Commentary IV

IV.1 Agni

IV.1.1: Hymn-introductory *hí* is difficult to render. It does not have its normal causal sense, though perhaps in this position *hí* is meant to explain why the hymn is recited following a particular ritual action.

With Ge (/WG) I take pādas def as the direct address of the gods to mortals, with the speech introduced by *íti krátvā* in c. (This idea goes back to Bergaigne; see Old SBE ad loc.) Rejecting this interpr., Old labors mightily to explain away the apparent 2nd pl. actives *yajata* and *janata* as voc. and 3rd pl. middle respectively. (In this he follows Sāy.) Re tries in addition to make *yajata* also a 3rd pl. mid. (see also Gonda [*Vedic Literature*, 228], whose tr. renders both forms as 3rd plurals). Although *yajata* could actually be a voc., 3rd pl. middles in *-ata* to thematic stems are morphologically impossible, no matter how metrically unfavorable *-anta* would be. Ge's direct speech interpr. solves these grammatical problems and also makes sense of the *íti* in c.

IV.1.2: As Arnold (VedMetre, 300) suggests (so also Old, HvN), deleting *agne* in pāda a and reading *vavṛtsᵘva* (as in 3a) yields a fine Jagatī line.

IV.1.4: My "may you please placate" is meant to capture the precative *(áva) yāsisīṣṭhāḥ* of the *siṣ*-aorist to √*yā*. Note the dissimilation (if that's what it is) of the middle sibilant from expected rukified *ṣ* to plain *s*.

Note the phonetic figure straddling the hemistich boundary: b *yāsisīṣṭhāḥ* / c *yájiṣṭhaḥ*.

IV.1.5: The idiom *áva* √*yā* 'placate, appease' found in 4b finds a close variant in 5c *áva yakṣva* 'placate through sacrifice' to *áva* √*yaj*. Though belonging to different roots, they are phonologically and semantically similar. Another such variant is found in d *vīhí mṛḷīkám* "pursue his grace," which echoes 3d *mṛḷīkám … vidaḥ* "you (will) find grace" -- again two different roots (*vī* and *vid*) but phonologically and semantically similar.

IV.1.6: Because of the position of *ná* (*ghṛtáṃ ná taptám*) I follow Ge in taking *śúci* as the shared quality between simile and frame and therefore "attracted" to the neut. of the simile, though we would expect a fem. modifying the gapped *saṃdṛ́ś*-.

IV.1.7: I take santi satyā́ here as an etym. figure, a phrasal verb meaning "come into existence" ("come [to be] true"), rather than taking *santi* as copula and *satyā́* as a simple adj. For one thing, pres. tense forms of √*as* in main clauses are usually existentials, not copulas; for another *tríṣ* should mean 'three times', not 'three' or 'threefold' as a copular reading seems to require (e.g., Ge "Dreifach sind diese seine höchsten wahren (Geburten) …").

I do not know what "enveloped within the limitless" (*ananté antáḥ párivītaḥ*) refers to. It may be the dense swirling smoke, lacking clear boundaries, that surrounds a fire, or it may be the unborn Agni's concealment in the kindling sticks -- though it's hard to see how they would be *anantá-*. It is also possible that this is a reference to the paridhi sticks that surround the ritual fire (see comm. ad IV.3.2 below); they would be "endless" because a circle has no end.

IV.1.8: The first cmpd member *ráṃsu-* is taken by Schindler (Rt Nns, 40) as the loc. pl. to a root noun *rán-* 'Freude', an analysis accepted by Mayrhofer (EWA s.v. *RAṆ*).

IV.1.9: I follow Ge (n. 9a) in giving *mánuṣaḥ* a double reading, acc. pl. obj. of *cetayan* and gen. sg. dependent on *yajñábandhuḥ*. Note that it is neatly positioned between those two words.

I think *yajñábandhuḥ* has a more specific sense than simply 'Opfergenosse'. Rather, Agni is literally our 'tie' (*bándhu-*) to the primal sacrifice instituted by Manu because he has always been present, always the same, at every sacrifice since.

The referent of *asya* in c is taken as the moral (*márta-*) in d by Ge (implicitly also Re), as Agni by WG. Either is possible, both grammatically and contextually. There is no requirement that a possessive coreferential with the subject be expressed by a reflexive (*svásya* in this case), and though, technically speaking, an unaccented oblique form of *ayám* should have an *ante*cedent, the close proximity of *mártasya* and the fact that the subject of the preceding verb (*nayanti*), though pl., is clearly mortal would make *asya* = mortal unproblematic. And given the ritual intimacy of Agni and his worshipper(s), the house belongs to both.

IV.1.10–18: Hoffmann tr. and comments on these vss. in Injunktiv (pp. 175-78).

IV.1.10: In b I follow Hoffmann (Injunk., 175) in taking the rel. clause as *devábhaktaṃ yád asya*, rather than just *yád asya* with the standard tr. The sense doesn't differ markedly.

More difficult is the configuration of cd. All the standard interpr. (incl. Hoffmann), save for Old (both SBE and Noten), take final *ukṣan* as the voc. sg. of *ukṣán-* 'ox', referring to Agni. I prefer, with Old, to take *ukṣan* as a 3rd pl. injunc. main-clause verb (√*ukṣ* 'sprinkle'), with the subj. the immortals of c. The image is of the gods first creating the treasure and then bringing it to life like a watered plant. In favor of the majority interpr, I must concede, is the common idiom *satyám* √*kṛ* 'make real', but I find a voc. address to Agni in the middle of 3rd ps. reff. to him (10ab, 11, not to mention vss. 6-9) awkward. Re refers to "l'étrangeté d'un tel Voc.," despite explicitly rejecting Old's finite verb interpr.

And what is the treasure? A slightly different phrase *rátnam … dyúbhaktam* (rather than *devábhaktam* as here) returns in vs. 18, where it seems to refer to the light of Dawn in the form of the cows released from the Vala cave; here I think it may be the light of the newly kindled ritual fire -- and of course the lights of Dawn and the fire of the dawn ritual can be superimposed upon and identified with each

other. If the light of the new fire is the primary referent in this vs., *ukṣan* 'sprinkled' may refer to sprinkling ghee on the fire, which action would cause it to be blaze up. The next vs. (11), which describes the birth of Agni, fits this interpr.

IV.1.11: The vs. treats the birth of the ritual fire on earth, with the second hemistich describing the amorphous shape and constant motion of physical fire.

IV.1.11–12: The repeated phrase "in the nest of the bull" (*vṛṣabhásya nīḷé*, 11d, 12b) is somewhat opaque, but I think Ge is basically right, that the *vṛṣabhá-* is Agni (not, with Hoffmann, heaven). His nest is, in my opinion, the ritual ground; its designation also as the "womb of truth" (*ṛtásya yóni-*, 12b) supports this identification. I find WG's n. on this phrase incomprehensible, though it seems to follow Hoffmann in part.

IV.1.12: I am in agreement with most of the standard interpr. that the referent of the subj. of ab is the troop of Aṅgirases, expressed by the neut. *s*-stem *śárdhaḥ* (*pace* Gr., who takes it as a thematic masc. nom. sg., referring to Agni, sim. Schmidt [B+I, 43 n. 21]), though this word generally refers to the Marut troop.

I part company with these interpr. with regard to the referent of c, however. Most take this string of nom. sg. masc. adj. as further descriptors of the Aṅgiras troop, while I think they refer to Agni. Agni and his births are referred to as *spārhá-* earlier in the hymn (6d, 7b); in 8c he is described as *vapuṣyò vibhā́vā* exactly as here. The recycling of this characterizing vocabulary seems to me a clue that the subject has changed here from the first half of the vs: it would be perverse to repeat this phraseology with a referent other than the original Agni. Note also that *yúvan-* 'young' is regularly used of Agni, and in the context of his birth the word is esp. apt. I take this nominal clause (/subclause) as annunciatory of the gapped object of d.

Ge, Re, and Old (SBE) take *janayanta* in d as intrans. 'be born' (e.g., Ge "Dem Bullen wurden die sieben Freunde geboren"), but this medial form is a standard ex. of *-anta* replacement of the undercharacterized act. *-an* and is therefore transitive. See my "Voice fluctuation in the Rig Veda: Medial 3rd plural *-anta* in active paradigms," *IIJ* 21 (1979) 146-69. It is correctly interpr. by Hoffmann (Injunk., 176) and WG. The form is an injunctive, contra the Pp.; so already Gr; see Old (Noten), Hoffmann.

The "seven dear ones" (*saptá priyā́saḥ*) are most likely the Aṅgirases, here referred to in the plural rather than the collective neut. sg. in pāda a. III.31.5 contains "seven inspired poets" (*saptá víprāḥ*) in a clear Aṅgiras/Vala context. It is also possible that the phrase refers to the Aṅgirases' music, since *saptá vā́ṇīḥ* 'seven voices' is a common phrase. The adj. *priyā́saḥ* could be either masc. or fem.

IV.1.13: This is the first of the Vala myth vss. As noted in the publ. intro., the actors throughout must be the Aṅgirases, but they are never named.

The curious phrase *ṛtám āśuṣāṇāḥ* "panting over the truth" occurs three times in IV.1–2 (also 2.14, 16). It expresses the energy and effort of the Aṅgirases in singing the true song that opened the Vala cave and freed the cows. See Lü (514–15).

The med. part. *huvānáˊ-* is ordinarily passive in value; *pace* Gr only VII.30.3 is clearly trans. I therefore take *huvāṇāḥ* here as fem. acc. pl. modifying *uṣásaḥ* in passive sense. The standard interpr. is masc. nom. pl. in trans. value, 'calling to'. This would of course make just as much sense; my choice is based on the usage of the preponderance of occurrences.

IV.1.14: Med. *marmṛjata* is most likely reflexive, as I and most other interpr. take it, though Sāy. and Re supply Agni as object. Although the reflex. interpr. seems a little lame -- splitting stone is dirty work, so they had to clean themselves up -- Agni is out of place in this Vala context and there is no other obvious candidate to be object. Moreover, the middle voice suggests a reflexive sense.

The referent of *anyé* in b is not clear to me. By my placement rules (see "Vedic anyá- 'another, the other': syntactic disambiguation," *Sound law and analogy*, Fs. Beekes [ed. A. Lubotsky], 1997, pp. 111-18), it must be definite ("the others"). Most tr. take it as indefinite, though Hoffmann tr. it as definite and implicitly contrastive with the unspecified subject of pāda a: "Die (einen) … Die anderen von ihnen …" I think this approach is the correct one, though I don't think we need or want the group of Aṅgirases to be split into moieties. Instead, in my view, the contrastive groups are the primordial singers, the Aṅgirases, and their modern counterparts, the poets and singers of the current ritual. The injunctive *ví vocan* would allow a presential interpr. ("they proclaim …") with current singers as subj. instead of or in addition to the preterital one in the publ. tr.

In c we return to the Aṅgirases, whose singing opens the Vala cave -- hence "they sang the decisive act." Most tr. take *kārá-* as a victory *song* of some sort (the exception is WG: "… singen sie auf das Schaffen," where *kārá-* is the subject of the song. But I think the expression is more radical: as so often in the RV, our poet wants to emphasize the power of words to make things happen, the connection between song (the cause) and the act, the splitting of the rock (effect).

The hapax cmpd. *paśváyantra-* is puzzling in formation and sense, although the parts it is based on are relatively clear. The 1st member is *paśu-* 'livestock' or a derivative thereof, the 2nd is or contains *yantrá-* 'binding rope'. The interpr. comes down to deciding which is the lesser of two evils: positing an otherwise unattested extended stem *paśvá-* beside *paśú-* but a relatively conventional bahuvrīhi 'having binding ropes for the livestock' or rejecting the extended stem but ending up with an anomalously formed and accented bahuvrīhi. Old argues strenuously for the former, with the rather cumbersome tr. "in ihren Vorrichtungen zum Festhalten … das Vieh haltend," and some version of this analysis is followed by Hoffmann and WG. Ge and Re (the latter with some hesitation) opt for the latter, with Ge suggesting a reverse bahuvrīhi (for *ayantra-pāsu-*). (He cagily fails to accent it.) In the end I swallow some version of the second analysis, primarily because I find it unlikely that such a common word as *paśú-* would display an unnecessary extended stem in just

this place in all of Sanskrit, particularly because there's little metrical advantage to it here. However, I do not follow Ge's reverse bahuvrīhi interpr. (roughly, "having livestock loosed from the binding ropes"), but assume that it is the Aṅgirases who lack *yantra*-s to bind the cattle and do so with song instead. (This interpr. goes back to Bergaigne; see Old SBE ad loc.) That some form of verbal expression could serve as a *yantrá*- is shown by the cmpd. *ślóka-yantra*- (IX.73.6) 'having *śloka*s as binding ropes'. Unfortunately I do not see how to make this explanation work formally, particularly with regard to accent, esp. as there exists a differently accented privative cmpd. *ayantrá*- in X.46.6. I leave it at this, unsatisfactorily.

In terms of the structure of the vs., I now think the odd pādas (a, c) refer to the Aṅgirases and the even ones (b, d) to the current singers. I would therefore slightly modify the published tr., which presents pāda d as if it were the direct speech -- the song -- of the Aṅgirases described in c. I now think d is what the other, current poets were said to proclaim in b.

IV.1.16: On *vrā́*- see comm. ad VIII.2.16 and Jamison 2003 (="Vedic vrā́: evidence for the svayaṃvara in the Rig Veda?" in *Paitimāna: Essays in Iranian, Indo-European, and Indian Studies in Honor of Hanns-Peter Schmidt*, vols. 1-2 [ed. Siamak Adhami], 2003, pp. 39-56).

Because of its accentuation *yaśásā* should be adjectival; the question is what to supply. Flg. Lü (Varuṇa, 521, also fld. by Hoffmann, WG), I supply 'name', which appears in pāda and appears to be the topic of the rest of the vs. Ge and Old prefer 'milk', but this is contextually less likely.

IV.1.18: I interpr. the "treasure apportioned by heaven" (*rátnam … dyúbhaktam*) to be in the first instance cows (as in I.73.6), those released from the Vala cave, but the cows conceived of as dawns and therefore as light, including the light of the newly kindled ritual fire. See vs. 10 above, with *rátnam … devábhaktam*. This buried "light" motif works well with the houses in pāda c, where the ritual fire is at home (see vss. 9, 11 above), and provides an easy transition to the invocation of Agni in the next vs.

The subj. of *dhārayanta* in b I take as the gods in c (with Old, SBE, Hoffmann, WG), rather than taking c as a separate nominal cl. (Ge, Re). Note the chiastic morphological figure in c, allowing alliteration between the nom./loc. pairs: *víśve víśvāsu dúryāsu devā́(ḥ)*.

In d I supply the treasure (in the form of light) as the subj. of *satyám astu* (so also Hoffmann). This VP should be interpr. in the context of *santi satyā́* in 7a. See comm. there.

IV.1.19: The general opinion is surely correct, that the "gleaming udder of the cows" (*śúcy ū́dhaḥ … gávām*) stands for the cows' milk, which is compared to the soma stalk, itself standing for soma. But I think that the udder also stands for the Vala cave, which contained the cows. The root √*tṛd* 'drill' is used for breaching the Vala cave in VI.17.1, 3, X.74.4. Ge finds the subj. of *atṛṇat* unclear, but surely Agni makes the most sense (not the sacrificer, per Sāy.). In his ritual role, Agni causes the dawn to

dawn and therefore opens up the Vala cave on a daily basis. And at the same time brings the outpouring of ghee (in the sacrifice) and the morning dakṣiṇā and other products of the cow.

I do not understand the position of *ná*. With the other standard interpr. I tr. it as if it qualifies the verb it immediately follows ("he drilled, seemingly …"; Ge "er zapfte gleichsam …," etc.), but this is simply not a regular RVic usage: similes are always nominal. I would like to connect it with the double usage of *ū́dhaḥ* just discussed, but I'm not sure how.

IV.1.20: Within the balanced phrases of the first hemistich -- *víśveṣām áditir yajñíyānām*, *víśveṣām átithir mā́nuṣāṇām* -- the nearly identical nominatives *áditir* and *átithir* make rhetorical sense. But why Agni is called, or identified as, Aditi (or boundlessness or innocence, if it is used as a common noun) is unclear. Since Aditi is the archetypal divine mother, perhaps Agni is being credited with a maternal relation to the gods, as a deliberate paradoxical foil to vs. 1, where the gods install Agni and are his de facto parents, and to the other accounts of his birth in this hymn. It is also the case that Agni is closely associated with Varuṇa, a son of Aditi, early in the hymn (vss. 2, 3, 4, 5, also 18), though in vs. 2 it is explicitly stated that Agni is Varuṇa's younger brother, certainly not his mother. For a different wordplay involving *áditi-* see IV.2.11 in the next hymn.

IV.2 Agni

IV.2.1: There seem to be deliberate echoes in this vs. of the 1st vs. of the preceding hymn (IV.1.1) -- esp. pāda b *devó devéṣu aratír nidhā́yi* corresponding to IV.1.1b *devā́so devám aratíṃ nyeriré*; also IV.2.1a … *mártyeṣv amṛ́taḥ* and IV.1.1f *ámartyam … mártyeṣv ā́*. The first pāda is identical to I.77.1c, which continues (I.77.1d) with *hótā yájiṣṭhaḥ* … as in our pāda c.

On trisyllabic *mahnā́* (restored as **mahinā́* by HvN, though as **mahanā́* by Gr; see also Old Noten), see comm. ad I.123.4.

With Old (Noten, not SBE; also Re; Keydana, *Infinitive im Ṛgveda*, 54), I take *īrayádhyai* as a causative inf. in passive construction, "to be roused," rather than Ge's intransitive "um … zu fahren" or WG's transitive reflexive "um sich … in Bewegung zu setzen."

IV.2.3: The two rhyme words *vṛdhasnū́* and *ghṛtásnū* clearly form a rhetorical pair, though they have different origins and grammatical analyses, as their different accents show. *ghṛtásnu-* is generally taken as a bahuvrīhi with the reduced form of *sā́nu-* 'back' as 2nd member. See Old ad loc. and ad I.16.2, and cf., with a different designation of the same body part, *ghṛtá-pṛṣṭha-*. However, this cmpd. has a complex relationship with the differently accented *ghṛtasnú-* as well as *ghṛta-snā́-* 'bathed in ghee'. See Scar (661–62).

As for *vṛdhasnú-*, Gr takes it as a root-noun cmpd, with *snú-* for *snā́*, and glosses 'Segen triefend'; Scar (662) more or less follows this analysis, though he

proposes several different morphological pathways. Debrunner (AiG II.2.930), a bit confusingly, takes it as a "Nachbildung" to *ghṛtásnu-* though containing a suffix *-asnu-* (sim. Old SBE). (Debrunner does not gloss it; Old 'mighty'.) WG seem to take it as containing the same 'back' as *ghṛtá-snu-*, tr. 'von hochgewachsenem Rücken'. I agree with the general sense that *vṛdhasnú-* has to have been influenced by *ghṛtásnu-*, hence my parenthetic 'strong(-backed)', but it cannot have been formed in direct parallel because of the accent. I think it should be evaluated in the context of another nearby form belonging to √*vṛdh*, viz. the irregular (pseudo-)participle *vṛdhasānáⁿ-* in IV.3.6, a stem that occurs 3x in the RV. Since that stem was part of our poet's repertoire, I think it possible that he could create a reduced form of the "suffix" *-sānáⁿ-* (intermediately **-snáⁿ-*, just as *-snu-* is reduced from *sānu-*) with further adjustment of the final vowel to match *ghṛtásnu-*.

The instr. *mánasā* must go with *jáviṣṭhā* given the close relationship between the root √*jū* and *mánas-* (cmpds *máno-javas-*, etc.) throughout the RV; the question is only how to construe the instr. with the splv. I take it as an instr. of quality, rather like Re's "les plus rapides par rapport à la pensée (même)." Flg. Sāy., Ge tr. the phrase as if it were a comparative with an abl.: "… schneller als den Gedanken," which certainly makes sense but airbrushes the grammar. WG seem to take *mánasā* as a dual acc. ("die beiden schnellesten Denkorgane des Ṛta"), which is grammatically impossible for neut. *mánas-* (expect **mánasī*). Masc. du. *-as*-stems do have the ending *-ā*, but if the word here is meant to be masc., it should either be in a cmpd. (type *su-mánas-*) or show accent shift to a derived poss. adj. **manás-* 'having mind', which is not attested. Others (Lü 454, Scar 662) simply detach *mánasā* from *jáviṣṭhā* and tr. it elsewhere in the clause, but the formulaics speak strongly against that.

In the second hemistich the 2nd sg. verb *īyase* and the 2nd pl. acc. prn. *yuṣmā́n* comes awkwardly into English ("you [sg.] speed between you [pl.] and …"), but neatly signals Agni's natal affiliation with one of the two sides for which he acts as go-between. See also 10b *devó mártyasya*, where Agni's divinity is juxtaposed with his mortal worshiper.

Contra Old (SBE and Noten) and Ge, I see no reason to take *mártān* (or, as Old wants to read, **mártām*) here as gen. pl. It is perfectly interpretable as an acc. pl. appositive to *víśaḥ*. However, the same form in 11b is a somewhat harder case; see comm. there, as well as *nṝ́n* in vs. 15.

IV.2.4: Unaccented gen. pl. *eṣā́m* must refer back to *yuṣmā́n … devā́n* "you gods" in 3d; evidently the poet only wants a selection of them to be brought to the sacrifice.

IV.2.5: The qualifier 'long' (*dīrghá́ḥ*) of wealth in d means, of course, 'long-lasting' (just as *dīrghám támaḥ* [I.32.10, etc.] refers to "long(-lasting) darkness"). However, since it is implicitly contrasted here with 'broad' (*pṛthu-budhná-* 'having a broad base'), it is clear that the image is one of physical dimensions, not merely temporal ones. And, at least for me, "long darkness" is a more striking verbal formulation than "long-lasting darkness."

IV.2.6: Having described in the previous vs. what a (properly performed) sacrifice can get us, the poet now tells us what we have to do to perform this sacrifice properly.

On the pf. subjunctives here, see my forthcoming "The Vedic Perfect Subjunctive and the Value of Modal Forms to Tense/Aspect Stems," with disc. of the pf. subjunctives in this verse as well as the pres. and aor. subjunctives in vss. 7–9. There I specifically dispute Kü's interpr. (340, also 212, 595) of the pf. subj. as functioning "zur Bezeichnung der vollendeten Handlung für den generellen Fall" (i.e., "… gebracht hat," etc.).

IV.2.7: As he often does, Ge takes *cid* as a simile marker, but I do not think that is a possible function of *cid*, and certainly in this case there is no need to interpret *ánniyate* as a simile: Agni is regularly depicted as a greedy eater.

Contra Gr, all standard modern tr. and comm. take *niśíṣat* (so Pp.; *niśíṣan* is also phonologically possible, though morphologically unlikely) as belonging to √*śā* 'sharpen' (common with *ní*), not √*śās* 'instruct' (not found with *ní*). There are formulaic parallels with clear forms of *ní* √*śā*; see Ge's n. 7b and esp. VII.3.5c. With Old it seems best to emend to **niśíśat*. He takes it as a short-vowel subj. to the redupl. pres. *śíśāti*. So also Hoffmann (Aufs. II, 445–46 n. 14). This is certainly possible, but it could also be a masc. nom. sg. act. part. to this same redupl. pres. Both a finite 3rd sg. in a rel. cl. and a part. would be accented on the stem (not the preverb) as here, and either form is contextually possible. It can simply belong to the string of subjunctives in this passage that express ritual service. But note pāda a of the previous vs. (6a), which has a subj. and a part. (*jabhárat siṣvidānáḥ*); one could argue that in this sequence of vss. there is no more than one finite verb per pāda, though that is not a particular telling argument.

IV.2.8: Because the loc. phrase *své dáma ā́* "in his own house" in c does not seem to fit the equine simile there, in the publ. tr. I took it implicitly with ab. However, cf. I.143.4 *agníṃ táṃ gīrbhír hinuhi svá ā́ dáme* "urge Agni on with songs here in his own home," with a form of √*hi* and the same loc. phrase. If the hapax *hemyā́-vant-* is derived from √*hi* (so Old, SBE and Noten, generally now accepted) and means something like 'possessing/receiving impulsion, much impelled', the spurring or impulsion may refer to hymns and be happening in Agni's own home. So an alternative tr. might be "receiving the spurring (of hymns) in your own house, like a horse you will carry …" The separation of *hemyā́vān* from the simile *áśvo ná* invites but does not require reading *hemyā́vān* primarily with the frame, not the simile.

IV.2.9: *rāyā́ … ví yoṣat* shows the well-known instr. of separation.

IV.2.10: *rárāṇaḥ* in b is clearly the middle part. to √*rā* 'give'. This form appears frequently in this metrical position with just that meaning (e.g., in the preceding hymn IV.1.5c). However, given the 2nd sg. subj. *jújoṣaḥ* 'you will enjoy' at the end of the preceding pāda, I think it likely that there is a secondary association with the near

synonym √*ran* 'enjoy, take pleasure' and that *rárāṇaḥ* could be loosely interpr. also as a 2nd sg. pf. subj. with irregularly strengthened root syllable and wrong accent (contrasting with the properly formed pf. subj. *rāráṇas, -at*, etc.).

Ge unaccountably interprets *hótrā* in c as the Goddess of the Offering found in the Āprī hymns rather than as a common noun meaning 'offering', an interpr. that severs c from the rest of the verse.

Pāda d is a clear relative clause (*yásya*), though both Ge and Re render it as an independent clause. Their tactic is understandable because pāda c, the only main cl. in the vs., has no overt antecedent for the rel. prn. in d. We must supply a 'his' with *hótrā* to produce the connection between c and d.

The identity of "we strengtheners" is a bit puzzling. The stem *vṛdhá-* generally refers to a god or gods who strengthen their worshipers. In X.147.3 it is used of *sūrí-*s, human 'patrons', but patrons should not be the 1st ps. speakers in Rigvedic discourse -- rather it should be those who receive their patronage, i.e., the poets. I assume here it must refer to the group of ritual officiants, including the poet himself, and the person they are strengthening is the Yajamāna (or what will become the Yajamāna in later Vedic ritual).

IV.2.11: Note the phonetic figure in a, with the repetition of *ci*, followed by *vi*.

It is tempting here to take *mártān* here as a short genitive plural (see 3d above), as Ge and Re do. However, in X.89.3 *ví yáḥ pṛṣṭhéva jánimāni aryá, índraś cikāya* … "who has distinguished the races of the stranger, like the (straight and crooked) backs (of horses)," the clear acc. pl. *jánimāni* 'races, peoples' suggests that semantically similar *mártān* here can be the obj. of *ví* √*ci*.

I see no reason to supply a verb in c (like Ge); it can be easily construed with d.

The pair *dítim … áditim* in d recalls the *cíttim ácittim* that opens the hymn. The standard interpr. take *dítim áditim* as a positive/negated pair, understandably. But this requires one of the words to be positively valued and one negatively valued (not necessarily corresponding to the privative form). The problem is that each of the verbs that govern these accusatives (√*rā* 'give', *uruṣyá-* 'make wide space, deliver') ordinarily takes positively valued objects. Attempts to give *uruṣyá-* a negative sense (e.g., Old SBE "keep off Aditi") founder on the large number of positive cases. I therefore think that *dítim áditim* are not in an etymological relationship but are actually a pun. *díti-* is the 'giving' goddess and derived from √*dā* 'give'. For this etymological relationship see VII.15.12 *dítiś ca dāti vā́ryam* "And Diti gives a thing of value." *áditi-* by contrast is both the familiar goddess Aditi and the common noun 'boundlessness' (derived from √*dā* 'bind'). Each of these is the object of an appropriate verb: a different root meaning 'give' for *díti-* 'giving', a verb meaning 'make space' for *áditi-* 'boundlessness'. For a different wordplay with *áditi-* see previous hymn, IV.1.20.

IV.2.12: I take *paḍbhíḥ* in this vs. as belonging to a root noun *páś-*, meaning 'with the eyes', flg. Oldenberg (SBE [1897]) and Schindler (Wurzelnomen, 31). (However,

Oldenberg silently retracted this view in his short piece on *paḍbhíḥ* some ten years later [ZDMG 63 (1909): 300-302 [=KlsSch 316–18].) As Schindler points out, other hapaxes occur in etymological figures like our *paḍbhíḥ paśyeḥ*. All other exx. of *paḍbhíḥ* belong to *pád-* 'foot', including the one two vss. later (IV.2.14). Although such close proximity of identical forms might appear to weigh against assigning them to two different stems, esp. since one of the stems would be a hapax, their contexts seem designed to disambiguate: vs. 12 contains the etym. fig., while 14 juxtaposes the word with another body part frequently paired with it: *paḍbhír hástebhiḥ* "with feet (and) hands."

IV.2.14: The vs. modulates from the 1st pl. of the subordinate clause in the first hemistich (*yád vayám … cakṛmā́*) to the 3rd pl. of the main clause of d (*yemuḥ sudhyàḥ*) via the simile in c (*rátham ná krántaḥ*). The simile could belong either to the subord. cl. or the main cl. and is grammatically and semantically appropriate to either the 1st or the 3rd ps. subject of either.

On *ṛtám āśuṣā́ṇāḥ* see comm. ad IV.1.13.

IV.2.15: For the third time in this hymn a pāda-final acc. pl. might more comfortably be interpreted as a gen. pl. -- here *nṝ́n*. In the cases of *mártān* in 3d and 11b we saw that the acc. pl. reading was easily possible and an abbreviated (or re-formed) gen. pl. interpr. was unnecessary. Here an acc. pl. interpr. seems more difficult, though perhaps not impossible. If it is a gen. pl. the tr. would be "as the foremost ritual adepts of/among men," and most interpr. implicitly or explicitly accept this analysis. (See also disc. in AiG III.119 and Old, ZDMG 55: 285–89 [=KlSch 744–78], though Old in the Noten favors a *nominative* pl. analysis, also by preference ZDMG 55: 287 [=KlSch 746].) Certainly *nṝ́n* appears to be more multivalent in the RV than other acc. pl., and, though reluctant, I cannot rule out a gen. pl. However, I think it is possible that *nṝ́n* is a rough acc. of goal ("born to men") or respect ("ritual adepts with respect to men").

Interestingly, here "we" aspire to a complete set of parents: Mother Dawn, Father Heaven. Generally in the RV a single parent will do in any particular rhetorical situation.

IV.2.16: On *ṛtám āśuṣā́ṇāḥ* see comm. ad IV.1.13.

This vs. has double temporal reference, to the Aṅgirases of long ago using sacred speech to split the Vala cave and release the cows and to the current priests, who imitate the speech of the Aṅgirases in order to release the dawns from darkness. The failure to realize the double reference to both the opening of Vala and the beginning of the current dawn sacrifice has caused interpretational difficulties.

To begin with, *śúci* in c has been puzzled over. Old (SBE) attempted to make it a fem. adj. modifying *dīdhitim*, but in the Noten opts rather for an adverbial neut. Most other tr. interpr. it as an abstract 'Klarheit' vel sim. (Ge, Re, Scar [530], sim. Schmidt [B+I 43-44]), while WG take it as the modifier of *ṛtám* in the preceding pāda. I do not know of other exx. of *śúci-* in abstract value; I interpr. it rather in

conjunction with the phrase *śúcy ūdhaḥ … gávām* "the gleaming/blazing udder of cows" in the preceding hymn (IV.1.19). As noted in the comm. there, I take this as a ref. to the Vala cave. But this "blazing (udder)" can also refer to the current sacrifice, with the newly kindled fire at its focus. The priests approach this with their sacred speech to set the ritual in motion and achieve *dīdhitim* 'visionary power'.

I think pāda c is appropriate for both the ancient Aṅgirases and the present-day ritualists, and so I would modify the publ. tr. somewhat. The verb *ayan* is a subjunctive to the root present of √*i* and therefore primarily applicable to the ritualists and the actions they will now perform. But I also think that it's possible to interpr. it as a backformed injunctive to the same root present. Since augmented imperfects to stems beginning with a vowel always have lengthened augment (here, well-attested 3rd pl. *āyan* 'they went'), it would be possible to form an injunctive by "subtracting" the augment *a-*, producing *ayan*, rather than the more proper *yan* (found only in III.4.5). By such an interpr. the Aṅgirases could also be subjects of the verb: they *came* (inj.) to the gleaming/blazingVala cave (represented by *śúci*), and the priests *will come* (subj.) to the gleaming/blazing place of sacrifice.

The Pp. reads *kṣā́mā* in d as *kṣā́ma*, and most interpr. (save for WG) follow the Pp. and take this form as a singular, tr. "splitting the earth" -- as a reference only to the Vala myth (even though it is not the earth that gets split in that myth). But I think we should take the Saṃhitā form seriously, as the eliptical dual it appears to be, extracted from the dual dvandva *dyā́vā-kṣā́mā*. The phrase "splitting (heaven and) earth would refer to the visual experience of dawn, when the appearance of the dawn light at the horizon seems to split sky from earth, allowing the light to flood in through the resulting slit.

IV.2.17: And yet again we have a form that would be best interpr. as a genitive pl., but formally is not -- *devā́* or *devā́ḥ* [so Pp.] in *devā́ jánimā* (cf. *devā́nām … jánima* [or *jánimā*] in the next vs., 18b). It would be possible to interpr. *devā́ḥ* as nominative subj. in the simile ("as the gods do metal"); on the other hand, reading *devā́*, some have taken it as a neut. pl. adj. with *jánimā*. Here, however, I think a gen. pl. interpr. is the correct one, but the poet is playing a little trick: the sequence *ná devā́* is to be flipped to **devā́na* → *devā́nā(ṃ)*. The occurrence of the expected phrase in the next vs. would be an example of immediate poetic repair (see my 2003 "Poetic 'Repair' in the Rig Veda").

The standard tr. take *śucántaḥ* as transitive, with *agním* as obj., but as most comment, verb forms to this root are otherwise intransitive; see esp. identical *śucántaḥ* in nearby 15d. It seems better to interpr. *agním* as the obj. of *vavṛdhántaḥ* along with *índram*; there is no obstacle to such an interpr.

On the secondary present stem seen in the participle *vavṛdhánt-* here, cf. Kü (471).

IV.2.18: This vs. closes the mythological section of the hymn and is so positioned to seem as if it ought to be the denouement of the Vala myth. But it seems, at least to

me, to have no connection with that myth or, indeed, with anything else in this hymn. I remain baffled by it, and my comments here will be only on matters of detail.

Ge (/WG) take the subj. of ab to be the leader of the Aṅgirases, possibly Bṛhaspati. I follow Old (Noten) and Re in taking Agni as 3rd ps. subj., though he is also addressed with the voc. *ugra*. In this vs. the discrepancy is the least of our problems. My rather weak reason for preferring Agni as subj. is the fact that the hymn, dedicated to Agni, is drawing to a close, and the final two vss. (19–20) are explicitly Agni vss. I see nothing in the vs. to suggest that any Aṅgiras is involved, save for the herds of livestock that remind us of the Vala myth -- but they are in a simile.

Ge takes *ā́ √khyā* as meaning 'count', but as Re points out, this sense is not found earlier than the ŚB. A parallel passage shows a clear word for 'watch over, look at': VII.60.3 *sáṃ yó yūthéva jánimāni cáṣṭe*, which supports 'watch over' for the verb here. That passage also suggests that the *jánima* in b is the obj. of *ā́ … akhyat* and corresponds to *yūthā* in the simile (similar Old, Noten). I therefore take the *yád* in b to be a neut. sg. referring to *jánima* rather than the subordinating conj. ('when, since') of the standard tr. -- and I also follow the Pp in taking sg. *jánima* as the underlying form in the sandhi conglomeration *jánimā́nti*, rather than pl. *jánimā* as assumed by others. (The *jánimā* of 17b does give me pause, however.) With Old I supply 'pasture' with *kṣumáti* in pāda, rather than taking it as a personal designation (Viehbesitzer, maître du bétail), though not much depends on it. In my (/Old's) reading, it would refer to the ritual ground. Old's paraphrase of the first hemistich in the Noten is "… dass Agni … vor sich die Götterscharen erblickte wie Viehherden auf der Weides des Opfers." His interpr. of the passage informed mine.

As to what the "nearby" race of gods consists of, I have no idea -- perhaps the gods that come to the sacrifice. Recall that in vss. 3–4 the poet asked Agni to bring (only) a selection of gods to the sacrifice.

The second half-vs. is even more puzzling than the first, because there seems no reason to introduce Urvaśī and her retinue (pl. *urvaśī́ḥ*) and her son Āyu. I supply *janima* with *mártānām* rather than construing this gen. independently as most others do; the parallelism of the passage supports this.

IV.2.19: The augmented 3rd pl. *avasran* is listed as an aor. to √*vas* 'shine' by Whiteny (Rts) and Gr and so tr. by Old (SBE), Re, and (somewhat attenuated) Ge. I take it rather as an impf. to the root pres. of √*vas* 'wear' (so listed by Lub., so interpr., more or less, by Kü, *Stativ*, 97–98); WG take it also to 'wear', but as an ingressive aorist. Since the root already has a root *present* and there are no other forms to a root aorist, this seems to multiply entities unnecessarily. What does it mean for the dawns to wear/clothe themselves in truth? Perhaps either that they are greeted by a (truly formulated) hymn that serves as their garment or that by dawning they display the truth of the orderly functioning cosmos as their clothing. Although I think that *avasran* belongs properly to √*vas* 'wear', this of course does not mean that there is not a pun on √*vas* 'dawn, shine'.

IV.3 Agni

IV.3.1: I render vs.-final *kṛṇudhvam* twice -- once with vs.-initial *ā́* in the meaning 'make = kindle', rather than with most tr. 'bring here', and once with the quasi-infinitival dat. *ávase*.

It is not entirely clear why Agni is identified as Rudra here. The word is most likely to be construed with the gen. *adhvarásya* as "the Rudra of the/your ceremony," on the basis of I.114.4 *rudráṃ yajñasā́dham* "Rudra bringing the sacrifice to success" and III.2.5 (also of Agni) *rudráṃ yajñā́nāṃ sā́dhadiṣṭim* "the Rudra of the sacrifices, bringing success to the offerings." Perhaps the point of comparison is Rudra's healing powers and, esp. here, his ability to ward off threats of all sorts, in this case the "unexpected thundering" (*tanayitnór acíttāt*) of pāda c.

ródasyoḥ can be either gen. (with most tr.) or loc. (so publ. tr.). There is little riding on the choice.

As most interpr. take it, "unexpected thundering" is probably a reference to all sorts of unforeseen dangers, rather than specifically of a sudden storm.

IV.3.2: All the standard tr. take the rel. cl. of pāda a (*cakṛmā́ yáṃ vayám te* "[the womb] which we have made for you") as the frame for the simile in b, with "we" matching the eager wife (*jā́yā … uśatī́*) and "you" (Agni) matching the husband. Old (SBE) goes so far as to supply "marriage-bed" as the match for the womb: "… as a well-dressed loving wife (prepares the marriage-bed) for her husband." This is one possible reading, but I don't think it is the only (or even the dominant) one; in fact, I think the simile can be matched to four different entities in the verse.

Let us begin by noting that pāda b, the self-contained simile, is found three times elsewhere (I.124.7 of Dawn, X.71.4 of Vāc, and X.91.13 of praise [*suṣṭutí-*] seeking Agni), in all cases of females or of entities conceived as female. An obvious "entity conceived as female" is found in the nominal main clause of pāda a, *ayáṃ yóniḥ* "here is the womb": the womb, though grammatically masc., is a female accoutrement and can be matched with the wife in the simile in b. This "womb" (=fireplace) is well prepared ("richly dressed" *suvā́sāḥ*) and ready to receive Agni as her husband. For womb = wife, cf. III.53.4 *jāyéd … séd u yóniḥ* "The wife -- just she is the womb."

But *suvā́sāḥ* elsewhere occurs in the same pāda with *párivītaḥ* (found in our pāda c): III.8.4a *yúvā suvā́sāḥ párivīta ā́gāt* "As a youth, richly dressed, engirded, he has come here." Although the referent there is the sacrifical post, the vocabulary is also appropriate to Agni. Therefore it could be the Agni of c who is like a wife, eager for her husband identified with the womb in pāda a -- a gender reversal that would appeal to the Rigvedic poets. (Note that the standard reading, where "we" the ritualists match the wife, also requires some gender reversal.)

Finally let us consider pāda d. The subj. of d is fem., expressed by *imā́ u te … pratīcī́h* "these facing you." Ge (/WG) supply "Frauen," but in n. 2d Ge suggests *gíraḥ* (inter alia); Re supplies "louanges." I think *gíraḥ* must be correct: there are a number of *imā́ u tvā́/te … gíraḥ* passages (e.g. VI.45.25, 28, VII.18.3, VIII.3.3), and

Ge/Re adduce V.12.1 for *gir-* as well: *gíram bhare vṛṣabhā́ya pratīcī́m*. As was noted above, in 2 of its 4 occurrences the "eager wife" simile has speech/praise as its comparandum, so in fact that simile in our b works best with the hymns in d: these hymns face towards you, like an eager wife to(wards) her husband.

Bloomfield discusses the simile at length ad I.124.7. He is rather sour about our passage: the construction is "very loose indeed"; "the metaphor limps decidedly." Contra Bl I consider the deployment of the simile here as an example of the poet's extreme cleverness, with the simile applicable to every single entity in the vs. To reflect the polyvalent status of the simile, the publ. tr. should probably be changed to "(It is / we are / you are / they are) like …," though this would be very clumsy.

As for *párivīta-* 'enveloped' in c, the question is what Agni is enveloped in. It could be the paridhi sticks that surround the ritual fire (see, e.g., Ge ad I.128.1, endorsed for that passage by Thieme [Unters. 19]); WG suggest dawn's light or hymns; Old (SBE) offerings and prayers. It's useful to note that *párivīta-* occurs twice with the loc. of *yóni-*: once in an Agni hymn X.46.6 *párivīto yónau sīdad antáḥ* (note √*sad* here as well) and once in the riddle hymn I.164.32 *sá mātúr yónā párivīto antáḥ*, so that the two concepts seem to be connected ("enveloped within the womb"). This could fit the paridhi sticks forming a border of the fireplace conceived as a womb. It might also refer to the kindling sticks, within which fire is hidden until he is ignited (/born), hence also his womb. There is another important parallel in nearby IV.1.7 *ananté antáḥ párivīta ā́gāt* "enveloped within the limitless, he has come here"; see comm. there. On the multiple meanings of *párivīta-* in Agni context, see Thieme (Unters., 19–20).

Modern tr. (almost) universally take the voc. *svapāka-* as 'having a lovely backside' vel sim., related to *ápāñc-* 'turned backwards' and here implicitly contrasting with *pratīcī́ḥ* 'turned towards, facing'. The one exception is Old, who in SBE (1897) tr. "O most skilful one," an interpr. that he swiftly disavowed (ZDMG 55 [1901]: 301 [=KlSch. 760]) as "nicht zu denken" -- without admitting he had in fact thought it previously. Nonetheless, I think this is a more appealing interpr. than the current standard. I take it as built to a negated *á-pāka-* 'not naïve, not callow' to *pā́ka-* 'naïve, callow, simple' -- like *ámūra-* 'not stupid': *mūrá-* 'stupid'. *ámūra-* is found three times in the Agni hymns of this maṇḍala (IV.4.12, 6.2, 11.5), always of Agni. The semantically similar *ádṛpita-* 'undistracted' in the next pāda (3a) supports this interpr. There are two other occurrences of *svápāka-* (VI.11.4, 12.2), both analyzed by the Pp as *sú ápāka-* (both adduced by Old, SBE), both modifying Agni. In neither case does a "having a lovely backside" impose (or even suggest) itself, and I propose to include them under this stem.

IV.3.3: Ge takes the voc. *vedhaḥ* as the poet's self-address, which is certainly possible; he is commanding himself to recite (*śaṃsa*). This does not solve the question of the person of the verb *īḷé* in d. Although this form is universally rendered (incl. in the publ. tr) as a 3rd sg. (and analyzed, because of its accent, as the only perfect form to this root, against root pres. *ī́ḷe*, *ī́ṭṭe*; see Kü 122), it could of course also be a 1st sg. pf., with *sótā* an appositive to the underlying 1st ps. subj. ("I the

presser"). Since the surrounding vss. (2 and 4) have explicit 1st persons (though pl.), I would be inclined to emend the publ. tr. to "whom I, the presser, invoke …"

Pāda d plays on the standard Rigvedic notion that the soma-pressing stones are very noisy and that their noise is like that of the priestly recitation and singing happening at the same time. The question here is which of the three terms in the phrase *grā̆veva sótā madhuṣút* belongs to the simile and which to the frame. On the basis of X.64.15 *grā̆vevā yátra madhuṣúd ucyáte bṛhát*, I take *grā̆vā … madhuṣút* "the honey pressing (pressing) stone" as a discontinuous simile, with the frame represented by *sótā* in between. Ge, Re, WG, Kü (122), and Scar (615) take the simile to be *grā̆veva sótā* and the frame *madhuṣút*; Old (SBE) confines the simile to *grā̆vā* with the frame *sótā madhuṣút*. Either of these configurations avoids a discontinuous simile, but such similes are not rare and the phraseology of X.64.15 supports my analysis. Little rests on it, however.

IV.3.4: My "at least" for *cid* follows Ge ("wenigstens"). This somewhat testy note seems to introduce the next part of the hymn, with its anxious or annoyed questions to Agni about his relationship to the sacrificers and how he will represent it to the other gods.

The *śámī-* and the *ṛtá-* here presumably refer to the complementary physical and verbal aspects of the sacrifice. On *ṛtá-* as "Kultlied" in this and similar passages, see Lü (esp. 442–43).

IV.3.5–8: The list of gods to whom Agni will tattle on us follows a certain pattern. Vs. 5 contains the standard great trio of Ādityas, Varuṇa, Mitra, and Aryaman, as well as a minor -- but for our welfare important -- Āditya, Bhaga 'fortune'. Although we might have expected the Sun here, because he serves as the Ādityas' eye, observing our offenses, we have instead Heaven and Earth, which frame the cosmos. In vs. 6 the nearer gods of the midspace, particularly Vāta 'wind' and the Aśvins, are featured. Rudra appears in both 6 and 7; I don't quite understand why, but recall first that Agni was identified as Rudra in vs. 1 and may be also in 10d (see also 14b). Moreover, in 6 the punishing aspect of Rudra is emphasized ("man-smiting," *nṛhán-*), while in 7 he is paired and/or contrasted with the benevolent Pūṣan under the ambiguous epithet *súmakha-*, which means both 'good combatant' and 'very generous', so his effects on human life are emphasized and he counts as a nearer god, who in fact is the giver of the oblation (*havirdā̆-*). In the 2nd half of 7 Viṣṇu and his three strides return us to the contemplation of the whole cosmos, and vs. 8 functions ring-compositionally with vs. 5: we have the Sun we expected (and didn't get) in 5, with Aditi standing in for the Ādityas in 5, and heaven (though probably the place, not the deity) is the final goal.

IV.3.5: The last pāda would be more accurately rendered "What to Aryaman, what to Fortune?"

IV.3.6: Note that all four pādas rhyme: *agn**é**#* (a), *śubhaṃy**é**#* (b), *kṣ**é**#* (c), *nṛghn**é*** (d); also 7ab *pūṣṇ**é**#* … *havird**é**#*, an unusual effect in RVic verse.

The so-called "double stem" *vṛdhasāná-* is morphologically anomalous, but belongs to a fairly large group of stems with apparent middle part. in *-asāná-*. This is not the place to treat the origin of these stems at length, but I think the starting point is *sahasāná-* (5x, 4x of Agni) 'displaying might', which I take as a metathesized form of a pf. mid. part. **sasahāná-*, beside *sāsahāná-* (1x) and the younger type *sehāná-* (3x). This metathesis was reinforced by the very common *s*-stem *sáhas-*, and several other *-asāná-*stems have *s*-stems alongside (*śavasāná-*: *śávas-*, *rabhasāná-*: *rábhas-*, *jrayasāná-*: *jráyas-*) and fall into the same general semantic field of strength, power, or violent action (though not one of the best attested, *mandasāná-* 'becoming exhilarated'). There is unfortunately no neut. *s*-stem *vṛ́dhas-*, though there is a single attestation of an infinitival dat. *vṛdháse* with suffixal accent. See also disc. of *vṛdhasnú-* ad IV.2.3.

Pāda c is problematic, both metrically (it lacks a syllable) and grammatically: this is the only place in the RV where *nā́satya-* appears in the sg., not the du., and the identity of pāda-vinal *kṣé* is disputed. The metrical problem and the *kṣé* problem can be easily solved together if we adopt the suggestion of Hoffmann (p.c.) registered in Schindler (Root nouns, s.v. *kṣā́-*) that *kṣé* is a haplologized form of dativ al inf. **yakṣé* 'to appear' in the environment *(nā́sat[i])yāya* [*ya*]*kṣé*. (Note that *yakṣám* 'apparition' appears in 13a.) This interpr. is also reflected in WG's rendering, and one way or other it goes back to Ludwig; see Old (SBE, Noten).

As for sg. *nā́satyāya*, although this analysis is emphatically rejected by both Old (Noten) and Debrunner (AiG II.2.136), I have adopted Henry's old suggestion that the form is an vṛddhi adj. of appurtanance whose vṛddhi is invisible because the base already has initial-syllable vṛddhi. We would of course expect the accent to shift to the final syllable (AiG II.2.133ff.), hence **nāsatyá-*, but the dominance of the initially accented noun could have altered the accent, possibly redactionally. I supply 'chariot' in this dat. expression, since the Aśvins' chariot is esp. prominent and *párijman-* modifies their chariot elsewhere (I.20.3, X.41.1). Cf. esp. I.20.3 *tákṣan nā́satyābhyām párijmanaṃ sukháṃ rátham* "They fashioned the earth-circling well-naved chariot for the Nāsatyas."

