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Abstract

The present paper deals with two reflexive pronouns that are attested in Vedic Sanskrit, tanū- and ātmān-. 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 tanū- and ātmān- (nominal and adverbial usages, rules of agreement in number with the antecedent, heavy reflexive constructions with svā- ‘own’) (‘own’). In the middle Vedic period, tanū- is ousted by ātmān-, while in the second most ancient Vedic text, Atharvaveda, both tanū- and ātmān- can be employed within the same clause, giving rise to a heavy reflexive construction. One of the typologically remarkable usages attested for tanū- 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.
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“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 2.48.5)

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. The reflexive function is rendered in Vedic by derivatives of the three following roots: svā-, tanā- and ātman- (tmān-). 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’: bhārate ‘moves’ (= *‘brings oneself’), vah ‘carry, convey’: vāhate ‘drives’ (= *‘carries, conveys oneself’); pṛ ‘fill’: pūrṣate ‘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. sāp ‘curse’: sāpate ‘swears’). Note, furthermore, that, although the reflexive tanā- 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 svā– ‘own’ (see Vine, 1997, with bibl.; Hock, 2006:24f.), attested in the pronominal adjective svā- and the isolated form svayām (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. svoj, etc.) and probably goes back to Proto-Indo-European (see, for instance, Petit, 1999:130ff. et passim). By contrast, the development of the reflexive usage of the feminine substantive tanā- ‘body’ and the

---

1 The most ancient Vedic text, the Rgveda (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: MSm, SBm, etc.);
- middle and late Vedic (= Vedic prose): the language of the Saṃhitā prose, or prose parts of the Yajurveda, as well as Brāhmaṇas, Āraṇyakas, (Vedic) Upaniṣads and probably the oldest Sūtras.


3 For etymological relationships between ātman- and tmān- (and, possibly, tanā-), see Wennerberg, 1981:268ff., with bibl.
masculine substantive ātmān- ‘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 tanū-, cf. Middle Persian tan) or Indo-Aryan (in the case of ātmān-). The grammars note that the reflexive usage of tanū- is more archaic (as its Iranian cognates also indicate), while the reflexive usage of ātmān- 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 tanū- (and the same holds true for its later replacement, ātmān-). 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)

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{yé} & \text{krímayaḥ} & \text{párvateṣu} & \text{vánesv} \\
\text{which: NOM.PL.M} & \text{worm: NOM.PL} & \text{mountain: LOC.PL} & \text{wood: LOC.PL} \\
\text{paśūṣv} & \text{apsuv} & \text{āntāḥ} & \text{yé} \\
\text{cattle: LOC.PL} & \text{water: LOC.PL} & \text{within which: NOM.PL.M} & \text{our} \\
\text{tanuva} & \text{aviviśuḥ} & \text{asmākaṃ} & \ldots \\
\text{body: ACC.SG} & \text{enter: PF:3PL.ACT} & & \\
\end{array}
\]

‘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 \ldots’

Yet, in many cases it is virtually impossible to draw with accuracy the distinction between the reflexive and non-reflexive usages of tanū- ‘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)

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{yán} & \text{mātaram} & \text{ca} & \text{pitaram} & \text{ca} & \text{sākām} \\
\text{since mother: ACC.SG} & \text{and father: ACC.SG} & \text{and together} \\
\text{ājanayathās} & \text{tanuvaḥ} & \text{svāyāḥ} \\
\text{produce: IMPF: 2SG.MED} & \text{self: ABL.SG} & \text{own: ABL.SG.F} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘\ldots 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) ātmān 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 *tanā*- 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 *tanā*- and *ātmān*-., mostly focusing on the early Vedic *tanā*-.. 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 *tanā*- and *ātmān*- (*tmān*-), 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 *tanā*- (Pinault, 2001) and its grammaticalization (Hock, 2006), as well as on the semantics of *svā*- (Vine, 1997), this paper will focus on a synchronic, typologically oriented description of syntactic constructions with *tanā*- and *ātmān*- (*tmān*-), 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

    *Ivan rugaet (samogo) sebja*
    

    *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 *tanvām* at RV 1.147.2 (cf. (33)) (“this is not a likely interpretation”) and *tanā* 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., Fultz, 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. In some languages, the reflexive and emphatic meanings are rendered by different words (cf. Russ. reflexive sebja versus emphatic sam), 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, tan- and ātmān-–(tmān-).

