

STEPHAN HILLYER LEVITT

III. SANSKRIT *ĀTMÁN* / *TMÁN* AND DRAVIDIAN **āl* A POSSIBLE SOLUTION TO A PROBLEM BASED ON A POSTULATED NOSTRATIC SOUND CORRESPONDENCE

Abstract. After a brief survey of the literature regarding the etymology of Skt. *ātmán/tmán*, it is argued that these forms are related to Dravidian **āl* 'person' by means of a postulated sound correspondence between Nostratic and Dravidian. Merger of this form is seen with the proposed Germanic cognates as explained by F. B. J. Kuiper and with Skt. *√an* as explained by Jacob Wackernagel and Albert Debrunner. Dravidian **āl* is argued to be related within Dravidian to Dravidian forms which are seen to be the basis for Skt. *tán* and *tanú*, as well as several other forms. Skt. *tán* and *tanú* have been argued to be related to Skt. *ātmán/tmán*. In this fashion, the meaning 'self' of Skt. *ātmán/tmán* and its usage as a reflexive pronoun is explained. Also explained hereby is the special relationship between Skt. *ātmán/tmán* and Skt. *tán* (*táne* and *tánā*) pointed out by, for instance, Franklin Edgerton. And through reference to the phenomenon of *c-:t-* within Dravidian, an explanation is offered for the idiosyncratic form *smán*.

Sanskrit *ātmán*, in the *Upaniṣads* and after, comes to refer to the individual Self, the individual soul, which is the essential reality in human personality and which in ultimate analysis is identical with the

ultimate reality of the universe, the *brāhman*¹. In the words of Uddālaka Āruṇi to his son Śvetaketu in *Chandogyopaniṣad* 6.8.6, repeated again and again in the immediately following *khaṇḍas* as well:

“That which is the finest essence – this whole world has that as its soul. That is Reality. That is Ātman (Soul). That art thou, Śvetaketu.”

In the words of the god Prajāpati in *Chandogyopaniṣad* 8.7.1:

“The Self (Ātman), which is free from evil, ageless, deathless, sorrowless, hungerless, thirstless, whose desire is the Real, whose conception is the Real – He should be searched out, Him one should desire to understand. He obtains all worlds and all desires who has found out and who understands that Self.” – Thus spake Prajāpati.

The translation cited here is the now classic translation of Robert Ernest Hume (1921).

This equation, *ātmán* = *brāhman*, is not yet developed in early Vedic literature.

In the *Ṛgveda* Skt. *ātmán* is used primarily to refer to the breath, the life breath, and the principle of life and sensation. Its usual form in the *Ṛgveda*, though, is as Skt. *tmán*, which occurs in oblique cases only, in which in its primary usage in the *Ṛgveda* it functions as a reflexive pronoun. This usage in which the form has the force of a reflexive pronoun is picked up in later Sanskrit literature by Skt. *ātmán*.

Monier Monier-Williams (1899: 135a) defines this form as follows:

ātmán, ā, m. (variously derived fr. *an*, to breathe; *at*, to move; *vā*, to blow; cf. *tmán*) the breath, RV.; the soul, principle of life and sensation, RV.; AV. etc.; the individual soul, self, abstract individual [e.g. *ātmán* (Ved. loc.) *dhatte* or *karoti*, ‘he places in him-

1. This paper is in series with Stephan Hillyer Levitt, “I. Kurukh *nād*, Sanskrit *nātha*, Burmese *nat*”, in *Haryana Sahitya Akademi journal of Indological studies* 1 (1986): 119-35 and “II. Sanskrit *brāhman*, as in *brāhman* and Semitic *BRK*”, in *Indologica Taurinensia* 21-22 (1995-96; issued October 1997 [i.e. September 1998]): 215-48.

self,' makes his own, TS. v; ŚBr.; *ātmanā akarot* 'he did it himself', Kād.; *ātmanā vi-√yuj*, 'to lose one's life,' Mn. vii, 46; *ātman* in the sg. is used as a reflexive pronoun for all three persons and all three genders, e.g. *ātmānaṃ sā hanti* 'she strikes herself'; *putram ātmanaḥ sprishtvā nipetatuh* 'they two having touched their son fell down,' R. ii, 64, 28; see also below s.v. *ātmanā*; essence, nature, character, peculiarity (often ifc., e.g. *karātman*, etc.), RV. x, 97, 121, etc.; the person or whole body considered as one and opposed to the separate members of the body, VS.; ŚBr.; the body, Ragh. i, 14; RāmatUp.; (ifc.) 'the understanding, intellect, mind,' see *nashṭātman*, *mandâ°*; the highest personal principle of life, Brahma (cf. *paramātman*), AV. x, 8, 44; VS. xxxii, 11; ŚBr. xiv, etc.; ... [Old Germ. *ātum*; Angl. Sax. *ædhm*; Mod. Germ. *Athem*, *Odem*; Gk. *ἀϋτήν*, *ἄπιος* (?).]

See Claes Wennerberg (1981: 268-69) for a detailed account of the usage of Skt. *ātmán*. Skt. *tmán* Monier Monier-Williams (1899: 456c) defines:

tmán (=ātmán) m. the vital breath, RV. i, 63, 8 (acc. *tmánam*); ĀśvŚr. vi, 9, 1 (acc. *tmānam*); one's own person, self, RV.; 'tman after *e* or *o* for *ātman*, KaṭhUp. iii, 12; MBh. i-iii; BhP. vii, 9, 32; *tmánā*, instr. and (at the end of a Pāda) *tmán*, loc. ind. used as an emphatic particle (like μέν and μήν) 'yet, really, indeed, even, at least, certainly, also,' RV.; VS. vi, 11; xi, 31; TS. ii, 1, 11, 2; AV. v, 27, 11; *utá tmánā* or *tmánā ca*, 'and also, and certainly,' *iva* or *ná tmánā*, 'just as,' *ádha tmánā*, 'and even,' RV.

Hermann Grassmann (1873: 552) defines *tmán* as follows:

tmán, m., shortened from *ātmán*, 1) *life's breath*; 2) the *individual self* (in singular for all numbers), and that with the contrast *toká*, *tánaya*, *tán*; 3) in Loc., *in its manner* or *in one's own person*, often in very weakened meaning; 4) in Instr., *according to one's nature* or *of one's own accord*, *from one's own power*, often so lessened that it scarcely can be translated, but always it stresses then that the declared state of the nature of the subject is corresponded to, or the declared activity will be exercised freely by the subject; 5) *iva tmán* or *iva tmánā*, *rightly so*, *entirely so*; 6)

utá tmán, utá tmánā, *and also, and especially*; 7) ádha tmánā, nu tmánā, *especially now, especially then*; in these three cases occurring always at the conclusion of a foot of verse. [Translation mine.]

Skt. *tmán*, which as noted occurs in oblique cases only, has been said to be the earlier form. Its frequent usage as a reflexive pronoun has been pointed to. There are about 75 instances of *tmán* in the *Ṛgveda*, and there are 20 instances of *ātmán* in the *Ṛgveda*. See Claes Wennerberg (1981: 281, 269).

For Middle Indo-Aryan and New Indo-Aryan forms and their meanings, see R. L. Turner (1966 [*i.e.* 1962-66]-85: entries no. 1135 and 5983).

Various etymologies for Skt. *ātmán/tmán* have been proposed. See Arthur Berriedale Keith (1909: 231 fn. 11), F. B. J. Kuiper (1942: 180), Albert Thumb (1953-59: 2.181b-182a), Manfred Mayrhofer (1956 [*i.e.* 1953-56]-80: 1.73, 1.528-29, 3.639, 3.726 and 1992 [*i.e.* 1986-92]-99: 1.164-65, 1.673), Claes Wennerberg (1981: 268-73, 281-84).

