VIII.1 Indra

VIII.1.1: In the publ. tr. I take *ca* in d as conjoining the two clauses found in c and d (so apparently also Ge and explicitly Klein, DGRV I.103, 105). However, given that the *ca* is somewhat wrongly positioned and that it reminds us of other *ukthā́ ca* passages, I now consider it possible that *ukthā́ ca* is part of a truncated conjoined NP. See disc. ad VIII.82.4.

VIII.1.2: This verse, couched in the acc. sg. masc., is entirely dependent on the *índram* of 1c.

In b Ge (followed by, e.g., Scar 163) takes *gā́m* as a "(Kampf)stier" terrorizing the communities. Although it is of course sometimes necessary to interpret forms of *gó-* as masculine, the feminine "cow" predominates (esp. in contrast to the bull of 1c and 2a), and the Kampfstier seems to me an invention of contextual desperation. I interpret it instead as the first member of a decoupled compound **go-ṣáh* (like *go-jít-*), parallel to *carṣani-* in *carṣani-ṣáh-*. A similar decoupling is found in the next pāda, and playing with analytic versus synthetic expressions is found elsewhere in the RV (see, e.g., VII.19.3–4). A plural *gā́s* might have been desirable, but number is of course neutralized in 1st compound members, and when decoupled, the default might be the singular.

In the compound *ubhayaṃkarám* 'making both', the 1st compound member *ubhaya-* 'both' is further specified by two syntactically independent words *vidvéṣaṇam* and *saṃvánanā* – a play reminiscent of the one proposed for the preceding pāda. For the latter word, Old considers but seems to reject the possibility that it represents *saṃvánanam* with contraction of *-a-* with following *u-* over the *-m.* It sees best to accept the text we have and interpret *saṃvánanā* as neut. pl., contrasting with the singular of *vidvéṣaṇam*. Perhaps Indra favors unions over divisions, and it would also be a clever reversal for 'division', which is inherently plural, to be presented in the singular, while 'union', which is inherently singular, is in the plural. It would also be possible to take *saṃvánanā* as an instr. singular of accompaniment: "division by hate along with union by love."

VIII.1.3: I follow Klein (I.58–59) in taking the *ca* as connecting *áhā víśvā* with *idám* used in a temporal sense. We might have preferred the order **áhā ca víśvā* in the 2nd constituent. but compare I.130.2, 9 *áhā víśveva*, where the phrase also behaves as an indissoluble unit before the particle *iva.*

VIII.1.4: Following Old I take both *vipaścítaḥ* and *vípaḥ* as nom. pl., rather than taking the latter as a genitive sg. (with Ge et al.). The thought is that the poets and their products that belong to and emanate from the competing sides – that of the stranger and that of our peoples – keep crossing each other in their efforts to reach and attract Indra. For a thorough discussion of the possibilities of this hemistich see Old, who calls it a "Musterbeispiel für Vieldeutigkeit." The intensive *ví tartūryante* brilliantly captures the constant roiling motion of these competitive elements.

The abrupt imperative *úpa kramasva* seems to merit a slangy tr.

nédiṣṭham appears to be functioning proleptically: bring it here so that it will be nearby.

VIII.1.5: This verse contains one of the two examples of *śulká-* in the RV. The word later becomes specialized in the meaning 'brideprice', but clearly does not mean that here.

On the famous root aor. opt. (trisyllabic) *deyām*, see Jamison 1999, with discussion of some of the abundant sec. lit.

VIII.1.6: Pāda c contains a cute and tricky construction: a conjoined nominative subject of a 2nd ps. dual verb, with one of the subjects gapped. That is, underlying **tvám mātā́ ca* "you and a mother" is reduced to *mātā́ ca*, with the other subject only detectable in the verb *chadayathaḥ* and implied by the *ca*. Similar gapping with the 1st dual is found, e.g., in VII.88.3 *ā́ yád ruhā́va váruṇaś ca nā́vam* "When we two, (I) and Varuṇa, mounted the boat…," VIII.69.7 *úd yád … gṛhám índraś ca gánvahi* "when we two, (I) and Indra , go up to his house…." Both constructions are somewhat reminiscent of the *vā́yav índraś ca* construction, though that does not involve gapping.

The sentiment of the verse is likewise a bit tricky. In ab the poet dismisses father and brother as providing no benefit, in contrast to Indra, who is "good for goods" (cd), but Indra is equated (positively) with a mother, who would in this society of course have little or no control over goods and giving (as opposed to the father and brother).

VIII.1.7: On *iyatha* (rather than *iyetha*) see Kü (100), following Hoffmann 1976: 553 n. 3.

The verse contains several unexpressed presuppositions. The anxious questions in pāda a are explained by the statement in b: we ask where Indra is because we know his mind is in many places. With Ge I take *álarṣi* in c also as a question, again explained by d: they have sung to you, so are you coming?

Pāda c contains a heavy, accentless vocative phrase: *yudhma khajakṛt puraṃdara*, the last two of whose members contain object-governing compounds. The long (12-syl.) third pāda of bṛhatī nicely accomodates such iterations.

VIII.1.8: The first hemistich reprises 7cd, with a close variant of 7d recast in the imperative (8a), and one of the vocatives of 7c made into a predicated nominative (8b). This compound (*puraṃdaráḥ*) is in turn transformed into an independent clause (with lexical variation) in 8d: *bhinát púraḥ*. This process is reminiscent of the play with synthetic and analytic means of expression in vs. 2.

The fem. pl. relative *yā́bhiḥ* has no possible antecedent anywhere in this verse or nearby verses. The only possible fem. pl. referent is the 'fortresses' implicit in *puraṃdaráḥ*, but this makes no sense. With Old and Ge I supply 'songs', suggested

by pl. *gāyatrā́* in 7d, although not directly connected thereto, because *gāyatrá-* is neuter.

Hoffmann (1967: 237–38) takes *bhinát* as a parenthetical verse filler, with the injunctive expressing a characteristic of Indra, parallel to *vajrî́*. Although he is attempting to account for the fact that *bhinát* is injunctive and *yā́sat* is subjunctive (and perhaps for the fact that sitting on the barhis and splitting fortresses can't be done at the same time), this explanation seems over-complex. *bhinát* is a rhyme form to *yā́sat*, and the expected subjunctive *bhinádat* would be a good candidate for haplology under these circumstances.

VIII.1.10: Most interpret *gāyatrá-vepas-* with a trans./caus. sense of *vepas-* (Gr 'zu Gesängen anregend', Ge 'die die Sänger beredt macht', Scar [69] sim.), but neither independently or in compounds does *vépas-* have this sense; it simply means 'trembling excitation, excitement'. Moreover the usage of *gāyatrá-* nearby in this hymn (7d, 8a) indicates that Indra (who is the referent of *gāyatrá-vepasam*, though in the guise of a cow) is the recipient of the songs, not their inciter. Presumably his pleasure in them will induce him to be a "good milker" by giving largesse to the singers, but at least in this passage he does not seem to be giving inspiration to the singers in the form of songs.

Trisyllabic *án [i]yām* in c is problematic, distinguished from *anyá-* 'other' both by accent and by trisyllabic reading. Nonetheless Ge (reluctantly, see his n.) tr. it as if it belonged to that stem: "eine andere [zweite]…" Old by contrast derives it from *á-ni-ya-* 'nicht niedergehend, nicht (in Unglück) hineingeratend'. (I assume that he meant the final portion to be analyzed as the root √*i* 'go', with thematic vowel, but he doesn't specify.) Both Gr and Scar (69) extend this semantically to 'nicht versiegend' (not drying up), which pushes the limit in my view. Its only other occurrence is in VIII.27.11, in a less diagnostic context but one that is at least compatible with a bovine referent. My own analysis of this word is admittedly quite shaky. I take it as a back formation of sorts from *ánīka-*'forefront' and meaning "belonging to the forefront, lead(-cow)'. Dawn is regularly called *ánīka-* and the word is sometimes used of her cows (e.g., I.124.11 *yuṅkté gávām aruṇā́nām ánīkam* "She yokes the forefront of the ruddy cows"). A couple of not very strong models can be adduced: *samanīká-* 'encounter' / *samanyà-* 'appropriate to the encounter', *dṛ́śīka-* 'appearance'/ *dṛ́[ś]ya-* 'to be seen'. However, I am aware of the weakness of this analysis, and only produce it because other analyses are equally weak; Old's is certainly thinkable, though not with the explicit extension to 'not running dry' made by others.

VIII.1.11: Various semi-understood myths are alluded to here, with minimal (or no) identification of the subjects of the three parallel injunctives (*tudát*, *váhat*, and *tsárat*). I am inclined to take the subject of all three as Indra (who is clearly the subject of the middle one), but see both Ge and Old for discussion of other possibilities.

VIII.1.12: As indicated in the intro., this verse poses serious problems of interpretation. It is also found in the AV in a marriage hymn (AVŚ XIV.2.47), used as an expiation when something is broken during the sacrifice, or anything on the bridal car needs mending, or when a student's staff is broken (see Whitney AV ad loc.). The verse is extensively and illuminatingly discussed by Old, who summarizes the first two pādas as indicating that (a) Indra heals without using any adhesive material to bring together the damaged parts, and b) he does so before the weapon (unmentioned but presumed by Old to be the cause of the damage) drills through to the collarbones, or rather the rib cartilage. This scenario seems plausible, although it rests on several assumptions not explicit in the text, and it is essentially followed by Ge, Tichy 1995: 327, 338, and Scar. I would only mildly dispute taking the root noun *abhiśríṣ-* in pāda a as a concrete noun, a sort of bandaid (*ṛté cid abhiśríṣaḥ* "auch ohne Verband" Ge, Tichy, Scar; see also EWA II.670), a piece of equipment that seems uncharacteristic of Indra. This ablative seems to me parallel to the ablative in b, *purā́ ... ātṛ́daḥ* "before drilling through," and this parallelism invites an abstract verbal interpretation of *ṛté … abhiśríṣaḥ* "without clasping/taking hold." The point would be that Indra can heal from afar, without even touching the afflicted, and can intervene before the damage is done. The root √*śreṣ* is primarily an Atharvan word and is found elsewhere in the RV only in the horse sacrifice hymn, I.162.11. Most similar to our passage is AV III.9.2 *aśreṣmā́ṇo adhārayan* "Without claspers they held fast."

VIII.1.13: Both this verse and the next seem to rest on the unexpressed presupposition that on our own we have a pretty poor impression of ourselves, but if Indra will pay attention to us, we'll feel good about ourselves again. (Early lessons in self-esteem!) It may be that the curious verse 12 that immediately precedes sets the stage for these verses by depicting Indra as one who can set everything to rights. See esp. the last pāda of 12.

On *duróṣa-* see EWA s.v. This rare and unclear word must be compared with similarly unclear Aves. *dūraoša-*, an epithet associated with haoma. The tr. adopted here, 'difficult to burn', makes a connection with the Aves. forms more difficult (see disc. in EWA) and is not altogether a good fit in any of the RVic instances; nonetheless, the alternatives seem worse.

VIII.1.14–17: Note the concentration of nominal forms of the root √*stu* 'praise' in these verses: *stómam* 14d, 15a, *sadhástutim* 16a, *úpastutiḥ* 16c, *suṣṭutím* 16d. The appearance of *sómam* in 17a signals a sort of ring-composition by variant, echoing the two forms of *stómam* in successive pādas of 14 and 15.

VIII.1.14: Although the primary sense of d, "take delight in your praise," is surely that the poets will enjoy praising Indra, in the context of these two verses it presumably also implies that they will take delight because their praise will put them (back?) into Indra's good graces and thereby improve their own view of themselves and their chances of making good.

VIII.1.15: Again the uncertainty about whether Indra will pay attention to their praise gives a slightly nervous air to the beginning of this verse. In the 2nd pāda the full form of 'our' (*asmā́kam*) is fronted; a tr. better reflecting this emphasis and in harmony with the poets' anxieties about Indra's attention would be "let it be *our* (soma-)drops that invigorate Indra…" Cf. 3cd.

VIII.1.16: The phraseology of this verse echoes some previous ones: its opening *ā́ tv àdyá* is identical to 10a, and *vāvā́tar-* 'favorite' occurs in the RV only here and in 8b (in the same position).

VIII.1.17: Because *dhāvata* in b is unaccented, it cannot be directly parallel with *sótā* in pāda a, as, e.g., Ge takes it, because the *hí* of a should then have domain over b and induce accent on the verb. I take the *hí* clause as indicating the grounds or prior action needed for the next clause, as so often when *hí* appears with the imperative (see Brereton 2012). It is also possible that *sótā* is an injunctive, though clear impv. *sotā* in 19b disfavors this interpretation.

On the *īm enam* doubling see Jamison 2002.

In c I take *gavyā́* as part of the frame, not the simile, because of the position of *iva*. Contra Ge, who takes *gavyā́ vástrā* as the simile: "[g]leichsam in Milchgewänder…"

dhukṣan should be an injunctive to the *sa*-aorist found in *ádhukṣat*, etc., the only reliably attested sigmatic aorist to √*duh*. It would be appealing to interpret it as a subjunctive to an athematic *s*-aorist (as the pub tr. "will milk"and Ge's "wollen … herausmelken" suggest), but it should then have full-grade **dhokṣan*.

VIII.1.19: The second hemistich contains a slight reversal of expectations: *śakrá-* is a standard epithet of Indra, who must be the subject of *pīpayat* (unless we read loc. *śakre*, not nom. *śakraḥ* with Pp.). But we do not expect Indra to swell the soma drink – if anything the reverse. (In fact, Gr suggests that *śakrá-* modifies soma in just this instance.) I think we must take Indra as the indirect agent of the swelling of soma: by his presence at the sacrifice he causes the sacrificers to press and mix the soma with water and milk, thus swelling it. See Old on this verse.

VIII.1.20: *gáldā-* appears in the RV only here and its meaning and etymology are entirely unclear. See EWA s.v. as well as detailed discussion by Old. In his study of the word (AcOr 13 [1925], see ref. in EWA), Lüders suggests that it means 'Strom, Gerausche'; although most do not accept Lüders' interpretation, it makes contextual sense here, and a passage adduced by Old from MŚS I.7.2.18 *ā mā viśantu indava ā galdā dhamanīnām*, where it is parallel to *indu* and is the *galdā(ḥ)* of pipes (*dhamanīnām*) also supports an interpretation in that general sphere. Note that the fact that the word begins and ends with plain voiced stops makes it phonotactically unlikely to be an inherited word, at least in the form we have it, and the *-l-* marks it as "popular."

The notion that "begging" by inferiors of superiors is a social requirement and also a potential source of annoyance to the superior is found elsewhere in Vedic. See Jamison 1996: 191–99.

VIII.1.21: The first three pādas of this verse are couched in the acc. sg. masc. I take them as continuing the last pāda of the previous verse, as objects of *yāciṣat* (to be supplied from 20d). So also Tichy (195). By contrast, Ge, flg. Old, supplies "(Preiset)," which is certainly possible but not generated from context. The root √*yāc* takes a double acc.: "beg s.o. for s.th." Here I assume that *mádam* of a is what is begged for and *ugrám* of b qualifies the one begged, namely Indra, as an appositive to *tvā́śānam* 'master' in 20d. The referent of *tarutā́ram* 'overcomer, triumphant one' in c is most likely Indra, but it is worth noting that *máda-* is the referent of *tarutár-* in VIII.46.8–9.

Why we are begging for *máda-* 'exhilaration', which is a state of Indra's, not ours, is made clear by pāda d: when Indra is exhilarated, he gives to us.

VIII.1.22: *śévāra-* 'treasury' is a hapax, derived from haplologized **śéva-vāra-* 'having dear valuables', a derivation found already in Gr (though with *vara-* as suggested 2nd member; for reff. see KEWA s.v. *śévaḥ*). Note its juxtaposition with *vā́ryā* 'desirable things' here.

I take pāda a as a nominal sentence, and supply *rāsate* 'will grant' in b, from c, given their parallel datives. Ge takes ab as a single sentence and supplies "verwahrt" (keeps), again possible but not generated from context.

VIII.1.25: I supply 'yoked' with *ráthe hiraṇyáye*, on the basis of the same phrase in 24 b with *yuktā́(ḥ)*, but it would be possible to follow Ge and take it as merely a locational phrase: "[d]ich … im goldenen Wagen."

VIII.1.27: *abhí* in b, in conjunction with *ásti* in a, invites us to read the lexeme *abhí* √*as* 'be dominant' in b.

The second half of the verse returns to the anxieties about whether Indra will come to our sacrifice found earlier in the hymn by a series of insistent assertions that he *will* come. Alternatively these could be read as questions: "Will he come?" etc.

VIII.1.28: In c I read the injunctive *ánu caraḥ* twice, once as preterite and once with future meaning, contrary to Ge, who only takes it as a modal: "Du mögest … nachgehen" (followed by Klein II.121). The peculiar position of the *ádha* and the presence of *dvitā́* suggest this double interpretation to me, though admittedly pāda-final *ádha dvitā́* does occur elsewhere without this syntactic effect (e.g., I.132.3, VI.16.4).

VIII.1.31: Some lexical and syntactic problems here. First, though the most obvious noun to construe with *ā́* … *ruham* 'I mounted' is the acc. *áśvān* 'horses', in fact horses never get mounted in the RV, only chariots (including in the loc., VIII.22.9). I

therefore construe *ráthe* with the verb here and take the horses loosely with *śraddhayā*.

The next question is the meaning of the adjective modifying the horses, *vánanvataḥ*. Ge connects it with *vána-* 'wood' and tr. "die ans Holz gespannten Rosse," but, although there are undoubted occurrences of the stem *vánanvant-* that do mean 'wooden', I doubt that this is one of them. Among other things in the occurrence in nearby VIII.6.34 modifying *matí-* 'thought', 'wooden' is effectively excluded. I instead connect it with √*van* 'win', whose various participles cross each other so much that a blend of this sort would not be surprising. For further disc. see VII.81.3.

The second hemistich opens with the conjunction *utá*, which is a problem for any interpretation of this verse, since it is ordinarily a coordinating conjunction but the first hemistich is a subordinate clause (note the final accented verb *ruhám* conditioned by *yád* in a) and the second a main clause (unaccented verb *ciketati*). Klein (I.451) is puzzled by the passage but suggests that if the chariot of the subordinate clause is a gift and the valuable goods is another prospective gift, "*utá* is thereby explained." But his tr. of the verse clearly divides it into subordinate and main clauses. I simply leave it unexplained.

Finally, what is the value of *ciketati*? Old, followed by Klein, suggests supplying the patron as subject: "(then) will (the liberal one) take note (to give me) also (some) of the desirable wealth, which is the herd of Yadu" (tr. Klein I.451), taking the verb in the I/T meaning 'perceives'. But this requires inventing a patron (although it is true that one appears in the next verse) and, more problematic, supplying a further verbal complement, not only "take note" but "to give me," which seems to me taking more liberties with the text that we should. I therefore prefer to follow Ge in taking *ciketati* in its less common intransitive value, meaning 'appears, stands out' (see Ge's notes for parallel passages, which interestingly are also dānastutis), with the relative clause of pāda d as its subject.

VIII.1.34: Although Ge takes *śáśvatī* as a personal name, and indeed the name of the poet's wife, in this dānastuti context it's far more likely that the woman in question is part of the gift, and *śáśvatī* makes good sense in the literal meaning of the stem *śáśvant-* 'each and every, one after the other, ever and always': the woman is "ever ready" for sex, at least in the poet's imagination.

VIII.2 Indra

VIII.2.2: This is an orphan verse, which cannot be construed grammatically with either 1 or 3, though a mere *yáḥ* would allow it to be the rel. clause to 3, as the initial *tám* of 3a suggests.

VIII.2.3: I take *góbhiḥ* twice, with both the frame and the simile. In the frame it is to be construed with *tám … śrīṇántaḥ* "preparing it with cows' milk," but in the simile

yávaṃ ná "like barley" I take it as a passive variant of the common figure "as cows enjoy a grainfield (*yávasa-*)," e.g., V.53.8 *ráṇan gắvo ná yávase*.

In c Ge supplies "lade ich," but I read *akarma* from b also in this pāda, in a different idiom "make X to be at/in." The usual idiom is *ắ √kṛ* 'bring here'; unfortunately there is no trace of *ắ*.

VIII.2.5: *tṛprá-* only here in the RV, though it appears later and may also be related to *tṛpála-*, also used of soma (see EWA s.v.); 'sharp' is only a guess, though shared with Ge, a characterization of soma usually expressed by *tīvrá-* (as in 10b).

