

MIKOŁAJ NKOLLO
(POZNAŃ)

THE ENTRENCHMENT OF OLD FRENCH *LI UNS L'AUTRE*:
FROM BOUND ITEM TO SCHEMATIC TEMPLATE.
AN ANALYSIS OF CORPUS-BASED DATA

The paper traces the evolution of textual properties of the Old French bipartite reciprocal marker *li uns l'autre* originating from Latin *unus alterum*. The data for carrying out the analysis were retrieved mainly from two corpora: the ARTFL *Textes de Français Ancien* and the *Perseus Digital Library* (perseus.tufts.edu). The markers documented at various stages of the history are demonstrated to have been different from each other mainly as far as two criteria are concerned: the type and the selection of antecedents. Unlike in classical and late Latin, where *unus alterum* used to be obligatorily co-indexed, Old French *li uns l'autre* was occasionally able to do away with antecedents (the *li uns N_{sing} l'autre* construction). The conclusions revolve around the adequacy of the Government and Binding theory: reciprocal markers in non-configurational languages are not always amenable to the analysis conducted in terms of this theoretical framework. Instead, it is claimed that the problem is more adequately grasped if the concept of construction, i.e. form-meaning pair, is applied.

KEYWORDS: anaphora, co-reference, binding, antecedent, construction grammar, reciprocal marker, bridging contexts

INTRODUCTION: AIM AND SCOPE (1^o)

This paper traces the changes that affected the textual features of the Latin and Old French bipartite reciprocal sequences – *unus alterum* and *li uns l'autre*. The rationale behind the present analysis is that diachronic variants of constructions within the same conceptual domain are not all alike. Over time, they become different at least as far as two cross-cutting bipolar dimensions are concerned: atomic vs. complex and substantive vs. schematic. Thus, the evolutionary behaviour of the linguistic signs under discussion implies that in spite of obvious etymological links between them, the marker found in Latin and late Latin texts represents a form-meaning pair that must not be equated with Old French *li uns l'autre*. In fact, the latter is evidenced in texts spanning three centuries (11th to 14th), approx. a millennium after its classical forerunner. The hypothesis that is going to be advanced here is as follows: with the passage of time, it is anaphoric links between reciprocal sequences and other segments appearing in the same text that became

increasingly loose. As a result, in Old French the contextual dependence of the marker on its antecedents is drastically reduced.

The focus on how the processes under discussion developed strongly favours the choice of a particular conceptual apparatus, namely construction grammar. The usefulness of constructions in evolutionary linguistics is due to the fact that they enable scholars to treat language competence as having arisen through the gradual entrenchment of patterns of understanding, in which morphology, syntactic relations, communicative function, and lexical meaning form an integrated whole. Linguistic change can involve any subset of these aspects (Fried 2013: 434). Principal assumptions of construction grammar are going to be summarized in section 2. Then, a short overview of how *unus alterum* used to be distributed in Latin texts is provided, with special attention being paid to evolutionary mechanisms leading to the increase in its role at the expense of other bipartite reciprocal markers. In section 4, the properties of Old French constructions with *li uns l'autre* are highlighted. Medieval texts have the advantage of illustrating how this marker sets about co-occurring with no antecedents whatsoever to express non-specific reciprocity, thus drifting away from the characteristics of its Latin forerunner. Then, the discussion turns to methodological consequences that these evolutionary shifts entail. The theoretical significance of such a study revolves around the concept of bridging contexts (for an in-depth analysis of the notion, see Yap, Matthews & Horie 2004: 139)¹.

French medieval material on which to perform the inquiry has been retrieved mainly from two corpora: The ARTFL *Textes de Français Ancien* (henceforth TFA) (103 texts from 12th through 15th century; 3 014 389 word occurrences) and ATILF's *Dictionnaire électronique de Chrétien de Troyes* (12th century, henceforth DÉCT). In each of the databases, the search was launched for the item 'autre' (defined, if available, as a lemma, not as a form, thus encompassing all inflectional and nearly all spelling variants, aside from a few attestations of *altre*). Considering the variety of structural solutions and linear models of Old French bipartite markers, further search required manual extraction of reciprocal constructions. Each example was looked over for the presence of one of the forms of 'un' (sometimes spelled as 'j', e.g. ... *Li.j. va ferir l'autre; ne se vont espargnant*; Anonymous. *Beaudouin de Sebourc*, p. 256 "They will exchange blows, without sparing each other").

¹ More precisely, both the presence and the absence of an expression anaphorically related to *unus alterum / li uns l'autre* are likely to be operationalized. The task can be carried out, e.g. along the lines suggested by Schwenter (2014: 246) for Spanish and Portuguese pronominal objects, thus providing a solid empirical basis for the changes to be circumscribed. "Referential distance looks back to the last mention of the same referent in the discourse, and counts (in clauses) the distance from the token in question to that last mention, as in (12), where the referential distance measured from *ele*₂ would be the distance in clauses back to the last mention of the same referent (*ele*₁), in this case one clause: 12. *Aí, ele levou ele₁ para o caminhão, levaram ele₂ para o hospital* – Then, he took him to the lorry, they took him to hospital". For the present study, the upper limit has been set at 4 clauses back or, if applicable, at the beginning of a section in the original text. Additionally, there is one case, characterized in the body of the paper, where rather than backwards, the count must go one clause ahead.

Indications on where a given quotation is located are as indicated in the respective sources. In sum, 240 examples have been retrieved from TFA and 117 from DÉCT with *li uns* and *l'autre* used in correlation to convey reciprocity. The final result includes sentences where other indefinite elements (replacing *li uns*) happen to co-occur with *l'autre* to express this semantic value. Unless indicated otherwise, Latin illustrations have been extracted from Perseus; biblical quotations (alongside their translations) are from latinvulgate.com.