IV.3.7: On the benevolent Rudra see comm. ad vss. 5–8. It is not clear why or how Rudra is the giver of the oblation. Old (see also WG's n.) suggests that it is in his capacity as *paśupati-*: he provides the beast for sacrifice. This is possible: though he is not so called in the RV (where the word is not found), this epithet is applied to him in AV (e.g., XI.2.28) and VS (e.g., XXVI.28).

In c *rétaḥ* 'semen' is somewhat surprising, esp. if it is to be construed as the object of *brávaḥ* -- so much so that Gr (tr., not Wö.) suggested emendation to *répaḥ* 'stain', an emendation accepted by Old (SBE, Noten) and Lü (622) and maintained tentatively by Scar (214). Re keeps the transmitted form but interprets it as a way of referring to negative speech: "Quelle semence (de blâme dirais-tu) …?" But in a culture so fixated on fertility, semen is basically always a positive concept. Important

is the fact noted by Ge (n. 7c) that Viṣṇu is elsewhere the protector of semen (cf., e.g., VII.36.9 *víṣṇuṃ niṣiktapā̆m* "Viṣṇu, protector of the poured-out [semen]"). In his n. (and contra his tr.) Re suggests an alternative interpr. of *rétaḥ* here as a truncated **retodhe* (cf. *retodhā̆*- 5x) or **retode* (Re does not accent either proposed form). This seems the correct solution, with the *-de* extracted from *havirdé*, which ended the preceding pāda.

In d Re suggests that *śárave bṛhatyaí* is the "état pré-compositionnel" of a bahuvrīhi **bṛhatśarave* (no accent provided and no application of sandhi), whose referent is Rudra. Although the arrow is surely Rudra's as all standard interpr. recognize, there is no reason to substitute the god for his symbolic accoutrement. Just as Agni can speak to the chariot of the Aśvins (6c, by my interpr.), he can also speak to Rudra's arrow.

Ge (n. 7d) points out the contrast between Viṣṇu as creator (c) and Rudra as destroyer (d).

IV.3.8: Although it is tempting to take *ṛtā̆ya* as an adj. modifying *śárdhāya* (so, e.g., Ge "der rechtwandelnden Schar," sim. WG, Old SBE), the stem *ṛtá*- is overwhelmingly a neut. noun. It is possible, with Re, to take it as an appositive with the Marut troop: "Ordre (incarné)" or, with Lü (623), as a separate entity to whom Agni's speech is directed, but I think it more likely that it is a dative of purpose, like (*ya)kṣé* in 6d, *havirdé* in 7b: "for truth," that is, for the Maruts to attain or ascertain the truth.

The masc. (/neut.) *turā̆ya* cannot modify fem. *áditaye* (*pace* Old SBE). Ge supplies "heaven"; WG suggest the sun. With Re I opt tentatively for Indra, who is frequently modified by this adj. and who is otherwise absent from this fairly comprehensive list of important gods (see Ge n. 8c). Brereton (*Ādityas*, 205–6) instead thinks *turā̆ya* represents an Āditya, probably Varuṇa, and takes *áditaye* not as the name of the goddess but as a common noun 'innocence', with the dative phrase meaning "for the mighty one (=Varuṇa) to (ascertain our) innocence." This assertion of innocence at the end of a series of questions about potential blame would set the stage for the request that Agni make our sacrifice succeed (pāda d). This suggestion is appealing, but I am not convinced that *áditi*- ever means 'innocence', and further in this sequence the purpose datives are only pāda-final, which *áditaye* is not.

Pāda d poses some syntactic challenges. The first is that *sā̆dhā*, by all accounts a 2nd sg. act. impv. to √*sādh*, has no expressed obj., though act. forms of this root are fundamentally tr. (but sometimes, esp. in the participle, used in absolute sense "assuring success"; cf. nearby IV.1.9). I supply *dhíyam* 'thought' vel sim. as the object, since forms of *dhī*- or other words for thought/prayer are regularly construed with √*sādh*. The other problem is what to construe gen./abl. *diváḥ* with. (It cannot be acc. pl. because of the accent.) The standard solution has been to take it with *cikitvā̆n* (e.g., Ge "der du den Himmel kennst"), but as Re points out, *cikitvā̆n* is never otherwise construed with a gen. His solution is to supply an obj. for *sā̆dhā* on which *diváḥ* is dependent: "Mène droit au but (les affaires) du ciel." My interpr. requires a slight emendation, from *sā̆dhā diváḥ* to **sā̆dhā diváḥ* -- that is, *sā̆dha ā̆*

diváḥ, with *ā́* + ABL in the meaning "all the way to." Cf. I.92.17 *yaú … ślókam ā́ diváḥ … cakráthuḥ* "you two who made your signal-call (reach) all the way to heaven"; sim. III.61.4. See comm. ad locc.

IV.3.9–12: Each of these vss. begins with the resonant and charged instr. *ṛténa* 'by truth', the usual introduction to a truth formulation. Each of the vss. does seem to express a mystical truth about the ritual or its mythic background. There is no obvious connection to the group of vss. that precede (the question vss. of 4cd–8), but if I am correct that we should supply 'thought' or 'thoughts' in 8cd, where we ask Agni to send them all the way to heaven, it may not be fanciful to think that vss. 9–12 are these very thoughts.

IV.3.9: This vs. expresses the beloved paradox about cows and milk, that the cow is "raw" but her milk "cooked" (that is, ready to consume), and further that a black cow can still give white milk. These paradoxes describe in the first instance the production of the ritual offering, the milk that will produce the ghee to be poured into the ritual fire. But it may also (esp. the 2nd hemistich) characterize the transition from the night (black cow) to dawn (the gleaming milk) at the dawn sacrifice; see Janert (Dhāsi, 29ff.).

The standard interpr. (save for WG) take *ṛténa* as the agent with the ppl. *níyatam* (e.g., Re "L'Ordre a été fixé par l'Ordre (même)"). Because the flg. 3 vss. also begin with *ṛténa*, interpreting the first one outside of the pattern established by the rest seems misguided, esp. given the usual function of initial *ṛténa* (see comm. above on vss. 9–12).

I take the *ṛtám* that I reverently invoke (*īḍe*) to be the paradoxes just discussed -- the mystical truth of the cow's nature -- and I interpr. *ā́ góḥ* as an ablative phrase, referring to the source of this truth. Most take *góḥ* as a gen., but this makes *ā́* hard to construe. (The phrase *ā́ góḥ* occurs 3x elsewhere, always pāda final, twice in this maṇḍala [IV.22.4, 23.6] and once in X [X.100.12]; nowhere is it clear.) At least acdg. to Old (SBE) and Ge, the *ṛtám* is actually a reference to the milk. I am somewhat skeptical.

On *dhāsí-* see comm. ad I.62.3, 140.1.

The hapax *jā́marya-* is opaque; see EWA s.v. My tr. follows Janert's analysis (Dhāsi, 33ff.), that it is a secondary derivative to *jām-ara-* "die die Nachkommen Nährende." Ge's suggestion (n. 9d) that it is related to YAves. *zəmar* 'on/in the earth' (in *zəmar-gūz-*), hence 'earthly' (versus heavenly milk = rain), fits the passage less well.

IV.3.10: This 2nd vs. in the truth-formulation sequence both continues the mystical description of the dawn sacrifice and presents another paradox. With regard to the sacrifice, the milk produced in vs. 9 becomes the butter oblation poured on the sacrificial fire, as Ge discusses. Ge's explanation of the phrase *páyasā pr̥ṣ̌thyèna* lit. "the milk belonging to the back" is ingenious and (to me) convincing: it is the milk on the top (the image is of a four-legged animal), i.e., the cream, which is made into

butter. With the offering of the butter, the fire flames up -- allowing it to go about "conferring vigor" (*vayodhā́-*) in c.

Pāda c also inaugurates the paradox that is most clearly expressed in d. Agni is characterized as *áspandamāna-* in c. As Ge points out (n. 10c), √*spand* 'kick, lunge, jerk' is only used in Vedic of cows when they are being milked, so Agni is both bull (*vṛ́ṣabhá-* [a], *vṛ́ṣan-* [d]) and cow. This paradoxical double identity is sharpened in d, where Agni is identified not only as a bull but as Pṛśni, the cow who is the mother of the Maruts, and he is the subj. of the quintessential "cow" verb √*duh* 'milk' and acts on the quintessential cow body part *ū́dhar-* 'udder'. The substance s/he produces from this udder is *śukrám*, which can refer not only to 'gleaming' milk, but is also used to refer to semen. A similar gender-bending milking scenario involving Pṛśni and Rudra, the Maruts' father, is found in II.34.2; see that passage and the comm. thereon. Here Agni may be being identified with Rudra; see the Agni-Rudra equation in vs. 1 and also the focus on Rudra in the "question" vss. (6d, 7b, 7d). There are a number of passages in the Agni hymns of IV that should be brought into the conversation, though unfortunately what they have to say is obscure: see the "gleaming udder" (*śúcy ū́dhaḥ*) in IV.1.19 and a neut. entity (quite possibly her udder) belonging to Pṛśni in IV.5.7, 10.

What -- if anything -- this refers to naturalistically is unclear. The tendency among interpr. has been to take it as a reference to rain (see Ge n. 10d) or to some other celestial phenomenon (Lü 390), but I find Bloomfield's suggestion (RR 213) more appropriate to the passage, that the fire, blazing up, "shoots out his flames from his bright udder; he, a bull, is thereby -- mirabile dictu -- also a pṛ́çni, the heavenly, yielding cow, *par excellence.*" Bl also suggests that *śukrá-* here mean 'semen', with a zeugma of *duduhe*: "As a bull he hath spurted semen, as a Pṛ́çni cow he hath milked his udder."

IV.3.11: The third truth-formulation vs. sets up the Vala myth as the model for the coming of dawn: as the Aṅgirases breached the Vala cave and let loose the cows, so the human sacrificers break Dawn out of her confinement by kindling the ritual fire. This is the third step in the depiction of the morning ritual. As noted elsewhere (see esp. the publ. intro to Maṇḍala IV and to IV.1), the Vala myth and the Aṅgirases play an outsize role in the Agni cycle of IV.

Despite the injunctives of pāda a (*vy àsan*) and c (*pári ṣadan*), I am tempted, with Gr, to read *anavanta* in b, to produce 11 syllables. (Consider the augmented impf. in d, *abhavat*.) Old (Noten) considers this restoration possible but not required. Hoffmann (Injunk., 209) gives a typical treatment of the vs. in his system, assuming an injunc. *navanta* in b.

IV.3.12: The ritual application of this final *ṛténa* vs. is less clear than for the first three. It may simply refer to the waters used at the first soma pressing. Or the ritual aspect may be muted, and the point is to make room for the Vṛtra myth next to the Vala myth in vs. 11. However, the opt. *dadhanyuḥ* seems to reflect a movement from

what has happened (the injunctives and preterite indicative of the last few vss.) to what should now happen, which suggests that there *should* be a ritual application.

The athem. mid. part. *-stubhāná-* is isolated, beside the act. them. 1st cl. pres. *stóbhati*, and it is therefore impossible to determine its exact value -- including whether it is passive (so, e.g., Old [SBE], Ge, Re) or not. Gotō (1st cl., 332 and n. 808) argues against such a value, on the basis of the intrans. sense of the root, and I have followed him in the non-passive assessment. My tr. "beat a tattoo" reflects my sense that √*stubh* is associated esp. with rhythm. As for *sárga-*, lit. 'surge, gush', it can refer to the instant when the surge is released, hence here the start of a race.

IV.3.13: This vs. is very difficult. As I see it, the point of the vs. is to demand that Agni not track down and punish the speaker for the transgressions of others, esp. others who are close to the speaker and could be mistaken for him. In the first hemistich this notion is expressed by GEN *yakṣá-* "the specter/apparition of X," where *yakṣá-* could perhaps best be rendered as Doppelgänger.

The first problem one encounters is *kásya* and the puzzle of how an interrogative would interact with the prohibitive *mā*. The standard solution is to treat *kásya* as an indefinite, without the usual particle (*cid, caná*) to mark this value -- e.g., Re "… de qui (que ce soit)." I propose instead to read **akásya* 'of (a) nobody'. With an accent like that of *akútra* 'nowhere', this interpr. does not require emending the Saṃhitā text (which would read *mākásya*), only the Pp., and the same stem is found twice elsewhere in the same context, at least by my interpr.: V.79.4 *mā kásya* (in a passage very similar to this one) and I.120.8 *mā kásmai*, parallel to *mākútrā* where the Pp. analyzes the first as *mā kásmai* but the 2nd as *mā akútra*.

The form *huráḥ* has been variously analyzed. Old (etc) takes it as an adv., and Ge (etc.) as the gen. of a root noun. (For detailed disc. see Scar [123], who vacillates.) I follow the latter view, but see it not as an abstract but as a personal gen. referring to one of the transgressors. (This seems to be the WG interpr., too.)

In d Old suggests emending *dákṣam* to *yakṣám* (matching the same form in pāda a and found elsewhere with *bhujema*), but it is hard to see how this error could have arisen. I think rather that *dákṣa-* is used here ironically or sarcastically.

On *mā* with the apparent opt. *bhujema*, see Hoffmann (Injunk., 95-97), who explains this grammatical anomaly (found several times) as a misinterpr. of expressions with the dat. inf. *bhujé*.

IV.3.14: Once again in this hymn Agni seems to be indirectly identified with Rudra, here by the use of the adj. *súmakha-*, used explicitly of Rudra in 7b. The ambiguity of this word works well here also.

IV.3.15: Vs. 3 also contains forms of both *mánman-* and *śastí-*.

On *sám* √*jṛ* see Gotō (1st cl., 154–55), who considers the two instances of this lexeme (also in the next hymn, IV.4.8) an individual use of this poet, in the meaning 'be welcome' [willkommen sein]. In both cases it has a verbal product of the poet as subj. (*śastí-* here, *gír-* IV.4.8). My 'bring harmony' is meant to capture the 'sing'

feature of the root √*jṛ*. Perhaps 'be harmonious' would have been better. For further disc. see ad IV.4.8 below.

IV.3.16: On this vs., see publ. intro.

IV.4 Agni the Demon-Smasher

IV.4.1: The repetition of the same word, *prásitim*, in a and c without any obvious difference in usage or sense (Re says they are "légèrement" distinct) seems uncharacteristically clumsy for a Vedic poet, which in turn makes it tempting to identify something that does distinguish them. Although he does not tr. them differently (nor does anyone else), Ge suggests in his n. 1a that *prásiti-* represents the coalescence of two words, one derived from √*sā, si* 'bind' ('Fanggarn', a hunting net) and the other 'Laut, Ansturm', related to *prásita-* (IV.27.4, X.77.5) 'shot forth'. The latter provides the usual meaning of *prásiti-* 'onslaught' vel sim., and the word is now usually considered to belong to PIE **seh*$_1$*(i)* 'loslassen' (cf. LIV^2 1.**seh*$_1$*(i)* n. 2; EWA s.v.) and to be related to *sā́yaka-* 'missile'. For disc. of some of the occurrences of *prásiti-* see Hoffmann (Aufs. 417–18 [=MSS 10, 1957]); curiously Hoffmann only notes the second occurrence of the word in this vs., not the first. Ge's suggestion that the word has two sources opens the possibility of accounting for the poet's seemingly awkward repetition here, if in fact he's using two different words *prásiti-* (or, to him, possibly two different sense of one word; for this cf. *sumatí* in 6a, 8a below). That the *prásiti-* in pāda a is 'broad' (*pṛthvī-*), while the *ánu* 'along' in c suggests that it is long and thin there might be a clue. I tentatively suggest that the first occurrence refers to a deployed hunting net -- broad so as to trap as many animals as possible (or to make it difficult for any animal to avoid it) and comparable to an advancing sheet or wall of flame. The second one would then have the usual sense of 'onslaught, forward dash'. Unfortunately altering the tr. to allows for these two separate meanings would lose the identity of the forms in this suggested pun.

Pace Ge, *íbha-* means 'entourage, retinue' not 'elephant' in Vedic, a meaning reinforced by the Middle Indic derivatives. See EWA s.v.

On *drūṇāṇá-* as belonging to √*drū* 'cut down, mow' see Hoffmann (Aufs. 414–21) and EWA s.v. *DRAV*^{I}.

Pāda c seems to go more naturally with b than with d, as most take it.

IV.4.2: Since √*spṛś* does not otherwise occur with *ánu* in the RV or, per Monier-Williams, in all of Skt., I supply an object with this preposition -- either the flames of pāda a or, perhaps preferably, the *prásitim* construed with *ánu* in 1c.

Most interpr. take *pataṃgā́n* as an unmarked simile, e.g. Ge "(gleich) Vögeln." My interpr. requires supplying an unparalleled noun but avoids the need for a simile particle.

IV.4.2–4: Note the preverb chaining: 2d *ví sṛja*, 3a *práti … ví sṛja,* 4b *práti.*

IV.4.3: Ge. renders d "keiner soll es wagen, dich irrezuführen," but *vyáthiḥ* 'veering course' is simply a description of the usual behavior of fire, amply described in vss. 1–2.

IV.4.4: As Ge suggests in his n. 4a, *ā́ tanuṣva* could reflect the common idiom *ā́ √tan* 'draw/stretch the bow (*dhánus-*, *dhánvan-*)'. Given that Agni is identified as a 'shooter' (*ástā*) in 1c and that bows are the presumed object of a different form of *√tan* in the next vs. (5c, see there), this seems quite possible, though I think the primary reading is simply the reflexive 'stretch yourself out'; cf. 1a for Agni's making himself broad.

IV.4.5: The standard tr. supply 'powers' with *daívyāni*, and this certainly could make sense. However, no word meaning 'power' occurs with pl. *daívya-* (I must admit that *sáhas-* occurs several times with the sg.) nor as obj. of *āvíṣ √kṛ* 'make manifest'. Since we expect something visual as the obj. of such a verb and since the hymn so far has concerned the shape-shifting of Agni, I tentatively supply 'forms' -- though 'powers' is not excluded contextually.

The adj. *sthirá-* 'taut, firm', esp. when obj. of *áva √tan*, presupposes 'bows' as its head noun; cf. the bahuvrīhi *sthirá-dhanvan-* (VII.46.1) and phrases like VIII.20.12 *sthirā́ dhánvāni*.

The more usual interpr. of cmpds with final root noun is OBJ + TRANS. VERB, and this seems to be the sense of many of the fairly numerous cmpds in *-jū-* (e.g., *vasū-jū-* 'speeding goods'), though Scar (166–77) hesitates in several cases. However, in *yātu-jū-* the final member must be read passively with agentive 1st member: 'incited by sorcerers', as VII.21.5, adduced by both Ge and Scar (173), definitively shows: *ná yātáva indra jūjuvur naḥ* "Sorcerers do not incite us, Indra."

IV.4.6: The 2nd hemistich has been variously interpr. Most recently WG take the neut. pls. *víśvāni … sudínāni … dyumnā́ni* as subjs. of the sg. verb *dyaut*, in the well-known, inherited, but relatively rare constr. of neut. pl. + sg. verb ("Zu ihm strahlen alle …"). Re takes all of the half-verse through *aryáḥ* as nominal sentences: "que tous (les jours) soient de beaux jours pour lui …," and the rest of d as an abrupt command. Ge has Agni shining the various good things through the doors to the fortunate *asmai*. My interpr. is closest to Old (Noten, not SBE) and Ge's alternative in his n. 6cd. I take *ví dúraḥ* as referring to the usual opening of the doors, an expression that usually contains a form of the verb *√vṛ* 'cover' (e.g., IX.45.1 *ví … dúro vṛdhi*). Here the more dramatic verb *dyaut* has been substituted, blending the lexeme *ví … dyaut* 'flashed forth (like lightning)' with the straightforward *ví √vṛ* 'open' -- hence my "flashed open the doors." I am not sure why all the standard tr. (except for WG) render the injunctive *dyaut* as a modal (e.g., Ge "… sollst du … scheinen").

I supply 'days' with *sudínāni* on the basis of passages like VII.11.2 *áhāny asmai sudínā bhavanti*.

rāyáḥ can be either acc. pl. (so Old, Ge, Re) or gen. sg. dependent on *víśvāni … sudínāni* (so Th [Fremdl. 61] "All die Sonnentage des Reichtums," WG). In the publ. tr. I took it as acc. pl. but, to my mind, nothing rides on it either way.

IV.4.7: It is not clear whether *nítya-* in this context has already developed its later technical sense of regular, obligatory ritual offering, as opposed to those performed irregularly for special purposes. Or whether it simply means, as Re takes the phrase *nítyena havíṣā*, "une offrande personnelle."

I have pushed the last phrase *sā́sad iṣṭíḥ* to "this desire will be" -- that is, "will come true" -- rather than simply "this will be his desire" (so Ge [WG]), since I otherwise find it difficult to interpr. the subjunctive.

IV.4.8: The word *sumatí-*, found in 6a, is repeated here. There it clearly referred to the benevolence or good will of Agni, which the successful priest/poet comes to know. Here I think it has double meaning. On the one hand, it still refers to Agni's good will, which the poet praises, but it also refers to the good thought, i.e., the poem, that the poet has produced for Agni. This double reading is enabled not only by the usual double meaning of *sumatí-* and the grammatical ambiguity of the enclitic *te* (gen. in the first interpr., dat. in the 2nd), but also by the double meaning of √*ṛc* 'chant, recite', which can take as object either the topic/goal of the praise (e.g., V.29.1 *árcanti tvā marútaḥ …* "The Maruts chant to/praise you") or the verbal contents of the recitation (V.30.6 *tubhyéd eté marútaḥ … árcanti arkám* "Just for/to you do these Maruts chant the chant").

ghóṣi (also VI.5.6) is a controversial form. The grammars/lexica generally take it as a 3rd sg. passive aor. to √*ghuṣ* 'hear'; it would take a putative *sumatíḥ* as subj. and mean "(the good thought) was/is/will be heard" (Old SBE "it resounded here," sim. WG). The other instance (in VI.5.6) is taken as a neut. adj. 'laut ertönend' by Gr, also Old (Noten, contra SBE). Most tr., however, render it as a 2nd sg. act. impv. "hear!" I think this is the correct interpr., though the morphology is a little troubled. It appears to be a *-si* imperative, though not built as usual (at least in my view) to an *s*-aor. subjunctive, but rather to, or alongside, the 1st class thematic pres. *ghóṣati*. So, e.g., Gotō (1st cl., 131 and n. 160, with lit.); it is curious that in WG this interpr. has been abandoned without comment. The form is disc., in typically indecisive fashion, by Baum (Impv., 46 and 27 [where he seems to accept the *-si* impv. analysis]).

The Vāvātā or 'Favorite' wife in later śrauta ritual is one of the wives of the king who has a series of set functions in the various royal rituals (see, e.g., my *Sacrificed Wife* passim). The presence of this figure, or of her prototype, may suggest that the lexeme *sám* √*jṛ*, found also in the preceding hymn (IV.3.15), may have deeper resonance than simply 'be welcome, bring harmony', perhaps something like 'be in tune with (s.o.)', referring to perfect harmonious agreement between two people, esp. two people in love. In both IV.3.15 and our passage the feminine song (*gír-*) / chant (*śastí-*) would put herself in tune with the masc. god, as a Favorite wife would to her kingly husband. Note that in IV.3.15 the chant is modified by *devávātā*

'favored by the gods', with the same *-vātā* as here (save for accent). In fact, as Ge points out (for different purposes) our *te vāvātā* is phonologically very close to IV.3.15 *devávātā*. It might also be that *jara(tām)* would be reminiscent of *jārá-* 'lover', to add to the erotic mood.

As Re's tr. makes clear ("Nous souhaitons t'orner, (dans l'espoir d'obtenir) de bons chevaux, de bons chars"), the two adj. *sváśvāḥ … suráthāḥ* are most likely proleptic: we want to tend the ritual fire in order to get possession of good horses and chariots. This contrasts with the use of *sváśva-* in 10a.

IV.4.9: *sumánas-* here recalls the two occurrences of *sumatí-* in 6a and 8a (see disc. there); this word two may have dual value: both 'benevolent, well-disposed' and 'having a good mind', that is, one capable of producing good thoughts in the form of hymns.

The *dyumnā́ni* of the *arí-* "the brilliant things of the stranger" that Agni opened up for us in 6d we seem to have thoroughly taken possession of here. The gen. *jánānām* here corresponds to *aryáḥ* in 6d.

IV.4.10: Unlike 8c where I took *sváśva- surátha-* as proleptic with the priestly subject "we," here the man who is *sváśva- suhiraṇyá-* appears to be already rich, with a chariot full of goods -- and therefore most likely the patron of the sacrifice, who (we hope) will redistribute this wealth to us performers via the sacrifice. This may be the purport of *sákhā* 'partner' here. Ge suggests (n. 10ab) that the figure in question is a ruler returning from battle with booty.

IV.4.11: This vs. concerning the poet's poetic gifts and his lineage, spoken in the 1st ps. sg., seems out of place in this hymn and anticipates the enigmatic hymn IV.5 that follows immediately, which focuses on the mysterious sources of poetic power. Of course, given the mechanical arrangement of the RVic hymn collections, we cannot assume that the hymns had anything to do with each other originally.

Old (SBE), Re think that the poet's lineage (*bandhútā*) is with Agni: Old "through my kinship (with thee)." But the next pāda, where the line of descent is traced from his father Gotama, makes that unlikely.

The next question is what to do with *maháḥ*. Old (SBE) takes it as acc. pl. object of *rujā́mi*; Ge (/WG) as gen. sg. with *vácobhiḥ*, referring to the poet's great (father). With Re I prefer to take *maháḥ* as adverbial. Although this leaves *rujā́mi* without an object, an object is easily supplied: the root √*ruj* is typed for the breaking of the Vala cave, particularly in this group of hymns so dominated by that myth. Cf. IV.2.15: ... *áṅgiraso bhavema, ádrimṣ rujema* ... "Might we become Aṅgirases; might we break the rock." On grounds of sense I don't think *maháḥ* is gen. with *vácobhiḥ* because I think the poet is asserting the power of his own poetic gift: he acquired this gift from his father (pāda b), but he is not using his father's words but his own -- or so I take his proud boast. By casting himself as the subject of the Vala-breaking verb, he is also implicitly asserting his identity with the Aṅgirases, who broke into Vala

with *their* words. Like the speaker(s) of IV.2.15 he seems to be saying "might I become an Aṅgiras."

IV.4.13: Since the *yé* of the rel. clause in ab has no obvious referent in the main clause of cd, it is tempting to connect ab with the preceding verse (12), and start a new sentence with 13cd -- esp. because 13a *yé pāyávaḥ* matches 12c *té pāyavaḥ* so exactly. But vs. 13 is a repeated vs. (= I.147.3), and so must be interpreted as self-contained. It is also likely, because of the reference to Māmateya, i.e., Dīrghatamas, that I.147, a Dīrghatamas hymn, is its source, and the vs. has been inserted here secondarily because of the match between the two *pāyávaḥ* phrases (so Bloomfield, RR ad I.147.3). On the relationship between the relative and main clauses in this vs. see comm. ad I.147.3.

IV.5 Agni Vaiśvānara

IV.5.1: Note that the first word of the hymn is *vaiśvānará-*.

Old (SBE), Ge, and WG all take *bṛhád bhā́ḥ* as the obj. of *dāśema* with the dat. *agnáye* phrase the indirect obj. (e.g., Old "How may we … offer mighty light to … Agni"). I am dubious about this for two reasons, one practical and one grammatical. First, why would we need to confer light on Agni -- does he not already have it? I suppose "*lofty* light" might refer to the sun and our ability to make the sun rise by kindling the ritual fire, but the phrase refers to Agni's own light elsewhere (e.g., VIII.23.5, X.3.1). Or conferring such light upon him might simply mean kindling him. More telling is the grammatical argument: although there are a few other √*dāś* passages with acc. of something conferred (though normally a ritual offering of some sort; cf. I.71.6 [*námaḥ*], I.93.3 [*havíṣkṛtim*]), the overwhelming number of passages have simply a dative of the honoree sometimes with *instrumental* of what is conferred. Alternatively and considerably less often, the verb can take an acc. of the honoree; cf. the very similar V.41.16 *kathā́ dāśema námasā sudā́nūn … marútaḥ* "How might we serve the Maruts of good drops with reverence?" I therefore think √*dāś* is participating in two syntactic frames here, 1st with dat. *agnáye*, then with acc. *bṛhád bhā́ḥ*, both as the object of honor and service. Re in his n. suggests that *bṛhád bhā́ḥ* is a "pré-bahuvrīhi," but in his tr. treats it as an appositive "Haut éclat" going with the 2nd hemistich and modifying the underlying subj. Agni there.

The usual obj. of √*stambh* is *dyā́m* 'heaven', which is the obj. expected (and supplied) in the frame. The obj. in the simile, *ródhas-* 'bulwark', may have been chosen because it is phonologically reminiscent of *ródasī* 'two world-halves', another way to refer to the cosmic masses. This word serves as obj. to √*stambh* a number of times with the preverb *ví* ('prop apart'), e.g. VI.8.3 (another Vaiśvānara hymn) with Agni as subj.: *vy àstabhnād ródasī*.

IV.5.3: In the publ. tr. I take *dvibárhāḥ* as the masc. nom. sg. it appears to be, modifying the subj. However, this particular form several times has to be taken as neut. (I.114.2, VII.8.6, 24.2; see comm. ad VII.24.2), and its position here may make

it more likely a modifier of neut. *sā́ma*, as Old (SBE), Ge, and Re take it. Hence, possibly "a great doubly lofty melody …"

I tr. *padám* twice, as 'word' and 'track', to bring out the pervasive pun in this hymn.

IV.5.5: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. characterizes rival poets as capable of producing a "deep word" (*padám … gabhīrám*) despite their bad characters. Sāy's interpr. of this phrase as a deep *place*, namely hell, fld. by Old in SBE (but decisively rejected by him in Noten) and in part by Doniger, has little to recommend it, esp. because *padá-* is the signature word of this hymn and has very specific values in the hymn. It would be a very slender basis on which to found Vedic views of the afterlife.

The form of the verb *ajanatā* causes interpretational difficulties. It appears to be the 2nd pl. act. impf. to the 1st cl. pres. stem *jánati* 'begets', and so I take it, as do WG (see also Gotō, 1st class, 145 n. 203) and, as a plausible alternative, Old (Noten). See also Narten (Sig. Aor., 117–18 n. 317). But most interpr. want the verb to be 3rd ps., and if possible, 3rd plural. Since the ending *-ata* (/*-atā*) can only be 3rd pl. to an athematic stem, an otherwise unattested root pres. was invented by Gr.; Ge takes it as an 3rd pl. aor.; Re tr. as 3rd pl. but does not comment. As Old points out, lengthening of *-ta* to *-tā* is far more common in the 2nd pl. act. than in 3rd ps. middle forms -- another argument in favor of the 2nd pl. Since unsignaled switch between persons is common in RVic discourse, there seems no contextual reason to reject the obvious morphological anaysis of *ajanatā*.

It is striking that the two damning similes compare the badly behaved poets to two types of contemptible females.

IV.5.6: This vs. is difficult both to construe and to render into English, and different interpretations of how to construe it lead to very different views of the meaning of the hymn as a whole. In my view, the poet claims that because of his upright behavior, in contrast to that of the likewise skilled but wicked poets in vs. 5, Agni takes some of the burden of the poetic labor upon himself. Other interpr. believe that the poet is complaining that Agni is imposing a further burden on him, the poet, despite his good behavior.

I take the first two words of the vs., *idám me*, as a separate clause, with the referent of *idám* the same as that in the last pāda of the preceding vs., *idám padám … gabhīrám* "this profound word." With *idám me* the poet lays claim to the poetic skill that seems also to characterize the wicked poets.

My view that *kíyate* starts a new clause is supported by the fact that all other exx. of *kíyant-* are pāda-initial. In attempting to render the rest of the vs. into parsable English I have scuttled the interrogative feature of the dat. *kíyate* 'for how great/small a one?' An interrogative rendering would be something like "For what such small one (like me) … have you placed …?"

With the dat. negated part. *áminate* I supply as obj. *dhā́ma* (or *dhā́mā[ni]*) (with most tr.), in a phrase contrasting with 4c *prá yé minánti váruṇasya dhā́ma*

"those who confound the ordinances of Varuṇa," which described his rivals and the targets of Agni's flame.

Given the position of the simile part. *ná*, the simile should consist only of *bhārám* 'burden', with *gurúm* 'heavy' the quality held in common. But since *mánma* is neut., *gurúm* can only modify m. *bhārám*. This seems to me a minor problem.

The problems of interpr. are esp. acute in the 2nd hemistich and involve esp. the assessment of the referent and meaning of the accusatives in the d pāda. Some tr. (I confess I don't entirely understand Ge's) take them as an appositive to *mánma* 'thought' in b, referring to the burden that Agni is laying on the poet, with the possibility floated (see Old [SBE], WG n.) that it refers to the later Pṛṣṭha Stotra. But in this type of context the 'back' (*pṛṣṭhá-*) is ordinarily Agni's (also in cmpds like *ghṛtá-pṛṣṭha-* 'ghee-backed') and the adj. *yahvá-* modifying it is almost entirely limited to Agni. I therefore think that the *pṛṣṭhám* phrase refers to Agni's back (so Ge n. 6d) and that it is a second acc. with *dadhātha* 'you have placed': √*dhā* 'place sthg (ACC.) on sthg (ACC.)' (so, possibly, Ge n. 6d). This is, admittedly and unfortunately, not a standard construction with √*dhā*, but, then, the usual case expression with √*dhā* for the location of what has been placed is the locative, while most tr. take the dative phrase in ab to be that location. I do, again, have to admit that √*dhā* + DAT. 'establish (sthg ACC) for someone (DAT.) is common, and this is doubtless what the other tr. are thinking of. However, the strong likelihood that pāda d refers to Agni's back and Agni's back can't be placed on the poet emboldens me to hold to my interpr. I take the dat. phrase as a dative of benefit.

IV.5.7: The first half of the vs. is fairly straightforward. The poet expresses his hope that his *dhītí-* 'conception, thought' will reach *tám* (most likely Agni, though 'sacrifice' is also possible). I take the etym. phrase *samanā́ samānám* as I do in similar phrases in IV.51.8–9 (Dawn), esp. 9ab … *samanā́ samanī́ḥ … uṣásaś caranti* "The Dawns proceed, the same ones in the same way," referring to the regular repetition of sunrise. Here I think the phrase refers to the repetition of the sacrifice and the ever-renewed Agni; similar is VI.4.1 addressed to Agni *evā́ no adyá samanā́ samānā́n … yakṣi devā́n* "even so for us today sacrifice in the same way to the same gods."

The second hemistich is close to impenetrable; Old (Noten) remarks "Die Dunkelheiten dieses Verses … sind ein Noli me tangere." As I indicated in the publ. intro., I think the impossible hapax *jábāru* that ends the vs. is not *meant* to be understood but is "a sort of abracadabra, a mystical expression, and the half verse in which it appears encapsulates the profound and transformative secret of the sacrifice." The meaning "solar disc" first suggested by Sāy. and followed, for want of anything better, by most since (though not by Old or WG), is, in my opinion, worse than useless, in that such a tr. obscures the enigmatic intent. Note first that the word rhymes with *cā́ru* in the preceding pāda and echoes the important word *bhārám* in 6b; it also has unusual phonology -- with internal plain *b* and the impression of slightly skewed reduplication: *jábaru* like *jabhā́ra*. (Note that this latter pf. shows up several times nearby: IV.7.4 *ā́ jabhruḥ*, *jabhárat* IV.2.6, 12.2; in fact a surprising

percentage of the RVic forms of this pf. are found in IV: *jabhartha* 19.9, *jabhāra* 18.4, 13; 27.2, 4.) It also appears to contain the mysterious suffix *-āru-* mostly found in nonce formations, on which see comm. ad III.30.8. And perhaps most important it's encoded into a repeated phonetic pattern involving *rup*: *... cā**ru p**ṛ́śner | ágre **rup**á ā **rup**itaṃ jábā**ru // p**ra ...*

With Gr (s.v. *cárman-*) I interpr. *sasásya cárman* "on the hide of the grain" as a ref. to the barhis, establishing the ritual ground as the locus of the mystery.

As often the mention of Pṛśni brings obscurity in its train. Here one question is what noun to supply in the phrase *cā́ru pṛ́śneḥ*, which recurs in 10b *gúhyaṃ cā́ru pṛ́śneḥ*. There are two good candidates, 'name' and 'udder', as Ge also points out. The adj. *gúhya-* in the latter passages suggests 'name', since it regularly modifies *nā́man-*; cf. also vs. 3c *padáṃ ná gór ápagūḍham* "the word hidden like the track of the cow," with a form of √*guh* 'hide' and a verbal referent, as well as III.5.6 (see below) *cā́ru nā́ma*. But nearby IV.3.10 connects Pṛśni with an udder, and IV.7.7 with similar phraseology also has an udder. I do not think an informed choice can be made, and I'm also not sure it matters -- though I weakly favor 'name'. See comm. ad vs. 10 below.

With most others I take *ā́rupita-* as a back formation to the *-p-*causative of √*ruh* 'ascend' found 1st in the Brāh. See also Schindler (Wurzelnom., s.v. *rúp-*), EWA s.vv. *RODH*^{2}*, ROP*.

The root noun *rúp-* is likewise obscure (see, e.g., Schindler, s.v.). I tr. 'mount', deriving it from the same secondary causative formation as gave rise to *-rupita-*. However, this is the merest guess (though coinciding with Bl [see RR ad III.5.5, with ref. to JAOS 27]), and the existence of a parallel phrase *ripó ágram* in III.5.5 with different vocalism (*rip-* vs. *rup-*) adds to the uncertainty. The sequence III.5.5–6 resembles our passage in other ways, esp. in III.5.6c *sasásya cárma*, as well as the *cā́ru nā́ma* mentioned above. Most important is the fact that III.5.5a is identical to pāda d of our next vs., save for *ripáḥ* vs. *rupáḥ*.

IV.5.8: Opinion is divided as to whether *pravā́cyam … me* means "to be proclaimed to me" or "… by me," and the dat. enclitic makes possible either interpr. (dative agents being found with gerundives). I take it as the former: the vs. (or at least bc) seems to concern the esoteric education of the poet. The unidentified "they," subjects of *vadanti* (b) and (*ápa …*) *vrán* (c), convey these secret teachings. I doubt that we are supposed to know who "they" are, and Re's impersonal "on" ("On parle …") may capture the intent better than a literal tr.

The hapax *niṇík* 'privately, secretly' is apparently derived from *niṇyá-* 'secret, private', though the details are disputed. See EWA s.v. *niṇyá-*.

Both Ge and Re in different ways make heavy weather of *vā́r* (ein Tor and une ouverture respectively), but there seems no reason not to take it as 'water' (as elsewhere), as Old rather scornfully observes ("Warum nicht *vā́r* 'Wasser'? 'Wasser der Kuh' ist die Milch"). The reference is of course to the Vala myth: they uncover secret teachings as they do the light (here light = water = milk) of the cows enclosed in the Vala cave.

As noted ad vs. 7, pāda d is identical to III.5.5a. Exactly what is meant here is not clear (what a surprise!), but if, as I suggest, "the tip of the mount" (*agré rupáḥ*) in 7c refers to the ritual ground, perhaps the ritual earthly fire or the top of that fire, it may be that "the track of the bird" (*padáṃ véḥ*) is the track of the sun, the heavenly fire. See publ. intro. to III.5. If it is a reference to the sun, it would provide a good transition to the next vs.

IV.5.9: This vs. brings us to the familiar ritual situation: dawn and the rising of the sun at the moment of the dawn sacrifice. After the obscurities of recent vss. it comes as a relief.

Flg. Sāy, all the standard tr. (save for Old SBE) take *viveda* as 1st ps. This is certainly possible, but there is nothing in the context that imposes it. Old supplies "he" without identification; I think Dawn is the possible discoverer.

IV.5.10: With Old (Noten, explicitly contra SBE) I take the whole vs. as a single sentence, with the final word *jihvā́* an instr. parallel to *āsā́* ending pāda a, both referring to Agni's flame. The other standard tr. take cd as a separate clause, with *jihvā́* the nom. subj.

The vs. continues the focus on the kindling of the ritual fire at the dawn sacrifice. The parents in pāda a are the kindling sticks, at least in my opinion (also explicitly Re). For the phrase *gúhyaṃ cā́ru pṛ́śneḥ* cf. *cā́ru pṛ́śneḥ* in 7c and disc. there. In both cases the phrase seems to encapsulate the mystery of the ritual. The verb *ámanuta* 'pondered' or 'brought to mind' somewhat favors supplying 'name' as the referent of the phrase. Cf. in this Agni cycle IV.1.16a *té manvata prathamáṃ nā́ma dhenóḥ* "They brought to mind the first name of the milk-cow," also X.68.7 *bṛ́haspátir ámata hí tyád āsāṃ, nā́ma svarīṇā́ṃ sádane gúhā yát* "For Bṛhaspati brought to mind this very name of these who were resounding (with)in the seat -- (the name) which was hidden." The two locations identified in c, "the furthest track of the mother cow" (*mātúṣ padé paramé … góḥ*) and "nearby" (*ánti*) suggest that the mysterious hidden substance is both on the ritual ground and in heaven or the equivalent. (See 11cd and 12cd.)

IV.5.11: I tr. injunc. aor. *voce* as an immediate past, because I think the poet is referring to his own poetic production in this very hymn. (The middle voice strengthens the sense of self-reference.) However, the verb could of course express a neutral present, as the standard tr. take it (e.g., Ge "Ich spreche"), or even a future/modal ("I shall proclaim"). I take the referent of *idám* at the end of b to be *ṛtá-*, which begins the vs.: the poet has hope for Agni's largesse in just the case that his speech is/contains truth. He phrases this as a conditional ("if"), but, with the confidence he has gained in the course of the hymn, one assumes he is certain that his speech is the truth that was revealed to him in the preceding vss.

My suggestion that the locations in 10c are heaven and the ritual ground is supported by the straightforward assertion here that Agni has power over wealth both on earth and in heaven.

IV.5.11-12: The accented demonst. *asyá* in 11c and in the repeated phrase *no asyá* (12a, c) causes minor interpretational difficulty because on the basis of its accent it should be adjectival. In 11c it anticipates *víśvam* in the izafe-like rel. cl. *yád dha víśvam*, as well as *dráviṇam* in its expansion in d. In 12a the two neut. interrogatives in a row (*kím … kád*) invite a differential tr., hence my rendering of the first as a question marker rather than a neut. pronominal. But the case disharmony of the phrase *asyá dráviṇam* is curious; it is generally interpr. as an attempt at a partitive expression, which I think is correct -- though I'm not entirely happy with Ge's notion that *dráviṇam* has been "attracted" out of the genitive by *kím*. If *kim* is taken as a neut. prn., the phrase could be tr. "what [=how much] wealth of this (wealth) is ours." For *no asyá* in 12c, see next comm.

IV.5.12: It is difficult to render the construction in 12cd literally without losing its sense, and the publ. tr. has rearranged the structure of the subordinate cl. in favor of parsability. In my view, all of cd is a relative cl. with neut. *yád* as the subordinator. It forms an acc. phrase *paramáṃ yád … padám* "which highest track/footstep" (see *padé paramé* in 10c). This acc. is limited by the gen. phrase *ádhvanaḥ … no asyá* "of this road of ours." The acc. phrase is construed as an acc. of (extent of) space with *áganma*: "on/along which track we have gone." So the frame of bcd would read literally "… you have announced to us in secret what highest track of this road of ours we have gone on." ("In secret" [*guhā́*] could instead be construed within the rel. clause "the track we have gone on in secret," without damaging the interpr.)

The rel. clause also contains a simile, *réku padáṃ ná nidāñ́aḥ* "like the spurned/scorned on an empty track," with nom./acc. matching the subj. ("we") and acc. goal ("track") of the frame. Because simile and frame share the acc. *padám* it appears only once, displaced to the simile from where we might expect to find it in the frame (and in fact to the wrong part of the simile with *ná* in the wrong place; we should expect **réku ná padám*).

The simile raises another question: why is our progress subject to this negative comparison? The standard response to this is that Agni is supposed to tell us whether we're on the wrong road or not, since the end of it is hidden from us. I think the point is more subtle: the wealth and treasure that we want (and have obtained) from Agni are not material, but rather the secret teachings and poetic enigmas we have learned in the course of the hymn. But to the vulgar and uninitiated, it looks as if we are going down a blind alley, heading to a dry hole with no material goods to show for it. As vs. 14 shows, those who scorn us for the path we have chosen will themselves be scorned for lacking the true poetic gift.

IV.5.13: The theme of the journey in vs. 12 morphs slightly into the image of a race or similar contest.

IV.5.14: With Old and Re I supply *vácasā* (from pāda a) with *ā́satā*, rather than taking the latter as 'non-being' vel sim., because that stem is regularly associated with speech.

IV.6 Agni

IV.6.3: The subject must change between pādas a and b, since the subj. of a is fem. and b contains a masc. nom. sg. (*urā́ṇáḥ*). I supply Agni as the subj. of b, as he clearly is of the repeated pāda III.19.2c. So also Old (SBE); others are less explicit.

The standard tr. take *urā́ṇáḥ* as transitive, with *devátātim* as obj. (e.g., Ge "die Götterschar sich erwählend") (also in the identical pāda III.19.2c). But in all clear cases *urā́ṇá-* is passive, and it seems esp. unlikely that the occurrence here would be transitive when the next vs. (4d) contains the same form in the same metrical position (verse-final) in clear passive usage (cf. also the next hymn IV.7.8c). Moreover it is not entirely clear to me what "choosing" the divine assembly would mean, whereas Agni's being chosen as a priest is a standard trope. The occurrences of *devátāti-* in vss. 1b and 9d show that the divine assemblage was present at the ritual and that Agni was acting on their behalf. Taking *urā́ṇáḥ* as the passive it ordinarily is leaves the acc. *devátātim* ungoverned grammatically, but in the publ. tr. I construe it loosely with *pradakṣiṇít*. It is possible that it could instead be loosely construed with *urā́ṇáḥ* "being chosen as priest for the divine assemblage").

On *akrá-* see comm. ad I.189.7.

It may seem odd that the wooden post "anoints" the sacrifical animal tied to it, and in fact WG dissociate pādas c and d and make Agni the subject of d. But this striking turn of phrase can be explained both as a metaphor and by the principle of ritual transfer. Metaphorically "anoint" can simply mean "make ritually fit for sacrifice," and this may be in play here: tying the animal to the post is a regular step in the animal sacrifice. But more interesting is the ritual transfer. In the one hymn in the RV devoted to the post (III.8), the post itself is anointed by the priests (III.8.1a *añjánti tvā́m … vánaspate*), and later in that hymn the mechanism for that anointing is made clear: the offering ladles have been stretched over the posts (III.8.7b *yatásrucaḥ*). Thus the posts dripping with ghee presumably transfer the ghee to the attached animals, anointing them in their turn. Note that in our vs. the first pāda concerns the outstretched ghee-filled ladle (*yatā́ … ghṛtā́cī*), and we can assume that the same ritual sequence obtains here: ladle anoints post, which anoints animals.

IV.6.4: The standard tr. take the two loc. phrases in pāda a as real locationals, but I consider it unlikely that the Adhvaryu (who is Agni himself) would stand *on* the barhis, which would unhelpfully go up in smoke. Rather these should be loc. absolutes, as Old (SBE) takes them.

IV.6.5: The stem *mitá-dru-* (5x) makes formal difficulties. If its 2nd member is a root noun belonging to √*dru* 'run', it should of course have the shape **-drut-*; root-noun cmpds also typically have accent on the root noun. Because of the former problem,

Scar (243–44) interprets *-drú-* in *raghu-drú-* as a *-u*-stem deriv. of √*drā* 'run'. The context here, however, suggests at least a folk-etymological connection with √*dru* 'run', since pāda c opens with a finite form of that root: *drávanty asya vājíno ná śókāḥ* "His flames run like prize-winners," which seems like a parallel expression to pāda a *mitádrur eti* "*mitádru* he goes." (Note that in two of the five *mitádru-* passages the adj. modifies *vājínaḥ* [VII.38.7, X.64.6].) Several factors may contribute to the anomalous shape of the compound. First, the rhyming *mitá-jñu-* 'having fixed/firm knees', where *-jñu-* is not a root noun but the reduced form of *jā̆nu-* 'knee'. Second, there is of course a noun parallel in formation to *jā̆nu-*/*jñú-*, namely *dáru-*/*drú-* 'wood'. The reduced form is found as 2nd member in at least one cmpd., *su-drú-* '(having) good wood'. It is possible that the existence of this homonymous form might have overridden the rule that added *-t-* to root nouns ending in short resonants. It is even possible that *mitá-dru-* actually contains the 'wood' word -- or at least that such a pun could be actualized: the cmpd could mean 'having wood fixed (in it)' referring to the fire. At least the three singular occurrences of the stem all refer to Agni, though the two plurals do not. Assuming that at least one reading of the cmpd contains a (pseudo-)root noun to √*dru*, the question then remains what the first member *mitá-* belongs to. The default assumption is √*mi* 'fix' as in *mitájñu-*, but my tr. reflects a deriv. from √*mā* 'measure'.