In c *ápa √spṛ* is found only here in the RV; if it belongs to *√spṛ* 'win', it might mean 'win away'. Ge. tr. "abstossen" (repel). EWA (s.v. *SPAR*) suggests that it belongs to a synchronically separate root 'losmachen, befreien, in Sicherheit bringen,' in which case 'keep away' would work.

VIII.2.6: A quite opaque verse. The underlying point, in the context of the preceding verse, is that though our own preparations of soma may not be of the best, Indra will still come to our sacrifice (vs. 5), even if other sacrificers aggressively pursue him with (better-tasting) soma mixed with cows' milk. The repetition of two words for cow (*góbhiḥ* opening the verse and *dhenúbhiḥ* closing it) draws attention to the notion and suggests that the other sacrificers have mixed their soma with milk (the most desirable way to serve soma), while our soma was characterized in vs. 5 as unmixed, badly mixed, or "sharp" (?).

Pāda b adds its own difficulties to the verse's interpretation, esp. the rare and disputed word *vrắ-*. In Jamison 2003 [HPS Fs.] I discuss this word and its contexts at length, suggesting that it means '(female) chooser' (that is, the bride at a svayaṃvara "self-choice" wedding) and is a reduced form of **varắ-*. This passage gave me pause, however, and in that article I toyed with the possibility that it contains a different word *vrắ-* or else that its meaning had become attenuated because it was moribund. I now think that it is the same word *vrắ-* and that it does here compare the other sacrificers to women chasing husbands, perhaps hinting at the unseemly nature of this pursuit. I take *mṛgám … mṛgáyante* as a phrasal verb with a cognate accusative, so meaning simply "go hunting."

Note that the accent on *abhitsáranti* requires it to be part of the *yád* clause, leaving the verse without a main clause and making its dependence on vs. 5 clear.

VIII.2.7: The three soma drinks might refer to the unsatisfactory types in vs. 5 or to the soma at the three pressings, but most likely to the three types mentioned in vs. 9 (the final verse of the tṛca of which this is the first). We might think of this as a species of "ritual repair": the poor versions of soma in vs. 5 are adjusted slightly to produce the properly prepared ones in this tṛca.

The referent of *své* in c is unclear. (Note in passing that if read as distracted *suvé* [with HvN], its first syllable matches *sutắsaḥ* of b and *sutapắvnaḥ*. However, with Old I prefer to distract the final word to *sutapắvanaḥ*; cf. *somapắvan-*, whose oblique forms require distraction although they are written with *–vn-*.) If we assume

that *své* refers to the subject, then it must be soma's dwelling, whatever that is (the ritual ground?). The only other personage mentioned in the verse is Indra, but it is unlikely to be his dwelling – *pace* Ge, who construes *sutapāvnaḥ* with the loc. phrase ("im eigenen Hause des Somatrinkers"). I take it as referring to the unexpressed agent of *sutāsaḥ santu* "let them be pressed," namely us.

VIII.2.9: There are successive gappings here: we need to supply *asi* with b, and *asi* + *āśīrtaḥ* in c. I take all three clauses as 2nd person, though Ge makes b and c both 3rd person.

VIII.2.11: It is a little odd to command Indra to undertake the sacrificial preparations that are really our job. Presumably once again (see VIII.1.19) Indra is conceived of as the indirect agent: by coming to our sacrifice he sets our preparations in motion, and our impetus for this preparation is the knowledge that he has riches to distribute.

VIII.2.12: A peculiar ending to a celebration of soma, presumably describing some of the potential side-effects of (over-)indulgence in soma.

With Ge (implicitly) I take *ūdhar* as belonging not to 'udder', but to a homonymous stem 'cold', with Avestan cognate (OA, YA *aodar-*). See EWA s.v. *ūdhan-*. But compare Old, who finds a complex way to rescue 'udder', though not one sufficently plausible to me, anyway.

VIII.2.13: Given the parallelism with ab, we might expect to supply *śrutáḥ* in c. However, *prá* makes some difficulties: no *práśruta-* is attested. However, *prá śṛnve, -ire* has the meaning 'is/are far-famed'.

VIII.2.14: As Ge (n.) points out, this is a subtle jab at Indra. If the god doesn't provide cows (and other wealth) to his praiser, then no one will pay attention to either the praiser or, by implication, the praise he produces for the god.

VIII.2.15: Note the etymological and phonological figure *śíkṣā śacīvaḥ śácībhiḥ*. The desire to have a pāda consisting of only these related words may account for the absence of *naḥ*: *śíkṣa-* regularly takes a dative. Cf. the fuller expression in I.62.12 *śíkṣā śacīvas táva naḥ śácībhiḥ*. Of course *naḥ* can be easily supplied here from pāda a.

VIII.2.16: This verse is a minor but neat example of syntactic modulation. The first pāda is in the 1st plural, the third in the 3rd plural, while the middle one is ambiguous: the plurals here can refer to *vayám* 'we' in pāda a or (coreferential with *káṇvāḥ* in c) serve as subject of the 3rd plural *jarante*. So pāda b, by being without inherent reference to grammatical person, allows "modulation" from 1st to 3rd person. I have taken pāda a as a nominal sentence, and b as having third person ref. and belonging with pāda c. But in fact the whole verse could be one sentence (as the *tvā* in pāda a suggests, since it should be the obj./goal of *jarante* in Wackernagel's Law position)

with a harsh clash between *vayám* and *jarante* (which, notice, are the absolute first and last words of the verse, so we can go along as an audience on the happy assumption that the whole verse is in the 1st plural until the rude awakening of *jarante)*.

The bahuvrīhi *tadídartha-* is a nice example of phrasal univerbation, from *tád íd ártham* "just this (is the) aim."

VIII.2.17: In b I follow a suggestion of Re's (EVP 13.98, ad IV.6.4) in interpreting the hapax *náviṣṭau* as *ná *viṣṭaú*, with the only emendation the accenting of the second word. Cf. I.92.3 *árcanti nārīr apáso ná viṣṭíbhiḥ* "They chant like women busy with their labors." Old explains it rather as a haplology of **návaviṣṭi-* 'new labor' (also Re's 1st suggestion), and he is followed by Ge "bei der Neuheit des Dichterwerkes," taking *apásaḥ* as a gen. sg. But by its accent *apásaḥ* should mean 'worker', not 'work'. Kü (p. 297) also follows Old, but, taking account of the accent, tr. "beim neuen Wirken des Künstlers." In the publ. tr. "at their labor" should be preceded by an asterisk.

VIII.2.18: *pramāda-* in c is a hapax, but clearly derived from √*mad*. I do not understand where Ge gets "… gehen sie auf Reisen." Old, commenting on Ge's same gloss in his Gloss., says "… glaube ich nicht."

VIII.2.19: Hoffmann (1967: 87) notes of *mā́ hṛṇīthāḥ* that the prohibitive contains a present injunctive, and he interprets it, plausibly, as "lass ab von deinen Groll…" rather than simply "don't be angry."

VIII.2.20: The opening *mó ṣú* matches *ó ṣú* of 19a.

On first glance this verse appears to contain a *mā́* prohibitive with a subjunctive *karat*, (so tr. Ge), which would be grammatically quite anomalous. Hoffmann (1967: 92) claims that in the Sprachgefühl *karat* is an injunctive, but this seems extremely unlikely to me because the root aor. of √*kṛ* is one of the best attested of such formations, and though the stem *kára-* is well established, there is no evidence that it is not interpreted as a subjunctive. There's no augmented *ákara-* for example, and no thematic part. **kárant-* or **káramāṇa-*. I therefore take pāda a as an independent clause, with gapped prohibitive copula ("don't be") with *mā́*. Since the root √*as* doesn't have injunctives (or an aorist), there is in fact no way to make a prohibitive copular sentence in any other way.

As noted in the intro., I think this may be a reference to the instituting of the Third Pressing, which happens in the evening. The point may be that sacrificers who fail to have a Third Pressing risk losing the presence of a disgruntled Indra to those who do.

I do not entirely understand the social relations depicted in c. Ordinarily, in patrilocal marriage the son-in-law would be at a distance anyway; that is, the wife would be living with her husband's family. Is this a reference to an in-comer, a husband who lives with his wife's family because he's too poor and who then makes

it worse by distancing himself -- or to the return of a bride because the husband was too feckless? Or is this similar to the situation in the Gambler's Lament (X.34), where the husband loses his wife because of his gambling or other economically ruinous activities?

In d "down on his luck" translates *aśrīrá-*, which phonologically resembles the characteristic offering of the Third Pressing, the *ā́śir-* 'milk-mixture'. It thus indirectly hints at the Third-Pressing theme.

VIII.2.21: The referent of "the three" in c is not clear; perhaps again the three pressings.

VIII.2.23: What to supply with *jyéṣṭhena* 'most superior' is not clear. Ge "Schoppen"; on the basis of nearby VIII.4.4 *jyéṣṭham … sáhaḥ* I supply 'might'.

VIII.2.28: *nā́yám* is a famous crux. See esp. Thieme (1949) and more recently Jamison 2013 (Fs. Hock), both with discussion of previous literature. After my recent reconsideration of the evidence I would now eliminate "to the landing site," since I now think the underlying expression is **nā́ ayám* "(just) this man here," which lost its transparency and came to mean "on one's own" and could be used for any person, not just the 3rd.

VIII.2.29–30: Verse 29 consists of a relative clause (beginning *stútaś ca yā́ḥ*) conjoined with the relative clause of 30 (beginning with parallel *gíraś ca yā́ḥ*), but the rest of verse 30 causes some syntactic problems. The main clause appears to consist of the end of 30b: *túbhyaṃ tā́ni*, but pāda c contains an accented verb *dadhiré*, which appears to continue the interrupted relative clause beginning in pāda a. The result is what looks like an embedded main clause, a syntactic anomaly. I am not happy with this syntactic arrangement, but if we read *dadhiré*, there seems no way to escape it. As Ge points out in his n., the Indian Pp. and Max Müller's 1877 edition read the verb without accent, but as he says, "*dadhiré* ist doch wohl die richtige Lesung."

VIII.2.31: Following EWA (s.v.) I take *tuvikūrmí-* to √*car*^{i}, not √*kṛ* as Gr, Ge do. See disc. ad III.30.3.

VIII.2.33: Ge takes Indra as the referent of c with *maghónaḥ* accusative pl. referring to human benefactors ("Wenn er berauscht ist, so tut er es den freigebigen Herren gleich"). However, *mandín-* usually describes soma (although it does modify Indra in I.9.2, 101.1, and X.96.6), and the only occurrence of *mándiṣṭha-* in the RV is found in this hymn and also modifies soma: VIII.2.9 *mándiṣṭhaḥ śū́rasya* "most invigorating for the champion," with a dependent genitive, which is how I take *maghónaḥ* here. I therefore, somewhat reluctantly take the subject to be soma here, who is accompanying (*ánu*) Indra, who already contains the multitudes listed in pāda a. However, the appearance of pl. *maghónām* in the next verse (34c), where it refers

to humans who receive Indra's largesse, gives me pause, and it is quite possible that Ge's interpretation is correct.

VIII.2.36: In the first pāda the grammatically unparallel *vípro árvadbhiḥ* express the two complementary areas in which Indra is the winner. So also Ge; see his extensive note.

VIII.2.37: On apparent impv. *yájadhva* see Old, though I don't think the last word has been said about this form.

VIII.2.38: The formation of the hapax *purutmānam* is not entirely clear. With Gr, AIG III.267 (and implicitly Ge), it presumably contains the truncated *tmán-* stem in one way or another, but I am dubious about the meaning generally assigned to it (Gr 'lebenreich', Ge 'langlebig'), since *tmán-* almost always means 'self' not 'life, lifebreath', and *puru-* 'much, many' doesn't seem the most likely way to characterize length of life anyway. I think it possible that it was influenced by expressions like *purú tmánā* (I.142.10) 'abundant in itself', though it is not a straight univerbation. It is also worth noting the long vowel in *-tmānam*, given that the only acc. sg. to *tmán-* is short-vowel *tmánam* (I.63.8), though I don't know what to make of this.

VIII.2.39: Ge's tr. with added "(fand)" (see also his n. and Hoffmann 1967:137) implies that this is a reference to the beginning of the Vala myth, in which the cows are stolen and leave no traces, so that Indra must find them before he gives them away. This interpretation makes sense of the otherwise opaque *ṛté cid … padébhyaḥ*, but it seems to require a lot of added machinery. I do not have an alternative interpretation, however.

VIII.2.40: This verse as it stands poses a number of problems, but some of them disappear if, following Ge's earlier Komm., adopted also by Old, and reflected in Ge's tr., the sequence *yánn áyaḥ* (per Pp.) is read *yán náyaḥ*, which requires no change in the Saṃhitā text. This produces a subordinating conjunction (*yád* out of sandhi), which in turn accounts for the accented verb (*náyaḥ*) and allows the whole verse to be read as a single dependent clause (in my interpretation: Ge supplies the verb "… hast du … erhört" for pādas ab, while Old suggests rather "du hast … gesegnet"). Although my interpretation has the *yád* uncomfortably late in its clause, after two heavy constituents (violating Hale's observation that only one constituent can precede the *yá-*form), it avoids supplying a verb out of nowhere for the first part of the verse, and I take the acc. phrase of ab as an almost extra-sentential topicalized NP, so positioned to get the name and attributes of the poet up front.

With Old and Ge I take *abhí* with *náyaḥ*, but unlike them don't supply 'heaven' as the goal (on the basis of AV XII.3.16, 17). In the RV the lexeme *abhí √nī* can take as goal *vásu* 'goods' (VI.53.2) or *vásyaḥ* 'better state' (VI.61.14, I.31.18), and since this verse inaugurates the dānastuti, goods would be at issue.

As noted in the intro., there are various tales or tale fragments in Vedic prose (see esp. JB III.233-35. also ŚB III.3.4.18) linking Indra as ram and Medhātithi, but to my mind they are later and not particularly successful rationalizations of this obscure verse.

VIII.2.41: As noted in the intro., one unfortunate consequence of taking all of vs. 40 as a single subordinate clause is that the 2nd ps. referent in the subordinate clause of 40 is Indra, while in the main clause here it is Vibhindu, the poet's patron. As I suggested in the intro., this may be a ploy to superimpose Indra's divine generosity on the human patron by implicitly identifying them. Vs. 21 in the next hymn (VIII.3), also in the dānastuti, supports this hypothesis, since there Indra and the Maruts and the human patron Pakasthāma Kaurayāṇa serve as undifferentiated subjects of the verb 'gave' (*dúḥ*).

VIII.2.42: Although Ge declines to tr. *mākî*, the interpretation of this word as a *–ka*-suffixed form of the 1st ps. possessive pronoun, accepted by Old (see also Scar 519), not only fits the context but would exemplify the tendency to use *-ka*-suffixed forms in slangy, low-register contexts such as dānastutis. For disc. see Jamison 2009, also 2008.

VIII.3 Indra

VIII.3.2: I am not sure why the "future imperative" *avatāt* is used in pāda c. Its use implies that Indra should, first, not lay us low and, then, actually help us. This is possible but not compellingly required by the sense.

VIII.3.4: In pāda a note *sahás(ram) … sáhas(kṛtaḥ)*.

In c "(When) realized" may push the English beyond the Sanskrit *satyáḥ só*, but the word order may weakly support this rendering. As often with *satyá-*, the meaning is 'real, really present'.

VIII.3.6: Pāda-final *śávaḥ* here is often consider to stand for instr. *śávasā* (see Old for previous lit., Ge's tr. and n., and most recently Hale [Fs. Melchert], who takes it as an archaic zero-grade *s*-stem instr., with loss of laryngeal in pause). However, as Old points out, an accusative reading is perfectly possible. The presence of the same pāda-final nom.-acc. form nearby (4c, 8a, 10b) supports an accusative interpretation here.

VIII.3.7: The *pūrvá-* in *pūrvápītaye* ushers in a set of verses with *pūrva* forms (7d, 8d, 9b, 11d).

VIII.3.9–10: Although Ge takes the second hemistich as dependent on the first, because of the parallel *yénā* clause opening vs. 10 I prefer to take 9cd and 10a as dependent on 10b, with the *yénā*'s of 9c, 9d, and 10a all referring to *śávaḥ* in 10b.

But this sequence can also be seen as a type of modulation: the hearer is invited to assume that the *yénā*'s of 9c and 9d have 9b *bráhma* as their antecedent, but the opening of the next verse can cause reanalysis and a refocusing on *śávaḥ* in 10b.

In 9c a verb needs to be supplied. Although the sentiment seems to be essentially identical to 9d ("you helped X"), the root √*av* 'help' does not take a dative recipient. I therefore supply a form of √*as* or √*bhū* with the meaning "be there for…" Ge rather "zu Hilfe kamst."

VIII.3.10: For *vṛ́ṣṇi* and the phrase *vṛ́ṣṇi te śávaḥ* see disc. ad VIII.96.19.

Thieme (KZ 92: 46) rejects the usual interpr. of *kṣonī́ḥ* as nom. sg., on the grounds that the nom. sg. is attested as *kṣoṇī́* in I.180.5 and that *kṣoṇī́ḥ* is otherwise nom. or acc. pl. However, this requires him to interpr. it as an acc. pl. of Inhalts or result with a passive verb: "dem (d.h.: wenn ihm) Gebrüll (aufrüttelndes Kampfgechrei) hinterhergeschreien worden ist." The syntactic complications of this interpr. seem to me to outweigh the drawbacks of assuming that the poorly attested stem *kṣoṇī́-* could generate a nom. sg. in *-ī́s*.

VIII.3.11: Rather than construing *vā́jāya* directly with *śagdhí*, as Ge does ("Tu uns, was du kannst zum Siegerpreis…"), I interpret it as the object of the participle *síṣāsate*, attracted into the dative in the fashion of dativa l phrases like *vṛtrā́ya hántave* (e.g., III.37.5–6). For the VP see VIII.103.11 *vā́jaṃ síṣāsataḥ*. However, 12d *śagdhí stómāya* may support Ge's interpretation.

VIII.3.12: Ge's interpretation of ab ("Tu uns, was du kannst, für diesen, der [den Preis] der Dichtung gewinnen möchte, da du ja dem Paura beigestanden hast") is syntactically quite troublesome, in that it not only involves an embedded relative (rare to non-existent in the RV) *yád … ā́vitha*, but one that splits up a close constituent *asyá ... síṣāsataḥ.* Old, by contrast, takes *dhíyaḥ* as object of *ā́vitha* parallel to *paurám* and cites abundant parallels for √*av* + *dhíyam*, *-aḥ*. This allows the *yád* clause to be normally positioned, although I still find the position of the *asyá* unusual. I also supply a presential form of √*av* to govern *dhíyaḥ*, since the aid to the striver's insights seems to be a matter of current concern.

Unlike Ge I do not take *svàrṇaram* as a fourth client of Indra's, but as an epithet of the final name in a classic Behagel's Law construction. In the next hymn (VIII.4.2) mentioning Ruśama, Śyāvaka, and Kṛpa there is no Svarṇara. I also take it as an epithet in VIII.12.2, but as a PN in VIII.6.39.

VIII.3.13: It is generally, and reasonably, accepted (e.g., Gr, Old, EWA s.v. *atasī́-*) that the hapax *atasī́nām* belongs with *atasā́yya-*, attested twice, so its meaning depends on our interpretation of the latter – generally held to mean 'to be called/praised'. However, I take *atasā́yya* as a negated gerundive to √*taṃs* 'shake' (see I.63.6), and so *atasī́-* should mean 'unshakeable, unshaking, firm'. In context here, I assume that it refers to the stable, fixed elements of the cosmic world and the standard subjects of poetry. This may implicitly contrast with *návyaḥ* 'anew',

sketching the usual tension between the poet's desire to produce a new song and the fact that his topics are preordained.

This category of possible *atasī* poetic topics is then exemplified by the sun in pāda d – a subject that, despite its greatness, does not match the greatness of Indra. This interpretation of cd follows Old; Ge switches the objects of participle and main verb, taking *svàr* with *ānaśuḥ* and *mahimānam* with *gṛṇántaḥ*: "Denn noch nicht haben die, welchen seine indrische Grösse besingen, die Sonne erreicht." Although word order is hardly a reliable guide to RVic interpretation, the adjacency of pāda-initial *svàr gṛṇántaḥ* weakly favors the Old interpretation, which also makes more sense.

VIII.3.17: Ge takes *parāvátaḥ* in b with the second hemistich ("aus der Ferne komme…"), but the idiom √*yuj* + ablative ("yoke out of X," that is, hitch up your horses and come from…) is found elsewhere; cf. esp. I.48.7 *eṣā́yukta parāvátaḥ, sū́ryasyodáyanād ádhi* "This one has hitched herself up from out of the distance, from (the place of) the rising of the sun" (also I.115.4, V.87.4, VII.60.3, 75.4, X.94.12, etc.).