1. There is an old, fairly well accepted connection between Skt. *ātmán/tmán* and AS *ǣðm* m., OS *āthum* 'breath, waft', OHG *ādhmōt* (Isidore), otherwise in OHG m. gramm. alternation *ātum* (= *ādum*, Isidore) m. 'breath', mod. G. *Atem* and (with dial. *o* for *a*) *Odem*. See Johannes Schmidt (1895:115-16) who argues for a Pre-Germanic form **ētmós* and a PIE form **ētm_n*. The connection of the Sanskrit form here is through an hypothesized lost neuter form, nom. **ātma*. Support for this is offered in a contrast between the Sanskrit nominatives *varimā*, *svādmā*, *varṣmā* and the corresponding nominative neuter forms *várima*, *svādma*, *várṣma*. Jacob Wackernagel (1896-1964: I.61 (1896)), however, argues that no explanation offered to that date was satisfactory since none explains the loss of *ā* in Skt. *tmán*. But later, Jacob Wackernagel (1896-1964: II.2.765 (1954)) points to this etymology in the discussion of the suffix *-man* as found in forms without demonstrable verbal or nominal foundation. See, though, the discussion of Jacob Wackernagel (1896-1964) referred to below under (2). As has been seen above, this connection is mentioned by Monier Monier-Williams (1899: 135a). Ernst and Julius Leumann (1907: 30)

also mention this connection, among others such as Gk. ἄτμός ‘smoke, fume or vapor’, and OIr. áthach ‘breath’, all of which they see to go back to a PIE form *ētmēn. In other volumes of his comprehensive grammar, Jacob Wackernagel (1896-1964: II, 1.12 (1905) and III.490 (1930)) restates in general and with variation in detail the earlier objection, as does in general Arthur Berriedale Keith (1909: 231 n. 11). F. B. J. Kuiper (1945: 19-20) argues that the Vedic alternation of ātmā́/inst. tmánā, which had not hitherto been explained, was an example of an ancient paradigmatical ablaut. tm- was due to paradigmatical vowel gradation. He argues that the forms with tm- must have belonged to the living speech since they appear also in Pāli. The original paradigm he reconstructs as, nom. *_ēh₁t-m-ō > ātmā́, acc. *_ēh₁t-m-ón-m̐ > ātmānam, gen. *_ēh₁t-m-n-ós > tmánaḥ. He argues for the connection with AS æðm, OS āthum, and as well for Fick’s earlier connection of ἡτορ ‘heart’ with these forms (see W. Prellwitz (1897: 75, 70)), and for a connection with Av. x^vāθra- (from *su-ātra-). Thomas Burrow (1949: 38-39), in discussing his derivation of Skt. pitá as p-itá and Skt. duhitá as duh-itá, the i- being viewed by him to be suffixal, argues that the apophony ātmā́:tmāne conforms to the general rule laid down in his paper, “that is to say ā disappears entirely in the weak grade.” Julius G. Pokorny (1959-69: 1.345 (1959)) places Skt. ātmán together with these Germanic forms under PIE *ētmén-. With question, he notes here also Ir. athach ‘breath, wind’. Gk. ἡτορ ‘heart’, and with question Av. x^vāθra (*su-ātra), he lists with PIE *ēter- entirely separately on p. 344. Manfred Mayrhofer (1956 [i.e. 1953-56]-80: 1.73 (1956)) notes that the connection of OIr. athach here is doubtful. Later, Manfred Mayrhofer (1992 [i.e. 1986-92]-99: 1.164 (1992)) suggests that these Sanskrit and Germanic forms are perhaps to be connected with Gk. ἡτορ ‘heart’. Helmut Humbach (1959: I.32 n. 47) connects Av. ātarš, m. ‘fire’ with both Gk. ἡτορ ‘heart’ and Skt. ātmán. Pokorny (1959-69: 1.69) lists Av. ātarš, m. ‘fire’ again completely separately under PIE *āt(e)r-. See in this regard Claes Wennerberg (1981: 272 n. 11) who comments that the primary center of signification of these words does not point to a common focus. Jochem Schindler (1967: 202) refers to Vedic ātmā́, acc. ātmānam, gen. tmánaḥ, loc. tmán ‘breath, self’ as a comparable formation of root ablaut less well proved, together with Skt. pánthāḥ,

Av. *pantā*, acc. *pánthām*, *pantam*, gen. *patháh*, *paθo*, loc. *pathí*, *paiθi* ‘path’. He cites Kuiper, noting that the decision for this interpretation of *ātmán* and *tmán* is the distribution of the individual cases. “The PIE paradigm consequently is **ētmōn:*(₂)tmṇés?*” [Translation mine.] Later, Jochem Schindler (1969: 149) gives the reconstructed paradigm as Vedic dat. sg. *tmáne* < **h₂tmṇnej:ātman* ‘wind, self’ < **eh₂t-mon-*, noting for the former that it stands in analogy instead of **h₂tmnes* (citing Franklin Edgerton (1943: 116-17) for this point, regarding which see (3) below). He places it here in the context of *nar-* ‘man’ < **h₂ner*, *vāti* ‘it blows’ (Hitt. *ḫuwant* ‘wind’, Gk. ἄησι), IA **star-* ‘star’ < **h₂ster-* (see Hitt. */h₂ster-/*), and so forth. R. S. P. Beekes (1972: 34, 43, 59) places Skt. *ātmán* together with Sanskrit inherited nouns in *-man*, noting that such nouns have full grade of the root and suffix accent. Ablaut has been preserved in Skt. *ātmā*, *tmānah*, he argues, accepting the argument of F. B. J. Kuiper. After this, Jochem Schindler (1975: 263) mentions the ablaut **eh₂t-mō:*(h₂)tmn-és* ‘breath’ as an example in which the root ablaut is still directly reconstructable. Other examples given are **d(h)égh-ōm:*(d(h)gh-m-és:*(d(h)gh-ém* ‘earth’, and **h₂éus-ōs:*(h₂us-s-és* ‘dawn’. He refers back to Jochem Schindler (1967: 200 ff.). Georges Darms (1978: 389) notes that the grouping of *men-* stems indicates for PIE speech ablaut between the suffix and termination. He cites Skt. *ātmán/tmán* as a single unique example of ablaut also in the root. He refers to Jochem Schindler (1967: 202) as setting up a paradigm **éh₂t-mō*, **h₂t-mn-és* for these forms. Darms states that the normal grade form **éā₂tmō* is not unproblematic, and is unusual by both laryngeal theory and root theory. He offers, however, as an analogous start for *ákmon-* the forms **éā₂kmo*, **ā₂kmnés*, which in Indo-Aryan would have produced the unexplained form **ásman*. He notes, however, that this is not without problems, especially since it is doubtful that the deviating and not unproblematic **éā₂tmō*, **ā₂tmnés* can guarantee it. He then goes on to discuss this form in the context of Germ. **hemena* ‘heaven’. Claes Wennerberg (1981: 270-71 n. 1), which see, criticizes F. B. J. Kuiper (1945: 19-20) as being problematic and contra-indicated by case forms within Vedic literature itself. Also of interest with regard to the above in Wennerberg’s discussion is Claes Wennerberg (1981: 269, 270-71 n. 8) in which the forms OFris. *ēthma*, *ādema* ‘breath’ and

mod. Fris. *amme* 'id.' are added to the listing of proposed Germanic cognates for Skt. *ātmán*. Wennerberg argues that these forms demonstrate, in the context of Skt. *ātmán*, that the *n*-stem is the original and that **ētmó* therefore has in the majority of Germanic speech only replaced an older **ētmén*.