IV.6.6: A rare example of a non-nominative concessive use of the pres. part. of √*as* 'be'.

IV.6.7: The first pāda contains three words not otherwise found in the RV: *sā̆tur jánitor ávāri*. Only the first is troublesome: though only occurring here, *ávāri* is clearly the passive aor. to √*vṛ* 'obstruct' (see *váranta* in 6c), and the abl. inf. *jánitoḥ* is structurally transparent and is also found post-RV. The hapax *sā̆tuḥ* is a different matter, however. Neither its root affiliation nor its grammatical identity is clear. Gr takes it as a *-tu*-stem to √*san*^{i} 'win, gain', with the meaning 'der empfangende Mutterleib', but the semantic extension envisioned is quite fantastic, and we should in any event expect a full-grade **sánitu-* (note immed. following *jánitu-* to the rhyming seṭ root). Ge tr. "Natur" (with ?) and suggests, rather wildly, that it's derived from a root √*sā* = *as*, an idea that must underlie Re's "l'être," though he cannily does not comment. Old (SBE) tr. "mother," but does not venture an etymology. Mayrhofer (KEWA s.v. *sā̆tuḥ*) summarizes the speculation but does not adjudicate. WG have proposed a different solution, that it's a *-tu*-stem to √*sā* 'bind', and tr. "Von dessen Erzeugung das Anfesseln nicht abgehalten worden ist," noting that Agni must be controlled after he is born. Although the morphology works better than the other suggestions, the meaning proposed seems rather contorted.

I have a more radical proposal -- that the phonological complex should be divided into *sā̆* + *ā̆/átur*. The former is the feminine pronoun, picking up fem. *tanū̆-* found in the loc. *tanvī̆* in the preceding pāda (6d). Although the pronoun would not be in its standard init. position, it's worth noting that the position of fem. *sā̆* is more variable than that of *sá* and also that both the neg. *ná* and the rel. prn. *yásya* might be

expected to be fronted. As for the second part, there are several possibilities. In my opinion the most likely is that it is the gen. sg. of a *-tar*-stem built to √*ad* 'eat', **ád-tar-* > **át-tar-*, showing the same reduction of the internal cluster as in (*átri-/*) *atrín-* 'devouring' (at least by the etym. I favor). (The reduction would most probably take place in weak forms with the suffixal shape *-tr-* [e.g., instr. **ád-tr-ā* > **át-tr-ā* >**átrā*] and spread to the gen./abl.) For textual support cf. X.79.4 *jā̃yamāno mātárā gárbho atti* "while being born, the embryo eats his two mothers [=kindling sticks]," a description of Agni's birth, as here. Less likely, but not completely impossible, is an analysis as the gen. sg. of the Indo-Iranian **ā̃tar-* 'fire' (Aves. *ātar-*) treated as a *-tar*-stem. (By Stanley Insler's very attractive, and unfortunately unpublished, etymology, the same word is also preserved in *mātaríśvan-*, whose initial *m* is owing to missegmentation.)

I am not entirely sure what pāda b contributes to the meaning -- perhaps the point is that the kindling sticks have kept *seeking* to produce fire and therefore his birth, depicted in pāda a, has taken place without a hitch. Note that this is the only occurrence in the RV of the full dual dvandva *mātárā-pitárā*.

IV.6.8: The part. *saṃvásānāḥ* is generally ascribed to √*vas* 'dwell', and the standard tr. 'dwelling together' makes good sense as a descriptor of fingers. However, forms unambiguously belonging to this root are active, and there is no root pres. or aor. Gotō (1st Class, 295 n. 698) therefore assigns the participle to √*vas* 'wear', which of course has a well-attested medial root pres., and tr. 'gleichgekleidet', an interpr. maintained in WG. I find the morphological arg. persuasive, but the meaning somewhat elusive: what do fingers wear when making fire? (I do not think we should assume gloves.) I take it as a pun.

Pāda c contains another hapax, *atharyàḥ*. This is generally taken as the gen. sg. of a fem. *atharī́-*, often interpr. as a female animal, whose tooth is the object of comparison with Agni's flame. See, e.g., Old's extensive disc. ad VII.1.1 (Noten II, p. 2), where he tentatively opts for a mare. Hoffmann suggests rather (registered in EWA I.805) that it belongs with *atharvī́-* 'following the way' (*athar-vī́*) (I.112.10), with the loss of *v* on metrical grounds, while WG take it simply as a fem. *-ī*-stem to *áthar-*, which they take as a root noun cmpd **h₂at-h₂ar-íh₂*, and tr. 'Wegzieherin'. The publ. tr. 'enveloped in flame' starts from Hoffmann's preform with *-vī́-*, but deviates in two regards. First it takes *athar-* with *atharyú-* with the meaning 'flame, flaming', and second it analyses the 2nd member as the root noun to √*vyā* 'envelop' (cf. *hiraṇya-vī́-* 'enveloped in gold', Scar 502). The phrase *atharyò ná dántam* would then be semantically parallel to the bahuvrīhi *śúci-dant-* (2x, of Agni) 'having blazing teeth'. I am not at all happy with my analysis, however -- primarily because I am dubious about the existence of an *athar-* 'flame' and because the loss of *v* suggested by Hoffmann seems difficult to motivate. I would therefore tentatively withdraw the publ. tr., though I have nothing better to substitute. I wonder if the word is not implicated in the same interpretational difficulty as *sā̃tuḥ* discussed above (7a). I doubt that a female animal is at issue.

IV.6.9: These variously colored horses of Agni's are, of course, his flames. The verb in d, *ah(u)vanta* 'called', can refer to the crackling of the flames: actual horses don't ordinarily 'call' anyone. However, I think we're also dealing with a pun, with *ā́ … ah(u)vanta* a phonological scrambling of **ā́ … avahanta* 'conveyed'. Cf. III.19.4 *sá ā́ vaha devátātim …*, VII.1.18 .... *vakṣi devátātim ácha*, with the same obj.

IV.6.10: This vs. contains yet another hapax, *duvasanā́so* in a, but in this case the form seems to have been generated to form a pair with its phonological near match *tuviṣvaṇáso* in b (with its last two syllables also matching preceding *śyenā́so*, which it modifies). It is generally connected (see Re ad loc., EWA s.v. *dūrá-*) with *dūrá-* 'distant', *dávīyas-/daviṣṭha* 'further, furthest', but the exact morphology is unclear. On semantic grounds it seems unlikely to be related to *dúvas-* 'friendship'. For a similar deformation of this lexical complex, see *duvanyasát* in IV.40.2, which also owes some of its phonological shape to its formulaic partner.

IV.6.11: Ge and Re interpret pāda b as having three finite verbs: *śáṃsāti*, *yájate*, and *ví … dhāḥ*, subjunctive, pres. indicative, and injunctive respectively. The first and third go well together (esp. if the injunctive is imperatival, as *dhāḥ* so often is), but the indicative does not sit well between them. By contrast Gr interprets *yájate* as the dat. sg. of the act. pres. part., rather than as a middle 3rd sg. With Old (SBE) and WG, I follow Gr in the morphological analysis, but both Old and WG construe the part. with *vy ū́ dhāḥ*. I think it belongs rather with *śáṃsati*, both because of the position of the *ū* and because of a nearby parallel passage also in an Agni hymn, IV.16.2 *śáṃsāti ukthám … cikitúṣe …* "He will recite his solemn speech to the one who attends to it," with a dat. participle in this formula. The referent of *yájate* is Agni; note that he is called the superior sacrificer (*yájīyān*) in 1b, so *yájate* forms a ring with that first mention.

It is not clear what obj. to supply with *ví … dhāḥ* 'apportion'. It generally takes goods or the like elsewhere, hence my 'treasures', though I am tempted by Re's "tu répartis (les rôles)" -- that is, Agni distributing ritual roles and ritual speech to the various participants.

"Laud of Āyu" (*śáṃsam āyóḥ*) must refer to Agni, however odd the expression seems to be -- rather like referring to someone as "the toast of the town." Of course, one of Agni's standing epithets is the cmpd. *nárā-śáṃsa-*, of which *śáṃsa- āyóḥ* is simply an analytic variant.

IV.7 Agni

Intro.: The publ. intro. states that Agni's role as messenger is first mentioned in vs. 3; this should be corrected to vs. 4.

IV.7.1: Apnavāna appears with the Bhṛgus also in VIII.102.4, but nothing more is known of him (cf. Mayr., Personenname s.v.). Scar (366–67), though without disc., renders it not as a sg. PN, but as a nom. pl. adj. modifying the Bhṛgus ("die reichen

(?) Bhṛgus"), presumably to a stem **ápnavan-*, roughly parallel to *ápnasvant-*. However, the usage in VIII.102.4 makes it clear that at least in that passage it is a PN.

In c *virurucúḥ* gives a bad cadence, and by meaning it could easily belong to the redupl. aor. *arūruca-*. The same pāda-final sequence (save for accent) … *bhṛ́gavo ví rurucuḥ* is also found at X.122.5. It is therefore tempting (see Old [Noten], Arnold [Ved. Metre 128] for the temptation) to lengthen the reduplicating vowel. However, the undeniable 3rd pl. pf. ending (aor. should be **rūrucan*) and the existence of other transitive exx. of *rurucuḥ* in other metrical positions (see Kü 431) temper the temptation. Still, I'd be inclined to read **virūrucuḥ* and assume that the stem has been secondarily incorporated into the pf.

IV.7.2: The point of the abrupt question opening this vs. must be that mortals have established Agni in his ritual role (vs. 1, 2cd), but Agni is not reliably fulfilling this role by manifesting himself at the proper times.

IV.7.3: This vs. continues the syntactic frame of vs. 2, with the nom. pl. subj. ("mortals" of 2d) modified by the pres. part. *páśyantaḥ* and Agni in the acc. sg.

vícetasam in pāda a is a pun, playing on the standard ambiguity of the root √*cit*, which means both 'perceive' and 'appear'. Referring to Agni's mental qualities, adjacent to *ṛtā́vānam* 'truthful', it means 'discriminating', but the simile in b, "like heaven with its stars," actualizes the 'appear' sense.

The "laughter" of Agni is the merry crackling of the fire.

IV.7.4: This vs. also appears to continue the syntax of vs. 3, with another acc. phrase referring to Agni (pāda a), though given the 3rd pl. verb in c (*ā́ jabhruḥ*) that could govern the acc., the vs. can be syntactically self-contained.

IV.7.4cd–5: Together these vss. reprise the first vs (and the beginning of the 2nd). Agni's association with the Bhṛgus of 1c is tightened by the adj. of appurtenance *bhṛ́gavan-* in 4d, and *viśé-viśe* returns from 1d. In 5a we find *ānuṣák* as in 2a. The verb *ní ṣedire* 'have set down' (5b), though etym. unrelated, is the transitive equivalent in ritual discourse of *dhāyi* (1a) 'has been installed', and its object Agni is identified as *hótāram … yájiṣṭham*, the words used of him as subject of *dhāyi* in vs. 1 (1b *hótā yájiṣṭhaḥ*). The root √*dhā*, insistent in 1a *dhāyi dhātṛ́bhiḥ*, is not absent here: see *dhā́mabhiḥ* in 5d. Meanwhile the signature root of this section of the hymn is √*cit*, which appears once in each of the first 5 vss., except for 4: 1d *citrám*, 2b *cétanam*, 3a *vícetasam*, 5b *cikitvā́ṃsam*.

IV.7.6–7: Though vs. 6 belongs metrically and syntactically with what precedes -- it is in Anuṣṭubh like vss. 2–5 and the accusative descriptive phrases hang off vs. 5 -- it belongs thematically with vs. 7, as noted in the publ. intro. Both vss. treat the mystery of the ritual fire, and being at the center of the hymn, they form a sort of omphalos.

IV.7.6: This vs. is structured as a series of paradoxes, one per pāda. The least clear is in pāda a, since there is only one qualifier, the loc. *śáśvatīṣu mātṛ́ṣu* "in ever new mothers," which must be construed with *vītám* 'enveloped' in b. The paradox there is that ordinarily one has only one mother and that mother is not self-renewing. The physical reference must be to the pieces of wood (his mothers) in which fire inheres and from which he flashes out one by one. This physical image is developed in b: the fire is within wood -- therefore apparently in a fixed place -- but is unfixed, in that it is in constant motion in and over the sticks of wood. In c the fire inherent in the wood, therefore hidden, is also bright when it catches. Note another instance of the root √*cit*, *citrám* (matching the same word in 1d). And finally in d, when the fire catches it's easy to see and therefore to find, but its movements are unpredictable.

IV.7.7: This vs., particularly the first pāda, has been subjected to a variety of interpretations, which I will not pursue in detail here. The vs. is reminiscent of, though far less difficult than, IV.5.7, and in both cases I think it concerns the ritual and the layout of the ritual ground. The loc. phrase *sasásya … víyutā* "at the separation of the grain" I take as a reference to the spreading of the barhis, the ritual grass; it seems to correspond to the loc. phrase in IV.5.7c *sasásya cárman* "on the hide of the grain." "At the same udder" (*sásminn ūdhan*) is also found in nearby IV.10.8, also with apparent reference to the sacrifice or the ritual ground.

On apparent 3rd sg. *veḥ* (√*vī*), see comm. ad II.5.3. Here the form serves as a pivot, *veḥ* in 8a having 2nd ps. reference. The instance in 8a also clarifies the construction of the verb here, with gapped object.

IV.7.8: The VP √*vid āródhanaṃ diváḥ* (a variant of our *vidúṣṭaro divá āródhanāni*) occurs in the next hymn, IV.8.2, 4, assuring that the acc. here is governed by the comparative to the pf. part. *vidúṣṭara-*. With most (though not Gr, WG) I take *āródhana-* as belonging with √*ruh* 'climb' (/√*rudh* 'grow'), not √*rudh* 'obstruct'. On the difficulties in sorting out these roots, see EWA s.v. *RODH*[2].

IV.7.9: My interpr. of this vs. differs from the standard ones in several ways. First, in b most tr. take *vápuṣām íd ékam* as a nominal sentence: "(this is) one of the wonders." In contrast, I take b as describing the moment of the birth of the ritual fire: a single physical flame rising from the wood, though it is well known that Agni has many forms (*vápūṃṣi* e.g., III.1.8, 18.5, 55.9). Thus, *ékam* modifies *arcíḥ*, and the pāda is a single clause.

Pādas bc then sketch a double paradox: the beam of the just-born Agni is single, though he has many forms *and* though a number of mothers conceive him as an embryo (*dádhate ha gárbham*). Pāda c also contains another paradox: his mothers conceive him though they are unimpregnated (*ápravītā[ḥ]*). My interpr. depends on reading pl. *ápravītāḥ* contra the Pp, which has singular *-ā* -- followed by Gr. and by all the standard tr., which also then must take *dádhate* as a thematic 3rd sg. (or perhaps a short-vowel subjunctive). With Old (Noten), I take *dádhate* as the expected indic. 3rd plural mid. to the redupl. pres. to √*dhā* and *ápravītā* as representing

ápravītāḥ in sandhi. The same form, in the pl., is found in the very similar passage III.55.5 *antárvatīḥ suvate ápravītā(ḥ)*, which also describes Agni's "virgin birth": "Having (him) within, (though) unimpregnated they give birth to (him)." Agni's multiple mothers also figure earlier in our own hymn, 6a.

The publ. tr. takes pāda d as a subordinate clause, still under the control of *yád* beginning pāda c, primarily because of the accent on *bhávasi*. However, it is quite possible that d is a separate main clause ("immediately at birth, you become a messenger") with the verbal accent owing to the immediately following *íd*. Many of the exx. given by Gr (no. 5, s.v. *íd*) of accented verbs followed by *íd* are pāda-initial and therefore non-probative (since they would be accented anyway), but there is a sturdy residue of non-initial apparent main clause verbs with accent.

IV.7.10: An undeniable ex. of a predicated perfect part., *dádṛśānam*.

On the supposed separate root √*di* 'destroy', see comm. ad III.34.1.

IV.7.11: Rather than supplying a verb to govern *ánnā* (e.g., Ge "die Speisen (verzehrend)"), I allow *tṛṣúṇā* 'thirsting (for)' to govern the acc.

In b the standard tr. supply 'wind': "he makes the thirsty (wind) his messenger." I resist this because it is Agni who is always the messenger (e.g., in this hymn 4a, 8a, 8c, 9d), and so I think it more likely that in this case Agni is making some part of himself (flame) into that messenger. A small problem is the masc. gender of *tṛṣúm*: the words for 'flame, blaze' in this hymn are neut. (*arcís-* 9b, *śocís-* 5c, 10b). However, a word like m. *śóka-* is always available, or we could attribute the masc. of *tṛṣúm* to attraction to *dūtám* or even take it as the modifier of *dūtám* ("he makes [his flame] into a thirsty messenger").

IV.8 Agni

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn shares much phraseology with the immediately preceding IV.7.

IV.8.1: The cmpd *viśvá-vedas-* is always at least potentially ambiguous. In general most other tr. interpr. it as 'all-knowing' (lit. 'having all knowledge'); certainly in this passage that is the dominant rendering. However, as an independent noun, *védas-* only means 'possession, property', and I think that in most (maybe all) occurrences *viśvá-vedas-* has that value -- though the 'knowledge' interpr. may be a secondary one. In this case Agni's having all property to distribute to us may well be of more practical importance to us than his omniscience. The larger context cuts both ways: the next three vss. all have verbal forms of √*vid* 'know' (2a *véda*, 3a *veda*, 4c *vidvā́n*), which might favor the "all knowledge" interpr., but the obj. of 'knows' in the next vs. is the depository of goods (*vásu-dhiti-*), which might favor the "possessions" interpr.; note also his giving of goods in 3c (*dā́ti … vásu*).

The anomalous 1st sg. *ṛ̃jase* belongs with other *-se* 1st sg. forms like *stuṣe* 'I (will) praise'. As the context here shows, despite its likely meaning 'aim/stretch out straight', *rñjase* patterns with those other verbs semantically, in expressing an act of

praise or reverence -- however they came into being. There is of course abundant literature on the subject; see recently Jasanoff 2016.

IV.8.2: It is quite possible that *vásudhiti-* here is a bahuvrīhi 'having the deposit(ing) of goods' vel sim., as it can be elsewhere. It could then refer to the earth (later, of course, called *vasudhā*) in contrast to heaven, which is found in the next pāda; the two pādas share the verb *véda*.

IV.8.3: I take *dā́ti* as a contracted root-aor. subjunctive.

IV.8.5: In the publ. tr. I tr. the first rel. cl. (in ab) as descriptive, while the 2nd one (in c) is predicative. In part the decision depends on what the temporal value of *dadāśúḥ* in the first clause is -- presential or preterital. Kü (242–45) allows both and in fact tr. other examples of this pf. ambiguously, with awkward parentheses, e.g., II.27.12 "Wer … auf(ge)wartet (hat)." (He does not tr. this passage.) The publ. tr. takes *dadāśúḥ* as preterital, expressing the past actions that should allow us to thrive now. However, it is possible that the actions of the verbs in the two rel. cl. (*dadāśúḥ … indhaté*) are sequential and both presential and should both be taken as predicated: hence "May we be those who do pious service to Agni … and, thriving, kindle him."

Most tr. take *puṣyántaḥ* as transitive: "cause him to thrive," but *puṣyáti* only takes Inhaltsakk. or accusatives of respect. Moreover, the point of the *té syāma yé …* clauses is surely that our pious actions should lead *us* to thrive.

IV.8.8: With Old (Noten) I take the gen. pl. *carṣanīnā́m* and *mā́nuṣānām* as dependent on *vípraḥ*, rather than making them dependent on a supplied object as most tr. do. Either way, some object needs to be supplied with *áti … vidhyati*; I've added 'obstacles' as a place-holder. The only other occurrence of *áti √vyadh* in the RV has "the backs of the mountains" as obj. (VIII.96.2, the Emuṣa myth), which certainly doesn't fit here. However, in that passage the backs of the mountains were pierced by an archer, and archery is surely at issue here as well: *kṣiprá-* 'quick, snapping' is construed twice with *dhánvan-* 'bow' (II.24.8 *kṣipréṇa dhánvanā*, IX.90.3 *kṣiprá-dhanvan-*), once with *íṣu-* 'arrow' (VII.46.1 *kṣipréṣu-*).

IV.9 Agni

IV.9.1: For obvious real-world reasons Agni [=fire] would not sit on the ritual grass, because it would go up in flames. But Agni regularly brings the other gods to sit on this grass, and so the mention of his coming here and of the "god-seeking" (*devayú-*) people may have made the action seem appropriate.

IV.9.2: On *prāvî-* see comm. ad I.34.4.

IV.9.8: The diction in this vs. is somewhat difficult to apply to the chariot that is its subject. What does it mean for a chariot to be "difficult to deceive/trick" (*dūḷábha-*,

reprised from 2a)? Perhaps it always follows the right route? And the lexeme *pári √(n)aś*, which barely exists (an infinitive in I.54.1), in conjunction with *viśvátaḥ* should mean "reach around/encircle on all sides," again an odd action to ascribe to a chariot. Given the paint-by-numbers style of the hymn, I attribute these lapses to an inattentive or unskilled poet. Note the careless combustion in vs. 1.

IV.10 Agni

On the unusual meter of this hymn and its interaction with the syntactic and semantic organization, see publ. intro.

IV.10.1: With most interpr., I supply 'sacrifice' with *tám* in pāda a, as the object of the verb *ṛdhyāma* in d.

The accent on *ṛdhyāma* is anomalous within Oldenberg's persuasive characterization of the meter of this hymn, since by this analysis *ṛdhyāma* is the main verb and interior to its Triṣṭubh pāda. I assume it acquired this accent redactionally after the meter was misanalyzed, with a pāda break inserted just before the verb. So also WG.

IV.10.3: Because it begins the second 5-syllable pāda, *bhávā* is correctly accented.

svàr ṇá jyótiḥ could be take as a quasi-compound in the Re mode, or it is possible that *svàr* indirectly continues an old gen. sg. See comm. ad II.35.6. Or *svàr* and *jyótiḥ* can be taken not as a single expression but syntactically separate, as Old (SBE) and WG do in different ways. I weakly favor the gen. interpr.

IV.10.5: Again, the accentuation of voc. *ágne* supports the division into 5-syllable pādas.

The etym. figure *rukmó ná rocate* is difficult to render in tr.

IV.10.6: The referent of *tát* in d is unclear. It cannot be 'body', since *tanū́-* is feminine. I've supplied 'flame', but any bright neuter entity would do. Most tr. simply leave the referent blank.

IV.10.7: Contra HvN, *mártāt* should be read as the first word of pāda d.

IV.10.8: The second pāda should read *sántu bhrātrā́gne*, with coalescence of the *a*-vowels. This also entails reading, out of sandhi, unaccented *agne*, contra Pp and HvN. The impv. *sántu* is accented because it's initial in the pāda.

IV.11 Agni

IV.11.1: The second hemistich is full of phonological and etymological figures: *dṛśé dadṛśe ... dṛśé* (the last as *dṛśá* in sandhi) and (beg. in pāda b) *ā́ rocate ... rúśad ... árūkṣitam ... ā́ rūpé*.

As Ge points out, Agni's 'not coarse' (*árūkṣita-*) food must be ghee.

IV.11.2: This vs. contains a faint phonological figure: #*ví ṣ(āhi)* … #*víś(vebhir)*.

With most interpr. I take *khám* 'opening, aperture' with pāda a. However, I do not think it is equivalent to or compared with *manīṣā́m* 'inspiration, inspired thought' (as, e.g., Ge "Schliesse … den … Gedanken (wie) einen Kanal auf"), but rather it is the opening through which (*ví*) the thought is supposed to be directed. As we all know, sending a stream of liquid (to which the *manīṣā́-* is implicitly compared) through a small opening increases its force, and I think that is the image meant.

Both hemistichs express a fine economical formulation of the tight closed loop of reciprocity envisioned in the RV. Agni and the rest of the gods desire praise *from* men, but they must provide *to* men the inspiration and the thought that takes shape as praise. So in ab Agni is asked to release the *manīṣā́* to us even as he is being praised (*stávānaḥ*), and in cd we ask him to grant us ample thought (*bhū́ri mánma*), which is exactly what he and the other gods crave (*vāvánaḥ*).

IV.11.3: The sense of the preceding vs., that Agni provides the thoughts with which we create his praises, is continued in 3ab. In cd and vs. 4 the material rewards that come to the poet who produces these praises are detailed.

The phrase *dráviṇaṃ vīrápeśā(ḥ)* also appears, also pāda-final, at X.80.4, and therefore the apparent nom. sg. masc. *vīrápeśāḥ* must modify the neut. sg. *dráviṇam*. This is a case like *dvibárhas-* (see comm. ad VII.24.2), where an *s*-stem ending in *-āḥ* at the end of the pāda must be interpr. as a neut. See AiG III.288.

IV.11.5: The juxtaposition of complementary opposites -- *devayánto devám* and *mártā amṛta* -- is deft though not particularly noteworthy.

Likewise note the pair *dámūnasaṃ gṛhápatim*, both referring to Agni's role in domestic arrangements, derivatives of the older and newer words for 'house'.

IV.11.6: I supply a form of the root √*yu* 'keep away' with the accusatives in ab, extracted from the root-noun cmpd in 5c *dveṣoyút-* 'keeping away hatred'.

I am not entirely sure what to do with *cid* in d. Perhaps the idea is that though you are a god, you are also our companion right here.

IV.12 Agni

IV.12.1: The form *prasákṣat* is implicitly taken as a finite form by Scar (602–3) and WG, presumably as an *s*-aor. subj. In Scar's tr. it is parallel to the impv. *abhy àstu* ("so sei es, an Herrlichkeit(en) überlegen sein [und] vorherrschen"), but the verbal accent makes trouble for this main clause interpr. (It could, I suppose, bear a "contrastive" accent.) WG make it a subordinate cl. without overt marking ("indem er vorwärts siegt"), which would account for the accent. Nonetheless it seems best to take the form as a participle. Gr. identifies it as a neut.; if this is so, it would have to be an example of the neut. used adverbially. This seems the analysis presupposed by Old's (SBE) tr. 'victoriously'. However, the simplest solution is given in AiG

II.2.162 (fld. by Narten, *Sig.Aor.*, 265): it is a *masc.* nom. sg. with the weak participial suffix appropriate to verbal stems that have weak 3rd pl. endings.

The last word of the verse, the perf. part. *cikitvā́n*, is characteristically used elsewhere of Agni, in absolute value. Indeed, the same pāda ending *jātavedaś cikitvā́n* qualifies Agni in nearby IV.3.8 and IV.5.12 (see also *cikitvā́n* of Agni in IV.8.4). However, in our vs. grammatically this nom. sg. must modify the worshiper, not Agni (*pace* Re, who manages to attach it to the preceding voc.: "ô Jātavedas, (dieu) qui comprends"). I think rather that the application of this standard epithet of Agni to Agni's devotee shows the same closed loop discussed with regard to the immediately preceding hymn (see comm. ad IV.11.2), where the worshiper shares qualities of the god, which he receives from the god. There may also be a slight pun: 'observant' means one thing for Agni -- he watches over everything -- but another for the mortal who attends on him: 'observant' in English can refer to someone who 'observes', that is, 'faithfully carries out', the prescribed rites.

In the publ. tr. I construe *táva krátvā* with the preceding pāda: may the man succeed "in accordance with your purpose," but I now wonder if it is not another indication of the closed loop of reciprocity: the mortal worshiper is observant like Agni because it is Agni's will or purpose that he should be. Of course it can be applicable to both pādas.

IV.12.1–2: On the parallel pres. and pf. subjunctives in these vss. see comm. ad IV.2.6 and my forthcoming treatment of the pf. subj. referred to there.

IV.12.2: The overlapping identities of Agni and his worshiper are indirectly signaled in this vs. Although the *sá* of c must be correlative with *yáḥ* in a and refer to the human, some of the phraseology used of him in cd matches that used of Agni elsewhere. The common med. part. *idhāná-* is almost always intrans./pass. modifying Agni ('[being] kindled'), but here it must be transitive with the worshiper as subject. (There are a few other undoubted transitive occurrences: I.143.7, VII.9.6.) The combination of this participle and a form of *púṣya-* as here, with Agni as subj., is found in V.26.6 *samidhānáḥ sahasrajid ágne dhármāṇi puṣyasi*. Similarly *sacate* in d seems to match *sácase* at the end of the last hymn (IV.11.6), but Agni was the subject of that verb. The point here is that, though the second hemistich must in fact refer to the mortal worshiper, some of the phraseology invites a superimposition of Agni.

IV.12.3: Assuming (as I do) that Thieme and Hoffmann are correct in their assessment of √*vidh* 'honor, serve' as a secondary root derived from *ví* √*dhā* 'apportion' (for reff. see EWA s.v. *VIDH*), the second half-vs. encapsulates an etymological pun: #*dádhāti … vidhaté …*, #*ví* ... This casts considerable doubt on Bloomfield's (RR, ad loc.) characteristically acerbic judgment "The preposition ví which limps, with sharp tmesis, behind its verb dádhāti …. impresses me as secondary." Furthermore, the positioning of *ví* directly before *ānuṣák* 'in due order' is found elsewhere (cf. I.72.7, VI.5.3). In such phrases the *ví* presumably emphasizes that goods are apportioned to each deserving recipient *separately* and *in order.*

IV.12.4: Though, as indicated in the publ. intro., the 2nd half of this hymn (vss. 4–6) has a very different tone from the first, nonetheless the two halves are bound together. Note, first, that voc. *yaviṣṭha* in 4a matches nom. *yáviṣṭhaḥ* in the same metrical position in 3c. Moreover, the worshiper who was identified as *cikitvā́n* 'observant' in 1d is contrasted with humans who have caused offense to Agni by their *ácitti-* 'lack of observance, heedlessness' in 4b.

Although *puruṣatrā́* has the locational suffix *-trá* / *-trā́*, it seems less a locational 'among men' than an abstract 'manhood, human nature'. Cf. similar expressions with the abstract suffix *-tā-*: VII.57.4 = X.15.6 *yád va ā́gaḥ puruṣátā kárāma*.

The use of *áditeḥ* in pāda c is clarified by the more expansive expression in d. On the one hand, *áditi-* is, of course, the name of the goddess and mother of the Ādityas, and the mention of her here ushers in the 2nd half of the hymn, which, as was indicated in the publ. intro., has a distinctly Ādityan tone. On the other, *á-diti-* means literally 'unbinding' (< √*dā* 'bind'), and the lexeme *ví … √śrath* 'let loose' in the VP *vy énāṃsi śiśrathaḥ* 'let loose our transgressions' is synonymous with 'unbind'.

IV.12.5: Some verb must be supplied with the ablative phrases in ab. I have pulled √*muc* 'release' from its occurrences in vs. 6.

Ge takes *ūrvá-* in b as a proper noun referring to the Vala myth, but the word generally just means an 'enclosure', here an imprisoning one.

IV.12.6: As noted in the publ. intro., the plural addressees in this vs. are almost surely the Ādityas; the vs. is repeated in X.126.8, where the referents are clearly the Ādityas.

The comparison "just as you released the buffalo-cow bound by the foot" is probably a reference to a well-known myth or legend, but unfortunately it is not known to us. It is reminiscent of X.28.10, a hymn full of untraceable references to animal stories, *niruddhā́ś cin mahiṣás tarṣyā́vān* "The buffalo also got trapped, when it was thirsty," but the animal in question there is a *mahiṣá-* not a *gaurá-* and is masc. not fem. Other RVic occurrences of *gaurī́-* are not helpful.

IV.13–14: As is generally recognized, these two hymns form a pair, and though nominally dedicated to Agni, they are really dawn hymns, with mention of the various divinities appropriate to the dawn sacrifice: Agni, Uṣas, Aśvins, Savitar, Sūrya. The patterning between the hymns gives us one of our rare opportunities to observe how Rigvedic variation-on-a-theme worked in practice, similar to the first few pairs of Vālakhilya hymns.. See the brief remarks in Bloomfield, RR, p. 13. For a more detailed account of the parallelisms see publ. intro. to IV.14 and comments on individual vss. in 14 below. The hymns are most alike at the beginning and end with the middle a fairly free zone. This pattern is similar to what is found in the paired Vālakhilya hymns. See comm. thereon and esp. on VIII.50.

IV.13: Agni or various deities

IV.13.2: In c the other Ādityas, or at least Aryaman, should be supplied, since the verb (*yanti*) is plural and there are only two expressed subjects (*váruṇaḥ … mitráḥ*).

IV.13.3: I take the Ādityas as the subj. of *ákṛṇvan*, since the Sun is their spy (see pāda d). It could also be, more generally, the gods, as Old (SBE), Ge, and Re take it. In any case it is certainly not the other pl. entity mentioned in cd, the seven golden mares.

IV.13.4: This vs. contains images drawn from the techniques of everyday life: tanning (cd) and sewing (ab). The lexeme *ví √hṛ* in pāda a with its object *tántu-* 'thread, web' has been differently interpreted, nor surprisingly since we don't have good evidence for such technical vocabularies. I interpr. it as 'take apart, unravel', in part because of *vipṛ́ce* 'pull apart' in the previous vs. (Sim. Thieme, Unters., 17.) Others, using different values for *ví*, interpr. the idiom as 'spread out' (Old, SBE) or 'alternate (threads [=the dark threads of night and the bright ones of day])' (Ge, WG).

IV.13.5: The question "how does the sun not fall?" is implicitly answered by pāda d: he's really a fixed pillar, not an unmoored orb in the sky. But this ignores the presupposition to the question in c: "with what power does he journey?" -- since a pillar doesn't journey. So, despite the apparent reassurance of d, the issues remain unresolved.

IV.14 Agni or various divinities

IV.14.1: The opening of the verse, *práty agnír uṣ́ásaḥ*, matches that of 13.1 *práty agnír uṣ́ásām*, though the difference in case of the dawn words signals that the verses will veer in slightly different directions. Both also share the verb *akhyat*, but in 13.1 it ends the first pāda, while in 14.1 it opens the 2nd pāda (accented *ákhyat*).

The 2nd half vss. of the two hymns deviate more, though both concern the Aśvins and contain the verb *yātam* (accented *yātám* in 13.1c). Sūrya (13.2d) is absent from 14.1.

IV.14.2: The first pādas of these two vss. are identical, save for the near synonyms *bhānúm* (13.2) and *ketúm* (14.2), which take 2nd position. The rest of the verses go their own ways, though Sūrya appears in the final pādas of both.

IV.14.3: Though both 13.3 and 14.3 contain horse imagery and the verb *√vah* 'convey', they are otherwise quite distinct, with Dawn the topic of 14.3.

IV.14.4: The splv. *váhiṣṭha-* in the pl. is found in both 13.4 and 14.4; the verb of motion is *yāsi* in 13.4 and *vahantu* in 14.4.

The referent of the 2nd du. must be the Aśvins (so also Old [SBE], WG], *pace* Re, who supplies Agni and Dawn. Though they are unnamed, the near identity of pāda b with IV.45.2b in an Aśvin hymn makes this identification most likely, esp. since soma and honey are the drinks of choice of the Aśvins.

IV.14.5: Identical to 13.5.

IV.15 Agni

IV.15.1: The usual concessive force of the nom. of the pres. part. to √*as* 'be' is absent here, as far as I can see. Ge suggests that it is marking the phrase as a simile (Re's tr. suggests that he agrees). Since the vs. seems to concern the *paryagnikaraṇa*, the leading of the sacrificial animal around the fire, the *sán* may signal that Agni is acting in the guise of a horse, "*being* a horse."

IV.15.4: Ge's tr. "vor Sṛñjaya Daivavāta" assumes that *puráḥ* can act as a preposition with a locative. Since there is no other evidence for this, and since the *puráḥ* is better taken as a reference to Agni's location on the ritual ground, as regularly seen in the epithet *puróhita-* 'placed in front', I take the loc. of the PN as an unmarked loc. abs. ("SD [being there]") or with Re and WG as a simple locational, which is far easier to convey with French chez or German bei than in English.

IV.15.5: The standard tr. take this vs. to mean "a mortal hero should have mastery over such a fire" vel sim., but given the previous mention of Sṛñjaya Daivavāta, I think the point is that not every mortal deserves a fire like this -- only a *vīrá-* like SD.

IV.15.6: Agni here is compared with soma, though without mention of that word. The comparison is esp. obvious in the verb *marmrjyánte* 'they keep grooming', since √*mṛj* is a signature word for soma, and in the descriptive phrase in b. As Old (SBE) points out, soma is often called *aruṣá-* 'red' (though it must be admitted that Agni is too), and 'child of heaven' (*diváḥ śíśu-*) is also a somyan epithet (IX.33.5, 38.5, though cf. VI.49.2 where it modifies Agni). As discussed in the publ. intro., this covert reference to soma ushers in the Dānastuti for Prince Sāhadevya, whose nickname is Somaka (9c).

IV.15.7: I interpr the apparent injunc. *bódhat* as a modal, rather than in the preterital value favored by most tr. -- and in fact follow Hoffmann (Injunk., 232) in taking it as a root-aor. subjunctive, not a pres. injunc. The poet is playfully reminding his patron that he's owed a gift, and he couches this as a bit of a joke, using the 'awaken' value of √*budh*: "wake me up with a nice surprise and I'll come and sing."

IV.15.8: This next vs. indicates that the reminder had its effect. The grammatical identity of *ā́ dade* is ambiguous: it could be pres. indic. or pf. indic. In fact in my interpr. of this two-verse sequence 7–8 it doesn't really matter: 8c could be tr. "I take

as soon as they are offered" without disturbing the rhetorical sequence. However, I follow most (incl. Kü, 241) in taking it as a preterital pf. rather than as a pres. with Hoffmann (Injunk, 232; so also WG).

IV.15.10: In one way this vs. is simply a more active variant of vs. 9. In 9 it is implied that Sāhadevya will be long-lived because of the Aśvins (somehow or other); in 10 they are ordered to make him so. But there's a grammatical twist at the end: the impv. *kṛṇotana* is plural not dual, and so the Aśvins may have helper(s). The shift to the pl. is probably yet another example of the tendency to open out to the larger divine world in final vss., by including unspecified others -- so here "you (two and other gods)." But it's worth pointing out that no du. impv. of √*kṛ* would fit this metrical slot. (On the other hand, no RVic poet with even middling skills would have been unable to throw in a particle or the like to make the meter work.)

IV.16 Indra

IV.16.1: As often, *satyá-* 'real' seems here to have the sense 'really present', expressing the standard hope of every Vedic ritual, that the gods, esp. Indra, should be physically present at the sacrifice, providing a technical epiphany.

IV.16.2: Rather than interpr. *vedhā́ḥ* as part of the simile (e.g., WG "wie die mündige Uśanā"), I take it as referring to Agni, the officiating Hotar-priest, as often. See further support for this identification in the next vs.

IV.16.3: I take the first hemistich as a continuation of 2cd. Phraseology suggests this connection: the simile *uśáneva* in 2c is matched by the simile beginning 3a *kavír ná*; together they add up to the full name of the mythic figure Uśanā Kāvya. (*kaví-* stands in for his patronymic elsewhere: cf. nearby IV.26.1 *aháṃ kavír uśánā*.) The participial phrase *vidáthāni sā́dhan* "bringing the rites to realization" has Agni as its subj. elsewhere (e.g., III.1.18 and the other passages adduced by Ge n. 3a). Agni is also often called a *kaví-*, and I take this word here as referring both to Uśanā Kāvya to whom Agni is compared and to Agni himself.

The subj. of pāda b must be different from that in a; I follow Ge (/WG) in taking it as the pressing stone. The idiom *ví* √*pā* 'extract/separate by drinking' favors this identification; see comm. ad VII.22.4, which passage also contains a form of √*arc* as here as well as an overt occurrence of the 'stone' (*ádri-*).

Unlike Ge (/WG) I do not take pāda c as the main clause with b, nor do I think they have the same subject. Rather with Schmidt (B+I, 48–49) I tentatively take Indra as subj. in c (though not, with Schmidt, a and b as well). The Vala myth is quietly introduced in this second half-vs., with Indra's creation of the poets and their singing into existence the ritual patterns. With Ge (etc.) it is likely that the seven bards are the Aṅgirases.

There may be a very backgrounded pun in cd: c opens with *divá(h)* 'of heaven', to be construed with *saptá kārū́n* "seven bards" at the end of the pāda, while

d opens with *áhnā* 'by day'. Despite the different accent and different case form, it might be possible to take *divá* (in sandhi) as a variant of *dívā* 'by day', anticipating the instr. *ahnā́* in the same position in the next pāda. But I am very uncertain about this.

Note the responsion of verse-final act. transitive *gṛṇántaḥ* to vs.-final med. passive *gṛṇāṇáḥ* in 1d.

IV.16.4: The Vala myth takes full hold in this vs.

Instr. *arkaíḥ* is a pun, referring not only to the chants of the singers but also to the rays of the sun itself.

The 3rd pl. *rurucur* has trans./caus. sense here and generally in its other occurrences (see Kü 431), though not VIII.3.20. In several of those passages it's in the cadence and would be better read **rūrucur* (IV.5.1, X.122.5), and here and in the other case (VI.62.2, but not the trans./caus. opt. *rurucyā́ḥ* VI.35.4) a heavy initial syl. is possible (though not metrically good in VI.62.2). The 3rd sg. act. pf. *ruroca* (1x: IV.5.15) and act. pf. part. (1x: I.149.3) are intransitive by contrast, as are the medial forms. The anomalous trans. *rurucuḥ* forms also have the ending characteristic of the perfect 3rd pl. act., not the *-an* expected for a redupl. aor. (e.g., *(á)jījanan*). Nonetheless I am inclined to believe that these forms originally belonged to a proper redupl. aor. paradigm *(á)rūruca-*, found in *árūrucat* (3x), with the heavy redupl. proper to a redupl. aor., and that the 3rd pl. forms first adopted the *-ur* ending of the pf. and then, quite possibly redactionally, shortened the reduplicating vowel. It should be noted that Old (ZDMG 60: 163) rejects this, an idea originating with Gaedicke.

Because *rurucuḥ* is unaccented, the first part of pāda b must be the main cl., with the following *yád* introducing a nominal cl. -- *pace* Ge, who simply declares it an unaccented subordinate cl. verb (n. 4b).

Note the periphrastic caus. *vicákṣe … cakāra*, on which see Zehnder (*Periphras. Kausativ*, passim, esp. 51). He suggests that it is parallel to the perfect *rurucuḥ* in b. If agreement in tense stem is really at issue, this would be another arg. against my assumption that *rurucuḥ* is an old redupl. aor.

The opening of 4c *andhā́ támāṃsi* is reminiscent of that of 1c *tásmā íd ándhaḥ*, though they have nothing in common lexically or thematically and they do not seem to demarcate a section. The repetition of *ṛjīṣī́* in the next vs. (end of pāda a), matching the end of 1a, suggests, however, that some demarcation is happening.

IV.16.5: On *ṛjīṣī́* see immed. preceding comment.

ámitam must be adverbial, as is recognized by all standard treatments.

I do not see a semantic diff. between the abstracts *mahitvá-* and *mahimán-*; what distinguishes them is their metrical shape. The nom. sg. *mahimā́* is obviously excluded from the cadence, but well suited for the break after a 5-syl. opening; instr. sg. *mahitvā́-* works nicely in a Triṣṭubh cadence. Curiously enough English does not seem to have two different abstract formations to 'great' (*greatitude, *greatery,

*greathood, etc.) despite the usual flexibility of our language, and so I have tr. both Skt. words with 'greatness'.

IV.16.6: See Ge's long note (6b) on the mixture of Vṛtra and Vala themes in this vs.

Ge (/WG) supplies 'deeds' with *náryāṇi* ("Mannestaten") without indicating what Sanskrit word he is thinking of. It should surely be *ápāṃsi* 'labors', which regularly shows up with some form of *nṛ́*- or a derivative thereof (on *nári ápāṃsi* see comm. ad VIII.96.19). Assuming this is the correct underlying noun, we can identify a buried pun: *apáḥ* (*apó* in sandhi) 'waters' opens the 2nd pāda; it is phonologically reminiscent of *ápaḥ* 'labor'.

IV.16.7: Ge tr. *párāhan* as a 3rd sg., continuing the 3rd persons of vs. 6, but the rest of vs. 7 has 2nd ps. reference. The verb *ahan*, ambiguous between 2nd and 3rd sg., serves as a modulation form, as often (cf. I.32.3d, 4a, for ex.).

IV.16.7–8: As noted in the publ. intro., these two vss. tease apart the Vala and Vṛtra myths that have been intertwined in the previous vss., with the Vṛtra myth allotted to vs. 7 and the Vala myth to vs. 8. But even with the clear mention of Vṛtra in 7a and Saramā in 8b, there is some ambiguity, centered on the *apó* beginning 8a. See comm. on vs. 8.

IV.16.8: As was just mentioned, verse-initial *apó* causes some problem. This form matches the two occurrences of *apó* opening 6b and 7a and grammatically should be, with them, the acc. pl. of *áp*- 'water(s)'. But the problem is that 'waters' do not figure in the Vala myth: it is cows/dawns that are freed from the rock. For this reason Old suggests reading **ápo* = *ápa* + *u*, with *ápa* a preverb with *dárdar*, and this conjecture is followed by Ge. However, *ápa* is only marginally attested with √*dṛ* (only RV VI.17.5 and nowhere else in Skt., at least acdg. to MWms). I therefore accept the transmitted *apó* and assume 1) syntactically, that √*dṛ* takes a double obj. here ("tear open the rock ACC (for) the waters ACC"), and 2) thematically, that because of the interpenetration of the Vala and Vṛtra myths just mentioned the cows/dawns in the Vala myth get assimilated to the waters of the Vṛtra myth. My 'tore open' actually assumes that Old's *ápa-u* is secondarily present, with my 'open' representing **ápa*. It is worth noting that forms of the root √*dṛ* are fairly rare without preverb. Schmidt (B+I 162), Hoffmann (Injunk. 270), and WG also all accept the 'waters' reading. Note that the waters here would correspond to the acc. with √*dṛ* in pāda c: *vā́jam* 'prize'. That is, the prize in c is what gets torn out of the rock (waters), while the rock in pāda a is what gets torn apart to get to the prize.

Acdg. to Schaeffer (136), the intens. to √*dṛ* has become lexicalized and no longer has any discernible frequentative value. However, most forms of this intens. take plural objects, so it could be object-distributive. In our case the pl. *apáḥ* 'waters' might fit this model, though the pl. tantum 'waters' really functions as a mass noun, not a set of countable hunks of water. See also *ví dardaḥ* in 13d below.

I take adverbial neut. *pūrvyám* in b as meaning 'previously, before', and in conjunction with the injunc. *āvír bhuvat*, as a somewhat awkward attempt to express anteriority: Saramā appeared to you previously (b), ordering you to √*dṛ* (*ā́ darṣi*, c), and then you did so (*dárdar*, a). Schmidt (B+I 162) avoids the anteriority reading by tr. 'zuerst', and Hoffmann (Injunk. 270) and WG render it "als erstes," an interpr. that would seem to me to require an adj. modifying nom. sg. fem. *sarámā*, not an adverbial neut.

Ge takes the 2nd hemistich as the words of Saramā, an interpr. I accept both because of the *si*-impv. *ā́ darṣi* in c and because of the pseudo-anterior construction in b just discussed.

Verse-final *gṛṇānáḥ* has an exact match at the end of vs. 1, and this bit of ring composition signals that this section of the hymn is finished. In the next section we move on to the Kutsa / Uśanā Kāvya story.

IV.16.9: Although, as noted ad vs. 3, the word *kaví-* often signals a mention of Uśanā Kāvya -- and this personage figures in the myth being recounted here -- in the publ. tr. I was tentatively inclined to follow Ge in taking *kavím* as a reference to Kutsa, since Kutsa could plausibly be qualified as *nā́dhamāna-* 'in need' in this myth and Uśanā Kāvya is unlikely to be. However, since the myth in question involves a trip to UK's place to seek advice (see next vs., 10a), the phrase *áchā kavím … gāḥ* "you came to the *kaví*" in pāda a probably refers to UK, and the *nā́dhamānam,* found only at the end of b, may conceal a different goal, namely Kutsa. Hence I would emend the publ. tr. to "you came to the poet (=UK) (and) to the one in need (=Kutsa) at the winning of the sun." In 11d *kavíḥ* also most likely refers to UK.

The phrase *nṛmano … abhíṣṭau* is reminiscent of 4d *nṛ́tamo abhíṣṭau*.

The apparent thematic verbal stem *iṣaṇa-* is almost confined to this group of Indra hymns (in addition to this vs., IV.17.14, 22.10, 23.9, as well as a single outlier I.134.5, for which see comm. ad loc.). Narten's interpr. of this stem as an aorist generated to the pres. *iṣaṇyáti* seems reasonable, though it does not account for the limited distribution of our stem: no forms of *iṣaṇyá-* are even found in the IVth Maṇḍala. (Narten, MSS 1982, cited after Kl. Schr., 266-67; cf. Gotō, 1st class, n. 243.)

In its other two occurrences (I.129.7, VI.26.8) *dyumnáhūti-* 'invocation to heavenly brilliance' is a call that we sacrificers make to attract the god(s). I do not understand what it is expressing here. It does not seem to have anything to do with *dyumnaíḥ* in 19c below.

IV.16.10: Pāda b *bhuvát te kútsaḥ sakhyé níkāmaḥ* echoes 6b … *sákhibhir níkāmaiḥ*. In 6 Indra performs manly deeds "with his eager companions" (either the Maruts of the Vṛtra myth or the Aṅgirases of the Vala myth); here Kutsa must be transformed into such a sidekick by his association with Indra: "In companionship with you, Kutsa will become eager."

