



Lingua

International Review of General Linguistics

Over 1,800 journals are included in ScienceDirect: www.sciencedirect.com

Available online at



ScienceDirect

www.sciencedirect.com

The reflexive pronouns in Vedic: A diachronic and typological perspective

Leonid Kulikov*

Leiden University, Department of Indo-European Comparative Linguistics (VIET), PO Box 9515,
2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

Received 1 April 2005; received in revised form 22 May 2006; accepted 22 May 2006
Available online 9 November 2006

Abstract

The present paper deals with two reflexive pronouns that are attested in Vedic Sanskrit, *tanū́-* and *ātmán-*. It is demonstrated that the former is employed both in reflexive usages properly speaking (of the type *John scolds himself*), and in emphatic usages (of the type *Peter repaired his car himself*). The emphatic analysis (not widely recognized in the standard Sanskrit grammars) gives the key to the interpretation of several obscure passages. The paper presents data relevant to the understanding of the syntax of constructions with *tanū́-* and *ātmán-* (nominal and adverbial usages, rules of agreement in number with the antecedent, heavy reflexive constructions with *svá-* ‘own’) ‘own’). In the middle Vedic period, *tanū́-* is ousted by *ātmán-*, while in the second most ancient Vedic text, Atharvaveda, both *tanū́-* and *ātmán-* can be employed within the same clause, giving rise to a heavy reflexive construction. One of the typologically remarkable usages attested for *tanū́-* is a construction where this pronoun occurs in the vocative case (*this chariot will carry me – itself! (i.e., without horses)*), used for special emphasis. The paper concludes with a diachronic survey of the functions of the two reflexive pronouns throughout the history of Vedic and a summary of the attested paradigm.

© 2006 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Vedic; Reflexive; Emphatic; Intensifier; Vocative; Middle

Abbreviations: AV, Atharvaveda (Śaunakīya recension); AVP, Atharvaveda; Paippalāda recension; MS, Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā; RV, Ṛgveda; RVKh., Ṛgveda-Khilāni; ŚB, Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa; TS, Taittirīya-Saṃhitā; **Grammatical abbreviations:** ABL, ablative; ACC, accusative; ACT, active; AOR, aorist; CONV, converb; DAT, dative; DU, dual; EMPH, emphatic; F, feminine; F-N, feminine-neuter; IMPF, imperfect; IMPV, imperative; INJ, injunctive; INS, instrumental; INT, intensive; LOC, locative; M, masculine; MED, middle; M-N, masculine-neuter; N, neuter; NOM, nominative; NOM-ACC, nominative-accusative; OPT, optative; PART, participle; PASS, passive; PF, perfect; PL, plural; PRES, present; REFL, reflexive; SG, singular; SUBJ, subjunctive; VOC, vocative

* Tel.: +31 71 5272203; fax: +31 71 5277569.

E-mail address: L.Kulikov@let.LeidenUniv.nl.

ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ śrotavyo mantavyo nididhyāsitavyo maitreyi. ātmano vā are darśanena śravaṇena matyā vijñānenedaṁ sarvaṁ viditam

‘Verily, it is one’s self (*ātman*), o Maitreyī, which one should see, hear, on which one should reflect and ponder. For by seeing and hearing one’s self, by reflecting and pondering on one’s self, one gains the knowledge of the whole world.’

(Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad 2.4.5)

1. Introduction

1.1. Reflexive morphemes in Vedic

The present paper deals with the semantics, syntax and usage of the reflexive pronouns in Vedic Sanskrit, one of the most ancient attested Indo-European languages.¹ The reflexive function is rendered in Vedic by derivatives of the three following roots: *svá-*, *tanū-* and *ātmán-* (*tmán-*).² The term ‘reflexive’ is also often employed to denote one of the functions of the middle diathesis (alongside the passive, the self-beneficent, and others), for instance, in *bhṛ-* ‘bring’: *bhárate* ‘moves’ (= *‘brings oneself’), *vah* ‘carry, convey’: *váhate* ‘drives’ (= *‘carries, conveys oneself’); *pṛ-* ‘fill’: *púryate* ‘becomes full, fills oneself’; see, e.g., Speijer, 1896:48; Gotō, 1987:27, 49 et passim. Although forms with middle inflexion can be employed in reflexive usages, in many cases such intransitives (which might be called ‘weak reflexives’) are not quite synonymous with the reflexive constructions in the strict sense of the concept (see, e.g., Gonda, 1979:49). The non-passive intransitives of this type often exhibit idiomatic semantic changes (cf. *śap* ‘curse’: *śápate* ‘swears’). Note, furthermore, that, although the reflexive *tanū-* is typically constructed with middle verbal forms, active forms are not exceptional in constructions with reflexive pronouns (see Hock, 2006, and section 3.3.3 below). The reflexive usage of *svá-* ‘own’ (see Vine, 1997, with bibl.; Hock, 2006:24f.), attested in the pronominal adjective *svá-* and the isolated form *svayám* (see section 3.3.1 and examples (23–24)), is also common for the cognates of this root in other Indo-European languages (cf. Lat. *suus*, Rus. *svoy*, etc.) and probably goes back to Proto-Indo-European (see, for instance, Petit, 1999:130ff. et passim).³ By contrast, the development of the reflexive usage of the feminine substantive *tanū-* ‘body’ and the

¹ The most ancient Vedic text, the R̥gveda (RV), dates to the 2nd half of the second millennium B.C.; the youngest texts can roughly be dated as late as the end of the first millennium B.C. Chronologically, several periods can be distinguished within Vedic:

- the language of the early mantras: the early RV (family books, or *maṇḍalas*);
- the language of the late mantras: the late RV (encompassing, above all, *maṇḍalas* I and X), followed by (though almost contemporaneous with) the Atharvaveda (AV), attested in two recensions, Śaunaka and Paippalāda, and the still more recent mantras contained in the texts of the Yajurveda and Brāhmaṇas (marked with the superscript ^m in text sigla: MS^m, ŚB^m, etc.);
- middle and late Vedic (= Vedic prose): the language of the *Saṁhitā* prose, or prose parts of the Yajurveda, as well as Brāhmaṇas, Āraṇyakas, (Vedic) Upaniṣads and probably the oldest Sūtras.

² See Grassmann, 1873:519f., 552; Delbrück, 1888:207ff., 262f.; Bloomfield, 1895:421; Macdonell, 1910:304f., §400; Oldenberg, 1919:86, footnote 4; 100ff.; Oertel, 1926:184ff.; Wackernagel, 1930:478ff., §237; 488ff., §240; Renou, 1966 [EVP XV]:172f.; Gonda, 1979:49; and, most recently, Vine, 1997; Pinault, 2001; and Hock, 2006.

For etymological relationships between *ātmán-* and *tmán-* (and, possibly, *tanū-*), see Wennerberg, 1981:268ff., with bibl.

³ It is important to note that, generally, the antecedent of *svá-* is the theme of the sentence, which may be different from the subject. See Vine, 1997 for details.

masculine substantive *ātmán-* ‘breath, soul’⁴ (which is typical for the nouns denoting soul, body or body parts in the languages of the world; see Moravcsik, 1972:272) is peculiar to Indo-Iranian (in the case of *tanŭ-*, cf. Middle Persian *tan*) or Indo-Aryan (in the case of *ātmán-*). The grammars note that the reflexive usage of *tanŭ-* is more archaic (as its Iranian cognates also indicate), while the reflexive usage of *ātmán-* is more recent, attested from the late RV onwards (Delbrück, 1888:208, 262f.; Wackernagel, 1930:488ff., §240; Pinault, 2001:190). The details of this development, as well as the exact distribution of functions, have not yet been the subject of special study.

1.2. Reflexive versus non-reflexive (substantive) usages

A difficult problem that one is faced with is to distinguish between the reflexive (‘self’) and non-reflexive, or substantive (‘body’), usages of *tanŭ-* (and the same holds true for its later replacement, *ātmán-*). In many cases, the meaning of the passage pleads for one of two interpretations. Thus, the context of the Atharvavedic spell against worms entering human bodies (1) seems to rule out the reflexive interpretation:

(1) (AV 2.31.5)

yé *krímayaḥ* *párvateṣu* *váneṣu* *óṣadhīṣu*
 which:NOM.PL.M worm:NOM.PL mountain:LOC.PL wood:LOC.PL plant:LOC.PL
paśúṣu *apsu* *ántaḥ yé* *asmākaṃ* ...
 cattle:LOC.PL water:LOC.PL within which:NOM.PL.M our
tanuvām *āviviśūḥ*
 body:ACC.SG enter:PF:3PL.ACT

‘The worms that are in the mountains, in the woods, in the plants, in the cattle, in the waters, that have entered our bodies/*ourselves ...’