2. Another etymology which has shown resilience through the years is a connection with Skt. \sqrt{an} . This would link the form with Lat. *animus* 'spirit, soul'. Otto Böhtlingk and Rudolph Roth (1855 [i.e. 1852-55]-75: 1.623 (1855)) suggest for the etymology of Skt. *ātmán* that it is probably from \sqrt{an} 'breathe' with the suffix *-man*. Christian Bartholomae (1890-91: 2,1.100) also connects Skt. *ātmán* with *anati* 'he breathes', as well as with Av. *anman*. The base form of the latter he sets up as **antm*^o; Skt. *ātmán* < $\tilde{n}tm$ ^o and also Gk. ἀτμός < $\tilde{n}tm$ ^o. Regarding the last form see the discussion under (5) below. He denies the connection with the proposed Germanic cognates referred to under (1) above. See also Christian Bartholomae (1904: 359). Jacob Wackernagel (1896-1964: I.14 (1896)) lists Skt. *ātmán* 'soul': Skt. *an(i)-* 'breathe' as one example among many in which \tilde{a} often corresponds to *a* in a syllable with an added nasal. This correspondence is mentioned again as well in this opus (II,2.567 and II,2.697 (1954)). In the latter location, citing the earlier reference, it is noted that \tilde{a} < PIE \tilde{n} in the correspondence \tilde{a} -*tman* 'breath, soul': *an(i)-* 'breathe'. The suffix here is viewed to be *-tman*, with *-tman*:*-man* as *-tvan*:*-van*. See, however, this opus elsewhere (II,2.765 (1954)), referred to under (1) above. W. Prellwitz (1897: 75) would connect Skt. *ātmán* with both the proposed Germanic cognates listed in (1) above and with Skt. \sqrt{an} , leading to a base form **ēntmē*'*n*. The *n* before *t* after a long vowel is lost, as is shown not only in Aryan but also in Germanic. Prellwitz argues that this form shows that \tilde{a} is not derived from a nasal (\tilde{n}) as argued by Wackernagel in brief, but rather that the nasal behind a full vowel \tilde{e} is lost. Arthur Berriedale Keith (1909: 231 n. 11) opines that a connection with \sqrt{an} as well is unsatisfactory since it does not explain Vedic *tmánā*, etc. Mme. Hélène de Willman-Grabowska (1929-30: 17) views the term *ātmán* to be the merger of two homonyms, one derived from the root *an* 'to breathe', and the other composed of the preposition \tilde{a} + *tmán* of which the etymology

is unknown, but in which one sees the element *t* and *m* which occur in pronouns. The form *tmán* preceded by *ā* would be a locative in *an*, said without flexional ending. The value of *ātmán* as a reflexive pronoun would be due to contamination by *tmán*. Regarding this latter suggestion see (7) below. Albert Thumb (1930: 71) repeats the argument of Jacob Wackernagel (1896-1964: I.14 (1896)) with similar detail. F. B. J. Kuiper (1943: 20) argues that on the basis of his connection, regarding which see (1) above, this connection cannot be upheld. Similarly, Julius G. Pokorny (1959-69: 1.39 (1959)) notes under PIE 3. **an(ə)-*, in which Skt. *aniti* 'he breathes' is listed, that Skt. *ātmán* 'soul' is rather to be grouped with OHG *ātum* 'breath' under PIE **ēt-mén-*. But Gert Klingenschmitt (1975: 155) cites the western Tocharian form *āñme*, and the eastern Tocharian form *āñcām* 'self' < Proto-Toch. **āñcm'a* < **ǵ₂anǵ₁-tme*, noting with question **ǵ₂anǵ₁-tmen* as an analogous formation from PIE **ētmén*, Skt. *ātmán* by way of a root *ǵ₂anǵ₁*. He also points here to a possible relationship with Gk. ἀντμήν 'breath', regarding which see (4) below. Klaus Strunk (1986: 457 n. 26) argues that Av. *qnman* is certainly not to be tied together with Skt. *ātmán* out of **antm-* as by Christian Bartholomae above, but was connected rather by Helmut Humbach (1959: II.59) with *anī* 'breathe' and its cognates.

3. Another derivation which has gained a certain resilience is related to an observation of Alfred Ludwig in 1883, on *R̥gveda* 5.352 ff., which noted that the *R̥gveda* stems *tán* and *tmán* 'self' are philologically the same word. See Franklin Edgerton (1962: 354) regarding this. Also note Jacob Wackernagel (1896-1964: II.1.12 (1905)) which suggests that *tmán* for *ātmán* is through the influence of *tanú*. Later, Jacob Wackernagel (1896-1964: III.489-90 (1930)) also discusses connection between *ātmán* and *tanú*. In a related argument, Johannes Hertel (1936: 42) notes a semantic connection between *tanú* and *tmán*, both meaning 'body', and derives *ātmán* – a newer formation, from *ā-√tan* 'to cover' (*√tan*, 'to extend, spread'). Monier Monier-Williams (1899:435c) defines *tanú* as "the body, person, self (often used like a reflexive pron.; cf. *ātmán*), RV. etc." Also see Manfred Mayrhofer (1992 [*i.e.* 1886-92]-99: 1.621-22) who lists Skt. *tanú* separately from Skt. *√tan*. Hertel suggests *tmán* is < **tmén* which >

**tamán*, with a dwindling to *a* for the nasal. Franklin Edgerton (1943: 116-17), taking a different tack, notes that the stem *ātmán* is the only fairly common word in which *-man* (or *-van*) follows a consonant preceded by a long vowel or another consonant. He notes that by the side of *ātmán* is *tmán*, which is not common after the *R̥gveda*, while *ātmán* becomes extremely common later. He observes that *ātmán* and *tmán* form practically one paradigm in the *R̥gveda*. He then relates the instr. form *tmánā* and the dat. form *tmáne* to Skt. *tánā* and *táne*, which Grassmann and others however have related to Skt. \sqrt{tan} . The forms *tánā* and *táne* occur invariably after a heavy syllable or initially, *tmánā* and *tmáne* after a light syllable. "Where the traditional text shows *tmánā*, *tmáne* after a heavy syllable or initially, the proper form should always be recognized as *tánā*, *táne*." He argues that we must assume an original declension nom. *ātamá*, acc. *ātamānam*, inst. *tmánā* (after a light syllable) or *tánā* (after a heavy syllable), etc. "The poets of the RV evidently spoke a dialect which (like Sanskrit) had introduced *ātmá*, *ātmānam*, apparently on the basis of *tmánā* etc. (note that *tmánā* forms are actually far commoner than *tánā* forms in RV), and used these in their compositions, presumably in violation of Proto-Rigvedic practice." Edgerton thus gives priority to the form *tmán*. For Skt. *tán* see Manfred Mayrhofer (1992 [i.e. 1986-92]-99: 1.620) who also lists this form separately from Skt. \sqrt{tan} , and who crossreferences it with Skt. *tanú*. Albert Thumb (1953-59: 2.181-82 (1953)), while noting the Germanic etymological connections noted in (1) above, appears to give priority to Hertel's argument, even in giving the base meaning of Skt. *ātmán* as 'sheath, life'. Regarding the signification 'sheath', see Johannes Hertel (1936: 42). Manfred Mayrhofer (1956 [i.e. 1953-56]-80: 1.529 (1956)) views Hertel's argument as highly questionable. In a later article, Franklin Edgerton (1962: 354) reiterates his earlier view that *tán* and *tmán* are philologically the same word. He reiterates *tán* < IE **t̥m̥n-* after a heavy syllable or pause, *tmán* < IE **t̥m̥n-* after a short syllable. "Taken together, the two forms follow my rule four-fifths of the time, and violate it one-fifth. This proves, of course, that the phonetic law in question was no longer fully in force in the Rigveda (as I conceded above [p. 353]). But does it not also suggest that it had been in force shortly before the time of the Rigveda? (Or how else would a sceptic explain

the relationship of *tán-* and *tmán-*?)” Andrew Sihler (1971: 75-76) argues that Edgerton’s suggestion that forms built to $(\bar{a})tmán$ ‘self’ and *tán* ‘offspring’ make up a single paradigm is not really proved by distributional facts. “The two stems ARE conceivably fragments of one original paradigm, but their relative distributions would be substantially the same in any event: *tāne* and *tānā* are distributed like any word with a word-initial CVCV structure, and *tmán-* is distributed like any word beginning with a consonant cluster. ... But there does remain one possible reason for retaining Edgerton’s suggestion: Sievers-Edgerton’s Law would account for the ORIGIN of the doublet forms, which otherwise just appear somewhat unexpectedly in the Rigveda.” Claus Wennerberg (1981: 270 n. 6) draws attention to a resemblance between Skt. *tán* ‘continuation, uninterrupted succession, etc.’ in the *Ṛgveda* and Ta. *tāṇ* (obl. *tan-*; before vowels *tanṇ-*) one-self; *tāṇē* himself, only, just; ... Ma. *tān* (obl. *tan-*) self, oneself; See Thomas Burrow and Murray B. Emeneau (1984 [hence *DEDR*]: entry no. 3196, and 1961 [hence *DED*]: entry no. 2612). He suggests, though, that this may well be based on chance, as also the resemblance between Skt. *tmán* ‘life’s wind; the individual person, the self’ and the Ta. substantive *tamaṇ* ‘a male relative or friend’ listed together with the pronouns in *DEDR* 3162, *DED* 2582, Ta. *tām* (obl. *tam-*, before vowels *tamm-*) they, themselves; you (hon. pl.); *tamar* one’s own people, relatives, kindred, friends, servants; ... Ma. *tām* (obl. *tam-*, *tamm-*) themselves; A possible relationship between Skt. *tanū* and the Dravidian forms in *DEDR* 3196 (*DED* 2612) has also been pointed to by Franklin C. Southworth (1979: 198-99). Southworth entertains the possibility that in origin the correspondence may have been due to chance, but that the Indo-Iranian forms grew closer to the Dravidian forms through contact.