On the enigmatic theme of the woman trying to tell Indra and Kutsa apart, see the publ. intro. As argued there, it is likely that the Jaiminīya Brāh. version (JB

III.199-202), with sexual mischief between Kutsa and Indra's wife, facilitated by the identical appearance of Indra and Kutsa, is only a secondary attempt to make sense of this tantalizing snippet and no such story underlies our passage. Certainly the woman (*nā́rī*) in our passage seems entirely upright and eager to distinguish between the two males.

IV.16.11: Although we don't ordinarily think of Indra as '*seeking* help' (*avasyú-*) but giving it, in this myth Indra goes to the house of Uśanā Kāvya to receive the mace from him. I therefore think that the 'help' Indra is seeking is concretized as the mace. See below on pāda d.

Note that *ī́śānaḥ* in b echoes *iṣaṇo* in 9c.

In d the two words *áhan pā́ryāya* have provoked a certain amount of discussion (see Old, Ge n. 11d, Kuiper, IIJ 5: 169ff., who is followed by Hoffmann, Injunk. 189 n. 151, and WG) because of its similarity to the expression *diví pā́rye* "on the decisive day" (VI.17.14, etc.). The dat. *pā́ryāya* here is therefore taken by some as a temporal expression with a word for 'day' or the like to be supplied (e.g., Old *pā́ryāya *áhne*). However, the dative expression nearby in IV.25.1 *mahé 'vase pā́ryāya* "for great, decisive help" (though see alternative tr. of Ge [/WG]) seems the more compelling comparandum, esp. since Indra has come to UK's seeking help (*avasyúḥ* 1a). By following *áhan* with the stem *pā́rya-*, the poet may be tricking us into expecting a temporal expression (cf. VI.26.1 *pā́rye áhan*; also III.32.14), but the case mismatch should alert the audience that our expection has been thwarted. As indicated in the comm. ad pāda a, I think the "decisive help" that UK gives Indra is the mace he fashioned; it's important to note that in another telling of this myth in I.121.12 the mace itself is called *pā́rya-*: I.121.12cd *yáṃ te kāvyá uśánā … dā́t, … pā́ryaṃ tatakṣa vájram* "UK fashioned the decisive mace which he gave to you." For UK giving Indra the mace, see also V.34.2.

IV.16.12: Note the phonological play in *śúṣṇam aśúṣam* "insatiable Śuṣṇa."

With Old (flg. Ge, Ved. St.; see also Hoffmann (Injunk. 189) I interpret the hapax *kutsyá-* 'Kutsian' in light of the phrase *vadháṃ kútsam* (I.175.4) "Kutsa (as) deadly weapon."

The "future imperative" *vṛhatā́t* in d follows nicely on the normal impv. *prá mṛṇa* in c.

IV.16.13: Here the intensive of √*dṛ*, *ví dardaḥ*, takes a plural obj. *púraḥ* 'fortresses'. See disc. above ad 8a.

The simile and frame in d are curiously intermingled, with the object in the frame, *púraḥ* 'fortresses', dropped into the middle of the simile *átkaṃ ná … jarimā́* "like old age a cloak." I also don't quite understand the content of the simile. It's presumably the age of the garment, not of its wearer, that causes the garment to fall apart. WG seem to take *jarimā́* not with the simile but the frame: "Wie einen Reisemantel spaltet das Alter die Palisaden auseinander." This would solve the intermingling problem identified above, but it otherwise doesn't fit the mythic

context. Surely it would be ignominious for Indra if, instead of Indra's heroically tearing apart these mighty fortresses, they just fell apart from decrepitude and deferred maintenance. The WG n. on the passage calls the simile a Sprichwort and it is not clear to me what function they see *jarimā́* as playing.

IV.16.14: As noted in the publ. intro., pāda b seems to resolve the problem of distinguishing between Indra and Kutsa that arose in 10cd. The same lexeme *ví √cit* 'distinguish' found in 10d recurs here.

The athematic middle participle *uṣāṇá-* 'wearing' here is a hapax stem and is, of course, morphologically anomalous: the full-grade medial root pres. *váste* is matched by a very well-attested full-grade athem. med. part. *vásāna-*. We do not expect a zero-grade formation to this root pres. However, our hapax calls to mind the unnamed hero of this portion of the hymn Uśanā (Kāvya), and the nonce creation of participle *uṣāná-* here (as an echo of *uśánā*) seems to me a text-book example of morphological aberrancies arising out of contextual pressures -- all the more striking because the word *uśánā* does not occur in this section of the hymn (but cf. 2c), so the participial echo is echoing something beneath the surface. WG's characterization of this form as "eine individuelle Fehlbildung des Dichters" itself fails to see the poetic purpose and clever creativity of this form. It is true, however, that it should probably also be evaluated in the context of several other such anomalous participles in this group of Indra hymns, *uśámāna-* (IV.19.4), *uṣámāna-* (IV.22.2), and *uśāná-* (IV.23.1).

IV.16.15: The simile in b, *svàrmīḷhe ná* "as if at (a contest) with the sun as its prize." provides a transition from the sun-winning myth of Indra and Kutsa, which occupied the previous few vss., and this more general final section of the hymn.

The desires (*kā́māḥ*) that are the grammatical subject of this vs. -- namely our desires for Indra's largesse -- take part in actions that might appear to be more appropriate to other subjects. On the one hand, they "take pleasure in the pressing" (*sávane cakānā́ḥ*); we would rather expect the god Indra to do so. On the other, the "perform ritual labor with hymns" (*śaśamānā́sa ukthaíḥ*), a priestly activity. The desires thus mediate between the two poles of ritual participation.

Pace Oldenberg, *ókaḥ* in d is most likely not an acc. goal to be construed with *agman* in a (though this might be a possible secondary reading), but a nominative -- on the basis of a web of formulaic associations with *raṇvá-* 'delightful'. Cf. I.66.3 *óko ná raṇváḥ* "(Agni) delightful like a home"; also I.69.4-5 *raṇvó duroṇé* "a joy in the house," X.64.11 [=I.144.7] *raṇváḥ … iva kṣáyaḥ* "delightful … like a dwelling," X.33.6 *kṣétraṃ ná raṇvám* "delightful like a dwelling place." The problem in our passage is that *raṇvā́* (the only possible underlying form given its sandhi context) cannot technically modify neut. *ókaḥ*, despite the formulaics just discussed. The solution, as Ge saw (n. 15d), is that nom. sg. fem. *raṇvā́* also participates in the second simile in this pāda, *sudṛ́ṣīva puṣṭíḥ* "like prosperity beautiful to see" -- with which *raṇvá-* also has formulaic associations. Cf. I.65.5 *puṣṭír ná raṇvā́* "like thriving that brings delight" (immediately followed by *kṣitíḥ* 'dwelling place') and

II.4.4 *raṇvā́ … iva puṣṭíḥ* 'id.'. Of course, both similes provide comparisons to the desires that are the ultimate subject, with *raṇvā́* as the pivotal tert. comp. in both -- though it does not match *kā́māḥ* in gender or number.

IV.16.16: I take *cid* with the dat. *mā́vate jaritré* since I do not see how to construe it sensibly with *gádhyam*. I cannot explain its displacement to pāda end, however.

On the *gádhyaṃ vā́jam* see 11c.

IV.16.17: Pāda b is difficult. Ge (/WG) construe the two locatives in b, *kásmiñ cid* and *muhuké*, together, which would of course be the default interpr. However, this leads Ge to render *muhuká-* as 'Schlachtgeschrei', a tr. for which there is no support: its closest etymological relative, adverbial *múhur*, only means 'suddenly, in an instant'. (WG's "in irgendeinem plötzlichen Vorfall" at least imposes less content and sticks closer semantically to *múhur* and company.) In the publ. tr. I separate the two locatives, taking *muhuké* as a simple temporal and construing the indefinite *kásmiñ cid* with the gen. pl. *jánānām*. This interpr. was in part prompted by the need to have something for *antár* to govern: *antár* does not take the genitive, so a direct connection with *jánānām* ("among the peoples") is out, but it regularly takes the locative. Hence my "among some one of the peoples": since *jána-* can refer to a group of persons who make up a people, it doesn't have to be a single individual, hence my "some one" rather than "someone." (Cf. also V.74.2 *kásmin … jáne.*) However, I recognize that this interpr. is both artificial and awkward, and (somewhat in the spirit of WG) I have cast about for an interpr. of *muhuké*, which should literally mean 'instantaneous', that both reflects its etymology and yet allows it to refer to a conflict and be plausibly construed with *jánānām*. The Engl. word 'skirmish' ("an episode of irregular or unpremeditated conflict") comes close. I would thus revise my tr. of ab to "If a sharp missile will fly within some sudden skirmish of the peoples, o champion, ..."

IV.16.18: The morphological ambiguity of *bhúvaḥ* (injunctive or subjunctive) allows for several possible interpretations of the first half-vs. Ge takes *bhúvaḥ* as imperatival "sei," though this is unlikely given the morphology. Hoffmann (Injunk. 262) takes it as a "generell oder resulative konstatierend" injunctive and tr. "du bist" (so also WG). By contrast, I think these two fronted *bhúvaḥ* are subjunctives and questions. There is of course no way to tell. However, the purpose clause with subjunctive in 20cd .. *yáthā … ásan naḥ ... avitā* "so that he will be our helper," matching our pāda a *bhúvo 'vitā́*, suggests that *bhúvaḥ* is indeed a subjunctive and that further we are not at this point certain that Indra *will* become what we want him to -- hence a question rather that a statement is more appropriate.

IV.16.19: The standard tr. supply a verb in ab: Ge "rufe ich," WG "bitten … wir." This seems unnecessary the instr. phrases in ab can be parallel to *dyumnaíḥ* in the simile in c, all controlled by the participial phrase *abhí sántaḥ* "(we) dominating" in c. One of the factors that might support supplying a verb in ab is the otherwise

apparently orphaned acc. encl. *tvā* at the end of pāda a, but even as Ge advances this reason for supplying a verb (n. 19a), he also suggests that *tvā* could be dependent on immediately preceding *tvāyúbhiḥ*, an explanation that the close sandhi of the two words (*tvāyúbhiṣ ṭvā*) might favor.

In b *víśve*, in the phrase *víśva ājaú*, must be a loc., although we might expect the pronominal form *víśvasmin*. It is, however, worth noting that *víśvasmin* is found only twice in the RV, in the same phrase (*víśvasmin bháre*) in adjacent hymns in the Xth Maṇḍala (X.49.1, X.50.4). A nominal-type loc. *víśve* here would also be facilitated by the plural version *víśveṣu ... ājíṣu* in I.130.8 with simple truncation of the *-ṣu*.

Although Ge construes *dyumnaíḥ* not in the simile but as an attribute of the subject ("we"), the almost identical X.115.7 *dyā́vo ná dyumnaír abhí sánti mā́nuṣān* may (but need not) support keeping it with the simile; Ge separates the two in his tr. of that passage as well.

IV.16.20–21: These two vss. provide a double ending to this hymn. The first (20) begins, as summary vss. often do, with *evá* 'just in this way'. It announces self-referentially, with the root aor. *akarma* "we have just made," that the hymn being completed is the *bráhman-* we have created for Indra. And, as noted above ad vs. 18, the purpose clauses with subjunctive provide reassurance for the worried questions in 18ab. Vs. 21 is repeated as the final verse of IV.17, 19–24 so it serves as a refrain vs. for (some of) the Vāmadeva Indra hymns. It also announces, with a root aor. (though aor. passive), that the formulation has just been made (*ákāri … bráhma*). Despite the apparent duplication, we should not necessarily assume that this refrain was tacked onto an already complete hymn, because *gṛṇānáḥ* at the end of 21a may form a ring with the same word at the end of vs. 1.

IV.16.20: The standard tr. (Ge [/WG]) take *viyóṣat* as intransitive, a view argued for by Narten (Sig. aor. 214), with a neut. pl. subj. (*sakhyā́*) of a sg. verb. For my argument for a trans. interpr. of this *s*-aorist, see comm. ad II.32.2. As at II.32.2 I take *sakhyā́* here as an instr. sg. of separation, though an acc. pl. obj. ("he will not keep our partnerships far away") is also possible.

Note that *tanūpā́ḥ* picks up 7d *tanvò bodhi gopā́ḥ*.

IV.16.21: The standard tr. (Ge [/WG]) as also Kü (300) interpr. *pīpeḥ* as hortative. This is certainly possible (and is reflected in the publ. tr.), but context would also allow "you (have) made swell" or "you make swell" just as easily.

IV.17 Indra

IV.17.1–4: Hoffmann (Injunk. 178–180) treats these four vss. They express the cosmic disruptions attendant on Indra's birth and the further disruptions caused by his smashing of Vṛtra. On the ring composition that demarcates this section, see comm. on vs. 4 below.

IV.17.1: The pair "earth / heaven" occupy the final slots of the first two pādas: … *kṣā(ḥ)*# … *dyaúḥ*#, with a shared 3rd *singular* verb *ánu … manyata*. Note that there also exists a dual dvandva containing these stems: *dyā́vā-kṣā́mā*.

The 2nd hemistich contains two pf. participles expressing action anterior to the main verb (*sṛjáḥ*): *jaghanvā́n* 'having smashed' and *jagrasānā́n* 'having been swallowed'.

IV.17.2: As in vs. 1, the pair heaven and earth are expressed by two singulars (*dyaúḥ*, *bhū́miḥ*), even though, again, there is a dual dvandva available: *dyā́vā-bhū́mī*.

BR suggest reading *dyaúr éjad* for Pp. *dyaúḥ* / *réjat*. Although rejected by Old, this reading (which does not require changing the Saṃhitā text) is accepted by Ge, Hoffmann (Injunk. 179, 181), and Gotō (1st class, 271–72), as well as by me. The stem *réja-* is almost entirely medial (see *rejata* in pāda a), while *éja-* is act. It is easy to see how the misparsing could have arisen, due to the presence of immediately preceding *rejata*.

With Ge, I take *tviṣáḥ* as a gen. dependent on *bhiyásā* in b, thus parallel to *manyóḥ*. It would also be possible to take *tviṣáḥ* as an abl. of cause (so Hoffmann 179, WG).

Note the phonetic figure *táva tviṣáḥ*. Note also that the reflex. adj. *svásya* must reference *táva* and therefore have 2nd ps. value (as well as not referring to the grammatical subj., as is sometimes claimed for reflexives).

IV.17.2–3: *saráyanta ā́paḥ* (*sarayánte* out of sandhi) in 2d is reprised by *sárann ā́paḥ* in 3d. The two verbs seem semantically identical; the intransitive *-áya*-formation takes the post-(late-)caesura position also favored by metrically identical *janáyanta*. Its medial ending is an example of *-anta* replacement of the usual type (cf. Jamison 1979: IIJ 21), though somewhat complicated by the fact that the form out of sandhi is actually *-ante*.

IV.17.3: Almost the full panoply of power terms is on display in the first hemistich: *śávas-*, *sáhas-* (in the pseudo-part., on which see comm. ad IV.3.6), and *ójas-*.

The "bull" of the waters is of course Vṛtra.

IV.17.4: This vs. shows a clever twist on ring composition. Like vss. 1 and 2 it contains occurrences of both heaven and earth (here *dyaúḥ* a, *bhū́ma* d), and in fact pāda a ends exactly as 1b does: *manyata dyaúḥ*. But the two phrases mean very different things: in vs. 1 *manyata* is construed with *ánu* in the lexeme meaning 'concede', whereas here there is no preverb and the verb means 'be considered as'. Moreover, although in the 1st two vss. heaven and earth functioned as a pair, though expressed as two singulars, here they have nothing to do with each other, and indeed earth is found only in a negative simile (*sádaso ná bhū́ma*, which in Engl. has to be awkwardly by "any more than …").

On the tangled paternity here, see publ. intro.

IV.17.5: The break from the themes of the first 4 vss. is signalled by pres. tense forms (*cyāváyati*, *madanti*), after the relentless march of injunctives (and one pf.) in 1–4. (Technically speaking *saráyanta* in 2d is a present out of sandhi [*-ante*], but it patterns like other *-anta* forms of this shape. See disc. ad 2d.) But vs. 5 is also verbally linked to what went before: *bhūma* ending the first pāda matches the same word ending the last pāda of vs. 4, and *ánu … madanti* in c phonologically recalls *ánu … manyata* in 1b.

The vs. is thematically structured by one / many. Indra alone (*ékaḥ*) is invoked by many (*puruhūtáḥ*), as (single) king of the separate peoples (*kṛṣṭīnā́m*), whom all (*víśve*) celebrate.

The *satyám* beginning the 2nd hemistich may signal Indra's real presence on the ritual ground, as I argue it does in IV.16.1. The rest of the half vs. clearly takes place at the sacrifice. So the tr. might be emended to "All celebrate him (who is) really here …"

The construction of the last pāda is unclear, esp. the morphological identity and referents of *devásya gṛṇató maghónaḥ*. Ol takes *rātím* as the obj. of *gṛṇatáḥ* ("singing the gift") and sees *gṛṇatáḥ* and *maghónaḥ* as parallel acc. pl. ("the singers and patrons"). But this phrase is supposed to be coreferential with *nominative víśve* in c: "Alle: die (Priester), welche des Gottes Gabe besingen, und die freigebigen Herren." This syntactic slippage seems unacceptable to me (and uncharacteristic of Old). Ge takes *gṛṇatáḥ* as a gen. sg. dep. on gen. sg. *maghónaḥ*, which is in apposition to *devásya:* "the gift of the god, who is the generous patron of the singer." This makes good sense, but I have not been able to find other passages with a genitive dependent on *maghávan-*. WG take all three as gen. sg. with the same referent, namely Indra, all dependent on *rātím*. But since this is not a Vala passage, Indra should not be singing, but receiving the singing of others. My tr. starts from passages like VII.12.2 *asmā́n gṛṇatá utá no maghónaḥ* (cf. also X.22.15), where *gṛnatáḥ* and *maghónaḥ* are overtly conjoined (by *utá*) and refer to humans: "us (who are) singing and our patrons." In that passage the forms are acc. pl.; in ours here I take them as gen. sg. in dativ al usage (as often).

IV.17.6: In pāda a the word *víśve* was omitted in the publ. tr., which should be emended to "Entirely his were all the soma-drinks."

The three initial *satrā́* (a, b, c) are echoed by *dátre* beginning d. Although there is some dissension on the root etym. of *dátra-* (cf., e.g., Old, who cites Neisser derivation from *dáyate* 'apportion' -- an analysis apparently followed by both Ge and WG, judging from their tr. 'Anteil'), the correct analysis was already sketched by Gr s.v.: it is a *-tra-* deriv. built to the weak stem of the redupl. pres. to √*dā* 'give' (*dad-*), hence **dáttra*, with simplification of the geminate before *r*, as often. See AiG II.2.703 and the important (if lapidary) correction in the Nachtr. to AiG I: Nachtr. p. 3, to I.5 ll. 30–31.

IV.17.6–7: I take the idiom found in 6d and 7b, LOC. ACC. *adhithāḥ*, as meaning ‘put s.o. in the path/way of s.th. The middle voice of *adhithāḥ* signals that the entity in the loc. belongs to the subject, namely Indra -- in the first case his generosity (just celebrated in 5d), in the second his power of attack. Although Ge recognizes the similarity of these constructions, with identical subjects and objects (see his n. 6d), he renders them quite differently. For *áme √dhā* in 7b, see also I.63.1, 67.3.

IV.17.8: The first half of this vs., describing Indra, is couched in the accusative, on which the rel. cl. of cd depends. Since both the preceding and following vss. refer to Indra in the nominative, this vs. is syntactically untethered. It seems best to supply an anodyne verb like “I call upon,” even though this cannot be generated from the immediate context.

Note that the *satrā* of vs. 6 has returned, though in a cmpd.

IV.17.9–10: This sequence of vss. is marked by initial *ayám* ‘this one here’ (9a, 9c, 10a, 10b; cf. also *asyá* 9d). This near-deictic pronoun may indicate that Indra is currently present at the sacrifice. These vss. are also marked by present tense verbs describing Indra’s characteristic and habitual activities -- in contrast to vs. 11, which opens with an imperfect (*sám … ajayat*).

IV.17.10: In pāda b the lexeme *prá kṛṇute* with its middle voice in my opinion encodes a complex thought: in battle Indra brings the (enemies’) cows forward in such a way as to make them his own, that is, to capture them. Med. *kṛṇuté* recurs in the next pāda, where its object is Indra’s own battle-fury (*manyúm*).

IV.17.11: The stem *aśv^{i}yá-* with suffixal accent is ordinarily a PN; the adj. ‘equine’ is regularly *áśv^{i}ya-*. However, as noted by AiG II.2.816 the accent of *-ya-* derivatives is variable, often within the same stem. The initial-accented *áśvya-* in the plural generally modifies *maghā(ni)* or *rādhāṃsi*. Here I am inclined to supply *maghāni* ‘bounties’ suggested by adjacent *maghávā*; cf. … *maghāni maghávā* in 8d and the repeated forms of *maghávan-* in this portion of the hymn (7d, 8d, 9b, 13b, 13d).

The referent of *pūrvīḥ* isn’t clear. Ge (/WG) supplies ‘fortresses’, which in turn requires supplying a transitive verb: Ge “der viele (Burgen erobert hat)”; WG “der ja viele (Palisaden besiegte).” I would prefer not to supply so much material. Moreover, in this group of hymns *pūrvīḥ* is used in temporal expressions: IV.16.19 *kṣapáḥ … śarádaś ca pūrvīḥ* “through many nights and autumns,” IV.18.4 *sahásram māsaḥ … śarádaś ca pūrvīḥ* “for a thousand months and many autumns,” IV.19.8 *pūrvīr uṣásaḥ śarádaś ca* “through many dawns and autumns.” I therefore take it that way here, as a temporal expression in a nominal rel. cl. with *maghávā* as the predicate.

IV.17.12: The exact sense of *ádhy eti* is not entirely clear. It generally means ‘study’ from the literal meaning ‘go over’, but shows various semantic developments: ‘give thought to, take cognizance of, be mindful of’, trouble oneself with, etc. In all cases,

the lexeme *ádhi √i* has a mental sense (though III.54.9 has a secondary literal reading): I.71.10, 80.15; III.54.9; V.44.13; VII.56.15; VIII.83.7, 91.3; IX.67.31, 32; X.33.7, 32.3, 100.4. Here I think we should read the expression in the light of vs. 4, with its apparent uncertainty about Indra's parentage -- esp. given 4a *janitā́* and 4c *yáḥ … jajā́na*, matched here by *janitúr yó jajā́na*.

I take the rel. cl. of cd with the following vs. The two share the verb *íyarti*, and 12cd can serve as the cause of 13a: when Indra raises a tempest, he destroys the man's peace.

I take *muhukaíḥ* as a temporal adverbial instr., expressing how suddenly Indra can erupt -- even though I have revised my view on *muhuké* in the preceding hymn (IV.16.17 -- see comm. there). I do not think "raises his tempest with/by sudden skirmishes" is what is meant here.

IV.17.13: *samóham* is derived by Gr (MonWms) from *sám √ūh* 'push together'. But *√ūh* does not have a full-grade *oh* in Vedic and is plausibly related to *√vah* (see EWA s.v., with lit.). Better to analyze as *sa-móham* and derive it from *√muh* 'be confused'. The same analysis should probably be applied to the differently accented *samohé* in I.8.6.

IV.17.14: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. and its pendant, the single pāda of vs. 15, are quite unclear, though at least 14ab concerns the Etaśa myth. There are also some formal issues.

The med. part. *sasṛmāṇá-* must belong to the pf. stem, despite its *-māná-* suffix appropriate to a thematic stem. This is the only such form, beside conventionally formed pf. part. *sasrāṇá-* (2x). Narten (1969: 81–82 = KlSch 128) explains the aberrancy as a quirk of the poet, who in this and adjacent hymns shows a penchant for *-māna-* participles. Another question is what is its value. Most pf. participles have anterior sense, but the publ. tr. renders it as "as he ran" -- in other words as an action simultaneous with the main verb. And I might be inclined to make this simultaneity more overt by tr. "as he was running." Kü's interpretation (552) as what he calls "resultativ" and I would call anterior is more in line with the perfect form: "wenn er seinen Lauf gemacht hat." But contextually that would be puzzling: what is the point of bringing the horse to a halt if it's already finished running. And on p. 602 he provides a diff. tr., closer to mine: "der sich im Lauf befindet." WG seem to take it almost as an inchoative -- "der sich in Lauf gesetzt hat" -- but cite alternative translations in their n. I would suggest that the aberrant shape and the aberrant sense are connected and that the poet created a nonce present-like pf. part. to convey the simultaneous and progressive value he was seeking to express.

The second hemistich is quite obscure. Old suggests reading *kṛṣṇé* against the Pp. *kṛṣṇáḥ*, and this has met general acceptance. The apparently parallel loc. *ásikhyām* 'on the dark (FEM.)' in 15a supports this reading, and it goes naturally with the locatives in 14d.

Who is the referent? Ge gives no hint of what he might think, but Kü and WG both think the subj. is Indra, who is acting on/against Etaśa. Judging from Kü's tr.

(602), he thinks the verb 'sprinkle' (*jigharti*) is a euphemism for violent action; its unexpressed obj. is Indra's *vájra*, which Indra 'sprinkles' onto the black (horse, namely Etaśa), while WG understand Etaśa himself as the object. For both, the part. *juhurāṇáḥ* belongs with √*hṝ* 'be angry' (flg. Insler 1968; see EWA s.v. *HAR*^{I}), which can capture Indra's mood in this encounter. (Note that the poet was not tempted here to give the redupl. part. a thematic suffix, *pace* Narten.) By contrast, I accept the traditional association of the part. with √*hvṛ* 'go crookedly'. I take the referent here to be Agni. Although the Kü / WG view that it is Indra would be the default interpr. in this Indra hymn, the phraseology of pāda d is almost identical to a pāda in an Agni hymn in this maṇḍala: IV.1.11ab *sá jāyata prathamáḥ pastyā̃su, mahó budhné rájaso asyá yónau* "He was born first in the dwelling places, at the base of this great realm, (as) his womb...." And 'moving crookedly' qualifies Agni very well. The simile comparing the subject here to a Hotar in vs. 15 also supports Agni as referent -- though I suppose it could be argued that since Agni is often identified as a Hotar he need not be compared to one. I confess that I am not at all certain of my interpr., and if I could find a plausible way to make Indra the subj. of cd I would do so.

IV.17.15: I supply 'hide' with *ásiknyām* on the basis of *tvácam ásiknīm* in IX.73.5 (so also Ge), though WG supply 'night' instead.

IV.17.16: Ge supplies a verb ("we call") in ab; WG take *ā́ cyāvayāmaḥ* in d as the verb of both hemistichs, not just the 2nd. My interpr. is similar to WG's, but with a further twist. I take *vājáyantaḥ* in b as a pun. The sense 'seeking prizes' is supported by parallel *gavyántaḥ … aśvāyántaḥ … / janīyántaḥ* "seeking cows, seeking horses, seeking wives," even though the denom. 'seeking prizes' is ordinarily accented on the denom. suffix as *vājayá-*. By contrast *vājáya-* is usually transitive in the meaning 'incite, rouse', and it can be so here, with *índram* as object.

IV.17.17: Ge (/WG) take the pf. part. *dádṛśānáḥ* as a mere attributive adj. with *āpíḥ* ("visible friend"), while I give it a more verbal sense. If my reflexive 'showing yourself' seems too strong, I would still prefer a participial 'being seen as / becoming visible' to a straight adjective. Once again, we are hoping for Indra's epiphany on the ritual ground.

In d in the publ. tr. I take *kártā* independently and construe *ulókam* as obj. of the part. *uśaté* ("longing for wide space") against Ge (/WG). I now see that this is wrong, as the parallel expressions with *kártā … ulókam* show (VI.23.3, VII.20.2). Both of those passages also have a dat. of benefit, *vīrā́ya* and *sudā́se* respectively, but neither of those datives is capable of governing an acc. I would therefore emend my tr. to "maker of wide space for the man who longs (for it), conferring vitality." As this emended tr. shows, I still think *ulókam* can be secondarily taken as the obj. of *uśaté*. This same part. *uśaté* can also serve as dat. of benefit with *vayodhā́ḥ*. Note the dat. *stuvaté* with *váyo dhāḥ* in the next vs. (18b).

IV.17.18: Though I am in agreement with Ge (/WG) that *cakṛmā* 'we have acted' refers to ritual action, I see no reason to supply an obj. (e.g., Ge "das Opfer").

IV.17.19: Ge's rendering of ab is not grammatically possible: he takes the subordinate clause as beginning with *yád* and continuing till the end of b ("weil er ja allein die vielen Feinde erschlägt"), but *hanti* is unaccented and must therefore belong to the main clause -- despite his rather casual dismissal of the problem (n. 19b). My tr. takes *yád dha vṛtrā́* as a self-contained subord. clause, with a verb ('smashes') to be supplied. Perhaps better is WG's interpr. of the same sequence as a nominal clause with *vṛtrā́* as nominative subj.: "wenn es ja Widerstände gibt." I might emend my tr. to "Indra is praised as the bounteous one; when there are obstacles, he alone smashes (them, though they are) many and unopposable."

IV.18 Indra

For general discussion of my interpr. of this hymn, see publ. intro.

IV.18.1: With Ge and others, I assign this vs. to Indra's mother, not to the poet or a narrator.

Note the precative *janiṣīṣṭa*, on which see Narten (Sig.Aor., 118). Though this is the only prec. form to this stem in the RV, others are found in other Vedic texts.

The periphrastic caus. *páttave kaḥ* (on which see Zehnder, Periphr.Kaus. 23 and passim) is generally taken as a euphemism for 'cause to die', but the root √*pad* 'fall' is regularly used of miscarriage (cf. my Hyenas [1991], 202-4), which fits this context well. Of course a miscarriage in ancient India could well also mean death for the mother.

The root aor. injunc. *kaḥ* is perfectly ambig. between 2nd and 3rd sg. The latter fits the previous pāda, where the fetus Indra is spoken of in the 3rd ps., but 2nd sg. would anticipate the upcoming dialogic context, with Indra speaking of himself in the 1st ps. in vs. 2. Since English forces us to make a choice, I have chosen 2nd sg., contra Ge and most other tr.

IV.18.2: Most tr. render *durgáhā* merely as 'bad passage' vel sim. (Ge "eine übler Durchgang"), but the word is associated with words meaning 'deep' (of water, inter alia, whether it should be derived from √*gabh* or √*gah* [on which see EWA s.v. *gáhana, GĀH*]). And given that Indra is rejecting vaginal birth, that is, a downward trajectory, in favor of coming out sideways, a more precise tr. seems desirable: a "plunge" down through the birth canal and out is what he seems to want to avoid.

Note the otherwise identical 1st sg. subjunctives *nír ayā* and *nír gamāni*, built to root pres. (√*i*) and root aor. (√*gam*) respectively. Surely some nuance of tense/aspect is being conveyed here; I wish I knew what. (An English rendering with a pres. progressive versus a straight eventive, "I will not be coming out from there; I will come out crosswise …," might capture something of the sense, with the progressive expressing deliberative possibilities and the eventive the ulitmate choice.)

IV.18.3: It is generally agreed that pāda b contains another snatch of Indra's speech. The question is how to interpr. the double *ná ná* that opens the pāda. The first *ná* can be taken as an independent assertion -- "No!" -- followed by an amplification of that assertion, *nā́nu gāni* "I will not follow." In that case the positive statement *ánu nū́ gamāni* "I will now follow" represents a contradiction of the first and is an indication of the new-born Indra's wavering mind. Such seems the interpr. of WG, for example. However, as Old points out, a double negative can instead express an emphatic positive. Such is the interpr. of Ge, and I follow it here, in part because I think the point is that Indra was decisive from the moment of conception.

Like 2ab, this pāda contains two parallel 1st sg. subjunctives, *ánu gāni* and *ánu .. gamāni*, though in this case they are both built to root aorists, but to two different roots. Again, I don't know what differential semantic nuance is being expressed (if any). Here the poet may simply be striving for euphony: note the pleasing phonological patterning in *ná nā́nu gāni ánu nū́ gamāni*.

IV.18.4: As Old discusses, the sequence *sá ṛ́dhak* must contain underlying *sā́*, not, with Pp., *sáḥ*.

IV.18.5: The standard tr. all construe *svayám* with what follows, *átkaṃ váśāna(ḥ)* -- e.g., Ge "selbst sein Gewand umlegen" -- on the basis of *svayám átkaiḥ* in II.35.14 (which I render differently). But surely what is most remarkable here is that a new-born stood up by himself; the self-swaddling would also be surprising but would simply follow from the first feat.

IV.18.6–9: For my interpr. of the speakers in these vss. and the role of the waters in the myth, see publ. intro. Most tr. take the vss. as all spoken by Indra's mother (Ge [/WG], Doniger), whereas I distribute them to a variety of voices: 6 Indra, 7 Indra's mother, 8 waters, 9 Indra's mother. As I see it, in 6 Indra prompts his mother to ask the waters questions; in 7 she rather sarcastically and belittlingly asks questions about them, whom she seems to accuse of trying to lay claim to her son. They respond directly to him in 8, reminding him of his mother's dereliction of maternal duty and suggesting that they are better at mothering him than she is. So that she rather defiantly points out in 9 that subsequent negative things that happened to him were not her fault.

IV.18.6: As suggested in the publ. intro., the (real) waters in the amniotic sac that "break" right before birth and the (mythological) waters confined by Vṛtra and released by Indra are conflated here. Indra may be speaking from within the womb of the waters there battering the womb itself for release, though the waters in the Vṛtra myth would not be far from the audience's mind. If Indra the fetus is immersed in these amniotic fluids, their sloshing sounds would surround him -- and it would be appropriate to ask his mother what they are saying.

The simile in b, *ṛtā́varīr iva saṃkróśamāṇāḥ* "like truthful women together shouting their witness" may have a quasi-legal resonance. The root √*kruś* is later used for raising a hue and cry on witnessing a crime (vel sim.), such as a Rākṣasa abduction (see my Sacr.Wife 233). Configuring the waters as truthful and articulate witnesses in this pāda leads directly to the suggestion in the next pāda that they should be asked what they are saying.

IV.18.6–7: The responsive phrases *kím … bhananti* (6c) and *kím … bhananta* (71) provide a textbook case of *-anta* replacement. See my 1979 IIJ 21 article.

IV.18.7: As just noted, I think that this vs. expresses Indra's mother's suspicions about the waters' alienation of Indra's filial affection for her. In pāda a she interprets the waters' speech, about which Indra asked her in vs. 6, as invitations to him (to join them and abandon her, presumably). In b the charged word *avadyá-* 'disgrace' recurs from 5a, where the mother considered Indra to be "like a disgrace, somehow a disgrace" and concealed him. Here she suggests that the waters are, in contrast, eager to assume his disgrace. In context this seems almost like an accusation that the waters are so perverse that in their pursuit of him they are willing to assume any evil that attaches to him. In fact, this is probably an allusion to the well-known concept that waters cleanse transgressors of their transgressions (cf., e.g., I.23.22–24). Indra would automatically acquire blood guilt from his killing of Vṛtra (on Indra's *kilbiṣāṇi* 'sins' and resulting impurity, see my Hyenas, 62–68, also vss. 12–13 below). (The interpr. of his 'disgrace' here as arising from his killing of Vṛtra goes back to Sāy. See Ge's n. 7b.)

In any case, in the 2nd hemistich Indra's mother goes on to assert the primacy of her relationship with Indra and thus her indirect role in his glorious deed, the slaying of Vṛtra. The fronted *máma* 'mine' makes this claim esp. strong.

IV.18.8: The waters throw this emphatically fronted *máma* back at her, with four fronted occurrences of *mámat*, which is, as Ge clearly argues, nonce ablative sg. of the 1st sg. pronoun, a blend of gen. *máma* and abl. *mát*. To interpret it as an adv. (Gr "bald-bald' and see lit. cited by Old) is to ignore the rhetorical responsion in this section of the hymn. In my interpr. of the verse each pāda is spoken by a different though undifferentiatable representative of the waters. The first two pādas counter Indra's mother's boast in 7cd about her son's great deed with reminders that she, not any of them [=waters], is responsible for transgressing against this same son. Both pādas begin *mámac caná* "not because of *me*." In the second hemistich they take credit for the good treatment Indra received and the way he thrived under it, each beginning *mámac cid* "certainly because of *me*." Putting the vs. in the mouth of Indra's mother, as most interpr. do, makes grave difficulties. Not only do the claims in ab become incoherent, but it also requires that the young woman (*yuvatíḥ*) in pāda a either not be identical with Indra's mother (despite 4a, 5a). Otherwise pāda a could be in the 1st ps ("I, a young woman, cast you aside" -- the pf. form *parā́sa* is compatible with a 1st sg.), but we then confront the problem that she both accepts

responsiblility for what seems a misdeed and disclaims any reason for or benefit from the action.

mamṛḍyuḥ is the only pf. form attested to √*mṛḍ* in all of Skt. (save for the grammarians). Because of its isolation, it is difficult to interpr. the optative. Kü (374) suggests it expresses the Potentialis der Vergangenheit. I might suggest rather that has the value of past habitual (like Engl. "would [regularly] X"), though this is not a normal use of the pf. opt in Vedic (on which see my "Where Are All the Optatives," 2009). But I also think the transmitted form may be signalling something else entirely. The indic. 3rd pl. pf. would be **mamṛḍuḥ*. Its root syllable should scan long (like **mṝḍá-* and **mṝḍáya-*, transmitted as *mṛḍ*) because of compensatory lengthening from **mṛẓḍ*). I wonder if the underlying form **mamṝḍur* was remade as an optative in order to ensure the necessary heavy syllable in the cadence. If it *is* a real optative, however, note that it is spoken by a woman and its subjects are females, demonstrating the association between the pf. opt. and women's speech that I discussed in the 2009 article.

In d the marvel of Indra's standing up (right after birth) is repeated from 5c. In 5 this was emphatically not his mother's doing: she had hidden him away. A watery foster mother seems to be claiming credit, one of those who showed mercy and kindness to the child in the preceding pāda.

IV.18.9: If I am correct that Indra's mother reclaims speech in this vs., she now indicates that a risky moment in the Vṛtra battle wasn't her fault. The opening *mámac caná* "not because of me" returns from 8ab, and, so it seems to me, this indicates that she implicitly agrees to the accuracy of the accusations in 8ab -- that she did throw the baby aside and let evil birth swallow him.

In the VP *ápa hánū jaghā́na* the jaws are universally taken to be Indra's (e.g., WG "hat … deine beide Kinnbachen abgeschlagen." But I know of no account of the Indra-Vṛtra battle when Indra's jaws are attacked, and in fact several times it is Vṛtra's jaws: X.152.3 *ví vr̥trásya hánū ruja* "break apart the jaws of Vr̥tra"; I.52.6 *vr̥trásya yád … nijaghántha hánvor indra tanyatúm* "when you, Indra, struck your thunder down upon the jaws of Vr̥tra." I therefore think that the *hánū* here have to be Vṛtra's, but with a twist: this is not a proclamation of Indra's triumphant blow, but rather a dicey moment when Vṛtra was counter-attacking. Vṛtra has 'pierced down' Indra (*nivividhvā́n*) and is presumably coming in for the kill. What kind of kill? The clue, in my view, is the preverb *ápa* 'aside, away'. I suggest that Vṛtra is smashing his own jaws aside, that is, moving his jaws apart to be able to swallow large prey. Acdg. to various websites (e.g., http://www.all-creatures.org/articles/ar-snake-myths.html), snakes' jaws are not fused together but merely held together by stretchy ligaments, an arrangement that allows them to open their jaws very wide. Just as "Evil Birth" swallowed the baby Indra in 8b, here the arch-snake threatens to do the same. But in the second half-vs. Indra reasserts his mastery and crushes his enemy.

IV.18.10: We return to the primal scene of Indra's birth again, with a reiteration of his mother's abandonment of the new-born babe (here expressed as the "unlicked

calf" *árīḷhaṃ vátsam*, pāda c), forcing him out on his own -- though the description of Indra as a strapping bull in ab makes him seem considerably less vulnerable.

The second hemistich lacks a main verb to govern the dat. pseudo-infinitive *caráthāya*. Most tr. supply 'let' vel sim. I suggest that *sasūva* in pāda a 'gave birth' (√*sū* 'give birth') may carry over into cd, as a stand-in for the (non-existent, or at least unattested) pf. to the homonymous root √*sū* 'impel'.

IV.18.11: The plot gets a bit murky here. His mother, having sent him off alone in vs. 10, now follows him, with the fear that the gods are abandoning him. This seems to happen much later, just before the Vṛtra battle and long after the birth and her own abandonment of the baby. But, despite her fears about the other gods, Indra finds a companion on his own -- Viṣṇu, who is not usually a party to the Vṛtra battle.

IV.18.12–13: See the publ. intro. for uncertainties about the interpr. of these vss. In some sense they seem to enlarge on the theme of "Indra's disgrace" (*índrasyāvadyám*) in 7b -- the blood guilt Indra incurs from even sanctioned killing, made far worse by the intra-family slaughter depicted in vs. 12. Which leads to Indra's extreme loss of status, isolation, and shunning by the other gods in the final vs.

IV.18.12: In light of d, which describes Indra's killing his father, the question in a, "who made your mother a widow," can only be answered "you did!"

The final word of the vs. *pādagṛ́ya* 'having grasped him by the foot' is puzzling. It might seem to exclude Vṛtra as the victim (and as Indra's father) since, as a snake, he has no feet -- though it might be a way of indicating picking up a snake by its tail. The only other occurrence of this cmpd gerund is in the desperately difficult hymn X.27, vs. 4, where the context is similar and the referent does seem to be Vṛtra.

IV.18.13: Indra gets the last word in this hymn and, having described his situation in the direst of terms, ends with a note of hope and coming triumph: the falcon's arrival with the soma, to be treated (in even more enigmatic terms) in two nearby hymns, IV.26–27. Since in our hymn the new-born Indra drank soma in Tvaṣṭar's house (3c) and presumably had a good dose of it before the Vṛtra battle, the falcon's stolen soma cannot be the primal soma, though it sometimes mythologically seems to parallel the primal stealing of fire in the Prometheus myth.

A dog-cooker (*svapaca-*) in later texts is a person living outside of societal norms (cf., e.g., MDŚ III.92), grouped with those who have fallen from caste and so forth.

Notice that Indra here finds no one to be merciful to him (*ná … vivide marḍitā́ram*), in contrast to the merciful waters when he was a baby (8c).

Most take the dishonored wife to be Indra's own, but no wife has intruded on the family drama we've been observing. I assume rather that this is another reference to his mother, who, now that she is a widow, receives slighting treatment.

IV.19. Indra

IV.19.1: As far as I can tell, this is the only ex. of *nír √vṛ* in the RV. In conjunction with *ékam* it must mean something like 'single out', 'pick out from a group'.

IV.19.2: The verb *ávāsṛjanta* lacks an overt object. This may be because it is middle, in contrast to the generally transitive active to this stem; so most tr., incl. the publ. tr. ("let go"). However, the *-anta* may be an *-anta* replacement of the usual type (see my 1979 *IIJ* article), and the verb form should be taken as a transitive equivalent to the active, with unexpressed obj. Indra. (This is how Kulikov [-ya-pres., p. 289] takes it, flg. a suggestion of Lubotsky's -- though *-anta* replacment is not mentioned: "The gods abandoned [Indra], like the feeble ones.") I am of two minds. The situation depicted is presumably the gods finking out on Indra when the Vṛtra battle looms; this might suggest that we should supply Indra as object: English "let Indra down" would be an almost exact match. But the simile *jívrayo ná* "like old/feeble (men)" does not fit this scenario as well; it implies that their powers simply failed them. They "let go" -- the stuffing just went out of them, as it were.

The usual problem with *bhúvaḥ* -- injunctive (so apparently Ge, also the publ. tr.) or subjunctive (so apparently WG). I assume that this verb refers to what happened after the event of pāda a: with the gods out of contention, Indra comes into his own as the universal monarch (*samrā́j-*) and takes his true and proper place (*satyáyoni-*). The use of *-yoni-* here is reminiscent of the passage in a nearby Indra hymn, IV.16.10, where Indra is urged to sit down on his own *yóni-* (*své yónau*) so that he can be recognized.

IV.19.3: The phrase *abudhyám ábudhyamānaṃ suṣupāṇám* "not to be awakened, unawakening, gone to sleep" must be proleptic, expressing the state the serpent will be in after Indra has done his work on him: 'put to sleep' and similar idioms are standard euphemisms for death in Vedic, as in many languages (e.g., modern English). See my "'Sleep' in Vedic and Indo-European," *Zeitschrift für vergl. Sprachforschung (KZ)* 96 (1982/83) 6-16. I do *not* think, *pace* most tr., that this depicts a drowsy Vṛtra whom Indra woke up to fight. For further disc. see I.103.7 and comm. thereon.

The hapax *aparván* at the end of d is picked up by *párvatānām* at the end of 4d. (They are, of course, synchronically unrelated.)

IV.19.4: As noted above ad IV.16.14 this group of Indra hymns contains a set of anomalously built medial participles to the roots *√vaś* 'desire' and *√vas* 'wear'. Here medial thematic *uśámāna-* is doubly unexpected: this root builds a root pres., with a weak grade *uś*, but it is only active (with an extremely well-attested act. part. *uśánt-*), save for three occurrences of athem. *uśāná-*. And there is no other trace of a 6th class thematic present to account for the *-māna-*suffix. Neither of these anomalies seems to me particularly serious or hard to account for. As for the middle voice, verbs of

desiring seem to fall naturally into the semantic realm of the middle voice, so that a transfer of the participle would not be surprising. Moreover, if we take the redupl. part. *vāvaśāná-* as belonging to a pf. of this root (contra Kü, who assigns all these forms to √*vāś* 'bellow'), there is a parallel formation with the same voice and same meaning. As for the thematic suffix, Narten (MSS 16: 82 = KlSch 128) suggests that this poet has a penchant for *-māna-*; if this explanation seems insufficent (and it does to me -- what about *uśāná-* in IV.23.1 as well as numerous well-behaved athem. middle participles in his oeuvre), one might point to the ambiguous 3rd pl. act. *uśánti* (3x), which is presumably the 3rd pl. of the root pres., but could belong also to a 6th class present. (However, I note that the three 3rd pl. forms are found only in I and X.)

I take *ójaḥ* as an acc. of respect with the part.

Ge sees pāda d as reflecting the Winged Mountains story, but this doesn't seem evident to me.

IV.19.5: Pāda a presents some interpretational difficulties that I think can be resolved by considering it an example of disharmony in a simile (see my 1982 IIJ article). I take the verb *abhí prá dadruḥ* as belonging to √*dṝ* 'split, burst' (see below for another possibility). In the simile *jánayo ná gárbham* it has transitive value, with the object expressing the contents that has been burst out (not the container), hence "as women (burst out) their embryo." In the frame I take the mountains that ended the previous pāda (4d) as the subject and the verb as intransitive: "they burst." (This is also Ge's and WG's interpr., as well as Kü's [230].) Old suggests as another alternative that the verb can be transitive, with mountains as subject and rivers as object, but I would prefer to supply as little as possible. Old suggests yet another possibility, that the verb actually belongs to the root √*drā* 'run'. Although this does not make sense for the simile (as Old notes), it could work for the frame -- though in that case 'rivers' might be a better subject. In that case we would have a pun separating the simile and frame ("[the rivers] ran [√*drā*], as women burst out [√*dṝ*] their embryo"), rather than a mismatch of usages of a single lexical item. I prefer the single-root solution.

The 2nd pāda also has a somewhat skewed expression. In this context we would expect the entities that "went/drove forth all at once" to be the released waters, who are certainly the topic of the 2nd hemistich. But instead it is 'stones' (*ádrayaḥ*). Now this is probably, on the one hand, a particularly vivid image of the mountains suddenly bursting and sending forth an explosion of stones, a rockslide. But on the other hand, pāda-final *ádrayaḥ* produces a Jagatī cadence in a hymn that is otherwise entirely Triṣṭubh. Old suggests (without great enthusiasm, as far as I can see) an emendation to abl. **ádreḥ* 'from the stone', which would fix both the meter and the image. I wonder if *ádrayaḥ* is a poetic trick: we expect the subject **ā́paḥ* 'waters' -- which would provide both the standard Vṛtra-myth denouement and a good Triṣṭubh cadence -- and instead get a twist of both sense and meter.

IV.19.7: This vs. celebrates the fructifying liquid that Indra released by destroying Vṛtra and its effects on humans (specifically females)(ab), the landscape (c), and

livestock (d). The first hemistich is a cleverly constructed echo chamber, because the females being made to swell (that is, get pregnant) there probably stand for the waters, but are also *compared* to waters. In other words the waters are being compared to waters, by way of the intermediate 'unwed girls' (*agrúvaḥ*). This is also something of a dig at Vṛtra, who hadn't managed to make them pregnant though he is sometimes called their husband (cf., e.g., *dāsá-patnī-* 'having a Dāsa as husband' in I.32.11, etc.). Indra's role as their real husband is embodied in the final word of the vs. *dáṃsupatnīḥ* (however we interpret the rest of it; see below).

In the simile *nabhanvò ná vákvā(ḥ), vákva-* belongs to the root √*vañc* 'surge, undulate, billow'. The stem *nabhanú-* is found only here and in V.59.7 and is transparently a derivative of the root √*nabh* 'burst, explode'. Old suggests the verbal meaning 'sich spalten' with nominal 'Spalt' 'split, cleft'. However, in both passages I think the nominal form refers not to the aftermath of the verbal action but rather to the process -- the spurts sent forth by the explosion (rather like the stones in 5b). The image is visually arresting (at least to me).

