivity as its dominant semantic value (Woodcock, 2005/1959: 24–25).⁵ Likewise, its paradigm used to exhibit some degree of structural freedom.

With respect to paradigmatic variability, it should be borne in mind that the choice of a given case value is usually subject to numerous constraints. Therefore, forms representing particular cells of the reflexive pronoun (GEN. *sui*; DAT. *sibi*; ACC. and ABL. *se*) in classical Latin are not used at random. Still, their diversity (with imparisyllabic variants) differs radically from what might be found in emergent Romance languages. As for its syntagmatic variability, *se* and its paradigmatic partners turn out nearly unimpeded in their capacity to be moved along the linear structure of the sentence (36–38 below). Items having such properties are thought to be 'lexical' and their evolution towards a more fixed position is still upcoming. By contrast, in early Romance languages, the erstwhile reflexive pronoun is

5 This pronoun must not be confused with the prepositional phrase *inter se*. The latter, throughout the Latin period, is dedicated to express reciprocity (*neque solum colunt inter se ac diligunt, sed etiam verebuntur* [Cic., *La* 82] 'and they will not only cherish and love, but they will also revere, each other'; ... *et mirati sunt omnes ita ut conquirent inter se dicentes quidnam est hoc* [Vulg., *Marc* 1, 27] 'And they were all amazed insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying: What thing is this?'). The distinction looks as if it were specially devised to avoid ambiguity. It proves so well entrenched that Romance languages, in spite of the gradual extension of the domain of *se* and in spite of some minor formal readjustments of *inter se* (e.g. the use of 3sg personal pronouns instead of *se* or Old French verbs with *s'entre*), carry on using different constructions that date back to *inter se* to express reciprocity. Cf. *E encara, aquei q̄ à caritaa no à envèga a nula re e no mou barala a u om, e no mou barales entre uns frares e altres. Qui a zò ò no à ergu* (Homilies d'Organyà, Pàg. 118, línia 11); ... *diu-se que entre ells se prometeren que ...* (Crònica [R. Muntaner], Fol. 100vb, línia 3).

already strongly constrained: it tends to occupy a fixed slot, generally being attached directly to the verb. One of the most acclaimed corroborations of this fact is known as Tobler-Mussafia Law: clitics do not appear post-verbally, unless their preverbal position would coerce them into being sentence-initial or clause-initial (cf. Renzi, 1994: 275–280). This law shows how the grammaticalization of the reflexive *se*, at least as far as its linear behaviour is concerned, is under way also in Old Catalan. Yet, the placement of the pronoun is not completely fixed, as evidenced by numerous clitic climbing phenomena (see 39–41):

- (36) A Cæsare valde liberaliter inuitor in legationem illam, **sibi** ut sim legatus (Cic., *Att* 2, 18, 3)
‘I am invited by Caesar in a very gentlemanly manner to accept a legation, to act as legatus to himself’
- (37) Misit qui vocarent Magium ad **sese** in castra (Tito-Livio, *UC* 23, 7, 7)
‘he sent to summon him to his camp’
- (38) ... cum multi principes civitatis Roma non tam **sui** conservandi quam tuorum consiliorum reprimendorum causa profugerunt (Cic., *Cat* 1, 7)
‘when many chief men had left Rome, not so much for the sake of saving themselves as of checking your designs’
- (39) Respòs lo savi e dix que la concordansa dels latins e d’aquels **se puria fer**, si era feta disputatió de hòmens savis, qui coneguessen la error per la qual són desviats e departits (Disputació dels cinc savis, Pàg. 25, línia 10)
‘Then, the wise man replied that concord among the Latins and the other ones could come into effect, provided a debate were held among wise men, who would have been aware of the mistake by which they had been led astray and got separated’
- (40) Encara més, renunciaren a la ley e frenquesa de Mallorques, en la qual ssa contén que anbans sia convengut lo principal que la fermansse, en tal manera que la **I scusar no s pusch** per l’altre (Un llibre reial mallorquí del segle XIV, Pàg. 233, línia 15)
‘And even more so, they gave up the law and the duty exemption in Majorca, in which it is stated that before agreement is reached on the main points, it should be confirmed that they might not be mutually excused’