4. Hermann Grassmann (1873: 175) connects Skt. *ātmán* to the Greek forms *ἀντήν*, *ἀετμόν*, and argues that the form is a contraction of **avatmán* and goes back to $\sqrt{*av} = \sqrt{vā}$ ‘blow’. Skt. *tmán* he notes to be shortened from *ātmán* (p. 552). As noted above, Monier Monier-Williams (1899: 135a) lists the Greek connection of this etymology together with the proposed Germanic cognates discussed in (1) above. Julius G. Pokorny (1959-69: 1.81-82) lists these Greek forms and the

related Skt. $\sqrt{v}ā$ under PIE 10. * $\underline{au}(e)$ -, * $\underline{auē}(i)$ -, * $\underline{uē}$ -, the Sanskrit form having a heavy root-form, the Greek forms cited having a light root-form. Pokorny, though, makes no mention here of Skt. *ātmán*. As noted above under (2), Gert Klingenschmitt (1975: 155) also points to the Greek forms cited here as possible cognates.

5. Albrecht Weber (1878: 82b) objects to a connection of Skt. *ātmán* with Gk. $\alpha\omega\ \acute{\alpha}\tau\mu\eta\nu$, and suggests rather a connection with Skt. \sqrt{at} ‘go constantly, walk, run’, Gk. $\acute{\alpha}\tau\mu\omicron\varsigma$ ‘vapor, fume, smoke’. He refers in this regard to the semantics of Skt. $\sqrt{dhū}$ ‘to shake, agitate, cause to tremble’ and Skt. *dhūma* ‘smoke, vapor, mist’, Gk. $\theta\upsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$. He argues that the Vedic form *tman* shows clearly that the base form was *ātman*, not *ātman*. Christian Bartholomae (1890-91: 2,1.100) also connects Gk. $\acute{\alpha}\tau\mu\omicron\varsigma < \bar{h}tm^{\circ}$ to Skt. *ātmán* < $\bar{h}tm^{\circ}$, as noted under (2) above. Richard Garbe (1894: 293, 1917: 355-56) argues that the etymology is not from the root *vā* as argued by Grassmann and Curtius, nor from the root *an* as argued by Böhtlingk and Roth, Fick, Wackernagel, and Prellwitz, but from the root *at* ‘to wander’ as argued by Weber. The base meaning was thus ‘to go there and here’. He makes reference to the philosophical literature in this regard. In the later edition of his book, Richard Garbe (1917: 355 n. 3) adds that the base form *ātman* argued for by Weber actually still exists in the usages of the older literature where the initial *a* of *atman* is elided before *e* and *o*. Regarding this, see Monier Monier-Williams (1899: 456c) quoted above. Richard Pischel and Karl F. Geldner (1889-1901: 3.116-17 (1901)) review Roth’s argument, and arguments from *an* and *vā*, and dismiss them. They opt instead for the argument of Weber and Garbe from *at* ‘wander’, and so denoting (1) the wandering wind, (2) the *samsārin* soul, whence come the other meanings, person, self, body, nature. As noted above, Monier Monier-Williams (1899: 135a) refers to the Greek cognate suggested by Weber, Gk. $\acute{\alpha}\tau\mu\omicron\varsigma$, with question. Ernst and Julius Leumann (1907: 30) list it along with the proposed Germanic cognates noted above under (1), and with OIr. *áthach* ‘breath’, all of which they see to go back to a PIE form * $\bar{e}tmen$. Arthur Berriedale Keith (1909: 231 n. 11), in response to Pischel and Geldner, argues that “it is quite possible that the soul and the wind were deemed to be closely connected – there are plenty of parallels –

but of course in this case we cannot take *saṃsārin* in the technical sense.” He adds that this explanation, as the others, does not explain Vedic *tmānā*, etc. Julius G. Pokorny (1959-69: 1.82) places Gk. ἄτμος, cited by Weber, together with Gk. ἀετμόν, ἀϋτμήν as a low grade form. This would place this Greek form together with those cited under (4) above.

6. Paul Thieme (1972: 81) takes issue with Wackernagel’s relationship with *ā* (low grade of *ani* ‘breathe’) + the suffix *-tmán*, arguing that it does not explain the form *tmán*. By no means can *ā*, when it becomes a root, be allowed to dwindle Thieme argues. Instead he suggests an analysis into (preverb *ā* +) *t* + suffix *-mán*, with the *t*- < **kt* (see Paul Thieme (1972: 27)), as in Skt. *cat* ‘creeping, gentle blowing’. Thus *tmán* m. ‘the creeping one, the gently blowing breath – in opposition to the wind’; *ā-tmán* m. ‘the creeping here’, the entering breath, the important part of the whole. He further finds fault with Kuiper’s argument of an ablaut variation on the basis of the handy analogy on which it depends, and on this basis. He concludes that the forms Skt. *ātmán*/*tmán* may nevertheless be connected with the Germanic words for ‘breath’, OS *āthum*, etc., but through the Old Indic preverb *ā* < **ē* – arguing for an etymology PIE *(*ē* +)*tmén*- < **q^utmén*-, which he finds to ring true without difficulty. Claus Wennerberg (1981: 272-73 n. 11) criticizes this argument on a number of fronts. He notes that despite considerable sagacity this etymology gives the impression of an *ad hoc* construction, that the base meaning of the considerably rare verb *cātati* appears rather to be ‘to hide one’s self’, and further that the prefix *ā*- does not occur with this verb. He further notes that a form **q^utmén*-, offered by Thieme with only a single word treated, presents great difficulty, noting that Pokorny has no root **k^uet*- or **k^uat*- or **k^uot*- (= **q^uet* in older transcription). In addition, Wennerberg adds, Thieme does not attempt to give an etymological explanation of the verb *catati*.

7. Paul Deussen (1894: 285-88) dismisses the connections with \sqrt{an} , \sqrt{at} , and $\sqrt{av} = \sqrt{vā}$. He prefers instead a derivation from two pronominal stems, *a* (as in *a-ham*) and *ta*, with the original meaning being ‘this I’, referring to the individual self, thus “the self (this I) as (1)

life, (2) body, (3) soul, life's breath, (4) nature". [Translation mine.] He refers as well here to Gk. αὐτός. Arthur Berriedale Keith (1909: 231 n. 11) criticizes Deussen's argument also as not explaining Vedic *tmánā*, etc. Mme. Hélène de Willman-Grabowska (1929-30: 17), as noted above, views the term *ātmán* to be the merger of two homonyms, one derived from the root *an* 'to breathe', and the other composed of the preposition *ā* + *tmán* of which the etymology is unknown, but in which one sees the element *t* + *m* which occur in pronouns. See under (2) above. The value of *ātmán* as a reflexive pronoun would be due to contamination by *tmán*. She adds in n. 6 that when she had written her article she had not seen the argument of Paul Deussen (1894: 285), but she finds herself to be in accord with him on the action that *tmán* has exercised on *ātmán*.