The sense of *dhvasrá-* in b also requires some discussion. The root √*dhvaṃs* is variously glossed (e.g., EWA s.v. 'zerstieben, zerstäuben, zerbröcklen'), but in my view the 'spray, scatter' sense is far less prominent than 'occlude' (with smoke, dust, or other concealing substance), a sense also found in derviatives like *dhvasmán-* 'miasma, (clouds of) smoke'. Thus to my mind the adj. *dvasrá-* means in the first instance 'occluded, dusty'; I have pushed this slightly to 'parched', from something like 'dry as dust'. Ge's "die dahinschwindenden" (dwindling away) conveys something of the same sense of weakness and lack of fertility, but I don't know how he arrived at it.

ṛtajñāḥ is identified as a nom. sg. m. modifying Indra by Gr, so also Scar (177). It can just as easily be an acc. pl. fem. modifying the young women / waters, as Ge, WG, and the publ. tr. take it. Given that the waters in the adjacent hymn, IV.18.6, are called *ṛtāvarīḥ*, the latter analysis seems preferable -- although it might be even better to read it with both referents.

The publ. tr. analyzes *dáṃsupatnī-* as having a first member *dáṃsu-*, an adjective 'wondrous' related to *dáṃsas-* 'wondrous power' (so Gr). However, the prevailing interpr. is that it is either a cmpd *dáṃ-supatnī-* or a two-word sequence *dáṃ *supátnīḥ*, with, in either case, a form of *dám-* 'house' (cf. *dáṃpati-*, *pátir dán*). The complex is then to be rendered 'having a good husband in the house' vel sim. Although I think the form plays off *dámpati-*, I am still inclined towards the 'wondrous' interpr., because of the deeds that have just been ascribed to Indra.

IV.19.8: The question in this vs. is what to do with *gūrtā́(ḥ)*. The standard tr. take it as modifying the temporal expression *pūrvīr uṣásaḥ śarádaś ca* -- hence, e.g., Ge's "[v]iele gelobte Morgen und Herbste." This is grammatically fine and perhaps also supported by the fact that the adj. is in the same pāda as the temporal expression. Still, I am somewhat unsatisified by this interpr. On the one hand, as Klein points out (DGRV I.74), this small group of Vāmadeva Indra hymns contains three similar temporal expressions (IV.16.19, 18.4, and here), and the only adjectives are

quantitative ones, so 'welcomed, besung, praised' would be an intrusion in the formulaic language. Moreover, *svágūrta-* 'self-greeted, i.e., gurgling' is used twice of rivers (I.140.13 *síndhavaḥ*, X.95.7 *nadyàḥ*), and something like that would fit semantically here. The problem of course is that *síndhu-* is masc., and so *gūrtā́ḥ* cannot modify acc. pl. *síndhūn* as the publ. tr. implies. It is possible that the expression *síndhavaś ca svágūrtāḥ* in I.140.13 was transposed to our passage without adjusting the gender. More likely is that the acc. pl. of another, feminne word for rivers, streams, or waters should be supplied: *nadyàḥ-* as in X.95.7, *sīrā́ḥ* as in pāda c of this vs., or *apáḥ*, the default watery referent in the Vṛtra myth. The tr. should be emended to better reflect this: "… he set loose the welcomed [/gurgling] *(waters/streams and) the rivers." Strikingly *svágūrta-*, which occurs only 4x total in the RV, appears two vss. later (10c) in the same metrical position with the same sandhi form. It there modifies *ápāṃsi* 'labors'. Is it too fanciful to suggest that that phrase, *svágūrtā*, *ápāṃsi*, is meant to invoke *(*svá)gūrtā*, **apáḥ* here? For further disc. see also Old ad loc.

IV.19.9: As indicated in the publ. intro., the contents of this vs. and the reason for its inclusion in this hymn are both deeply obscure, though the occurrence of the rare stem *agrū́-* 'unwed girl' in 7a may have prompted the inclusion of the bizarre anecdote in 9ab. As Ge's reff. for ab show, the shunned son of a maiden, the blind man, and the lame man are mentioned together in II.13.12, 15.7, I.112.8; also IV.30.16, 19. So, however ill-assorted, this is a set. The unfortunate son of an *agrū́* is also mentioned in nearby IV.30.16, though there he is only shunned, not eaten by ants.

On *ukhachíd-* see Scar (131).

Unfortunately I have nothing further to say about the sense of this vs. I have toyed with the possibility that there's a ritual reference here, to the taking out of the offering fire from the householder's fire and its removal to the east. But, though there might be rough correspondence -- very rough -- between the first and third parts, the middle part with the blind man and the snake doesn't work at all, as far as I can see.

IV.19.10: Contra the standard tr. and interpr., I take *āha* as 1st sg. This is the summary vs. of the hymn (with vs. 11 simply the Vāmadeva Indra refrain), and in such vss. the poet often speaks in his own person or that of the group, referring to the hymn that has just been recited. This vs. entirely fits that pattern. I also interpr. the enclitic *te* not only as a genitive with the deeds, but also as a dative with the part. *vidúṣe*, identifying Indra as the knowing audience. (And who better than Indra to know his own deeds?)

āvidvā́n is one of the few forms of √*vid* 'know' cmpded with the preverb *ā́* in the RV. It does not seem to have a clear nuance.

IV.20 Indra

The midsection of this hymn (vss. 5–8) has a surprising concentration of *-tar-* stem nominals, both root- and suffix-accented.

IV.20.1: Note the patterned phonological repetition *dūrā́d … āsā́d … yāsad*, with the 1st two morphologically parallel (ablative sg.) and the last not (subjunctive, 3rd sg.).

To make the tr. clearer, "our" should be inserted before "help." Otherwise it sounds as if Indra needs to find help for himself.

IV.20.2: Again, "our" should be inserted before "help."

IV.20.3: As Ge suggests, the imagery in the first hemistich seems to come from chariot racing. Pāda b is identical to V.31.11d (save for the ps. of the verb), a verse concerned with the chariot contest between Indra and the Sun. Putting smthg in front must simply refer to placing it in the lead, but in a ritual context like this one, there is interference between that sense and the ritual action of placing the offering fire to the east, also expressed by *purás √dhā* and regularly represented by the epithet of Agni *puróhita-*. But since Indra is never the agent of that ritual action and since it is the fire, not the sacrifice, that is put in front ritually, the chariot race interpr. must be primary here. In saying this, I find myself in disagreement with Bloomfield, who says "The repeated pāda fits well in 4.20.3, is dubious in 5.31.11," without commenting on either the fit or the dubiousness.

The Engl. phrase "gain our intention" is somewhat awk. What *saniṣyasi krátuṃ naḥ* means, I think, is that Indra's action of putting the sacrifice in front will cause him to win the race, which is what we want to happen. But objects of the root *√san* are usually concrete (*vā́jam*, etc., as in *vā́jasātau* in 2d; cf. also *sanáye dhānānām* "to gain the stakes" in the next pāda) and also things that the grammatical subject desires to win, so my suggested indirect benefit is somewhat anomalous. So it is possible that "our *krátu*" that Indra will win is something he wants -- perhaps our intention or resolve to sacrifice to him, not to other gods.

IV.20.4: The verb *pā́(ḥ)* opening the 2nd half-vs. should also be read with (or supplied with) pāda b. Ge supplies "sei" for the first hemistich and construes the gen. phrase in b with *upāké*. This is possible but, given the parallelism of the two genitive phrases referring to soma in b and c, less likely.

Ge and WG take *pr̥ṣṭhyà-* lit. 'related to the back' as an adjective of (superior) quality in a spatial metaphor -- the sense of "top" in Cole Porter's "You're the top" or the adj. "tip-top." Cf. WG's "am erstklassigen Soma-Spross." I think rather that the adj. is meant literally to refer to the soma plant's well-known growing place, the back of the mountains (that is, the high slopes). Cf., e.g., V.36.2 *rúhat sómo ná párvatasya pr̥ṣṭhé* "as the soma-plant grows on the back of the mountain."

IV.20.5: In my opinion, the first half-vs. consists of two separate similes, the second of which, *sr̥ṇyo ná jétā*, needs to be fleshed out. In the first one Indra with his abundant seers is like a tree with ripe fruit (*vr̥kṣó ná pakváḥ*). In the second Indra the

winner/conquerer is like a man who *harvests* the fruit with a sickle -- or more likely who harvests grain, the crop having subtly changed, with the *pakvá-* 'ripened' held constant. Cf. X.101.3 *nédīya út sṛṇyàḥ pakvám éyāt* "the ripe (grain) should come even closer to our sickles." For ripe grain see I.66.3 *yávo ná pakvó jétā jánānām* "Ripe like grain, a conquerer of peoples," which also contains *jétar-*, though in my view in an independent syntagm.

The simile in the 2nd half-vs. is striking because it casts Indra as a maiden (*yóṣām*), pursued by the poet as a dashing and virile young man (*márya-*, a word sometimes applied to Indra) -- a notable gender reversal.

This vs. contains one of the few finite forms of the secondary root √*rapś* 'teem, abound', and 2c has an occurrence of the better-attested related possessive adj. *virapśín-*. In the currently favored etym. the "root" √*rapś* was extracted ultimately from the nominal *virapśá-* 'abundance' (the basis for *virapśín-*), itself constructed from a dvandva of *vīrá-* 'men' and *paśú-* 'beasts' (see EWA s.v. *virapśá-*). It's important to note, however, that this etym. is soundly rejected by Kü (417–18), though I still favor it. The two forms of the thematic pres. *rapśa-* (IV.45.1, X.113.2) are both immediately preceded by the preverb *ví*, which (by most lights) has been secondarily extracted from the cmpd. Our perfect form here, *rarapśé*, is also construed with *ví*, but with *yáḥ* intervening, and the other pf. form (VI.18.12) lacks *ví* but appears with *prá* in distant tmesis.

IV.20.6: The publ. tr. reflects the emendation of *vájraṃ* to **vrajáṃ*, in concert with Gr, Ge, Schmidt (B+I, 137), Lub, and, after some resistance, Old. The resulting phrase *ādartā *vrajám* has a close parallel in VI.66.8 *vrajáṃ dártā*, as Ge points out. Ge takes **vrajám* as part of the simile and supplies Vala as the object in the frame: "… erbricht wie einen festen Pferch (den Vala)…" But the position of the simile marker *ná* speaks against this. I instead take **vrajám* as a reference to Vala, with the simile portraying the attack of a wild beast (*bhīmáḥ*) on a real pen (thus effectively reading **vrajám* twice and separating *bhīmáḥ* from Indra). For *bhīmá-* as a wild beast see *mṛgó ná bhīmáḥ* (I.154.2, 190.3), *siṃhó ná bhīmáḥ* (IV.16.4 [nearby], IX.97.28), etc. In their tr. WG keep the transmitted text and tr. "Der Furchtbare ist der die Keule Stiebende (in den) … prallen (Pferch) …," thus silently incorporating a **vrajám* in the final parenthesis ("Pferch"). I am also not certain what the VP "die Keule stieben" would mean nor how (*ā́*) √*dṛ* can mean 'stieben'. They acknowledge the generally accepted emendation in their notes. Although I do not see an easy way to avoid this emendation, I do not know how the corruption could have arisen, esp. given *vrajám apavartāsi* in 8b.

IV.20.7: The rel. prn. *yásya* of the first hemistich serves as a modulation pivot from the 3rd ps. of vs. 6 to the direct 2nd ps. address to Indra of 7cd.

On *udvāvṛṣāṇáḥ* see comm. ad VIII.61.7, where I reject the Neisser / Gotō / Kü positing of a 2nd root √*varṣ* 'sich ermannen, etc.' and assign it to √*varṣ* 'rain', with the specialized meaning 'boil up and over', as an expression of irrespressible

energy. This image would work nicely here with the pen "overflowing with goods" (*vásunā nyṛ̀ṣtam*) in the preceding vs. (6d).

IV.20.8: For brief and unilluminating comments on *śikṣānará-* see comm. ad I.53.2. Here I prefer to read the loc *samithéṣu* with it rather than with what follows.

The root noun cmpd. *prahā́-* is discussed with care and insight by Scar (698–700). The cmpd. is found in X.42.9 in a clear gambling context. Of the various proposals Scar makes, I find most satisfying the one in which *prahā́-* is the stakes/pool/kitty 'left out in front'. The possessive adj. here would then mean 'having the jackpot' and would fit with the gambling imagery in 3d *śvaghnī́va … sanáye dhánānām* "like (a gambler) with the best throw to gain the stakes." (Scar, however, takes our particular passage in a different and, to me, unconvincing direction, p. 700.) The standard interpr. is 'take the lead' (e.g., Ge "den Vorsprung gewinnend") in a race, but I'm not sure how this meaning would develop from 'leave' and 'forth'.

IV.20.9: Pāda a is a definitional one, with the precise type of ability (*śácī-*) possessed by Indra giving him the designation 'most able' (*śáciṣṭha*).

Ge interprets *múhu kā́ cid* as haplologie for **muhukā́ kā́ cid* (so also EWA s.v. *múhur*, WG, and, somewhat differently, Old flg. Ludwig). Cf. nearby IV.16.17 *kásmiñ cid … muhuké* (also *muhukaíḥ* IV.17.12). I have come, somewhat reluctantly, to the conclusion that this is correct. However, as disc. ad IV.16.17, I do not accept Ge's rendering of *muhuká-* as 'Schlachtgeschrei', which produces for this passage "… jedwedes Schlachtgeschrei hervorruft." WG's "… welches plötzlichen Vorfälle auch immer erledigt" is, however, more plausible. In IV.16.17 I suggest a sense 'skirmish', which works contextually there, but is here, I think, too specific. In fact, the published tr., "does everything instantly," can stand, for a literal Engl. "does every instantaneous thing."

The lexeme *ví √ci* means literally 'pull apart'; an exactly parallel usage to this one appears in VI.67.8 *yuváṃ dāśúṣe ví cayiṣṭam áṃhaḥ* (also cited by Ge), and the notion of pulling apart / opening up a narrow place (*áṃhaḥ*) is very apposite. It should also be noted, however, that the same lexeme is used in gambling contexts, indeed in the very X.42.9 just cited for *prahā́vant-* in 8c. In gambling it means 'pile apart, pull out (a good hand)'. Although I don't think that idiomatic sense is reflected here, I do think that the gambling overtones would resonate with the other gambling vocabulary in this hymn.

IV.20.10: I do not understand the function of the initial *prá* in b. Gr indicates that it belongs with *dā́tave*, and Keydana (Infinitive, p. 255) explicitly says that it must belong with *dā́tave* and is therefore in tmesis. Though this is not impossible, I am somewhat reluctant to accept this explanation in part because *prá* is relatively rare with *√dā*. I wonder if it signals the lexeme *prá √as* 'be present, be prominent', with the copula gapped. Fortunately, the interpr. chosen has almost no effect on the sense of the pāda.

IV.21 Indra

IV.21.1: As indicated in the publ. tr., this vs. bears some resemblance to the first vs. of the preceding hymn: our first pāda *ā́ yātu índró 'vasa úpa naḥ* more or less lexically matches IV.20.1ab *ā́ na índro … ávase yāsat*. See also vs. 3 below.

The second hemistich is syntactically problematic; see Old's extensive n. The problem is that both nom. sg. *vāvṛdhānáḥ* and the gen. sg. rel. prn. *yásya* appear to refer to Indra. Ge interprets *yásya* as a reflexive rel. (see n. 1c): "der erstarkt seine vielen Kräfte," but not only am I not aware of other reflexive uses of the relative, but this tr. requires that the med. participle *vāvṛdhāná-* be transitive, which it is usually not (though, to be fair, a reflexive transitive would probably require middle voice). Although the publ. tr. is syntactically trickier (by cutting the pāda into two syntactic pieces), it avoids both problems by taking the participle as a separate clause ("when he has grown strong") and the antecedent to *yásya* in a rel. clause that begins with *táviṣīḥ*. In this interpr. *táviṣīḥ … pūrvī́ḥ* is nom., not acc. The relative also has domain over the clause in d, with *yásya* limiting *kṣatrám*, which is taken as a nom., not acc. as in most tr. Ge's "wie der Himmel seine überlegene Herrschaft entfalten möge" also violates the standard construction of similes, by making the simile clausal, with the verb *púṣyāt* in the simile seeming to correspond to the participle *vāvṛdhānáḥ* in the frame. (WG's tr. of d avoids this problem; their rendering is quite similar to the publ. tr.)

IV.21.2: The *nṝ́n* in pāda b is problematic. It appears to be an acc. pl., and in fact is an acc. in the same phrase *tuvirā́dhaso nṝ́n* in V.58.2 (referring to the Maruts). But here the undoubted gen. sg. *tuvidyumnásya* immediately preceding (and morphologically parallel to *tuvirā́dhasaḥ*) invites a gen. sg. reading also of ambiguous *tuvirā́dhasaḥ*. This in turn presents us with several choices: 1) to take *nṝ́n* as a real gen. sg., 2) to assume that the last two words were borrowed from V.58.2 (or based on the formula found therein) and not adjusted morphologically, so that *nṝ́n* is functionally a gen. sg. but really an acc. pl., or 3) to detach *nṝ́n* syntactically from what precedes it. Old opts for option 2 (see disc. in ZDMG 55 [1901]: 745–47 = KlSch. 286–88). He assumes that since *tuvirā́dhasaḥ* can represent either acc. pl. or gen. sg., when the formula in V.58.2 was imported here, *nṝ́n* could come along for the ride, functioning as a gen. sg. though adopted from an acc. pl. environment. The third tack is taken by Ge, who takes *ṇṝ́n* as a complement of gen. sg. *tuvirā́dhasaḥ* ("des … gegen die Männer Freigebigen"), and by WG, somewhat differently. The latter take *nṝ́n* as a second obj. of *stavatha* (besides *vṛ́ṣṇyāni*), with the two genitives preceding it hanging off it and modifying Indra: "… seine stierhaften (Kräfte) sollt ihr hier preisen, (und) die Männer des …" (A fourth option, a variant of 3, would be possible: to take *tuvirā́dhaso nṝ́n* as the 2nd acc. obj., with only *tuvidyumnásya* a gen.) Presumably the "men" WG have in mind are the Maruts, who do appear with Indra in the very next vs. (*marútvān* 3c) and as just noted are the referents of the undoubted acc. phrase in V.58.2. As for option 1, without endorsing this solution I would point out that a variant of this might be possible. The expected gen. sg. to the root noun

*nṛ́-, based on comparison with Aves. *nərəš*, should be monosyllabic **núr* (like *pitúr*) (see AiG III.212), **nuḥ* in pausa. Clearly this brief and opaque form didn't stand much of a chance of preservation as such; but I wonder if, esp. in formulaic phrases like *tuvirā́dhaso *núḥ*, it wasn't substituted for by the acc. pl. *nṝ́n*, the only other (surviving) monosyllabic form in the paradigm, whose affiliation to *nṛ́-* was much clearer.

In d the verb *abhy ásti* 'overwhelms' picks up the nominal *abhíbhūti-* 'overwhelming(ness)' in 1d, with the substitution of √*as* for √*bhū*.

IV.21.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. also recalls the opening vs. of the preceding hymn. There the verb *ā́ … yāsat* 'he will drive here' is construed with two ablatives of place-from-which (near and far), plus *ávase* 'for help' + *naḥ*. Here *ā́ yātu*, also with *ávase naḥ*, is construed with no fewer than six ablatives of the same type, elaborating on the near/far contrast to provide a universe of choices.

On *púrīṣa-* see comm. ad I.163.1.

Ge (/WG) take *svàrṇara-* as a PN, but this interpr. does not fit the pattern of the vs., and moreover *svàrṇara-* as PN seems to be confined to Maṇḍala VIII. See Mayrhofer (PN, s.v.), who also sees the name only in VIII.

IV.21.4: Ge takes *gómatīṣu* as referring to a particular river basin and WG to "cow-rich (rivers)" -- the latter apparently flg. Gr's "rinderreicher Ort." But the mention of Indra's companion Vāyu here points to a ritual, not battlefield, victory, specifically the morning pressing when Indra and Vāyu receive the first oblations. There are two nouns that are regularly modified by *gómati-* in the fem. pl.: 'dawns' (*uṣā́saḥ*) and 'refreshments' (*íṣaḥ*). Either of them would work in this context. The publ. tr. supplies the latter, functioning as a loc. absol.: "when (refreshments) consisting of cows [that is, milk and butter] are at stake." *íṣ-* does not have an attested loc. pl., and if it did, it would not be pretty or easily recognized: **ikṣú*? *iṭṣú*? It would therefore not be surprising if such a form were gapped, with the final of the adj. (*-īṣu*) gesturing towards it phonologically. However, it is also possible that "at the cow-rich dawns" is meant, given that the ritual in question happens at that time. *uṣás-* also lacks an attested loc. pl., though we should probably expect **uṣátsu* (see my 1991 "Ox, Cart," 90–91). Again, gapping this awkward form would not be surprising.

IV.21.5: I take *ṛ́ñjasānā-* to be built to the anomalous 1st sg. middle *ṛ́ñjase* (for which see comm. ad IV.8.1), *pace* Jasanoff 2016 (etc.), based in part on the shared constr. *ṛ́ñjas-* GOD (acc.) HYMN (instr.) exemplified, e.g., by IV.8.1 *yájiṣṭham ṛ́ñjase girā́* "I aim towards the best sacrificer with a song" (cf. VI.15.1) and our *ṛ́ñjasānáḥ … ukthái*ḥ *… índram* "aiming straight at Indra with hymns." (In fact I would now favor slightly changing the text of the publ. tr. to "aiming straight with his hymns" rather than translating *ukthaíḥ* with the following pāda as in the publ. tr.) The creation and maintenance of the stem *ṛ́ñjasānā-* is supported by the other *-asānā-* secondary participles, on which see comm. ad IV.3.6.

IV.21.6–8: As discussed in the publ. intro., the next few vss. are very challenging; they have received multiple interpretations, which can't be discussed in detail here. The vss. form a unity based on their shared vocab. (e.g., *góhe* 6b, 7c, 8c; *auśijásya* 6b, 7c), their shared syntactic formulae (*yád *ī* 6a, *yád īm* 7a, 7c, and *yád ī* 8d), and their shared metrical irregularity.

IV.21.6: As indicated in the intro., I think vs. 6 simultaneously depicts the gods' approach to the ritual ground and the Aṅgirases' journey to the Vala cave. The rock (*ádri-*) to which they hasten is the pressing stone in the case of the gods and the Vala cave in the case of the Aṅgirases.

In pāda a I interpret *yádi* as *yád *ī*, parallel to *yád īm* in 7a and 7c and *yád*(#)*ī* in 8d. For this phenomenon, see my 2002 "RVic sīm and īm." With Ge I take *ádrim* as the goal of *saraṇyắn* rather than construing it with *sádantaḥ*, allowing the latter participle to be construed with the loc. *góhe* (a stem found only here, in the three vss. 6–8).

For *dhiṣā́* see comm. ad I.173.8 as well as I.3.2. The denom. *dhiṣaṇyá-* is found only here; I take it as 'seeking a holy place', derived from *dhiṣáṇā* 'holy place', on which see comm. ad I.3.2.

Note the phonetic echoes in *dhiṣā́ ya(di) dhiṣaṇyán(taḥ) (sar)aṇyắn*.

As indicated in the publ. intro. I take *auśijá-*, the vṛddhi deriv. of *uśíj-* 'priest, fire priest', as referring to the collectivity of these priests (see also V.41.5). It seems to be parallel to / contrastive with the vṛddhi deriv. in the next pāda, *pāstyá-*, found only here, 'belonging to the dwelling place'. In my interpr. the *duróṣāḥ hótā* is Agni, and *pāstyá-* refers to the collectivity that he belongs to or represents, that of the household.

On the problematic *duróṣāḥ* (here apparently an *-s-*stem, as opposed to the thematic stem found in the two other occurrences), see comm. ad VIII.1.13.

IV.21.7: Another very opaque vs. The only thing we have to hold onto is structure: the X-*ā yád īm* of pādas a and c recalls X-*ā́ yád *ī* of 6a, and notice X *yád dhi(yé)* in pāda d. The whole vs. is a subordinate clause (or series of them), continued by 8ab, with the main clause in 8c -- and a final *yád(#)ī* clause rounding out the sequence in 8d.

As indicated in the publ. tr., I think vs. 7 depicts the bursting into flames of the ritual fire, whose difficult kindling was (possibly) treated in 6cd. This bursting into flames is expressed by *śúṣmaḥ* 'explosive force' in 7b. The gen. *bhārvarásya vṛ́ṣṇaḥ* 'devouring bull' refers to Agni, in this interpr.; the only two forms to the (pseudo-)root √*bharv* 'devour' have Agni as their subj. (I.143.5, VI.6.2). In the publ. tr. I also tentatively took Agni as the referent of *īm*, but I now think that the *īm* in pāda a refers to the praiser in b, while the *īm* in c refers to the Aṅgirases. (Remember that number is neutralized in *īm.*) The point is that the *śúṣma-* of the kindled fire accompanies each of these in order to allow the desired outcomes expresed in pāda b and d to occur -- the singer to receive his reward and the Aṅgirases to cause the cows to come out of the Vala cave. (I am tempted to tr. a version of "may the force be with

you.") So I would modify the tr. to "When … the force … accompanies him [=singer], for the singer to take his reward; when it accompanies them [=Aṅgirases] to the secret place [=Vala cave], … for (the cows) to go forth …" In d I take the three datives *(prá) dhiyé (prá) áyase mádāya* not as triply parallel, but make the first and last further complements to *áyase* 'to go forth'. The two *prá*'s would in some sense structure these two parallel goal expressions: "to go <forth to insight>, <forth to exhilaration>."

Needless to say, it is impossible to be certain about this interpr., but at least it hangs together.

IV.21.8: Note the play in the pāda-initial sequences: *ví yád* (a), *vidád* (c), *yádī v*(…) (d).

As noted in the publ. intro., this last vs. of this obscure three-vs. group is the clearest indication of a Vala-myth subtext in the triad and thus serves as a species of poetic repair. As just noted ad vs. 7, the syntactic construction continues from vs. 7 and therefore indicates that the verses should be interpreted within the same conceptual framework. The vs. contains clear Vala vocabulary (esp. *vidát*) but leaves both subject and objects unexpressed, therefore allowing the double reading that I also suggested for vss. 6 and 7, namely that of the Vala myth and of the current ritual.

Although the reference is clearer in this vs., the grammar is another matter. The major problem lies in the two parallel verbs *vṛṇvé* and *jinvé*. Both appear to be 1st sg. middle presents to the stems 5th cl. *vṛṇóti, vṛṇuté** and 1st cl. *jínvati*, *-te* respectively (so Gr, e.g.). However, Whitney and Macdonell group *jinvé* instead with the marginally attested 5th cl. pres. (RV 1x *jinóṣi* 'bring to life' V.84.1), which would account better for the accent -- and a 5th cl. pres. must of course ultimately underlie thematized *jínvati* (see Gotō, 1st Kl., 76). But 1st singulars do not fit the context at all, nor really do presents. Old tr. them both as 3rd sg. preterites ("er … enthüllte … belebte …") with, frustratingly, no comment. In this interpr. he seems to be following (or at least in agreement with) Sāy., and the publ. tr. reflects the same analysis, though with a historical present interpr. because of the apparent primary ending *-é*. Ge and WG take them as reflexive (Ge) / passive (WG), with neut. pl. subjects *várāṃsi … jávāṃsi* (e.g., Ge "Wenn sich die Breiten des Berges auftun," etc.). Like Old, Ge keeps silent about the grammar, but WG identify the two verbs as 3rd sg. statives construed with the neut. pl. as subject. I am torn. On the one hand, it is difficult to wring a standard 3rd sg. of the type I want from the forms in the text. On the other, I am very dubious about the existence of the "stative" -- and even if this had been a separate grammatical category in the prehistory of Vedic, I doubt that it would have surfaced in just these two nonce forms in a single passage. Moreover, there is nothing semantically or functionally "stative" about either of these verbs, "open up" / "quicken," either in isolation or in this passage; note that even in the passive the WG tr. are overtly eventive: "… aufgeschlossen werden … belebt werden." I also think that the mythic model found in the passage is against a reflexive or passive interpr. In the other standard depictions of the Vala myth, the opening of the mountain and the flowing out of cows/waters/dawns are not events

that happens spontaneously; the god Indra (/Bṛhaspati) or the Aṅgirases cause these actions. The 3rd sg. *vidát* 'he found' of 8c, a signature verb in the Vala myth, shows the typical pattern of expression in this myth. I therefore, uncomfortably, stand by the 3rd sg. transitive interpr. of these verbs, without being able to account for their form. They do belong to a little morphological pattern in 5th class presents, where 3rd sg. *-é* is not uncommon: cf. *śṛṇvé, sunvé, hinvé*. But unfortunately all three of the just cited forms are passive, and, in my reading, *vṛṇvé* and *jinvé* are not.

The neut. pl. *várāṃsi* in pāda a I take as a pun. The stem *váras-* definitely means 'wide space' and is of course related to *urú*. However, as the object of √*vṛ* 'enclose' (+ *ví* = 'unenclose, open') and coming so soon after *saṃváraṇeṣu* (6d) 'in the enclosures', it is not difficult to imagine that it could temporarily acquire a secondary association with √*vṛ* -- hence my double tr. "opens out the … enclosures into wide spaces."

I supply 'cows' as the first obj. of *vidát* on the basis of the use of this verb with obj. *gā́ḥ* in the Vala myth elsewhere (e.g., I.62.3=X.68.1, II.19.3; note also the bovine vocab. *gaurásya gavayáya* in the rest of the pāda), but in keeping with my double reading of this whole passage also supply 'goods' as the desired discovery in the ritual context.

The *sudhyáḥ* 'those of good insight' are probably, with WG, the Aṅgirases in the Vala myth, but I would add that this word would also identify the poets/priests at the ritual, in the double reading of this triad of verses that I favor.

IV.21.9: It is with considerable relief that we return to Indra.

In c I tr. *kā́ te níṣattiḥ* -- lit. "What is this sitting down of yours?" -- more idiomatically, to convey the exasperation of the singer.

The sequence *kím u nó …, kíṃ nód-ud u* …is playful and, probably for that reason, somewhat difficult to parse. The *nó* in the first part of the phrase appears in the Pp. as *no iti.* Although normally a final *-o* of this type, generally found on the end of function words, represents *-ā/a* plus the particle *u* (see Klein, Part. *u*, 168–78), Klein specifically lists this passage (168 n. 3) as a case where the presence of *u* is unlikely because "the syntactic environments within which *u* is found do not appear." It is easy to see why he came to that judgment, esp. because there's an *u* almost immediately preceding it and the 2nd *u* would come very late in the syntactic complex. However, it is difficult to see what else to make of it, and the almost mirror image in the next pāda, where there's a coalescence of *ná* + *úd* into *nód* and an even later *u* following the complex of *kím* NEG PREV, suggests that the poet is having a bit of fun with *u*. Given the colloquial tone of this hemistich, we may also be seeing a looser deployment of particles and "little" words characteristic of ordinary speech. (And who can resist the lilt of *nód-ud u*?) The multiplication of *u*'s is completed by a form of the notorious *-tavā́ u* infinitive at the end of d.

IV.21.10: This last vs. before the refrain shows some ring-composition with the beginning of the hymn: *samrā́ṭ* (a) and *krátvā* (c) respond to *krátuḥ ... samrā́ṭ* in 2c.

In pāda a *satyáḥ* 'real, really here' may signal Indra's epiphany at the sacrifice.

IV.22 Indra

Hoffmann treats and translates the first four vss. of this hymn (Injunk. 186–88) as an ex. of "die erwähnende Beschreibung eines präteritalen Tatbestandes" associated with the general description of a god. He notes the unclear boundaries between past and present in such contexts.

IV.22.1: This vs. propounds a novel version of divine-human interaction: it suggests that what a god wants from us -- the verbal and material offerings we make to him at the sacrifice -- he actually arranges to have available there. There seems no other way to read the *ā́ √kṛ* 'make (to be) here, bring here' in b (… *karat … ā́*). This model almost reduces the human role to being middlemen in a loop connecting the god with himself, in contrast to the usual reciprocal model in which each side (divine / human) makes its own contribution.

In d *éti* appears to be used as an auxiliary with the participle *bíbhrat* (so also Hoffmann, with ref. to Delbrück, AiS 390), though Ge seems to take it as a full lexical verb ("… tragend auszieht"). Engl. "goes on X-ing" captures both the literal sense and the auxiliary function of the verb here.

IV.22.2: The hapax *vṛ́ṣandhi-* has been variously explained. Old rejects the reading as "sinnlos" and suggests an emendation to **tríṣandhi-*, remarking that the vajra is so described in AV XI.10.3, 27. The influence of preceding *vṛ́ṣā* would account for the change. Hoffmann (MSS 8 [1956]: 15 = Aufs. II.395–96) instead suggests it is a haplology of *vṛ́ṣa-saṃdhi-* 'mit starker Verbindung', which in his view describes the binding of the head of the vajra, which he thinks was a hammer-like weapon, to the shaft. One of the unexamined assumptions of both Old's and Hoffmann's interpretations is that the weapon referred to here is the vajra and that this is identical to the stone (*áśman-*)in 1d. As I argue ad I.152.2 (see comm. thereon), there is no reason to assume here that the stone = vajra or that the unnamed weapon in 2a is identical to both. A form of *vájra-* is found in 3c, but it need not be the same as the weapon(s) referred to in 1d and 2a -- and in fact some reason to believe it is not, as the weapon here is being 'hurled' (*ásyan*), and to my knowledge the vajra is never thrown while stones regularly are (e.g., I.172.2). In my opinion the weapon in 2a is the stone of 1d and the qualifier *vṛ́ṣandhi-* is a formation like *iṣu-dhí-* 'repository of arrows, quiver', *uda-dhí-* 'repository of water, spring, basin', *utsa-dhí-* 'fountainhead', hence 'repository of bullish(ness)'. The difference in accent can be attributed to the influence of immediately preceding *vṛ́ṣā*. The combining form *vṛ́ṣan-* rather than more common *vṛ́ṣa-* is also found in *vṛ́ṣaṇvant-* and *vṛ́ṣaṇ-vasu-*.

The anomalous med. them. participle *uṣámāna-* 'clothing oneself', as if to an otherwise unattested 6th cl. pres. to *√vas* 'wear', belongs with the other unexpected med. participles (both them. and athem.) to *√vaś* 'be eager' and *√vas* 'wear' found in this Indra cycle. See disc. ad IV.16.14 and IV.19.4 and cf. *uśānā́-* in the next hymn (IV.23.1).

The second hemistich is best interpreted in the context of V.52.9, a Marut hymn, where the Maruts *páruṣṇyām, ū́rṇā vasata* "clothe themselves in the wool [=foam] in the Paruṣṇī (River)." Note that in that passage *páruṣṇyām* and *ū́rṇā* are in different cases and numbers (fem. loc. sg. and fem. acc. pl. respectively) unlike here, where both are fem. acc. sg. Their grammatical difference in V.52.9, which imposes a semantic separation, makes it less likely here that *páruṣṇīm* is simply an adj. modifying *ū́rṇām*, as Hoffmann (/WG) take it: "in shaggy wool" (KH: "in zottige (?) Wolle"; WG "in struppige Wolle"). Since *páruṣṇī-* is simply the fem. to *paruṣá-*, which is otherwise a color term ('gray'), the introduction of 'shaggy' would also be puzzling. I therefore essentially follow Ge's interpr. He takes *páruṣṇīm … ū́rṇām* as an unmarked simile: "in the Paruṣṇī (River) (like) wool"; I take it rather as a metaphor: "in the Paruṣṇī 'wool' [=foam]." The color gray enters this image in two ways. On the one hand, it's quite possible that the Paruṣṇī River was so called because it appeared gray; on the other, river foam in general is gray-ish (and tufty, like wool), as google images of river foam show (unfortunately mostly of polluted rivers).

The unexpressed connection with the Maruts via the passage just cited is also expressed in pāda d through *sakhyā́ya* 'for partnership', where the partners must be the Maruts.

The word *párvan-* usually refers to a joint or segment; with Ge, I take it in this image to refer to tufts or articulated hunks of foam, like tufts of wool. With Ge I also think there's a secondary word association between *páruṣṇī-* and *párvan-* (/ *páru(ṣ)*).

IV.22.3: In the publ. tr. I take the whole vs. as a single sentence, with ab a relative clause to the main cl. in cd. Ge (Hoffmann/WG) take b as the main clause to the rel. cl. in a and take cd separately. This is entirely possible; there is no grammatical marking to determine the structure, since b lacks a finite verb. Since b is a repeated pāda (VI.32.4b), it might indeed be better to take it as an independent unit and follow the Ge interpr.

The distraction of #*dyā́m ... bhū́ma*# in d is paralleled by 4b #*dyaúr ... kṣā́ḥ*#.

IV.22.4: As just noted, polarized #*dyaúr ... kṣā́ḥ*# in b match the same (conceptual) pair in the same positions in 3d. Here in 4b the disjunction is emphasized by the fact that the two nominatives are subjects of a singular verb (*rejata*). The connection of the 3d and 4b is signaled by the fact that the same root provides the verb in both 3d and 4b: trans.-cause. *rejayat* and intrans. *rejata* respectively (both injunctives), and heaven and earth switch grammatical identity and function from object to subject.

Pāda a sits somewhat uncomfortably between these two complementary pādas. The river banks and beds seem rather paltry natural features next to heaven and earth, which flank them. But they may serve a grammatical purpose: both NPs (*víśvā ródhāṃsi* [neut. pl.] and *pravátaḥ … pūrvī́ḥ* [fem. pl.]) are neutral as to case (nom. vs. acc.) and can thus serve as a pivot, available as both acc. objects for *rejayat* in 3d and nom. subjects for *rejata* in 4b. (Of course, although the neuter pl. could be the subject

of a sg. verb, technically speaking a feminine pl. should not, but this does not seem a problem to me, as the neut. pl. leads the conjoined NP and would set the tone -- and they are pretty distant from the verb anyway.)

Pāda c produces problems on several fronts. Who are the mother and father (*mātárā*)? (Old flatly announces he has no intention of trying to find out.) Why is the verb (*bhárati*) accented? Why are there two instances of *ā́*? What is the cow (*góḥ*) doing grammatically and/or conceptually? The only word that is not problematic (though see below) is *śuṣmī́*, which must refer to Indra, as in 1b. I do not have entirely satisfactory answers to the puzzles. Probably the default referent for *mātárā* would be Heaven and Earth, and they have figured prominently just previously. But there is the problem that Heaven and Earth are not particularly mobile, so how is it that Indra "brings them here"?

As for the accent on *bhárati*, Ge suggests that pāda c is dependent on either ab or c, without overt subordination. Old (ZDMG 60 [1906]: 725–26 = KlSch 200-201) places it in the class of "priorischer Nebensatz" (to the main cl. in pāda d), but c doesn't seem to provide sufficient grounding for d to justify the verbal accent. Hoffmann (Injunk. 187 n. 147) cites Old's own citation of himself (given above), but also what is the more likely explanation, given by Old in the same art. (708–12, esp. 711 = KlSch. 186): that it is implicitly antithetical, participating in two interlocked constructions, what Old (711 = 186) designates pavpα (that is, PREV [x-word] VERB PREV [corresponding ́x-word]) -- with, in our passage, *ā́* as the PREV, *mā́tárā … góḥ* as x and ́x, and *bhárati* as accented VERB. In his exx. nothing intervenes between VERB and the repeated PREV, unlike *śuṣmī́* here, but I consider this a minor variant in the model. Perhaps more problematic is that *mātárā* and *góḥ* do not correspond grammatically, but again I would prefer to work with a more flexible model (and see below). In this model the accent on the verb and the doubled *ā́* fit under the same explanatory rubric, a desirable situation, all things being equal. (Such an explanation is blocked for Ge, who thinks the two *ā́*'s have different functions, the first preverb, the second preposition.)

But what about the cow? One might note that there's a similarly pāda-final *góḥ* in 8d as well as another quite baffling one in the next hymn, IV.23.6. I also wonder if this pile-up of pāda-final *góḥ* is not a sly reference to the impenetrable pāda-final *góhe* in the previous hymn (IV.21.6b, 7c, 8c), which caused so many interpretational difficulties there (though they are not etymologically related, at least by our current understanding of *góhe*). But this doesn't help us at all with the meaning or the function of *góḥ* here. The first thing to consider is what case it is -- gen. or abl. Ge opts for the latter: Indra brings the two mothers *from* the cow ("von dem Rinde"), though in n. 4c he also entertains the possibility of an ellipsis of a nominative with a dependent genitive *góḥ*, "(son) of the cow," namely the bull Indra. As far as I can tell, WG also take it as an abl., but construed with *ā́* in the sense of "all the way to" (a marginal, but certainly attested, construction in the RV). There is nothing impossible about either of these interpr., but I do not see what they would mean in context, and neither Ge nor WG give much help in that regard. For me the most appealing attempt to wring sense from this is Hoffmann's (Injunk. 187). As in

Ge's alternative, Hoffmann takes *góḥ* as a gen. in an elliptical expression, but with the gapped item a second object to *bhárati*: "Herbei bringt der Kraftschnaubende (seine) Eltern, herbei (das) der Kuh." This makes good sense of the structure of the pāda (fitting better with Old's pavpα scheme, since α would now be grammatically parallel to a). So what is the "das" in Hoffmann's tr.? He suggests 'milk' or similar, though not with a great deal of conviction. The publ. tr. supplies 'milk' as a possible metaphor for 'rain', and given the roaring winds of pāda d, I think rain is quite likely the gapped object, since 'cow' can be used of rain-bearing clouds. It also now occurs to me that it might instead be the Maruts ("[those] of the cow"), since they are the sons of the cow Pṛśni, as noted, e.g., in V.52.16, the same hymn that has the Paruṣṇī River foam passage cited above (vs. 2). The Maruts would also fit with the violent roaring of the wind in d.

IV.22.5–6: These vss. summarizing Indra's great deeds begin identically: *tā́ tú te* [*ta* in sandhi before vowel in 6]. The vss. appear at the exact center of the hymn and thus may count as an omphalos. Although both pādas have Indra's deeds as subject, neither has a word for 'deed'.

IV.22.6: The b pāda contains one of the RV's beloved gender-bending paradoxes, with the cows coming out "from the udder of a bull" (*vṛ́ṣṇa ū́dhnaḥ*). Ge (/WG) interprets this as rainwater coming from the sky (Parjanya or Heaven). I think it more likely that it concerns the Vala myth. Indra's other signature deed, the slaying of Vṛtra, was treated in the immediately preceding, paired verse (5d), and so we might expect mention of his other most prominent feat. In that case the "bull" would be the Vala cave. On the other hand, this might continue the treatment of the Vṛtra myth in 5d (as Ge also suggests, n. 6b), in which case the "bull" would be Vṛtra himself or the mountain in which the waters were confined. The more thorough treatment of the waters in the Vṛtra myth in the following vs. 7 might support this view.

IV.22.6–7: Another responsion: 6c *ádhā ha* / 7a *átrā́ha*. Later in the pāda 7a *tā́ u* recalls the openings of 5a and 6a *tā́ tú*.

IV.22.7: Most tr. take *stavanta* as passive, and this seems the correct interpr. The sisters are likely the rivers or waters released after the killing of Vṛtra. The question is why they would be praised as well as Indra. Ge's suggestion (n. 7ab) is that it is essentially a spill-over effect (not that he uses that term), that Indra's praiseworthy deed that brought the waters release also brought them praise by association.

I don't understand the double *ánu* (pādas c and d), though my surmise is that the first one simply anticipates the second, which is in a semi-fixed expression *dīrghā́m ánu prásitim* (cf. X.40.10). Gr takes it as part of a preverb complex with √*muc*: *ánu prá* √*muc* 'nacheinander loslassen', and its position might support that assumption. But surely one of points in the Vṛtra myth is that the rivers burst out dramatically all at once. Ge, by contrast, compares the identical sequence *yát sīm ánu*

in I.37.9, I.141.9, but those two passages seem unconnected with ours, with the *ánu* construed with preceding *sīm* "following them." (One can also compare IV.38.3 *yáṃ sīm ánu*, but this has yet a different sense.)

IV.22.8: *asmadryàk* opening 8c ushers in the suite of pāda-initial emphatic forms of the 1st pl. pronoun that lasts and intensifies through the real end of the hymn, vs. 10 (vs. 11 being the Vāmadeva Indra refrain): 8c: *asmadryàk,* 9a *asmé*, 9c *asmábhyam*, 10a *asmā́kam*, 10b *asmábhyam*, 10c *asmábhyam*, 10d *asmā́kam*.

Kü (310) interpr. *pipīḷé* as presential, but there is in fact no way to tell: this is not only the only perfect form to this root attested anywhere but the only verb form to it in the RV (*pīḍayati* is added in the AV). I think it works better as an immediate past, although there is in practice little difference between my "has been squeezed" and Kü's "ausgepresst ist."

Ge, flg. Sāy., takes *mádyaḥ* with *āṃśúḥ* and explains the position of *ná* as "wie oft in Pādaausgang vor dem Vergleich." But there seems no reason to ignore the usual structure of the simile, since *mádyaḥ* easily modifies *síndhuḥ*.

The syntax of bc is somewhat unusual, in that the subject / verb construction is split over the hemistich boundary (b … *śaktíḥ*# c … *yamyāḥ*#), while the object *tvā* is in Wackernagel's position in pāda b. Moreover, at least in the publ. tr. the genitive that limits the subj. *śaktíḥ* is only found in the next pāda: *śuśucānásya*. Ge (/WG) take the gen. *śaśamānásya* in b as dependent on *śaktíḥ*, with *śámī* an instr. adjunct to that participle: "the skill of the one laboring with labor" -- in contrast to the publ. tr., where *śaśamānásya* is dependent on *śámī*. I now think that the Ge interpr. may be preferable and would emend the publ. tr. to "Might the skill of the one laboring with labor (and) of the bright-blazing one pull …" The question is whether the two genitives are coreferential, with bright-blazing Agni identified as the one laboring with labor, or whether a (human) priest and Agni are both referred to. I do not think this can be determined, esp. since subjects of √*śam* include both Agni and mortals.

The simile in d and the frame in bc have slightly different senses. In the simile the swift horse is pulling on the reins: it is so eager to reach its goal that it strains against the reins rather than being guided by them. In the frame the *śaktíḥ* of the priest/god is strong enough to pull Indra to us. The difference in the relation of the accusative to the verb results from exploiting different senses of the root √*yam*.

Despite Old's expressed disbelief, I think Gr and Ludwig are correct in taking *góḥ* 'of the cow' to refer to reins made of leather. On pāda-final *góh* see also disc. ad vs. 4c.

IV.22.9: Ge tr. *nṛmṇā́ni* as 'Mannestaten', which works well as an object of √*kṛ* (though parallel *sáhāṃsi* 'powers' does not). But *nṛmṇá-* ordinarily refers not to deeds but to the abstract powers associated with manliness that allow such deeds to be performed. Hence my 'activate' for *kṛṇuhi*.

IV.23 Indra

Thieme tr. and comments on this hymn in Gedichte (pp. 30–33).

IV.23.1: Ge (/WG) take pāda b as a complete clause, supplying a main verb ('kommt' Ge, 'geht' WG). They then take the 2nd hemistich as a syntactically independent declarative sentence. Given the density of questions in the first 6 vss. of this hymn, I think a declarative sentence would be intrusive and therefore take bcd as part of the question begun with *kásya* in pāda a, with *vavakṣé* in d as the main verb for the whole.

On soma as an udder, see III.48.3 cited by both Old and Ge.

Note the close proximity of *juṣāṇáḥ* (b) and *juṣámāṇaḥ* (c). The latter is the only occurrence of this participle stem, while *juṣāṇá-* is of course quite common. I don't see any semantic nuance that would justify using two different stems here. I wonder if *juṣámāṇa-* is a nonce to create a Behagel effect with the three near-rhyming and semantically similar stems: *juṣāṇó … uśānó juṣámāṇo*. It should also be evaluated in the context of the other anomalous and phonologically similar middle participles in this Indra cycle, including *uṣāná-* (IV.16.14), *uśámāna-* (IV.19.4), *uṣámāna-* (IV.22.2), and our own middle term *uṣānáḥ*. (For disc. see esp. comm. ad IV.16.14.) Though *uṣāná-* is attested twice elsewhere, it is still problematic: though there is a root pres. to √*vaś* 'be eager' with a zero-grade *uś*, the stem is otherwise only act. and the act. part. *uśánt-* is extremely well attested (see., e.g., the next hymns, IV.24.6b, 25.1b).

Ge is adamant that the two verse-final datives *śucaté dhánāya* are not to be construed together. In principle I think they belong together. Of 6 occurrences of *dhánāya* (always pāda-final), 2 are preceded by *mahaté* (I.104.7, IX.97.4), which modifies it. I am just somewhat uncertain what it refers. Although √*śuc* is generally an Agni root, and cf. *śuśucāná-* in the immediately preceding hymn, probably of Agni (IV.22.8), I think that referent is unlikely here. *dhána-* refers to the stakes in play or a prize or spoils, in this case presumably something Indra wants enough to exert himself for it. The verse has made abundantly clear what Indra wants most -- soma (*sómam* b, *ándhaḥ* c) -- and I think it likely that soma is the referent here as well. A deriv. of √*śuc*, the adj. *śúci-*, is regularly used of a type of soma (clear, as opposed to mixed), and the participle here may be expressing the same thing. I would therefore slightly emend the tr. to "for the gleaming stakes [=soma]."