Only third person contexts have been taken into account, thus leaving aside antecedents, whether overt or not, corresponding to other grammatical persons. The latter usually refer to something that is not directly present in the linguistic context, but appears in the very situation of the utterance (e.g. the antecedent “you, brothers”, strengthened by *discatis.2.PL.PRES.SUBJ*, see below). In Latin and Old French, the very presence of an overt antecedent in such contexts is frequently disfavoured.

Haec autem fratres transfiguravi in me et Apollo propter vos ut in nobis discatis ne supra quam scriptum est unus adversus alterum infletur pro alio Vulg., 1 Cor 4, 6 ... “Now, brothers (...), so that you may learn from us the meaning of the saying, ‘Do not go beyond what is written’. Then you will not take pride in one man over against another”

THE FRAMEWORK: CONSTRUCTIONS AND SCHEMATA (1°)

For the adherents of Construction Grammar the basic unit of analysis is a conventional linkage between a particular form and a particular meaning or discourse function. Therefore, in works stemming from this epistemological stance, a linguistic system is conceived of as a repository of interwoven “form-meaning pairs”. It encompasses both individually specified expressions, including idiomatic ones, and highly productive abstract schemas, constantly recurrent in a given speech community. Within this framework special attention is paid to the fact that the semantic value of numerous constructions is not adequately captured as a sum of the meanings of their parts and the way these parts are put together. Their non-compositional character coerces scholars into accepting that lexical items are themselves constructions. For instance, since in no way can the meaning of “to track and kill animals illegally” be associated with the sequence *poach*, the problem can be overcome only if one admits that *poach* itself is a construction, i.e. an 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 constructions that have various degrees of generality. In this way, not only does this framework offer a convenient tool for capturing the underlying principles of grammar and lexicon in a holistic way, but it also accounts for how speakers’ knowledge is organized and activated. Rather than processing forms one by one to eventually derive a global meaning, speakers tend to employ larger constructions.

Constructions are stored in memory as such and can be easily accessed each time they are needed in an utterance. This is to say that lexicon and grammar can be adequately approached as overlapping patterns sharing essentially the same nature.

Yet, the grammar / lexis dichotomy has not been eliminated altogether. They are different in that they are placed at various points along the directional cline extending from the substantive to the schematic pole (Gisborne & Patten 2011: 96-98). 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 their historical development, items are thought to advance from a more substantive to a schematic status.

In order for a given form-meaning pair to count as an utterance token, schemata and substances must be in constant interplay. “More lexical” and “more grammatical” are overlaid by another distinction: atomic vs. complex. Unlike complex constructions which comprise more than one part, their atomic counterparts are not amenable to further decomposition. Yet, the first distinction is more important for the purposes pursued here. 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* 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 the 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 clearly meaningful in much the same way as a substantive item *poach* is.

THE ADVENT OF *UNUS ALTERUM* IN LATIN (1°)

Unus alterum, reportedly belonging to the oral register, is documented as early as in classical Latin. In the few available examples of that period (mainly dialogues imitating the everyday speech), it points unambiguously to its left toward the antecedent. Yet, its paucity in written texts renders its discourse value difficult to pin down accurately. In modern Latin grammars and corpora, it is equated, in a more or less *ad hoc* fashion, with another bipartite reciprocal marker – *alter alterum*. As for the cardinality of entities, no important differences between these two linguistic signs are recorded. Both clusters are earmarked for expressing that exactly two parties (including not only individuals, but also groups) are active. Yet, unlike *alter alterum* which preferentially accompanies specific antecedents, *unus alterum* is documented both with specific and unspecific ones (see the example from Vitruvius quoted below). Be that as it may, the interpretation of this seemingly peripheral expression in classical Latin obviously depends upon another element.

Verum tempestas memini quom quondam fuit, quom inter nos sorderemus unus alteri Plautus, *Truculentus*, 2, 4, 30 “Indeed, I remember that there was once a time when between ourselves we were loathsome, the one to the other” (note, in addition, the co-reference between *-emus* of *sorderemus*.1.PL.IMPERF.SUBJ “to be dirty, be mean, appear worthless” and *unus alteri*)

A more general panorama of bipartite reciprocal markers found in classical Latin helps shed light on how *unus alterum* gradually extends its domain. Although they do not constitute an impeccable series of one-to-one form-meaning correspondences, reciprocal markers in classical Latin exhibit a high degree of semantic specialization. As for overwhelmingly anaphorically used bipartite clusters, they rely on reiterations: two different and contiguous forms of the same element, either *alter* or *alius*, are involved. Each of them is assigned a different case. Polypototic sequences with pronouns are designed to report on the exact number of parties involved. As a result, the two following constructions need to be distinguished:

- i) relations involving exactly two parties subject to existential quantification (*alter alterum*)

non abscisum in duas partes exercitum, cum altera alteri auxilium ferre non posset Cæs., *BG* 3, 72 “and the separation of the army into two parts, so that the one could not give relief to the other”.

deinde aequitate iustitiaque 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”.

qui noxii ambo, alter in alterum causam conferant, Liv., *UC* 5, 11, 6 “for whilst both were guilty, each threw the blame on the other”.

- ii) relations involving more than two parties (*alius alium*)

Alius ex alio causam tumultus quaerit Cæs., *BG* 6, 37, 6 “one inquires of another the cause of the confusion”.

... atque alios alii deinceps exciperent, integrique et recentes defetigatis succederent Cæs., *BG* 5, 16, 4 “... and then the one relieved the other, and the vigorous and fresh succeeded the wearied”

Inde ista tanta coacervatio aliorum super alios ruentium. Quod in strage hominum magna evenit, Sen., *De vita beata* VII, 4 “The result of this is that people are piled high, one above another, as they rush to destruction. And just as it happens that in a great crush of humanity”.

The last of the above examples is peculiar in that it expresses a general, timeless judgement. The relation sets up a correspondence between no specific individuals. Yet, *hominum* in the following sentence is the postcedent of *aliorum super alios*.