- (41) Uns ab los altres acordaren-se e parlaren a i_a part que se n'irien la major partida d'èls del Pug, los uns per faenes que havien a fer en lur terra, e ls altres per occasions males que trobaren, que **no s'í volien aturar**; e de tot aço no sabíem nós res
(Llibre dels fets del rei en Jaume, Fol. 105v, línia 9)
'they agreed with one another, the greater part of them parleying apart, that as soon as I was gone they would quit the Puig; some, for business they had at home, some for bad excuses they invented, because they did not wish to stay there. I knew nothing of all that'

Likewise, the two markers may not be equated if their conceptual properties are taken into consideration. The reason is that they represent different evolutionary paths, thus posing a serious challenge: why is one functional feature, i.e. reciprocity, associated with two etymologically and conceptually different markers at the same time?⁶ If the origin of *la un a l'altre* can be traced back to the erstwhile reiterations which recede to the benefit of contrasts, *se* comes into existence when reflexivity is analogically extended so as to cover interaction between numerous participants. According to Heine & Miyashita (2008: 194–195), the grammaticalization chain involves the following stages in this case: A > A/B (the so-called 'bridging context') > B. Their evolutionary account draws on some fairly traditional assumptions about the distribution of a bare pronoun and of the pronoun complemented with additional markers, be they reflexive or reciprocal. Stage A encompasses a putative period when the reflexive does not assume

6 Five sources from which reciprocal markers are reported to originate cross-linguistically (Maslova & Nedjalkov, 2014) have been discovered: 1) relational nouns, e.g. *friend, mate, neighbour* > reciprocal marker; 2) reiterations; 3) contrasts (e.g. *unus alterum* juxtaposing two different elements representing one conceptual domain, i.e. indefiniteness); 4) collective; 5) reflexive. It's worth pointing out the fact that out of these five developmental paths only one has a straightforwardly lexical character (*friend, mate, neighbour* > reciprocal). The remaining ones either look more as schematic templates enabling the names of participants and the name of the relation to be put together (repetition > reciprocal, contrast > reciprocal), or are already specialized in conveying meanings associated with other grammatical categories (collective > reciprocal, reflexive > reciprocal). Now, if grammaticalization is to be defined, in keeping with seminal insights of Meillet and Kuryłowicz (1965: 68), as a gradual drift of a given linguistic unit from lexicon to grammar, or from a less grammatical to a more grammatical status, then the question arises whether early Ibero-Romance reciprocal markers can be reliably construed as outcomes of a grammaticalization chain. Their already constrained and schematic status, documented in classical and late Latin texts, is not in keeping with the assumptions about the nature of the process under discussion.

other functions, i.e. represents self-oriented actions only, both with singular and with plural antecedents; A/B – an increasing number of reflexives, if in company of plural antecedents, are capable of receiving either reflexive or reciprocal interpretation, depending on the lexical semantics of the verb and the expectations of speech participants; additional markers might be needed to decide which reading should be selected⁷ (e.g. *entre ells se prometeren que ...* [Crònica [R. Muntaner], Fol. 100vb, línia 3]); B – some verbs, irrespective of their morphological number, are clearly entrenched with one interpretation only, at the expense of another; the pronoun *se* goes on to be able to appear even in company of verbal singular; in the latter case, the second argument surfaces generally as a comitative NP (two concurrent structures are then active: ‘A and B V.*se*.pl’ and ‘A V.*se*.sg with B’). The putative stage A/B is found as early as in very classical Latin, esp. when the combination *sui / sibi / se ... ipse* comes into play. The multifunctional *se* is maintained in the following centuries.