IV.23.2: In b Ge (/WG) and Thieme (Gedichte 31) take the instr. *sumatíbhiḥ* as the object of *sám ānaṃśa* (e.g., Ge "Wer wurde seiner Gnaden teilhaft?"), but this seems an unlikely use of the instr., even with the presence of the preverb *sám* -- esp. because the verb in b is essentially identical to the verb in a, *āpa*, which takes the acc. Although Gr allows both acc. and instr. with *sám* √*naś* in the sense 'erlangen', a careful perusal of the entry shows that this is the only instance with a supposed instr.; the others have the acc. I therefore supply the same obj. found in pāda a (*sadhamādam*) and take *sumatíbhiḥ* in normal instr. usage.

The second hemistich contains two occurrences of *kád*; the second is taken by all as simply a question marker, but Ge interprets the first one as a full neut. with *citrám*, "welches Wunder?" This is possible, but it seems rhetorically better to take it

as parallel in function to the other *kád* (so Th and WG as well as me). I supply 'course' on the basis of II.34.10 *citráṃ tád vo maruto yāma cekite* "This bright course of yours, Maruts, appears ever more brightly," also adduced by Ge. The notion of a journey is reinforced by the 2nd part of the hemistich. However, a tr. like WG "Ist sein Glanzzeichen bemerkt?" is certainly possible.

IV.23.3: Gr, Ge, et al. take *hūyámānam* to refer to the call or summons to Indra (e.g., Ge "Wie hört Indra den Ruf?"). Kulikov (*-ya*-presents, 307–8) rejects this interpr., noting that this is the only instance of such a construction: normally the subject of the passive is the deity being invoked. Although he reluctantly admits that it might correspond to the rare transitive type in which what is spoken is the object of the verb (1.17.9), he prefers to derive this form from √*hu* 'pour' and translates "How does Indra hear the (libation) being offered?" -- that is, the sound of the pouring. A different reconsideration is found in WG, who interpr. *hūyámāna-* in the standard way, as having the deity invoked as its subject -- but they think Indra is listening to the summons to a *different* deity than Indra. Although I recognize that the standard interpr. may have glided too swiftly over the problems with *hūyámāna-*, the two revisionist versions both seem overelaborate and implausible to me. Since it is undeniable that forms of √*hū* do sometimes take what is spoken as obj. (see the above-cited I.17.9), I think we must allow this rare usage in the passive as well, a point made very economically by Old. My tr. follows that of Thieme (p. 31) "Wie hört Indra den [Ruf], der gerufen wird?"

In b *ávasām* is taken by all modern comm. and tr. as the gen. pl. of *ávas-* 'help' that it appears to be. Although this gen. pl. is not otherwise attested (the only pl. cases are nom./acc. and instr.), *ávasām* is what the gen. pl. of this stem would be. Moreover, it can easily be the complement of *veda*, which takes both acc. and gen. Nonetheless I favor Gr's interpr., that it is the acc. sg. of a root noun cmpd from *áva* √*sā* 'unhitch'. There is a major obvious stumbling block: the accent. Root noun cmpds are invariably accented on the final, so we expect **avasā́m*. However, the other putative ex. of this cmpd at III.53.20 has been mangled in transmission (see disc. by Scar s.v. and comm. ad loc.), and I think it likely that the dominance of the 'help' stem, which is remarkably well attested, led to a redactional change in accent. One of the reasons I favor this solution has to do with the *asya*. In the 'help' interpr., the *asya* would refer to the mortal who will receive this help (see Ge n. 3b), but this hymn contains a lot of *asya*'s, and they all otherwise refer to Indra: 2a, 2b, 2c, 3c, 5c, 6c, plus *enam* 3d and *asmin* 5d. I very much doubt the poet would break this sequence with a pronoun referring to someone else. The only exception is *asyā́(ḥ)* 5a, which is both accented and feminine, and is playing a trick by its patterning with the *asya* in 5c.

For *úpamāti-* from *úpa* √*mā* 'mete out', see comm. ad VIII.40.9.

IV.23.4: I take *dī́dhyānaḥ* as parallel to *śaśamānáḥ*, referring to the verbal/mental work at the sacrifice as opposed to the physical -- hence my tr. 'produced insights'. Other tr. seem to me to attenuate the semantics.

IV.23.5–6: The root √*juṣ* encountered in two different forms in 1bc recurs here in the perfect, subjunctive (4d) and indicative (5b).

IV.23.5: As noted above, fem. *asyā́(ḥ)* patterns with the ubiquitous *asya* in this vs.: 5a *kathā́ kád asyā́* / 5c *kathā́ kád asya*.

IV.23.6: *ā́d* is very rarely not in 1st position. Here the interrog. *kím* may have displaced it. See *kím ā́d* at IV.30.7, as Ge also notes, as well as … *kuvíd ā́d* I.33.1.

Ge (/WG) take the referent of *te* to be Indra (Ge: "Wann dürfen wir wohl von deiner Brüderschaft öffentlich sprechen?"). I very much doubt that. As I noted in the publ. intro., Indra is always referred to in the 3rd ps. in this hymn, except in the final extra-hymnic Vāmadeva refrain (vs. 11), and the thwarting of the poet's longing for intimacy by the distancing that the insistent 3rd ps. pattern imposes is in many ways the point of the hymn. I think it unlikely that the poet would introduce the intimate 2nd ps. reference through a single monosyllabic enclitic and then revert, in the next pāda, to the 3rd ps. *asya*. This leaves me with the problem of identifying an alternative referent for *te*. My assumption is that it is the poet speaking to himself, while the "we" represents the collectivity of the ritual officiants. Alternatively, it is possible that *te* does refer to Indra and that this pāda represents a wistful wishful thinking about an intimacy not otherwise achieved -- with its 1st ps. / 2nd ps. structure (the only place where a 1st ps. shows up in the hymn, save for the refrain -- though see comm. on pāda d) and the particularly intimate relationship 'brotherhood' (*bhrātrám*) that is aimed at

The second hemistich is problematic, primarily because of the form *iṣa* (Pp. *iṣe*) in d. (Ge characterizes it as "das zu den schwierigen Formen des ṚV. gehört"), a problem compounded by the fact that its first syllable should, ideally, be heavy in this Triṣṭubh cadence. Before tackling it, we should consider the structure of the two pādas. With Old and WG, but not Ge, I take c and d separately, with c a nominal clause equating *sárgāḥ* 'surges' with *vápuḥ* 'marvel'. In my view the surges consist of soma: *sárga-* is regularly used of soma in Maṇḍala IX. Again with Old and WG, but not Ge, I take *sudṛ́śaḥ* as nom. pl. with *sárgāḥ*, not gen. sg. -- with *śriyé* construed with this adj.; cf. V.44.2 *śriyé sudṛ́śīḥ.* As for d, Old interprets *iṣe* as a 1st sg. "setze ich … in Bewegung," with *svàr ṇá citrátamam*, standing for the surges in c, as its object. WG likewise take *iṣe* as a 1st sg. (aor. injunctive), but with the meaning 'ich suche', with the same obj. as Old. By contrast I take it as a 3rd sg. (so also Ge, it seems) and in fact would emend it (slightly) to **īṣe* (an asterisk should be inserted in the publ. tr.), belonging to the perfect to the root given as √*eṣ* 'suchen' (etc.) by Kü (126–28). As was just noted, a heavy initial syllable would better fit the cadence; my one concern is that I do not understand why the short *i* was introduced. Though he does not include our form in his conspectus, Kü does list two other 3rd sg. med. occurrences of this shape (*īṣé* X.89.3 and, with unclear root syllable, *upeṣé* I.129.8). He considers the pf. as resultative, and it is possible that my 'seeks' should be changed to 'has sought'. However, neither of the other examples (I.129.8, X.89.3)

needs to be preterial, and so 'seeks' may as well stay. What Indra is seeking is, in my view, the milk to be mixed with the soma. It is characterized as "very bright like the sun," and its source as 'of/from the cow' (*góḥ* or *ā́ góḥ*) (*ā́* may go with either **īṣe* or *góḥ*). The slight disadvantage to my interpr. is that the two occurrences of *ā́ góḥ* here and in the preceding hymn (IV.22.3) are construed differently, but given the convoluted structure in IV.22.3, that is probably unavoidable.

IV.23.7-10: The contrast between the 'lie' (pāda-initial *drúh-* 7a) and *ṛtá-* (10 pāda-initial and 2 pāda-medial exx. in vss. 8–10) certainly underlines and cements the sense 'truth' for this word. Note also that *ṛṇā́* 'debts', which opens the 2nd hemistich of vs 7, phonologically anticipates the *ṛtá*'s to come.

IV.23.7: The tr. of *tétikte*, 'sharpens', may not seem to express its intensive semantics, but plain 'sharpen' itself incorporates the iterative, repetitive motions of blade across stone that sharpening involves.

Ge notes the similarity of *ṛṇā́ cid* to the root noun cmpd *ṛṇa-cít-* 'collector of debts' found in the strikingly similar phrase II.23.17 *sá ṛṇacíd ṛṇayā́(ḥ)*. But there are no grounds to emend the phrase to a compound, though a deliberate echo seems possible. In fact changing the text here would eliminate the obvious object to *babādhé*.

IV.23.8: Ge (/WG) take the deaf ears to be those of Āyu -- with Āyu referring to the Ārya in general, WG suggest. Āyu always poses difficulties, but in this case I think gen. *āyóḥ* should be construed with *ślókaḥ*: the "signal call of Āyu," referring to Agni and the sound of blazing fire. Elsewhere Agni is referred to as the "laud of Āyu" (*śáṃsa- āyóḥ*, IV.6.11, V.3.4), and this seems a similar expression referring to an audible product. The nom. participles *budhānáḥ śucámānaḥ* 'awakening, blazing' of course fit Agni very well. And it is not surprising, given his ritual role, that the sound of Agni should be considered to be identical to that of truth. As for the position of *āyóḥ*, at some distance from *ślókaḥ*, note that it rhymes with *ā́ góḥ* in 6d, likewise stationed at the end of the verse.

IV.23.9: The tr. of *dīrgham* as extent of space, rather than Ge's extent of time ("lange Zeit"), follows Thieme (p. 32): the nourishments as oblations go from earth to heaven, as rain from heaven to earth.

On irregular full-grade 3rd pl. *viveśuḥ* see Kü (499-500).

IV.24 Indra

IV.24.3: Most depictions of battle in the RV do not frame the risks of entering into battle quite so starkly. Here both *ririkvā́ṃsas tanvàḥ* "having given up their bodies" in b and *tyāgám … ágman* "have come to the abandonment (of their bodies, presumably)" in c seem to refer to a sort of resignation in the face of death and a loss of the sense of self. (Note that this is the only occurrence of *tyā́ga-*in the RV.) It is

esp. telling that they give up their own bodies to gain offspring and a long line of descendents. For the similarity between this passage and the Tānūnaptra ritual, see Proferes (58).

IV.24.4–5: The pile-up of pāda-initial *ā́d íd* 'just then, just after that', beginning with 4d and marking every pāda in 5, conveys the quick succession of events, but switches abruptly from battlefield to sacrifice. The *néme* constructions of 4d and 5a make it clear, however, that despite the change in venue the same antagonists are in play. Note also the similarity of the predicates of the two *néme* constructions: *indrayante … indriyáṃ yajante*. This is the only occurrence of the denom. *indraya-* in the RV and it may have been created to serve as a foil for the second VP.

IV.24.4: The 'winning of the flood' (*árṇasātau*) presumably refers, as Ge, etc., point out, to the battle to control water resources, esp. dwelling places near water.

Most tr. give a more neutral rendering of *ávavṛtranta*, but my "have rolled together" is meant to convey the deeply entwined, rough-and-tumble quality of pitched battle (and, perhaps, the actual rolling of chariots onto the battlefield).

IV.24.5: The bridge between 4d and 5a has already been noted, as well as the change of scene. However, I think the competition visible in vss. 3–4, as well as in vss. 6–7, continues here by other, sacrificial, means. To get Indra on their side in battle, the men must perform not only a correct sacrifice, but a better sacrifice. One puzzling feature of this vs. is the presence of pf. optatives in pādas b and c. As I have discussed elsewhere (2008 "Women's Language in the RV" [Ged. Elizarenkova], 2009 "Where Are All the Optatives" [*East and West*]), the pf. opt. has a curious distribution and, to some extent, a particular sociolinguistic profile, and it is not clear what *riricyāt* (b) and *ví papṛcyāt* (c) are doing sandwiched between a pres. (*yajante*, a) and a presential perfect (*jujoṣa*, d), esp. because the four pādas are otherwise unified by the opening *ā́d íd*. What sets bc off from a,d is the fact that the subjects in b and c are ritual offerings, *paktíḥ* 'cooked food' and *sómaḥ* respectively, as opposed to the personal subjects (at least in my interpr.) of a and d. What optative function do these verbs express (and do they express the same): necessity ('should'), potentiality, more certain ('would') or less certain ('might'), possibility ('could'), or desire (also 'would')?

My surmise is that the vs. depicts the beginning and end points of the successful sacrifice that one of the groups of competitors mounts. Pāda a contains a general description of the sacrifice and implies its start. In d the unnamed subject, in my opinion Indra, shows that the sacrifice has been successful by enjoying the offered soma (the bull, *vṛṣabhám*). The pādas in between describe the qualities of the better sacrifice that our side performs, in contrast to our opponents, and I interpr. the optatives as expressing near-certain possibility. I therefore take *riricyāt* in b as meaning 'would leave behind, succeed' not in a temporal sense (the cooked food is the next course after the offering cake) but in an evaluative one: cooked food is just better than a *puroḷāś-*. (This seems generally agreed by interpr.; see esp. Ge's n. 5b.)

(Note however that the *puroḷāś-* was probably not eliminated, but supplemented, since the successful sacrificer not only cooks cooked food for Indra in 7b but also roasts grains.)

Even more important is the mere presence of soma in c. The pāda implies that the other side consists of non-pressers (*ásuṣvīn*), who therefore cannot offer soma to Indra. Soma is our trump card and leaves our competitors out in the cold, as it were. (Notice that the non-pressers contrast with the *súṣvi-* in 2d. For *súṣvi-/ásuṣvi-* as well as *paktí*, see also the next hymn IV.25.6–7.)

My tr. of d differs in an important way from Ge (/WG). They take *yájadhyai* as an infinitive complement to *jujoṣa* with *vṛṣabhám* as object, though with two different interpretations. Ge's "dann beliebt man einen Stier zu opfern" (so also Keydana, Inf., p. 289, with disc.) assumes that the *vṛṣabhá-* is a sacrificed animal. WG correctly point out that √*yaj* does not take an acc. of the offering but of the god who receives the offering and therefore take *vṛṣabhá-* as referring to Indra. The subj. in either case must be an unidentified priest or the like. In my view, by contrast, Indra is the unnamed subj., who receives pleasure from the 'bull' soma -- note that *vṛṣabhá-* is an epithet of soma, as well as of Indra and other gods. The *yájadhyai* is a purpose inf. without object, as it generally is (cf., nearby IV.21.5 *íyarti vā̆caṃ janáyan yájadhyai* "(who) raises his speech, giving birth to it in order to carry out the sacrifice").

As Old notes, there are 3 forms of √*ric* in this hymn, all pf.: pf. part. *ririkvāṃsaḥ* (3b), pf. opt. *riricyāt* here, and a plupf. (probably) *arirecīt* (9c). They are all somewhat marked in form and have different contextual meanings. Old remarks "der Dichter liebte dies Verb." Certainly he seems to be making a point with it.

IV.24.6–7: The battle/sacrifice trajectory of vss. 4–5 is wrapped up in vss. 6–7, where it is made clear (esp. in 6d) that if you want Indra's help on the battlefield, you had better perform a good sacrifice, not stinting on the soma.

IV.24.6: The "wide space" theme returns from 2d. The laconic expression of the recipient of wide space in 2d (the dat. *súṣvaye* 'for the presser') is expanded into a dat. pronoun with rel. clause attached: *asmai … yá itthéndrāya sómam uśaté sunóti*. Since the first part of this hymn ends with vs. 7, vss. 2 and 6 are symmetrical and this echo forms a small internal ring. But there are no other signs of ring composition.

The tradition (and modern ed. and tr.) is split on whether to read *ávivenam* (HvN, Müller ed., Sāy., Lub, and AiG I.1.333) or *ávivenan* (Auf. ed., Pp, Gr, Ol, and Ge); see Old's disc.

Quite apart from the actual form is its referent. Old, who accepts the *ávivenan* reading, takes c with d and identifies Indra as the referent of *ávivenan*. Although this fits better with the similar expression in the next hymn (IV.25.3) where gods are (or may be) the subject, here I think Ge is correct that c belongs grammatically with the rel. cl. in ab, and the referent of *ávivenan* is the soma presser subject of that rel. cl. This nominative is resumed by the appropriate correlative prn. *tám* in the acc. in d.

IV.24.7: The *śúṣma-* that Indra confers on the sacrificer is the 'explosive force' that will help him (both Indra and the mortal aided by him) prevail in battle.

IV.24.8–10: For my interpr. of these vss., see publ. intro.

IV.24.8: Both Ge and Old suggest that *ŕ́ghāvā* should be read as neut. **ŕ́ghāvad* on the basis of similar (but not identical) X.27.3 *yadā́vā́khyat samáraṇam ŕ́ghāvad*. This seems unnec., since nom. sg. *ŕ́ghāvā* makes fine sense, and, as anyone who has tangled with it knows, X.27 is a very strange hymn. The only factor in favor of the emendation is the fact that *ŕ́ghāvā* is the only representative of the *-van-*stem *ŕ́ghāvan-*; otherwise we find the *-vant-*stem *ŕ́ghāvant-* (3x). But *-van-* and *-vant-* stems coexist elsewhere -- cf. *maghávan(t)-* -- and eliminating the *-van-*stem here doesn't seem sufficient reason to make the emendation. (Note that WG do not follow Ge and Old, and Ge allows for the possibility of the nom. in his n. 8a.)

Ge suggests that the subjects of a and b might be Indra's wife. Scar (616 and n. 882) has her as the subj. of b but not a. After surveying the various possibilities in his n. he says, with remarkable understatement, "Das Dramolett lässt Raum für verschiedene Interpretationen." I think it likely that Indra is the subj. of the first two pādas both because the word *pátnī* is only introduced in the 3rd pāda and because one wonders whether a woman would be in a position to survey the battlefield.

In d "whetted sharp by the soma pressers" (*níśitaṃ somasúbhiḥ*) continues the theme of the previous vss., that getting Indra on one's side in battle requires plying him with soma at the sacrifice.

IV.24.9: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. introduces the vocabulary of commerce, which is otherwise little represented in our texts (though see AVŚ III.15, called by Whitney "For success in trade") and therefore difficult to get a handle on. My interpr. differs on some important points from the standard (Old, Ge, WG, Kü [425]). In pāda a most interpr. take *kánīyaḥ* 'lesser' as referring to the price and *bhū́yasā* 'greater' as what is being bought. But price is always in the instr.: see in the next vs. 10ab *daśábhiḥ … dhenúbhiḥ*. Therefore, grammar requires us to conclude that, rather than complaining that the potential purchaser offered too little for that very valuable asset, Indra himself, Indra is protesting that the purchaser went for an inferior product (another god?) with too high an offer. In pādas b and c he further points out that the purchaser failed to take advantage of the chance to buy Indra (who therefore went away 'unsold' *ávikrītaḥ*) and to leave behind (/replace) the poor bargain he made in the first place.

As also indicated in the publ. intro., I take pāda d as an old saying encapsulating the wisdom of not wasting your money on a substandard item. The problem in this pāda is *vāṇám*, which ordinarily means 'voice, music' (see EWA s.v.). However, Ge tr. 'Handel' and suggests (n. 9d) that it is derived from *vaṇíj-* 'merchant', which seems very plausible. That it is otherwise unknown in this meaning would not be surprising, given the specialized lexical level it inhabits.

IV.24.10: The big question about this vs. is the identify of the speaker. The standard view is that it is the poet Vāmadeva, who is putting Indra on sale temporarily, with the requirement that he be returned after his obstacle-smashing is done. I find this unlikely. How did Indra come to be possessed by Vāmadeva (*imám … máméndram* "this Indra of mine")? Who is he hawking Indra to? Why has the scene changed from the domestic one of Indra and his wife to, presumably, the ritual ground? My own suggestion, albeit somewhat tentative, is that the speaker is Indra's wife. Who would have a better right to call him "this Indra of mine"? Moreover, there seems no good reason to introduce his wife as an emphatic actor in vs. 8 and then drop her out of the story. Since the three vss. seem unified in tone and theme, common sense suggests that they should take place in the same location with the same actors.

The standard tr. take c with d, e.g., Ge: "Wenn er die Feinde erschlagen hat, so soll er ihn mir zurückgeben." The problem with this is that it assumes an anterior, specifically future anterior, value "(will) have smashed" for the intensive subjunctive *jáṅghanat*. For this reason I attach it to ab. However, it may make more sense to allow the future anterior and make the *yadā* clause the prior condition for the return in pāda d. In this case the tr. would be "Who buys this Indra of mine with ten cows? When he [=Indra] will have smashed the obstacles, then will he [=buyer] return him [=Indra] to me?"

IV.25 Indra

IV.25.1: On the phraseology of c, see comm. ad IV.16.11. Though Ge (/WG) supply 'day' with *pāryāya* there seems no reason not to take it with the two immediately preceding datives.

Pāda d contains two functionally parallel expressions in two formally different guises: the loc. absol. *sámiddhe agnaú* "when his fire has been kindled" and the nom. bahuvrīhi *sutásomaḥ* "possessing pressed soma / he whose soma has been pressed." A parallel bahuvrīhi to the first expression is also attested: *iddhāgni-* (2x).

IV.25.2: The last part of d, *kaváye ká ūtī́*, is somewhat unclear. Ge, flg. Sāy., identifies the *kaví-* as Indra, but this seems unlikely. If *káḥ* refers to the mortal worshiper (as seems likely, given the referents of the preceding *káḥ*'s), he would not ordinarily be supplying help to Indra, and though Indra is sometimes called a *kaví-*, that is comparatively rare (though see the next hymn, IV.26.1) and not found in such a context. Other passages with *ūtī́* and an overt or covert form of the copula (vel sim.) generally have the god as subject. Cf. nearby IV.23.2 … *kád ūtī́, vṛdhé bhuvac chaśamānasya* ... "Will he be here with help for the strengthening of the one who has labored" (sim. IV.29.1, 4; 31.1), but as was just noted, changing the referent of *káḥ* in the middle of this insistent sequence (9 occurrences of *káḥ* in 3 vss.) is undesirable. My 'joins together' is an awkward attempt to avoid that.

IV.25.3: On *ávivenam* / *ávivenan* see comm. ad IV.24.6. Assuming the *-am* form is correct here, it would be an absolutive in *-am*. In IV.24.6 the same expression

mánasāvivenan/m qualified the mortal worshiper (acdg. to most -- see disc. there). Here it seems to qualify the gods. However, it is just possible that as an adverbial absolutive it could refer to the mortal worshiper, represented by *kásya*: "the pressed soma plant of which (mortal), never losing track in his mind, do …" The fact that until this sentence the mortal had appeared in the nom. *káḥ* could contribute to the somewhat mixed construction.

IV.25.5–6: For *suprāvî-/duṣprāvî-* see comm. ad I.34.4.

IV.25.6: See Old's disc. of *kévalā* as neut. pl., in agreement with Gr.

On *prāśu-*(/*śū-*) see comm ad VIII.31.6; 32.2, 16.

IV.26–27

These are the famous hymns devoted to the stealing of soma from heaven. Unfortunately they are very obscure in many details, esp. in IV.27. The myth and these hymns are treated in detail by U. Schneider, *Der Somaraub des Manu* (1971).

IV.26 Indra (1–3), Praise of the falcon (4–7) [=Soma-theft]

As indicated in the publ. intro., I believe the whole hymn is spoken by Indra, against the Anukramaṇī but with Ge (/WG).

IV.26.1: In this vs. Indra identifies himself with the three most resonant RVic words for poet: *ṛ́ṣi-*, *vípra-*, *kaví-*. I am not sure why. The named beings in the 2nd hemistich, Kutsa and Uśanā, belong in the same mythic complex, along with Indra; see in this Indra cycle IV.16.10-12. Kakṣīvant is one of the most accomplished RVic poets (I.116–26), and his collection immediately follows that attributed to Kutsa (I.101–15). But again I don't know why he claims identity with Kakṣīvant, esp. because only one hymn of Kakṣīvant's is even possibly dedicated to Indra (the maddening I.121). His desire to claim both Manu (first man) and the sun (most prominent heavenly body) is more understandable.

In c I take *ny ṛ̀ñje* not as a 1st sg. present but as the homophonous 1st sg. injunctive to the 6th cl. pres. *ṛ́ñjá-* and therefore as preterital.

IV.26.3: Atithigva is often associated with Kutsa, sometimes with both as enemies of Indra (I.53.10, VI.18.13, VIII.53.2), sometimes, as here, as his clients.

IV.26.4–7: The 3rd sg. act. impf./injunc. of √*bhṛ* is the "hero" of this, the mythological portion of the hymn: *bhárat* (4d, 5a), *bharat* (6c), *abharat* (7a).

IV.26.4: The first hemistich sounds like a formal eulogistic opening, though I don't know of any parallels elsewhere (quite possibly for want of looking).

IV.26.5: My interpr. depends on reading (as sometimes elsewhere) *yádi* ('if') as *yád *ī* ('when it'), despite the short *i* before a single consonant. It is possible that *yád *ī*

was changed redactionally, to match *yádi* in IV.27.3. A heavy syllable in fourth place in an opening of four is standard (see Arnold 182, 188), and in particular the sequence of four shorts in #(*bhárad) yádi | vír á(to)* seems quite unusual, while a long vowel before the caesura and preceding a break of two shorts is metrically more favorable -- though given the many metrical departures in this hymn (see, e.g., the next vs.), this is not a strong argument.

IV.26.6: Three of the four cadences in this verse are bad (b, c, d).

ṛjīpín- (2x) must be closely related to better-attested *ṛjipyá-* (6x), which also has Iranian cognates, e.g., Aves. *ərəzifiia-*. Werba bei EWA, s.v., suggests that it is a contamination with *ṛjīṣín-*, which seems a promising suggestion.

Goto (1st Kl, 171–72, flg. Wackernagel) argues that the thematic middle *dádate* is synchronicially distinct from √*dā* 'give' and means 'keep safe'. My 'hanging onto' represents a compromise between such a rendering and 'take', the standard sense of medial (*ā́*) √*dā* (see 7a *ādā́ya*).

IV.26.7: The obj. *mūrā́(ḥ)* is fem. and presumably matches the gender of the parallel object *árātīḥ* 'hostilities' in the preceding pāda.

IV.27 (323) Falcon (1-4), **Falcon or Indra** (5) **[=Soma theft]**

Note the periodic punctuation by *ádha* (1d, 3a, 4d, 5a) -- and some play with that word: *ádhi* 4b, *adhva...* 5c, *ándhah* 5b, maybe *adīyam* 1d; also the preponderance of *a*-init. preverbs, *ánu* 1a, *ápa* 2a, *abhí* 2b, *áva* 3a, 3c.

The perfect *jabhāra* is found in vss. 2 and 4 (cf. the pres. stem forms to √*bhṛ* in the preceding hymn, vss. 4–7). It thus frames the central vs. 3, which could then be an omphalos. That vs. is certainly confused enough to qualify and captures the crucial moment of the grabbing of soma. But since vs. 3 consists of a series of subordinate clauses whose main clause is found in vs. 4, it cannot be syntactically isolated into a free-standing omphalos.

IV.27.1: The major problem with this vs. is pāda d, with a nom. *śyenáḥ* and the 1st sg. *nír adīyam*. At first glance this seems to require that the speaker be the falcon, not Soma. The problem, and various previous suggested solutions, are discusssed at length by Old. He rejects an emendation to 3rd ps. **adīyat* (rightly in my view) and suggests instead that we must indeed take the speaker to be the falcon. In this he is followed by Ge (/WG). However, this makes problems with pāda c ("a hundred metal fortifications guarded me"), where the 1st ps. speaker should surely be Soma, whose release from captivity in heaven is the subject of the hymn, not the falcon, who flies freely around. Moreover, it seems unlikely that we would care about the long-standing knowledge that the falcon has (ab), whereas again Soma's knowledge is relevant. A somewhat ad hoc, but still satisfying (to me anyway) solution was suggested by Thieme (Gedichte, 41), who takes *ádha śyenáḥ* as an abrupt nominal clause -- "Then the falcon!" -- expressing the surprise advent of the bird in Soma's place of captivity. The 1st sg. verb can then have Soma, the speaker, as its subject.

IV.27.2: There is general agreement that Soma speaks this and the following vss.

I read *ápa* twice in pāda a -- first with *jabhāra* 'he carried away', but also with *jóṣam* 'against (my) will' (despite Old's rejection of the latter). This phrase would be constructed on the model of *ánu jóṣam* 'following my will'. That it was not against Soma's will is explained by the next pāda, where he boasts that he is stronger and braver than the falcon, implying that without Soma's agreement the falcon could not have borne him away. The standard tr. take *jóṣam* positively -- so that in conjunction with the neg. *ná* the whole is negative: "he did not willingly carry me away." In this reading it is the falcon's will or pleasure that is at issue (e.g., WG "Nicht hat der mich ja zu (seinem) Gefallan fortgebracht."). I don't understand what this would convey: that the falcon was forced on this mission by someone else? that once the falcon saw Soma, he didn't want to take him? Thieme **(ref.)** by contrast takes it as the guard's will ("mit Zustimmung [des Wächters]"), but we would surely need more signalling than the bare noun *jóṣam* to indicate that the *jóṣa-* belongs to a character we haven't met yet (presumably Kṛśānu of 3d). Moreover, it suggests, only to reject, a scenario involving a corrupt prison guard that seems to me out of place.

Pāda c is almost identical to 26.7, with the addition of the adv. *īrmā́* 'still, quiet' (on which see comm. ad VIII.22.4). It qualifies the left-behind *árātīḥ* 'hostilities'; cf. V.62.2 *īrmā́ tasthúṣīḥ* 'standing still', with the adv. limiting a fem. pl. participle. See Narten's sim. tr. (Kl Sch. 69).

Since *púraṃdhi-* is fem., and the nom. sg. *śū́śuvānaḥ* in d is masc., Puraṃdhi cannot be the subject there -- rather the falcon, as the standard interpr. agree.

IV.27.3: This is a difficult vs. to construe and to interpret. What we have to go on is the syntactic skeleton the poet has provided us: a triple *yád* construction, with *yád* in Wackernagel's position in the first three pādas, and in the fourth a nominative NP that serves as the subject of the clause introduced in c. The main cl. is then provided by 4ab (so, generally, Old, Ge, WG, Schneider).

Within this structure pādas a and cd are relatively straightforward internally; it is b that causes further problems, esp. in the sequence … *yád yádi vā́ta(ḥ)*. First, note the mirror-image phonology of the opening: *ví yád yádi v(…)*. Ge takes *yádi vā* simply as a strengthened 'or', and similarly Schneider (16 n. 35) states that *yádi vā* is simply equivalent to *vā*. The tr. of Ge and WG reflect this stripped-down interpr. of the sequence *yád yádi vā*, reducing that complex just to "oder als …" I find this exceedingly unlikely. The sequence is simply too tricky and too unprecedented to be a long-winded way of saying 'or', and anyway RVic poets do not resort to pleonastic expressions to fill out their pādas: 11 syllables is too tight a space as it is. I think we must give *yádi vā* its lexical weight "or if" and assume that the poet is introducing a bit of doubt about some details of the story. This doubt coincides with the switch from 3rd singular reference to the falcon to unidentified 3rd plural: "they carried" (*ūhúḥ*), and these are likely to be connected. The two almost identical statements about Puraṃdhi (26.7c and 27.2c) simply state that she "left behind" hostilities.

Neither says she was carried away, much less by whom -- so how Puraṃdhi departed remains unclear, and pāda b seems to be reminding us of that.

The similarity of *vā́ta(ḥ)* (Pp. *vā átaḥ*) to the word for 'wind', just met in *vā́tān* (2d), has been generally remarked on. Ge (n. 3b) tentatively suggests a haplology: *vā́to vā́tā(ḥ)*, that is, *vā átaḥ vā́tāḥ* 'or the winds from there (carried off Puraṃdhi).'' I see the temptation, but I think *vā́ta(ḥ)* is only a word play and does not conceal a form of 'wind'. Among other things, the winds in 2d were not carrying anything away; they were overtaken by the falcon, who was.

IV.27.4: The adj. *ṛjipyá-* = Aves. *ərəzifiia-* (and other Iranian forms). I favor the old notion that it contains a Caland form of 'straight' (*ṛjú-*, etc.) + **pt-ya-*, with a zero-gr. of √*pat* 'fly'. See EWA s.v., though Mayrhofer considers the etym. "unsicher." (The lack of *-iya-* readings, indicating that the root-final laryngeal was lost without leaving a trace, might be problematic, but *-iya-* and *-ya-* adjectives tend to become confused.) Scar. (318) suggests rather a derivation from √*pā*[3] 'go', but the existence of such a root is in question.

índrāvataḥ is most likely an acc. pl. and refers to the companions of Indra who will ritually prepare the soma for him to drink. However, the form has been much discussed and much emended (see Old's detailed disc. and Ge's n. 4a ["eine alte Crux"]). I understand the urge to emend --which for me stems less from any problems construing the transmitted form within the frame of the passage than with the ill-formed simile, *ná bhujyúm*, that ends the pāda. This clearly refers to the Aśvins' rescue of the hapless Bhujyu, whom they pull out of the sea and bring home (e.g., I.116.5 *yád aśvinā ūháthur bhujyúm ástam*). As the simile is constructed in our vs., the simile particle *ná* precedes the only word in the simile, though ordinarily *ná* follows the first word of the simile. Although Ge attributes this to what he considers a common transposition of X *ná* to *ná* X at the end of a verse line, this is not a phenomenon that I have regularly encountered. If we were to read du. **índrāvantā*, the adj. could identify the Aśvins (they are so called in I.116.21, the hymn just cited with Bhujyu), and we would have a fully formed simile: "as the two companions of Indra [=Aśvins] (did) Bhujyu." As Old discusses, this emendation has been suggested previously, both as is and via **índrāvantā+u*. Unfortunately I do not understand why such a form would have been corrupted, and I therefore stick with the transmitted text.

The expression *patatrí … parṇám* "winged feather" strikes me as odd -- it is generally birds that are winged, not their feathers. I therefore propose to read **patatrí(y)asya* 'of the winged one' rather than *patatrí asya*. (This actually requires no change to the Saṃhitā text.) Grammatically this is not difficult: *-(i)ya-* adjectives are made regularly to *-a-*stems, including *-trya-* to *-tra-*, like *mitríya/mítrya-* to *mitrá-*, which also has *mitrín-* beside it. There's a *pátatra-* 'wing', beside *patatrín-*, so there's no reason why not to have a *patatríya-*. Gen. *patatríyasya* then modifies *véḥ*. It is worth noting that a number of occurrences of *patatrín-* modify *ví-*.

IV.27.5: The first occurrence of *mádāya-* was omitted in the publ. tr., which should read "… Indra will aim it for drinking to exhilaration."

As noted in the publ. intro., *práti √dhā* is an idiom meaning 'aim (an arrow)', and the word play is surely meant here, given the immediately preceding vss. about Kṛśānu and his arrowshot.

IV.28 Indra, or Indra and Soma

IV.28.1: The construction in b -- *apáḥ … sasrútas kaḥ*, lit. "made the waters flowing," with an acc. pl. adjectival root-noun cmpd. modifying 'waters' -- is a little odd. In this type of periphrastic causative context with *√kṛ*, we expect a complement infinitive. In fact compare the completely parallel VII.21.3 *tvám indra srávitavā apás kaḥ*, with an infinitive built to the same root *√sru*. There is no obvious reason for the different constructions. Perhaps it anticipates the *akṛṇoḥ* NOUN-ACC ADJ-ACC constructions in 4cd, where there exist no alternative infinitive possibilities. (The publ. tr. "made the waters flow" rather than "… flowing" is meant to avoid an interpr. that Indra thawed or otherwise liquified something solid. It should, however, be "flow together," to represent the *sa-*.)

IV.28.2: Ge plausibly suggests that the "great deceit" is Śuṣṇa. See his cited parallels.

IV.28.3: My "house of no exit" is a somewhat loose way of rendering *durgé duroṇé* "house of difficult going." I think Ge is correct in interpreting this as the grave.

Note b #*purā* c #*purū*.

IV.28.4: On the construction with *akṛṇoḥ* see disc. ad vs. 1.

There is a slight syntactic clash between ablative *víśvasmāt*, appropriate to a comparative ("lower than all"), and the superlative *adhamā́n*, which should have a genitive ("lowest of all").

The dual verbs of cd (*ábādhethām ámṛṇatam … ávindethām*) must have Indra and Soma as subjects, as the larger context (vss. 1-2) and the explicit Vāyav Indraś ca construction in 5b show. But the immediate context (vs. 3) falsely suggests Indra and *Agni* on the basis of 3a.

IV.28.5: Note #*índraś ca* here and #*índraś ca(krám)* in 2b. Also, presumably we get a reverse Vāyav Indraś ca here (*índraś ca soma* rather than standard *soma índraś ca*, so that Indra can be pāda-initial, as in 1b, 2b.

There is clear (and fairly unusual) enjambement over the hemistich boundary: *… ūrvám áśvyaṃ góḥ / ádardṛtam*, with the obj. of the verb in c found in b. There is disagreement about the disposition of the rest of the 2nd hemistich. The publ. tr. takes *ápihitāny áśnā* as obj. of *riricáthuḥ*, with *tatṛdānā́* a dual pf. part. with acc. pl. *kṣā́ḥ* as its obj. As indicated in the publ. intr. I identify those things "covered over by the stone" to be the waters and cows that Indra released (in the Vṛtra and Vala myths respectively). This fits with the use of *ápihita-* in 1d. Ge also takes *ápihitāni* as obj.

of *riricáthuḥ*, but the last three words, *kṣā́ś cit tatṛdānā́* as a simile (marked by *cid*, which he considers a possible simile marker, and I don't). For him *tatṛdānā́* is passive and *kṣā́ḥ* is nom. sg. WG take *ápihitāni* as a second obj. of *ā́dardṛtam*. The obj. of *riricáthuḥ* is, for them, *kṣā́ḥ* (acc. pl.), which also serves as obj. of *tatṛdānā́*, which they consider dual and transitive, as I do. Their interpr. of cd follows that of Kü (216, 424), and it is certainly grammatically possible. However, I do not understand what it would mean to release the dwelling places (Kü) or the parts of the earth (WG) (e.g., WG "Ihr habt die Erdteile freigelassen"), whereas the release of the pent-up waters after drilling through the earth fits the Indra mythology perfectly.

The cadence of b is bad and would be improved by reading **tātṛdānā́*, as Arnold suggested and Old seems tentatively to accept.

IV.29 Indra

IV.29.1: I take *mandasānáḥ* in a prospective or purpose sense, like the caus. *mandayádhyai* in 3b, because Indra is surely not getting exhilarated while on his journey.

IV.29.2: The phrase *ábhīrur mányamānaḥ* is troublesome. The other three occurrences of *ábhīru-* all mean 'fearless', but "thinking himself fearless" is an odd thing to say about Indra. For one thing, he's such a mighty warrior that there seems no need to assert fearlessness about a creature for whom fear would be unthinkable (though recall his flight at the end of I.32, where he's compared to a "frightened falcon" [*śyenó ná bhītáḥ* I.32.14]). For another, X *mányate* (/*-yamāna-*) expressions almost always identify the content of the thought as being the wrong idea about oneself or someone else. But surely it's not that Indra *thinks* he's fearless but is actually terrified. For this reason I take this bahuvrīhi to mean 'not having -- that is, not producing -- fear' (in others). This is a sense that Gr allows ('nicht furchterregend'), though for a different passage. The point here would be that Indra is coming to the sacrifice to have a jolly soma drink-up with the pressers, thinking he's just a regular guy, not a terror-inspiring deity. Note that he "produces fearlessness" (*kárat … ábhayam*) for us in the next vs.

IV.29.3: I take *vājayádhyai* not to the denom. *vājayá-* 'seek prizes', but the primary *-áya-* formation *vājáya-* 'rouse'. It shows accent shift in the *-dhyai* infinitive, just as *mandayádhyai* does.

If we maintain the transmitted text, I do not know what to do with *prá* in b, apparently interrupting the expression *júṣṭām ánu … díśam* (though this interruption is mitigated by its immediately flg. the caesura). √*mand* does appear with *prá*, though not terribly often, so it might go with the infinitive. Or one can supply a verb of motion: "(he goes / send him) forth to make him reach exhilaration." Ge cites similar *pū́rvam ánu prá díśam* in I.95.3 and also suggests that an impv. parallel to *śrāváya* should be supplied. However, the most likely solution is that endorsed by Old: to read *pradíśam*, a reading already found in Gr.

IV.29.5: Ge (/WG) construe the part. *bhejānāsaḥ* one way or another with *syāma* (Ge: "… möchten wir … deines himmlischen Reichtums teilhaftig werden"). This is certainly possible. However since this leaves *te* in b somewhat orphaned and since "may we be yours" is a frequent sentiment (e.g., II.11.13), I have separated the participle from *syāma*, respecting the hemistich boundary.

IV.30 Indra

IV.30.2: Ge takes *víśvā* with *kṛṣṭáyaḥ*, but in this sandhi situation it would have to represent a corruption of *víśvāś*. See Old for disc. of this form. I take it as a neut. acc. pl.

IV.30.3: The neg. scope problem potentially posed by *víśve … ná* -- "all did not" vs. "not all did" -- can be easily solved. See my 1997 "Vedic anyá- 'another, the other': syntactic disambiguation," where I establish that the independent negative *ná* coocurs with *víśva-* only with the corporate entity *víśve devāḥ*, enforcing a meaning "all did not."

Reading **yūyudhuḥ* would provide a better cadence. Old tentatively endorses this.

The sense of pāda c is not entirely clear, but there are several factors that allow us to close in on the meaning. First, it seems to provide the reason why the gods did not fight Indra. Further, *ātiraḥ* recurs in vs. 7, and it seems unlikely that the two identical verbs would have substantially different meanings. Finally, as far as I can tell, all occurrences of *náktam* are temporal ('by night'); when poets want to refer to night as an entity or entities they use *rātrī-*, *aktú-*, or *kṣáp-*. (On *uṣāsā náktam* in VIII.27.2, see comm. ad loc.) Therefore tr. like Ge (/WG) that take *áhā náktam* as parallel objects (e.g., Ge "als du Tage und Nacht abgrenztest") cannot be correct. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think that this pāda concerns Indra's destabilization of time when he steals the Sun's wheel -- a myth that will be glancingly related in the next tṛca. What exactly is going on I don't know -- it sounds as if Indra fast-forwards or skips over days during the night, perhaps because the Sun can't make his normal daily circuit and therefore daytime is significantly abbreviated and no longer lasts as long as night?

IV.30.4–6: All three vss. of this tṛca begin with *yátra*. I take them all as subordinated to vs. 3. Ge [/WG] and Klein (DGRV I.432) take the main clause for all three vss. to be 6c, but Indra's help for Etaśa does not seem sufficiently significant to carry the whole tṛca. Ge (/WG) take all three *yátra* as 'where', not 'when', but what location they are thinking of I don't know.

I do not know what to do with the *utá*'s in *yátrotá* in 4 and 6, but assume they are there to indicate the additive nature of the sequence of subordinate clauses. Sim. Klein (DGRV I.431–32). It would be better if the first one was in vs. 5, not vs. 4.

IV.30.4: √*muṣ* takes a double acc.

IV.30.5: It seems curious that in vs. 3 it is emphatically stated that the All Gods did not fight Indra, and yet here he is fighting them -- in what I consider the same circumstances, namely the theft of the Sun's wheel. This problem clears up if we render both *yuyudhuḥ* in 3b and *áyudhyaḥ* in 5b as 'attack'. The gods were reluctant to attack him after he showed his power over time and the Sun, but he did not hang back in attacking them though he was alone.

IV.30.6: The Pp reads *prá āvaḥ*, which would make it a main clause verb and pāda c the resolution of the subordinated *yátra* clauses. This reading is followed by Ge (/WG) and Klein. My reasons for rejecting this interpr. were given above, and with Old I interpr. the ambig. *prāvaḥ* as *pra-āvaḥ*, a subordinated verb.

I do not understand what is going on in ab. Who is the mortal who benefits from Indra's deed -- perhaps Kutsa? And what action does *áriṇā(ḥ) … sū́ryam* describe. The root √*rī* means 'flow' (etc.), and the nasal pres. means 'let flow', but in certain contexts, often hostile, it can have the developed meaning 'dissolve' or 'let overflow'. I've tr. 'let slip' here, but without certainty. Does it mean 'let flow' -- that is, let the Sun continue on his way after the incident with the wheel? or is the sense more sinister: the Sun slips away from its usual path? The presence of the Sun's horse Etaśa doesn't help, as Indra gives aid to Etaśa even when he is attacking the sun.

IV.30.7–12: After a tṛca on stealing the Sun's wheel there follow two more on the related myth of Indra's crushing Dawn's cart. The myth is actually confined to vss. 8–11, with the two outer vss. semi-independent. WG (nn. to vss. 10, 11) suggest a radical interpr. of this sequence: that Uṣas here is the name of the female leader of a matriarchal tribe who opposed the territorial expansion of Vāmadeva's group. This seems reductive in the extreme, and since the Uṣas vss. immediately follow the treatment of the stealing of the Sun's wheel, a cosmic rather than local interpr. imposes itself. They must also explain why this local matron is called "daughter of Heaven" (*duhitáraṃ diváḥ*) twice (8d, 9a): acdg. to them, it is her boast, which the poet jeers at. The only advantage of this unlikely interpr. is that it accounts for the localization of her crushed cart at the Vipāś river (acdg. to WG, where she lived), but this doesn't seem sufficient.

IV.30.7: In c *átra* seems to correspond to the three *yátra*'s in the preceding tṛca. The point seems to be that even after all the energy Indra expended in his fight with the sun (and the gods), he still has a lot of *manyú-* left to apply in the Uṣas incident.

The repetition of *ā́tiraḥ* here was already noted ad vs. 3. Note the similarity of the pādas: 3c *(yád) áhā … ā́tiraḥ* / 7c *(átr)āha … ā́tiraḥ*; though *áhā* 'days' in 3 and the particle *áha* in 7 are unrelated, the echo is surely deliberate.

I supply "lying there" with Dānu, because in two of the four singular passages containing *dā́nu-* what the Dānu does is 'lie': I.32.9 *dā́nuḥ śaye*; II.12.11 *dā́nuṃ*

śáyānam. So, although 'overcame' is probably part of the semantics of *ắtiraḥ*, the lit. sense 'pass over' fits having the prostrate enemy as the object.

IV.30.8–21: These vss. are tr. by Hoffmann (Injunk., 184–86).

IV.30.8: The juxtaposition of *vīryám … paúṃsyam* "manly and masculine" with *stríyam* "woman" brings the gender polarization into sharp relief. There is certainly no sense that it's unseemly or unsporting to hit a girl!

IV.30.9: The voc. *indra* was omitted in the publ. tr., so "o Indra" should be inserted at the end.

IV.30.12: *vibālī́-* is almost universally taken as the name of (another) river, though the name (and indeed the word) shows up nowhere else. By contrast, in the first ed. of the dictionary (1872) MonWms. takes it as an adj. *vibālya-* "passed beyond a state of youth, in full vigor; swollen (said of a river)," though in the 2nd ed. (1899) it is simply the fem. river name *vibālī́-*. WG take it not as a toponym but with the sense 'mit breiter Öffnung'. An attributive adjective would certainly be preferable to an unlocatable placename. Although WG give no explan. of their interpr., it rests on earlier discussions, whose details can be recovered in EWA (s.v.). EWA considers it the name of a river (produced from the confluence of the Vipās and the Śutudrī), but derived from a word with the same (or similar) sense as WG ascribe to it: 'dessen Ufer weit auseinanderstehen', an early MIA word with *-bāra-* representing *pārá-* 'far shore'. See the lit. cited there.

IV.30.16: This son of the unwed maiden appears to be the same one who was being eaten by ants in IV.19.9 (in the same Indra cycle); see comm. there. These tantalizing snippets are all we know about the story.

IV.30.17: WG render *asnātắrā* as "ohne dass sie untertauchen," flg. Tichy (Nom.Ag. 107). It seems to me to be pushing the syntax to render a negated agent noun as a negative purpose clause, though it is also the case that we don't know much if anything about swimming in ancient India. **[but check how she does this]**

IV.30.19: The blind man and the lame one also figure in IV.19.9, along with the son of the unmarried woman; see vs. 16 above. The blind and the lame form a pair elsewhere in the RV, e.g., I.112.8; II.13.12, 15.7; VIII.79.3.

The infinitival phrase *ná … áṣṭave* is rendered in the publ. tr. "not to be equalled," though it lit. means "not to be reached/attained." The lit. tr. implies that no one can actually receive Indra's favor, but I think the point is rather that favor such as Indra's cannot be deployed by anyone else (that is, any other deity) -- hence the adjustment in the English. On this interpr, see Hoffmann (185). Ge supplies "with words" (i.e., "not to be obtained [with words]"), presumably meaning that no poet can describe the extent of Indra's favor.