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 tan- and (ā)tmān-, 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 tan- (e.g., ins.sg. tanvā) and some oblique case forms of tmān- (instrumental, locative), cf.:
ráyá madema tānāvå tānā 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.’

... mandasvā... ándhaso
become.inebriated:PRES:2SG.IMPV.MED Soma.juice:GEN.SG
rādhase tānāvå mahé
for.generosity self:INS.SG great
‘... become inebriated with Soma juice yourself, for great generosity.’

āva drugdhāṇi púryā sṛjā nó
away sin:NOM-ACC.PL fatherly:NOM-ACC.PL.N remit:PRES:2SG.IMPV.ACT our
‘āva yā vayāṃ cakṛmā tanūbhīḥ
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. sebja, 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 tanā- and āmān- (but not tmān-, 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) usages:

(12) (RV 3.1.1)

... agne tānāvå juśasva
Agni:voc.SG self:ACC.SG enjoy:PRES:2SG.IMPV.MED
‘... O Agni, enjoy yourself!’

(13) (RV 10.8.3)

āruṣṭr... ṛṭasya yōnau tānāvå juśanta
‘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 tānāvå tānā 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)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{indrāgni} \ldots & \text{ mithō } \text{ hinvānā} \\
\text{Indra.Agni:NOM-ACC.DU} & \text{ mutually impel:PRES:PART.MED:NOM-ACC.DU.M} \\
tanvā & \text{ sāmokasā} \\
\text{self:NOM-ACC.DU/INS.SG} & \text{ having.same.abode:NOM-ACC.DU.M}
\end{align*}
\]

‘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 tan- must agree in number with its antecedent (the dual compound indrāgni), 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)

\[
\begin{align*}
punānē & \text{ tanvā } \text{ mithāḥ svēna dākṣena} \\
\text{purifying:NOM-ACC.DU.F-N} & \text{ self:NOM-ACC.DU mutually own:INS.SG.M-N force:INS.SG} \\
rājatha & \text{ rule:PRES:2DU.ACT}
\end{align*}
\]

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

(16) (RV 1.181.4)

\[
\begin{align*}
iheha & \text{ jātā } \text{ sām avavaśītām} \\
\text{at.different.places born:NOM-ACC.DU.M} & \text{ harmonize:IMPF:3DU.MED} \\
arepāsā & \text{ tanvā } \text{ nāmabhīḥ svāīḥ} \\
\text{spotless:NOM-ACC.DU.M} & \text{ self:NOM-ACC.DU name:INS.PL own:INS.PL.M-N}
\end{align*}
\]

‘(Albeit) born at different places, the spotless [Aśvins] 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 nāmabhīḥ. 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)

\[ yajñāṇaḥ \text{ } janitvā \text{ } tanuvāhi \text{ } nī māmṛjuḥ \]

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)

\[ váśaṁ \text{ } devāsas \text{ } tanuvāhi \text{ } nī māmṛjuḥ \]

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 ātmān-; 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- (/ svayām) tanū-

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

(19) (RV 7.86.2)

\[ utā \text{ } svāyā \text{ } tanuvā \text{ } sāṃ \text{ } vade \text{ } tāt \]

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)

\[ ṿtāya \text{ } saptā \text{ } dadhiṣe \text{ } padāni \]

order:DAT.SG seven put:PF:2SG.MED step:ACC.PL

\[ janāyan \text{ } mitrāṁ \text{ } tanuvā \text{ } svāyai \]

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)

\[ svāyā \text{ } tanuvā \text{ } tanuvām \text{ } airayata \]