Yet, in many cases it is virtually impossible to draw with accuracy the distinction between the reflexive and non-reflexive usages of *tanŭ-* ‘body’: both interpretations may be perfectly appropriate in the context, or, as Wackernagel (1930:489) notices, “an manchen Stellen schimmert die substantivische Bedeutung “Leib”, “Person” mehr oder weniger stark durch” (see also Pinault, 2001:189; Hock, 2006:25ff.), cf. (2), (35–36):

(2) (RV 10.54.3)

yán *mātáraṃ* *ca* *pitáraṃ* *ca* *sākám*
 since mother:ACC.SG and father:ACC.SG and together
ājanayathās *tanuvāḥ* *svāyāḥ*
 produce:IMPF:2SG.MED self:ABL.SG own:ABL.SG.F

‘... since you produced (your) mother and (your) father together from your own body/ from yourself.’

⁴ Next to its primary meaning and reflexive usage, in late Vedic texts (in particular, in the Upaniṣads; see the epigraph) *ātman* becomes one of the most important philosophical notions, denoting “the spiritual self or the inmost core of a human being” (Olivelle, 1998:22, 26 et passim). For the philosophical aspects of the semantics of the Vedic words for ‘self’, see Gardner, 1998.

It is thus perfectly natural that the interpretations of *tanū́-* suggested by different authors vary considerably and, when rejecting an alternative interpretation, translators appeal to “common sense”.⁵

Within the scope of this paper it is impossible to offer an exhaustive solution for this difficult philological problem. Like other translators, in some cases we can only take recourse to “common sense” and reject some interpretations as “awkward” or “unlikely”.

1.3. The aims of the paper

The present paper will pay special attention to the distinction between reflexive and emphatic usages of *tanū́-* and *ātmán-*, mostly focusing on the early Vedic *tanū́-*. I will argue that this opposition, well-known from studies on the typology of reflexive pronouns but largely disregarded in the Vedic scholarship, may be the key to understanding several difficult passages where the reflexive morphemes occur. After a short introductory discussion of the opposition ‘reflexive (proper)/emphatic’ (section 2), I will offer a systematic survey of the syntactic properties shared by both reflexive pronouns: attested case patterns, agreement properties, diathesis (middle/active) of the verb with which the pronouns in question are constructed (section 3). Sections 4 and 5 will concentrate on some important peculiarities of *tanū́-* and *ātmán-* (*tmán-*), respectively. The concluding section 6 will summarize the main periods in the historical development of the reflexive construction. An overview of the paradigm of the reflexive pronouns attested in early Vedic will be given in Appendix A. Thus, in contrast to the recent studies on the Vedic reflexive pronouns concentrating on the etymology of *tanū́-* (Pinault, 2001) and its grammaticalization (Hock, 2006), as well as on the semantics of *svá-* (Vine, 1997), this paper will focus on a synchronic, typologically oriented description of syntactic constructions with *tanū́-* and *ātmán-* (*tmán-*), as well as on their historical developments attested between the early and middle Vedic periods.

2. Reflexive versus emphatic: general remarks

As is well-known, reflexive usages in a broad sense encompass reflexives properly speaking, i.e. the expression of coreference with the subject,⁶ and emphatics (emphatic reflexives), or intensifiers. The reflexive type *sensu stricto*, exemplified in (3–4), does not require special clarification:

(3) *John scolds himself.*

(4) Russian

<i>Ivan</i>	<i>rugaet</i>	<i>(samogo)</i>	<i>sebjá</i>
John:NOM	scolds	(self.EMPH:ACC.SG.M)	self.REFL:ACC

‘John scolds himself.’

⁵ Thus, Hock (2006:26ff.) disagrees with Grassmann’s (1873:1763) “literal reading” (‘Leib’ = ‘body’) of *tanvám* at RV 1.147.2 (cf. (33)) (“this is not a likely interpretation”) and *tanvī* at RV 10.65.7 (cf. (17)) (“a literal interpretation seems unlikely”); the reflexive interpretation of RV 7.86.2 (cf. (19)) ‘I consult with myself’ is considered by him “better than [non-reflexive] ‘with my own body’”; etc.

⁶ For a definition of reflexive, see, e.g., Faltz, 1985; Testelec and Toldova, 1998; Ryan, 2004:57ff. et passim.

The emphatic type can be illustrated by the examples in (5–7):

- (5) *I myself agree with you.*
- (6) *Newton himself was unable to solve this problem.*
- (7) *Peter drew this picture himself.*

The meaning of *-self* in such usages can be determined as a signal of the fact that its referent “is to some degree unexpected in the discourse role or clausal role where it occurs” (Kemmer, 1995:57). In other words, one might expect that Newton would have been able to solve the problem, Peter would not have drawn this picture without someone’s help, and so on.⁷ In some languages, the reflexive and emphatic meanings are rendered by different words (cf. Russ. reflexive *sebjā* versus emphatic *sam*⁸), in some other languages it is rendered by one single word (cf. English *-self*); see König and Siemund, 1999. Vedic Sanskrit belongs to the latter type of languages. Like English *-self*, Vedic reflexive pronouns can be employed in both usages, i.e. either as a marker of the coreference with the subject or as an intensifier (cf. the examples below).

3. Some syntactic features of the reflexive and emphatic pronouns

This section will briefly discuss a few important syntactic peculiarities shared by the two Vedic reflexive pronouns, *tanū́-* and *ātmán-* (*tmán-*).

3.1. Case patterns

The case of the reflexive pronoun is determined by its syntactic function in the clause structure (direct object = accusative, indirect object = dative, etc.). The case-marking of the emphatics is regulated by more complex rules and depends, in particular, on the position of its antecedent and some other syntactic and semantic parameters. Typological studies on emphatics distinguish between adnominal and adverbial uses (see, e.g., Edmondson and Plank, 1978; König and Siemund, 1999:43ff., with bibl.). In the former use, emphatics surface as adjuncts to noun phrases, while in the latter use, they are adjoined to verbal phrases and fill the position of an adverbial; cf. examples (8a–b) from Edmondson and Plank (1978:374):

- (8) a. *Lizzy herself shaved father.*
- b. *Lizzy shaved father herself.*

Both *tanū́-* and (*ā*)*tmán-*, when employed as emphatics, prefer the adverbial uses, which display two syntactic patterns determining their case: (i) the pronoun copies the case of its antecedent noun phrase; (ii) the pronoun surfaces in the case which is used adverbially, irrespectively of the case-marking of the corresponding noun; hereafter I will call these two strategies ‘**nominal pattern**’ and ‘**adverbial pattern**’.

In the RV, we find in the adverbial pattern the instrumental forms of *tanū́-* (e.g., ins.sg. *tanvā*) and some oblique case forms of *tmán-* (instrumental, locative), cf.:

⁷ For the semantics and typology of intensifiers, see Moravcsik, 1972 (one of the pioneer studies in the field); Dirven, 1973; Ljutikova, 1997, 1998 (with bibl.); König and Siemund, 1999; Ryan, 2004:203ff.

⁸ For Russ. *sam*, see, e.g., Janko, 1999.

(9) (RV 6.49.13)

rāyā́ madema tan_uvā́ tánā ca
 wealth:INS.SG enjoy:PRES:1PL.OPT.ACT self:INS.SG offspring:INS.SG and

‘May we enjoy wealth ourselves and in (our) offspring.’

(10) (RV 3.41.6)

... *mandasvā* ... *ándhaso*
 become.inebriated:PRES:2SG.IMPV.MED Soma.juice:GEN.SG
rādhase tan_uvā́ mahé
 for.generosity self:INS.SG great

‘... become inebriated with Soma juice yourself, for great generosity.’

(11) (RV 7.86.5)

áva drugdhāni pútrīyā sṛjā nó
 away sin:NOM-ACC.PL fatherly:NOM-ACC.PL.N remit:PRES:2SG.IMPV.ACT our
 ’*ava yā́ vayāṃ cakṛmā́ tanūbhiḥ*
 away which:NOM-ACC.PL.N we do:PF:1PL.ACT self:INS.PL

‘Remit our fatherly sins (i.e. sins which our fathers have committed), [remit] those which we have committed ourselves.’

The nominal pattern is illustrated in examples (37–38) below.