IV.30.23: Note the rare future subjunctive *kariṣyă(ḥ)*, otherwise found only in corrupted form in I.165.9; see comm. there, as well as Old on our passage.

IV.30.24: The voc. *ādure* is a hapax, and there is no agreement about whether it is a PN or an attributive adj. and whether it is addressed to a deity (possibly Indra) or a human (possibly a patron). Nor does it seem likely that any definitive answers can be obtained, given the stark paucity of evidence. I have therefore tr. it as a PN as the line of least resistance, and I think it quite unlikely that it is addressed to Indra: would relatively low-level gods be giving things to Indra, and do gods ever receive, rather than give, *vāmá-*? I tentatively assume that it is the name of the/a patron. Although this vs. is not technically a dānastuti, it occupies the position in the hymn where a dānastuti would be found, with mention of the human patron, and in opening out to a range of (mostly minor) gods, the mention of a mortal would not be amiss.

On the hapax *kárūḷatī* see EWA s.v.

IV.31 Indra

According to Old the hymn is in tṛcas, but Ge asserts that it consists of 3 verse pairs and 3 tṛcas. Ge concedes that vss. 1–3 occur as a unit in SV, VS, and AV, but argues that the content and form of the verses speak for a different division: vss. 1-2 are questions, vss. 3-4 both begin with the same word, and vss. 5-6 concern the relation between Indra and Sūrya. After this verse, again on formal and thematic grounds, he considers the rest tṛcas. Despite these considerations, Old's view seems correct. That both 3 and 4 begin with *abhí* (used in two different senses) is scarcely remarkable; note the verbal concatenation between tṛcas in the next hymn, IV.32.3–4. Moreover, vs. 3 fits more comfortably with the preceding vss.: The question "with what help?" (*káyā … ūtī́*) posed in vs. 1 is answered in vs. 3 with the assertion that Indra will be our "helper with help" (*avitā́ … ūtíbhiḥ*), a satisfying finale to a tṛca. Vss. 5–6 do indeed involve Indra and Sūrya, but vs. 4 provides the lead-in to Indra's journey continued in vs. 5.

IV.31.5: In b I read *ā́hā* not *ā́ hā* (a change only in the Pp. not the Saṃhitā text), and analyze this sequence as *ā́* + *áhā*, the neut. pl. of 'day' (found also in IV.30.3 and 33.6; cf. also *viśváhā* in 12a below). This is one of only two supposed exx. of the particle *ha* with long vowel; the other one (V.41.7) also follows *ā́* and is susceptible to the same analysis. The *ā*-final version of *ha* is *ghā*, which shows Brugmann's Law and velar outcome before original **o*, acdg. to Mark Hale. Note that *ha* only once elsewhere occurs after the preverb *ā́* (VIII.9.18 *ā́ hāyám …*). (In fact an analysis *ā́hā́yám* "this one through the days here …" is also possible in VIII.9.18, though I did not so analyze it there.) By contrast *ghā* is found fairly commonly after *ā́* (I.30.8, I.48.5, etc.).

"Along the slope of your intentions" (*pravátā … krátūnām*) means that the journey to our sacrifice is an easy one because it is in accord with Indra's intentions. Why this should be like coming by foot (*padéva*) is not entirely clear: the journey is

so easy that it can be undertaken on foot? pleasant pedestrian rambles generally involve taking an easy downward path? Neither of these seems particular applicable to Indra's travels.

When *sácā* occurs with a loc., it generally lacks lexical value and simply signals a locative absolute -- as in the common expression *suté sácā* "when (the soma) is pressed." I think that is the intention here, in the phrase *sū́rye sácā*: it is a temporal expression, "when the sun (rises)"; cf. I.135.3 and comm. ad loc. I have here included a lexical tr. "in company with" because I think *sácā*, with lexical value, needs to be supplied or understood in the next vs., 6c, for which see disc. below. However, I would now be inclined simply to tr. here "I have taken my share at sun(rise)."

IV.31.6: The purport of this verse is something of a puzzle. I think the point is that the journey undertaken by Indra in vs. 4 has finally brought him here, with both his battle-lust and his equipment on full display, in order to drink soma with the ritualists (including the "I" of the speaker). Cf. nearby IV.29.2, where Indra presents himself in a non-intimidating way (or so he thinks) and "becomes exhilarated along with the heroes who have pressed the soma." Here his arrival is at sunrise, and "I" have a share in the soma along with Indra at that time. In order to make sense of 6c, we need to understand/supply *ábhakṣi* from 5c (as Ge [/WG] do also). Although Klein (DGRV II.129) thinks the two *ádha*'s in c have different functions, the pointed parallel structure of that short pāda -- *ádha* LOC *ádha* LOC -- makes that conclusion quite unlikely in its strong form -- though I think it is the case that the formal parallelism conceals a functional distinction (different from the one suggested by Klein). The question is how to construe the locatives, and it is here that the *sácā* in 5c comes into play. As I noted apropos of that pāda, the *sácā* there seems just to signal that the loc. *sū́rye* is a functional loc. absol. In our pāda c there is no *sácā*, but I think it should be understood. On the one hand it again (silently) marks *sū́rye* as a loc. absol.; however, with *índre* I suggest it has lexical value (as it likely has in the two occurrences of *tvé sácā* in the next hymn [IV.32.3c, 4a]), indicating that "I" take my share in Indra's company. What I am suggesting is that a non-overt *sácā*, supplied on the basis of its occurrence in the previous vs., has two different functions in a single pāda, a pāda whose structure suggests that its parts should be rigidly parallel. This is not sufficiently conveyed by the published tr. -- I am not sure that English is up to conveying it -- which I would now emend to "(I have taken my share) now in (company with) you, now in (company with) the sun (i.e., at sunrise)."

IV.31.7–8: My interpr. of the structural relationship of these two vss., and the internal structure of vs. 8, differs considerably from the standard. Because of the parallelism of the openings of these vss., both with *utá smā*, I think that there should be two parallel clauses. But vs. 7 is a *hí* clauses with accented verb (*āhúḥ*), whereas the only verb in vs. 8 is *maṃhase* in pāda c. I am also puzzled by the *pári* in 8a, which is difficult to construe with the rest. There is no *pári* √*maṃh* elsewhere, and *pári* is in any case not situated where we would expect a preverb in tmesis. WG tr.

valiantly "du schenkst … ringsum," which works in a pinch but I find it unsatisfying. I suggest instead that pāda a contains an abbreviated form of a common formula containing both *pári* and *sádyaḥ* and a verb of motion. Cf. in IV: nearby IV.33.1 *pári dyā̃ṃ sadyó apáso babhūvuḥ*; IV.45.7 *yéna sadyáḥ pári rájāṃsi yāthá́ḥ*; IV.51.5 *pariprayāthá bhúvanāni sadyáḥ*. And elsewhere, e.g., I.115.3 *pári dyā́vāpr̥thivī́ yanti sadyáḥ*; I.123.8 *ékaikā krátum pári yanti sadyáḥ*; I.128.3 *évena sadyáḥ páry eti pā̆rthivam*; III.58.8 *pári dyā́vāpr̥thivī́ yāti sadyáḥ*; V.47.4 *diváś caranti pári sadyó ántān*; VII.5.7 v*āyúr ná pā́thaḥ pári pāsi sadyáḥ*; VII.75.4 *páñca kṣitī́ḥ pári sadyó jigāti*. Given the remarkable number of such collocations, I find it difficult to believe that our poet is not evoking this formula. Since much of this hymn concerns Indra's journey, it would be contextually appropriate. That vs. 9 asserts that no hindrances can obstruct Indra supports the journey theme. Then, by my interpr., pādas bc constitute the main clause for vss. 7–8.

IV.31.10: The "hundred forms of help" found at the end of the first tṛca (3c) recurs here at the beginning of this tṛca, following the two more challenging tṛcas in between.

IV.32 Indra

IV.32.2: The stem *citrín-* is a hapax, and it is not clear what the fem. pl. referents are. Ge suggests 'battles'. On the basis of the fem. pl. phrase in 5, *citrā́bhiḥ … ūtíbhiḥ* I tentatively supply 'means of help'; note that *ūtíbhiḥ* appeared at the end of the previous vs., 1c.

IV.32.3: Ge takes *ójasā* as belonging to the enemy and providing the content of their boast: "der sich mit seiner Stärke grosstut." But since *ójasā* is almost always pāda-final no matter what part of the vs. it belongs with and since Indra's *ójas-* is usually what is referred to, I take it as Indra's.

The comparative *śáśīyas-* occurs only twice in the RV, once in a very slangy passages referring to a woman (V.61.6), in a usage that does not illuminate this one. Context in our passage favors the rendering 'more numerous' (so also Gr, Ge), given its contrast with *dabhrébhiś cid* "with only a few." The question is how to get from the positive *śáśvant-* 'each and every, one after another, successive, recurrent, continual' to a comparative 'more numerous'. The English expression "they just keep coming, more and more" might be the clue. WG incorporate the literal sense of *śáśvant-* but seem not to render the comparative: "die der Reihe nach erscheinenden."

See disc. of *sácā* ad IV.31.5–6.

IV.32.10: The rel. prn. beginning pāda b, Saṃhitā *yā́*, is ambiguous: it can stand for *yā́* (neut. pl. and presumably picking up immed. preceding *vīryā́* in the main cl.) or *yā́ḥ* (so Pp.) (fem. pl. and presumably anticipating *púro dā́sīḥ* in c). Neither is syntactically satisfying: if it has *vīryā́* as its antecedent, as normal syntactic practice would expect, it doesn't make sense in its clause: Indra didn't "break into" his manly

deeds. If it refers to the fortresses, it works fine with the verb in its clause but has no direct connection to the main clause. I assume the ambiguity was meant and loose subordination was the reason. I render it as a general subordinator to avoid both bad choices.

IV.32.11: Pāda b is most likely an embedded relative -- a very rare syntactic phenomenon in the RV -- because the most likely reading of c is that the singers sing (a) "at the pressings" (*sutéṣu* c), not that Indra performed his deeds *sutéṣu*. However, it is just possible that *sutéṣu* could mean "in (the exhilaration of) the pressed soma drinks" and therefore continue the rel. cl. in b. In any case in this casually assembled Gāyatrī hymn, a syntactic violation does not seem too critical.

IV.32.13: The use of *śáśvant-* here seems unconnected to the comparative *śáśīyaṃs-* in 3a. Since vs. 13 is found also in VIII.65.7, it may simply have been imported from elsewhere; the structure of this hymn is very loose and seems to have been cobbled together from standard tropes and formulae.

IV.32.15: The phrase *matīnā́m … stómaḥ* "the praise-song of our thoughts" refers to the actual poetic composition that stems from our thoughts. In RVic discourse every step from 'mental inspiration' to 'thought' to 'song/poem' can be used to refer to the composed or formulated praise for a deity. Here we see the progression expressed.

IV.32.16: On the accent of *ghásaḥ* see III.52.3.

IV.32.17: For *vyáti-* (RV 3x), despite Mayrhofer's apparent skepticism (EWA s.v.) I follow Re's deriv. (EVP 15: 37) from *vi √yam* with a presumed development 'hold separate/apart' → 'pair', though Re doesn't deign to indicate what the semantic channel might be.

khārî-, a measure of capacity', is found only here and much later in the sūtras and Classical Skt, but it appears to be widespread in MIA. See EWA s.v.

IV.32.20: *mā́ dabhrám* ("not a little!") is a prohibitive lacking a verb, though an aor. injunc. can easily be supplied of course: **dāḥ* matching the impv. *dehi* in the positive expression preceding it. Or alternatively s-aor. **bhāḥ* (i.e., **bhār*) to match flg. *bhara*.

IV.32.22: This very obscure dānastuti begins by presenting itself as an explicit formal praśasti (eulogistic praise), an important genre in later times and, in my opinion, the missing link between Rigvedic praise poetry and kāvya (see Chap. IV in my *Rigveda between Two Worlds*), with the annunciatory verb *prá … śaṃsāmi*. I think this high-style opening is meant as a deliberate contrast with the bawdy nature of the gift praised.

As noted in the publ. intro. I consider "the two brown ones" (*babhrū́*) found in all three vss. of the dānastuti (22–24) to be the breasts of a woman given to the poet as a gift from his patron (a not-uncommon gift).

In c the poet playfully warns the patron not to stint on cows on the grounds that he's already given him something else. The expression is quite condensed.

IV.32.23: This is the most difficult vs. of the sequence and has given rise to multiple contradictory, not to mention ludicrous, interpr. -- among which my own may be numbered (although I certainly think it's better than eyeballs). Note the two *-ká-* forms (*kanīnaké(va)*, *arbhaké*), indicating slangy, low-register speech and quite possibly associating it with women's language. (For disc. see my 2008 "Women's Language in the RV" and 2009 "Sociolinguistic Remarks on the Indo-Iranian *-ka-Suffix: A Marker of Colloquial Register.") If the gift is really a woman, then evoking women's language would make sense.

On *vidradhá-* 'undressed, without clothes' see EWA s.v. As for *drupadá-* 'post', AV VI.63.3 *ayasmáye drupadé* "on a metal post" shows that the post need no longer be wooden (despite *dru-*), just as "plastic glasses" does not strike an English speaker as odd or contradictory. As I said in the publ. intro., I think the post refers to the woman's slender body, with two very prominent breasts, an ideal of a woman's body also encountered in Classical Skt. lit. The breasts are personified ("little baby-dolls") and invested with some autonomy as they move about during sex. Crosscultural parallels in sexual slang could surely be found.

[IV.33–37 JPB]

IV.38 Dadhikrā

The middle vss. of this hymn are introduced by repeated *utá sma* (5, 6, 8, 9), varied by *utá syá* in 7. As noted in the publ. intro, this sequence of 'and's adds to the sense of speed.

IV.38.1: Although the Anukramaṇī take Heaven and Earth to be the deity of this vs., the unidentified duals must rather refer to Mitra and Varuṇa, as also in vs. 2. This is clear from IV.39, where Mitra and Varuṇa give Dadhikrā to the Purus (2cd, 5cd).

The form *nitośé* is much disputed. Gr identifies it as a 3rd sg. to the thematic pres. *tośate* (otherwise unaccented), but not only is there a perfectly fine *-te* 3rd sg. (*tośate* 4x) while a *t*-less 3rd sg. would be anomalous, but given the full-grade we would expect root accent (**nitóśe*). Old vacillates but displays a weak preference for a 3rd sg. unreduplicated perfect, and Ge, who does not comment, appears to follow him ("… ausgeschüttet hat"). Despite this scholarly pedigree, this solution appears to me to have little to recommend it: non-reduplicated perfects are quite rare. Gotō **[**1st Kl, 167–68**]** also vacillates: if it's a verb it's a non-redupl. pf. Or it might be the loc. of a noun *nitośá-*; this appears to be the view represented in WG. There does exist a them. noun *tośá-*. Re also tentatively suggests a locative but "à nuance semi-infinitive," tr. "pour être déversées." I find Re's interpr. appealing, though, as often, somewhat cavalier about grammar. I would like to take the form directly as a dative root noun in infinitival usage, but we should probably expect **nituśé*. It may have been adjusted to match the grade of *tośá-*, or the loc. ending *-é* of the them. noun may

have been reinterpr. as a purpose dative. One might expect the hapax *naitośá-* to provide some help, but it is only found in the impenetrable Aśvin hymn X.106.6, which appears to be written in code. In any event, the point of the hemistich seems to be that Mitra and Varuṇa provided gifts to Trasadasyu, who then redistributed them to his subjects the Purus in an appropriately kingly way.

IV.38.2: On *-niṣṣídh-* see comm. ad III.51.5. It is possible here that *-niṣṣídh-* 'tributes' are owed to Dadhikrā rather than provided by him. Cf. Klein (DGRV I.420) "to whom many tributes are due"; this would fit better with *carkṛ́tyam aryáḥ*.

For *pruṣita-psu-* 'frothing at the mouth' (< 'having spraying breath'), see EWA s.v. *psu-*.

IV.38.3: There is sharp difference of opinion about the sense of *medhayú-*: is it built to *medhā́-* 'wisdom' or *médha-* 'ritual offering, meal"? The former is the choice of Ge, Re, Mayr (tentatively, EWA, s.v. *medhā́-*), while Gr, Scar (188), and I opt for 'meal'. (WG's rendering "wie ein Opfertier Verlangender" must also reflect this *médha-* stem.) The 'meal' interpr. fits well with *gṛ́dhyantam* 'greedy', and it also makes more sense to me that a horse would want something to eat rather than wisdom. Moreover, if Dadhikrā represents the sacrificial horse in the Aśvamedha, there is a (sinister) echo of the name of this sacrifice: the horse is unwittingly seeking his own sacrifice. It can, of course, also be a pun.

IV.38.4: This vs. contains a number of puzzles, though the general purport -- the success of Dadhikrā in battles and raids -- is clear.

gádhya- elsewhere (3x) modifies *vā́ja-* 'prize', but that precise word can't be supplied here, because it is masc. and *gádhyā* must be neut. pl. Nonetheless, battle spoils or the like must be meant. Ge's rendering of *gádhya-* as "bis an die Wagendecke reichende (Beute)" must rest on the later (sūtra) *gadhā* 'Verdeck des Lastwagens' (see EWA s.v.), but given the chronological gap and the fact that EWA considers the etym. of *gadhā* unklar, this seems unnecessary. Ge is consistent: the other occurrences of *gádhya-* he tr. 'deckenhohe'.

I take *cárati … gáchan* as a periphrasis, "keeps going," though the standard tr. take the two verbal forms separately. There is no way to tell.

The problematic form in this pāda is *sánutaraḥ*, about which there is no consensus even on what part of speech it represents. The uncertainty can be seen acutely in Mayrhofer's changing approach to it. In KEWA (s.v. *sanutáḥ*) he tentatively decides to follow AiG II.2.596, 608, 698 in taking it as a comparative built to the verb stem *sanóti*, meaning 'mehr gewinnend' (an interpr. that goes back, one way or the other, to Sāy.). But in EWA (s.v. *sanutár*) he has changed his mind, attaching it rather to the adv. *sanutár* 'away', attributing its aberrant form to reinterpretation by this late poet, and citing Tichy (Nom. agen. 58–59), who suggests it's a comparative to the adv. Both Ge and Re derive it from √*san* 'win', though in different ways: Ge's tr. ("als bester Gewinner") seems to reflect the comparative interpr. favored by Sāy. and AiG (though transposed into the superlative); Re

("gagnant") explicitly suggests that it stands for **sánutra-*, formed like *tárutra-*, an interpr. that Gr also gestures towards. Old favors a connection with the adv. *sanutár*, as do WG (flg. Tichy), tr. "immer ferner wandelt." My tr. reflects an analysis as comparative agent noun to √*san* ("as one better at winning"), but I do not feel strongly about it. In fact, I would probably now emend my tr. to "keeps going further in (the contests for) cows": the contrast between his hemming in the booty in a and himself going further in b would be thematically nice, and if I am correct about the meaning of d, the expansion of the horse's wanderings further and further would be appropriate to what is expressed in d. But I am not certain that this question can be decided.

My interpr. of *āvírṛjīkaḥ* rests on Thieme's (Unt. p. 40, n. 2): 'an dem der Schaum hervortritt'. This image responds to *pruṣitápsum* in 2c.

vidáthā nicíkyat recurs in AV V.20.12.

The last pāda is the most baffling of all. The second part of it, *páry ā́pa āyóḥ*, is also found at I.178.1 (q.v.). The major question is the identity of *ā́paḥ*: is it a form of √*āp* 'reach, acquire', whether verbal or nominal (so Ge, WG); is it a derivative of *ápas-* 'work' (so Gr, Re; dubious EWA s.v. *ápas-*), or is it the nom. pl. of *áp-* 'water', used as an acc. (Old, Thieme, WG possibly [in n.])? I follow Thieme's interpr. (Unters. 40–41), which sees "the waters of Āyu" as an expression referring to land habitable because it is well watered. If this phrase is essentially locational, then one might expect the preceding *tiró aratím* to be as well: "across the *aratí-*." Unfortunately, though Thieme's general interpr. of *aratí-* I find persuasive, his tr. of this phrase "schneller als die Räder [seines Wagens]" is problematic, because I do not see how *tiráḥ* can mean 'faster'. It is always otherwise a preposition/adverb. I therefore think Dadhikrā is being depicted as crossing the *aratí* and racing around "the waters of Āyu." These two locational phrases may refer to the ritual ground, as Old suggests: the horse runs across the fire on the ritual ground and around the water vessels used for the sacrifice. Or, my preference, it can refer to the territory of the Ārya, which the horse traverses and thus, as it were, claims for his owner (much as the Aśvamedha horse does in his year-long pre-sacificial ramble). What *aratí-* would stand for in this scenario isn't entirely clear to me -- but since *aratí-* can mean 'spoked wheel, circlet, circle', I would tentatively suggest that the horse runs *across* a notional circle of land belonging to / claimed by / aspired to by the Ārya and then *around* the periphery of this circle to enclose it as Ārya possession. I would therefore now emend my tr. to "across the circle (of Ārya land), around the waters of Āyu."

IV.38.5: The lexeme *ánu* √*kruś* is later a semi-technical term for raising the hue-and-cry, which would be appropriate in this context.

There is a phonological echo of 4c *nicíkyat* in 5c *nīcā́yamānam*, although the latter is to be analyzed as *nīcā́+áyamānam*. The latter belongs to the marginal thematized pres. *áyate* to √*i* (see Gotō, 1st Kl., 92–97). There is one other occurrence of this medial part. in the RV, otherwise a few finite forms, some of which are ambiguous between subjunctive to the root pres. and indicative to a them. pres.

IV.38.6: The referent and construction of *āsu* require discussion. Ge (/WG) construe it with *prathamáḥ* (“first among these”) and supply “cows.” But this doesn’t make sense if the meaning is “desiring to run first among these,” because that conjures up a picture of the horse leading a stampede of cattle in a race -- surely not an ancient Indian sporting event or battle array! If the *āsu* is to be construed with the rest of its pāda, it should refer to the ranks of chariots in b (*śréṇibhī ráthānām*): *śréṇi-* is fem. and the image appears to be of Dadhikrā leading a charge of chariots, a far more likely scenario. However, I think unaccented *āsu* is simply taking (modified) Wackernagel’s position in the clause and should be construed with *ní veveti* in b: the horse is bearing down on the females. (Note that *ní veveti … āsu* is found also in III.55.9.) Even so, I would not supply ‘cows’: although we are (too) accustomed to having (notional) cows as the goal of a hypermasculine animal in the ever-repeated formulae in Maṇḍala IX, where Soma the bull seeks cows in the form of milk, in fact Dadhikrā should be seeking mares, not cows, if this is about his desire to mate. However, if he is not seeking mates, but merely prizes, cows will do.

The sexual reading I suggest for ab may be supported by pāda c, where I follow Gr, Re, and WG (in n.) in taking *jánya-* as a member of a wedding party, not merely a man ‘belonging to (one’s own) people, Landsmann’. For *jánya-* in a wedding context, see AV XI.8.1–2. Here the comparison is presumably between the garland of the winner of the race and that of a suitor or groomsman at a wedding.

Ge and Re (EVP 15.163) render *kiráṇam* as ‘rein’ (Ge Zügel, Re rêne), flg. Sāy. (*āsyagataṃ khalīnam*), though Re appears to recant in his n. Neither etymology nor the other occurrences of the word (*not* so tr. by Ge, e.g.) support this interpr., and context also favors a version of ‘dust’ (so WG ‘Stäubchen’). Note *kirate reṇúm* “scatters dust” in 7d, where the verb *kirate* echoes *kiráṇa-*.

IV.38.7: On pāda b (=VII.19.2) see comm. on the latter passage. As discussed there, although the standard tr. (here Ge, Re, WG) take *śúśrūṣamāṇaḥ* as a form of √*śruṣ* ‘obey’ and tr. accordingly, it is simply a well-formed desiderative to √*śru* ‘hear / be heard/famed’ (so classified by Gr, Wh [Rts], Heenen), with the mid. meaning ‘desiring fame (for oneself), desiring to be(come) famed’.

Pāda c contains another unidentified fem. loc. pl., the pres. part. *yatīṣu*. Old, Ge, and Re take the referent to be the ranks of chariots from 6b, WG cows. I again prefer mares (though the other two are possible, depending on how it is construed). I take the *túram*, the acc. sg. of a root noun (see Schindler s.v., though I do not follow his interpr. of this passage), as an adverb. It forms a phrasal verb with √*i* ‘go hastily’ (so approx. Old). In context *túraṃ ya(tīṣu)* is a close match to the immed. following *turáyan*. It would be an even better match if the 2nd participle were *turaṇyán* (two forms of this verbal stem are found in the Dadhikrā hymn IV.40: *turaṇyatáḥ* 3a, *turaṇyati* 4a, and cf. also *turaṇyasát* 2b), and I am tempted to think that the poet had this stem in mind, but opted for phonologically similar *turáyant-* because his preferred form would have produced a bad break. Like *turaṇyasát* in 40.2, our form would be a deliberate deformation of the expected one to fit metrical circumstances, though our *turáyan* makes no morphological difficulties, unlike *turaṇyasát*.

IV.38.9: As Old points out, the contrastive lexemes *sám √i* and *ví √i* are juxtaposed in *samithé viyántaḥ*.

IV.38.10: The first hemistich contains a three-termed simile / frame construction, in which all three terms are realized in both simile and frame. This is fairly unusual.

Re nicely points out that the product of d would be what is later called the *madhuparka*, the concoction offered to an honored guest.

IV.39 Dadhikrā

As was noted in the publ. intro., the middle hymn of the small Dadhikrā cycle differs in style and content from the hymns before and after, presenting a formal praśasti-type encomium.

IV.39.1: The hopes expressed for "my" improvement and safety in the 2nd hemistich are presumably in service of my producing a good praise-hymn.

IV.39.2: I take *kratu-prā-* as referring to the poet's own *krátu-* 'intention, conception' -- that is, producing the praise-hymn he has envisioned. So also Re and (partly) WG. Others consider it the *krátu-* of others or of all, and Old suggests an emendation to **kratupráḥ* (gen.) because he thinks it more applicable to Dadhikrā than the poet. This cmpd seems to play off *kṛṣṭi-prā-* in the last hymn (IV.38.9b) in structure and phonology, but since it is found once elsewhere, as is the derivative *kratu-prāvan-*, both in the same hymn X.100.12 and 11 respectively, it was not simply created here for the occasion on that model. That both words in X.100 refer to a poet/singer as here undercuts Old's justification for his emendation.

Maurer (324–25) renders *puruvāra-* as 'richly tailed' (*vāra-* 'tail-hair' beside *vāra-* 'favor, choice thing'), an interpr. also given by Scar (332) as an alternative ('mit den buschigen Schwanzhaaren'). I find this appealing (as a pun, not as the primary reading) -- but ultimately unlikely: unlike the other hymns in this sequence, no other physical attributes or characteristics of Dadhikrā, save his swiftness, are described in this hymn.

In the 2nd hemistich *pūrúbhyaḥ … táturim* was mistakenly tr. twice in the publ tr. Eliminate the last phrase "as one triumphant for the Pūrus."

IV.39.3: The interpretive problem in this vs. is caused by the length of a single vowel: *sá* instead of **sā* in d. The most obvious contextual reading of the pāda is that Aditi should act in concert with Mitra and Varuṇa, but of course Aditi is feminine and the pronoun is masc. Sāy. makes Dadhikrā the referent and is followed by Ge, Re, Maurer, and (tentatively, see their n.) WG. (Maurer in fact takes Dadhikrā also as the subj. of *kṛṇotu* in c and interprets *áditiḥ* as a masc. adj. 'free of bond'.) Old discusses at some length and comes to a solution (in agreement with Hillebrandt) somewhat like Maurer's: that the subject of both c and d is Dadhikrā in the guise of / identified with Aditi. I find all this unlikely; despite the syntactic problem, I think the

subject of d has to be Aditi, who has a close natural connection with her sons Mitra and Varuṇa (unlike Dadhikrā). Masc. *sá* may simply show attraction to the adj. *sajóṣāḥ*, which is ambig. between masc. and fem. Or, in my opinion more likely, the pāda may have been incompletely adapted from one in which the referent of *sá* was Aryaman, the standard third member of this trio. No exact parallel is found in the RV, but cf. passages like I.90.1, I.186.2=VII.60.4 and, with Aditi, VI.51.5 and V.31.5. Another possibility, that the *sá* refers to the mortal poet favored by Aditi in c, was essentially closed off by Old, who persuasively argues that *sajóṣa(s)-* refers almost without exception to the relationship of gods with gods or, less frequently, mortals with mortals -- but not interspecies relationships, as it were.

IV.39.4: There are several ways to configure the syntax of this vs. The first question is whether the genitives in pāda a should be construed with the verb of b. But since *ámanmahi* takes an acc. (*nā́ma*) in b, this seems unlikely (though Maurer does it that way), and the standard tr. (including mine) supply in pāda a a form of √*kṝ* 'pay tribute', which has dominated the hymn so far (1ab, 2a, 3a) and consistently takes the gen. (The aor. *ákārīt* in the preceding vs. [3a], or rather the 1st pl. equivalent, seems the obvious form to supply.) The question then arises what the relationship between pādas a and b is. Ge seems to take pāda a as the main cl. and b as dependent on it ("… da wir …"), presumably subordinated by the *yád* ending pāda a. Re seems to follow this interpr., though with some French curlicues of his own. This type of structure, with one clause ending right before the final monosyllable of a pāda and the next beginning with that monosyllable and continuing through the next pāda, strikes me as an unprecedented, or at least exceedingly rare, clause configuration. If one of these clauses is subordinated to the other, it should be the other way around, with pāda-final *yád* marking what precedes as a subordinate clause and b as the main clause. (Note that although *yád* is preceded by a lot of material, it all belongs to a single NP.) In this account the accent on *ámanmahi* would be due to its pāda-initial position. This is the way WG take it. My interpr. differs from both of these in making both clauses in the first hemistich subordinate to cd, expressing a temporal progression: after we have celebrated (aor.?) and brought to mind (aor.), then we call upon (pres.).

The relationship between the genitives in a, which are simply strung together without internal structure (*dadhikrā́vṇa iṣá ūrjó maháḥ*), is clarified in the next hymn (IV.40.2d), where it is said that Dadhikrā(van) gave birth to *íṣ-* and *ū́rj-*.

IV.39.5: Dadhikrā as *sū́danam mártyāya* "making sweetness for the mortal" provides a ring with 1c *mā́m uṣásaḥ sūdayantu*, though there the sweetening was attributed to the dawns. Since vs. 6 is a summary vs. and in a different meter, the 1/5 ring defines the outer edges of the poem.

IV.40 Dadhikrā

See the publ. intro. for a disc. of the style. The poet likes repetitive figures: 2a *bhariṣó gaviṣó* (b *iṣá[ḥ]*); 2ab *duvanyasác*, (*chravasyā́d*) … *turaṇyasát* (3a

turaṇyatáḥ … 4a *turaṇyati*); 2c *dravó dravaráḥ* (3a *drávatas* … 3c *dhrájato*); 5 *śuciṣád … antarikṣasád … vediṣád … duroṇasát | nṛṣád varasád ṛtasád vyomasád*; 5d *abjā́ gojā́ ṛtajā́ adrijā́*; see others noted below. The means he uses to produce these patterns are not always strictly grammatical and there are a number of hapaxes. Orthodox Vedic linguists have not always responded to the exuberant linguistic invention on display and have produced some plodding by-the-book analyses.

IV.40.1: As noted in the publ. intro., vs. 1 stands apart from the rest of this hymn and is a simple variant on 39.1: our pāda a telescopes 39.1ab; our b corresponds to 39.1c; and cd are an afterthought list in the genitive, attached loosely to the first pāda.

IV.40.2: Note pāda-initial *sátvā* (a) and *satyó* (c).

The first hapax we encounter is an easy one to account for (almost as though the poet was breaking us in slowly): *bhariṣá-* 'seeking plunder' is modeled on immed. flg. *gaviṣá-*; so Old, flg. AiG II.1.65. I think that *iṣáḥ* in the next pāda is also felt as part of this series, although it has a different grammatical analysis and function.

The very puzzling rhyming pāda-final *duvaṇyasát* (a) and *turaṇyasát* (b), also both hapaxes, have to be considered together, and the latter needs first to be put in context with likewise pāda-final *turaṇyatáḥ* (gen. sg. part., 3a) and *turaṇyati* (3rd sg. pres., 4a), both of which also have Dadhikrā as subject. Clearly the poet wanted to position this signature word (see also 38.7c and comm. thereon) in the same place in all 3 pādas, but since our verse is couched in the nom. sg., the grammatical form of the part. would be *turaṇyán*, which would not fit (and a finite form would be out of place, since the pāda already has a finite verb). He needs another syllable -- a point also made by Scar (565). How exactly does he get it? Unfortunately I don't have an altogether satisfactory answer, but I am tolerably certain that the standard answer given -- that this is a root-noun cmpd with final member from √*sad* -- is dead wrong. It is true that vs. 5 has an impressive array of *-sád-* compounds, but their first members are actual places, and, in the phrases in which they're embedded, sitting makes sense (e.g., 5b "a Hotar sitting at the vedi"). (For the function of these cmpds in the hymn, see comm. ad vs. 5.) Here the horse is on a dizzying breakneck run -- "sitting" in or among anything is exactly opposite to the spirit of the vs., no matter how attenuated "sit" might have become in the cmpd. And the supposed first member, *turaṇya-*, is simply not a place to sit. So the various tr. offered -- Gr 'in Raschheit wohnend', Ge 'der unter den Spitzenführern sitzt', Re 'qui siège parmi ceux qui foncent-en-avant', Scar 'unter die Vordringenden, Eifrigen, Eilenden setzend', WG 'der unter den Durchsetzenden Sitzende' -- despite the worthiness of their attempts, simply sound silly *and* significantly slow the onrush of this wonderful verbal picture. My own suggestion begins with the class of *-asāná-* participles or pseudo-participles like *sahasāná-* (on which see comm. ad IV.3.6). I suggest that our poet was familiar with such forms (of which there are quite a few in IV; cf. nearby *mandasānā́ḥ* IV.34.10, IV.35.6, etc.) and that he created an active participle on the model of these apparent middles: *mandānā́-* : *mandasāná-* :: *turaṇyánt-* → **turaṇyasánt-*. Note that the accent matches that of the *-asāná-* forms; note also that act. *turaṇyasát* fits a

Triṣṭubh cadence, while a med. **turaṇyasānā-* would not. (The *mandasānā-* forms just cited are pāda-final in Jagatī.) Why *-sát*? I would argue that it is the neuter in adverbial usage; an original nom. sg. masc. in *-sán* may have been readjusted to match the *-sād-* cmpds in vs. 5, but I am certain its origin was verbal.

Now what about *duvanyasát*? First, it is clear that the *-anyasát* part is completely dependent on *turaṇyasát*. As we just saw, the latter belongs to a tight-knit *turaṇyá-* set, but there is no **duvanyá-*. The form is almost universally taken as a *-sād-* cmpd. based on *dúvas-* 'friendship', similar to the denon. *duvasyáti* 'offers friendship, gives friendly reception to'. Scar (566) explicitly presents it as a crossing of *duvasyá-* with *turaṇyá-*, "was bei der Experimentierfreude des Dichters von 4.40 akzeptable scheint." The whole cpmd is then rendered 'der unter den Bevorzugten … sitzt' (Ge), 'qui siège parmi les privilégiés' (Re), 'unter die, denen Ehrung zuteil wird, setzend'(?) (Scar), 'unter den Huldigenden Sitzende' (WG). Such an interpr. requires pushing the semantics of *dúvas-* and its relatives rather further than seems reasonable, while a more lit. 'sitting among friends/those who offer friendship' would be a somewhat comical description of a racehorse. Further it suffers from the "sit" problem identified also for *turaṇyasát*: the horse is galloping at top speed, not sitting in the bleachers with the grandees. I therefore reject the connection with *dúvas-* and take my cue from Gr's (ignored) interpr, 'in der Ferne weilend', 'dessen Wesen es ist, in die Ferne zu dringen' -- in other words to associate the first member with *dūrá-* 'far', with a thematized zero-grade *duv-a-* beside pre-consonantal *dū-rá-* (and pre-vocalic full-grades *dávīyas-*, *daviṣṭha*). A similar derivation must account for *duvasanā̃saḥ* 'going the distance', vel sim. (e.g., Re 'fonçant-au-loin, WG 'sich … entfernend'), in IV.6.10 (note, also in Maṇḍala IV), whose connection with *dūrá-*, etc., is generally agreed upon, though its morphology is unclear and also owes something to nearby forms. See comm. ad loc. It should be noted that Re in EVP 13 (1964) in his comm. to IV.6.10 suggests that our *duvanyasát* contains the 'far' word: 'qui demeure loin (en arrière)' and is oppositional to *turaṇyasát* 'qui (va) rapidement (en avant)', but in EVP 15 (1966), which contains his tr. and comm. to IV.40, he has substituted the tr. given above.

Pāda c produces a new set of problems, though happily much less intractable than those just discussed. Though *dravá-* is found only here in the RV (but common later), its derivation and meaning are straightforward. The next word, *dravará-*, is a hapax, but transparently generated to the preceding *dravá-*. It may simply have the suffix *-ara-* (so AiG II.2.215) like semantically similar *patará-* 'flying' (RV 3x), but I wonder, given the missing syllable in this pāda, described by HvN as "a rest at the 5th place" (that is, directly before *dravará-*), whether *dravará-* is meant to remind us of an allegro form of a compative in *-tara-*, slurred in rapid speech (though the accent would be wrong). Finally, another hapax, *pataṃgará-*, owes its *-rá-* to preceding *dravará-*, added to the well-established stem *pataṃgá-* (the aforementioned *patará-* may also have played a part).

IV.40.3–4: These two vss. revisit the *utá sma* opening that characterized the middle vss. of IV.38.

There is also a concentration of intensives: 3d *táritrataḥ*, 4c *saṃtā́vīt^{u}vat*, 4d *āpaniphaṇat* -- appropriate to the ever-increasing speed and the intense repetitive movements of the horse racing to the finish line.

IV.40.3: The imagery of this vs. picks up the 'flying' (*pataṃgaráḥ*) of 2c.

In pāda a *drávataḥ* both looks back to *dravó dravaráḥ* in 2c (all derived from the same root and with *dravaráḥ* metrically identical to and in the same metrical position as *drávataḥ*) and forward to *dhrájataḥ* in 3c (same metrical shape and position, rhyming forms).

Most tr. give *ánu vāti* additive semantics, 'blows after, blows following', but elsewhere this lexeme means 'fan (flames)' (I.148.4, IV.7.10, VII.3.2, X.142.4). Here I think it's used figuratively, of the wind ruffling up mane/feathers. The standard tr. (including mine) supply 'wind' as the subj.

As both Ge and Old point out, the *parṇám* 'wing, feather(s)' in the simile lacks an overt correspondent in the frame, where we'd expect a body part of the horse. Old suggests quick feet or (from Ludwig) the mane. I assume the latter, and in fact I think that *parṇám* can be read with both simile and frame. In the simile *parṇám* is used as a collective for the bird's feathers, in the frame metaphorically for a horse's mane. (A Google search of "feathery mane" produces respectable results, including a snatch of John Keats, "the eagle's feathery mane" ["Hymn to Apollo"], which shows the metaphor going the opposite direction.)

pragardhín- 'greedy' is appropriate for both the bird and Dadhikrā, as Ge also points out: cf. IV.38.3 *paḍbhír gṛ́dhyantam*.

I follow Schaeffer (Intens. 131) in taking *aṅkasám* as referring to the curving racetrack rather than, with some, as a curvy part of a horse. Since *áṅkāṃsi* in the next vs. clearly refers to the racetrack, it's unlikely that a related word would have an entirely different referent in such close proximity.

IV.40.4: *kṣipaṇí-* is yet another hapax. The standard rendering is 'lash' (Ge: Peitschenhieb, Re: coup-de-fouet), and the publ. tr. simply follows this. WG suggest rather 'in Beschleunigung' (acceleration). Acdg. to their n. they take it as an Inhaltsakk., flg. Gaedicke. This is possible, I suppose: 'rushes a rush' → 'rushes a flinging' ('flinging' → 'acceleration'). But since the similarly formed *kṣipaṇú-* (IV.58.6) appears to be a physical weapon, a physical object seems likely here. Moreover, this vs. abruptly confronts us with the harsh constraints imposed on the horse by his rider -- "bound" in three places and whipped to frenzied running. The lash is an important part of this picture. Until now Dadhikrā has been presented as an untrammeled autonomous agent, but now the audience must suddenly reassess who's the boss, as it were. For the relationship between √*kṣip* 'fling, hurl' and whips, see V.83.3 *rathī́va káśayā́śvān abhikṣipán* "Like a charioteer lashing out at his horses with a whip."

The two pādas of the 2nd half-vs. are nicely balanced, each ending with an intensive participle preceded by a preposition phrase headed by *ánu* 'following' (in the same metrical position). The two *ánu* phrases are contrastive, however: in c what

is being followed is mental (*krátum*), in d simply the physical course (*pathā́m áṅkāṃsi*). Given the horse's portrayal in the first half of the vs., we must now wonder whose *krátu-* Dadhikrā is following. For most of this series we would have assumed he follows his own -- he's been shown as an irresistable force of nature -- but 4ab show him under human control, confined in horse tackle and whipped, so we might instead wonder if it is his rider's *krátu-* that he is subject to.

IV.40.5: After the increasingly furious speed and frenzied activity in the last vss., culminating in the three intensives (two in the preceding hemistich, 4c, d), this vs. brings it to a shockingly abrupt stop. Eight cmpds ending in 'sit' (*-sád-*), with a sense exactly opposite to the preceding verbs of motion, decisively halt the movement and impose a state of rest, even inertia. The horse is gone; I explicitly do not think this series of phrases are meant to serve as predicates to an unexpressed Dadhikrā, *pace* Old and WG. Instead I think these are images of tranquility, of beings in their proper places, a vision of cosmic balance that has no need for the frenetic agitation we have just witnessed. The lack of finite verbs and participles -- all verbal notions being expressed by root-nouns in compound -- models this stasis. The *-sád-* cmpds give way in the final pāda to 4 *-jā́-* 'X-born' cmpds. I am not entirely sure of their purpose, but I think they sketch (however incomplete) the sources of the entities in the cosmos. And we end with the single word *ṛtám* 'truth', which, perhaps, incorporates it all, beyond which nothing more is needed and no motion required.

IV.41 Indra and Varuṇa

The patterning of the names of the two gods is mildly interesting. It is fairly strict for the first half of the hymn but varies considerably in the 2nd. The first 5 vss. have a discontinuous dual dvandva opening the first pāda, either as voc. *índrā … varuṇā* (1a, 4a, 5a) or nom./acc. *índrā … váruṇā* (nom. 3a, acc. 4a). The next vss. break the pattern, but the variation starts slowly: vs. 6 (the central vs. of the hymn) does contain the pāda-initial nom. dual dvandva but postponed until the 2nd hemistich (6c). But then vs. 7 omits the names altogether. The names reappear in vs. 8, but in the final pāda and not as a dual dvandva but as a pāda-initial discontinuous individual sg. acc. phrase: 8d *índram … váruṇam*. The same individual acc. phrase (now continuous but not pāda initial) is found in 9a. Vs. 10 again omits the names. The final vs. returns to a discontinuous pāda-initial voc. phrase, but only in the b pāda and with singulars not dual: *índra … varuṇa*. Thus the 2nd half of the hymn appears to treat the gods separately rather than as a unit, but I see no reflection of this separation in the content of the hymn: the two do not display their individual characteristics more in the 2nd half.

IV.41.1–2: Note *āpa* ending 1a matched with *āpî* ending 2a. Also the accumulation of *-vant-*/*-mant-* forms in these 2 vss.: *havíṣmān* 1b, *krátumān* 1c, *námasvān* 1d, *práyasvān* 2b.

IV.41.1: I am unhappy with the preterital value ('has obtained') universally assigned (incl. Kü 115) to *āpa* in pāda a, because it ill-fits the subj. *paspárśat* 'will touch' in d. My 'will obtain' is a wishful thinking, however, at odds with the grammar. I would emend to 'obtains', with a presential value Kü (116) allows for some passages.

IV.41.2: With Re, flg. AiG III.477, I take *vā* in d not as the disjunctive 'or', but the enclitic dual 2nd ps. prn. (*vā(m)*) before *m*-, though Old rejects this view.

IV.41.3: The orphaned *tā́* at the end of b is a bit surprising, somewhat reminiscent of the pāda-filling mechanisms engaged in by the epic bards, but not usually resorted to or needed by Rigvedic poets. This hymn is, however, not particularly topnotch work; compare Re's comment "Banalisation des hymnes joints."

I am inclined to read *yádī* as **yád ī*, even though the *ī* would not double an object (unless it is the unexpressed reflexive 'themselves') but would be pleonastic. The standard tr. indeed all render as 'when', not 'if'.

IV.41.4: Re makes the nice point that *vṛkáti*- 'wolfishness' and *dabhī́ti*- 'deception' are respectively Indraic and Varuṇian.

IV.41.5: Note the middle opt. *duhīya+t* remarked as act., like the impf. *áduha+t*.

IV.41.6: The first hemistich consists of a series of loc. absol., all depending on *hité* 'set (as stake)'.

IV.41.7: My tr. departs in two ways from the standard. I take *prábhūtī* as instr. sg. (as it is in IV.54.3), not acc. du., and *gavíṣaḥ* as gen. sg. with *svāpī* (also suggested by Ge in his n.), not nom. pl. The *pári* is somewhat perplexing. Re construes it with *prábhūtī* ("ô vous qui dominez tout autour," wrongly as a voc.); my "pervasive preeminence" is a version of this.

IV.41.8: Vs.-initial *tā́* is ambiguous: it can represent either masc. du. *tā́* supporting the immed. flg. enclitic *vām* (as so often; see my "Vedic 'sá figé': An inherited sentence connective?" *Historische Sprachforschung* 105 [1992]) or fem. pl. *tā́ḥ* (so Pp.) modifying *dhíyaḥ*. Or, my preference, both.

Although, strictly speaking, fem. *vājayántīḥ* belongs in the frame, modifying *dhíyaḥ*, in sense it fits better with the simile, since contests are where prizes are won. Moreover, see the next vs. (9d) where fem. 'fleet mares'(*raghvī́ḥ*) seek fame -- so female racehorses would be possible in the simile here.

In c *śriyé* has double sense, belonging both to *śrī́* 'glory, splendour' and to √*śrī* 'mix', as Ge and Re point out. The latter is appropriate to the simile, the former to the frame.

Acdg. to WG, the *gíraḥ* go to Indra and the *manīṣā́ḥ* to Varuṇa. Although, as was noted above, this is the first place in the hymn where the two names are singular, not associated as a dual, I think it unlikely that the different vocal products have

different divine goals. Note that in the first half of the vs. the *dhíyaḥ* are going to both, and the repeated *manīṣā̆ḥ* in the next vs. go to both as well. That *gíraḥ* immediately follows *índram* in 8d is not significant; In all but one instance (9a) of the two names, something intervenes.

IV.41.9: I read *vásvaḥ* twice, once as the complement of *joṣṭā̆raḥ* in the simile ("those who enjoy a good thing") and once in the frame with *bhíkṣamāṇāḥ* ("seeking a share of the goods"). Contra WG, I take *śrávasaḥ* only in the simile, since this part of the hymn seems all about our acquiring possessions, not fame.

IV.41.10: Pāda c has been variously dealt with -- as parenthetical (Ge), as a separate clause (Re, WG), as the obj. of the verb in d (Old). All of these take the two gods as the subj. of the part. *cakrāṇā̆* (flg. the du. reading of the Pp., *cakrāṇaú*), and all of them fail to render the medial sense of the part. Since the med. pf. *cakré* in 2a has clear medial sense ("made X his own"), the voice of this participle should not be ignored. I therefore read it as nom. plural (contra Pp. but compatible with Saṃhitā), modifying the 1st pl. subj. of ab. Again, we want to make the gods our own; this forms a ring with the same usage in 2a.

[IV.42 JPB]

IV.43 Aśvins

IV.43.1: As disc. in the publ. intro., the two forms of *katamá-* 'which of 3+' and the pl. *amṛ́teṣu* make it clear that these questions are applicable to all the gods, not just the Aśvins.

IV.43.2: Again, two occurrences of *katamá-* and one of the pl. *devā̆nām* keep the widest possible range of choices for the answer to these questions.

On "Sūryā chose the chariot" and sim. expressions as an indication of the svayaṃvara (self-choice) marriage in the RV, see my "The Rigvedic svayaṃvara? Formulaic evidence" (Fs. Parpola 2001). Although, as just mentioned, the first half-vs. keeps the options open, the mention of Sūryā and the chariot immediately narrows down the choice of answer to the Aśvins (to a contemporary audience).

IV.43.3: This vs. gives the answer to the questions in 1–2: the Aśvins. As was just indicated, this answer was adumbrated by 2cd, but indirectly, via a mention of a chariot that could only be the Aśvins. Now we finally have a verse couched in the dual, but note that the name Aśvin (or Nāsatya) is not found; the dual is enough.

Pāda a gives an implicit answer to 2a -- *katamá ā̆gamiṣṭhaḥ* "Which one (will be) the first to come?" -- by asserting that they "come right away" (*makṣū́ … gáchathaḥ*). I don't quite understand *ī́vato dyū́n* "during/through days such as these"; I assume it indicates that even in our time (not merely in the mythological past), they still rush right here.