- (42) Ubi milites **sibi ipsos** esse impedimento vidit (Cæs., *BG* 2, 25, 1)
 ‘where he perceived that his men were hard pressed against each other’
- (43) Vixeruntque mira concordia, per mutuam caritatem, et invicem **se** anteponendo (Tac., *Vit. Agr.* VI)
 ‘They lived in singular harmony, through their mutual affection and preference of each other to self’
- (44) Vis, inquit. unum vel alterum, immo plurima eius audire facta? Nam ut **se** ament afflictim non modo incolae verum etiam Indi vel Aethiopes utrique vel ipsi Anticthones (Apuleyo, *Asinus Aureus* I, 8)
 ‘Then answered he, Will you hear one or two, or more of her deeds? Not only does she make that the inhabitants of the country here, but also the Indians and the Ethiopians, and also the Antictons are in love with one another’

7 Sentences with additional markers prevail if speakers reckon that a bare plural form of *se*-verb runs the risk of being given a wrong reading, thereby failing to materialize their communicative intentions. The more a speaker expects their addressees to construe relations referred to in a given speech event as a series consisting of separate, mutually independent actions, with no exchange of roles, the lesser the need for specialized reflexive exponents to be called for. Conversely, if such a message is intended to convey reciprocal meaning, thereby contradicting the expectations of addressees, *la un a l'altre* is more likely to be added. It is in this sense that the opinion according to which marked structures report on communicatively marked meanings (Levinson, 2000: 328) can be seen as adequate.

What is found in Old Catalan texts corresponds roughly to the stages A/B and B. First of all, sentences with bare *se*, yet showing an unambiguously reciprocal value, are not infrequent:

- (45) E ssalavòs éls ss'acostaren la I a l altre e **prengueran-ssa abressan-ssa** e salavòs lo dit Pericó sí arapà lo coltell al dit Jacme
(Un llibre reial mallorquí del segle XIV, Pàg. 268, línia 30)
'And as soon as they came near, they put their arms around each other giving each other a big hug and, immediately, the aforementioned Perció stole the knife from the afore-mentioned Jacme'
- (46) E mantinent se levaren lus elmes e **baysaren-se** en plorant abdós
(Questa del sant grasal, Fol. 116rb, línia 6)
'And then they took off their helmets, exchanging kisses mournfully'
- (47) ... cascú dels reys venc, si altre a cavayl, en la mijania d'amdues les hosts, e aquí éls s'encontraren e **abressaren-se** e **besaren-se** en la boca (Crònica [B. Desclot], Pàg. II.157, línia 15)
'Each of the kings, riding on his horse, came to the front of the two armies, where they met, gave each other a big hug and exchanged kisses'

Yet, the trickiest class of reciprocal constructions comprises sentences where two markers appear alongside each other. In traditional grammars, then, bipartite reciprocal sequences are seen as a convenient means of getting rid of an undesired interpretation. Nevertheless, examples where *la un a l'altre* really eliminates doubts as to the semantic value of *se* are hard to come by (48 below is the only good candidate).

- (48) E cant él ho sebé, sí s féran la I a l'altre gran yoya e gran feste que mayor no poria hom dir (Questa del sant grasal, Fol. 118rb, línia 9)
'and when he was acquainted with that, they jumped for joy and organized a big feast for each other' (without *la I a l'altre* the sentence could readily be taken to mean that feasts are organized for one's own sake, without interaction)

In point of fact, with an overwhelming frequency lexical semantics of verbal forms transmits enough information to enable addressees to match communicative intentions of the speaker. The question of why *se* is complemented with *la un a l'altre* can, then, be answered if some findings of the

inferential theory of semantic change (Traugott & Dasher, 2005: 93–96) are evoked. In a nutshell, reciprocity is sometimes overrepresented because speakers try to satisfy their subjectively felt need for greater clarity of discourse. Even if *la un a l'altre* contributes poorly to the propositional content of a sentence, its presence is conceived of as a device presumed to clarify the value of *se*, which is known to be inherently problematic. In this way, the former content item (with scope over some elements within a proposition) turns into a more procedural one (with scope over the very fact of uttering *se*). This developmental path is known as ‘subjectification’ (Pérez Saldanya, 1998: 28–29). The essence of that process is that an expression, instead of conveying a full-fledged referential meaning, tends to reflect authors’ attitudes towards their addressees. In spite of an apparent excess of information generated by the co-occurrence of *se* and *la un a l'altre*, the underlying mechanism of this change is consonant with Grice’s maxim of quantity. By using *la un a l'altre*, speakers try to prevent themselves from being asked for further indications. Below are some illustrations where *se* is sufficiently informative, and *la un a l'altre* does nothing but satisfies subjective needs of the chroniclers:

- (49) ... e ploraren amdós molt fort e **demanaren-se perdó la I al altre** (Crònica [B. Desclot], Pàg. II.157, línia 15)
 ‘They wept bitterly and begged each other’s apology’
- (50) E tuit anaren oyr les misses, e confessaren e conbregaren; e puis anaren-se dinar de plors, e de làgrimes e d’altres menjars, e **perdonaren-se los uns als altres** (Crònica [B. Desclot], Pàg. II.134, línia 12)
 ‘And all of them went to Mass, confession and a common prayer and later, crying and shedding tears, they went to eat other meals, and granted forgiveness to each other’
- (51) ... **ls uns ab los atres acordaren-se** e parlaren a i_a part que se n’irien la major partida d’èls del Pug (Llibre dels fets del rei en Jaume, Fol. 105v, línia 8)
 ‘... they agreed with one another, the greater part of them parleying apart, that they would quit the Puig’
- (52) ... nyul temps ne fos gerra entr’él e mi, si doncs nós amdós, cors a cors, no **ns desexíem la un de l’altre** (Crònica [B. Desclot], Pàg. IV.8, línia 7)
 ‘... at no time the war is waged between him and me; so that both of us, side by side, we are not separated from each other’

Thus, the differences exhibited by Old Catalan reciprocal constructions with *la un a l'altre* are the result of this sequence having scope over various elements within the sentence, or over the very fact of uttering *se*. They can be, in accordance with the chronological order, summarized as below. If the first two structural types can be traced back to at least late Latin, the third pattern represents a Romance innovation. It appears in the wake of a gradual extension of the ancient reflexive *se*.

- In late Latin and in medieval Catalan texts, *unus alterum* (and, accordingly, the split sequence *la un ... a l'altre* in most of its occurrences), apart from expressing reciprocity, involves two anaphorically bound elements; additionally, the split sequence in Catalan can convey timeless reciprocal relations, in which case there can be no co-indexation at all.
- In late Latin and in medieval Catalan texts, *unus alterum* and the continuous sequence *la un a l'altre* gain the status of a unique bipartite c-structure node; their elements do not refer to participants of the communicated state of affairs any longer; instead, they are dominated by the predicate and their only role consists in expressing reciprocity.
- In medieval Catalan texts, having entered the *VERB se ... la un a l'altre* construction, the continuous sequence loses its status of a reciprocal marker; this function is carried over to the pronoun; *la un a l'altre* evolves towards having within its scope the very act of utterance of *se*, thus satisfying the speaker's subjectively felt need for greater transparency of discourse.

■ 5 Concluding remarks

This paper focused on the Old Catalan reciprocal sequence *la un a l'altre*. To achieve its characterization, the diachronic processes that had led to its emergence were outlined. The main research problem revolved around whether *la un a l'altre* should be seen more as a single and very general form-meaning pair or rather as a series of interrelated semantic and syntactic templates. In accordance with the principles of the approach advocated here, equal attention was paid throughout to both form and meaning. These heuristic steps proved helpful in that they demonstrated the existence of several, albeit lexically related, constructions in medieval Catalan texts. Their specific features would probably have gone unnoticed if their overall semantic value, i.e. reciprocity, had been the only aspect taken into consideration.

Although only a very small segment of the grammar of Old Catalan was analysed here, the study revealed an effectual network of form-meaning pairs. Specific features by which particular constructions can be distinguished required the use of analytic tools that lie outside the standard conceptual apparatus of Construction Grammar. Their implementation did not prove particularly troublesome as far as the concept of subjectification was concerned. The task proved more challenging when it came to ascertaining in what respects split sequences are different from their continuous counterparts. As demonstrated in the preceding paragraphs, the difference between them cannot be merely reduced to the presence or absence of anaphoric links (as timeless states of affairs may require no antecedents whatsoever). That is why the c-structure, a concept borrowed from Lexical Functional Grammar, was needed. It proved valuable in demonstrating how the internal organization of the sequence relates to the hierarchical structure of the whole sentence, thus providing a solid argument in favour of the diversity of reciprocal form-meaning pairs in Old Catalan.