3.2. Number agreement

Very often, the reflexive pronouns lack a distinction in number, cf. Russ. *sebjā*, which only has the singular paradigm. On the other hand, in languages where the reflexive originates in a non-pronominal substantive (‘body’, ‘soul’ or the like), it may inherit the full paradigm and agree with its antecedent in number.

Early Vedic typically follows the latter pattern. Both *tanū́-* and *ātman-* (but not *tmán-*, which only shows a few singular forms; see section 5.2.2 below) agree in number with the antecedent noun both in the reflexive (cf. (12–13)) and emphatic (examples (10–11) above)⁹ usages:

(12) (RV 3.1.1)

... *agne tan_uvāṃ juṣasva*
 Agni:VOC.SG self:ACC.SG enjoy:PRES:2SG.IMPV.MED

‘... O Agni, enjoy yourself!’

(13) (RV 10.8.3)

áruṣīr ... řtāsya yónau tan_uvò juṣanta
 reddish:NOM.PL order:GEN.SG womb:LOC.SG self:ACC.PL enjoy:PRES:3PL.INJ.MED

‘The reddish [flames] ... enjoy themselves in the womb of order.’

⁹ But cf. (9), where the singular form is likely to be due to the fixed character of the collocation *tanvā́ tánā ca* ‘(one)self and (in) his/her/their children’.

This syntactic feature can serve as an additional criterion for disambiguating the homonymous form *tanvā* (nominative-accusative dual versus instrumental singular) in examples such as (14):

(14) (RV 10.65.2)

<i>indrāgnī</i> ...	<i>mithó</i>	<i>hinvānā</i>
Indra.Agni:NOM-ACC.DU	mutually	impel:PRES:PART.MED:NOM-ACC.DU.M
<i>tan_uvā</i>	<i>sámokasā</i>	
self:NOM-ACC.DU/INS.SG	having.same.abode:NOM-ACC.DU.M	

‘Indra and Agni, ... mutually impelling each other themselves, having the same abode ...’

An instrumental form might be possible in the adverbial use of the emphatic. However, since *tanū-* must agree in number with its antecedent (the dual compound *indrāgnī*), the alternative morphological analysis as an instrumental singular can be ruled out.

The same considerations seem to hold true for a few other occurrences of *tanvā*, cf. (15–16):

(15) (RV 4.56.6)

<i>punāné</i>	<i>tan_uvā</i>	<i>mitháḥ</i>	<i>svéna</i>	<i>dákṣeṇa</i>
purifying:NOM-ACC.DU.F-N	self:NOM-ACC.DU	mutually	own:INS.SG.M-N	force:INS.SG
<i>rājathaḥ</i>				
rule:PRES:2DU.ACT				

‘Purifying each other yourselves, you (sc. heaven and earth) rule with your own power.’

(16) (RV 1.181.4)

<i>ihéha</i>	<i>jātā</i>	<i>sám avāvaśītām</i>
at.different.places	born:NOM-ACC.DU.M	harmonize:IMPF:3DU.MED
<i>arepāsā</i>	<i>tan_uvā</i>	<i>nāmabhiḥ sváiḥ</i>
spotless:NOM-ACC.DU.M	self:NOM-ACC.DU	name:INS.PL own:INS.PL.M-N

‘(Albeit) born at different places, the spotless [Ásvins] harmonized (?) with each other themselves (and) in (their) names.’

Note that in the latter case the instrumental analysis of *tanvā* (cf. Geldner’s (1951:I, 261) translation: ‘[a]n verschiedenen Orten geboren stimmten die Makellosen **an Körper** und mit ihren Namen zueinander’) would leave unexplained the singular number (instead of the expected plural or dual), coordinated with the plural *nāmabhiḥ*. For all the above-quoted occurrences (14–16), the nominative dual analysis was adopted by Grassmann (1873:519, 1763).

From the late RV onwards, both pronouns tend to lose the number distinction and generalize the singular forms,¹⁰ cf. examples (17–18) from the late book 10 of the RV (see also Hock, 2006:27–28, for discussion of these examples):

¹⁰ Cf. Wackernagel, 1930:490.

(17) (RV 10.65.7)

yajñám janitvī tanuvī ní māmṛjuḥ
 sacrifice:ACC.SG produce:CONV self:LOC.SG wipe.into:PF:3PL.ACT

‘Having produced the sacrifice, [the gods] have appropriated it (lit. rubbed it into themselves).’

(18) (RV 10.66.9)

vásam devāsas tanuvī ní māmṛjuḥ
 power:ACC.SG god:NOM.PL self:LOC.SG wipe.into:PF:3PL.ACT

‘The gods have appropriated the power (lit. rubbed the power into themselves).’

In Vedic prose we only exceptionally come across the plural and dual forms of *ātmán-*; see a detailed discussion of the middle and late Vedic evidence in Oertel, 1926:184ff.; see also Wackernagel, 1930:490.

3.3. “Heavy” reflexives and the active/middle distinction

3.3.1. *svā-* (/ *svayám*) *tanvī-*

In early Vedic, the reflexive *tanvī-* sometimes occurs constructed with the pronominal adjective *svā-* ‘own’ (feminine stem *svā-*), as in (19–21, 39):

(19) (RV 7.86.2)

utá sváyā tanuvā sám vade tát
 and own:INS.SG.F self:INS.SG together speak:PRES:1SG.MED this:NOM-ACC.SG.N

‘And I discuss it with myself.’ (see Pinault, 2001:187; Hock, 2006:26)

(20) (RV 10.8.4)

ṛtāya saptá dadhiṣe padāni
 order:DAT.SG seven put:PF:2SG.MED step:ACC.PL
janáyan mitráṃ tanuvè svāyai
 producing:NOM.SG.M friend:ACC.SG self:DAT.SG own:DAT.SG.F

‘You (= Agni) placed seven steps for order, producing a friend for yourself.’

(21) (AV 7.3.1)

sváyā tanuvā tanuvām airayata
 own:INS.SG.F self:INS.SG self:ACC.SG send:IMPF:3SG.ACT

‘He sent forth himself by himself.’ (?)

Cf. also the verse RV 10.120.9, where the identification of the referent of the emphatic reflexive poses some problems:

(22) (RV 10.120.9)

mahān *bṛhāddivo* *átharvā*¹¹
 great:NOM.SG.M Bṛhaddiva:NOM.SG Atharvan:NOM.SG
ávocat *sváṁ* *tanuvām* *índram* *evá*
 say:AOR:3SG.ACT own:ACC.SG.F self:ACC.SG Indra:ACC.SG verily

‘The great Bṛhaddiva Atharvan ... told to Indra [as] to himself ...’

Geldner (1951:III, 347) saw here the emphatic (but non-reflexive) usage: “Also hat der große Bṛhaddiva Atharvan zu ihm selbst, zu Indra gesprochen”. His analysis (“ad Indrum ipsum”) is adopted and advocated by Vine (1997:210). Although, as Vine rightly points out, *svá-* does not necessarily refer to the subject of the sentence, the antecedent of the collocation *svá- tanú-* is typically the subject (cf. the examples quoted above), and the hypothetical construction with the genitive of Indra, **sváṁ tanvām índrasya*, suggested by Vine, is hardly possible. The interpretation suggested by Elizarenkova (1999:278, 518) is more likely: the antecedent of *sváṁ tanvām* is the subject, Bṛhaddiva Atharvan: “... vozzval k Indre (, kak) k samomu sebe” [he appealed to Indra (as) to himself].

Note too that the root *svá-* appears in the isolated form *svayám* ‘(one)self’, which behaves as a nominative (see Wackernagel, 1930:480ff.),¹² as in (23, 24, 35):

(23) (RV 6.51.7)

svayám *ripús* *tanuvām* *rīriṣṭṣṭa*
 self deceiver:NOM.SG self:ACC.SG hurt:AOR:3SG.INJ.MED

‘Let the deceiver hurt himself (on his own).’

(24) (RV 7.8.5)

svayám *vardhasva* *tanuvām* *sujāta*
 self increase:PRES:2SG.IMPV.MED self:ACC.SG well-born:VOC.SG

‘Increase yourself by yourself, o well-born one.’