The mechanism underlying the opposition between the two clusters relies on a morphologically (or word-internally) marked distinction between binary quantification and generalized plural. In classical Latin, the first of these semantic values is paired with the affix *-(e)r*. It comes, then, as no surprise that *alter* exhibits etymological

links with *aut*, an exclusive disjunction (“either ... or”, “one of the two, but not both” as distinct from *uel* “or” in “one of the two, or both” whose origin is to be traced back to *uelle*, *volui* “to want”; Traina & Bertotti 1985: 180-183).

in quo quid potest esse mali, cum mors nec ad vivos pertineat nec ad mortuos? Alteri nulli sunt, alteros non attinget Cic., *Tusc.* 1, 38, 91-92 “And in this state of things where can the evil be, since death has no connection with either the living or the dead? The one have no existence at all, the other are not yet affected by it”.

Milites Romani, perclusi tumultu insolito, arma capere alii, alii se abdere, pars territos confirmare, trepidare omnibus locis Sall., *Jug.* 38, 5 “The Roman soldiers were alarmed with an unusual disturbance; some of them seized their arms, others hid themselves, others encouraged those that were afraid; but consternation prevailed everywhere”.

Yet, this morphological contrast is found only peripherally, encompassing some pronouns, prepositions and adjectives. The opposition between the binary plural (exactly two) and the ordinary plural (no matter how many, short of one) fails to be maintained. In the course of history, generalized plural becomes the only solution, leaving binary quantification to be expressed with more lexical means (e.g. Port. *ambos*, Old Fr. *ambedui*; etc.). Curiously, the form surviving the reductive shift is *alter*, the erstwhile binary pronoun². Little by little, it broadens its use, eventually overriding *alius*. Indeed, in ensuing Romance vernaculars no lexical element originating from *alius* is left.

As a result, in the latter stages of Latin a real upsurge of bipartite sequences incorporating *alter* might be observed. For example, in the original text of the Vulgate, as many as three elements of this kind are documented. Hardly any semantic differences between them can be picked out. All of them share the property of being anaphorically related to another element within the same text. The nature of this relation is unrestricted: the cluster either co-refers with items across constructions or merely co-indexes arguments within the same construction (binding; see Waltereit 2012: 57). It seems that at least part of these shifts arise by the decline of the morphological marking of the cardinality of participants.

eadem ratione iumenta, cum iuga eorum subiugiis loris per medum temperantur, aequaliter trahunt onera. cum autem in pares sunt eorum virtutes et unum plus valendo premit alterum Marcus Vitruvius Pollio, *De architectura* 10, 8 (approx. 15 BC) “Thus also oxen have an equal draft when the piece which suspends the pole hangs exactly from the middle of the yoke. But when oxen are not equally strong”.

... *dicunt unus ad alterum, vir ad proximum suum, loquentes* ... Vulg., *Ezek.* 33, 30 “... and speak one to another each man to his neighbour, saying”.

² According to P. Tekavčić (1980: 159), contrasts involving two things are perceived as sharper (i.e. average response time in various elicited tasks aimed at recognizing an object is shorter) by language users than an opposition among many similar objects. Hence, they represent the default option. 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.

Similiter et summi sacerdotes ludentes ad alterutrum cum scribis dicebant alios salvos fecit se ipsum non potest salvum facere Vulg., Mark 15, 31 “In like manner also the chief priests, mocking, said with the scribes one to another: He saved others; himself he cannot save”.

et murmurati sunt contra Moysen et Aaron cuncti filii Israhel dicentes [...] Dixeruntque alter ad alterum constituamus nobis duces et revertamur in Ægyptum Vulg., Numbers 14, 2, 4 “All the Israelites grumbled against Moses and Aaron, and the whole assembly said to them [...] And they said one to another: Let us appoint a captain, and let us return into Egypt”.

... sub firmamento autem pinnae eorum rectae alterius ad alterum unumquodque duabus alis velabat corpus suum et alterum similiter velabatur Vulg., Ezek. 1, 23 “And under the firmament were their wings straight, the one toward the other, everyone with two wings covered his body, and the other was covered in like manner”.

Reciprocal sequences in most of the above examples perform an indiscriminate selection of individuals referred to elsewhere in the text (a phenomenon referred to as “fake co-reference” in what follows, partially based on the concept of “weak reciprocity” in Langendoen 1978: 179-180). In such circumstances, the co-indexing in the case of late Latin *unus alterum*, *alterutrum* and *alter alterum* is only spurious. An indefinite individual from the group identified as *iumenta* (with no existential presupposition whatsoever in this case), *sacerdotes cum scribis*, *cuncti filii Israhel* is said to be in correspondence with another individual that is known to belong to the same set. Reciprocity is the type of relation that ensures such series of correspondences, irrespective of the exact number of entities involved. Therefore, it remains unclear how many instances of such relations are needed in order for these sentences to be true (see similar remarks of Bhat 2004: 87). Thus, innovatively, *unus alterum* in late Latin sets about reporting on an indefinite set of individuals. Co-reference is no longer needed, albeit possible. The irrelevance of the erstwhile contrast between binary and ordinary plural entails the increase of the types of antecedents for *unus alterum*.