On *hí* with the imperative marking that clause as the causal basis for the following imperative clause, see Brereton 2012.

VIII.3.18: Most assign *vāvaśúḥ* to √*vaś* 'desire' (e.g., Ge "diese deine Dichter … verlangen…"; so also Gr, Lub), but I take it to √*vāś* 'bellow'. Kü (477-80) allows both possibilities. I have opted for √*vāś* because this hymn contains a number of instances of noise-making by poets or their substitutes: 3d *abhí … anūṣata,* 7c *sám asvaran*, 16d *asvaran,* in addition to the usual verbs of singing and praising. Notice also the very parallel 5cd ... *havāmahe ... dhánasya sātáye*, with a verb of calling and X *sātaye.*

VIII.3.19–20: The preverb *níḥ* is the theme of this pragātha, with seven occurrences, six pāda-initial, in eight pādas, with a variety of different verbs.

VIII.3.21: On the mixture of divine and human subjects, see comm. on VIII.2.40–41.

VIII.3.23: The son of Tugra is Bhujyu, a client of the Aśvins, whom they rescue with birds or winged steeds – a tale alluded to especially in the Kakṣīvant hymns (e.g., I.116.3–5, 117.14).

VIII.4 Indra

VIII.4.3: *apā́* is one of the few singular forms of the *áp-* 'water' stem.

On *íriṇa-* as 'salt-pocket', see EWA s.v., citing esp. Falk, *Bruderschaft.*

VIII contains two other occurrences of *āpitvá-*, both clearly derived from *āpí-* 'friend' and meaning 'friendship' (VIII.20.22, 21.13), but the presence of the

temporal designation *prapitvá-* here suggests a similar temporal analysis, *ā-pitvá-*. It is surely a pun, as indicated in the publ. tr.

VIII.4.4: Pāda c refers to Indra's stealing of his father Tvaṣṭar's soma right after birth – the drinking of which made him immediately strong. See III.48.4, etc.

VIII.4.5: The image of warriors holding themselves down "like trees" belongs more to the Maruts' rhetorical realm, where all natural phenomena bend before their storm (see nearby VIII.7.34). Vs. 10c below contains another image fully intelligible only in a Marut context.

VIII.4.6: The subject shifts without overt signaling from Indra to the man who ritually serves Indra. Indra himself features in the verse as the *yavīyudh-* 'ever-battling' one, who is worth a thousand others.

prāvargá- is found in the RV only here, but cannot be separated from *suprāvargám* (which I tr. 'well in advance') in VIII.22.18 *suprāvargáṃ suvîryam* (cf. our *prāvargám … suvîrye*). There is also *dāsá-pravarga-* in I.92.8, which I tr. 'with alien-slaves as its forelock'. The *prā- … kṛṇute* also reminds us of vs. 5a *prá cakre* 'put forward'. It is difficult to arrive at a consensus translation for these forms; although all share the sense that the item in question is in front, it is difficult to assess the contribution of the *-vargá-* element (much less what connection it might or might not have with the Pravargya ritual). My "with a good twist" was an attempt to render the root value of √*vṛj* (cf. *suvṛktí-*), but I am not now sure that it was a happy choice.

VIII.4.7: The logical connection between pādas c and d can be variously interpreted (see Ge n.). In my view pāda c expresses the desire that Indra should in short order perform a great deed that we can witness, rather than the usual bland notion that we wish to celebrate his previous great deeds. Since Indra regularly aids Turvaśa and Yadu (e.g., I.54.6), we may desire to see them (pāda d) because under those circumstances we are likely to encounter Indra doing such deeds.

VIII.4.8: Pāda a contains one of the two occurrences of *sphigî-* 'hip' in the RV (and in fact anywhere). The other is in III.32.11 in a thematically similar passage, *yád anyáyā sphigyā̃ kṣā́m ávasthāḥ* "… when you wore the earth on the other hip." (See comm. there.) It is difficult not to assume that the same situation is being depicted in this passage, and I therefore supply 'earth' here as well, esp. since a tr. without an object makes little sense (e.g., Ge's "Der Bulle deckte seine linke Seite," without further interpretation). In III.32.11 the image serves to give a comparison by which to measure Indra's vast size (the preceding pāda says "Heaven did not come close to your greatness then"). Despite the truncated expression in our passage, I think the same comparative impulse applies: Indra is so big that the whole earth fits on one of his hips.

Pāda b is then thematically contrastive, though in a very indirect way. Even though he is so vast and, by implication, too important to concern himself with the

likes of us, he gives freely and without feeling peevish towards the petty recipients of his largesse. This sets the stage for our invitation to him in cd, describing the soma mixed with milk (or rather, the reverse in this case: the milk mixed with the honey[ed soma]) and then urging him to come.

VIII.4.9: This verse returns to the theme of vs. 6, the prosperity of a man who has Indra on his side. The only difficult phrase is *śvātrabhājā váyasā*, which Ge takes as referring to a particular age in the life of a man: "Er steht jederzeit in dem Alter, in dem man die Vollkraft besitzt." Although *váyas-* can refer to a vigorous time of life, it generally means simply 'vigor' itself, and I also find it hard to make *sacate* + INSTR mean "steht … in." I think that it simply refers to the waxing prosperity and strength of the man in question.

VIII.4.10: As noted in the intro., this verse forms a ring with vss. 3–4: 3a/10a the buffalo at the waterhole, 4d/10d Indra's assumption of power (… *dadhiṣe sáhaḥ*).

Pāda c with *niméghamānaḥ* 'pissing down' fits a Marut context better than an Indraic one, and the other occurrence of this form (II.34.13) does in fact refer to the Maruts and the rain they produce. See 5d above for another motif borrowed from a Marut context. In this passage the product is presumably metaphorically the gifts that Indra showers down.

VIII.4.12: The last pāda echoes 8d, with the same three abrupt imperatives in the same order: *éhi (prá) dravā píba*, but in 12d the initial *tásya* needs to be construed with the final imperative *píba.* On this as a quasi-serial-verb construction, see Yates 2014 [UCLA conf. vol.]. On the sandhi of *tásya* + *éhi* as *tásyéhi* (not **tásyaíhi*), see Old ad loc. and ad I.9.1.

VIII.4.13: On the basis of *bradhnásya viṣṭápam* (VIII.69.7, IX.113.10) I supply *viṣṭápam* here as well. In these contexts *bradhná-* 'coppery' refers to soma (see Old).

VIII.4.14: *apásu* is supposed to be the only RVic ex. of a loc. pl. to an *s*-stem in *-asu* < **as-su*, corresp. to Aves. *-ahu*.

VIII.4.16: Pāda d is, one way or another, an improper relative, in that there is no referent for the *yám* in the main clause. Ge's 'wenn' suggests that he takes *yám* as standing for *yád*. I am assuming the ellipsis of a *ca*, for a "X and which Y" construction.

VIII.4.17: See the intro. for speculation about the social situation here. Pajra Sāman produces his own dānastuti in VIII.6.47, and our poet seems to be both denying any interest in Pajra's windfall and declaring Pajra's duty to compose his own thanks for it. See also Old's extensive note on this passage.

VIII.4.18: Here the singer seems to be implicitly separating his own (newly acquired) cows from the alien ones of Pajra mentioned in 17 (*nítyaṃ réknaḥ* "our own legacy" 18b, *áraṇaṃ hí tád* "for that is alien" 17c) and driving them to a different pasture. For the driving see vs. 20.

VIII.4.19: Here the desire expressed in 7d, to see Turvaśa (and Yadu), is realized in imagination: the largesse of the king is so extensive that the poet feels he himself is in company with the favored Turvaśa (and family). This returns us to the beginning of the hymn (vss. 1–2), where Indra comes to various sacrificers, including Turvaśa (1d).

VIII.4.20: There is no consensus on the meaning or etymology of the hapax *nírmajām*; see EWA s.v. *nírmaj-*, with various reff. to KEWA; also Old ad loc. Scar does not comment on it, though at least by shape it appears to be a root noun (presumed gen. pl. to a stem *nírmaj-*, though EWA allows possibility of *–majā*, and AiG II.1.220 lists it as *nírmajā* without further comment). The tr. 'flawless' is adopted from Old. Though it may not be possible to determine what the word mean or where it comes from, as often it *is* possible to suggest a motive for its presence in the passage: the phonological figure (*nír-)majāmaje, nír*.

VIII.4.21: The meaning of this verse is opaque to me. Perhaps the trees (and the rest of the landscape features) are enhanced by the presence of an abundance of cattle, indicating that the owner (or controller) of the land is prosperous. Kü (p. 413) tr. essentially as I do, but (wisely) makes no comment.

VIII.5 Aśvins

VIII.5.1: *áśiśvitat* is an isolated verbal form; the stem is otherwise not attested. Gr identifies it as the "Aor. des Caus.," and formally this is possible (type *atitrasat* 'made terrified' √*tras*). However, there is no trans./caus **śvetáyati* to which it could have been generated, and there is no possible direct object in this passage to justify a trans./caus. reading. It is more likely a nonce intrans. redupl. aor. (type *apaptat* 'flew' √*pat*) created to substitute for the *s*-aor. *aśvait* (or the root aor. **aśvet* on which *aśvait* is built, acdg. to Narten), which would not fit the expected iambic cadence of dimeter verse. The *i* root vocalism of √*śvit* would account for the redupl. vowel, which would by chance coincide with the redupl. vowel expected for a causative aorist: short *i* before the initial cluster.

VIII.5.2: Ge and Re take *nṛvát* as standing for *nṛvátā*, on the basis of VI.62.10 *nṛvátā ráthena*, but there seems no reason to do so, since the adverbial neut. *nṛvát* is well-attested.

VIII.5.3: The Pp. analyses the sequence *yáthohiṣe* as *yáthā ohiṣe*, which would be, to say the least, unusual sandhi. Nonetheless, the context favors a connection with the

root √*ūh* ‘solemnly proclaim, etc.’ with pres. *óha-* (in my opinion); cf. I.30.4 *vácas tád ... ohase* “I solemnly proclaim this speech,” with a 1st sg. *-se* form, as apparently also here. For this passage I assume a form *ūhiṣe*, built to the presential perf. *ūhé*. This is also Kü’s solution (488–89), though he assigns the form to √*vāh* ‘anerkennen’, which, acdg. to him, is at least synchronically separate from √*oh*. Re and Lub. assign the form instead to √*vah* ‘convey’. For further disc. cf. Old and Ge (n. 3c).

VIII.5.3–4: Both these vss., though not belonging to the same tṛca, most likely contain 1st sg. *-se* forms.

VIII.5.4: Note the three compounds beginning with *puru-* in ab.

I emend the accented nom. *káṇvāsaḥ* to accentless **kaṇvāsaḥ*, thus avoiding the awk. “I shall praise (and also) the Kāṇvas (shall praise)” (so Re), or the necessity of taking *stuṣé* as an infinitive. Nearby VIII.7.32 has #*káṇvāsaḥ ...* /#s*tuṣé* ..., with a pāda-init. accented voc. *káṇvāsaḥ* (cf. also VIII.2.38, and with nom. VIII.4.2, VIII.6.31), and the accent here may have been acquired redactionally on these models. By my interpr. “I” (the poet, who is himself a Kāṇva) announces to his fellow Kāṇvas that he is invoking the Aśvins “for *our* help” (*na ūtáye*); the 1st pl. enclitic *naḥ* encompasses the poet himself and those addressed in the voc.

VIII.5.5: Here and in the repeated pāda VIII.22.3d I think *gántārā* may, but need not, be interpr. as a periphrastic future. There are enough possible exx. in the RV that Macdonell’s statement (VGS, p. 177) that there are no certain examples in the Saṃhitās needs reexamination.

VIII.5.6: With Ge and Re I (reluctantly) supply imperative ‘give’ in ab. It is barely possibly (but I think unlikely) that *ukṣatam* in c is a pun, belonging to √*ukṣ* ‘sprinkle’ in c, but √*vakṣ*/*ukṣ* ‘increase’ in ab, with the meaning “increase good wisdom for the pious man.” (Kiehnle 1979: 152 takes it to ‘increase’ in the whole vs.) Unfortunately there are no certain exx. of the act. suffix-accented stem *ukṣáti* to √*vakṣ* ‘increase’ (though see med. part. *ukṣámāṇa-* and isolated root-accented part. *úkṣant-*), and even if so, we would probably expect them to be intrans., at least on the basis of pf. *vavákṣa*, etc., and the just cited pres. forms.

The hapax *ávitāriṇī-* is clearly derived from *ví* √*tṝ*, but its meaning is variously rendered. Gr (Sāy) ‘enduring, lasting’, Ge “die nicht auf sich warten lässt” [doesn’t keep (s.o.) waiting], on the basis of X.34.6. However, I take that passage in the Gambler hymn to mean ‘run counter’ (adopting the tr. of Macdonell), or more pointedly ‘doublecross’, the tr. I use here, though something like ‘thwart’ would convey the sense of this idiom as well.

VIII.5.8: The acc. phrases *tisráḥ parāvátaḥ*, *divó víśvāni rocanā́*, and *trī́ṁr aktū́n* are all accusatives of extent and presented as if they were parallel; the specification ‘three’ in the first and last underlines this supposed parallelism. But the first two

express extent of space and the third extent of time. A better tr. might be "you fly around the three far distances (and? see below) all the luminous realms of heaven *for* or *during* three nights. I do not know what "three nights" refers to: there is no parallel locution elsewhere and the standard tr. do not comment. It may simply reflect the common association of the Aśvins with triplets of various sorts. See esp. I.34, which does have a roughly similar expression: I.34.7 *tríḥ … divé-dive* "Three times, day after day …" As for the first two accusative phrases, the *rocanā̆(ni)* are regularly qualified as 'three', so "all the luminous realms" may be synonymous with immediately preceding "the three far distances" (a phrase also found in I.34.7 and VIII.32.22).

VIII.5.9: Re (explicitly) and Ge (implicitly) supply as the verb of ab *voḷhám* 'convey' from 10c. This is not impossible, and the duplication of some vocabulary (9a *gómatīr íṣa(ḥ)*: 10 *gómantam … rayím … áśvāvatir íṣaḥ*) may favor it. But the two verses belong to different tṛcas, a fact that should disfavor such automatic filling in the blanks. I in fact think that ab can be construed with c. That pāda asks the gods to "unfasten" the paths (*ví patháḥ … sitam*), in other words, to make the way clear, for winning (*sātáye*). The dat. infinitive *sātáye* frequently takes an accusative of what is to be won (among many exx., cf., e.g., IX.88.2 *purū̆ṇi sātáye vásūni*). I see no reason why the accusatives of ab cannot be the object of this infinitive; with the acc. in b, *sātī́ḥ*, we would have not only a cognate accusative construction, but one involving two forms of the same stem. Alternatively the accusatives in ab could serve as objects of *ví … sitam*, thus parallel to *patháḥ*. Cf. VIII.23.29, where both accusatives found here are the objects of *ápā vṛdhi* 'uncover', semantically similar to *ví … sitam*: VIII.23.29bc *tváṃ no* ***gómatīr íṣaḥ /*** *mahó rāyáḥ* ***sātím*** *agne ápā vṛdhi* "Uncover for us refreshments consisting of cows and the winning of great wealth, o Agni." Hence in our passage "(Unfasten) refreshments and winnings; unfasten the paths for winning." See further disc. ad vs. 21 below, which lends additional support to the 2nd alternative..

The epithet *aharvíd-* (4x, twice in this hymn) can contain either √*vid* 'know' or √*vid* 'find'. Ge (and Gr) opt for the former, with Ge generalizing it to 'Zeitkenner'. Scar (480–81) considers either possible, though his tr. reflect the former. In I.2.2 and I.156.4 I choose 'know', because both passages seem to involve knowledge of the ritual day, but esp. in the latter I recognize the possibility of 'find'. (See comm. thereon.) By contrast the publ. tr. of this hymn has 'find' for both occurrences. I do not feel strongly either way, but since this hymn begins with the Aśvins accompanying Dawn (vss. 1–2) and the immediately preceding vs. (8) has a mention of their traversing the nights, I mildly favor 'find', expressing the Aśvins' advent in the early morning, bringing the daylight with them. Note also *svarvidā* 'finders of the sun' of the Aśvins in nearby VIII.8.7. This well-attested cmpd. seems universally to be analysed as containing 'find', not 'know'; cf. Scar 491–92.

VIII.5.12: The voc. *vājinīvasū* recurs here from 3a; in both verses it is immediately preceded by a heavy dat. pronoun, the near-rhyming *yuvābhyām* and *asmabhyam*. Its other two occurrences in this hymn (vss. 19, 30) are not so structured.

"Shelter that cannot be cheated (/deceived)" (see also VIII.85.5) is a striking and somewhat opaque expression, since *ádābhya-* usually modifies animate beings (generally gods) who aren't guillible. I assume that the intention is shelter that can't be breached by trickery, vel sim., but the context of neither passage gives us any help.

VIII.5.13: The Pp. analyses *yāviṣṭam* as *yā́ áviṣṭam*, with the latter an injunc. *-iṣ-*aor. to √*av* 'help, favor'. Ge accepts this analysis and Re is sympathetic; however, Old dismisses it, taking *yāviṣṭam* rather to √*yu* 'unite', as the verbal counterpart (with initial preverb *ní*) of the common noun *niyút-* 'team'. This analysis is already found in Gr and is vigorously defended by Narten (Sig. Aor. 212). One argument against the Pp. interpr. is the fact that this would produce an unambiguous embedded relative clause, and these are rare to non-existent in the RV.

VIII.5.19: I don't really understand why the skin-bag of honey is set in the chariot-rut. One might think of the English expression "grease the skids," except that the Aśvins are meant to drink out of it.

VIII.5.20: The referent of *téna* "with it" is not clear. Although the verse sequence might suggest the skin-bag of vs. 19, the chariot makes more sense, and in 30a where pāda a is repeated it does seem to refer to the chariot or parts thereof.

VIII.5.21: This vs. is structured very like vs. 9, presenting some of the same syntactic problems, but in a somewhat clearer fashion. The first two pādas, *utá no divyā́ íṣa, utá síndhūm̐r aharvidā* are identical to 9ab *utá no gómatīr íṣa, utá sātī́r aharvidā*, save for the adj. modifying *íṣaḥ* in a and the acc. pl. found in b. Recall that Ge and Re supply a verb (*voḷhám*) for ab, separating those pādas from c. Some support for their position might be found in the larger context of vs. 21: the immediately preceding pāda, 20c, contains *váhatam* with a variant *íṣaḥ* object ("fat," not "heavenly"). So it could be possible to read 21ab as a continuation of the VP in 20c, giving support to Ge/Re, who supply a verb from the same root (√*vah*) to govern the identically structured 9ab. But Ge happily takes ab as the obj. of the verb in 21c, *ápa … varṣathaḥ* 'you two will open up' (*s*-aor. subjunctive to √*vṛ* 'cover, obstruct'). As was noted ad vs. 9, *ápa* √*vṛ* 'uncover, open up' is semantically very like *ví* √*sā* 'unfasten', and if refreshments can be the object of the first, this should also be possible for the second.

varṣathaḥ is the only *s*-aor. form to √*vṛ* in all of Sanskrit. It is very possible that it was created for this passage because the resulting syllable *varṣ* evokes the root √*vṛṣ* 'rain', which would be appropriate for the liquids that are its objects in ab. Re also remarks on this word play.

VIII.5.22: The subjunctive *pátāt* seems to be used in an unusual past prospective sense in this mythological context. This may be an English problem, however. Since the verb of the main clause is injunc. *vidhat*, this context is not necessarily preterital, but "timeless," and the subjunctive can therefore be expressing pure future modality. The fact that the next verse is also mythological and contains an undoubted present tense form *daśasyathaḥ* shows that mythological tense is fluid here. Re remarks (ad vs. 23) that the indifference between present and preterite underlines the reflection of the current human situation in the legendary material.

VIII.5.24: *suśastíbhiḥ* in pāda b is taken by Ge (also Gr) as modifying *ūtíbhiḥ* in pāda a ("mit diesen löblichen Hilfen"; Ge takes *návyasībhiḥ* as adverbial "aufs neue"), but this requires *suśastí-* to be adjectival. However, almost all occurrences of this stem -- and all seven other instr. -- are nouns ('good laud')(and see nominal *suṣṭutím* 'good praise', identically formed and nearly synonymous, in 30c below). Although in Gāyatrī the b-pāda more regularly construes with the a-pāda, it is not out of the question for it to go with c instead. In this case the instr. phrase of b goes well with c, and it would only represent one constituent fronted before the subordinating *yád*.