Apparently, both *svá-* and *svayám* additionally emphasize the coreference of the object with the subject (Gonda, 1979:49, Pinault, 2001:188f.), pointing to the unexpected character of the reflexive situation and contrasting it with the non-reflexive situation (the deceiver is hurt by himself, not by the others, etc.). Most likely, the opposition between the emphasized (*svá-* (*/ svayám*) *tanú-*) and non-emphasized (*tanú-*; cf. (12, 13, 18, 33)) reflexives represents the same distinction as that between (morphologically) complex (heavy) and simple reflexives, repeatedly discussed in the typological literature and exemplified by such pairs as Dutch *zichzelf* ~ *zich*, Russ. *sam sebja*, *samogo sebja* ~ *sebja* (see, for instance, Dirven, 1973:294ff.; Ljutikova, 1997:64ff. et passim; Ljutikova, 1999; König and Siemund, 1999:41f., 47ff.).

¹¹ The symbol ~ shows that the sandhi has been undone.

¹² The final part *-ám* may have been borrowed from the nominative form of the 1st person pronoun *ahám* ‘I’ or from the demonstrative (nom.sg.m.) *ayám* (see Wackernagel, ibid.).

3.3.2. *ātmán-* *tanū́-*

In the language of the Atharvaveda,¹³ alongside the collocation *svā́-* *tanū́-*,¹⁴ we find constructions where *tanū́-* and *ātmán-* co-occur in the same case form, cf.:

(25) (AVP 4.10.4)

adbhir *ātmānaṃ* *tanvaṃ*¹⁵
 water:INS.PL soul/self:ACC.SG body/self:ACC.SG
śumbhamānā *gṛhān* *prehi*
 adorn:PRES:PART.MED:NOM.SG.F house:ACC.PL go.forth:PRES:2SG.IMPV.ACT

‘Adorning yourself/[your] own body with waters, go forth to the homestead.’

(26) (AV 1.18.3)

yát *ta* *ātmāni* *tanvāṃ* *ghorám*
 what:NOM.SG.N your soul/self:LOC.SG body/self:LOC.SG terrible:NOM.SG.N
ásti *yád* *vā* *kéśeṣu* ...
 be:PRES:3SG.ACT what:NOM.SG.N or hair:LOC.PL

‘Whatever is terrible in yourself/in your own body, whatever in [your] hairs ...’

The exact translation of such constructions poses some difficulties. We can hardly surmise here the meaning ‘soul’ (‘adorning your soul ...’?). On the other hand, a mere juxtaposition of two functionally equivalent reflexive pronouns barely makes better sense. Given the obvious parallelism of (25) (*ātmānaṃ tanvaṃ śumbhamānā*) with such Ṛgvedic passages as (36) (*tanuvā śumbhamāne*) and (35) (*svayám tanuvāḥ śumbhamānāḥ*), *ātmán-* appears to behave as a functional equivalent of *svā́-* in the collocation *svā́-* *tanū́-*, which either means ‘own body’, or is employed as a heavy reflexive pronoun. Although, morphologically, *ātmán-* can hardly be an adjective,¹⁶ it seems to take over the syntactic and semantic functions of *svā́-*. Note the following Atharvavedic passages, where *ātmán-* is likely to mean ‘own’, thus being a replacement of *svā́-*:

(27) (AVP 11.1.4)

ātmanas *te* *lohitād* *garbhaḥ* *saṃ vartatām*
 self:ABL.SG your blood:ABL.SG embryo:NOM.SG arise:PRES:3SG.IMPV.MED

vṛṣā
 bull:VOC.SG
 ‘Let an embryo arise from your own blood, o bull.’

¹³ I am much indebted to A. Lubotsky for my discussion of the Atharvavedic evidence. Of course, I take full responsibility for possible misinterpretations.

¹⁴ *svayám tanū́-* is unattested.

¹⁵ Note that the oblique case stem *tanv-* is often monosyllabic in the AV, in contrast to the RVic *tanuv-*, which always is dissyllabic.

¹⁶ In that case, we would expect a form that would agree in gender (feminine) with the head noun *tanū́-*. The nominals with the suffix *-man-* do not occur as autonomous feminine stems in early Vedic. We only find a few examples in compounds, such as *su-tárman-* ‘well-protecting’, *pṛthú-yāman-* ‘having a broad path’; see Macdonell, 1910:206.

(28) (AV 5.29.6)

yó mā piśācó áśane dadāmbha tād
 who:NOM.SG.M I:ACC Piśāca:NOM.SG eating:LOC.SG hurt:PF:3SG.ACT then
 ātmānā prajāyā piśācā ví yātayantām
 self:INS.SG offspring:INS.SG Piśāca:NOM.PL do.penance:PRES:3PL.IMPV.MED

‘If a Piśāca-demon has hurt me during eating, then let the Piśācas do penance in (their) own offspring.’¹⁷

3.3.3. Vedic prose

After the AV, *tanū-* falls out of use and, accordingly, the heavy reflexive *svā-* (*/ svayám*) *tanū-* does not occur anymore. Yet, it seems that middle and late Vedic has developed another way to render the same distinction. In his survey of the reflexive *ātmán-*, Delbrück (1888:262f.) briefly outlines the emphatic value of the diathesis opposition (active/middle) in constructions with *ātmán-*. According to Delbrück, the active appears “wenn die Gegenüberstellung von Subject und Object besonders deutlich empfunden wird, also *ātmānam* ganz so wie ein anderes Object behandelt wird”. This explanation appears to be somewhat misleading (see also Hock, 2006:37), since Delbrück’s examples and comments upon them rather point to the contrastive or emphatic function of the active in such uses. Witness the use of the middle inflexion in (29–30), as opposed to the active in (31–32):

(29) (MS 1.6.4:93.3)

híraṇyam dadāty ātmānam evá téna punīte
 gold:ACC.SG give:PRES:3SG.ACT self:ACC.SG thereby purify:PRES:3SG.MED

‘He gives gold; thereby he purifies himself.’

(30) (MS 1.9.3:132.8)

sá yajñám ātmānam vy ádhatta
 he:NOM sacrifice:ACC.SG self:ACC.SG change:IMPF:3SG.MED

‘He changed himself into the sacrifice.’

(31) (TS 1.7.5.2)

yád yajamāna-bhāgám prāśnāty
 if sacrificer-portion:ACC.SG devour:PRES:3SG.ACT
 ātmānam evá prīṇāti
 self:ACC.SG delight:PRES:3SG.ACT

‘If he devours the sacrificer’s portion, he delights himself.’¹⁸

¹⁷ Note that only on the assumption that *ātmán-* means ‘own’ can we explain the discrepancy between the singular and plural number of *piśācā-* in the subordinate and main clauses. All Piśācas (a class of demons) are supposed to do penance (in their offspring) because of a deed committed by one of them.

¹⁸ Cf. Delbrück’s translation and comments: “wenn er den Antheil des Opferers verzehrt, erquickt er sich selbst (sonst hat er die Aufgabe, andere zu erquickern)”.

(32) (ŚB 1.2.4.7)

néd ātmānam vā pṛthivīm vā hināsāni
 lest self:ACC.SG or earth:ACC.SG or hurt:PRES:1SG.SUBJ.ACT
 ‘Lest I hurt myself, or the earth.’

The active diathesis is marked in the context of *ātmānam*, as compared to the more common middle, and probably for that reason takes over the function of *svā-* (*svayám*) in the early Vedic collocation *svā-* (/ *svayám*) *tanú-*.¹⁹ This morphological strategy is quite remarkable from the typological point of view, since the ‘heavy’ reflexive (*ātmán-* + active inflexion) is morphologically no more complex than the ‘simple’ reflexive (*ātmán-* + middle inflexion). Rather, its “heavy” character is rendered by the diathesis that is marked in the reflexive context.

In what follows I will discuss *tanú-* and (*ā*)*tmán-* in detail, particularly the attested case patterns.

4. *tanú-*

4.1. Reflexive usage

The reflexive *tanú-* is well-attested from the early RV onwards. We find practically the full paradigm in this usage: accusative *tan_uvām* (33), instrumental *tan_uvā* (19), genitive *tan_uvāḥ* (34), dative *tan_uvè* (20), locative *tan_uvì* (*tan_uvī*) (17–18), cf.:

(33) (RV 1.147.2)

vandārus te tan_uvām vande agne
 praiser:NOM.SG your self:ACC.SG praise:PRES:1SG.MED Agni:VOC.SG
 ‘As your praiser, I praise myself, o Agni.’

(34) (RV 8.44.15)

yó agnīm tan_uvò dāme devám
 who:NOM.SG.M Agni:ACC.SG self:GEN.SG house:LOC.SG god:ACC.SG
mártaḥ saparyāti
 mortal:NOM.SG worship:PRES:3SG.ACT

‘The mortal who worships the god Agni in [his] own (Agni’s (?)) house ...’²⁰

As mentioned above (section 1.2), in some cases it is nearly impossible to draw with accuracy the distinction between the reflexive and non-reflexive (‘body’) meanings: both interpretations are perfectly appropriate in the context, as in (2). This is also the case with the accusatives *tanvām*

¹⁹ Note that in constructions with *tanú-* both active and middle forms are possible; see section 1.1 and Hock, 2006, for details.