Finally, the analysis of the historical development of *VERB se ... la un a l'altre* sequence showed that Latin bipartite sequences had been partially grammaticalized in Old Catalan. Over time, there was a noticeable increase in the complexity of this constructional pattern. In addition to that, this construction grew more common and productive. Therefore, some of the Old Catalan reciprocal constructions can be said to have become more schematic both in form and meaning.⁸ ■

■ References

- Adams, James N. (2003): *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bhat, Darbhe N. S. (2008): *Pronouns*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bruno, Carla (2012): «On a Latin-Greek diachronic convergence: the perfects with Latin *habeo* / Greek *écbō* and a participle», in: Chamorro, Claudine / L'église, Isabelle (eds.): *Dynamics of Contact-Induced Language Change*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 359–376.

8 Acknowledgments: Research exposed in the present paper has been conducted as part of a project funded by the Polish National Centre of Science (Narodowe Centrum Nauki) (DEC-2012/07/B/HS2/00602).

- Croft, William (2001): *Radical Construction Grammar. Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dalrymple, Mary (2001): *Lexical Functional Grammar*, Leiden: Brill (Syntax and Semantics; 34).
- / Kanazawa, Makoto / Kim, Yookyung / Mchombo, Sam / Peters, Stanley (1998): «Reciprocal Expressions and the Concept of Reciprocity», *Linguistics and Philosophy* 21:2, 159–210.
- Gisborne, Nikolas / Patten, Amanda (2011): «Construction Grammar and Grammaticalization», in: Narrog, Heiko / Heine, Bernd (eds.): *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 92–104.
- Gras, Pedro (2011): *Gramática de Construcciones en Interacción. Propuesta de un modelo y aplicación al análisis de estructuras independientes con marcas de subordinación en español*, Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona (doctoral thesis), <<http://hdl.handle.net/2445/35049>> (last accessed at Oct. 22, 2014).
- Heine, Bernd / Kuteva, Tania (2005): *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- / Miyashita, Hiroyuki (2008): «The intersection between reflexives and reciprocals: A grammaticalization perspective», in: Gast, Volker / König, Ekkehard (eds.): *Reciprocals and Reflexives. Theoretical and typological explorations*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 169–223.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy (1965): «L'évolution des catégories grammaticales», *Dio-gène. Revue internationale des sciences humaines* 51, 54–71.
- Lehmann, Christian (1995 [1982]): *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*, Munich: Lincom.
- Levinson, Stephen C. (2000): *Presumptive Meanings. The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature*, Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.
- Luís, Ana R. / Otoguro, Ryo (2011): «Inflectional morphology and syntax in correspondence. Evidence from European Portuguese», in: Galani, Alexandra / Hicks, Glyn / Tsoulas, George (eds.): *Morphology and its Interfaces*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 97–135.
- Maslova, Elena / Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. (2014): «Reciprocal Constructions», in: Dryer, Matthew S. / Haspelmath, Martin (eds.): *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, <<http://wals.info/chapter/106>> (last accessed at Oct. 21, 2014).