VIII.5.28: This vs., like the almost identical IV.46.4, is syntactically somewhat ragged: the beginning of pāda c, *ā́ hí sthā́thaḥ*, should ideally be the beginning of the clause, given the fronted preverb and the *hí*. But the object occupies all of ab (and the end of c).

VIII.5.29: The syntactic disorder continues here. The main clause corresponding to vs. 28 is vs. 30; this intermediate verse, the middle one of the tṛca, is an elaborate nominal sentence couched entirely in the nominative and functions as an extensive parenthesis further specifying the features of the chariot found in 28a (in the acc.).

VII.5.31: The sense of this vs. is a little odd: it sounds as if the Aśvins on their journey are snacking on the comestibles they are bringing to us and we will only get the scraps. This is not the usual way to urge the gods to bring us things and makes the Aśvins sound mingy. Perhaps the point is rather that there are so many (*pūrvîḥ*) refreshments that there's enough for everyone? Ge compares 19c, which does not seem similar to me.

VIII.5.33: The publ. tr. "feathered birds, frothing at the mouth" is, to say the least, inelegant and perhaps unintelligible. What I think is meant: the birds are compared to horses (or the horses to birds); *pruṣitápsavaḥ* 'frothing at the mouth' qualifies the underlying horses and indicates their speed. Cf. the overt horses in V.75.6 *áśvāsaḥ pruṣitápsavaḥ*, VIII.87.5 *áśvebhiḥ pruṣitápsubhiḥ* (both Aśvin hymns)(latter =VIII.13.11 [Indra]).

VIII.5.34: The hapax *-gāyas-* (a hapax) in *ánugāyasam-* is generally taken as a primary *s*-stem to the diphthongal root √*gā*^{i}; see Whitney (Roots), AiG II.2.235,

EWA s.v. √*GĀ*[2]. The contextual question is what is following what. For Ge the song is sounding after/following the chariot ("Gesang schallt eurem Wagen nach"), but most *ánu-* compounds have the structure "following X," where X is the 2nd member (e.g., *ánu-patha-* 'following/along the path'; with diff. accent *anu-kāmá-* 'following/acroding to desire'). I therefore think the chariot is following the song; in other words, it is making its way to the ritual ground, drawn to the song being sung there.

Pāda b seems to be a clear embedded relative clause -- or else, at least as I have punctuated it, a parenthesis.

The point of c seems to be that the wheel doesn't knock against the chariot no matter how fast it moves. Such knocking presumably would be a problem with wheels that were not securely fastened to their axle and well balanced, so the Aśvin's chariot is, not surprisingly, well constructed.

VIII.5.36: With Sāy I take the wakeful wild beast to be soma. The obj. of √*svad* is regularly an oblation, and in IX.105.1 its object soma is compared to a *śíśu-*, the young of an animal or human.

vā in b cannot be the disjunctive 'or', as there is no disjunction possible. I take it as the short form of *iva* 'like' (with lengthening), as Ge also seems to (on the grounds of his "sozusagen"), marking the statement as an approximative. Old's comment is not entirely intelligible, but he seems rather to imply that *vā* expresses a strong positive, and I therefore assume he thinks it's a form of *vaí*, as do Re and Klein (DGRV II.201–2).

VIII.5.38: There is much disagreement on what to supply with *híraṇyasaṃdṛśaḥ* and indeed on whether it modifies *rā́jñaḥ*, interpreted as an acc. pl. (see Ge n. 38ab). Since it seems unlikely that Kaśu gave the poet ten golden *kings*, even as figurines (pace Old), it seems best to take *rā́jñaḥ* as gen. sg. and supply another desirable golden item. Ge suggests garments, probably in part because of the hide-tanners? Hoffmann (Inj. 229 n. 227) points out that gold(-bedecked) horses are mentioned elsewhere in dānastutis, and I follow him in the publ. tr. However, given how prominently gold figures in the description of chariots in this hymn (vss. 28–29, 35; cf. also 11), 'chariots' might be a better choice.

The apparently contemptuous 'hide-tanning' (*carmamnā́ḥ*) must be a way of indicating that, in comparison with Kaśu, all men hereabouts are no better than tanners: ignoble, low, and engaged in dirty and polluting activity. But perhaps there's just a whiff of a suggestion that Kaśu has enough cows to furnish work for many tanners -- and therefore he should be more generous with these cows to his poet.

VIII.5.39: Like many dānastutis, this one seems to have a bit of sting in its praise. The poet *seems* at first to be saying that the Cedis are so lavish in their giving that no one else could follow them, but the 2nd half of the verse warns that all it would take for another man to receive more praise than Kaśu is to give more. Although the *mā́* prohibitive of ab is technically applied to other men ("let no one go …"), it's really

an implicit challenge to Kaśu: he can only stop others from going on his path by always giving the most.

VIII.6 Indra

VIII.6.1: Displaced *iva* in b; we might expect **parjánya iva vṛṣṭimā̃n*, which would also be metrically acceptable.

VIII.6.2: The publ. tr. takes pāda a as a nominal sentence with a predicated present participle (*pípratah*), a fairly rare but not unprecedented construction. This has two advantages: 1) it provides the verse with a main clause, 2) it avoids an anomalous position for *yád*. However, since *yád* is also badly positioned in 3a and 8b, the second observation may not be an argument. See remarks on 8 below.

VIII.6.7: The co-occurrence of a 1st pl. verb (*abhí prá ṇonumaḥ*) and nom. pl. *imā̃ḥ … dhītáyaḥ* causes some interpretational difficulties. Ge takes initial *imā̃ḥ* as an accusative plural object with the verb in pāda a ("Diese stimmen wir auf (dich) an"), separating it from *dhītáyaḥ* in b, and interprets pādas bc together as a nominal clause. This would rescue the word order, but an accusative with √*nu* is almost always the goal of the roaring (and this exact phrase *abhí prá nonumaḥ* occurs a number of other times), not the contents of the roar, as an obj. *imā̃ḥ* would require (but see comm. on I.6.6). I prefer to take the insights as identified with ourselves, both subjects of *abhí prá* √*nu*. Old also suggests this identification, which is also found in vs. 8.

With *vipā̃m ágreṣu* compare IX.99.1 *vipā̃m ágre*. There are 43 occurrences of sg. *ágre* and one of pl. *ágreṣu*; it seems unlikely that the number is significant here, but simply used to supply an extra syllable.

In c Ge sees two similes, "like the flame of fire, (like) missiles," but I think the latter is not used as a comparison but an identification, just as in 3c the Kaṇvas praises are called their "familial weapon" (*jāmí … ā̃yudham*).

The simile marker *ná* is again misplaced; we would expect **agnér ná śocíḥ*.

VIII.6.8: See comments on 7ab. The identification of the Kaṇvas and their *dhītí* is quite clear here.

Another example of anomalously positioned *yád*, like 2b and 3a. In fact this verse is structured entirely parallel to vs. 2: participial phrase in pāda a, *prá yád* opening b followed by an injunctive in *-anta* and a nom. pl. subj *-i*-stem, c nom. pl. referrring to poets followed by *ṛtásya* INSTR. phrase.

VIII.6.10–12: This tṛca is characterized by emphatic pronominals: initial *ahám* 10a, 10c, 11a; *tvā̃m* 12a; *máma* 12c.

VIII.6.10: Ge explains the form of *ajani* as "attraction to the simile" (that is, 3rd ps. instead of 1st ps.), but although obviously there is no 1st ps. passive aorist, if there were to be, this is what it would be. More problematic is the logical connection of ab

with c. Ge thinks that the rebirth is "durch die Erleuchtung"; I assume he means that the acquisition of knowledge and the resulting illumination caused the poet to be reborn like the sun. But the sun is reborn every day, and the passing of knowledge from father to son presumably happens once or a few times at most.

VIII.6.12: The 2 occurrences of *tuṣṭuvúḥ* are standardly interpr. as preterital ("… gepreisen haben"; see Ge and Kü [578], as well as the publ. tr.), but the context does not impose this value, and the existence of an augmented plupf. *átuṣṭavam* (III.53.12) with the same apparent meaning is disturbing. It is therefore possible that the verbs here should be rendered "… who do not praise you … who do praise you." The existence of a pf. subj. in a nearby hymn, *tuṣṭávat* in VIII.8.16, also supports a presential interpr. of this pf.

Pāda c contains an ellipsis: we expect an instr. here, as in VIII.1.18 *ayā́ vardhasva tanvā́ girā́ máma*. The appropriate word can either be extracted from the proleptic adj. *súṣṭutaḥ* "by my (praise) (so that you become) well praised" (as well as the two forms of *tuṣṭuvúḥ* in ab) or, less likely, *pratnéna mánmanā* in 11a.

VIII.6.13: The accented *aírayat* in c raises questions. It is natural to interpret c as the main clause, in which case we must assume a preverb *ā́* with an unaccented *airayat* (see Old ad I.157.5). This is possible semantically and syntactically, but the Pp. does not so analyze. Alternatively we could take all of vs. 13 as a subordinate clause ("when his battle-fury smoked … (and) he sent …") dependent on the main clause in vs. 14, but this is not attractive, because it not only requires a switch from 3rd ps. to 2nd, but it also yokes together two otherwise independent myths.

VIII.6.16: Ge takes the footsteps or feet in c to be those of Indra's horses, but on the basis of I.32.8 *tā́sām áhiḥ patsutaḥśīr babhūva* "The serpent came to be lying at the feet of those (waters)" it should rather be the waters' feet or footsteps. What these are conceptually is not clear – perhaps deeper pools in the riverbeds? – but the parallel is clear, and furthermore Indra's horses take no part in the Vṛtra myth.

VIII.6.18: This verse is structured entirely parallel to vs. 12 and thus forms a small ring that does not conform to the tṛca structure. On *tuṣṭuvúḥ* see comm. on vs. 12.

VIII.6.19: *enā́m* in c would be the only accented form of the ordinarily enclitic pronominal stem *ena-*. See Old's lengthy discussion of possibilities and previous suggestions, although he does not reach a definitie conclusion. My interpretation is one that Old also seems to favor, that *enā́m* stands for the adverbial instrumental *enā́* 'thus, in this way' (an idea in different form that goes back to Hopkins). As he points out, in the position before *ṛ* this would probably come out as *enā́m̐* with anunāsika (Proleg. 470), and the redactional conversion of this to a "real" *m*, esp. in a feminine context, would not be surprising. This adverb *enā́* is quite often, though not invariably, pāda-initial. See esp. semantically parallel III.33.4 *enā́ vayám páyasā*

pínvamānāḥ “So we (are) -- swelling with milk …” For *pipyúṣī-* construed with the genitive, see vs. 43b below, *mádhor ghṛtásya pipyúṣīm*.

VIII.6.20: The first problem in this verse is what to do with *āsā́*. Ge construes it with *prasvàḥ* “Die … durch den Mund gebärend…,” and it would also be possible to take it with *ácakriran*, as Old seems to imply, yielding “with their mouth they have made you their child.” In either case this would require that ‘mouth’ is equivalent to the products of mouth, namely noise, and that the bellowing of the cows, which stands for the poets’ insights, is the instrumental cause. This is not impossible; indeed *āsā́* sometimes refers to poetic speech. But I suggest instead that *āsā́ gárbha-* is an idiom, “infant-by-mouth,” that is, nursling, and that they are nurturing him directly.

Pāda c is puzzling, in part because it lacks both a verb and both parts of the frame that should match the simile *dhármeva sū́ryam*. The verb is the easiest: the preverb *pári* invites us to supply a form of √*as* ‘be’, in the standard idiom ‘surround, envelop’. Ge’s reconstruction of the frame also seems the most likely: the subject continues to be the cows/insights of vss. 19 and 20ab, the object ‘you’ [=Indra]. They surround/envelop him in a nurturing, maternal manner. But the image in the simile is very different: I do not know of other places in which the sun is surrounded or enveloped in this fashion or what “supports” could be involved. If they are in fact the “supports (of heaven),” as seems at least reasonable, it is possible to envision the sun operating within a space defined by these supports – though, again, this does not seem to be a RVic notion elsewhere. See Old for other, not particularly plausible, scenarios. As indicated in the publ. intro., the translation given is very uncertain.

VIII.6.22: The position of the *utá* is abnormal, as it most naturally connects the two nominatives *práśastiḥ* and *yajñáḥ*. See Klein DGRV I.434–45. The *utá*’s of 23b and 24a are correctly positioned.

VIII.6.25: The lexeme *abhí* √*tan* has the idiomatic meaning ‘stretch over’ and therefore ‘extend control, dominate’. The image found in the simile (*vrajám ná*) is found exactly in the parallel IX.108.6, where the *vrajám* is not in a simile.

Here the question is the referent of the object in the frame, *sū́ra upākácakṣasam* “whose eye is near to the sun.” Ge supplies “Schatz” and thinks it refers to gold, which is “near to the sun” in its color and also (hyperbolically) its value. This is quite possible, but Agni is also found in just these expressions, e.g., IV.11.1 *upāká ā́ rocate sū́ryasya*, and of course Agni is often identified as the sun. The “gold” interpretation is probably correct, however, since the idea would be that Indra controls goods and therefore can distribute them to us; what Indra’s control over Agni would amount to is less clear. Note the independent gen. *sūráḥ* dependent on the first member of the compound *upāká-*.

Because the verb of c is a subjunctive, which would clash with the preterital perfect of ab, I take c with the following verse, whose present tense verbs are more compatible with a subjunctive.

VIII.6.26–27: Vs. 26 (and if I am right, 25c) are both dependent on vs. 27 by my reading.

VIII.6.28-30: The tr. of this tṛca is superficially easy, but its interpretation is difficult. Ge takes 28 as referring to soma, 29 to Indra (or 29ab to Indra and 29c to soma; it's not entirely clear), while Old emphatically rejects Ge and takes Indra as the referent of both verses. Neither of them is entirely clear about the identity of the plural subjects of 30, though both think that the verse is a reference to the dawn and/or the dawn sacrifice.

I do not have a solution to these riddles, though I have some further suggestions. But before presenting them, I should first point out how different the style of ths tṛca is from the rest of the hymn. There are no proper names in the verse, either divine or human; the reference is only 3rd person; there is no specific ritual vocabulary; the presentation is all descriptive, without even an implicit hint of the hortatory; there are no similes, though the imagery is strikingly poetic. The whole effect is almost allegorical, stripped of the busy specificity and the divine-human give-and-take that characterize the rest of the hymn and reappear emphatically in the next tṛca.

As often in the RV, I think some of the difficulties arise because two separate referents are present. On the one hand, the location of the birthplace of the poet in 28 suggests, as Ge says, that soma is the subject. Soma, esp. the celestial soma often encountered in Maṇḍala IX, could also be the subject of 29, looking down upon the sea of the earthly soma. But in both verses poetic inspiration could also be the subject, signaled by the two forms of √*vip*, *vípraḥ* in 28c, *vipānáḥ* in 29c, and by the emphasis on seeing in 29 and 30. The progression from birth with insight (28c) to quivering and stirring (29c) seems to describe first the germ of the poetic idea and then its development. In 30 in a different image "they" (poets/sacrificers?) see "the dawning light of the age-old semen" – a baffling phrase. The "milk of the age-old semen" (*páyaḥ pratnásya rétasaḥ*) is found in III.31.10 in a Vala context, where it may refer to the poetic products that help open the Vala cave. Here it may refer to the even further development of the poetic insight, now fitted to a ritual context and available to be "seen" by the ritualists who will make use of it. But all this is highly speculative.

VIII.6.34: "Wooden" seems excluded for *vánanvatī* here. See VIII.1.31.

VIII.6.36: Note the phonetic figure *háribhyāṃ haryatābhyām*. See also VIII.12.25–28.

VIII.6.38: The tr. of a and c may be difficult to parse in English: "after you (roll)…" does not contain a temporal conjunction ("after") followed by a subject + verb, but rather a prepositional phrase ("after you," that is, "following you") followed by a verb with postposed subject ("both worlds" / "the drops").

The isolated verb form *varti* is, curiously, identified as an injunctive by Lub, despite the apparent primary ending. Gr considers it a development of **vart-ti*, which

is phonologically possible. I don't have a firmly founded analysis of it, but I wonder, since outside of the perfect, intransitive forms of √*vṛt* are medial, if this is actually a "passive aorist," which displays the expected strong form and *-i* ending, in which case Lub's inj. label would be correct.

In c *svānāsaḥ* is a pun: it can either be the nom. pl. m. of the mediopassive participle of the root aorist to √*su* 'press' or nom. pl. m. to the thematic nominal *svāná-* 'sounding, sound'. See VIII.7.14, 17.

VIII.6.39: I give *śaryaṇāvati* its literal meaning, rather than taking it as a PN as Ge does, since in other places it seems to have literal content. But a PN, esp. in this context, is certainly possible.

VIII.6.41: On the sense of *coṣkūyá-* see Schaeffer (201); the action envisaged is poking or prodding a fire, extended to Indra's poking more and more good things out to us.

VIII.6.44: *vímahi-* is a hapax, but presumably built to *vímahas-* (2x) and of fairly obvious meaning.

VIII.7 Maruts

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn contains dense repetitions of vocabulary and numerous phonetic echoes within and across verses. I have noted some, but by no means all, below. Particularly common in the earlier part of the hymn is the root √*yā* 'drive', in both verbal and nominal forms (2b, 4c [2x], 5a, 7b, 8b; also 14b, 23a, 26b, 28c, 29c).

VIII.7.1: *triṣṭúbham íṣam* "Triṣṭubh refreshment" causes some interpretational difficulties. Although in RVic discourse there is no problem with an image that involves refreshment conceived as metrical poetry, this hymn containing the phrase in its opening phrase is in Gāyatrī meter, not Triṣṭubh. The same phrase recurs in VIII.69.1 (Indra), a hymn that is also not in Triṣṭubh. Some remove the word here entirely from the poetic sphere, as in Macdonell's "threefold Soma draught." Ge believes that it can't refer to the Triṣṭubh *meter* here, but that it must be a different technical term in recitation. I do not think that the fact that these two hymns are not in Triṣṭubh necessarily means that that meter can't be referred to in this expression; there are, after all, plenty of hymns to both the Maruts and Indra in Triṣṭubh, and the verb governing the phrase is in the imperfect and therefore should refer to another occasion. But following Ge's lead, I think it possible that '(having?) threefold rhythm' could refer to the Gāyatrī meter in which this hymn is composed, since Gāyatrī consists of three pādas. Unfortunately this will not work for VIII.69, which is composed in a variety of meters (incl. Gāyatrī, but only vss. 4–6); the verse in which the phrase is found (VIII.69.1) is in Anuṣṭubh. I might emend the publ. tr. to "refreshment in threefold rhythm." For further on the compound see Scar (641–42), who is somewhat indecisive about both the compound type and the sense.

VIII.7.2: *ácidhvam* in b (see also the identical pāda in 14b) should be read with distracted final syllable (*ácidh*ʰ*vam*) in order to make up an 8-syllable pāda, but it also should ideally have a heavy root syllable in order to avoid four consecutive light syllables in the cadence. (Even though I do not believe that the cadences of dimeter verse are as regulated as those in trimeter, iambic cadences do prevail, and four shorts would be quite unusual.) Werba (183, flg. Seebold) suggests that the form represents **ácid-dh*ʰ*vam* to √*cit*, which seems very plausible (also for the identical distracted form in I.87.2; in V.55.7 it does not require distraction and is therefore not diagnostic). Gr assigns *ácidhvam* to √*ci*, which is nearly identical in meaning to √*cit*; Lubotsky, curiously, puts it with √*ci* 'pile'. The same type of cluster reduction is found in the Marut hymn VIII.20.18 in *vavṛdh*ʰ*vam*, which likewise requires distraction and a heavy root syllable and represents **vavṛd-dh*ʰ*vam* from √*vṛt* 'turn'.

VIII.7.3: I take *úd īrayanta* here as a reflexive transitive. It thus contrast with intransitive *úd … īrate* in 7b.

See also comm. on vs. 10.

VIII.7.1–4: Note recycling of vocab. -- *íṣam* 1, 3; *párvata-* 1, 2, 4; *yā́mam* 2, 4; *vip/vep* 1, 4; *vāyúbhiḥ* 3, 4.

VIII.7.4 *vápanti* is also echoed by *vepayanti* in the next pāda, and the whole verse is marked by alliteration: *v*'s, *p*'s, and *r*'s in *vápanti … prá vepayanti párvatān*; *m*'s in *marúto míham* (both sets in ab), and *y*'s in c: *yád yā́maṃ yā́nti vāyúbhiḥ*.