OLD FRENCH INNOVATIONS (1°)

The changes that *li uns l'autre* underwent in Old French are concomitant with the rise and the subsequent widespread use of *se* (acc./abl. of the reflexive pronoun in classical Latin). In incipient Romance languages, the latter combines exclusively with plural forms of finite verbs to express reciprocity and is documented as a regular marker of this semantic value forthwith. The interplay of these two linguistic signs reshapes their distributional properties, eventually assigning each of them specific discourse values. First, aside from a dozen or so of verbs of movement (*se partir*, *se departir*, *se dessevrer*)³, *li uns l'autre* and *se* hardly ever appear together to

³ According to M. Manoliu (2011: 521-524), combinations of reflexive pronouns with verbs belonging to this lexical class were quite common as early as in classical Latin (*se mouere* ‘quit, leave’). In her view, such constructions had the effect of emphasizing the very action signified by

reciprocalize the same predicate. If *se* is used, clitic climbing phenomena are licensed. If numerous verbs subject to transformation appear in a series, by coordination or in enumerations, it is frequently the case that *li uns l'autre* accompanies one of them, whereas *se / soi* attaches to the next. The competition goes as far as to extend over the then very widespread class of *entre-* verbs. Disregarding the reciprocal or distributive value of their prefix, they are known to require one more marker. Unlike in contemporary French, there are attestations in medieval texts of both *s'entre-V* or *entre-V li uns l'autre*. Yet, the two markers never appear alongside this class of verbs, neither. All these cases are represented in the examples below:

- *se / soi (sei)* is the only marker

Au departir se corurent besier (Anonymus, *Coronement Loois* v.241 ; 12th century; clitic climbing)

Ja n'ait il Paradis Qui por malvais segnor se laist navrer el vis Ne qui n'avra colee desor son escu bis ; Combatet soi li serf que il a enrichis (Alexandre de Paris, *Roman d'Alexandre*, branche 3, p. 147 ; 12th century)

- many predicates reciprocalized with different markers each

Li.j. va ferir l'autre; ne se vont espargnant: par dessus les hïammes se vont maint cop donnant (Anonymous ; *Beudouin de Sebourc* ; p. 256; 14th century)

Andui joignent li arrabi, li uns l'autre pas ne failli. La ou il primes se troverent, es escuz granz cox se donerent, la ou li barons s'entrecontrent, escuz et hauberz s'entresfondrent; de vertu li barons se fierent, mes en char pas ne se toucherent (*Roman de Thèbes* ; p. 178 ; 12th century)

- the *entre-* verb with *se* (without *li uns l'autre*)

Les fers des glaves ont basciés, si s'entredonent es escus; d'oltre en oltre parmi les fus se sont entredoné des fers (Anonymous, *Vengeance Raguidel* ; p. 33 ; 13th century)

Bien fierent cist, bien fierent cil, Tost an veïssiez morir mil. Fieremant s'antreconbatoient (Wace, *Partie arthurienne du Roman de Brut*; p. 148 ; 12th century)

- the *entre-* verb with *li uns l'autre* (without *se*)

... si s'an issent joie feisant et li uns l'autre antrebeisant (Chrétien de Troyes, *Érec* 6309-6310 ; 12th century)

- verb of movement with *se ... li uns l'autre*

Et il dient qu'il aille en la garde Nostre Seignor, car il dui se partiront le matin li uns de l'autre (*Queste del Saint Graal*; p. 244 ; 13th century)

a verbal form instead of foregrounding the subject argument. Moreover, pronominal constructions were allowed alongside bare (i.e. unaccompanied by a pronoun) verbs of movement. Yet, a slight semantic difference between the two variants can be easily noted. P. Flobert (1975: 387) stresses the fact that, unlike their simple counterparts, pronominal verbs conveyed the idea of a movement being performed of one's own volition. Thus, *se mouit ex urbe* would mean "He left the city", whereas *mouit ex urbe* could mean "He left the city" or "He was expelled from the city".

... ne les diz piez ne les genouz ne **se dessevroient l'un de l'autre**, ne ne li estoit miex en nule partie de son cors ne autrement qu'il estoit ainçois que ele entrast le baing (Guillaume de Saint-Pathus, *Miracles de saint Louis*; p. 121 ; approx. 1300)

Furthermore, the properties of *li uns l'autre* are not in keeping with one of the purported processes whereby former lexical units tend to acquire a more grammatical status. It has frequently been observed in evolutionary linguistics that, in their historical development, expressions that used to move around freely turn into immobile elements in later stages of their existence (Norde 2012: 103, 105). As a result, they occupy fixed slots within a linear structure of sentences. The decrease in the syntagmatic variability of linguistic signs is traditionally viewed as an inescapable directional drift. Yet, *li uns l'autre* behaves differently. Compared to its Latin forerunner, it exhibits an astonishing variety of linear configurations. Its elements can either appear adjacently (*li uns l'autre V* and *li uns l'autre V*) or the name of the relation can be inserted in between (*li uns V l'autre*). Things get even more complicated with compound verbal forms (*li uns AUX l'autre V_{non-finite}*, *AUX li uns l'autre V_{non-finite}*). Additionally, objects appear sometimes inserted in the middle (*li uns OBJ a l'autre V*). In Old French, none of these variants is systematically paired with any special type of reciprocity, let alone with any lexical class of predicates. In fact, verbs representing the same semantic class are reciprocalized with various linear configurations of this marker.

- verbs of fighting and hitting:

Trestous les moines a mout mal demenés, Par les cheveus l'un a l'autre hurté
(Anonymous, *Moniage Guillaume*. Première rédaction ... ; p. 33 ; 12th century).

« Voir, » dist Guillaume, « bien se sont encontré, bien a l'uns l'autre feru et assené ... »
(Anonymous, *Moniage Rainouart I*; p. 270 ; 13th century).

Coarz ne s'i sot consellier. L'un a ferir l'autre destorbe
(Wace, *Partie arthurienne du Roman de Brut*; p. 140 ; 12th century).

Li uns formant l'autre requiert Et li uns l'autre formant fiert
(Wace, *Partie arthurienne ...*; p. 146 ; 12th century).