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)

\[ \text{mah\`an bhr\'addivo \`atharv\-}^{11} \]
\[ \text{great:NOM.SG.M Bhraddiva:NOM.SG Atharvan:NOM.SG} \]
\[ \text{\`avocat sv\`am tan\`av\`am \`indram ev\`a} \]
\[ \text{say:AOR:3SG.ACT own:ACC.SG.F self:ACC.SG Indra:ACC.SG verily} \]

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

Geldner (1951:III, 347) saw here the emphatic (but non-reflexive) usage: “Also hat der große Bhraddiva 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, sv\`a- does not necessarily refer to the subject of the sentence, the antecedent of the collocation sv\`a- tan\`a- is typically the subject (cf. the examples quoted above), and the hypothetical construction with the genitive of Indra, *sv\`a- tan\`av\`a \`indrasya, suggested by Vine, is hardly possible. The interpretation suggested by Elizarenkova (1999:278, 518) is more likely: the antecedent of sv\`a- tan\`av\`a is the subject, Bhraddiva Atharvan: “. . . vozzval k Indre (, kak) k samomu sebe” [he appealed to Indra (as) to himself].

Note too that the root sv\`a- appears in the isolated form svay\`ám ‘(one)self’, which behaves as a nominative (see Wackernagel, 1930:480ff.),\(^{12}\) as in (23, 24, 35):

(23) (RV 6.51.7)

\[ \text{svay\`a\`m ripus tan\`av\`a\`m riri\`isha} \]
\[ \text{self:ACC.SG.F hurt:AOR:3SG.INJ.MED} \]

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

(24) (RV 7.8.5)

\[ \text{svay\`a\`m var\`dhasva tan\`av\`a\`m suj\`ata} \]
\[ \text{well-born:VOC.SG} \]

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

Apparently, both sv\`a- and svay\`ám 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 (sv\`a- (/ svay\`ám) tan\`a-) and non-emphasized (tan\`a-; 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 zicz\`elf ~ zich, Russ. sam sebja, samogo sebja ~ sebja (see, for instance, Dirven, 1973:294ff.; Ljutikova, 1997:64ff. et passim; Ljutikova, 1999; König and Siemund, 1999:41ff., 47ff.).

\(^{11}\) The symbol ~ shows that the sandhi has been undone.

\(^{12}\) The final part -a\`m may have been borrowed from the nominative form of the 1st person pronoun ah\`am ‘I’ or from the demonstrative (nom.sg.m.) ay\`am (see Wackernagel, ibid.).
3.3.2. átman- taná-

In the language of the Atharvaveda, alongside the collocation svá- taná-, we find constructions where taná- and átman- co-occur in the same case form, cf.:

(25) (AVP 4.10.4)

\[
adbhir átmanāṇ tanvāṇ
\]

water:INS.PL soul/self:ACC.SG body/self:ACC.SG

\[
śumbhamānā
gṛhan prehi
\]

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

(26) (AV 1.18.3)

\[
yāt ta átmani tanvām ghorām
\]


\[
āsti yād vā kéṣeṣu ...
\]

be:PRES:3SG.ACT what:NOM.SG 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) (átmanāṇ tanvāṇ śumbhamānā) with such Rgvedic passages as (36) (tanu, vā śumbhamānē) and (35) (svayaṁ tanu, vā śumbhamānāh), átman- appears to behave as a functional equivalent of svá- in the collocation svá- taná-, which either means ‘own body’, or is employed as a heavy reflexive pronoun. Although, morphologically, átman- can hardly be an adjective, it seems to take over the syntactic and semantic functions of svá-. Note the following Atharvavedic passages, where átman- is likely to mean ‘own’, thus being a replacement of svá-:

(27) (AVP 11.1.4)

\[
ātmanas te lohitād garbhaḥ saṇ vartatāṃ
\]

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 svayaṁ taná- is unattested.