VIII.7.5: The vs. consists only of a subordinate clause. I attach it to the preceding vs., since the *yád* clause of 4c seems parallel to the *yád* clause of 5 and *yā́ma-* recurs here. However, there is a change from 3rd ps. ref. in 4 to 2nd ps. in 5.

VIII.7.6: Each pāda of this vs. begins *yuṣmā́n*, picking up *śúṣmāya* in 5c.

VIII.7.7: Both *úd … īrate* and *vāśrá-* echo vs. 3. There is an internal echo between *ar**uṇá**psavaḥ* (a) and *ṣṇ**únā*** (c).

VIII.7.8: Exactly what atmospheric phenomenon is being described here is not clear. Ge seems to think that it's the Maruts who are traveling the path (*pánthām … yā́tave* "dass sie ihre Bahn laufe"), though his n. 8b seems closer to my interpr. I suggest that it is a post-storm image: the thunderclouds/Maruts part, releasing the sun's ray and allowing the sun to travel its usual path across the sky. The parting of the clouds is expressed in c, the extending or spreading of the clouds which is accompanied by the beams of the sun. Thieme (Fremd. 112) instead sees the Maruts releasing a ray as the path for the sun to travel: the first ray of morning, which the sun follows. But the Maruts are not dawn gods.

Pāda c is repeated as the final pāda of the hymn (36c).

VIII.7.10: The stem *pṛśni-* in the plural otherwise refers to "dappled cows" and is marked (by pronouns and modifying adjectives) as feminine; see the immediate preceding hymn VIII.6.19, as well as VIII.69.3, I.84.11. Here, however, there are no diagnostically feminine forms syntactically associated with *pṛśnayaḥ*. This allows it to refer both to (fem.) dappled cows and to the (masc.) Maruts, whose mother is Pṛśni. Although the Maruts are regularly called "Rudras" after their father Rudra (e.g., 12b), this is the only place in the RV where they are called "Pṛśnis" after their mother. This verse reprises 3bc … *pṛśnimātaraḥ | dhukṣánta pipyúśīm íṣam* "They whose mother is Pṛśni have milked out swelling refreshment," with the bahuvrīhi *pṛśnimātaraḥ* matched with *pṛśnayaḥ* here and *dhukṣánta* matching *duduhré*. The *pṛśnimātaraḥ* in 3b all but ensures that we will take *pṛśnayaḥ* here as a referent to the Maruts.

The referent of the three lakes they milk out as honey is the rain they produce.

VIII.7.12: Ge and Re (see his comm.) take *sudānavo, rúdrā ṛbhukṣaṇaḥ* as predicative vocatives with the copula expression *yūyáṃ hí ṣṭhā* "for you are …" This seems unnecessary, since there is a fine nominative plural, *prácetasaḥ*, which can serve as predicate. I take the *utá* to be connecting not the supposed predicative vocc. with *prácetasaḥ*, but the two locc. *dáme* and *máde*. The predicative vocative analysis is esp. unlikely because this is a repeated pāda (I.15.2, VI.51.15, VIII.83.9; there are also further exx. of *yūyám hí ṣṭhā* … as a pāda-opening), and only in I.15.2 is a predicative voc. likely. (See Bloomfield, RR ad I.15.2; he considers it "plain mechanical borrowing" there.)

The conjoined vocc. "in our house and in exhilaration" may not seem to form a natural semantic class, but note that they are anagrams of each other: *dáme | máde*, and in a hymn so structured by phonetics, that would be enough.

VIII.7.13: I take *madacyútam* as having "active" meaning ('arousing exhilaration'), rather than passive. Scar (126) allows either for this stem, and Re takes it as passive here. Since the passive form *mádacyutam* built with the past participle would fit the same metrical slot, I think that the active sense must be meant.

VIII.7.14: I supply loc. *upahvaré(ṣu)* in a because *ádhi* doesn't take the genitive (so can't be directly construed with *girīṇā́m* as Ge does), on the basis of the immediately preceding hymn VIII.6.28 *upahvaré girīṇā́m* and the Marut hymn I.87.2 *upahvaréṣu yád ácidhvaṃ yayím*, whose phraseology is very close to this.

I do not entirely understand what *iva* is doing here. Perhaps their wandering in the distant parts of the mountains is implicitly compared to their journey here.

As in VIII.6.38 (q.v) I take *svāná-* as a pun, both a passively used root aor. mediopassive participle to √*su* 'press' ('being pressed'), which is eminently appropriate for drops, and a thematic adj. to √*svan* 'sound'. Although the latter may seem less characteristic of drops, see 16a *drapsā́ iva … dhámanti* "like droplets they blow their blast," as well as 17a, where *svāná-* seems to encapsulate the same pun.

VIII.7.15: The problem in this verse is the referent and syntactic construction of gen. sg. *etā́vataḥ … ádābhyasya* (assuming that the two are to be construed together). Most take the phrase as obj., one way or another, of *bhikṣeta*. Ge takes it as a separate obj. of *bhikṣeta*, parallel to *sumnám*: "Um solche unfehlbare (Gabe), um ihre Gunst …" Old, by contrast, suggests that the poet started out with the gen. *etā́vataḥ*, meaning to continue with **sumnásya*, but had to substitute the acc. *sumnám* for metrical reasons. He then takes *ádābhyasya* either as continuing the gen. phrase *etā́vataḥ … *sumnásya* or as having a separate referent, the Maruts considered as a unity. Re also considers *sumná-* to be the ultimate referent, but has the genitive phrase express a partitive sense: "Puisse le mortel avoir une part, (si) petite (soit-elle), à la bonne grace …" Sim. Bl (RR) ad loc. In favor of the Old/Re/Bl solution is the phrase *etā́vataḥ … sumnásya* in VIII.49.9 (Vālakh.), construed with *īmahe* 'we beg' (cf. 50.9); see also VIII.5.27 *etā́vat... / ... sumnám īmahe*. But I find Old's metrical about-face very unlikely: RVic poets don't have "whoops, that genitive won't fit here" compositional moments, as far as I can tell, while Re's semi-partitive construction seems rather weasely. Moreover, *√bhikṣ* is almost always construed with the acc. as here (genitives probably in I.152.6 and VII.90.6). And, further, in the scenario where *ádābhyasya* is part of the phrase, "unfehlbar" (Ge), "unerring" (Bl) is not what *ádābhya-* means. My solution is not necessarily better, though it does arise in part from Old's alternative suggestion for *ádābhyasya.* I take the gen. sg. phrase as doubling the gen. pl, *eṣā́m*, with both referring to the Maruts -- the plural to them individually, the singular to their collectivity (so Old's "von den als Einheit gedachten Maruts"), i.e., the Marut flock (*gaṇá-*). This seems to be Gr's view, also Macdonell's. It should be noted that the Maruts (in pl.) are several times referred to as *ádābhya-* (II.34.10, III.26.4).

The publ. tr. reflects that analysis, but I am not entirely certain it is right. If I were to follow some version of the other view, I would render *bhikṣeta* in two different ways depending on the case of its complement: "might beg their benevolence, might seek a share of such undeceivable ..."

VIII.7.16: However odd the expression *drapsā́ḥ … dhámanti* "the droplets blow their blast" may seem, it is found twice elsewhere: the extremely enigmatic VIII.96.13 and the somewhat clearer IX.73.1. The latter is a noise-making context, as this may be.

VIII.7.16–17: 16c *útsaṃ duhántaḥ* reprises 10bc *duduhré … útsam*, which in turn reminded us of *dhukṣánta* in 3c. Other elements in vs. 3 reappear in vs. 17: *pṛ́śnimātaraḥ* in 17c was the subj. of *dhukṣánta* in 3b, and 17ab *úd u … īrate … úd u vāyúbhiḥ* reminds us of 3a *úd īrayanta vāyúbhiḥ* (cf. also 7ab).

On *svānébhiḥ* in 17a see comm. on 14. Because vss. 16 and 17 are so closely tied, I connect the *drapsá-* of 16a with the *svānébhiḥ* in 17a and consider this a variant of *svānaíḥ … índubhiḥ* in 14c.

VIII.7.18: Note the extremely recessive 2nd pl. perfect *āvá*: 2nd pl. pfs. are rare and poorly marked as it is; with its initial swallowed by *yéna*, it barely surfaces.

The referent of *yéna* and its correlative *tásya* is most likely 'help' (*ávas-*); so Ge. This assumption is supported by I.112.5 *yā́bhiḥ káṇvam … ā́vatam* "with which you two helped Kaṇva," where the referent of *yā́bhiḥ* is the etymologically related *ūtíbhiḥ* and the same Kaṇva story as in 18b is referred to.

As for Turvaśa and Yadu -- though, as Ge points out, their helper is usually Indra, in this run of hymns the deed is assigned to several different gods: the Maruts (here), Indra (VIII.4.7), the Aśvins (VIII.9.14, 10.5).

The construction of c is unusual. With Ge (and Re), I take *tásya* as a partitive gen. with *dhīmahi*, though somewhat reluctantly. The dat. *rāyé* 'for wealth' is then an indication of our purpose once we receive some help from the Maruts; Ge's fuller "um Reichtum (zu gewinnen)" makes the purpose clearer.

VIII.7.19: *pipyúṣīr íṣaḥ* echoes *pipyúṣim íṣam* in 3c.

VIII.7.21: Ge thinks that this verse is addressed to the other singers, but this requires that the voc. *vṛ́ktabarhiṣaḥ* in 20 and 21 have two different referents (so explicitly Ge's n. 3), which seems unlikely. I take the Maruts to be the addressees, as in vs. 20, and follow Macdonell (*Hymns from the Rigveda*, p. 60) as well as Lüders (Var. 426–27) in taking the verse as contrasting the Maruts' former friendly behavior to the poet and his fellow ritualists with their neglect now -- a neglect drawn attention to by the questions in the immediately preceding vs. 20. Acdg. to Delbrück (AiS 502), *ha sma purā́* + PRESENT expresses what was accustomed to happen in the past. I also take *stómebhiḥ* not as the Maruts' praise songs, but rather the ones produced by us, as an instrumental of price. Macdonell's tr. "as once ye did *for praise*…" seems to reflect a similar interpr.

VIII.7.22–23: The insistently repeated *sám* in vs. 22 (4x in 3 pādas) is complemented by its opposite *ví* in 23, though *ví* needs only two occurrences to continue the pattern.

VIII.7.23: *arājín-* is a hapax. Though it is obviously derived from a root √*rāj*, it is not clear whether it belongs to 'shine' (so Gr 'nicht glänzend', Re 'sans éclat') or 'rule' (Ge 'die herrenlosen Berge'; Old 'königlos') -- or both, as I suspect. Although neither root yields compelling sense as a negated quality of mountains, the phrase should be interpreted in light of 1c *ví párvateṣu rājatha*, where I see the same pun.

It is possible that *ví* √*yā* should be rendered 'drive through', not 'drive apart', although this produces a less happy contrast with *sám* in vs. 22. In that case I would tr. "they drove through Vṛtra, joint by joint, (drove) through the mountains …"

On *vṛ́ṣṇi* see comm. ad VIII.96.19.

VIII.7.24: The pattern of repeated preverbs continues with *ánu*. The lexeme *ánu* √*av* is quite rare (but see X.113.1); presumably the poet was looking for a preverb to

pattern with *sám* and *ví* in the previous vss. In X.113.1 I tr. 'assist', but 'stand by' here to provide a separable particle for the pattern.

VIII.7.25: I have punctuated pāda b as a parenthetical expression, a nominal locational clause, but in context it is the equivalent of a decompounded bahuvrīhi modifying the Maruts and parallel to *vidyúddhastā(ḥ)* 'having lightning in their hands' in a (so approx. Re). A bahuvrīhi would have been difficult to construct with these elements. Including the modifier 'golden' would have produced a three-member compound, which would be unusual for the RV, and determining what form 'head' (*śíras-* / *śīr̥ṣ-ṇ-*) would have taken as the final member of a masc. pl. bahuvrīhi may have defeated the poet. This analytic expression is given somewhat fuller form in V.54.11.

VIII.7.26: Like every verse involving Uśanā, this one is quite obscure. On the morphology of the name, see my art. in Fs. Jasanoff; for the mythological background and development of Uśanā, chap. 4 in my *RV between Two Worlds*. I take this verse as a disguised treatment of the Vala myth, with which Uśanā Kāvya is associated elsewhere. Pāda a is also found at I.130.9; there I take Uśanā as an acc. of goal (or perhaps a gen. with a gapped 'house'), while here I take it as an instr. As discussed in the Fs. Jasanoff article, the word *uśánā* behaves essentially like an indeclinable in the RV.

In my analysis the curious expression *ukṣṇó rándhram* "the loins of the ox" (on *randhrá-* see Gotō 1985 [MSS 44] and EWA s.v.) is a reference to the Vala cave: the loins are a weak or vulnerable spot in animals, and MIA *randha-* 'opening, cleft, weak spot' shows how easily this can develop into a word that might qualify a cave. A similar circumlocution for the Vala cave is *náme góḥ* "in the bend of the cow" (III.39.6). Ge takes the phrase instead as a personal name; as he points out Ukṣṇo Randhra is a PN in PB 13.9.19/JB III.150 and has the epithet *kāvya-*, apropos of the so-called Aukṣṇorandhra Sāman, but this is surely a secondary reinterpretation of this opaque vs.

The roaring in c is the noise of the cows penned inside the cave.

Note the phonetic echo in the initial words of the first two pādas: #*uśanā* / #*ukṣṇas*.

VIII.7.28: *práṣṭi-* 'side-horse' is a rare word in the RV, occurring two other times in addition to a single instance of the deriv. *práṣṭimant-*. As often, the occurrence of a rare word can be attributed to phonological triggers; here ***pṛ́ṣatī ráthe*** / ***práṣṭir*** ... ***róhitaḥ*** (with a nice scrambling of *th* → *h...t* in *ráthe … róhitaḥ*). Our pāda b is also found at I.39.6b, with *rátheṣu pṛ́ṣatīr* in the preceding pāda. (The other two occurrences are less phonologically driven.)

The exact arrangement of the horses isn't clear, and the sandhi form *pṛ́ṣatī* has accordingly received different grammatical analyses. I take it as representing underlying *pṛ́ṣatīḥ*, an acc. pl. fem., obj. of *váhati* (so also Gr, Bl). Ge (/Re) seems to take it rather as a nom. pl. implicitly conjoined with *róhitaḥ*, presumably with the

verb agreeing with the latter. Hoffmann (Inj. 126) take the form as a dual nom., a parallel subj. to *róhitaḥ*.

Old suggests that *riṇán(n)* is a nom. sg. participle, modifying the subjects of *yā̃nti* with incongruence of number. This seems unnecessary, since it can easily be a 3rd pl. injunctive, requiring no such grammatical adjustment.

VIII.7.31: On *kadhapriyaḥ* see comm. ad I.30.20. Note *kád dha … kadha-*.

The verse seems to allude to the Maruts' supposed leaving Indra in the lurch at the Vṛtra battle, but this seems to be a slander: it is often said that they were the only gods who stayed with him (though Ge adduces ŚB IV.3.3.6, where they temporarily withdraw until Indra offers them a joint share of the sacrifice [7ff.].). Certainly 24c expresses their help to Indra at that time.

VIII.7.32–33: Note opening 32a #*sah**o ṣu*** / 33a ***#o ṣu***. HvN mark *o* in 33a as disyllabic. The agreement across vss. would be an argument against such a reading, and Old has several alternative suggestions.

VIII.7.35: I take the final word of the vs., *váyaḥ*, as a pun, both nom. pl. 'birds' and neut. acc. sg. 'vital energy', with the birds subject of *vahanti* in pāda a. Birds figure in several nearby hymns (VIII.3.23, 5.33), with the latter passage esp. close: *... vām ... váyo vahantu parṇínaḥ* "Let your feathered birds [=horses[convey you two [=Aśvins] here." Ge instead takes the obj. of *vahanti* here to be the Maruts' horses (supplied), with the Maruts themselves presumably the subj. Scar (415–16) has the Maruts as subj. and clouds as obj., but in the absence of any clouds in the context, it seems better not to invent them. The disadvantage to my proposal is that the 'birds' reading of *váyaḥ* has to leap backwards over a nominal clause (*dhā̃tāra stuvaté …*) that clearly has the Maruts as its nominal referent. Nonetheless, I think this kind of syntactic manipulation is possible in punning: the audience reaches the end of the verse and realizes that 'birds' is the subject they were missing at the beginning, while also interpretating *váyaḥ* as the neut. object of *dhā̃tāraḥ*.

I am tempted to take *dhā̃tāraḥ* as a periphrastic future: "they will establish …"

VIII.7.36: Pāda b contains two ambiguous forms, whose variant interpretations have produced very different tr.: *chándaḥ* may be nom. sg. masc. to *chánda-* 'pleasing' or nom./acc. sg. neut. to *chándas-* 'meter'; *sū̃raḥ* can be nom. sg. masc. *sū̃ra-* 'sun' or gen. sg. *svàr-* 'id.' The standard tr. opt for the former choice in both cases, e.g., Re "tel un charmeur est le soleil, de par (son) éclat." I have chosen the latter in both cases. The verse is a reference to the ritual here-and-now, the kindling of the fire at dawn: the phrase *sū̃ro arcíṣā* "with the ray of the sun" is an indicator of that time. I take *chándaḥ* as a metrical verse because the hymn opened with a similar metrical expression: *triṣṭubham íṣam* (see comm. ad vs. 1). The Maruts are characterized as *chandastúbh-* 'chanting in rhythm' in V.52.12, a cmpd that unites the *chandas-* of our vs. 36 with the 2nd part of *triṣṭúbh-* in vs. 1. To be born "like a metrical verse"

makes sense in a RVic context: the fire is kindled (born) as the verbal portion of the ritual begins to be spoken (born).

VIII.8 Aśvins

VIII.8.4: The hapax voc. *adhapriyā* is clearly based on the slightly better attested *kadhapriya-*/*-prī-* (on which see comm. ad I.30.20), a form of which is found in the immediately preceding hymn VIII.7.31. The latter is a dismissive and slighting form of address ("when-friends?" -- that is, fair-weather friends) whereas *adhapriya-* seems to be the opposite: "now/here-friends," that is, reliable friends.

VIII.8.5: I construe both *svāhā* and *stómasya* with *úpaśrutī*, although they are in different pādas. (Ge takes *svā́hā* as an independent mini-clause and construes *stómasya* with voc. *vardhanā*.) Although *várdhana-* regularly does take the genitive, I am reluctant to take *stómasya* with it because we might expect the gen. to lose its accent in a vocative phrase (although this loss is of course not invariable, as Old points out). *úpaśruti-* also takes the gen. (see I.10.3), and since *svā́hā* is indeclinable, it can also be dependent on *úpaśruti-*, at least as I see it. Old also floats the possibility that *stómasya* goes with *úpaśrutī*, though he seems to favor a connection with *vardhanā*.

It is not clear whose *dhītí-* 'insights' are in question in c. Ge takes them as the Aśvins', and the fact that *kavī* 'poets' qualifies them directly adjacent to *dhītíbhiḥ* would support this view. However, in 19cd the *dhītíbhiḥ* definitely belong to the poet, and this also seems to be the case with *suvṛktíbhiḥ* in 3b (on the basis of 22ab), as well as *dhībhíḥ* and *stómebhiḥ* in 7cd. In general the unrelenting point of this hymn is that the Aśvins are supposed to come here at our producing various verbal products for their delectation. I take the instr. in these cases to be instrumentals of cause.

With *prá* in d I supply another verb of motion. Judging from his tr. Ge must take it as *prá √as* 'be outstanding': "Ihr … (seid) an Gedanken … voraus." This is not impossible, but this is a journey hymn and not much else happens, esp. in this section: we offer praise; they come.

VIII.8.6: *yác cid dhí vām purā́* … is very like (*nahí ṣma*) *yád dha vaḥ purā́* in the immediately preceding hymn (VIII.7.21), which, with a present tense verb, expresses habitual action in the past. Here we have instead the med. 3rd pl. perfect *juḥūre* (found otherwise only in almost identical context in I.48.14; see Kü 606), also apparently expressing habitual past action. (Delbrück [AiS 501–3] does not comment on this usage.) In both cases (also I.48.14) that action is implicitly compared to what is happening in the present. Here *my* praise is contrasted with those of the seers of the past.

VIII.8.11, 14–15: The bahuvrīhi *sahásranirṇij-* 'having thousandfold raiment' is found only in this hymn and does not seem a particularly natural qualifier either of a chariot (vss. 11, 14) or of refreshment (15).

VIII.8.15: The first hemistich reprises 8cd, but in this vs. the poet asks for something in response to his strengthening hymns.