²⁰ The literal translation (‘in the house of the body’?) is hardly possible. This is a very rare example of the pronoun *tanú-* referring to the theme, not to the subject of the sentence, and thus employed like the adjective *svā-* ‘own’ (see Renou, 1964 [EVP XIII]: 74, 154 [“aboutissement extrême de *tanú-* comme réfléchi”]; Vine, 1997; Pinault, 2001:189, and footnote 3 above; for this passage, see also Hock, 2006:27). It may represent one of the peculiarities of the dialect of book 8, which is different from the language of the bulk of the RV in some respects.

(sg.), *tanvā* (du.), *tanvāḥ* (pl.) in constructions with the verb *śubh* ‘adorn, beautify’,²¹ where both translations (‘body’ and ‘self’) are appropriate (RV 2.39.2, 7.56.11, 7.59.7), cf. (35–36):

(35) (RV 7.56.11)

utā svayām tanvāḥ śumbhamānāḥ
and self body/self:ACC.PL adorn:PRES:PART.MED:NOM.PL.M

‘... and adorning themselves/their bodies.’ (a hymn addressed to the Maruts)

(36) (RV 2.39.2)

... *vāram ā sacethe méne*
according to wish follow:PRES:2DU.MED courtesan:NOM-ACC.DU
iva tanvā śumbhamāne
like body/self:NOM-ACC.DU adorn:PRES:PART.MED:NOM.DU.F

‘... you (Aśvins) move together according to your wish, adorning yourselves/your bodies like two courtesans.’²²

4.2. Emphatic usage

In the more common adverbial case pattern we find the instrumental forms, as in examples (9–11). The nominal pattern is attested, for instance, with accusatives and datives:

(37) (RV 1.31.12ab)

tvām no agne tāva deva pāyúbhir
you:NOM us/our Agni:VOC.SG your god:VOC.SG protecting.power:INS.PL
maghōno rakṣa tanvāś ca
bountiful:ACC.PL protect:PRES:2SG.IMPV.ACT self:ACC.PL and
vandīya
praiseworthy:VOC.SG.M

‘You, o Agni, protect with your protecting powers, o god, the bountiful (patrons) and ourselves, o praiseworthy one!’

(38) (AV 1.13.2 = RVKh. 4.4.2)

mṛḍáyā nas tanúbhyo máyas
be.gracious:PRES:2SG.IMPV.ACT us/our self:DAT.PL pleasure:ACC.SG
tokébhyas kṛdhi
offspring:DAT.PL make:AOR:2SG.IMPV.ACT

‘Be gracious towards ourselves, make pleasure for [our] offspring.’²³

²¹ For these constructions, see, in particular, Roesler, 1997:162ff.

²² Translations suggested by Geldner (1951:I, 327) (‘... wie Frauen mit ihrem Leibe prunkend’) and some other scholars pose certain morphological problems: we would expect the instrumental dual form *tanúbhyām* instead of the instrumental singular *tanvā*.

²³ The dat.sg. form *tanvè* occurs in the emphatic usage, e.g., in RV 1.84.17, 6.46.12, AV 5.3.7.

There are a few attestations of some other case forms of *tanū́-* for which an emphatic interpretation seems very plausible. Thus, the emphatic analysis of the nominative *svā́ tanūr* in (39) gives the key to the understanding of the following passage:

(39) (RV 10.83.5 ≈ AV 4.32.5)

<i>tám</i>	<i>tvā</i>	<i>manyo</i>	<i>akratúr</i>	
this:ACC.SG.M	you:ACC	Manyu:VOC.SG	unintentional:NOM.SG.M	
<i>jihīḷa~</i>	<i>ahám</i>	<i>svā́</i>	<i>tanūr</i>	<i>bala-déyāya</i>
make.angry:PF:1SG.ACT	I:NOM	OWN:NOM.SG.F	self:NOM.SG	force-give:DAT
<i>mā~</i>	<i>ihī</i> ²⁴			
I:ACC	come:PRES:2SG.IMPV.ACT			

‘Unintentionally, I have made you angry, o Manyu. Come here yourself, in order to give me force.’ (hymn addressed to Manyu (fury))

The noun phrase *svā́ tanūr* has caused difficulties for many scholars. Hillebrandt (1913:111, with footnote 6) left it untranslated (“Konstruktion der Worte *svā́ tanūr* unklar”). Some interpreters stuck to the original meaning of *tanū́-* ‘body’ (cf. Ludwig, 1876:II, 279: ‘ich bin [nur] mein eigener leib, kom [du noch] zu mir ...’), which obviously leads to forced translations. Geldner (1951:III, 266) hesitated between the meanings ‘person’ (‘[i]n eigener Person komme zu mir ...’) and ‘body’ (‘(ich bin) dein Leib’). Renou (1966 [EVP XV]: 172f.; see also Pinault, 2001:187) followed Geldner’s former interpretation (‘viens à moi en personne’), though pointed out that *tanū́-* can also be employed in the reflexive usage in cases other than the nominative (“ailleurs qu’au Nomin., *t°* tend vers le réfléchi”).

In my view, the most natural interpretation of *svā́ tanūr* is the emphatic reflexive – which seems to have actually underlain Whitney’s (Whitney/Lanman, 1905:I, 204) translation of the parallel Atharvavedic verse 4.32.5 (‘come to us, thine ownself’): ‘Come here yourself, in order to give me force’.

An emphatic analysis appears very likely for the locative plural form *tanū́ṣu* in (40):

(40) (RV 7.30.2)

<i>hávanta</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>tvā</i>	<i>hávīyaṃ</i>	
call:PRES:3PL.INJ.MED	you:ACC	worthy.of.sacrifice:ACC.SG.M		
<i>vívāci</i>	<i>tanū́ṣu</i>	<i>śūrāḥ</i>	<i>śūrīyasya</i>	<i>sātáu</i>
verbal.contest:LOC.SG	self:LOC.PL	hero:NOM.PL	sun:GEN.SG	fight:LOC.SG

‘The heroes themselves (= even the heroes) call in the verbal contest you (= Indra), worthy of sacrifice, in the fight for the sun.’

Geldner (1951:II, 207) translated this passage as ‘Dich rufen sie, ... die Helden (im Kampf) um ihre Leiber, um die Sonne zu gewinnen’.²⁵ This interpretation is awkward²⁶ and, moreover, suggests a heavy ellipsis. In my view, an emphatic analysis provides here a more likely

²⁴ AV *bala-dāvā na éhi*.

²⁵ Cf. also Elizarenkova (1995:207): ‘Zovut že tebjā ... geroi (v bor’be) za svoi tela ...’

²⁶ What could ‘im Kampf um ihre Leiber’ mean? The meaning “Kampf um Leib und Leben”, suggested by an anonymous reviewer of this paper, does not seem likely to me.

interpretation. The locative may substitute for the instrumental form of the emphatic reflexive pronoun, perhaps attracted by two other locatives in the same passage, *vívāci* and *sātáu*. The semantics of the ‘unexpected role’ of the antecedent (heroes) appears to fit the context perfectly. Generally, heroes are supposed not to call someone’s help in a contest; nevertheless, even they cannot manage without the help of Indra, the supreme deity of the Vedic pantheon.

Finally, a somewhat peculiar usage of the vocative form of the emphatic is exemplified in (41)²⁷:

(41) (RV 1.120.11)

<i>ayám</i>	<i>samaha</i>	<i>mā</i>	<i>tanu</i>
this:NOM.SG.M	verily	I:ACC	?
<i>ūh.yā́te</i>	<i>jánāṁ</i>	<i>ánu</i>	
carry:INT:3SG.SUBJ.MED	man:ACC.PL	along	
<i>soma-péyaṁ</i>	<i>sukhó</i>	<i>ráthaḥ</i>	
Soma-drink:ACC.SG	easy.going:NOM.SG.M	chariot:NOM.SG	

The hymn is composed by an offended poet, who was given a chariot with no horses (*rátham anaśvám*) for his work. The hieratic part of the hymn properly speaking, addressed to the Aśvins (verses 1 through 9), is followed by a kind of appendix (verses 10–12), where the author expresses his indignation at the stingy sacrificer. In verse 11 he sarcastically conveys the hope that his chariot will drive him to the place of soma-drinking by itself, without horses. Although the general sense of the stanza raises no questions, there are two unclear word-forms which pose serious difficulties: *ūhyā́te* and *tanu*.