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

16 In that case, we would expect a form that would agree in gender (feminine) with the head noun taná-. 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’, prthi-śāman- ‘having a broad path’; see Macdonell, 1910:206.
3.3.3. Vedic prose

After the AV, tanā- falls out of use and, accordingly, the heavy reflexive svā- (/ svayaṃ) tanā- 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 ātman-, Delbrück (1888:262f.) briefly outlines the emphatic value of the diathesis opposition (active/middle) in constructions with ātman-. 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)

|hīrāṇyaṃ| dadāty ātmānam evā 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)

|sā| yajñām ātmānam vy ādhatta
|he:NOM| sacrifice:ACC.SG self:ACC.SG change:IMPF:3SG.MED

‘He changed himself into the sacrifice.’

(31) (TS 1.7.5.2)

|yād yajamāna-bhāgāṃ| prāśnāty
|if sacrificer-portion:ACC.SG devour:PRES:3SG.ACT ātmānam evā priṇāti
|self:ACC.SG delight:PRES:3SG.ACT

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

17 Note that only on the assumption that ātmān- means ‘own’ can we explain the discrepancy between the singular and plural number of piśācī- 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 erquicken)”. 

(28) (AV 5.29.6)

|yó| mā piśācō āsane dadāmbha tád
|who:NOM.SG.M| I:ACC Piśāca:NOM.SG eating:LOC.SG hurt:PF:3SG.ACT then ātmānā prayāyā piśācā vī yātayantām

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

17
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- (svayām) in the early Vedic collocation svā- (/svayām) tanā-. 19 This morphological strategy is quite remarkable from the typological point of view, since the ‘heavy’ reflexive (ātmān- + active inflexion) is morphologically no more complex than the ‘simple’ reflexive (ātmān- + middle inflexion). Rather, its “heavy” character is rendered by the diathesis that is marked in the reflexive context.

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

4. tanā-

4.1. Reflexive usage

The reflexive tanā- is well-attested from the early RV onwards. We find practically the full paradigm in this usage: accusative tanavām (33), instrumental tanavā (19), genitive tanavah (34), dative tanavē (20), locative tanavī (tanavī) (17–18), cf.:

(33) (RV 1.147.2)

vandāgrus te tanavām 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 tanavā dáme devām
mártah 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 tanā- 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 tanā- 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 tanā- 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.), tanvah (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)

\[ \text{utra svayāṃ tanuḥvah śumbhamāṇah} \]

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)

\[ \ldots vāram ā sacethe méne \]

according to wish follow:PRES:2DU.MED courtesan:NOM-ACC.DU

\[ \text{iva tanuḥvah śumbhamāne} \]

like body/self: NOM-ACC.DU adorn:PRES:PART.MED:NOM.DU.F

‘... you (Asvins) 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)

\[ \text{tvāṃ no agne táva deva pāyūbhīr} \]

you:NOM us/our Agni:voc.SG your god:voc.SG protecting.power:INS.PL

\[ \text{maghōno rakṣa tanuḥvāś ca} \]

bountiful:ACC.PL protect:PRES:2SG.IMPV.ACT self:ACC.PL and

\[ \text{vandiya praiseworthy:voc.SG.M} \]

‘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)

\[ \text{mṛdāyā nas tanubhyo máyas} \]

be.gracious:PRES:2SG.IMPV.ACT us/our self:DAT.PL pleasure:ACC.SG

\[ \text{tokēbhyaś kṛdhī} \]

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 (1951:1, 327) (‘... wie Frauen mit ihrem Leibe prunkend’) and some other scholars pose certain morphological problems: we would expect the instrumental dual form tanubhyām instead of the instrumental singular tanuḥvā.