- verbs of saying

li uns a l'autre afe et jure
(Chrétien de Troyes, *Érec*, v.292, 12th century)

Li uns dit a l'autre : « Por voir, ceste doit l'esprevier avoir. »
(*Érec*, v.759-760)

Dex ! dit l'une a l'autre, lasse ! (*Érec*, v.5461)

S'a li uns a l'autre mandé qu'a la mivoie assanblerioient
(Chrétien de Troyes, *Cligès*, v.3992-3993 ; 12th century)

Li uns son non a l'autre dist
(Chrétien de Troyes, *Yvain ou Le Chevalier au Lion*, v.6330, 12th century)

The aim now is to ascertain how this syntagmatic variability relates to the presence / absence of antecedents and their different types. As seen above, throughout the Latin period *unus alterum* is anaphorically related to an antecedent (possibly by co-reference). Gradually, it extends its textual domain to antecedents with an unrestricted cardinality. In such circumstances, the co-indexation of arguments within the same construction involves the relation of the bindee to the binder. Old French takes advantage of all these possibilities as well. As for constructions involving a bound variable (Büring 2005: 84), they rely preferably on non-contiguous associations of quantifiers (*nus*, *nus home*, *chacuns*) with *l'autre* (yet, one case is recorded where a quantifier and *li uns l'autre* appear together: *chascuns amoit l'un l'autre, car raysons s'i assent...* “each loved the other, because it stands to reason”; Anonymous, *Beaudouin ...*, p. 256).

- specific definite antecedents (coreference)

Artus les voit, lors s'abandonne,
De Caliborne granz cos done.
L'anpereres pas ne sejourne,
De s'espee granz cos i done;
Ne se pueent antr'ancontrer
Ne l'uns ne puet l'autre adeser
 (Wace, *Partie arthurienne ...*; p. 148)

et *Tibert* avoit l'uis fermé, qui mout estoit de chanter las; si dist le Deo gracias, après ont vigile chantee, et quant dou tot l'orent finée, si prist *l'un l'autre* a aresnier et *Renart* a parlé premier
 (Richard de Lison, *Roman de Renart. Branche II*. p. 96 ; v.12359; approx. 13th century)

- specific indefinite antecedents (fake co-reference), underspecified cardinality

Et leur va disans sans riens varier
Tout l'estat de Garin le baceller legier.
Dont le sievent ouvriers et les gens de mestier;
Ly uns se va a l'autre et dire et conseillier
 (Anonymous, *Enfances Garin de Monglane*; approx. 1400)

- non-specific antecedents (bound variable)

« Vouz m'envoiaitez au preudomme mezel, Malades est, il n'a souz ciel si bel. Un hannap a qui mout fait a proisier, S'il et li vostres ierent entrechangié, Dex ne fist *home nul de mere* soz ciel Qui *l'un de l'autre* en poïst retercier ... »
 (Anonymous, *Ami et ...* ; p. 87)

Ains puis que Jhesus vint cha jus pour nostre amour
ne vit nulz homs vivans si grande tenebrour
qu'il ot devant Nimaie, signour, a icel jour,
car li.j. ne monstroït a l'autre point d'amour
 (Anonymous ; *Beaudouin ...* ; p. 80)

Yet, Old French *li uns l'autre*, unlike in Latin, has one more textual value – it can appear with no antecedent whatsoever. Actually, the nominal element that

would in normal circumstances serve as an antecedent, is placed medially, i.e. between *li uns* and *l'autre*. Even so, no disruption makes the continuity of the plot fall apart. The story goes on – the construction, although neither binding nor co-reference are involved, is clearly related to what the foregoing text is dealing with. Syntactically, instead of being distributed over different constructions, *li uns l'autre* and the corresponding noun form a single coherent assemblage. The pattern is not entirely rigid: first, the very NP can vary from one construction to another. Second, a predicate can either be inserted in the middle or appear externally to *li uns NP l'autre*. Yet, one noticeable morphological constraint is recurrent all over: in all retrieved examples the noun is singular, thus producing a mismatch between the number of participants and the inflectional characteristic of the NP.

... font contre Dieu et sa mere Homme felon de mal affaire. Nul ne se vicut de mal retraire, Ne vers Dieu tourner soy et traire: Nul ne garde mes la Dieu loy. En nul n'a loiauté ne foy, Et un voisin l'autre conchie; L'un sur l'autre a grant envie, L'un de l'autre la marchandise Blasme, c'est envieuse guise. Loiauté ne foy mes n'i a, Et s'ele i est, pou en i a.

(Anonymous, *Bestiaire marial*, p. 168 ; 14th century)

Tramblerent les cités desi qu'en la rais; Trestous li firmamens par estoit si noircis Que li uns hom de l'autre ne pot estre choisis, Et por ce que li cieus estoit si oscurcis Ardoient en la sale mil cierge couleüs.

(Alexandre de Paris, *Roman d'Alexandre, branche 4* ; p. 343; 12th century)

*... sachiés par verté, Quidoient tous li puples les deust esgarder. Dont estoit fois el siecle, creanche et loiautés: Mais puis est avarisse et luxure montés, Mavaistiés et ordure, et faillie [e]s[t] bontés; **L'uns compere** ne vicut **a l'autre** foi porter Ne li enfes al pere, tant est li maus montés! On fait mais.ii. enfans de.xii. ans asanbler*

(Anonymous, *Aiol* ; p. 50)

Paradys com richece en terre. J'en conois certes plus de mil Qui sont poieur que ne fu cil Que li dyable a cros de fer Entraînerent en enfer. Boule et baras tant monteplioie Que toz li mondes s'i aploie. Tant a partot barat et guille Que li uns freres l'autre guille. Chascuns vielt mais vivre de boule. Milz est vaillans cilz qui mielz boule.

(Gautier de Coinci, *Miracles ...* ; p. 178)

The syntactic pattern under discussion is not infrequent in Old French. It occurs in constructions that have their antecedents and those that do not. Both types are roughly evenly distributed over sentences containing *li uns NP l'autre*. Below are two examples illustrating its use with antecedents (*beisast* and *ferre plus*, subsumed under *chose* in the first fragment, *enfantz* – *enfant* in the second).