For *ūhyā́te*, there are good reasons to follow the analysis first suggested by Oldenberg (1909:117f.), revived by Hoffmann (1982:69f. [= Aufs. 3, 775f.]) and adopted by some other Sanskritists. Oldenberg took this form as going back to the reduplicated intensive with the suffix -yá- (**ūa-uj^h-ja-*) rebuilt in analogy with the weak perfect stem (**ūu-uj^h-*), not as a -yá-passive (‘is driven’), contra Macdonell (1910:334, §446) and some others.

As for *tanu*, we probably have to reject the analysis of this form as a 2sg.act. imperative (with the zero ending) of the verb *tan* ‘stretch’, adopted by some scholars.²⁸ The verb *tan* denotes making an object longer and/or bigger by stretching it or by a change in its posture *within its inner limits* (Eng. *stretch*, *extend*, Germ. *strecken*), not dragging or hauling an object in order to move it. Thus, the phrase *mā tanu*, supposedly addressed to a chariot, can only denote a quite masochistic wish to be stretched by means of this chariot. This fact has already been noticed by Ludwig (1881:42): “Die anwendung im sinne von ‘ziehen’ ist sonst unerhört, und daher ser auffallend: *tanoti* bezeichnet sonst das ziehen, wobei das eine ende des gezogenen gegenstandes als fest zu denken (strecken)”. An unaccented word-form, unless a finite verb, can only be a vocative. Thus, Hoffmann’s (1982:69f. [= Aufs. 3, 775f.]) translation of the passage (‘dieser leichtlaufende Wagen wird mich irgendwie, o (du mein) Leib, über die Volksstämme hin (immer wieder) zum Soma-Trinken fahren’) seems preferable – except for the awkward meaning ‘o (du mein) Leib’, which apparently makes little sense in the context. In my view, *tanu* belongs as a vocative with the emphatic pronoun, not with ‘body’. The ‘unexpected role’ perfectly suits the context, being much in the vein of the sarcastic intonations of the poet: ‘the

²⁷ For a more detailed discussion of this passage, see Kulikov, 2000.

²⁸ See Renou, 1967 [EVP XVI]:23; Elizarenkova, 1989:150 and 617 (‘*Tašči menja kak-nibud’!* Pust’ dvinetsja vsled za ljud’ mi éta legkoxodnaja kolesnica na pit’e somy!’); Lubotsky, 1995:259 (‘This one, verily, *pull* me! May this easy-going chariot be drawn to Soma-drinking, along the people!’).

chariot will drive me [many times]’ (note the intensive verb), while everybody certainly knows that it will never happen without horses.

Although, at first glance, vocative and reflexive appear to be incompatible grammatical characteristics, I do not see good reasons to reject this combination of functions as impossible. On the one hand, there are no constraints on the use of emphatic reflexives in the subject position (which is impossible for reflexives proper by virtue of their definition).²⁹ It has been demonstrated in typological studies on reflexive pronouns that emphatic reflexives can surface as adjuncts to noun phrases regardless of their grammatical relations, or syntactic positions (subject, object, etc.) – in particular, as an adjunct to the subject; cf. (39) and see Faltz, 1985:38ff. with evidence from Modern Hebrew, Turkish and Irish. On the other hand, the vocative can replace the nominative in some (rare) cases. Cf. the textbook example of a predicative vocative (see Delbrück, 1888:106):

(42) (RV 6.31.1a)

ábhūr éko rayipate rayīṇām
become:AOR:2SG.ACT one:NOM.SG.M Lord:VOC.SG wealth:GEN.PL

‘You alone have become the Lord of wealth.’ (lit. ‘you ... have become – o Lord of wealth!’)

The similar construction in (43), with the nominative *rayipātī*, shows that the vocative in (42) must be secondary:

(43) (RV 2.9.4)

tvām hīy ási rayipātī rayīṇām
you:NOM because be:PRES:2.SG.ACT Lord:NOM.SG wealth:GEN.PL

‘... because you are the Lord of wealth.’

In such uses, the vocative seems to emphasize some features or aspects of the referent (‘you ... have become – the Lord of wealth! ...’, etc.).

In my view, *tanu* in RV 1.120.11 exemplifies the emphatic reflexive usage of *tanū́-*, specifically the type illustrated above by English *Peter drew this picture himself* (= without someone’s help, cf. Russ. *sam*), on the one hand, and the emphatic function of the vocative case (as e.g. in (42)), on the other. Thus, the passage in question can be translated as follows:

‘This easy-going chariot, indeed, will carry me – itself! (i.e. o you, which will do it itself, without horses!)³⁰ – to Soma-drinking, along the people.’

By means of such a double emphasis, the poet might have sarcastically stressed the inability of a horseless chariot to move by itself. The use of the ‘emphatic vocative’ may have been a feature of the colloquial style, quite appropriate in the non-sacral appendix to the hieratic part of the hymn.

Alongside its case forms, *tanū́-* can be employed in the emphatic usage as a bound morpheme, as the first member of the compounds *tanū́-kṛ́-* ‘made by oneself’ and *tanū́-pā́-* ‘protector of oneself’. Note example (44), where the opposition ‘self’ ~ ‘other’ is particularly clear, and examples (45–46):

²⁹ Note the lack of the nominative case in the paradigm of reflexive pronouns like Russ. *sebjá*, and cf. Renou’s (1966 [EVP XV]:172f.) remark on the reflexive usage of *tanū́-*: “ailleurs qu’au Nomin., *r* tend vers le réfléchi”.

³⁰ Or, even more literally: ‘This chariot, indeed, will carry me, O (you) by (your)self ...’.

(44) (RV 8.79.3)

tvám soma tanū-kṛdbhyo dvēṣobhyo 'anya-kṛtebhyah
 you:NOM Soma:VOC.SG self-made:ABL.PL³¹ evil:ABL.PL other-made:ABL.PL
urú yantá asi várūtham
 broad:ACC.SG.N giver:NOM.SG be:PRES:2SG.ACT protection:ACC.SG

'You, o Soma, give the broad protection from the evils committed by [our]selves and by the others.'³²

(45) (RV 8.9.11)

bhūtām jagat-pā
 be:AOR:2DU.IMPV.ACT living.world-protector:NOM-ACC.DU
utá nas tanū-pā
 and our self-protector:NOM-ACC.DU

'Be protectors of the living world, as well as protectors of ourselves.'³³

(46) (RV 7.66.3)

tā na sti-pā tanū-pā
 this:NOM-ACC.DU.M our dependent-protector:NOM-ACC.DU self-protector:NOM-ACC.DU

'... these two [gods = Mitra and Varuṇa], the protectors of our dependents [and] protectors of [our]selves'.

5. *ātmán-* and *tmán-*5.1. *Reflexive usage*

The reflexive usage of *ātmán-* becomes common after the RV. In the RV itself, it is very rare, attested only once, in the chronologically heterogeneous book 9, in hymn 9.113 (which, incidentally, may point to the fact that this hymn belongs to a more recent layer of book 9):

(47) (RV 9.113.1)

sómam índraḥ pibatu ...
 Soma:ACC.SG Indra:NOM.SG drink:PRES:3SG.IMPV.ACT
bálam dádhāna ātmáni
 force:ACC.SG putting:NOM.SG.M self:LOC.SG

'Let Indra drink Soma, ... putting the force into himself.' (see also Hock, 2006:20f.)

³¹ The root noun *kṛt-* is employed here in the passive usage typical of the *-ta*-participle *kṛtá-* 'made' (see Caland and Henry, 1906:110, footnote 6; Renou, 1961 [EVP IX]:125).

³² Thus Renou, 1961 [EVP IX]: 70, 125 ('Toi, ô soma, tu es celui qui confère une vaste protection / contre les actes-hostiles faits par soi-même, (contre ceux) faits par d'autres') and Elizarenkova, 1995:417, 720 ('Ty, o Soma, tot, kto daet širokuju zaščitu / Ot vraždebnyx dejstvij, vyzvannyx samimi, / (Ot vraždebnyx dejstvij), vyzvannyx drugimi'), contra Geldner (1951:II, 406) and Oldenberg (1912:139–140) (see also Scarlata, 1999:73).

³³ Geldner's (1951:II, 305) translation ('seid ... Schützer unseres lebenden Besitztums und unserer Leiber') seems less plausible.