23 The dat.sg. form tanvē 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 tanā- for which an emphatic interpretation seems very plausible. Thus, the emphatic analysis of the nominative svā tanār in (39) gives the key to the understanding of the following passage:

(39) (RV 10.83.5 ≈ AV 4.32.5)

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllll}
\text{táŋ} & \text{tvā} & \text{manyo} & \text{akratúr} \\
\text{this:ACC.SG.M} & \text{you:ACC} & \text{Manyu:VOC.SG} & \text{unintentional:NOM.SG.M} \\
\text{jihí} & \text{aháṃ} & \text{sva} & \text{taná} & \text{bala-déyāya} \\
\text{make.angry:PF:1SG.ACT} & \text{I:NOM} & \text{own:NOM.SG.F} & \text{self:NOM.SG} & \text{force-give:DAT} & \text{má} & \text{ñi} \\
\text{I:ACC} & \text{come:PRES:2SG.IMPV.ACT} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘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 svā tanār has caused difficulties for many scholars. Hillebrandt (1913:111, with footnote 6) left it untransated (“Konstruktion der Worte svā tanār unklar’’). Some interpreters stuck to the original meaning of tanā- ‘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 tanā- can also be employed in the reflexive usage in cases other than the nominative (“ailleurs qu’au Nomin., r tend vers le réflechi’’).

In my view, the most natural interpretation of svā tanār 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 tanāyu in (40):

(40) (RV 7.30.2)

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllll}
\text{hávanta} & \text{u} & \text{tvā} & \text{hávyañ} \\
\text{call:PRES:3PL.INJ.MED} & \text{you:ACC} & \text{worthy.of.sacrifice:ACC.SG.M} \\
\text{víváci} & \text{tanáśu} & \text{śárāḥ} & \text{sürjasya} & \text{sátáu} \\
\text{verbal.contest:LOC.SG} & \text{self:LOC.PL} & \text{hero:NOM.PL} & \text{sun:GEN.SG} & \text{fight:LOC.SG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘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’. This interpretation is awkward and, moreover, suggests a heavy ellipsis. In my view, an emphatic analysis provides here a more likely

---

24 AV bala-déyā na ēhi.
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 sātu. 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)\(^27\):

\[(41) \quad \text{(RV 1.120.11)}\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ayáḥ} \quad & \text{samaha} \quad \text{mā} \quad \text{tanu} \\
\text{this:NOM.SG.M} \quad & \text{verily I:ACC} \quad ? \\
\text{āhāvāte} \quad & \text{jānāṇāḥ} \quad \text{ānu} \\
\text{carry:INT:3SG.SUBJ.MED} \quad & \text{man:ACC.PL} \quad \text{along} \\
\text{soma-pēyaṁ} \quad & \text{sukhό} \quad \text{rāthāḥ} \\
\text{Soma-drink:ACC.SG} \quad & \text{easy.going:NOM.SG.M} \quad \text{chariot:NOM.SG}
\end{align*}
\]

The hymn is composed by an offended poet, who was given a chariot with no horses (rātham anāsvām) 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: āhāvāte and tanu.

For āhāvāte, 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 -yā- (*ya-ujh-yā-) rebuilt in analogy with the weak perfect stem (*u-ujh-), not as a -yā-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 ljui’d mi ēta legkoxodnaja koselica 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):

\[(42) \text{(RV 6.31.1a)} \]
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{ābhūr} & \text{éko} & \text{rayipate} & \text{rayīnām} \\
\text{become:AOR:2SG.ACT} & \text{one:NOM.SG.M} & \text{Lord:VOC.SG} & \text{wealth:GEN.PL} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘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:

\[(43) \text{(RV 2.9.4)} \]
\[
\begin{array}{llllllllll}
\text{tvām} & \text{hī} & \text{āsi} & \text{rayipātī} & \text{rayīnām} \\
\text{you:NOM} & \text{because} & \text{be:PRES:2.SG.ACT} & \text{Lord:NOM.SG} & \text{wealth:GEN.PL} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘... 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 tanū-, 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, tanū- can be employed in the emphatic usage as a bound morpheme, as the first member of the compounds tanū-kṛt- ‘made by oneself’ and tanū-pā- ‘protector of oneself’. Note example (44), where the opposition ‘self’ \sim ‘other’ is particularly clear, and examples (45–46):

\(^{29}\) Note the lack of the nominative case in the paradigm of reflexive pronouns like Russ. sebja, and cf. Renou’s (1966 [EVP XV]:172f.) remark on the reflexive usage of tanū-: ‘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)

tvāṃ soma tanū-kṛdbhyo dvēśobhyo 'anyā-kṛtebhyaḥ
urā yantāasi vārāham
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.’