*Oil, ce ne cresra ja nus qu'il la **beisast sanz ferre plus que l'une chose l'autre atret***

(Chrétien de Troyes, *Perceval*, v.3839-3841, 12th century)

*Qui l'esgardeit en mi le vis, Il sambloit bien et ert avis Qu'ele deüst les genz maingier. **Enfantz** fuür et desrengier Faisoit souvent aval ces rues, Et des grans genz et des menues Haie estoit plus qu'uns vielz viautres. **Li un enfant crient as autres**: « Fuionz! fuionz! vez ci Gondree, Qui de mauz leuz soit esfondree! »*

(Gautier de Coinci, *Miracles ...* ; p. 220)

This particular constructionist profile of Old French *li uns l'autre* and its varieties offers some clues to the evolutionary mechanisms leading to their emergence. Reciprocal constructions with no antecedents owe their discursive viability to the fact that their NPs are used non-specifically. Specificity and non-specificity, as they are introduced in texts, result from judgements formulated in terms of whether or not the referent in question corresponds to a unique token of a given referent, or whether the referent could be replaced with another token of the same type without affecting the interpretation. By no means is the existence of participants in such cases presupposed (speakers do not commit themselves as to whether any identifiable and reciprocally related individuals actually exist), thereby weakening the link their nouns have to other segments of the same text.

In Latin, non-specific reciprocity is paired with yet another structure involving two contiguous forms of the same lexical unit. Unsurprisingly, rather than relying on pronouns *alter* or *alius* whose intrinsic function is to be co-indexed with other elements within the same construction or across constructions, such clusters in Latin contain nouns. Thus, the necessity of establishing an anaphoric relation to previous fragments of the same text is more easily circumvented. Unlike Old French *li uns NP l'autre* where singular is pervasive, in classical Latin in such sentences singular and plural nouns can be interchanged with no observable semantic difference.

tradet autem frater fratrem in mortem et pater filium et insurgent filii in parentes et morte eos adficiunt Vulg., Matthew 10, 21 “And the brother shall deliver up the brother to death, and the father the child: and the children shall rise up against their parents, and cause them to be put to death”.

... *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”.

liceretne civibus ad cives de pace legatos mittere, quod etiam fugitivis ab saltu Pyrenaeo praedonibusque licuisset, praesertim eum id agerent, ne cives cum civibus armis decertarent? Cæs. *BG* 3, 19 “Are citizens permitted to send deputies to citizens to treat of peace? a concession which had been made even to fugitives on the Pyrenean mountains, and to robbers, especially when by so doing they would prevent citizens from fighting against citizens?”

Vir viro, armis arma conserta sunt Q. Curtius *Hist* 3, 2, 13 (in a phalanx), “people and pieces of weaponry are placed very close together”.

It is going to be argued here that the Old French pattern *li uns NP l'autre* results from a mixture of two different models: Latin non-specific reciprocal clusters and *unus alterum*. After the disappearance of case inflection, the former cannot be maintained easily (the only two examples in my corpus where two names of participants are syntactically correlated are given below). That is why all necessary elements, a noun alongside a bipartite marker, are cumulated within a single construction, eventually producing *li uns NP l'autre*. It seems that the emergence

of articles to convey two distinct, albeit interrelated functional features (definite / indefinite and specific / non-specific), might have also played a role (Nkollo 2014: 33). Instead of relying on binominal sequences to convey information about reciprocal states of affairs, French has switched over to various configurations of *li uns l'autre* ever since.

Ne sai se li reis en gusta, Mes il guari e trespasa. E des que il pot sus lever, Ses nefs fist mettrè a la mer, A Kidalet ariva dreit, Ki a cel tens cité esteit. Entre Dinan e la marine, Encore i pert bien la ruine. Li uns reis l'autre rei reçut

(Wace, *Roman de Brut*; p. 744, v.14222-14229 ; 12th century).

*Se cist es tan ta tere seus, se li doz compaignie feire, que **prodome** doit **prodome** atreire et enorer et losangier, nel doit pas de lui estrangier*

(Chrétien de Troyes, *Lancelot ...*, v.3210-3214).

DISCUSSION. CONSTRUCTIONS AND GRAMMATICALIZATION (1°)

The increasing scope of *li uns l'autre* demonstrates the usefulness of constructions in analysing diachronic shifts. The development of this marker does, indeed, involve the emergence of a new form-meaning pair out of specific configurations of features (textual, morphological and semantic). First, compared to other bipartite reciprocal markers, *unus alterum* represents a rather marginal combination in classical Latin. Initially, strong constraints on the range of its antecedents might be presumed, with relations involving exactly two participants being prevalent. Then, its scope broadens so as to include antecedents referring to an unspecified number of participants (fake co-reference). As a result, *unus alterum* becomes licensed, alongside other markers involving the *-t(e)r* element, with all types of antecedents in late Latin. In subsequent phases, *unus alterum* must have outranked all the remaining bipartite reciprocal markers. It is the only evidenced form right from the outset of Romance languages. In a nutshell, in the course of its history, *unus alterum* became flexible enough to be able to appear in reciprocal constructions regardless of their textual status. Old French is innovative in that *li uns l'autre* is able to do away with antecedents altogether, thus gaining an even higher autonomy than throughout the Latin period. This textual novelty counts as a clear-cut form-meaning pair.

One of the methods to account for how similar processes take place consists in representing particular phases as a chain-like structure, where the overlapping stages surface as contextually defined variants in the synchronic form of a language. The crucial stage, the so-called 'bridging context', corresponds to point II below:

I There is a linguistic structure A

II A acquires a second structure B in specific contexts (= A/B)

III In some other context, A is lost, with the effect that there is only B

This method has also been tentatively applied in cross-linguistic reconstructions of the origin of reciprocal sequences. The most cogent attempt of this kind is the chain representing the entrenchment of the reflexive pronoun in its new function of reciprocal marker (Heine & Miyashita 2008: 194; Heine & Narrog 2009: 416). The purported diachronic path is as follows:

- I. There is a grammatical marker (and an associated construction) with a reflexive meaning when used with singular antecedent referents.
- II. When used with multiple antecedents, the marker may additionally be assigned a reciprocal meaning in addition – the result being ambiguity.
- III. When used with multiple antecedents in specific contexts (e.g., with symmetric predicates), reciprocal meaning is the only one.