VIII.8.15–16: Another example of chained vocabulary: *ghṛtaścút-* 'dripping with ghee', which is reasonably appropriate both for 'refreshment' (*íṣ-*, 14) and 'nourishment' (*ū́rj-*, 16).

VIII.8.18: I supply "who listen" in d on the basis of V.61.15 *śrótāro yā́mahūtiṣu*.

VIII.8.19: *mayobhúvā* in pāda a repeats the same word in 9d, with *śambhúvā* in b generated as a variant to it.

Pāda d, *gīrbhír vatsó ávīvṛdhat*, is the third occurrence of this same pāda in this hymn (also 8d, 15b, except the verb in 8 lacks the accent). The instr. pl. *dhītíbhiḥ* at the end of c seems to double *gīrbhíḥ*, as *śambhúvā* does *mayobhúvā* in the first half-verse.

VIII.8.22: It may not be clear in the publ. tr. that "found in many places" is a voc. addressed to the Aśvins and does not qualify the songs and hymns. I take this form as a "vocativized adverb" in Re's phrase, derived from *purutrā́* 'in many places', against the standard opinion that it contains the root noun to √*trā* 'protect' and means 'protecting many' (so Sāy, Gr, Ge). Scar (194) considers both options and cannot decide. In fact I do not feel strongly about the analysis reflected in the publ. tr. and could also accept 'protecting many'. However, it might be worth noting that the adv. *purutrā́* frequently occupies pāda-initial position, as here, and that there are several occurrences of it in nearby hymns (VIII.1.7, 5.16, 11.8), one of which (VIII.5.16) is in an Aśvin hymn. The Aśvins are the subj. of a form of √*trā* only once (VII.71.2), but this is not a strong argument either way.

VIII.8.23: As noted in the publ. intro., the three footsteps (*trī́ṇi padā́ni*) attributed to the Aśvins must be meant to evoke the three celebrated *padā́ni* of Viṣṇu (cf. I.154.4). Perhaps it is simply the Aśvins' penchant for trios (not found in this hymn, however) that is the point of contact. One might note, however, that in the next hymn (VIII.9), also by Vatsa, vs. 2 asks the Aśvins to confer on us the power in the midspace, in heaven, and "through the five peoples of Manu" (i.e., on earth). Since Viṣṇu's three steps cover the same three cosmic divisions, the Aśvins' geographical reach may be alluded to here. Even more striking in the next hymn (VIII.9.12d), the Aśvins "stand in the strides of Viṣṇu" (*víṣṇor vikrámaṇeṣu tíṣṭhathaḥ*).

The purport of the paradoxical pāda b is also not clear; see speculations by Old, Ge, and Re. I think it must have something to do with the anxiety expressed throughout this hymn about exactly where the Aśvins are and our oft-expressed desire for them to leave wherever it is and come to us. So we are never sure whether they are visible or hidden.

The final pāda reflects our also stated desire that the Aśvins forsake other sacrificers to come to us (see esp. vs. 8).

VIII.9 Aśvins

VIII.9.2: For the possible relevance of this verse to VIII.8.23, see comm. ad loc.

VIII.9.3: *pári √mṛś* is a more vivid expression than Gr's 'geistig berühren', Ge's 'befassen' indicate: in X.34.4 it is the verb the Gambler uses in his tortured imagining of others fondling his wife: *anyé jāyā́m pári mṛśanti asya*. Something similar seems to be the point here. The Aśvins put their powers at the disposal of other poets; Vatsa sees this promiscuity in almost sexual terms and begs them for an exclusive relationship.

VIII.9.4: I take *cíketathaḥ* 'attend to' in a somewhat sinister sense here: with the help (/invigoration) of soma the Aśvins will turn their attention to Vṛtra/the obstacle and take care of the threat he/it poses. However, I am not entirely certain why the Aśvins are being implicated in the Vṛtra battle and assimilated, as it were, to Indra. The gharma of the 1st half-verse is more naturally their drink. But see 7cd below. Note also that in 12a they drive on the same chariot with Indra. On the basis of that hemistich, which also associates them with Vāyu (12b), we can assume that it is their joint appearance at the dawn sacrifice that brings them into conjunction.

VIII.9.5: The referent of the *yád*'s in ab is not overtly expressed. Ge supplies 'Heilmittel' on the basis of vs. 15 with *bheṣajám*. That verse does not seem to me particularly apposite. Nonetheless, I follow him, because the denom. *bhaiṣajyá-* is found in the next vs. (6b), because *bheṣajá-* is elsewhere found in the waters (cf. I.23.19), and because plants are generally associated with healing (see X.97).

kṛtám can be either a neut. sg. ppl., agreeing with *yád*, or a root aor. 2nd du. act. injunc. Gr and Ge take it as the former; Old considers the latter, but rejects it on what seem to me slight grounds. I take it as the latter, in part because the immediately preceding hymn contains 2 of the 7 (per Lub; 8 if this is counted) examples of accented finite 2nd du. *kṛtám* (VIII.8.13, 17) and also because I think it more likely that the Aśvins would be portrayed as actively producing these remedies (see 6b) than that the remedies simply got made. However, the ppl. interpr. is far from excluded.

VIII.9.6: The rendering of *ná vindhate* in the publ. tr. is opaque. By "does not get enough" I meant something like "produces in superfluity" -- from Vatsa's point of view, there can never be enough praises for the Aśvins.

The sense relation between the *yád* clauses of ab and the main clause in c is not clear. I *think* the idea is that even when the Aśvins are preoccupied with some other activity, Vatsa keeps praising them on the assumption that they will pay attention at some point.

I am also a bit unclear on how pāda d fits with the rest. I think that it reinforces pāda c; that is, Vatsa keeps producing hymns because he knows that the Aśvins ultimately come to someone who offers them sacrifice (here represented by the *havís-* 'oblation'). But it could instead mean that Vatsa is wasting his time, because the Aśvins go for the oblation, not the praise. This seems less likely, esp. since both praise and oblation are offered to the Aśvins in the next vs.

VIII.9.7: This new tṛca opens as the hymn does (1a): *ā́ nūnám*, followed by a form of *aśvín-*. The 2nd vs. of the tṛca (8) also opens with *ā́ nūnám*.

Ge (also Lü 362) supplies a form of 'speech' with *vāmáyā*, obviously as part of the seer's ritual offering to the Aśvins. But *vāmá-* generally expresses the valuable thing that the ritualist receives from the god(s) in exchange for his ritual service, and I have taken it this way here, with (loosely) an instr. of price. I do not have an explanation for its fem. gender, however. There are no other occurrences of a fem. in *-ā́* to this adjective; most forms are masc. or neut, and the other fem. forms are in *-ī́*.

The honeyed soma and hot milk of vs. 4 return here.

Ge (also Lü) , flg. Ludwig, takes *átharvaṇi* rather bizarrely as a nominative, but there seems no reason not to interpr. it as the loc. it appears to be (so, e.g., Old). Nor does there seem any reason not to take it as the name of a priest, as it is elsewhere (pace Sāy, Old). I take it as a loc. absol. without an overt participle marking it.

VIII.9.8–9: With Kü (181–82), I assign the curious paired reduplicated med. opt. forms (*ā́* …) *cucyavīrata* (8) and *ācucyuvīmáhi* (9) to the caus. reduplicated aorist, which is otherwise only active. I have no explanation for the difference in the grade of the root syllable (*-cyav-* vs. *-cyuv-*); no morphological or metrical factors can explain the variation between these two almost adjacent forms. Possibly the 3rd pl. has full grade in some kind of imitation of the full grade of act. 3rd pl. imperfects to redupl. presents (type *ájuhavur* vs. *ájuhuma*), but that is found only in the active voice and not in the optative, so it would be a bizarre and tenuous imitation indeed.

VIII.9.9: The last pāda of the verse (d) is identical with the last pāda of vs. 3 (c), but the point is very different. In vs. 3 the poet asks the Aśvins to pay attention only to him despite the activities of *other* poets; here it's "we" who are moving the Aśvins, but the poet still asks for their exclusive attention. Given the constant interchange between 1st singular and plural in ritual situations, I find it difficult to think that the poet is trying to distance himself from his priestly comrades and get the Aśvins all to himself. But I don't have a good explanation.

VIII.9.10: The final pāda here is a variant of 3c and 9d, but the circumstances differ from both. Here the poet doesn't contrast himself with other rival poets (as in 3) or with the larger group of "us" (as in 9), but asks that the Aśvins pay attention as they did to previous seers -- though actually not *so* previous: Kakṣīvant and Dīrghatamas are of course famous poets represented in the collections of Maṇḍala I (I.116–26 and

I.140–64 respectively); Kakṣīvant is also identified in the Anukramaṇī as Dīrghatamas's son (or descendant). A son/descendant of Vyaśva, Viśvāmitra, is the poet of VIII.23–26, and X.148 is attributed to Pṛthu (not Pṛthī) Vainya. So our poet seems to be asking for the same attention as these famous seers received, but they are not seers of the distant past but at most of a few generations ago, possibly even roughly contemporary (though the perfect *juhāva* puts the invocation in the past). They are both models and, to a certain extent, rivals.

Pṛthi in the publ. tr. should be corrected to Pṛthī.

VIII.9.16: Ge tr. *devyā́ … vācā́* (belonging to different pādas) as "mit der göttlichen Rede," which is certainly possible. But since Dawn is explicitly the topic of the next two vss. (17–18) and since there's a voc. *devi* (or possibly, against the Pp., a nom. *devî*) in pāda c, it seems best to separate the two instrumentals and take *devyā́* as referring to Dawn. The poet has awoken with the advent of the goddess Dawn (the natural world) at the same time as the ritual speech directed to the Aśvins commences.

If nom. *devî* is read here, *vy ā́var* can be 3rd ps., not 2nd. But I see no reason to go against the Pp. in this case, since Dawn is addressed in the voc. (*uṣaḥ*) in both 17a and 18a, and the unambiguous voc. *devi* is found in 17b.

VIII.9.19: *ā́pīta-* is better derived from √*pī* 'swell' (so Ge, EWA s.v. *PAY*[I]) than to √*pā* 'drink' (Lub, Re [though Re allows a double sense]).

Pāda d requires a verb to be supplied with *prá*. I follow Re in supplying 'wake', on the basis of vs. 17. Ge *kṛnvata* (on the basis of I.186.10), thus "… (lassen) … den Vorrang." His model seems awfully distant, given that *prá bodhaya* appeared two vss. previously.

VIII.10 Aśvins

VIII.10.1: Ge and Re take *dīrghá́prasadman-* as a PN, but I follow Gr and Old in taking it as a fully lexical bahuvrīhi, 'providing a long seat'. Both of the latter consider the word an epithet of the earth, and the parallel cited by both, V.87.7 *dīrghám pṛthú paprathe sádma pā́rthivam*, is quite suggestive. However, the other occurrence of this form in VIII.25.20 seems to narrow its application to the ritual ground, rather than the earth in general.

I do not know quite what an *ā́kṛta-* house is, and the past participle *kṛtá-* is not otherwise found with *ā́*. The publ. tr. 'prepared, made ready' follows Ge/Re. However, since the lexeme *ā́* √*kṛ* generally means something like 'bring here', and since there is no second *vā* in pāda c, I am tempted to tr. "on the sea in a house directed here', namely a boat, though this may be too whimsical.

VIII.10.2: Elsewhere *héṣas(-vant)-* means 'weapon', and I see no reason to ascribe a different sense to it in this compound. So Lü (Philol. Ind. 783), contra Ge's

‘Rosstreiber’, Re’s ‘à l’incitation rapide’. I am somewhat disturbed by the accent, however.

VIII.10.3: Re points out the similarity of *gṛbhé kṛtā́* in 3 with *ā́kṛte gṛhé* in 1c.

VIII.10.4: Again Ge takes the presumed loc. *asūré* as a PN, explicitly rejecting Gr’s ‘sunless time’ in his n. 4b. But I do not see a good reason for this rejection, and given that the Aśvins are the “early-coming” gods and receive offerings before dawn, ‘sunless time’ makes sense ritually. As Old and Ge both point out, *asūré* is involved in word play with *sūráyaḥ*, which of course may account for the appearance of this hapax here, as so often.

VIII.10.5: The final clause of this vs. contains a misleading ambiguity: the second element in *átha mā́ gatam* ‘so come to me” should be interpreted as *mā ā́*, but *mā́* could also represent the prohibitive particle, with *mā́ gatam* “don’t go” or even *mā́ ā́ gatam* “don’t come.”

VIII.11 Agni

VIII.11.4: The verb *veṣi* can be either a 2nd sg. indic. pres. or a *si*-impv. to √*vī* ‘pursue’. (See, e.g., the distribution as given by Lub 1330 and 1331; Lub takes this occurrences as an indic.) Ge tr. it as an indic., Re as an impv., and the publ. tr. takes it as an indicative present. Contextually I would (weakly) prefer the imperative, and the undoubted *si*-imperative *sátsi* found in 10b might support this interpr. But I am not certain that *si*-imperatives take *ná* as negative rather than *mā́*. Given their derivational status as haplologized *s*-aor. subjunctives, *ná* should be quite correct, but they have generally transferred functionally into the imperative domain and so might be expected to take *mā́*.

The voc. ‘o Jātavedas’ was carelessly omitted from the publ. tr.

VIII.11.10: The accent of *sátsi* is probably owing to its presence in a *hí* clause. However, if one follows Ge and Re in seeing a suppressed “you have taken your seat” to be supplied with *sanā́t* ‘of old’ (e.g., Re “assieds-toi comme Oblateur nouvellement, (comme tu t'es assis) anciennement!’), the accent could come from the implicit contrast between the two vereb forms.

The accent on *pipráyasva* is somewhat more difficult to account for, and, curiously, the standard tr. and comm. do not mention it (incl. Kü 323). I think it also arose by contrast with another verb form, namely *ā́ yajasva*. The stem *pipráya-* to which this impv. belongs (see Kü), several times co-occurs with a form of √*yaj* and on several of these occasions is accented (e.g., VIII.39.9 *yákṣac ca pipráyac ca naḥ*, also VII.17.4; cf. aslo II.6.8 without accent, all cited by Kü 323).

VIII.12 Indra

VIII.12.1–3: This tṛca is unified by a series of relative clauses (mostly introduced by *yéna*) whose antecedent in the main clause is the *tám* that opens the refrain. The presumed referent of all the relative pronouns (and the *tám*'s) is *mádaḥ* in 1b, although it could be any power or capacity of Indra's that comes to mind.

VIII.12.1: Although it is Indra whom we expect to be the best soma-drinker, here the epithet is transposed to his *máda-* 'exhilaration'.

VIII.12.2: Unlike Ge I take *svàrṇara-* here as an epithet of Adhrigu, rather than a PN (sim. VIII.3.12), though not on strong grounds, and VIII.6.39, where I do take it as a PN, undercuts this position.

Either Adhrigu or, if he is a personage, Svarṇara receives the qualifier *vepáyant-* 'setting atremble', without an object. Given how little we know about Adhrigu (or Svarṇara), it is not clear what such an object might be, though it might refer to poetic inspiration.

VIII.12.4: Ge supplies a verb (verhilf) to govern the accusative phrase in ab, but given the parallelism of vss. 4 and 5, it is better that this phrase is governed by the *juṣasva* in 5a.

VIII.12.5–6: The verbal form that constitutes the refrain, *vavákṣitha* 'you have waxed strong', is accented. Old plausibly attributes the accent to its position as a semi-independent refrain (Anhang), so that it is not necessary either to supply a subordinator or to take the verb as an independent clause. Ge, by contrast, supplies a subordinator, flg. Sāy (see Ge. n.).

VIII.12.6: In c *pratháyan* is used differently in simile and frame. In the former it is straightforwardly transitive, with *vṛṣṭím* as object; in the latter it is intransitive or, at least, absolute, as in, e.g., IV.53.2.

VIII.12.7: Note the chaining between tṛcas, with the refrain of vss. 4–6 *vavákṣitha,* returning as the first word of the following verse, *vavakṣúḥ*, with person and number adjustment. Interestingly, it's this verse where the Anhang refrain doesn't precisely match the two following verses: *ávardhayat* versus *prá vāvṛdhe*, with the same root but different stem, and transitive versus intransitive. This is the only such deviation in this hymn.

VIII.12.8: I take *yádi* in pāda a as standing for **yád ī*, with shortening before the cluster *pr*. See Jamison 2002. Hence 'when', not 'if'. The **ī* as usual functions as an accusative, anticipating the obj. *sahásram mahiṣā̃n*.

The word play between the voc. *pravṛddha* in a and the refrain verb *prá vāvṛdhe* cannot be easily captured in English.

VIII.12.9: Ge takes the simile in c *agnír váneva* with ab: "Indra brennt … den Arśasāna nieder, wie Agni die Bäume," with *sāsahíḥ* only construed with the refrain: "der Siegreiche ist erstarkt" (though see his n. on 9c). But this violates the structure of the rest of the hymn, where the c pāda hangs together. I therefore take the quality held in common between simile and frame to be *sāsahíḥ*. For √*sah* with this simile see VIII.40.1 *yénā dṛḷhā́ … sāhiṣīmahi / agnír váneva...* "by which we might become victorious over the strongholds … as Agni (is victorious) over the woods," and for the reduplicated *-i*-stem governing the accusative III.16.4 *cákrir yó víśvā bhúvanābhí sāsahíḥ* "Who creates and overwhelms all living beings…" On this nominal type and its syntactic behavior, see Grestenberger 2013 (JAOS 133).

Arśasāna is an enemy of Indra in the RV about whom little is known.

VIII.12.10, 12: The verb initiating the refrain, *mímīte*, is accented, and in these two verses the accent can be explained as a result of the status of the refrain; see above ad vss. 5–6. In 11 it starts a new clause and can owe its accent to that.

VIII.12.10: Encouraged by the insistent feminines, *ṛtvíyāyatī* here is a pun, referring both to Thought's conformity to the ritual order and to her menstrual cycle. See VIII.80.7 for the same word play involving *dhīḥ*, where the femininity of the subject is more emphasized than here. It is possible that the refrain here "she is (well-)measured indeed" can also refer to the menstrual cycle. Otherwise it probably refers to the metrical character of the thought and perhaps the fact that she measures up even to Indra's great size. The refrain also has to be considered beside a phrase in the next hymn, VIII.13.30 *mímīte yajñám ānuṣák* "measures the sacrifice in proper order."

VIII.12.11: The subject of this verse is not made clear. Ge suggests either *stóma-* or *dhītí-*. The latter is more likely in my view, continued from vs. 10. There are no clashing non-feminines, since *devayúḥ* could serve either for masc. or fem., and in any case could be matching the gender of the *gárbhaḥ*. Another possibility is Agni, since he is regularly called an embryo in these circumstances, but the unity of the tṛca speaks against this. I would therefore change the "it"s in the publ. tr. ("its intention," "it has grown," "it is") to feminine forms, to match vs. 10.

The VP *krátum punīte* of b is found in the next hymn, VIII.13.1b, where the subject is Indra, but this referent is not possible here.

VIII.12.12: Since *sáni* is only a nom. actionis, not an agent, it must mean 'winnings, gain'. What it must mean here is that Indra is what we win if we keep our part of the sacrificial bargain (*mitrá-*).

The subject of c must again be the *dhītí-*. So also Ge. But the point of the simile "like an axe" (*vā́śīva*) is somewhat unclear, though Ge's explanation seems reasonable: just as the thought is measured out metrically (*mímīta íd*), so is an axe wielded in a regular rhythm (he compares VIII.19.23).

VIII.12.13–15: Lüders (*Varuṇa* 450) comments about the tṛca that it concerns only the songs sung to Indra; therefore in the refrain *ṛtá-* can only refer to "die Wahrheit des Liedes," and the refrain *ṛtásya yád* is paraphrase for "das Lied." I agree that the refrain refers to the verbal product offered to Indra, but prefer to supply *ukthá-* '(solemn) speech', extracted from *ukthá-vāhas-* in 13a for 13c and 14c.

VIII.12.13: Ge interprets the verb *abhipramandúḥ* somewhat bizarrely as "go on a pilgrimage to" ("Zu dem … die … Āyu's … pilgerten"), presumably influenced by *ukthávāhasaḥ* 'whose conveyance is solemn speech'. Kü (357) takes the same verb as intransitive, with the *yám* expressing the source of pleasure ("An dem die Erregten … sich (schon immer) erfreuen"). I see no reason why it is not a straight transitive "bring to exhilaration" like other forms of the act. pf. of √*mad*.