- Meillet, Antoine (1948): *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*. Vol. I, Paris: Honoré Champion.
- Moll, Francesc de B. (2006): *Gramàtica històrica catalana*, València: PUV.
- Nkollo, Mikołaj / Wielgosz, Malgorzata (2014): «El recíproco “uno a otro” y sus variedades en el español medieval. Un estudio evolutivo», *Romance Philology* 68:2, 339–368.
- Pérez Saldanya, Manuel (1998): *Del llatí al català. Morfosintaxi verbal històrica*, València: Universitat de València.
- Renzi, Lorenzo (1994): «Il posto dei pronomi clitici», in: Renzi, Lorenzo (ed.): *Nuova introduzione alla filologia romanza*, Bologna: Il Mulino, 275–282.
- Rusiecki, Jan (1991): «Generic sentences, classes of predicate and definite generic noun phrases», in: Grochowski, Maciej / Weiss, Daniel (eds.): *Words are Physicians for an Ailing Mind*, Munich: Otto Sagner (Sagner Slavistische Sammlung; 17), 363–370.
- Tekavčić, Pavao (1980): *Grammatica storica dell'italiano*. Vol. 2: *Morfosintassi*, Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Traina, Alfonso / Bertotti, Tullio (1985): *Sintassi normativa della lingua latina*, Bologna: Cappelli.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. (2008): «The grammaticalization of NP of NP patterns», in: Bergs, Alexander / Diewald, Gabriele (eds.): *Constructions and Language Change*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 23–45.
- / Dasher, Richard B. (2005): *Regularity in Semantic Change*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trousdale, Graeme (2012): «Grammaticalization, constructions and the grammaticalization of constructions», in: Davidse, Kristin / Breban, Tine / Brems, Lieselotte / Mortelmans, Tanja (eds.): *Grammaticalization and Language Change. New reflections*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 167–198.
- Waltereit, Richard (2012): *Reflexive Marking in the History of French*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Woodcock, Eric Ch. (2005/1959): *A New Latin Syntax*, Waconda: Bolchazy & Carducci.
- Joan Torruella (ed.) with the assistance of Manuel Pérez Saldanya and Josep Martínez: “Corpus Informatitzat del Català Antic” <<http://www.cica.cat>>.

- Mikolaj Nkollo, UAM, Faculty of Modern Languages, Al. Niepodległości 4, PL-61-874 Poznań, <mikon74@amu.edu.pl>.

Resum: L'objectiu d'aquest article és traçar, d'acord amb les pressupòsits de la Gramàtica de Construccions, com les construccions recíproques reiteradament emprades en llatí acabaren per subsumir-se a *la un a l'altre* en els textos en català antic (segles XIII–XIV). Les dades per dur a terme l'anàlisi han estat extretes del *Corpus Informatitzat del Català Antic*, que comprèn 240 construccions recíproques bipartides. El canvi pot rastrejar-se prenent en consideració dos mecanismes diacrònics: la pèrdua de les relíquies de la quantificació binària i l'adveniment gradual dels articles. Per mitjà de l'aparell formal de la Gramàtica de Construccions, s'ha demostrat que el català antic tenia tres parells de forma i significat diferents, si bé relacionats lèxicament. Difereixen pel fet que en alguns d'ells *un* i *altre* tenen l'estatus d'elements anafòricament lligats i representen dos nòduls d'estructura-c diferents; en canvi, en d'altres, *un* i *altre* configuren un únic constituent. Finalment, en les oracions en què apareix juntament amb *se*, més que verbalitzar la reciprocitat en si, *la un a l'altre* adquireix un estatus més subjectiu. Tots aquests fets recolzen la hipòtesi de la consolidació gradual i el caràcter creixentment esquemàtic de la seqüència recíproca medieval. ■

Summary: The aim of this paper is to trace, in accordance with the assumptions of Construction Grammar, how Latin reiterated reciprocal clusters came to be subsumed under *la un a l'altre* in Old Catalan texts (13th to 14th century). The data for conducting the analysis were selected from *Corpus Informatitzat del Català Antic*, comprising 240 bipartite reciprocal constructions. The shift can be traced back to two diachronic mechanisms: the loss of the relics of binary quantification and the gradual advent of articles. By means of the formal apparatus of Construction Grammar, Old Catalan is demonstrated to have had three distinct, albeit lexically related, reciprocal form-meaning pairs. They are different in that in some of them *un* and *altre* have the status of anaphorically bound elements and represent two distinct c-structure nodes, whereas in others *un* and *altre* form a single constituent. Finally, rather than conveying reciprocity proper, in sentences where it appears alongside *se*, *la un a l'altre* gains a more subjective status. All these facts lend support to the hypothesis of a gradual entrenchment and an increasingly schematic character of the medieval reciprocal sequence. [Keywords: reciprocal constructions, continuous vs. split bipartite sequence, c-structure, form-meaning pairing, binding, subjectification] ■