The problem in this reconstruction is the claim to the effect that, once upon a time, a given set of grammatical words used to combine with singular verbal forms only. As for now, phase I has never been demonstrated to correspond to a chronologically circumscribed reality, whether in Latin or in Romance. At first glance, its existence seems to be unwarranted altogether. Some types of activities (such as bathing, shaving, blowing one's nose, gnawing at one's fingernails, etc.) are known to be typically performed by individuals on themselves⁴. One can hardly see why such kinds of predicates would only be used with elements denoting single individuals to keep their reflexive character.

The assumption here is that the idea of bridging contexts should be evoked only if each of the putative phases is sufficiently documented. Consequently, it has not been used as a descriptive tool in the present study. Examples of *unus alterum* in earlier stages of Latin are in poor supply, thus precluding all kinds of generalization on the succession of contexts to be advanced seriously.

Another problem has to do with the exact status of *li uns NP l'autre*. The question arises whether it should count as a construction on its own or rather as a textually circumscribed realization of *li uns l'autre* in general. Although all the variants of *li uns l'autre* can be construed as representing a common and highly schematic form-meaning pair (reciprocal construction), there are reasons why some more subtle distinctions should be introduced. First, given that its parts can appear both contiguously and separately, this expression is an extremely variable unit. Additionally, its internal structure can undergo further change if a variable is introduced to replace *li uns*. Second, its meaning can be adequately circumscribed only if local surroundings are taken into consideration. Therefore, if the focus is switched over from the general concept of reciprocity to the textual characteristics of reciprocal constructions, some gradation is easily perceived. Not all of these expressions exhibit the same degree of integration with remaining portions of the

⁴ The predicates representing them are given the following definition by Faltz (1977: 3-4) "a two-argument predication, the argument being a human agent or experiencer on the one hand and a patient on the other".

neighbouring text. That is why *li uns NP l'autre* can be thought of as representing a separate construction (see the line of reasoning of Trousdale 2012: 173).

As for constructional profile of *li uns l'autre*, taken together, the processes recorded at various levels pave the way to a highly general category out of an erstwhile semantically constrained context-dependent expression. With the passage of time, the bipartite marker under discussion becomes nearly all-encompassing, i.e. able to express reciprocity in any textual setting. Such a process is referred to as 'constructionalization'. Its crucial characteristics are listed below:

- i) directional change. Unlike *unus alterum* in early stages of Latin, *li uns l'autre* in Old French is an overarching exponent for all types of reciprocity, irrespective of their particular properties. Therefore, the item advances towards becoming a default marker for both referentially (specific and non-specific) and for textually (anaphorically related vs. unrelated to another element) delimited reciprocal constructions. The increasingly schematic position of *li uns l'autre* enables it to sanction more and more instances.
- ii) gradual change. As highlighted in the discussion on bridging contexts, if sufficient documentation on bygone uses of a given item is lacking, the reconstruction can only be probabilistic. Nevertheless, one change is undeniable: the frequency of *unus alterum* increases dramatically. Whereas in classical Latin, the item hardly ever appears in written form, it is well documented in later stages of its development.
- iii) analogical extensions. Constructions exhibiting similar semantic values (multiple participants, timeless reciprocity) are all subsumed under *unus alterum*. The process reaches its peak in Old French where a clear-cut formal pattern *li uns NP l'autre* can dispense with antecedents. With each new type of reciprocal construction that is paired with the new pattern, the speakers take advantage of analogical reasoning to entrench an innovative use.
- iv) syntactic reanalysis. First, instead of appearing as a full-fledged antecedent introducing *li uns l'autre* in Old French, the NP is reanalysed as an integral part thereof. Second, in the *li uns NP l'autre* model nouns lose their ability to be inflected; singular is pervasive and represents an unrestricted number of reciprocally related participants.
- v) the rise of constructional polysemy. Possessive reciprocal meaning (one whereby some kind of entity – feelings, attitudes, everything that can be pragmatically controlled by participants – being subject to exchange, becomes linguistically encoded) is associated with *li uns l'autre* model, too. Thus, possessive reciprocity can be viewed as an extension of straightforward reciprocity. Structurally, it does not differ from ordinary reciprocals.

Andoi furent navré, si se vont mechinant; les plai[e]s l'un de l'autre vont li baron bendant.
(Anonymous ; *Beaudouin ...*; p. 213)

... ausi a il a la Table Reonde colombes qui devisent les uns des sieges des autres
(*Queste ...*; p. 156)

CONCLUDING REMARKS (1°)

All in all, recent attempts to bring together construction grammar and the grammaticalization theory have brought encouraging results. Especially, the concept of constructionalization can be evoked to match all the criteria of grammaticalization. Indeed, it is frequently the case that changes undergone by constructions over the course of time can be equally well defined both in terms of two constructionist dichotomies (atomic – complex, schematic – substantive) and in terms of the traditional assumptions of grammaticalization theory. Yet, this correspondence is not without its flaws. As demonstrated in the present paper for *unus alterum* and *li uns l'autre*, some of the parameters proposed by Lehmann are not in keeping with the developmental status of these expressions. Likewise, the gradualness of changes that resulted in the emergence of *li uns l'autre*, rather than being straightforwardly documented in written texts, can be, at best, inferred. That is why the foregoing analysis could not be couched in terms of “bridging contexts”.