The question is what is the relationship between ab and c. Properly speaking, the *yám* should have a referent in the main clause (which is c: note the unaccented verb *pipye*), but there is no obvious candidate. Ge simply treats ab as an unresolved relative clause, without comment. I assume that Indra, the presumed referent of *yám* in pāda a, is covertly present in c: it is his mouth in which the speech/hymn swells – the speech having been homologized to soma already by the √*mad* form in b. See also 4ab where praise is compared to purified ghee, which may mediate the simile in our c, *ghṛtám iva.* Ge, however, seems to take the mouth as belonging to the Āyus ("… ihrem Mund"); this would make sense as the source of the speech offered to Indra. Perhaps the lack of an overt genitive limiting 'mouth' allows both interpretations some currency. I might therefore emend the publ. tr. to "it swells in his/their mouth."

VIII.12.19: Ge tr. the infinitival *gṛṇīṣáni* as a modal "soll … loben." Similarly Keydana, who takes it as a "matrix infinitive" with 2nd ps. subject but tr. modally ("… sollt ihr euch zu Hilfe besingen," 174, 246). Because it is locative in form, I am somewhat dubious about assigning it this value, which is typical, and understandable, for dative infinitivals.

I have reordered the elements in c to make the sentence parsable. That the refrain *vy ānaśuḥ* should be construed with what precedes is shown by the parallel VIII.45.27 *vy ānaṭ turváṇe śámi* "he came through to victory by his labor."

VIII.12.24: Note the slight variation on the refrain: abl. *ójasaḥ*, parallel to abl. *ámāt* in b, versus 22–23 dat. *ójase*.

Ge supplies "the world" (extracted from the dual of a) as subject of *titviṣe* in c. I follow Old in taking Indra as subject, with the *asya* reflexive. As Old points out, in nearby VIII.6.5 it is Indra's *ójas-* that is subject of the same verb; here the attribute has been deflected to an oblique case and the god himself is subject. Note also X.55.1, where Indra is modified by the participle *titviṣānáḥ*.

VIII.12.25: The opening verse of this tṛca echoes that of the last tṛca (22), with 22ab *índram …, devā̃so dadhire puráḥ* matched by 25b *devā̃s tvā dadhiré puráḥ*.

VIII.12.25–28: The phonetic figure noted in VIII.6.36 dominates the next four verses: *haryatā́ hárī*.

VIII.12.27: That *te* in a is a dative of benefit, not a genitive with *ójasā* is shown by VIII.52.3 *yásmai víṣṇus trī́ṇi padā́ vicakramé*.

VIII.12.28–30: The linkage of tṛcas is unusually close here, with the pāda-length refrain of vss. 25–27 recast as the first hemistich of vs. 28 and *ā́d ít te*, which opened the refrain of 25–27, retained as the opening of the refrain of 28–30.

For the only time in the hymn the Anhang is only three syllables, *yemire,* but this deviation is probably a word play. Old rejects Ge's older suggestion that we should read *ní yemire* as the refrain on the basis of *niyemiré* in 28b, but although Old is probably correct that we should not change the text by accenting *ní*, I think he was too hasty in dismissing the idea out of hand. The refrain *ā́d ít te víśvā bhúvanāni yemire* temptingly juxtaposes the final syllable of the neut. pl. *bhúvanāni* and the verb *yemire,* and of course *bhúvanā* without its *-ni* would be a fine neut. plural as well. The audience is surely being invited to consider alternative segmentations.

VIII.12.29: The doubling of *te … túbhyam* is presumably pleonastic in ab, with the *yadā́ te* simply repeated from 27a, 28a.

VIII.12.31: Pāda c presents some difficulties of interpretation, in particular how to distribute the three accusatives *jāmím, padā́,* and *pípratīm*. The last, a participle, takes *padám* as object in IX.10.7 (adduced by both Old and Ge): *padám ékasya pípratas* "guiding the track of the lone one safely across." But it also takes personal objects, as in nearby VIII.6.2 *prajā́m ṛtásya pípratas* "guiding the child of truth [=poem] safely across." I therefore take it as a semantically mixed construction, with *jāmím* 'kin' (which in this case, as in VIII.6.2, would be a poem or hymn) in the frame and 'footsteps' in the simile. By contrast, Ge takes *jāmím* as the subject of the simile, parallel to *suṣṭutím*: "die wie eine Schwester deine Schritte geleitet." His interpretation reads better, but ignores the position of *iva* and also the contrasting constructions of the participle *píprat-* elsewhere. By my interpretation the point is that the *suṣṭutí-* produced in ab takes the rest of the verbal portion of the sacrifice along with it to the god.

I take the refrain *prā́dhvaré* as a (quasi) locative absolute, as in VIII.46.18, rather than as integrated into what precedes.

VIII.12.32: Contrary to Ge, I take pāda c as part of the subordinate clause of ab, with vs. 33 the main clause. Ge. is forced to supply a verb ("geht").

dohánā is the problem here. Gr suggests we read it as underlying *dohánās* as in I.144.2, despite the sandhi. This seems to be the basis of Ge's interpretation ("die Melkung" as subject), but Old rejects this and takes it as an instrumental. I weakly follow Old, but neither of the interpretations is particularly compelling.

VIII.13 Indra

Although the intro. to the publ. tr. is somewhat dismissive of this hymn and dubious about any unifying factors, closer examination shows a subsurface thematic unity esp. in the mid and later parts of the hymn, roughly vss. 16-30. For discussion see below.

VIII.13.1: For b see VIII.12.11.

VIII.13.2: The word *apsujít* never occurs without an immediately preceding *sám*, whose function is not clear. See VIII.36.1–6, IX.106.3. Scar (154–55) suggests that the phrase is a metrically more favorable version of **apsú sáṃjit* "completely victorious in the waters." This seems reasonable, but it's also worth noting in this metrical context that there seems to be a feeling that a preverb is a good way to start the final four syllables of an uṣṇih, and when in doubt *sám* is a safe one. See in the previous hymn VIII.12.16-18 *sám índubhiḥ* (though the *sám* is functional there), 22-24 *sám ójase, -aḥ*.

VIII.13.3: "I call" in the publ. tr. is a careless error for "I have called," tr. augmented *ahve* and should be changed.

VIII.13.6: In c the subject of sg. *rohate* 'grows' is apparently unexpressed. Ge supplies Indra, while supplying the songs as subject of the pl. *juṣánta*, which he takes as transitive 'please': "dann wächst er [n. Indra] wie Zweige nach, wenn sie [n. Lobreden] wohlgefallen." But forms of *juṣáte* almost always mean 'take pleasure', not 'give pleasure' (see 29b for *juṣánta* in just this sense). To tackle the latter problem first, I take the subject of *juṣánta* to be the closest plural noun, namely 'branches'. Although the notion of branches enjoying themselves seems odd, I suggest it may refer to their growth under favorable conditions, with good soil and the proper amounts of water and light. (Modern gardening manuals often say that a plant "likes" this or that condition.) As for the subject of *rohate*, I take it as an imperfect pun: the form *vayā̆(ḥ)* is, on the one hand, the nom. pl. of *vayā̆-* 'branch'; however, a **váya(ḥ)*, which would differ from the text only by accent and the length of the final vowel, could be the nom. sg. of the neut. *–s*-stem meaning 'vitality', and so I take it. Alternatively one could follow Bloomfield's suggestion (made at the parallel passage II.5.4) that *vayā̆(ḥ)* is the masc. nom. sg. of an internally derived **vayás-* 'possessing vitality, vital one' (=Indra). In fact I now prefer this solution and would change the publ. tr. accordingly. (In II.5.4 this is unnecessary because Agni is easily and properly supplied as subject, and the tree branches work fine in the simile.)

VIII.13.14: Although Ge interprets the stretching of the thread as a metaphorical expression for the continuation of old relationships, it seems far more likely that it reflects the normal idiom "stretch the thread" for setting up and performing the

sacrifice. See vs. 18b *devā́so yajñám atnata*. "The way that is known" means the standard procedure. That Indra is being urged to do this, rather than the sacrificers, might be a little odd, but see, in fact, 18b just cited, as well as 30c *mímīte yajñám*.

VIII.13.15: The next section of the hymn is introduced by the end of this verse *(a)vitéd asi* "Just you are (our) helper," a phrase repeated in 26a *índra tvám avitéd asi*, signalling the subsurface thematics of the apparently disordered midsection of this hymn.

VIII.13.16–18: This tṛca begins and ends in the same way: 16a *índraṃ vardhantu no gíraḥ* and 18c *tám íd vardhantu no gíraḥ* … In between are several clauses with augmented verb forms (aor. *arāniṣuḥ* 16c, impf. *avardhayan* 17c, aor. *atnata* 18b). It is not immediately clear if these form a mythological or historical sequence or are unconnected observations about the mythological and/or historical past. The most specific statement is found in 18ab, with the gods stretching the sacrifice *tríkadrukeṣu*. This same verse is found in VIII.92.12, which, however, provides no contextual help. But, as Ge points out, in I.32.3 Indra drinks soma *tríkadrukeṣu* before the Vṛtra battle, and II.11.17 and II.22.1 suggest the same scenario. If 18ab is somehow concerned with a soma sacrifice connected to the Vṛtra battle, then 17 may belong to the same complex, with the "inspired poets" of 17ab perhaps being the Maruts, who in some version of the myth encouraged Indra before the Vṛtra battle and, again perhaps, their battle cries also strengthening Indra in 17c. Note that JPB tentatively identifies the Trikadrukas in I.32.3 and II.11.7, 22.1 as the Maruts. The clause in 16c may also belong with these mythological references, if the clans (*víśaḥ*) are the same as or equatable with the *marútvatīr víśaḥ* in 28c.

VIII.13.17: I am puzzled as to what "downward coursing help(s)" (*pravátvatībhir ūtíbhiḥ*) might be. As Ge points out, vs. 25 shows that the instr. phrase should be construed with *avardhayan* and so it must be help that the poets are giving Indra rather than getting from him (though they themselves are also *avasyávaḥ* 'seeking aid'). The stem *pravátvant-* is generally used of landscape/cosmic features that have a gentle, and by implication pleasant and easily traversed, slope; see esp. V.54.9, where heaven and earth, the paths, and the mountains all provide a *pravát-* for the Maruts' journey. The help provided to Indra by the poets may be of the same quality, smoothing and easing his journey to the sacrifice and his participation in it. In our 8b we met waters at play going along a slope (*pravátā*). Again 'downhill, sloping down' implies the path of least resistance and the opposite of effortful activity. If the identification of the poets with the Maruts suggested above is correct, it might be worth noting that four of the seven forms or *pravátvant-* are found in a single verse in a Marut hymn (the aforementioned V.54.9).

We meet *vayā́ iva* again, repeating the simile of 6c. As in 6 I think that the tree branches are compared with Indra (and hence are acc. here), rather than being compared to the battle cries. They make Indra grow as tree-branches grow.

VIII.13.18: See the discussion of the tṛca as a whole above.

VIII.13.19: It is noteworthy that the properly performing praiser acquires epithets esp. characteristic of Agni and Soma (*śúci-*, *pāvaká-*), the quintessential ritual gods.

VIII.13.20: This verse is quite opaque and its grammar can be construed in a number of different ways, giving the lie to Ge's breezy "Die Konstruktion ist klar." See Old's rather more despairing assessment ("Es ergeben sich mannigfache Möglichkeiten, zwischen denen sichere Entscheidung ausgeschlossen…").

The first problem is the value of the verb *cetati* and, when that has been determined, the identify of its subject. Ge takes the verb as intransitive/reflexive "… zeichnet sich … aus," but an I/T value ('perceive') is also possible for this active stem. I interpret it so (as does Old in one of his suggested tr.), and continue as its subject the *stotā̆* of vs. 19.

The next issue is the reference and distribution of *tád íd rudrásya … yahvám*, which Ge takes as subject of *cetati* and I as object. I will not rehearse the various suggested possibilities (see Ge and Old), but simply add my own: *rudrásya* is generally used with 'son(s)' to refer to the Maruts, who can be called 'young' in that context (cf. V.42.15b *rudrásya sūnŭ̆r yuvanyŭ̆n*...); and a neut. noun regularly used for the Maruts is *śárdhas-* 'troop', as in the nearby hymn VIII.15.9c *śárdhaḥ … mārutam.* In fact see *mārutaṃ śárdhaḥ* in the pāda immediately preceding V.42.15b, namely 15a, where the singular (15a) and plural (15b) expressions are coreferential. So here I supply that noun with *tád … yahvám*.

Then what are the "ancient domains"? On the basis of IX.52.2 *pratnébhir ádhvabhiḥ* "along your age-old routes," referring to the protocols of the soma sacrifice and the ritual journey of soma, I suggest that the ancient domains here are the age-old practices of the sacrifice. It is essentially equivalent to 14c *tántuṃ tanuṣva pūrvyáṃ yáthā vidé* "Stretch the ancient thread in the way that is known."

In c I take *vícetasaḥ* to refer again to the Maruts. For the switch between singular and plural see V.42.15 just cited. The Maruts are called *vícetas-* in V.54.13.

What the whole verse means and what function it fills in the hymn are not clear to me. If my interpretation of the various parts is correct (and I have no confidence that it is), the successful human praiser of vs. 19 perceives his divine model, the Maruts, whose praise inspired Indra in the Vṛtra battle, at his sacrifice, where they have placed the thought or mental power that he should himself follow.

VIII.13.21: I struggle to make the final verse of the tṛca fit with the speculative scenario sketched for the first two verses (19–20). (As far as I can tell, neither Ge nor Old makes the attempt, an omission with which I am in sympathy.) One thing to account for is the switch from 3rd ps. in 19–20 (though note *te* in 19a) to a 1st–2nd partnership in 21. I suggest that the *stotā̆* in 19 (and 20, by my reading) is now the 1st ps. speaker of 21. He offers Indra companionship or partnership (*sakhyám)* modeled on that shared by Indra and the Maruts, of which he had a vision in vs. 20. The sign

of Indra's chosing his companionship will be his (=Indra's) acceptance of the speaker's offered soma.

On *ā́váraḥ* see comm. on I.143.6. It may be better to tr. it as 'grant', rather than 'choose'. If so, I would change the sentence immediately above to "The sign of Indra's *granting* his companionship …"

VIII.13.22: One piece of evidence for my interpretation of the preceding tṛca as having the praiser (*stotár-*) as its thematic center is his reappearance in this verse, in this anxious question. The verse expresses the reciprocity inherent in the ritual situation, with the praiser wishing to be "most wealful" for Indra, while also receiving his own benefits from the god. This reminds us of verse 17, where the poets (quite possibly the Maruts) were both seeking help and making Indra increase through the help they gave him.

VIII.13.24: Pāda b *yahvám pratnā́bhir ūtíbhiḥ* is a deliberate echo of 20a *yahvám pratnéṣu dhā́masu*, and the only indication that *yahvám* is neut. in 20b but masc. in 24b are the pronouns *tád* and *tám* respectively that open the a-pādas. The phrase *pratnā́bhir ūtíbhiḥ* also recalls *pravátvatībhir ūtíbhiḥ* in 17b. These patterns suggest there is some reality to the below-the-radar thematic unity I've sketched out for the three tṛcas, vss. 16–24.

VIII.13.25: This verse both parrots the preceding verse (24ab … *puruṣṭutā́m, … ūtíbhiḥ* / 25ab … *puruṣṭuta, … ūtíbhiḥ*) and concentrates into a single expression the reciprocal aid between god and praiser that has dominated the rhetoric of the last tṛcas. In the command *vardhasva … ūtíbhiḥ* "become increased … by forms of help," the instr. should express the means by which Indra becomes strong, and that should be the help given him by others, as in vs. 17 *tám íd víprāḥ … ūtíbhiḥ / … avardhayan*… "The inspired poets increased him with helps." But the forms of help in 25 are *ṛ́ṣistutābhiḥ* 'praised by the seers', which suggests that these are forms of help given by Indra to us, like those in 24b. The condensed expression in this verse sets up a closed circle, a never-ending loop, in which forms of help given and received are identical and have identical results. With that established, the poet then presses his advantage and in pāda c and in 26a puts Indra squarely in the role of helping us.

VIII.13.26: See remarks on the repetition in pāda a under vs. 15 above.

VIII.13.27: Although Ge gives up on the cmpd. *pratádvasū*, which modifies *hárī*, Old plausibly suggests that it's a univerbation of the frequent collocation *prá tád* "forth to that" or perhaps *prá tád vásu* "forth to that good thing," perhaps as the actual command Indra "cries out" to the horses. Rendering it in English is somewhat clumsy.

VIII.13.28: Note the chaining over tṛca boundary: 27c … *abhí svara*# / 28a #*abhí svarantu.*

Most interpreters (Ge, Old, Klein [I.383]) take *sakṣata* as the verb of the relative clause beginning *yé táva*, but it is unaccented. Old recognizes the problem but considers it unnatural to separate *táva* from *śríyam* and accounts for the lack of accent acdg to ZDMG 60, 737–38 [=Kl.Sch. 212-13], namely occasional lack of accent when the rel. pronoun and the verb are in different pādas (not, in my opinion, a compelling explanation in any of these cases). But *yé táva* functions fine as an independent rel. clause, and supplying 'your' again with *śríyam* is no problem in an independent clause.

Ge supplies "come" in c, but the verb in b can do duty here as well.

The Maruts, who were only latent in vs. 20 (and probably 17), appear here with Rudra, who was present in vs. 20. The Marut clans here may pick up the clans in 16c; see above.

VIII.13.29: As Ge says, the subject here probably remains the Maruts. The question is whether "which is in heaven" is a restrictive or non-restrictive relative clause – that is, are there various possible tracks and it's the one in heaven that they like, or is there one track and it happens to be in heaven. My inclination is to take it as restrictive, and the track or footstep in which they take pleasure is the one called elsewhere the *paramá-* (I.22.20–21, 72.2, 4, 154.5, etc.), *upamá--* (V.3.3), or *uttamá-* (V.51.4) 'highest', as well as *divás padá-* (IX.10.9, 83.2). There seems to be an implicit contast to this high and distant *padá-*, which they like, and "the navel of the sacrifice" (*nā́bhā yajñásya*), where they find themselves. But these locations may be more complementary than contrastive, since the "highest track/footstep" often seems to indicate a place where a heavenly form of the earthly sacrifice is conducted simultaneously. See, e.g., I.22.20–21 and remarks on I.21.6.

VIII.13.30: This verse uses some of the material found in the previous hymn, also in uṣṇih: *prā́ci prayaty àdhvaré* is a heavy variant of *prā́dhvaré* (that is, *prá adhvaré*) of VIII.12.31–33; *mímīte* is identical to the refrain *mímīta íd* (12.10–12); *ānuṣák* occurs in 12.11.

Who is *ayám*? This near demonstrative should mean that the referent is actually present. It can only be Indra. In the first two verses of the tṛca the focus is on his companions, the Maruts ("who are yours [=Indra]" 28a), and now attention turns to their leader, the subject of the hymn as a whole, and in the finale to the hymn his longed-for epiphany is signalled by this dramatic *ayám*.

That Indra himself "measures the sacrifice" is consistent with his being urged to "stretch the thread" in 14c above.

Ge's interpretation of ab is quite different from mine, and seems to envisage the sacrifice receding in the distance as the subject keeps gazing further out towards it. This doesn't make much sense to me, and the similarity of the expression in b to the cliched *prá adhvaré* (see just above), which refers to the temporal progress of the

ritual (and in this case, perhaps the carrying of the Āhavanīya fire eastward), makes his interpretation unlikely.

The only other occurrence of *dīrghā́ya cákṣase* is in I.7.3, where Indra puts the sun in the sky for this purpose. See remarks ad loc., where I point out that the expression can be either temporal or locational or both.

VIII.13.33: *prátiṣṭuti-* occurs only here. I assume that it is a praise-hymn made in response to whatever the god has done for us, though Ge suggests it is a praise that corresponds to Indra's greatness.

VIII.14 Indra

VIII.14.5: Note the phonetic figure in ab: ... *avardhayad*# / ... *ávartayat*#

VIII.14.8: The sense of c is a little unclear; I consider it a condensed expression for "he shoved (the contents of) Vala [=cows] in our direction." The verb *nunude* was presumably chosen to constrast with *parāṇúde* in 9c.

VIII.14.10: Misplaced simile marker in pāda a.

Both verbs in this verse are nonce forms: *ajirāyate* and *arājiṣuḥ*. Note their mirror image phonology, *ajirā* / *arāji*, which may help account for the creation of both the hapax denominative and the nonce *iṣ*-aorist. The former is built to *ajirá-* 'quick'; the latter could belong to either of the √*rāj* roots, 'rule' or 'shine'. Ge seems to opt for the former, at least judging from his invocation of *ví rājasi* in the preceding and following hymns (VIII.13.4=15.5) in his n., but his "haben den Ausschlag gegeben" (decided the issue) is hard to derive from 'rule over' and also doesn't make much sense to me. But his n. also cites *ví rājati* in IX.61.18, where it clearly means 'shines forth', and also cites Sāy's gloss *dīpyante.* Narten discusses the issue and finally decides (weakly) for 'shine', an interpretation I share.