8. Jean Przyluski (1934: 274-75) follows Mme. Hélène de Willman-Grabowska and argues that after what she has written, the origin of the Vedic pronoun *tmán* appears less obscure. He then suggests that placed next to the Hittite pronominal forms *tamais* (*ta-ma-iš*), *tamas* (*ta-ma-aš*) and *amukman* (*am-mu-uk-ma-an*), Vedic *tmán* presents itself as a combination in which the initial element of *tamais*, that is to say *ta* reduced to *t*, precedes the final element of *amukman*. Semantically, he notes, this comparison is satisfying because the reflexive pronoun *tmán* presents the same imprecision as the indefinite pronoun *tamais*.

9. V. Pisani (1935: 364-65) also refers back to the arguments of Mme. Hélène de Willman-Grabowska (1929-30: 15, 18 ff.). On the basis of her observations, such as those regarding *tanū* 'body' and usages of both *tmán* and *ātmán*, and on the basis that the usage of the term 'body' for 'oneself' is quite broad, he argues that the original meaning of *tmán* was 'body' – more precisely 'the upper part of the body' that *ātmán* assumes more than once, probably through the influence of *tmán*. Pisani sees in *tmán* a form in *-an* of the root **tem*, Gk. τέμνω etc., the 'body' as 'a piece'. He draws a parallel between the semantics here and between Skt. *śarīra* 'body' and root *śṛ* 'to break in pieces'. Manfred Mayrhofer (1956 [i.e. 1953-56]-80: 1.529) notes of this etymology, "very unbelievable".

Manfred Mayrhofer (1956 [i.e. 1953-56]-80: 1.73, 1.528-29, 3.639, 3.726) lists *ātmán* and *tmán* separately. Mayrhofer here appears to give primacy to *tmán*. He connects *ātmán* with the often cited proposed Germanic cognates but also notes that the connection between *tmán*, and *tán* and *tanú*, should be paid attention to. He notes of Hertel's etymological argument, "highly questionable". And he states that in spite of the intimate connection of *[ā]tmán* and *tan[ū]*, one probably must separate their etymologies. Or, he argues, *[ā]tmán* develops from **[ā]tṇ-án-:tán??* Further, he derides the connection with *aniti* as not very tenable. In the "Supplement and Corrections" (3.639, 3.726 (1976)) when he lists *tmán* he notes, "properly *tmán-/tán- Obl.*". And he lists the forms under *ātmā* as *ātmán*, *tmán/tán*.

In his later opus Manfred Mayrhofer (1992 [i.e. 1986-92]-99: 1.164-65, 1.673) lists the forms *ātmán* and *tmán* together in the same entry, and the Vedic ablaut variation of *ā:ø* is cited as the basis of the alternation. Reference is made to the PIE paradigm **é_h₁t-mō(n):dat. sg. *h₁t-mén-e_i*. Utilizing the suffix **-mo*, Mayrhofer unites the proposed Germanic cognates. He further connects *√an* with the form, referring to *ā(tman) < *h₂gh₁-:AN¹* 'breath'. And he dismisses here the connections with *tán*, "despite Edgerton", and with *tanú*.

Claus Wennerberg (1981: 268-73, 281-84) follows the earlier etymological arguments of Manfred Mayrhofer (1956 [i.e. 1953-56]-80) and carries Mayrhofer's proposed possible etymology of *[ā]tmán < *[ā]tṇ-án-:tán* a step further, suggesting a single semantic development between *ātmán*, *tmán*, *tanú*, *tán*, AS *æðm*, OS *āthum*, etc. (p. 269). He concludes that the form *ātmán* is an original **-en* derivation which through its development gained the appearance of a **-men* (Skt. *-man*) form (p. 269). This latter conclusion is in opposition to, for instance, the treatments given the form by R. S. P. Beekes (1972) and Georges Darms (1978), regarding which see (1) above.

For many years I have thought that Skt. *ātmán/tmán* must in some fashion be related to Ta. *āl* 'person'. The difficulty in arguing for a relationship as a loanform from Dravidian in Sanskrit, however, is that by Tamil laws of euphonic combination *l + m > ṇm* as in Ta. *āṇmai* 'manliness, virility, courage'.

These forms are reflected in two entries in *DEDR*, *DEDR* 399 (= *DED*342(a)) and *DEDR* 400 (= *DED* 342(b)). *DEDR* 399 contains

only South Dravidian and North Dravidian forms. *DEDR* 400 contains primarily Central Dravidian forms, with just a few South Dravidian and North Dravidian forms as well. The semantic split between the two sets of etyma is that *DEDR* 399 refers to male persons, *DEDR* 400 to female persons. To be noted is that the primary meaning of Ta. *āl*, 'person', is not listed here as it is for instance by Johann Philip Fabricius (1933: 62b), "*āl*, s. a person, a grown man; 2. one that is able to act for oneself, a man of power, consequence; 3. a messenger, a labourer, servant, slave; 4. warrior; 5. husband." It is so listed, though, for the main Malayalam form.

DEDR 399. Ta. *āl* man, husband, servant, labourer, adult; *āḷan* husband; (Tinn.) *āḷiyan* id.; *āṇ* male, manliness, courage, superiority, warrior; *āṇan* manly person; *āṇmai* manliness, virility, courage; *ātavan* man, youth. Ma. *āl* a person, able person, servant, slave; *āṇ* male; *āṇma* bravery. Ko. *a·ḷ* man, servant, husband. To. *o·ḷ* man, Toda; *o·ḷ* coolie (< Ta.). Ka. *āl* servant, soldier, messenger, a grown person in general; *āl*, *āṇ* male, manliness, bravery; *āḷike* state of being a person; *āḷutana*, *āḷtana* service; prowess, valour; *ālma*, *āṇma*, *āṇba* husband; *āṇmu* to be manly, vigorous; n. manliness, vigour. Koḍ. *a·ḷi* servant; *a·nī*, *a·ṇ* *a·ḷi* man, male; *a·ṇuññi* male child (< *a·ṇi-kuññi*). Tu. *āḷu* person, labourer, messenger; *āḷmage* servant; *āṇu* adj. male; *āṇujovu*, *aṇjāvu* a male, a man (*jōvu* child); (Bright and Ramanujan) *āṇu* boy. Kur. *āl* adult male, husband, servant, mankind; *ālas* an adult male person, husband, friend, servant, soldier. Malt. *āl-urqe* to grow up to maturity. Cf. 291 Ta. *al* strength. [PNSDr. **āl*-/**āṇ*-/**āt*-.]

DEDR 400. Ta. *ātṭi* woman, wife; *ātavaḷ* woman (lex.). Ka. *āḍaṅgi* a female. Tu. *āḍe* a coward. Te. *ālu*, (inscr.) *āḷu* (pl. *āṇḍru*) woman, wife; *āṇadi*, *āḍadi*, *āḍudi* woman; *āḍaṅgulu* females, women; *āḍaṅgi* a man of womanish character and ways; *āḍu* womanishness. Pa. *aḍey* wife. Ga. (S.³) *āḍa payya* female calf. Go. (Tr.) *ār*, (G. Mu. M.) *ār* (pl. W. Mu. Ma. *āsk*) woman (Voc. 139). Konda *āṇḍu* female (prefixed to certain animal names); *ālu* wife; *ālsi* id. (related to 3rd person: 'his w. '); *āl māsir* wife and husband; *āṇu* wife (N. and W. dialects). Pe. *ār* (pl. *ācku*) woman,

wife. Mand. *ār* (pl. *ācke*) id.; *āco-mgār* (pl. *āco-mgahke*) woman (for *-mgār*, see 4616). Kui *āsa* (pl. *-ska/-saka*) id., female; (Letchmajee) *āli* woman, wife. Kuwi (S.) *ādi*, (T.) *āru* wife; (Isr.) *ārī* woman, wife; (D.) *āca* (pl. *āska*) woman; (S.) *āca* female. Kur. *ālī* woman, wife. ... Cf. Skt. *ālī* a woman's female friend (this is borrowed back as Ma. *āli*, Ka. *āli*, *āli*, Te. *āli*, *āli* id.). [PDr. **āl-/ *āt-/ *āṭ-/ *āṇ̣t-/ *ār-/ *āṛ-/ *āṝ-*.]