The second problem revolves around the properties of sentences with reciprocal markers. Within the Government and Binding framework, bipartite sequences of the type discussed here are interpreted as unitary signs. In configurational languages such as present-day English they are subject to the so-called Principle A (Haegeman 1994: 223) designed to represent items that have their antecedent nearby in a local domain (*They asked whether the girls_i like each other_i*, but not *They_i asked whether the girls like each other_i*). By contrast, in non-configurational languages, such as classical Latin and Old French (see Marchello-Nizia 1999: 40-48), anaphoric links and word order variability are more closely tied with discourse prominence (thematic and rhematic structure) and, broadly speaking, the informational dimension of the text⁵. Such factors are not taken into consideration in GB framework. That is why a consistent application of this framework has been rejected here.

REFERENCES

- BHAT, D. N. S. (2004): *Pronouns*, Oxford.
 BÜRING, D. (2005): *Binding Theory*, Cambridge.
 FALTZ, L. M. (1977): *Reflexivization: A Study in Universal Syntax* (PhD Dissertation), Berkley.
 FLOBERT, P. (1975): *Les verbes déponents latins des origines à Charlemagne*, Paris.
 YAP, Foong Ha/ MATTHEWS, S./ HORIE, K. (2004): „From pronominalizer to pragmatic marker. Implications for unidirectionality from a crosslinguistic perspective”, in: FISCHER, O./

⁵ By contrast, word order in late Latin does exhibit a statistical submission to a bundle of constraints, as summarized by J. Herman (2000: 86) “...the characteristic feature of late Latin texts seems to be to have the verb between the two noun phrases [...] that is either SVO or OVS”. Even so, for anaphoric links between *unus alterum* and its antecedents frequently span numerous sentences, GB principles cannot be straightforwardly applied here.

- NORDE, M. / PERRIDON, H. (eds.): *Up and down the cline – the nature of grammaticalization*, Amsterdam – Philadelphia, 137-168.
- FRIED, M. (2013): „Principles of Constructional Change”, in: HOFFMANN, T./ TROUSDALE, G. (eds.): *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, Oxford, 419-437.
- GISBORNE, N./ PATTEN, A. (2011): „Construction Grammar and Grammaticalization”, in: NARROG, H./ HEINE, B. (eds.): *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*, Oxford, 92-104.
- HAEGEMAN, L. (1994): *Introduction to government and binding theory*, Oxford UK – Cambridge US.
- HEINE, B./ MIYASHITA, H. (2008): „The intersection between reflexives and reciprocals: A grammaticalization perspective”, in: GAST, V./ KÖNIG, E. (eds.): *Reciprocals and Reflexives. Theoretical and typological explorations*, Berlin – New York, 169-223.
- HEINE, B./ NARROG, H. (2009): „Grammaticalization and Linguistic Analysis”, in: HEINE, B./ NARROG, H. (eds.): *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis*, Oxford, 401-423.
- HERMAN, J. (2000): *Vulgar Latin*, Pennsylvania.
- LANGENDOEN, T.D. (1975): “The Logic of Reciprocity”, *Linguistic Inquiry* 9/2, 177-197.
- MANOLIU, M.M. (2011): „Pragmatic and discourse changes”, in: MAIDEN, M./ SMITH, J.CH./ LEDGEWAY, A. (eds.): *The Cambridge history of Romance languages*. Vol.1 *Structures*, Cambridge, 472-531.
- MARCHELLO-NIZIA, Ch. (1999): *Le français en diachronie. Douze siècles d'évolution*, Paris.
- NKOLLO, M. (2014): “Esquemas de gramaticalização – os marcadores de reciprocidade portuguesas e espanholas da Idade Média”, *Romanistik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* 20/1, 25-44.
- NORDE, M. (2012): „Lehmann’s parameters revisited”, in: DAVIDSE, K./ BREBAN, T./ BREMS, L./ MORTELMANS, T. (eds.): *Grammaticalization and Language Change. New reflections*, Amsterdam – Philadelphia, 73-109.
- SCHWENTER, S.A. (2014): „Two kinds of differential object marking in Portuguese and Spanish”, in: AMARAL, P./ CARVALHO, A.M. (eds.): *Portuguese-Spanish Interfaces. Diachrony, synchrony, and contact*, Amsterdam – Philadelphia, 237-260.
- TEKAVČIĆ, P. (1980): *Grammatica storica dell'italiano*. Vol. 2. *Morfosintassi*, Bologna.
- TRAINA, A./ BERTOTTI, T. (1985): *Sintassi normativa della lingua latina*, Bologna.
- TROUSDALE, G. (2012): „Grammaticalization, constructions and the grammaticalization of constructions”, in: DAVIDSE, K./ BREBAN, T./ BREMS, L./ MORTELMANS, T. (eds.): *Grammaticalization and Language Change. New reflections*, Amsterdam – Philadelphia, 167-198.
- WALTEREIT, R. (2012): *Reflexive Marking in the History of French*, Amsterdam – Philadelphia.

Corpora

- Perseus Digital Library*. Ed. Gregory R. Crane. Tufts University. <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/> (date of access 14/03/2015).
- The ARTFL Project, *Textes de français ancien*, Department of Romance Languages and Literatures, Division of the Humanities, The University of Chicago <http://artfl-project.uchicago.edu/content/tfa> (date of access 21/01/2015).
- Latin Vulgate Bible with Douay-Rheims and King James Version side by side <http://www.latinvulgate.com/> (date of access 05/02/2015).
- DÉCT : *Dictionnaire Électronique de Chrétien de Troyes*, <http://www.atilf.fr/dect>, LFA/Université d'Ottawa – ATILF/CNRS & Université de Lorraine (date of access 04/02/2015).

Acknowledgements. The paper is a part of the research project ‘Old Romance Reciprocity – the evolution of reciprocal markers from Classical Latin to incipient national languages’ financed by the National Science Centre (Poland) under the agreement DEC-2012/07/B/HS2/00602 (funding initiative OPUS 4).