(45) (RV 8.9.11)

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

‘Be protectors of the living world, as well as protectors of ourselves.’

(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. ātmān- and tmān-

5.1. Reflexive usage

The reflexive usage of ātmān- 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)

sōmam īndraḥ pibatu...
Soma:ACC.SG Indra:NOM.SG drink:PRES:3SG.IMPV.ACT
bālāṁ dādhāna ātmāni
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 kṛ- is employed here in the passive usage typical of the -ta-participle kṛta- ‘made’ (see Caland and Henry, 1906:110, footnote 6; Renou, 1961 [EVP IX]:125).
33 Geldner’s (1951:II, 305) translation (‘seid ... Schützer unseres lebenden Besitztums und unserer Leiber’) seems less plausible.
After the RV, the reflexive ātmān- becomes well-established, but is still in competition with tanā- in the AV (see section 3.3.2). In Vedic prose, ātmān- completely ousts tanā-; 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 ātmān- in Vedic prose need further study; I hope to return to this issue elsewhere.

5.2. Emphatic usage

5.2.1. ātmān-

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

(48) (TS 1.7.3.3)

tātō devā ābhavan pārā- āsurā yāsyā-
then god:NOM.PL become:IMPF:3PL.ACT away Asura:NOM.PL who:GEN.SG.M
evāṁ vidūso 'nvāhāryā āhriyāte
thus knowing:GEN.SG.M Anvāhārya: NOM.SG bring:PRES.PASS:3SG
bhāvaty ātmānā pārā- asya bhāṭvya
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. tmān-

In contrast to ātmān-, the more archaic stem variant tmān- 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 2.6.8.4, etc.), cf.:

(49) (RV 10.110.10)

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

‘Release [the sacrificial gifts] yourself.’36

The locative is attested in two forms: tmānī (2 occurrences), and the more archaic variant with the zero ending, tmān (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.
(50) (RV 6.68.5)

*sá út sudánuḥ svávāṁ ... indrā*

he:NOM only rich.in.gifts:NOM.SG.M rich.in.protection:NOM.SG.M Indra:VOC.DU

yó vāṃ varuṇa dāśati tman

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)

úpa tmáni dádhāno dhuryā āśán

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

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

(52) (RV 1.114.6)

*tmáne tokāya tánayāya*

self:DAT.SG offspring:DAT.SG grand-children:DAT.SG

mṛḳa

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)

*tmanā devēbhyo agnir havyāṁ . . .*

self:INS.SG god:DAT.PL Agni:NOM.SG oblation:ACC.SG

svadayatu

sweeten:PRES:3SG.IMPV.ACT

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

6. tanā-, ātmān-, tmān-: 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, tanā- 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 svā- (śvayām) tanā-.
(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 tanū-. 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- tanū-, ātmán- tanū-.

(iii) tmán- falls out of use by the middle Vedic period; ātmán- completely ousts tanū-. 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.
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**Appendix A**

Paradigms of the reflexive and emphatic pronouns in early Vedic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reflexive</th>
<th>Emphatic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ṛgveda</td>
<td>Atharvaveda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGULAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.</td>
<td>tanvām</td>
<td>tanvām, ātmān̄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC.</td>
<td>tanvā</td>
<td>tanvā, ātmān̄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT.</td>
<td>tanvē</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN-ABL.</td>
<td>tanvāḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC.</td>
<td>tanvī, (ātmān̄)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUAL.</td>
<td>tanvā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM-ACC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLURAL</th>
<th>Reflexive</th>
<th>Emphatic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rgveda</td>
<td>Atharvaveda</td>
<td>Rgveda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACC.</strong></td>
<td>tanvāḥ</td>
<td>tanvāḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INS.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>tanābhiḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAT.</strong></td>
<td>tanā́ṣu</td>
<td>tanā́ṣu, ātmāsu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOC.</strong></td>
<td>tanā́ṣu</td>
<td>tanā́ṣu (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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