If the form were in some fashion borrowed into Sanskrit, it would explain the meaning 'self' of Skt. *ātman/tmān*. The semantics here, though, would indicate that the form was borrowed from either South Dravidian or North Dravidian, not Central Dravidian. The geographical point of contact between Sanskrit and Dravidian at the time concerned would indicate North Dravidian. I have argued elsewhere that the Dravidian borrowings in Vedic Sanskrit seem to have been coming from North Dravidian (Stephan Hillyer Levitt 1977-81, and 1980: 29, 35-36, 44-45, 55-56 n. 27).

It has recently come to my attention that a postulated sound correspondence between Nostratic and Dravidian according to the correspondences argued by Vladislav M. Illič-Svityč is Nostratic *t-* > Dravidian *t-*. Intervocally, Nostratic *-t-* > Dravidian *-l-* by Illič-Svityč's later reconstructions, and Nostratic *-t-* > Dravidian *-l-*, *-l-* by his earlier reconstructions. See Vladislav M. Illič-Svityč (1989: 175-76) for the correspondences for the earlier reconstructions, and Vladimir Dybo (1989: 114-21 and 1990: 168-75) for the correspondences for the later reconstructions. This correspondence, however, is not recognized by Allan R. Bomhard and John C. Kerns (1994: 124-31).

The forms indicating this sound correspondence in initial position in the earlier reconstructions of Vladislav M. Illič-Svityč (1989: 151) are Nostratic ***tak* 'leg', Drav. **tāk* 'walk'; Nostratic ***tok* 'collect, gather' (> 'count'), Drav. **tok* 'collect'; Nostratic ***ton/k/* 'bend, incline, bow', Drav. **tonk* 'incline, hang'; Nostratic ***tu/k/* 'thrust, shove', Drav. **tukk* 'shove'. All but the second of these are included in the later reconstructions of Vladislav M. Illič-Svityč (1990: entries no. 255, 260, 261).

The forms indicating the intervocalic sound correspondences in the earlier reconstructions of Vladislav M. Illič-Svityč (1989: 147,

156) are Nostratic **/k/o/ʌ 'lake', Drav. *k/o/ʌ 'reservoir, pond'; and Nostratic **pālʌ 'half', Drav. *pāl 'part, section'. Only the former finds representation in Vladislav M. Illič-Svityč's later correspondences. This is listed by Vladislav M. Illič-Svityč (1990: entry no. 177) as Nostratic *kiŭä* 'lake, small reservoir', Drav. *kUḷa* 'reservoir, pond, lake'.

A correspondence of Skt. *ātmán/tmán* and Dravidian *āḷ would require the loss of the initial *ā-* for the postulated sound law to be in force. This might have been facilitated by merger in Sanskrit with the proposed Germanic cognates noted in (1) above, and as argued by F. B. J. Kuiper in which the weak or reduced grade of the form is *tmán*, with *ā:∅*. Primacy here, though, would have to be given to the weak grade of the form – which, indeed, is in accord with the usage in the early literature. What we would appear to have in the Dravidian loanform component here is *t-* of the Dravidian form + the Sanskrit primary suffix *-man*. A parallel situation was argued by me earlier (Stephan Hillyer Levitt 1995-96). Argued for there was a merger of the Semitic root *BRK* + the primary suffix *-man* with Skt. *√brh* in the Sanskrit form *bráhmaṇ*.

Alternately, the Dravidian form with an initial *t-* might be based on a process of metathesis within Dravidian. Metathesis is common in, for instance, Central Dravidian. It is generally not a feature of South Dravidian. Stephan Hillyer Levitt (1977-81, and 1980: 44-45, 55-56 n. 27) has argued for it in North Dravidian. Stephan Hillyer Levitt (1998: 138-39, 142-43, 151-52) has also argued for it as occurring between forms held in Indo-European on the one hand and in Dravidian on the other. That such in fact occurred here may perhaps be indicated by the Dravidian forms noted by Claus Wennerberg in his discussion of Skt. *tán* in the *R̥gveda* and by Southworth in his discussion of Skt. *tanú́*, as referred to under (3) above. These forms might be repeated profitably here in slightly fuller listing than above, though nevertheless abbreviated. The forms are:

DEDR 3196. Ta. *tāṇ* (obl. *taṇ-*; before vowels *taṇṇ-*) oneself; *tāṇē* himself, only, just; ... *taṇmai* nature, essence, property, inherent or abstract quality, character, temper, disposition, state, condition, position, circumstances; ... *taṇṇōr* one's kith and kin, rela-

tives or dependents. Ma. *tān* (obl. *tan-*) self, oneself; ... *tānē* by himself; *tāni*, *taniccu* by itself, alone; ... Kur. *tān* (obl. *taŋg-*) refl. pron. of the 3rd pers. himself. Malt. *tán*, *táni* (obl. *taŋg-*) himself, herself, itself. Br. *tēn* self, myself, thyself, himself, ourselves, etc.; *tēnāi* that which belongs to self, etc.; brotherhood, friendship; ... Cf. 3162 Ta. *tām*. *DED(S)* 2612.

DEDR 3162. Ta. *tām* (obl. *tam-*; before vowels *tamm-*) they, themselves; you (hon. pl.); ... *tamar* one's own people, relatives, kindred, friends, servants; ... *tamaṇ* a male relative or friend; fem. *tamaḷ*; *tami* solitude, loneliness, destitution; ... Ma. *tām* (obl. *tam-*, *tamm-*) themselves; ... Kur. *tām* (obl. *tam-*) id. [=they, themselves] Malt. *tám*, *támi* (obl. *tam-*) id. Cf. 3196 Ta. *tāṇ*. *DED(S)* 2582.

Note in this regard the usage of Skt. *tán* to refer to 'propagation, offspring, posterity' in comparison with the usage of these Dravidian forms to refer to 'one's own people, relatives, kindred'. As noted above, Claus Wennerberg views the similarity here to be chance and Southworth entertains this possibility in origin as well. Wennerberg also draws attention to what he views to be a chance resemblance between Skt. *tmán* and Ta. *tamaṇ* above. I must emphasize in this latter regard that I would not focus attention on this specific surface resemblance on account of the grammatical structure of the Tamil form, and on account of the disparate meanings of the two specific forms being compared. I would argue, though, for a connection between these forms and Dravidian **āḷ*.

Suggested here is that the postulated sound correspondence between Nostratic and Dravidian is operating within Dravidian, and is operating in loanforms to Sanskrit from Dravidian ². A parallel example within Dravidian would be PDr. **kāl-* 'leg, foot' (*DEDR* 1479, *DED* 1243) and PCDr. **tāk-* 'to walk' (*DEDR* 3151, *DED* 2571). See in this regard the correspondences suggested by Vladislav M. Illič-

2. A paper outlining this sound correspondence within Dravidian, titled "The alternation of **-l-/*-ḷ-* and **-t-* in metathetical forms in Dravidian", is now prepared and will appear elsewhere.

Svityč noted above, and Stephan Hillyer Levitt (1998: 139). In all likelihood the argued for presence of Dravidian forms in Sanskrit in this case was a borrowing in Northwest India. I would not argue that what we have here is a deeper Nostratic correspondence. Indications in Stephan Hillyer Levitt (1977-81, and 1980: 34), it is to be noted, are that there was a lengthy period of contact with North Dravidian prior to the composition of the *R̥gveda*. This is perhaps more in keeping with contemporary archeological models. We would seem to have had in Northwest India a hybrid civilization. The name Manthara of the humpbacked female slave of Bharata's mother in the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa*, for instance, it has been argued by Stephan Hillyer Levitt (1977-81, and 1980: 44-45, 64 [Table III]) was in origin a Dravidian form meaning 'hunchback'.

Previously, Thomas Burrow (1946: 22-24) has shown that there are in Vedic Sanskrit approximately twenty-five easily identifiable words with Dravidian etymologies. Thomas Burrow (1968 [*i.e.* 1958]: 322-23) argues that this demonstrates early contact of the Vedic people with Dravidian.