After the RV, the reflexive *ātmán-* becomes well-established, but is still in competition with *tanú-* in the AV (see section 3.3.2). In Vedic prose, *ātmán-* completely ousts *tanú-*; see Delbrück, 1888:207ff., 262f.; Wackernagel, 1930:489ff., §240b and, especially, a brief survey in Oertel, 1926, with a rich collection of examples. Several details of the syntactic behaviour of *ātmán-* in Vedic prose need further study; I hope to return to this issue elsewhere.

5.2. Emphatic usage

5.2.1. *ātmán-*

The emphatic usage is attested for *ātmán-* from the AV onwards, cf. (48):

(48) (TS 1.7.3.3)

táto devā ábhavan párá~ ásurā yáasya~
 then god:NOM.PL become:IMPF:3PL.ACT away Asura:NOM.PL who:GEN.SG.M
evám vidúšo 'nvāhāryā āhriyāte
 thus knowing:GEN.SG.M Anvāhārya:NOM.SG bring:PRES.PASS:3SG
bhāvaty ātmānā párá~ asya bhrātr̥vyo
 become:PRES:3SG.ACT self:INS.SG away his rival:NOM.SG
bhavati
 become:PRES:3SG.ACT

‘Then the gods prospered, the Asuras perished. He, who, knowing thus, performs the Anvāhārya-rite, prospers himself, his rival perishes.’

5.2.2. *tmán-*

In contrast to *ātmán-*, the more archaic stem variant *tmán-* already occurs in the emphatic usage in the early RV. The adverbial pattern is attested with the instrumental and locative, with both cases being represented by two forms. The instrumental appears in the very frequent regular form *tmānā* (63 attestations in the RV³⁴) and in the form *tmānyā* (built on the stem *tmānī-* or *tmānya-*, of unclear origin³⁵), which occurs in the late RV (1.188.10, 10.110.10) and in the late mantras (Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā 20.45 = Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa^m 2.6.8.4, etc.), cf.:

(49) (RV 10.110.10)

upāva sṛja tmānyā
 release:PRES:2SG.IMPV.ACT self:INS.SG

‘Release [the sacrificial gifts] yourself.’³⁶

The locative is attested in two forms: *tmāni* (2 occurrences), and the more archaic variant with the zero ending, *tmán* (5 occurrences), cf.:

³⁴ See, in particular, Wielińska, 1995:144–147, 150 on the meaning of *tmānā* in AV 6.6.3 ~ RV 10.133.5.

³⁵ See Macdonell, 1910:206, footnote 11.

³⁶ Elizarenkova (1999:267): ‘otpusti nas po svoemu počinu’.

(50) (RV 6.68.5)

<i>sá</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>sudānuḥ</i>	<i>svāvāñ</i> ...	<i>índrā</i>
he:NOM	only	rich.in.gifts:NOM.SG.M	rich.in.protection:NOM.SG.M	Indra:VOC.DU
<i>yó</i>		<i>vāṃ varuṇa</i>	<i>dāśati</i>	<i>tmán</i>
who:NOM.SG.M	you	Varuṇa:VOC.DU	honour:PRES:3SG.ACT	self:LOC.SG

‘Only the one who honours you himself, o Indra, o Varuṇa, is rich in gifts, rich in protection ...’

(51) (RV 4.29.4)

<i>úpa tmáni</i>	<i>dádhāno</i>	<i>dhurṇy</i>	<i>āśún</i>
to self:LOC.SG	put:PRES:PART.MED:NOM.SG.M	yoke:LOC.SG	quick:ACC.PL.M

‘... [Indra], harnessing quick [horses] to the yoke himself.’

The nominal case pattern is attested for the dative *tmáné*. Note that all four occurrences of this form are in a coordinate construction with the nouns *tokāya* and/or *tānayāya*, meaning ‘for/ toward ourselves and for/toward our offspring’, as in (52):

(52) (RV 1.114.6)

<i>tmáne</i>	<i>tokāya</i>	<i>tānayāya</i>
self:DAT.SG	offspring:DAT.SG	grand-children:DAT.SG

mṛḷa

be.gracious:PRES:2SG.IMPV.ACT

‘Be gracious to [our]selves, to [our] children [and] to grand-children.’

After the RV, *tmán-* almost disappears. We find but one new attestation in the AV (cf. (53)), as well as a few unclear occurrences in the late mantras:

(53) (AV 5.27.11)

<i>tmánā</i>	<i>devébhyo</i>	<i>agnír</i>	<i>havyám</i> ...
self:INS.SG	god:DAT.PL	Agni:NOM.SG	oblation:ACC.SG
<i>svadayatu</i>			
sweeten:PRES:3SG.IMPV.ACT			

‘Let Agni himself sweeten the oblation for the gods.’

6. *tanū́-*, *ātmán-*, *tmán-*: a diachronic overview

The distribution of functions of the different reflexive pronouns throughout the history of Vedic can be briefly summarized as follows.

- (i) In the early RV, *tanū́-* bears the reflexive function; some of its forms (particularly the instrumental) can also be employed in the emphatic usage. In addition to this, some forms built on the stem *tmán-* (dative, instrumental, locative) are used as emphatic pronouns. The heavy reflexive is expressed by the collocation *svā́-* (*ī svayám*) *tanū́-*.

- (ii) From the late RV onwards, *ātmán-* is attested in the reflexive usage. In the AV, it becomes common but is still in competition with *tanú-*. From the AV onwards, it could also be employed as an emphatic pronoun. Thus, *ātmán-* and *tmán-* are opposed both chronologically (*tmán-* is older in the pronominal emphatic usage) and functionally (originally, *ātmán-* is only used as a reflexive, while *tmán-* only functions as an emphatic). In the function of the heavy reflexive we find, alongside *svā- tanú-*, *ātmán- tanú-*.
- (iii) *tmán-* falls out of use by the middle Vedic period; *ātmán-* completely ousts *tanú-*. In constructions with active verbal forms, *ātmán-* functions as a heavy reflexive pronoun.

For the sake of convenience, the attested paradigms of the reflexive and emphatic pronouns in early Vedic (i.e. in the language of the RV and AV) are summarized in the appendix below.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to A. Griffiths, H. Hettrich, H.H. Hock, A. Lubotsky, V.P. Nedjalkov, N. Nicholas, and R. Ryan, as well as two anonymous reviewers of *Lingua*, for their comments on the earlier drafts of this paper. I also would like to take this opportunity to express my thanks to the audience of the International Conference “Reflexive and Middle” (Tunis, 15–17 March 2001), and the audience of the seminar at the Institute for the culture and history of India and Tibet of Hamburg University (May 2002), where parts of this paper were presented – in particular to A. Aklujkar, G. Lazard, A. Montaut, T. Oranskaja, Chr. Pilot-Raichoor, and A. Wezler. I am also thankful to W. Knobl for his valuable comments on my interpretation of RV 1.120.11. I acknowledge the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO), grant 275-70-009 (VENI-project), and Alexander von Humboldt foundation for financial support.

Appendix A

Paradigms of the reflexive and emphatic pronouns in early Vedic

	Reflexive		Emphatic	
	Ṛgveda	Atharvaveda	Ṛgveda	Atharvaveda
SINGULAR				
NOM.			(<i>tanúḥ</i>), <i>svayám</i>	<i>svayám</i>
VOC.			<i>tanu</i> (?)	
ACC.	<i>tanvām</i>	<i>tanvām</i> , <i>ātmānam</i>	<i>tanvām</i>	
INS.	<i>tanvā</i>	<i>tanvā</i> , <i>ātmánā</i>	<i>tanvā</i>	<i>ātmánā</i>
			<i>tmánā</i> , <i>tmányā</i>	(<i>tmánā</i>)
DAT.	<i>tanvè</i>	<i>ātmāne</i>	<i>tanvè</i> , <i>tmané</i>	<i>tanvè</i>
GEN-ABL.	<i>tanvāḥ</i>	<i>tanvāḥ</i> , <i>ātmánaḥ</i>		<i>tanvāḥ</i> , <i>ātmánaḥ</i>
LOC.	<i>tanvì</i> , (<i>ātmáni</i>)	<i>ātmán(i)</i>	<i>tmán(i)</i>	<i>tanvām</i> , <i>ātmáni</i>
DUAL				
NOM-ACC.	<i>tanvā</i>		<i>tanvā</i>	

Appendix A (Continued)