In b *śaktím* is a slightly odd goal. Ge takes it as an infinitive, a use of the acc. of the *-tí-*stem I'd rather avoid. I think it means "comes into his ability/power" -- i.e., is immediately able to wield it at the necessary, decisive moment.

Pāda d, with the two forms of √*śac* (*śácīnām … śáciṣṭhā*) echoing *śaktím* in b, seems to allow the possibility that the Aśvins have comparable, but different, abilities from Indra's.

IV.43.4: On *úpamati-* as belonging to √*mā* not √*man*, see comm. ad VIII.40.9. Note that WG ('Zumessung') must also derive it from √*mā*. The Aśvins' *úpamāti-* might be an answer to the question in 3d: which one is their best ability? This stem is also the obvious one to supply with the instr. fem. *káyā*, which immediately follows.

I construe cd very differently from the standard tr., which take c and d as separate clauses (though Ge and Re both supply a form of the verb of d, *uruṣyá-*, in c). I take *kó vām* as an independent nominal cl., with the next cl. beginning with *maháḥ* and running to the end (cf. the structure of ab, which also has a clause break in the middle of pāda a, with the 2nd cl. continuing to the end of b). The reason for this choice is that it is difficult to render c as a unity if *abhîke* is taken in its usual sense (hence the attenutations in the other tr.). Moreover, *abhîke* regularly appears with *uruṣyá-* and similar 'make wide space' expressions: VII.85.1 *tā́ no yā́mann uruṣyatām abhîke* "Let those two give us wide space in close quarters on our journey," X.38.4 *yó abhîke varivovít* "who finds wide space in close quarters…," X.133.1 *abhîke cid ulokakṛt* "a maker of wide space even in close quarters." Earlier in IV an ablative phrase like our *mahás cit tyájasaḥ* is found adjacent to *abhîke*: IV.12.5 *mahás cid agna énaso abhîke* "(Release us) from even a great offense in close quarters, o Agni." All of these parallels lead to the conclusion that everything starting with *maháḥ* should be read with *uruṣyátam* in the next pāda, since *abhîke* patterns with *uruṣyá-* and the abl. phrase is connected with *abhîke*. However, I realize that the phrase in the publ. tr. "even out of great neglect" seems unconnected to the rest and makes little sense. I now feel that we need to interpr. *uruṣyátam* in two different senses. With *abhîke* it has its physical literal meaning 'make wide space', but with the abl. *mahás cit tyájasaḥ* it has the extended sense 'release, free (from)'. I would therefore emend the tr. to "Make wide space for us in close quarters, free us even from great neglect/abandonment." WG take *tyájas-* as 'Lebensopfer', but this must rest on the later notion of sacrifice as *tyāga-*. This concept is not really a part of the RVic ritual universe -- though see the single occurrence of *tyāgá-* in the RV in IV.24.3, where it refers to the abandonment of one's body in battle.

IV.43.5: I take pāda b with c rather than a, because I think those two middle pādas depict (somewhat playfully?) the Aśvins' chariot on an independent journey, coming towards them from the sea and, with the journey originating in a wet place, splashing them. I do not see any other easy way to construe the unusual pāda-final *vām* in b but as the goal of the goal-oriented verb *abhí vártate* (note similarly pāda-final acc. *vām* in the next hymn, 44.2). As Ge's parallels (I.139.3, 180.1) suggest, the likely subject of *pruṣāyan* is the chariot's 'wheel-rims' (*paváyaḥ*).

The verb in d, *bhurájanta*, is a hapax and much disputed. Probably the current standard view is that it is an enlargement of √*bhṛ* (see the standard tr., as well as EWA s.v. with further lit.). This view is supported by an apparently parallel passage in V.73.8d *pakvā́ḥ pṛ́kṣo bharanta vām* "they bring cooked foods to you" (or "cooked foods are brought to you"), very close to our *yát sīṃ vām pṛ́kṣo bhurájanta pakvā́ḥ*. But it is easy to imagine that a poet, adapting Aśvin phraseology to the simpler dimeter meter and confronting a baffling word like *bhurájanta*, would substitute a word that sounded more or less similar and would work in the passage. Re suggests breezily that *bhuraj-* is the same type of formation as *bhiṣaj-* and *saraj-*, but this seems to me to undercut the explanation because these two formations are so outré; *-aj-* is a pretty salient piece of morphology and wouldn't, I think, be lightly attached to a normal root (particularly one that should not be showing **bhur-* forms). I therefore favor the older (Gr, etc., incl. also Wackernagel, AiG I, passim) connection with √*bharjj* 'roast'. Although this verbal root is found only once in the RV, it is widely attested in Middle and New Indo-Aryan (see Turner, √BHRAJJ and, e.g., 9583–86), and there is an underlying nasal-infix pres. **bhṛnak-ti,* which acdg. to Turner (9586) is presupposed by **bhṛñjati* 'parches'. With some manipulation of MIA phonology, this might give us our form. The relative absence of √*bharjj* from the RV and other early Vedic texts is not surprising, since it would belong to kitchen vocabulary.

IV.43.6: More sprinkling and splashing. The instr. *rasáyā* is probably an instr. of accompaniment (both the Sindhu and Rasā sprinkle) rather than of means.

With most interpr. I read acc. pl. *ghṛṇā́(ḥ)* against Pp. instr. *ghṛṇā́*.

yā́na- is found only here in the RV. On the basis of the strong association between Sūryā and the chariot, I take it, with Gr, as a vehicle not, with most interpr., as abstract 'journey',

IV.43.7: The consensus is that *papṛkṣé* is a 1st sg., which is certainly appropriate for a final summary vs. A 3rd sg. is not excluded, however; in that case a subj. would have to be identified and supplied.

The āmreḍita *ihéha* and *samanā́* seem to be implicitly contrastive: wherever you are, I have nourished you in the same way.

IV.44 Aśvins

IV.44.1: The phrase *sáṃgatiṃ góḥ* "meeting with the cow" refers to a second period in the morning, when the cows are milked. See Ge's n. 1b.

IV.44.2: There is much disc. in the lit. about what manner of horses *kakuhá-* refers to (see, e.g., WG n. ad loc.). I do not have an opinion, nor do I think it matters contextually.

IV.44.3: The standard tr. take the dative phrase in c, *ṛtásya … vanúṣe pūrvyā́ya* as personal (e.g., Ge "für den, der schon früher des rechten Brauches beflissen war"). But since this phrase is parallel to two purpose-activity datives in b (*ūtáye .. sutapéyāya*) and is in fact conjoined with them by *vā*, I think they should be parallel in function. Old sees the problem and suggests that if we interpr. the passage as I do, we might need to read **vánuṣe* -- though he ultimately opts for the personal dative.

IV.44.4: The root noun cmpd. *purubhū́-* can, of course, be interpreted in many ways, given its component parts. See disc. in Scar (362). Four of its five occurrences modify the Aśvins (and the fifth may not belong to this stem; see comm. ad IX.94.3); since one of the oft-noted characteristics of the Aśvins is their peripatetic nature, I interpr. it as 'appearing in many places'. In our passage it strikes the same note as *ihéha* 'here and there' in vs. 7 (=43.7). There are two occurrences in VIII.22 (vss. 3, 12), and the Aśvins hymns in VIII often express concern about the many places the Aśvins could be besides here.

IV.44.5: By my rule (see "Vedic anyá- 'another, the other': syntactic disambiguation," Fs. Beekes, 1997), because it is in (modified) 2nd position, *anyé* in c should be definite ('the others'), not indefinite as Ge (/WG) take it. This makes perfect sense: we are well aware of the other sacrificers who are our rivals.

IV.45 Aśvins

IV.45.1: Acf. *úd iyarti*, esp. in contrast with its med. correspondent *úd īrate* in 2a, should be transitive. With Ge, the pub. tr. renders it as intransitve ('arises'). WG take it as transitive and supply 'sun' as the object. I am now inclined to think that it is transitive (the contrastive verb in 2a has convinced me), but am uncertain what object to supply. The most common object of *íyarti* is 'speech' (vel sim.), but curiously for a RVic hymn, there is no mention of speech or praise-song in this hymn (until a cmpd. in the final vs., 7a *dhiyaṃdhā́-* 'setting my insight'). Since the subj. of intrans. *úd īrate* in 2 is chariots and horses, I think the object here should be the chariot whose hitching up is described in the rest of the hemistich. I would therefore emend the tr. to "Now this radiant beam impels (the chariot) upward." The radiant beam is presumably the ritual fire, though it might be the beam of dawn, an identification that finds support in the mention of dawn in 2b. The chariot being impelled upward may not be the same as the Aśvins' chariot in the rest of the hemistich, but the complementary "chariot" of the ritual.

For the mild paradox in c, the three who form a pair, see publ. intro. That this refers to the two Aśvins paired with Sūryā was already well recognized by Ge (see his n. 1c).

IV.45.4: *uhū́-* is a hapax, and an onomatopoeic origin seems reasonable (see EWA s.v., citing AiG II.2.492). With sufficient goodwill, one can configure the bar-headed goose cries available for hearing on the internet as "uhu."

IV.45.6: *ākenipāsaḥ*: see Old, EWA s.v. *āké*.

Very unusually, pāda b is a verbatim repetition of 2d. Except in refrains, repeated pādas are almost never found in the same hymn. In this particular case the repeated pādas are symmetrical, that is found in vss. equidistant from the center, but there are no other signs of omphalos structure in this hymn, save for the faint ring-composition between vss. 1 and 7 (see below). Since horses and chariots are the referents in 2d, I supply horses as the subject here. That the sun then hitches up his horses in c may support this.

Although the intens. *dávidhu-* (also *dódhu-*) generally takes an object, it is often an internal one (that is, a body part of the subj., e.g., lips, horns), and in this passage I think it is simply intransitive (though Schaeffer, Intens. 138, supplies lips). Ge (/WG) supply 'darkness' as obj. on the basis of IV.13.4 *dávidhvataḥ … támaḥ*, but if, as seems likely, horses are the subject, I have trouble envisioning them shaking anything with their hooves.

IV.45.7: This final vs. in part reprises vs. 1: *ráthaḥ* begins both b pādas, and *párijmā* 'earth-encircling' of 1b is paraphrased by 7c *yéna sadyáḥ pári rájāṃsi yāthá́ḥ* "with which in a day you drive around the dusky realms" -- though *-jman-* and *rájas-* are of course unrelated, there is some phonological similarity. Given this ring-compositional effect between vss. 1 and 7, it is barely possible that we should supply *dhíyam* from cmpd *dhiyaṃdhā́-* in 7b as obj. to *úd iyarti* in 1a (see disc. there).

IV.46 Vāyu and Indra

IV.46.1: Since Vāyu has the first drink of soma to himself, it is appropriate that only he is called on in this vs.

IV.46.2: This vs. provides the transition between Vāyu as sole drinker and Vāyu and Indra as joint drinkers. Because the nominatives in b, *niyútvāṁ índrasārathiḥ*, are singular, it seems best, with Ge, Re, to supply a sg. impv. 'come' (vel sim.) for ab. The dual verb *tṛmpatam* in c has of course Vāyu and Indra as its subjects; Indra can be extracted from the cmpd. *índrasārathiḥ* in b, and the voc. *vā́yo* in c is in effect a truncated Vāyav Indraś ca construction. This construction is nonetheless avoided in the rest of the hymn: vss. 3–7 all contain the dual dvandva voc. *índravāyū*. Note that this stem never appears as the more "correct" **índrā-vāyū́* with du. first member.

IV.46.4: Ge unaccountably tr. the apparent aor. subjunctive *sthā́thaḥ* as an impv.; Re suggests that it may have a "nuance injonctive (malgré les désinences primaires)." Neither of these makeshifts seems necessary. Because of the *hí* I take this vs. as the foundation for the next, journey vs. -- first mount, then drive.

IV.47 Vāyu and Indra

As in the preceding hymn, vs. 1 is addressed only to Vāyu, with single voc., but the rest of the vss. address them jointly, in three different ways. In 2a we have a reverse Vāyav Indraś ca construction *índraś ca vāyo*, in 3a the same construction in normal order, and in 4d the dual dvandva voc. *índravāyū* found in 46.3-7.

IV.47.3: Of the two pāda-final qualifiers, *śuṣmínā* (a) and *śavasas patī* (b), the first is nom., the 2nd voc. It is not clear to me why, since, save for the accent, nom. and voc. would be identical.

IV.47.4: The qualifier of the teams, *puruspṛ́haḥ* 'craved by many', reprises 1d *spārháḥ*, used of Vāyu, again a faint sign of ring composition.

IV.48 Vāyu

IV.48.1: The publ. tr. renders *hótrā(ḥ)* as 'invocations'; this is possible, but it may also (or in addition) refer to 'ritual offerings', perhaps better in a Vāyu context.

As noted in the publ. intro., the construction and meaning of the first half of this vs. are disputed. Ge and Re (in diff. ways) take *vihí hótrā* as an independent clause and construe *ávītā(ḥ)* with pāda b, while Old (ZDMG 54.171–72), WG, and I take *ávītā(ḥ)* as qualifier of *hótrā(ḥ)*, forming an etymological figure with *vihí*. In pāda b the same verb ('pursue'), though not imperatival, is to be supplied in the simile, with subj. and obj. ranged around it. The disagreement among Old, WG, and me has to do with the identity of subj. and obj. WG take *vípaḥ* ("die Geisteserregten") as subj. and *rā́yo aryáḥ* ("die Reichtümer des Sippenherrn") as obj. This seems quite reasonable, save for the fact that in all clear cases *víp-* is non-animate 'inspiration, inspired poems' vel sim. Old also takes *vípaḥ* as subj. though in its usual sense, but construes with *aryáḥ* and tr. "die Gebete des Besitzlosen." This would be, to say the least, an unusual sense of *aryáḥ*; moreover, *rā́yo aryáḥ* is a common phrase (note in passing the phonological parallelism). As I said in the publ. intro., on the basis of VI.14.3 I believe that "the riches of the stranger" refers to the Ārya people in general and their poets in particular. In my reading of the simile here, this collectivity of poets is pursuing inspiration as avidly as Vāyu does invocations/libations.

IV.48.2: The poet's playfulness continues. The qualifier *niyútvan-*, 'possessing a team', common in these Vāyu contexts (see in this hymn sequence III.46.2, 47.1, 47.3) opens pāda b; the preceding pāda opens with a near phonological match, *niryuvāṇáḥ* -- a participle to the same verb with a preverb that is only minimally different from *ní*. (The lexeme *nír √yu* is found only here.) It should mean 'disjoin, disband'. My 'take out of harness' is an attempt to convey the play on *niyútvan-*: Vāyu 'unteams' the *áśāstīḥ*, while himself coming with his team.

IV.48.3: The standard tr. assume that Night and Dawn are directing themselves towards Vāyu. I think rather that they are simply following each other in the normal

daily succession. Since Vāyu comes at dawn, the transition between the two temporal halves is simultaneous with his journey.

On the "two black treasure chambers" (*kṛṣṇé vásudhītī*), see Bloomfield (RReps ad III.31.17): "The words kṛṣṇé and vásudhitī are both dvandva ekaśeṣa 'black (Night) and (Uṣas)' is a way of saying náktoṣâsā; conversely 'treasure-giving (Morn) and black (Night)' is uṣâsānáktā. Cf. Berg. i.250." In other words, *kṛṣṇá-* is applicable to Night, *vásudhīti-* to Day, but the two are conflated into a single dual expression.

IV.49 Indra and Bṛhaspati

As disc. in the publ. intro., this hymn seems to be modeled on the Indra/Vāyu hymns just preceding, esp. since there is no joint offering of soma to Indra and Bṛhaspati. Like Indra and Vāyu in IV.46.3–7, Indra and Bṛhaspati are consistently addressed with a dual dvandva, *índrābṛ́haspátī*, which is found only here. (Note the correct dual 1st member *índrā*, in contrast to *índra-vāyū* discussed ad IV.46.2.) This dvandva is found as an unaccented voc. in every vs., save for 5, where the fully accented form occurs as an acc. In addition, in 3b there is a headless Vāyav Indraś ca construction, *índraś ca*, lacking the voc. **bṛ́haspate* -- though the preceding pāda does contain voc. *indrābṛhaspatī*. See further below.

IV.49.3: As noted above, *índraś ca* in b signals a headless Vāyav Indraś ca construction, and indeed the "Vāyav" is apter than might appear at first glance. Pāda b is identical to I.135.7c, which is an Indra and Vāyu hymn. The missing voc. is found there, in pāda a: *vāyo*. Clearly our b was adapted from I.135.7, with the non-conforming god lopped off in this expression. I have not attempted to render the voc. dvandva plus mutilated Vāyav Indraś ca, unlike the standard tr., which supply an extra verb in a and an extra voc. in b.

IV.50 Bṛhaspati

On the divisions of the hymn, see publ. intro. Old and H.-P. Schmidt (cf. esp. B+I 215) consider it to be three separate hymns; I instead see it as a unified composition with three parts. So also Gonda (Vedic Lit., 191) and, implicitly, Ge. The hymn has been much tr.; besides the usual trio (Ge, Re [EVP 15.63–65], WG) also Macdonell (VRS), Maurer, Schmidt (B+I, vss. 1–6 216ff., 7–9 117, 10–11 96).

IV.50.1–6: As indicated in the publ. intro., this section concerns the unitary figure (Indra-)Bṛhaspati, here insistently identified as Bṛhaspati: there are 7 occurrences of the name in 6 vss., one in each save for two in vs. 2.

IV.50.1: The preverb *ví* is curiously positioned, neither adjacent to its verb nor to a metrical boundary. Perhaps its position is iconic, with 'earth' (*jmáḥ*) between its separated ends (*ví … ántān*).

As noted in the publ. intro., the VP *puráḥ … dadhire* "they set in front" marks the appointment of Bṛhaspati in what will be his later role, Purohita.

IV.50.2: The rel. clause of abc (by most interpr. -- c could also go with d) has no main clause correspondent in this vs. As most interpr. take it, the pl. *yé* seems rather to refer to the Ṛṣis in vs. 1 and continue that sentence, forming a transition to the explicit Vala myth.

The acc. *supraketám* in pāda a is taken by some (e.g., Old, Macdonell, Schmidt) as coreferential with the acc. in c, but I consider it too far from the verb and from the other accusatives to be an anticipatory object. Instead I prefer Ge's solution, to construe it loosely with *mádantaḥ* (cf. IV.33.10 *ukthā́ mádantaḥ*, also cited by Ge): Ge "jublend unter guten Vorzeichen," my "exulting at the good sign." Since Agni is several times called *praketá-* as the sign of the day or the ceremony (e.g., VII.11.1 *mahā́m asy adhvarásya preketáḥ* "you are the great visible sign of the ceremony"), I wonder if this is a temporal reference, dawn when the ritual fire is kindled.

The acc. phrase in c refers to the Vala cave and is the obj. of *abhí … tatasré* in b. The head-noun *ūrvá-* 'container, enclosure' refers to the cave itself, but the three adj. *pṛ́ṣantaṃ sṛprám ádabdham* "dappled, glossy, uncheatable" are better applicable to its contents, the cows. Note the mirror-image phonetic figure beginning c: *pṛ́ṣ(antaṃ) sṛp(rám*), which contains partial anagrams of B**ṛ**ha**sp**ati.

The "future impv." *rákṣatāt* in d is somewhat surprising, in that it does not follow a previous impv., as is usual. I take it to imply that Bṛhaspati should do his guarding after the Aṅgirases have breached the cave and released the cows. For another unexpected future impv. see nearby *suvatāt* in IV.54.3

IV.50.3: Ths vs. also contains phonetic echoes of Bṛhaspati: *ṛtaspṛ́ś(o*) (b) and *(vi)rapś(ám*) (d). Another phonetic pattern worthy of note, though it doesn't directly reference Bṛhaspati, is the unbroken sequence of short and long *a*, starting with *yā́* in pāda a (right after initial *bṛ́haspate*) and continuing into pāda b, till right before *ṛtaspṛ́śo*, the echo of the name: *ā a a ā a ā a, a a ā a.*

As Ge's cited parallels make clear, pāda b concerns the Sattra that the Aṅgirases performed.

IV.50.4: With Macdonell, I take *mahó jyótiṣaḥ* as a separate abl. phrase, rather than a gen. qualifying *paramé vyòman* with the standard interpr. Since we otherwise know little or nothing about Bṛhaspati's birth, it is difficult to make an informed choice. I have gone with the abl. interpr. because the common phrase *paramá- vyòman-* does not seem to be qualified by a gen. phrase elsewhere (though this is not decisive) and because the contrast in this vs. between light and the darkness that Bṛhaspati blows away would be stronger if he were directly born from light.

As usual, numerology is difficult to interpr. I think Ge is correct that the seven in *saptā́sya-* 'having seven mouths' must be the Aṅgirases (see the same word in the next hymn, IV.51.4). What the seven reins (*saptáraśmi-*) are is more difficult. Ge suggests the seven reins of the sacrifice; I prefer the seven seers, who are, in my opinion, the referents of the phrase *saptá raśmáyaḥ* in the enigmatic I.105.9 (see

comm. ad loc.). This would provide Bṛhaspati with two different connections to poetic speech, appropriately enough.

IV.50.6: As indicated in the publ. intro., this is the final vs. of the 1st section of the hymn and has the standard marks of a hymn-final summary vs. It is the best evidence that vss. 1–6 were a separate composition, only secondarily amalgamated with the following two sections. Nonetheless, I think it simply marks a pause and a transition to the thematically contrastive next section.

IV.50.7–8: These vss. are structured similarly: a main clause (or clauses) referring to the happy results for the king who (now a rel. cl.) properly treats a particular figure. The figure in vs. 6 is Bṛhaspati; filling the same slot in vs. 7 is the *brahmán-* 'formulator'. We have thus moved from the divine to the human realm, and the identity of Bṛhaspati and *brahmán-* is signaled by their parallel roles in the vs. structure.

IV.50.7: Note the etymological figure in c: *súbhṛtam bibhárti*.

The sense of *pūrvabhāj-* is limited by *pū́rva eti* in 8d and for that reason is presumably not a ritual technical term. (Vāyu would be the god who "receives the first portion" by that measure.)

IV.50.9: The shift from divine to human just noted above in vss. 7–8 comes full circle in this vs. The human Formulator is, it seems, in need of aid from the king (*avasyáve … brahmáṇe*), but if the king provides this aid he himself receives aid from the gods (*tám avanti devā́ḥ*).

IV.50.9–10: This last section consisting of two vss. introduces Indra by name for the first time in the hymn. The two divine figures are carefully balanced, as the address to them shows: vs. 10 opens with the name Indra in a reverse Vāyav Indraś ca construction, *índraś ca … bṛhaspate*, while two independent vocatives open vs. 11, this time with Bṛhaspati first: *bṛhaspata indra*.

IV.50.11: Ge, Re, and Schmidt all attach *sácā* to the preceding pāda (e.g., Ge "Stärket uns gemeinsam"). Despite the position of *sā́*, I think *sácā* belongs in the pāda in which it is found. So also WG.

IV.51 Dawn

It is worth noting that the nom. (and voc.) pl. of *uṣás-* is consistently *uṣásaḥ* in this hymn (every vs. but 10), with short suffixal vowel -- the newer form replacing inherited *uṣā́saḥ*.

As disc. in the publ. intro., this is an omphalos hymn, with the middle verse 6 posing the central question. This omphalos is surrounded by concentric rings: *divó duhitáro vibhātī́ḥ* of 1c is answered by the same phrase (in the voc.) in 10a and 11a,

while vss. 5 and 7 contain an inner ring with *ṛtá-* (*ṛtayúbhiḥ* 5a, *ṛtájātasatyāḥ* 7b) and *sadyáḥ* (5b, 7d). There is also much lexical chaining between adjacent vss.

IV.51.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the dawns are so insistently in the plural in this hymn that when a single one is referred to, another word must be used -- in this case *jyótiḥ* 'light'.

IV.51.2: Note absolute initial root aor. *ásthuḥ* contrasting with absolute final *asthāt* in 1b.

I have taken gen. *támasaḥ* as dep. on gen. *vrajásya* ("of the enclosure of darkness") with Ge, but *támasaḥ* could be dep. instead on *dvā́rā*, parallel to *vrajásya* (so Re, WG).

IV.51.3: The multivalent stem *citáya-* is here used in transitive value (see my disc. in *-áya-* book). The 3rd pl. *citayanta* is simply an *-anta* replacement of the expected active of the usual type (see my 1979 IIJ article).

IV.51.4: The opening of this vs. *kuvít sá* resonates with the opening of 6 *kúva svid*.

With Ge I take the *yénā* clause of cd to be a third possible course, against the old and new ones offered as possibilities in ab. Since cd presumably refers to the Aṅgirases' involvement in the Vala myth, it *is* the case that the Dawns' course in that instance was an unusual one: they came out of a rock!

IV.51.6: *katamā́* 'which one?' echoes *purutámam* 'the latest of many' in 1a. Note that again when a singular dawn is referred to, the word *uṣás-* is not used.

I do not understand what the Ṛbhus are doing here, nor do I know the exact sense of *ví √dhā* in the etymological figure *vidhā́nā vidadhúḥ*. A similar etym. figure is found in nearby IV.55.2 *vidhātā́ro ví … dadhuḥ*, where I tr. 'distribute', which I've imported here. However, I am now inclined to think that this has to do with the creative division of an undifferentiated mass (such as the Ṛbhus performed in I.161.2–3 also cited by Ge) and with the regulation of these divisions, possibly of divisions of time. Such "division" contrasts sharply with the lack of distinction among the dawns stated in cd. It is not surprising that a single (unnamed) dawn (pāda a) would be associated with division and distinction (pāda b), as opposed to the plural dawns in the rest of the hymn. For other interpr. of pāda b see the various tr. and comm.

IV.51.7: The opening *tā́*, esp. in its emphatic form *tā́ ghā tā́(ḥ)* is echoed by the openings of 8 (*tā́ ā́ …*) and 9 (*tā́(ḥ)*).

At the same time *sadyáḥ* makes an interior ring with 5b around the omphalos vs. What's striking about this little ring is that, though the *sadyáḥ* in 5 and 7 match verbally, the word is in a different temporal setting in the two vss: present in 5 and remote past in 7, and in 6 those two temporal settings are dissolved or confused (as also in a different way in 4).

The cmpd. *ṛtájātasatya-* is unusual not only in having 3 members (quite rare in the RV) but also for containing both *ṛtá-* and *satyá-*. Re suggests that *-satya-* functions as a sort of "particule intensive". Given how charged both words are in the RV, I think this unlikely, although the rendering in the publ. tr. ("who were really born of truth") is close to Re's intensive particle interpr; cf. his own tr. ("véritablement nées de l'Ordre"). I think the cmpd requires a more literal and weighty rendering -- "whose reality was born from truth" (which I would substitute for what is found in the publ. tr.) -- meaning that the dawns we see and who come daily to our world and our sacrifice, who are *really* here, arose from the true cosmic patterns that govern the universe of time and space.

IV.51.8–9: The unbroken similarity of the dawns who just keep coming, day after day, is conveyed by the stasis of these two vss., where forms of 'same' (8ab *samanā́ … sanānátaḥ samanyā́*, 9a *samanā́ samānī́ḥ*) and the same verb *caranti* (8a, 9b) bring all movement to a halt, even though the dawns are constantly on the move.

IV.52 Dawn

IV.52.1: Although by the time of the composition of this hymn the pun may have long been buried, for Indo-Europeanists the juxtaposition of **-Hner* and **g^{w}enH* (man and woman) (*sūnárī jánī*) is very cute.

Note the distraction of the usual "daughter of heaven" phrase into a three-termed alliterative phrase *divó adarśi duhitā́*.

IV.53 Savitar

IV.53.2: With *urú* we can supply *rájaḥ* from 3a, where *rájāṃsi* occurs as the obj. of the same verb *ā́ √prā*, or *antárikṣam*, the most common noun found with this neut. adj. and found in this phrase at the end of the immediately preceding hymn, IV.52.7b *antárikṣam urú*.

IV.53.3: As Ge's parallels show, this must be Savitar's own *ślóka*.

The dat. *svā́ya dhármaṇe* would be easier to parse as "for his own support." Both Ge and Re are rather cavalier about the dat. here. Ge tr. 'nach'; Re claims it's no different from the instr., further stating "indecision des cases obliques dans ce type de noms," which seems like a dangerous interpretive principle to me.

In cd I take *sávīmani* with the participles of d. In that pāda *aktúbhiḥ* 'through the nights' strictly speaking goes with *niveśáyan* 'causing to settle down'.

IV.53.6: The participles *niveśáyan prasuván* are reprised here as agentives *prasavitā́ nivéśanaḥ*.

IV.54 Savitar

IV.54.3: This middle vs. (the final vs., 6, opens out to other gods and is essentially extrahymnic) expresses the particular intercession we want Savitar to make for us and also admits to possible offenses committed by us that make this intercession necessary. The vs. also has a few disharmonies, unlike the smooth vss. that make up most of the rest of the hymn.

The first question is how to interpr. *yád*. If it is taken as a neut. rel. prn. ('what'), this leaves the main cl. of cd without a referent for this rel. If (with the standard tr.) it is taken as a general subordinating conjunction ('when, if'), this leaves the verb *cakṛmā́* without an obj. Ge just barrels through, tr. the verb as "gesüdigt haben" without comm.; Re and WG supply parenthetical objects ("une faute," "ein Vergehen"). Given *ánāgas-* in d and IV.12.3 *yád … ácittibhiś cakṛmā́ kác cid ā́gaḥ*, *ā́gaḥ* would be the appropriate obj. to supply if this syntactic path is chosen. I am therefore inclined now to emend the publ. tr. to "If we have committed an offense …"

The other question has to do with the verb *suvatāt* in d. First, why a future impv.? There is no prior impv. whose action it follows. (For a similarly unsupported fut. impv. see nearby *rákṣatāt* IV.50.2.) Moreover, the VP doesn't make sense: … *naḥ … suvatād ánāgasaḥ* should mean (as I tr. it) "impel us to be without offense," but how would Savitar's impulsion render us offenseless? The standard tr. simply fudge the verb: Ge "so sollst du … bestimmen, dass wir daran schuldlos sind"; Re "veuille … nous en rendre innocents" (which he then further glossses "veuille nous susciter = nous faire sortir (de l'état de péché, en sorte d'apparaître) innocents" [one of Re's finer parentheses]); WG "… sollst du … uns daran für schuldlos erklären." But none of these is a standard (or even non-standard) use of this verb, and since forms of this verb are found in vss. 2, 4–6 with its normal sense (at least in my opinion; see below), we can't simply impose a new interpr. for contextual convenience. I have two remarks on this. First, it is striking that in what is otherwise a pretty simple hymn, it is in the vs. most significant to the human audience that we encounter little issues in the words themselves. I think this is a sign that the poet wants his audience to slow down, to really pay attention, and the way he gets this accomplished is by tossing little obstacles in our path, requiring us to turn the phrases around in our heads until we get a satisfactory sense. We could generalize this observation to RVic poetry as a whole: one of the (many) reasons it is so difficult is that the poet assumes that an audience that has to do a lot of the work will really engage with the poetry, will get deeper into its meaning. The second remark has to do with what we get if we reflect further on why the poet use a form of √*sū* here. In this hymn and the last (IV.53), not to mention most other Savitar hymns, Savitar's control over all the parts of the cosmos and, especially, of the alternating movement and rest of living beings (cf. esp. IV.53.3, 6) is powerfully asserted and associated with the verb (√*sū*) that supplies his name. Impelling us to be without offense is simply a specialized version of this: his special power of √*sū* enables him to push all the elements (including weak humans) back into cosmic balance.

IV.54.4: The standard tr. supply as subj. of *pramíye* and referent of *tád* the whole *yáthā* cl. of b. But one of the most common objects of (*prá*) √*mī* is *vratá-*, and in the

preceding Savitar hymn his *vratá*-s were much in evidence: 4a *vratā̃ni deváḥ savitā̃bhí rakṣate*, 4d *dhṛtávrataḥ*, 5c *tríbhir vrataíḥ*. I therefore think *vratám* should be supplied here; among other things this follows directly on the vs. presenting the offenses we may have committed against the gods, and it would be appropriate to reaffirm the importance of not offending Savitar in particular.

I then take the *yáthā* clause as a purpose clause. We shouldn't violate Savitar's commandment because we want him to (continue to) support the world. Although we generally expect the subjunctive in such clauses, the future is beginning to supercede the subjunctive in general and would make fine sense here. (Re states that this is the only ex. of *yáthā* with the future.)

IV.54.5: The standard tr. here impose a different sense on √*sū* than in the previous vs. and one no more aligned with its usual semantics, i.e., 'assign, direct', with the interpr. that Savitar is assigning dwelling places to gods (the high mountains) and to men (*pastyā̃vataḥ*, interpr. by Ge and Re as watery places, WG just dwelling). Old, however, resists the easy contextual shift and attempts to find an interpr. compatible with lexicon and grammar. (Among other things, he points out that unaccented *ebhyaḥ* should not introduce a new referent, 'men', into the discourse.) He does not settle on an interpr., however. My own interpr. assumes first that *índrajyeṣṭhān* refers to the Maruts, rather than the gods in general. (This stem sometimes modifies one, sometimes the other.) I also take *párvatebhyaḥ* not as dat., but abl. The Maruts tend to haunt the high mountains, but Savitar can dislodge them. He can also impel the clouds on which they (fancifully) dwell -- this is, in my opinion, the referent of *kṣáyān … pastyā̃vataḥ*, with *ebhyaḥ* here a dative referring to the previously mentioned Maruts, thus properly unaccented. The 2nd hemistich announces that the famously hyperactive Maruts can be controlled by Savitar: they can fly widely, but they can also be brought to a standstill.

IV.55 All Gods

For the structure of the hymn and its parts, see publ. intro. As indicated there, the first 7 vss. (in Triṣṭubh) are concentrically structured, with the agenda set by the questions posed in vs. 1. There are a number of difficulties, and much remains uncertain. The final three vss. (in Gāyatrī) appear to have originally been a separate hymn, as has long been recognized, and are quite straightforward.

IV.55.1: On the anomalous form *trā̃sīthām* see Old. Whatever its morphological status otherwise, it is clearly a dual, and therefore, strictly speaking, only *dyā̃vābhūmī* can be its subj., not the additional voc. *adite*.

Since pāda b is a repetition (=VII.62.4), Ge interprets it as parenthetical, with pāda c continuing pāda a ("who is the protector and defender … from the stronger mortal") (so also Bloomfield, RReps). The is not impossible, but since the abl. phrase in c can just as easily be construed with the verb in b, I see no reason why the repeated pāda can't have been stitched into the fabric of this vs. (Re and WG both take c with b, as I do.)

With Ge, I take *vaḥ* as a dat. of benefit: the wide space is made for the gods (see also Oberlies, Relig. des RV I.461). Re and WG construe *vaḥ* with *káḥ* ("which among you?"), and WG specifically indicate that the wide space is made for us by one of the gods. Although the identical phrase *kó vaḥ* opening pāda a favor this latter interpr., I follow Ge, in part because I think whoever would be acting thus at the ceremony would be a human ritual officiant.

IV.55.2: My understanding of this difficult and disputed vs. is set forth in the publ. tr. I will not engage here in detail with the various alternative interpr. offered by others. I take the vs. in general as a response to the question posed in 1d (as I understand that question), "who will make wide space at the ceremony for you gods?" The answer is the unnamed priests acting at the dawn sacrifice. It is the priests who chant the ordinances in 2a, at the time when the dawns are "dawning widely" (*ví … uchā̆n*)(2b), with the notion of "wide space" implicit. The priests return in c, distributing the dakṣiṇās (or perhaps the dawns themselves perform the distribution). Pāda c contains two forms of the *ví* (*vidhātā̆ro ví … dadhuḥ*), echoing the two in b (*ví … uchā̆n viyotā̆raḥ*). Though the *ví* forms in c are not directly connected to "wide space," they continue that theme verbally. Pāda d has the dawns as subject.

In my interpr. of b, with dawns as subj., one could expect a fem. agent noun **viyotrí-*, but *-tár-* forms can serve for fem. as well, esp. as an attributive (so better tr. "they (the dawns) as discriminators …"). As pointed out in the publ. tr., the dawns "discriminate" because they separate night and day. Old has a clever, but I think ultimately incorrect, suggestion that instead of *uchā̆n* we should read **yuchā̆n* to √*yu* 'separate', providing an etymological figure *ví … *yuchā̆n viyotā̆raḥ*, exactly parallel to *vidhātā̆ro ví … dadhuḥ* in the flg. pāda. (Old seems also to consider only to reject this idea.)

The grammatical identity of *rurucanta* is unclear. Lub calls it a pf. subjunctive, and Ge and Thieme (Plusq. 46) interpr. it as hortative. But the zero-grade would be anomalous for a subjunctive. Kü (430–31) takes it rather as an injunctive, although he does not see a clear injunctive context (though generell-erwähnende Funktion seems possible). I also interpr. it as injunctive, in the publ. tr. with preterial sense, though "shine" would work as well in context.

IV.55.3: In pāda a #*prá … arkaíḥ*# echoes 2a #*prá … árcān*#.

The 2nd hemistich gives some support to my interpr. of vs. 2b, that the dawns are marking the limit between night and day. Here Night and Dawn arrange that both day halves provide protection.

As WG point out, all the divinities here are fem.

IV.55.4: I take *ví … ceti* to √*ci* 'pile'; see comm. ad I.90.4. Re assigns it to √*cit* 'perceive' (so also Gr); WG to √*ci* 'perceive' as an Augenblicksbildung to the aor. stem.

The final word of the vs., *várūtham*, recalls *varūtā́*, the final word of the 1st pāda of the hymn (1a). As indicated in the publ. intro., I consider vss. 3–5 to be a response to the question posed in the hymn's first pāda.

IV.55.5: The echo of vs. 1 noted at the end of vs. 4 continues here, where *devásya trātúḥ* picks up *trātā́* of 1a (as well as *trā́sīthām* in 1b). The abl. "(protect) from …" in 1c *sáhīyasaḥ … mártāt* recurs in cd *jányād áṃhasaḥ … mitríyāt*.

The standard tr. begin a new clause at the beginning of d and take *mitríyāt* with *uruṣyet*. This is not impossible; nonetheless I prefer to construe *mitró mitríyāt* with c. The strict parallelism/gapping of the 1st part, plus the pāda-medial *utá naḥ* in d I find too compelling to ignore, since *utá* generally begins new clauses. It is true, however, that *uruṣyá-* is several times found with *áṃhasaḥ*. The purport is much the same either way.

The standard tr. take *jánya-* as referring to foreign people (this goes back at least to Gr., meaning 2a). I do not know of any evidence for this interpr., and in fact all clear passages indicate that it's someone/-thing belonging to one's own people (which would be the default reading of such a deriv., in my view). Here the contrast is between problems internal to the group and those coming from allies (external but contractually connected).

Pāda d revives the question of wide space, here with a god making it for mortals (us), which might give support to the Re / WG interpr. of 1d (see above). Nonetheless, I think the overall structure of the hymn fits better with my interpr.

IV.55.6: This vs. is close to impenetrable. For my view of its function in the hymn, see publ. intro. I am still baffled by the concentration on water in bcd and by the proper disposition of the parts of cd.

The first question to approach is the root identity and referent of *iṣṭá-* in b. The standard view is that it belongs to √*iṣ* 'desire' and the phrase *ápyebhir iṣṭaíḥ* refers to "desired watery (gods)" (so, more or less, Ge, Re, WG) as an instr. of accompaniment referring to another set of recipients of praise. Although there do seem to be one, at most two, references to watery gods (masc.) -- VI.50.11, maybe VII.35.11 (though that appears to have fem. referents) -- most of the animate beings qualified as *ápya-* are females. I don't know who the watery gods might be. My interpr. of the phrase is quite diff.: I take *iṣṭá-* to √*yaj* 'sacrifice'. Although its ppl. *iṣṭá-* is rare and rarely applied to the object sacrificed, there are such examples: compare I.162.15, where it refers to the sacrificed horse, also in the same hymn *svìṣṭa- yajñá-* vs. 5. I then take our *ápya- iṣṭá-* to be equivalent to X.86.12 *ápyaṃ havíḥ* "watery oblation."

Under this interpr. the water sacrifices are what the unnamed priests have revealed /opened up (*ápa vran*, using language from the Vala myth), and they are implicitly compared with two different entities: the contents of the gharma pot and rivers. In d *gharmásvarasaḥ*, lit. 'having the gurgling of the gharma pot', targets the sound of the watery sacrifices, while *samúdraṃ ná saṃcáraṇe … nadyàḥ* "like rivers in their converging on the sea" refers to their movement to their goal (presumably

the gods -- cf. X.86.12 *yásyedáṃ havíḥ priyáṃ devéṣu gáchati*). I have major misgivings about my interpr., however, for several reasons. The parts of the simile just proposed are quite separated, with the first part opening c and the 'rivers' only appearing in the middle of d, after the bahuvrīhi referring to the gharma pot. Although some distraction of complex similes is not rare, this seems an extreme example. Moreover, pāda c is identical to I.56.2, where there are no rivers in the context (but where the pāda doesn't make much sense in context either). On the other hand, rivers converging on the sea is a very common trope in the RV, and so the distraction would not be too challenging to interpret. I am not particularly convinced by my own construction of this hemistich, but I find the the various other attempts at wringing sense out of it (in addition to the standard tr., cf. Lüders [Var. 190–91]) no more (indeed generally less) persuasive.

IV.55.7: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. in part forms a clear ring with vs. 1 and provides the answer to the question in 1a. Note the reoccurrence of the gods Aditi, Mitra, and Varuṇa, as well as of the agent noun *trātár-* and a finite form of the root √*trā* (here *trātā́ trāyatām*).

The 2nd hemistich is somewhat puzzling, however, and has given rise to a number of competing interpr. (in addition to the standard, see Janert [*Dhāsi*, pp. 6, 43ff., 52], Thieme [ZDMG 95.109], Scar [387, and Lühr 1997 cited by Scar]). Ge and Re both attempt to give *sā́nu* a loc. sense (Ge by taking it as a truncation of *sā́nuni*, a move that Re disallows), but by form it ought to be an object parallel to *dhāsím*: the *dhāsí* of Mitra and Varuṇa (and) the back of Agni. This is the interpr. of Janert, and I follow him in his syntactic evaluation, though I do not necessarily follow him in seeing the *dhāsí-* of M+V as the seat of truth nor the back of Agni as the back of the Sun (as the heavenly Agni). I tentatively would suggest that not violating the back of Agni means not failing to provide appropriate oblations (recall that Agni is sometimes called *ghṛtásnu-* 'ghee-backed'). Judging from X.30.1, the "wellspring of Mitra and Varuṇa" is in heaven among the gods -- presumably the source of rain. Not violating it may again mean not failing to make the oblations that will travel to heaven and replenish that source of water. Perhaps the "watery sacrifices" in vs. 6 are connected.

IV.56 Heaven and Earth

IV.56.1: As often, *árka-* can be a pun, both 'ray' and 'chant'.

As Ge (and others) suggest, the bull in d is probably Agni (/Sun), who every morning recreates the two worlds in their separation with his light.

IV.56.2: This vs. contains several puns, including a repetition of *śucáyadbhir árkaiḥ* from 1d. The final word of the 1st hemistich *ukṣámāṇe* can belong either to √*ukṣ* 'sprinkle' or to √*vakṣ* 'grow', and both are appropriate. And the preceding negated participle *áminatī* can take different objects and utilize different senses of the root √*mī*. On the one hand, as Re (and others) point out, the other occurrence of *áminatī*

(I.92.12=124.2) takes *daívyāni vratā̆ni* "heavenly commandments" as object. However, cf. nearby *ámīta-varṇa-* 'of immutable color' (IV.51.9), which supports Ge's "ohne (ihr Aussehen) zu verändern."

IV.56.5: The phrase *máhi dyávī* is very problematic morphologically. It echoes the first two words of the hymn: *mahî dyā̆vāpṛthivī* "great Heaven and Earth," but in a very refracted form. I do not have a solution for how it came to take the form it has (for various suggestions, see Old and the standard tr., as well as lit. cit. therein, e.g. AiG III.52, 226). I can get a certain distance, quite speculatively, but no further. I tentatively suggest that we start with an alternative dual dvandva **dyā̆vā-mahî*, with *mahî* 'the great (fem.)' substituting for 'earth'. I then suggest that something like a Vāyav Indraś ca construction was created to it, with the 2nd member properly providing the first term of the construction (see my "Vāyav Indraś ca Revisited"). The proper voc. sg. of *mahî-* would be *máhi* (which is indeed attested, though without accent [and not qualifying earth]). In this context it shouldn't have an accent, but that's the least of our problems. Unfortunately that's as far as I can get. We should expect, per my suggestion, the 2nd part of the construction to contain **dyaúś ca*, and that's about as far from *dyávī* as one can be and still belong to the same stem. I can spin a line of analogies: *dyávī* is a rough-and-ready nominative sg., built from a full-grade form of the stem found in *dyā̆vā* (found in loc. sg. *dyávi*) and the fem. *-ī*. But I can't imagine why anyone would create such a form, particularly to a stem so well known to every RVic poet. If it participated in a phonetic or semantic figure, there might be motivation but I see none.

IV.56.6: In ab *mitháḥ* 'mutually' and *svéna dákṣeṇa* 'by your own skill' seem implicitly to contrast.

On *ūhyā̆the* see Old and more recently Kü (489–90) and Hoffmann (Aufs. III.776).

IV.57 Agricultural Divinities

IV.57.1: With Ge, Re, Oberlies (RRV I.189), I supply *mitréṇa* with *hiténeva*; WG by contrast take it to √*hi* 'impel' and assume a winning horse.

IV.58 Ghee

IV.58.2: The final pāda, with Soma (as a buffalo) vomiting (*avamīt*) ghee, takes one aback, esp. after the high-style extolling that has preceded it. Ge's explanation, that "ghee" is a secret sacred word ("ein sakrales Geheimwort") and Soma reveals it, may be correct. But the bluntness of the verb still surprises, and I am inclined to think something further is going on. There are only two verb forms to √*vam* in the RV, and the other one (*váman* X.108.8) also has speech as its object, but the evil Paṇis as subj. Note that the Paṇis are found in vs. 4, as hiders of the ghee. Does our passage

express some sort of rivalry between the two ritual substances? Or does it have to do with the Sautrāmaṇi ritual, meant to cure Indra after vomiting?

IV.58.3: Clearly no bull found in nature. The numerology here presumably has to do with items in the ritual. For a conspectus of later interpr., see WG n.

IV.58.4: As was just noted, the Paṇis (niggards) may be indirectly implicated in the verb *avamīt* in 2d. Here they appear overtly, as the hiders of ghee -- presumably a reference to their stealing of the cows, since the gods find the ghee in the cow in pāda b.

The threefold nature and creation of ghee has been variously interpreted; it again participates in the numerology of the hymn. I do not have a view on it.

IV.58.5–10: Each of these 6 vss. contains the phrase *ghṛ́tásya dhā́rāḥ* (or equiv.: *ūrmáyo ghṛ́tásya* in 6c).

IV.58.5: "My" ability to see the ghee streams indirectly attests to my good character, since the cheat cannot see them.

IV.58.6: Pāda c combines *etā́ arṣanti* from 5a with a variant of the repeated *ghṛ́tásya dhā́rāḥ*, namely *ūrmáyo ghṛ́tásya*.

IV.58.7: A difficult verse, primarily because of the two hapaxes, *śūghanā́saḥ* and *vā́tapramiyaḥ*. The former is taken by Ge as 'whirlpools, eddies' (Wirbel)(followed not terribly enthusiastically by Re) on no particular basis, and others have added their own at best weakly supported tr.: e.g., Thieme 'cow-killing' [*śū-* < **pśu-*] KlSch. 52), most recently WG 'die schwellenden Massen' (presumably with root noun 1st member and later *ghana-* 'clump, mass'). The interpr. reflected in the publ. tr. is no stronger than these others. It begins with *ghaná-* 'smiter' (well represented in the RV), as Th's also must. But for 1st member I assume a zero-grade of *āśú-* 'swift' (for the uncertainties of the initial of the PIE 'swift' words, see EWA s.v.) with lengthening at compound seam. With two such ad hoc assumptions, the interpr. is simply a place-holder.

As for *vā́tapramiyaḥ*, there is no question about its component parts, merely about how they fit together. *-pramiyaḥ* patterns with the nearby forms IV.54.4 *pramíye* ('to be violated') and IV.55.7 *pramíyam* ('to violate'). It also strongly recalls I.24.6 *ná yé vā́tasya praminánti ábhvam* "nor those [=the gods] who confound the wind's formless mass." As Old points out, this latter passage fixes the interpr. of our cmpd.: the first member must be functionally the object of the 2nd. The problem is the accent; it should be a bahuvrīhi, not a tatpuruṣa. See, however, Scar (388), who suggests a plausible bahuvrīhi interpr. 'die Schmälerung des Windes habend', with the first member essentially an objective genitive. The point is that the speed and violence of the streams are stronger than those of the wind, which is thus confounded.

I read *kāṣṭhā(ḥ)* in both simile and frame: in the simile it refers to the wooden barriers of the race-course that the horse splits in his speeding around the course, in the frame to sticks floating in the current of the streams and split (against rocks vel sim.) by the violent speed of that current. (Of course the "frame" here is itself metaphorical, since these are streams of ghee, not actual watercourses.)

IV.58.8: The violence of the movement of the ghee-streams in the preceding vs. is abruptly replaced by the placid and benign approach of these same streams in this vs.

IV.58.11: Re points out the ring composition of 11d *mádhumantaṃ ta ūrmím* and 1a *ūrmír mádhumān*.