Argued here for Skt. *ātmán/tmán* is merger of Dravidian and Indo-European forms in Sanskrit. I would argue not only for a merger in Sanskrit with the proposed Germanic cognates noted in (1) above, but also with the cognates proposed in the etymology argued for in (2) above. Such a merger of Dravidian and Indo-European forms is parallel to my argument regarding Skt. *√mand/mad* (Stephan Hillyer Levitt 1980). I would also draw attention to Asko Parpola (1981) which argues for a Dravidian etymology for the sacred syllable *om*, and Hans Henrich Hock (1991) which responds to this from a purely Sanskrit vantage. Hans Henrich Hock's argument would seem to throw doubt on Asko Parpola's suggestion. Parpola's suggestion remains, though, as a basis for reinterpretation within Sanskrit of an originally independently generated particle.

Regarding the forms mentioned in etymology (3) above, *tāne* and *tānā*, and *tanū*, these may in fact be related to *DEDR* 3196 Ta. *tān* (obl. *tan-*; before vowels, *tann-*) and *DEDR* 3162 Ta. *tām* (obl. *tam-*; before vowels *tamm-*). Both phonology and semantics suggest this. I would not argue that this is accidental. Rather, we probably do have here a borrowing of a Dravidian form in Sanskrit. Also probably rela-

ted are such forms as Skt. *tána* n. 'offspring, posterity', RV. AV.; Skt. *tánaya* mfn. 'propagating a family, belonging to one's own family', RV. AitBr., 'a son', Mn. MBh. etc.; n. 'posterity, family, race', RV. VarBrS.; and Skt. *tánas* n. 'offspring', RV. From this vantage, the various relationships of these forms with Skt. *ātmán/tmán* noted in (3) above ought not be dismissed.

The interpretation of Skt. *ātmán/tmán* offered here also offers a possible explanation of the form *smán* in *Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā* 4, 8, 7. Previously, it has been explained by Louis Renou as a wrong writing for *tmán* through an accidental association with the semantically close form *svá* 'own, one's own; one's self'. It has also been explained as a *-man* form of Skt. *√as* 'to be', regarding which root see Julius G. Pokorny (1959-69: 1.340-42). In this regard, compare Skt. *stí* 'a dependent, vassal' from *√as*. See Claus Wennerberg (1981: 283 n. 2). It may, however, be related to the phenomenon of *c-:t-* in Dravidian. Murray B. Emeneau (1988) argues that in part *c-:t-* in Dravidian goes back to an original palatal affricate [*tʃ*] pronunciation of PDr. initial **c-*. In these instances **c- > t-*. I would argue that such Vedic and later Sanskrit alternation such as *√scut/ścyut/cyut* similarly indicate an original affricate in early Sanskrit speech. Emeneau (1988: 265-66) also attempts to treat instances in which **t- > *c-* and **t- > c-* in Dravidian, without phonological explanation. In this context, and in the context of Skt. *tmán* and its occurrence as *smán* in *Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā* 4, 8, 7, note that Thomas Burrow (1945: 118) has noted previously instances in which Skt. *ś-* represents Dravidian *t-* on the basis of *c-:t-*. An example of this latter occurrence is in evidence for a possible correlation of Skt. *śūrpa* with *DEDR* 3402 (*DED* 2798) Ta. *tūr̥ru* (*tūr̥ri-*). Within Dravidian **c- > s-* as well in a number of Dravidian languages. The Central Dravidian languages other than Telugu show in general secondary development of the palatal affricate to a sibilant. See Murray B. Emeneau (1988: 242a-47a) regarding **c- > s-* throughout Dravidian. The North Dravidian instances of this are noted by Emeneau (1988: 245a) to be doubtful, however. He would prefer to treat them as borrowings from Indo-Aryan. Note, though, that in North Dravidian **-c- > -s-*. An explanation of Skt. *smán* in *Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā* 4, 8, 7 in line with the phenomenon of *c-:t-* in Dravidian as outlined here, facilitated by a partial Dravidian etymo-

logy for Skt. *ātmán/tmán*, would seem to be a more reasonable explanation for this form than the explanations offered to date.

There is to date no clear explanation of the meaning 'self' of Skt. *ātmán/tmán* and its usage as a reflexive pronoun. The argument here of a relationship with Dravidian *āḷ 'person', and merger of this form with the standardly proposed Germanic cognates as explained by F. B. J. Kuiper, and with Skt. *√an* as argued by Jacob Wackernagel and Albert Debrunner, would explain this usage. Further, such partial derivation of Skt. *ātmán/tmán* from a form argued to be related within Dravidian to Dravidian forms also used as reflexive pronouns and seen to be the basis of Skt. *tán* and Skt. *tanū́*, as well as other forms such as Skt. *tána*, Skt. *tánaya*, and Skt. *tánas*, explains the special relationship of Skt. *ātmán/tmán* and Skt. *tán* (instr. sg. *tānā* and dat. sg. *tāne*).

REFERENCES

- Bartholomae, Christian. 1890-91. *Studien zur indogermanischen Sprachgeschichte*. 2 vols. Halle a.S.: Max Niemeyer.
- . 1904. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.
- Beekes, R. S. P. 1972. "The nominative of the hysterodynamic noun-inflection." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 86: 30-63.
- Böhtlingk, Otto and Rudolph Roth. 1855 [i.e. 1852-55]-75. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch herausgegeben von der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. 7 vols. St. Petersburg: Buchdr. der K. Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Bomhard, Allan R. and John C. Kerns. 1994. *The Nostratic macrofamily: a study in distant linguistic relationship*. Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 74. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Burrow, Thomas. 1945. "Some Dravidian words in Sanskrit." *Transactions of the Philological Society* [no vol. no.]: 79-120.
- . 1946. "Loanwords in Sanskrit." *Transactions of the Philological Society* [no vol. no.]: 1-30.
- . 1949. "'Shwa' in Sanskrit." *Transactions of the Philological Society* [no vol. no.]: 22-61.
- . 1968. "Sanskrit and the pre-Aryan tribes and languages." *Collected papers on Dravidian linguistics, by Prof. T. Burrow*. Annamalai University Department of Linguistics Publication No. 13. Annamalainagar: Annamalai University. Pp. 319-40. [Originally published in *The bulletin of the Ramakrishna Mission, Institute of Culture* (Calcutta) 9 (1958).]
- Burrow, Thomas and Murray B. Emeneau. 1961. *A Dravidian etymological dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (=DED).
- . 1984. *A Dravidian etymological dictionary*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (=DEDR).
- Darms, Georges. 1978. *Schwäher und Schwager, Hahn und Huhn: die vrdhhi-Ableitung im germanischen*. Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft 9, n.F. München: R. Kitzinger.
- Deussen, Paul. 1894. *Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Religionen. Erster Band, Erste Abteilung: Allgemeine Einleitung und Philosophie des Veda bis auf die Upanishad's*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.
- Dybo, Vladimir. 1989. "Comparative phonetic tables." *Explorations in language macrofamilies, materials from the first international interdisciplinary symposium on language and prehistory, Ann Arbor, 8-12*