	Reflexive		Emphatic	
	Ṛgveda	Atharvaveda	Ṛgveda	Atharvaveda
PLURAL				
ACC.	<i>tanvāḥ</i>		<i>tanvāḥ</i>	
INS.			<i>tanūbhiḥ</i>	
DAT.				<i>tanūbhyaḥ</i>
LOC.	<i>tanūṣu</i>	<i>tanūṣu, ātmāsu</i>	<i>tanūṣu (?)</i>	

References

- Bloomfield, M., 1895. On assimilation and adaptation in congeneric classes of words. *American Journal of Philology* 16 (4) [= No. 64], 409–434.
- Caland, W., Henry, V., 1906. *L'agniṣṭoma. Description complète de la forme normale du sacrifice de soma dans le culte védique*. Ernest Leroux, Paris.
- Delbrück, B., 1888. *Altindische Syntax*. Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, Halle a.S.
- Dirven, R., 1973. Emphatic and reflexive in English and Dutch. *Leuvense Bijdragen* 62, 285–299.
- Edmondson, J.A., Plank, F., 1978. Great expectations: an intensive *self* analysis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 2, 373–413.
- Elizarenkova, T.Ja., 1989. *Rigveda. Mandaly I–IV*. [Perevod i kommentarii T. Ja. Elizarenkovej] Nauka, Moskva.
- Elizarenkova, T.Ja., 1995. *Rigveda. Mandaly V–VIII*. [Perevod i kommentarii T. Ja. Elizarenkovej] Nauka, Moskva.
- Elizarenkova, T.Ja., 1999. *Rigveda. Mandaly IX–X*. [Perevod i kommentarii T. Ja. Elizarenkovej] Nauka, Moskva.
- Faltz, L.M., 1985. *Reflexivization: a study in universal syntax*. Garland, New York.
- Frajzyngier, Z., Curl, T.S. (Eds.), 1999. *Reflexives: form and function*. Benjamins, Amsterdam. (Typological studies in language; 40).
- Gardner, J.R., 1998. *The developing terminology of the Self in Vedic India*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa.
- Geldner, K.F., 1951. *Der Rig-Veda aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt ... Bände 1–3*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA. (Harvard Oriental Series; 33–35).
- Gonda, J., 1979. *The medium in the Ṛgveda*. Brill, Leiden.
- Gotō, T., 1987. *Die “I. Präsenklasse” im Vedischen: Untersuchung der vollstufigen thematischen Wurzelpräsentia*. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien.
- Grassmann, H., 1873. *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. Brockhaus, Leipzig.
- Hillebrandt, A., 1913. *Lieder des Ṛgveda*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen; Hinrichs, Leipzig. (Quellen der Religions-Geschichte; 5).
- Hock, H.H., 2006. Reflexivization in the Rig-Veda (and beyond). In: Hettrich, H., Tikkanen, B. (Eds.), *Themes and tasks in Old and Middle Indo-Aryan Linguistics. Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference. Vol. 5*. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, pp. 19–44.
- Hoffmann, K., 1982. *Vedica. Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 41, 61–94. [= K. Hoffmann. Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik. Bd. 3. Reichert, Wiesbaden, 1992, pp. 767–800].
- Janko, T.E., 1999. Eščë raz o slove *sam*: invariant i kommunikativnye osobennosti. In: Rakhilina, E.V., Testeleis, Y.G. (Eds.), *Tipologija i teorija jazyka: Ot opisanija k ob’jasneniju*. K 60-letiju A.E. Kibrika. [Typology and linguistic theory: From description to explanation. For the 60th birthday of Aleksandr E. Kibrik]. Jazyki russkoj kul’tury, Moskva, pp. 340–361.
- Kemmer, S., 1995. Emphatic and reflexive *-self*: expectations, viewpoint, and subjectivity. In: Stein, D., Wright, S. (Eds.), *Subjectivity and subjectivisation: linguistic perspectives*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 55–82.
- König, E., Siemund, P., 1999. Intensifiers and reflexives: a typological perspective. In: Frajzyngier, Z., Curl, T.S. (Eds.), pp. 41–74.

- Kulikov, L., 2000. RV 1.120.11: a note on the Vedic reflexive. In: Ofitsch, M., Zinko, C. (Eds.), 125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz. Festband anlässlich des 125jährigen Bestehens der Forschungsrichtung "Indogermanistik" an der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz. Leykam, Graz, pp. 231–238.
- Ljutikova, E.A., 1997. Refleksivny i emfaza. Voprosy jazykoznanija 6, 49–74.
- Ljutikova, E.A., 1998. Intensifikatory i tipologija refleksiva. Candidate dissertation, Moskva, MGU.
- Ljutikova, E.A., 1999. Reflexives and emphasis in Tsaxur (Nakh-Dagestanian). In: Frajzyngier, Z., Curl, T.S. (Eds.), pp. 227–255.
- Lubotsky, A., 1995. Vedic *samaha* 'verily'. Indo-Iranian Journal 38 (3), 257–260.
- Ludwig, A., 1876. Der Rigveda oder die heiligen hymnen der Brāhmaṇa. Zum ersten male vollständig ins Deutsche übersetzt mit commentar und einleitung von A. Ludwig. Bde I-II. F. Tempsky, Prag.
- Ludwig, A., 1881. Der Rigveda oder die heiligen hymnen der Brāhmaṇa. Bd. IV. Commentar zur Rigveda-übersetzung. I. Teil: Zu dem ersten bande der übersetzung. F. Tempsky, Prag.
- Macdonell, A.A., 1910. Vedic grammar. Trübner, Strassburg.
- Moravcsik, E.A., 1972. Some crosslinguistic generalisations about intensifier constructions. In: Peranteau, P., et al. (Eds.), Papers from the eighth regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago, pp. 271–277.
- Oertel, H., 1926. The syntax of cases in the narrative and descriptive prose of the Brāhmaṇas. I. The disjunct use of cases. Winter, Heidelberg.
- Oldenberg, H., 1909. Ṛgveda. Textkritische und exegetische Noten. Bd. 1. Erstes bis sechstes Buch. Weidmann, Berlin.
- Oldenberg, H., 1912. Ṛgveda. Textkritische und exegetische Noten. [Bd. 2]. Siebentes bis zehntes Buch. Weidmann, Berlin.
- Oldenberg, H., 1919. Vorwissenschaftliche Wissenschaft. Die Weltanschauung der Brāhmaṇa-Texte. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.
- Olivelle, P., 1998. The early Upaniṣads. Annotated text and translation. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Petit, D., 1999. *sue- en Grec Ancien: la famille du pronom réfléchi. Linguistique grecque et comparaison indo-européenne. Peeters, Leuven.
- Pinault, G.-J., 2001. Védique *tanī-* et la notion de personne en indo-iranien. Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris 96 (1), 181–206.
- Renou, L., 1955–1969. [EVP] Études védiques et pāṇinéennes, vols. I–XVII. Boccard, Paris.
- Roesler, U., 1997. Licht und Leuchten im Ṛgveda. Untersuchungen zum Wortfeld des Leuchtens und zur Bedeutung des Lichts. Indica et Tibetica Verlag, Swisttal-Odendorf. (Indica et Tibetica; 32).
- Ryan, R., 2004. The 'reflexive' as an interpretation. Doctoral dissertation, Växjö University.
- Scarlata, S., 1999. Die Wurzelkomposita im Ṛg-Veda. Reichert, Wiesbaden.
- Speijer [Speyer], J.S., 1896. Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax. Trübner, Straßburg.
- Testelec, J.G., Toldova, S.Ju., 1998. Refleksivnye mestoimenija v dagestanskix jazykax i tipologija refleksiva. Voprosy jazykoznanija 4, 35–57.
- Vine, B., 1997. On the expression of the reflexive possession in the Rig-Veda: RV *svá-*. In: Pirart, E. (Ed.), Syntaxe des langues indo-iraniennes anciennes. Editorial AUSA, Barcelona, pp. 203–214.
- Wackernagel, J., 1930. Altindische Grammatik. Bd. III. Nominalflexion – Zahlwort – Pronomen. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.
- Wennerberg, C., 1981. Die altindischen Nominalsuffixe *-man-* und *-iman-* in historisch-komparativer Beleuchtung. I: Wortanalytischer Teil -Wörterbuch-. Universität, Institutionen für Jämförande Språkforskning, Göteborg.
- Whitney, W.D./Lanman, Ch.R., 1905. Atharva-Veda Saṁhitā. Translated into English ... Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA. (Harvard Oriental Series; 7–8).
- Wielńska, M., 1995. Kilka uwag na temat AV 6.6.3. Studia indologiczne 2, 139–152.