- November, 1988. Ed. Vitaliĭ Viktorovich Shevoroshkin. Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. Norbert Brockmeyer. Pp. 114-21.
- . 1990. "Comparative phonetic tables for Nostratic reconstructions." *Proto-languages and proto-cultures, materials from the first international interdisciplinary symposium on language and prehistory, Ann Arbor, 8-12 November, 1988*. Ed. Vitaliĭ Viktorovich Shevoroshkin. Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. Norbert Brockmeyer. Pp. 168-75.
- Edgerton, Franklin. 1943. "The Indo-European semivowels." *Language* 19: 83-124.
- . 1962. "The semivowel phonemes of Indo-European: a reconsideration." *Language* 38: 353-59.
- Emeneau, Murray B. 1988. "Proto-Dravidian *c- and its developments." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 108: 239-68.
- Fabricius, Johann Philip. 1933. *A dictionary, Tamil and English, based on Johann Philip Fabricius's "Malabar-English dictionary"*. 3rd ed., rev. and enl. Tranquebar: Evangelical Lutheran Mission Publishing House.
- Garbe, Richard. 1894. *Die Sāmkhya-Philosophie*. 2nd ed., 1917. Leipzig: Verlag von H. Haessel.
- Grassmann, Hermann. 1873. *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. 4., unveränderte Auflage, 1964. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Hertel, Johannes. 1936. *Der Planet Venus im Awesta*. Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-Historische Klasse. Bd. 87 (1935), Heft 1. Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel.
- Hock, Hans Henrich. 1991. "On the origin and early development of the sacred Sanskrit syllable *om*." *Perspectives on Indo-European language, culture and religion. Studies in honor of Edgar C. Polomé*. Vol. 1. Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph No. 7. McLean, Virginia: Institute for the Study of Man. Pp. 89-110.
- Humbach, Helmut. 1959. *Die Gathas des Zarathustra*. 2 vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag.
- Hume, Robert Ernest. 1921. *The thirteen principal Upanishads, translated from the Sanskrit with an outline of the philosophy of the Upanishads*. 2nd rev. ed., 1931. London and New York: Oxford University Press and H. Milford.
- Illič-Svityč, Vladislav M. 1989. "The early reconstructions of Nostratic by V. M. Illič-Svityč." Trans. and arr. by Mark Kaiser. *Reconstructing languages and cultures, abstracts and materials from the first international interdisciplinary symposium on language and prehistory, Ann Arbor, 8-12 November, 1988*. Ed. Vitaliĭ Viktorovich Shevoroshkin. Bochum: Studienverlag Dr. Norbert Brockmeyer. Pp. 125-76.

- , 1990. "The Nostratic reconstructions of V. Illich-Svitych." Trans. and arr. by Mark Kaiser. *Proto-languages and proto-cultures, materials from the first international interdisciplinary symposium on language and prehistory, Ann Arbor, 8-12 November, 1988*. Ed. Vitaliĭ Viktorovich Shevoroshkin. Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. Norbert Brockmeyer. Pp. 138-67.
- Keith, Arthur Berriedale. 1909. *The Aitareya Āraṇyaka*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Klingenschmitt, Gert. 1975. "Tocharisch und urindogermanisch." *Flexion und Wortbildung, Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 9.-14. September 1973*. Ed. Helmut Rix. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag. Pp. 148-63.
- Kuiper, F. B. J. 1942. *Notes on Vedic noun-inflexion*. Mededeelingen der [Koninklijke] Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, [Amsterdam], Afdeling Letterkunde. Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 5, No. 4. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij.
- Leumann, Ernst and Julius. 1907. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Sanskrit-Sprache. Lieferung I: Einleitung und a bis jū*. Indica, Heft 1. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 1977-81. *Sanskrit -ndr- and Dravidian*. In manuscript.
- , 1980. "Sanskrit $\sqrt{\text{mand}}/\text{mad}$, 'background noise' and Dravidian." *The journal of Sanskrit Academy, Osmania University* 2: 25-64 (tables, 57-64).
- , 1995-96. "II. Sanskrit *brāhman* and Semitic *BRK*." *Indologica Taurinensia* 21-22: 215-48.
- , 1998. "Is there a genetic relationship between Indo-European and Dravidian?" *The journal of Indo-European studies* 26: 131-59.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1956 [i.e. 1953-56]-80. *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des altindischen*. 4 vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag.
- , 1992 [i.e. 1986-92]-99. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des altindoarischen*. Vols. 1-3 (installment 26). Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitäts-Verlag.
- Monier-Williams, Monier. 1899. *A Sanskrit-English dictionary*. New ed., greatly enlarged and improved. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Parpola, Asko. 1981. "On the primary meaning and etymology of the sacred syllable *ōm*." *Studia orientalia* 50: 195-213.
- Pisani, V. 1935. "Ai. tmán-." *Rivista degli studi orientali* 15: 364-65.
- Pischel, Richard and Karl F. Geldner. 1889-1901. *Vedische Studien*. 3 vols. Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer.

- Pokorny, Julius G. 1959-69. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 2 vols. Bern: Franke Verlag.
- Prellwitz, W. 1897. "Studien zur indogermanischen Etymologie und Wortbildung. III. √āi 'brennen, leuchten'." *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen* 23: 65-77.
- Przyluski, Jean. 1934. "Sur quelques formes pronominales en hittite et en védique." *Académie royale de Belgique, bulletins de la classe des lettres et de sciences morales et politiques*, 5e série, 20: 273-78.
- Schindler, Jochem. 1967. "Das idg. Wort für 'Erde' und die dentalen Spiranten." *Die Sprache, Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 13: 191-205.
- . 1969. "Die idg. Wörter für 'Vogel' und 'Ei'." *Die Sprache, Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 15: 144-67.
- . 1975. "Zum Ablaut der neutralen s-Stämme des indogermanischen." *Flexion und Wortbildung, Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg, 9m.-14. September 1973*. Ed. Helmut Rix. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag. Pp. 259-67.
- Schmidt, Johannes. 1895. *Kritik der Sonantentheorie, eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung*. Weimar: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger.
- Sihler, Andrew. 1971. "Word-initial semivowel alternation in the Rīgveda." *Language* 47: 53-78.
- Southworth, Franklin C. 1979. "Lexical evidence for early contacts between Indo-Aryan and Dravidian." *Aryan and non-Aryan*. Ed. Madhav M. Deshpande and Peter Edwin Hook. Michigan Papers on South and Southeast Asia 14. Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, The University of Michigan. Pp. 191-233.
- Strunk, Klaus. 1986. "Miscellanea zum avestischen Verbum." *Studia grammatica Iranica. Festschrift für Helmut Humbach*. Ed. Rüdiger Schmitt and Prods Oktor Skjaervø. München: R. Kitzinger. Pp. 441-59.
- Thieme, Paul. 1972. "Lückenbüsser." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 86: ..., 27, 81.
- Thumb, Albert. 1930. *Handbuch des Sanskrit*, Pt. 1: *Grammatik*. 2nd ed., ... by Hermann Hirt. Indogermanische Bibliothek. Erste Abteilung, Sammlung Indogermanischer Lehr- und Handbücher. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- . 1953-59. *Handbuch des Sanskrit*. 2 vols. in 3. Pt. 1: *Grammatik*, 1. *Einleitung und Lautlehre*. 3rd enl. ed., by Richard Hauschild (1958). Pt. 2: *Formenlehre*. 3rd enl. ed., by Richard Hauschild (1959). Pt. 2: *Texte und Glossar*. 2nd enl. and entirely new rev. ed., by Richard Hauschild (1953). Indogermanische Bibliothek. Erste Reihe, Lehr- und Handbücher. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag.

- Turner, R. L. 1966 [i.e. 1962-66]-85. *A comparative dictionary of the Indo-Aryan languages*. 3 vols. London: Oxford University Press (1966-71). *Addenda and corrigenda*. Ed. J. C. Wright. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London (1985).
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1896-1964. *Altindische Grammatik*. 3 vols. Bd. I. *Lautehre* (1896). *Nachträge zu Bd. I*, by Albert Debrunner (1957). Bd. II,1. *Einleitung zur Wortlehre. Nominalkomposition* (1905). *Nachträge zu Bd. II,1*, by Albert Debrunner (1957). Bd. II,2. *Die Nominalsuffixe*, by Albert Debrunner (1954). Bd. III, *Nominalflexion-Zahlwort-Pronomen*, by Albert Debrunner and Jacob Wackernagel (1930). *Register zur Altindische Grammatik von J. Wackernagel und A. Debrunner (Bd. I-III)*, by Richard Hauschild (1964). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- Weber, Albrecht. 1878. Review of P. Regnaud, *Matériaux pour servir à l'histoire de la philosophie de l'Inde* (Paris, 1876). *Jenaer Literaturzeitung* 5,6 (February 9): 81a-84b.
- Wennerberg, Claes. 1981. *Die altindischen Nominalsuffixe -man- und -iman- in historisch-komparativer Beleuchtung*. I. Wortanalytischer Teil, *Wörterbuch*. Göteborg: Institutionen för jämförande språkforskning, Göteborgs Universitet.
- Willman-Grabowska, Mme. Hélène de. 1929-30. "L'idée de l'Ātmán du Rig-veda aux Brāhmaṇa." *Rocznik orientalistyczny* 7: 10-25.