VIII.14.11: The two *-várdhana-* compounds express something of the same type of role reversal found in the last hymn, where the help given by Indra and received by Indra became conflated. Here we might expect Indra to *be strengthened* by the praises and recitations, rather than strengthening them. And in fact, contrary to grammar, both Gr and Ge so interpret the compounds (Gr 'am Loblied sich erlabend', Ge "Denn dir sind … die Lobgesänge, die Lobgedichte eine Stärkung"). But *–ana-* nominals have transitive-causative force and are associated with *-áya-* verb stems, and in compounds their first member serves as object. See other *-várdhana-* compounds such as *nṛmṇa-várdhana-* 'strengthening manly powers' (II.36.5), *paśu-várdhana-* 'strengthening livestock' (IX.94.1), as well as numerous other stems such as *yajña-sā́dhana-* 'making the sacrifice succeed' (2x). If we stay true to the grammar, the point is that Indra, by his presence at the sacrifice and his willingness to receive praise, strengthens the products of his praisers, and this in turn creates *bhadrá-* for them, as pāda c says.

VIII.14.12: The last two words of the verse are *yajñám surādhasam* "sacrifice, very generous," which appear to belong together, but the latter must in fact modify *índram*, the first word of the verse, as it usually does. A textbook example of why word order is not a reliable guide to RVic interpretation.

VIII.15 Indra

VIII.15.3: By the rules established in Jamison 1992 for *sá* with 2nd ps. reference, *sá rājasi* here is in violation. But notice that this line (*sa rājasi puruṣṭutaṅ̍, éko vṛtrā̍ṇi jighnase*) is twinned with 11ab *satrā̍ tvám puruṣṭutaṅ̍, éko vṛtrā̍ṇi tośase*, which begins with *satrā̍*, phonologically like our *sá rā* ... Also note *ví rājasi* in 5c, which could invoke a **sáṃ rājasi* here (which would change the meter, but not improperly). For *sám √rāj* / *ví √rāj*, see I.188.5 *virā̍ṭ samrā̍ṭ* ... And note that *samrā̍jam* is the second word of the next hymn (VIII.16.1).

VIII.15.6: In c *jayā* can be a 2nd sg. imperative with lengthened final (so Pp., Gr, Ge) or a subjunctive (*jayāḥ* out of sandhi). Although an undoubted form of the imperative is found in 12c (*jaya*), I weakly favor the subjunctive here, the idea being that the praisers keep praising the same deed, and so he will keep doing it.

VIII.15.7–10: Every half-verse in this tṛca but 7c and 10c opens with a form of the 2nd sg. pronoun.

VIII.15.9: Since *kṣáya-* otherwise means only 'dwelling place', the text as we have it means "Viṣṇu, the lofty dwelling place," as in the publ. tr., not "der hohe *Wohner* (my italics)," as Ge would have it. Already BR (see Gr s.v. *kṣáya-*) suggested that we read instead a bahuvrīhi **bṛhát-kṣayaḥ* 'having a lofty dwelling place'. This of course makes better immediate sense, but I think we can keep the text as we have it and also avoid making *kṣáya-* into a nonce agent noun (per Ge). Given the flexibility of RVic diction, it is not difficult to identify a god with his most characteristic product —in this case, Viṣṇu's three footsteps, particularly his highest one, which becomes an important locus in heaven (see, e.g., I.22.19–21) — and he elsewhere is said to create dwelling places: VII.100.4 *ví cakrame pṛthivī́m eṣá etā̍ṃ, kṣétrāya víṣṇur mā̍nuṣe … / urukṣitím … cakāra* "Quick Viṣṇu strode across this earth for a dwelling place for Manu … / He has made wide dwelling." The identification of Soma with a dwelling place in vs. 13 below supports the literal reading here.

VIII.15.11: On this verse forming a ring with 3ab, see intro. and comments on vs. 3.

VIII.15.12: Note that *nā̍nā* opening b picks up *nā̍nyá(ḥ)* opening vs. 11.

VIII.15.13: The identity of the addressee in this verse is not overt. As Ge points out, Sāy suggests that the singer is addressing himself, though pādas ab make difficulties

for that interpretation. Old argues for Soma, which seems likely even though, unusually for an Indra hymn, soma has not previously figured in this hymn. However, all three pādas have parallels in the soma maṇḍala: for pāda a see IX.109.3c *mahé kṣáyāya*; pāda b is repeated in IX.25.4a modifying soma; and IX.111.3e is identical to the first three words in pāda c, save for the grammatical identity of the verb form (3rd pl. injunctive in IX.111.3, 2nd sg. imperative here). That Soma is the addressee here and so the subject of the impv. *harṣayā* is also supported by vs. 4 in the next hymn (VIII.16), where the exhilarating drinks (of soma) are called *harṣumánt-*.

Again, as in vs. 9, Ge waters down the meaning of *kṣáya-* to fit the context ("dweller," not "dwelling"), but in his n. suggests that the dwelling, namely heaven, stands as a metonym for its inhabitants, the gods. I prefer not to recast and paraphrase the literal sense as Ge does, especially since, as it stands, this half-verse expresses a small but neat paradox involving container/contained: Soma both enters everything (b) and provides a vessel in which everything (or "we" anyway) can dwell (a).

In c *jaítrāya* picks up *jaítrā* in 3c.

VIII.16 Indra

VIII.16.2: The simile in c, *apā́m ávo ná samudré*, is hard to interpret. "The sea" corresponds to Indra in the frame and "the aid of the waters" should correspond to recitations and famous deeds, but what is the *aid* of the waters? Ge suggests in passing a possible connection with *avániḥ* 'stream(bed)', but this seems based only on superficial phonological similarity, and in the end he tr. "die Gunst der Gewässer" and hopes for the best. Old suggests an emendation to *apā́m *ápaḥ* 'work of the waters', but it is hard to see how a nice alliterative phrase like that would become corrupted, and so like Ge, I stick to the text transmitted and the common word *ávas-* that it seems to contain. Perhaps the point is that, like recitations that find their joy in contributing to Indra's power, the waters take pleasure in submerging themselves in the sea, "aiding" the sea by making it bigger.

VIII.16.3: How to construe *maháḥ* in c is not clear. I tentatively take it as the gen. sg. of *máh-* and supply 'prize' or "wealth'. Lub groups it with the adverbial *maháḥ* 'greatly', which is also possible. I do not understand how Ge takes it grammatically from his tr. "der grosse Beute macht," which must somehow be rendering *mahó vājínam*.

VIII.16.4: *harṣumánt-* occurs only here, but note the impv. *harṣayā* that ends the last hymn (VIII.15.13).

VIII.16.6: The rare verbal stem *ā́rya-* 'recognize' is probably a derivative of the *arí-* word family (including *ā́rya-* 'Ārya, that is, belonging to our group') and means 'recognize as an Ārya, treat as an Ārya'. See EWA s.v. *ĀR*, where some doubts are

expressed, and recently Kulikov (522–23), who tr. “Him alone the races treat as an ārya through his activities …”

VIII.16.8: The content of ab is straightforward, but it is worth noting the phonological play. On the one hand the independent pronouns *sá … sá* of pāda a are picked up in b by *sa(tyáḥ) sá(tvā)*. On the other, the morphologically parallel forms *stóm^{i}yaḥ ... háv^{i}yaḥ* in a are picked up by the morphologically different *satyáḥ* in b. (This would be a neater figure if the first two words didn’t show distraction in the suffix, as opposed to *satyá-*.) Then the *–tyáḥ* of *satyáḥ* morphs into the *–tvā* of *satvā*, which then distracts into *tuvi-* in the following word.

VIII.17 Indra

VIII.17.1: On the injunctive *sadaḥ* as functional imperative, see Hoffmann 1967: 263.

VIII.17.3: Old discusses who/what to supply with *yujā*, suggesting first the *bráhman-* of 2c, but then opting with Gr (tr.) and Ge, for soma. See Ge “(mit Soma) im Bunde.” Old rejects the possibility that it is Indra, which is the solution I have adopted here. I do so because you=Indra is almost the default with *yujā* throughout the RV. For exx. in VIII see nearby VIII.21.11 *tváyā … yujā* (where the referent of the 2nd ps. is Indra) and VIII.68.9 *tvā yujā* (ditto), etc., etc., and for the full noun I.23.9 *índreṇa … yujā*, etc. I would in fact suggest that the poet is here making the enclitic *tvā* do double duty; it is the correct accusative goal with *havāmahe*, but it also evokes the accented older short instr. *tvā* that as an independent word is limited to constructions with *yujā*.

VIII.17.7: The consensus that soma is covered (*sáṃvṛtaḥ*) with milk is surely correct; this is simply a different way of expressing the mixing of the two substances that is such a common trope in the soma maṇḍala. But the simile presents difficulties. For both Old and Ge a covered-up person (presumably male) is going to women/wives (Ge “soll … wie ein Verhülter zu Frauen schleichen”). Neither of them makes any comment on this bizarre image. I prefer to follow Caland-Henry’s interpretation (cited and rejected by Old): “voilé comme des femmes [qui vont au rendez-vous].” There is evidence elsewhere in the RV of women going to trysts (e.g., X.40.2), and the abhisārikā, a woman going secretly to her lover, often depicted as veiled or disguised, is, of course, a standard figure in the later literary and artistic traditions. (Perhaps the untethered *abhí* in this pāda refers to this idiom, although it must be admittted that neither √*sṛ* or √*srp* appears with *abhí* in the RV.) There are a few grammatical difficulties to address. First, *sáṃvṛtaḥ* is masculine and singular, whereas the corresponding women are feminine and plural, but *sáṃvṛtaḥ* refers to soma in the frame, and the later rules about grammatical agreement between elements in the frame and the simile simply do not hold in the RV. More serious is the fact that the nom. pl. of *jáni-* is normally *jánayaḥ*. However, the asigmatic nom. sg. *jánī* in IV.52.1 shows that a long *ī*-stem *jánī-* had been extracted from the ambiguous forms acc. pl. *jánīs* and gen. pl. *jánīnām* (cf. AIG III.144).

VIII.17.8: *vapódara-* is a hapax, but its general analysis is fairly clear: it's a bahuvrīhi with *udára-* 'belly' as second member and some word for 'fat' or 'bulging' presumably as first member. Filliozat (*Doctrine classique*, 126, without comment) takes it to be *vapā́* 'omentum'. See EWA s.v. *vapā́-*.

VIII.17.12–13: Contains a number of PNs, whose exact identity eludes us. See Ge's nn., Mayrhofer PN s.vv.

VIII.17.13: *kuṇḍapā́yya-* is a technical term in later śrauta ritual; see Old. I have given a literal tr. of the word and disclaim any knowledge of what this verse really refers to.

The verb *dadhre* is taken by Old as most likely a 1st sg.; Ge allows that possibility but tr. with a 3rd sg. I supply Indra as subject, both because he is the deity of the hymn and because he is the default consumer of soma. Kü (264) takes the verb as intransitive and presential with *mánaḥ* as subject: "darin bleibt das Denken fast." He also notes the possibility that this is a 3rd *plural* to √*dhā*, rather than belonging to √*dhṛ*.

VIII.17.15: The PN should be Pṛdākusā́nu, with a second long ā. The publ. tr. should be corrected.

In c the unaccented form *gṛbhā* in the HvN edition is a mistake for *gṛbhā́*, with the Pp.

VIII.18 Ādityas

VIII.18.1: Ge (see also Gr s.v. *sávīman-*) construes *ādityā́nām* with *sávīmani*, but this seems unlikely. *sávīman-* is otherwise only found with its etymological partner Savitar, who does indeed appear in the last verse of this tṛca (3a). It is hard to believe that any other divinities could lay claim to this word.

VIII.18.2: The cmpd. *sugévṛdh-* is a hapax; the locative 1st member *suge* 'on an easy road' was presumably suggested by the paths of the first half of the verse.

VIII.18.3: As pointed out by JPB, both Savitar and Bhaga are anticipated in this tṛca by the cognate forms *bhikṣeta* and *sávīmani* in vs. 1.

VIII.18.6: There may be phonetic play between *dívā* in a and *ádvayāḥ* in b, faciliated by the *áditiḥ* that opens each pāda.

VIII.18.7: The *naḥ* of pāda a was careless omitted in the publ. tr., which should be changed to "will come to us with her help."

The text of pāda a reads *utá syā́ no dívā matír*, with *matí-* 'thought'. Ge takes this pāda a as a separate clause: "Und dies ist unser Gedanke bei Tag." But the

context seems to enforce Aditi as referent for *syā́*: note the insistent repetition of nom. sg. *áditiḥ* in all 3 pādas of the previous vs., once also associated with *dívā*; the initial *áditiḥ* of our pāda b; the parallel opening of 8a *utá tyā́*, also with a divine referent. Re uses his trademark parentheses to manipulate the syntax, yielding "this celebrated Aditi, (the object of our) poetic thought" -- "cette-célébre Aditi, (objet de notre) pensée-poétique" -- which can't be legitimately extracted from the text. The text as transmitted, with two fem. nominatives, should rather encourage an identification of Aditi with "thought," a step I am reluctant to take. I suggest instead a slight alteration to the text, which could have read **dívāmátir*, i.e., *dívā* + **amátir* 'banner', contra the Pp. This requires only a change in the accent, which could have been redactional, arising because of *durmatím* in 10b (cf. also *ámatim* in 11b). In this reading Aditi is implicitly compared to a banner or ensign. Although this comparison is not found of Aditi otherwise, *amáti-* is associated elsewhere with the Ādityas: Mitra and Varuṇa (V.62.5, 69.1) and Savitar (VII.38.1, 2, 45.2, 3).

Although as a noun, we would expect *śáṃtāti* to be feminine, hence **śáṃtātim* in context, I prefer to take it here as a nonce neuter noun, rather than as a nonce neuter adjective modifying *máyaḥ*, contra Ge's "beglückende Freude." Perhaps instead of a neuter, we might consider it an honorary indeclinable, matching its base *śám* 'weal', which opens 8b and all three pādas in vs. 9; our *śáṃtāti … karat* would be entirely parallel to 8b *śám … karataḥ* and 9a *śám … karat*.

VIII.18.19: Ge and Re take *hīḷáḥ* as a gen., construed with *ántaraḥ* interpreted as 'between'; hence "the sacrifice comes between (us and) your anger." But this poses several difficulties: *antarā́* and sometimes *antár* mean 'between', but *ántara-* ordinarily means 'nearer, dearer'; moreover, the other party to the 'between' reading, namely 'us', is not in the text. Old's solution, which I follow, avoids both difficulties. He takes *hīḷáḥ* as an ablative (also accepted by Schindler, Rt Nouns), construed with the comparative *ántaraḥ*. The idea must be that, given the choice between holding on to their anger and accepting a sacrifice, they will opt for the latter. This sentiment might be more straightforwardly expressed in English by "Sacrifice is closer to you than your anger," rather than the publ. tr. "There is a sacrifice …" However, I am disturbed by *ásti*: a copular sentence like the one suggested does not need, and should not have, a surface copula. I therefore take it as an existential "there exists a sacrifice that is closer …" As for the accent, *ásti* may be accented because it follows a pāda-initial voc. or because it is immediately followed by another verb and shows contrastive accent.

VIII.19 Agni

VIII.19.4: In the second hemistich of the publ. tr. "in heaven" (*divíˊ*) has been carelessly repeated; the second one should be deleted.

VIII.19.7: The verse contains a double 2nd ps. address: implicitly with oblique 2nd ps. plural prn. *vaḥ* in pāda a, explicitly with the (singular) voc. phrases in b and the 2nd

singular prn. *tvám* in c. The latter invoke Agni, of course, but the former are most likely, in my opinion, the assembled peoples bringing together their clan fires. (See publ. intro.) Ge suggests rather the "Opferveranstalter" (arrangers of the ritual), which would ordinarily be the default reading of *vaḥ* in this type of context, but given the political agenda of the hymn, I think it covers a greater number of mortals than simply the ritual officiants. In the publ. tr. I take the vocc. of pāda b with c, which allows the vocatives to be the correct grammatical number and addressed to the correct personage. Strictly speaking, however, this logical division is not syntactically possible, as the vocc. are unaccented and must therefore belong with the preceding clause, ending *syāma*. Nonetheless, the slight violation in the tr. seems justified by sense.

VIII.19.8: The standard tr./interpr. assign *védyaḥ* to √*vid* 'know': Ge 'denkwürdig', Re 'reconnaissable' (also Gr). But a connection to √*vid* 'acquire' makes more sense to me.

VIII.19.9: Assuming (see EWA s.v.) that *addhā́* is cognate with Old Aves. / OP *azdā*, as ppl. to PIIr √**adh*, Skt. √*ah* 'speak', I take this adv. to mean originally 'in the announced / stipulated / well-known way', which can then be bleached to 'truly' vel sim. But this passage allows the more literal meaning.

VIII.19.10: I supply *astu* ("let him be") with the two forms of *sánitā* in cd on the basis of 9c *sá … astu sánitā*. However, either a straight equational reading ("he is a winner …") or a periphrastic future ("he will win …") is also possible.

VIII.19.11–12: The VP *cáno dadhīta* "should take delight" takes complements in two different cases (both found independently elsewhere), acc. *stómam* (11b), *havyā́* (11c) and loc. *rātíṣu* (12b), all connected by *vā* (11c, 12a). Another ex. of the poets' enjoyment of syntactically licensed case disharmony.

Note the alliterative *v*'s of 11c *havyā́ vā́ véviṣad víṣah* (immediately preceded by 11b … *viśvávāryaḥ* and immediately followed by 12a *víprasya vā́* …) and of 12d *váso vividúṣo vácaḥ*.

VIII.19.12: Both Ge and Re take the hapax *avódevam*, modifying *vácaḥ*, as meaning 'below / inferior to (that of) the gods'. This makes a nice contrast to *upárimartyam* 'above (that of) mortals'. However, it otherwise seems an odd sentiment: it is surely a given that anything we mortals produce will be inferior to whatever comes from the gods, but this is a given that we don't necessarily want to emphasize. In this ritual context the point of our speech is that it should be good enough (better than that of other mortals) to bring the gods to us. Hence something like Gr's "die Götter herunterholend, sie herablockend" seems preferable (see also Kü 492). The compound itself is a version of, or manipulation of, the reasonably common expression *avó divā́ / diváḥ* (I.163.6, V.40.6, VIII.40.8, IX.74.6).

VIII.19.14: My semantic reasons for rendering *áditim* as 'boundlessness' here, rather than as the PN of the goddess (contra Ge/Re), are given in the publ. intro. I would add here that √*dāś* almost never otherwise takes an acc. of the recipient of the pious service (except V.41.16 and possibly VI.48.2), but does occasionally take an ac. of the offering (e.g., I.71.6, 93.3). It's also the case that *áditim* makes an irregular cadence: it should have an initial heavy syllable, though I don't know what to make of that or how to repair it. There is also some phonetic play between pāda-final *áditim* and the final of 13a (*havy)ádātibhiḥ.*

Ge, flg. Sāy, takes *víśvā* (< *víśvéd*, i.e., *víśvā+íd*) with *jánān* and explains its neut. pl. form as attraction to *udnáḥ*, "das trotz der maskulinen Form doch Neutr. ist" -- a convoluted and quite dubious explanation. It seems best to take the neut. pl. form seriously (with Re; see also Old) and supply another (underlyingly masc. pl.) 'all' with *jánān*, by perserveration, as it were. (Old and Re do not go that far.)

As for Ge's supposed *udnáḥ*, the Saṃhitā text of d reads *dyumnaír udná iva tāriṣat*, and the Pp. analyses the 2nd word as *udnáḥ*. But, as the HvN restoration *udná 'va* shows, the pāda has one too many syllables. Moreover, the second syllable of *udná* would be better heavy. I follow Gr in assuming an instr. *udnā́* here, despite Old's curt dismissal. The underlying text may have been either *udnéva* or *udnā́ 'va*. I find entirely baffling the Old/Ge preferred underlying form *udnáḥ* (presumably because they wish to follow the Pp.) and their analysis of it as acc. pl. masc. because the expected neut. pl. cannot be produced ("für den kaum herstellbaren neutralen," so Old). Why would **udā́(ni)* be blocked when *áhā(ni)* 'days', to an entirely parallel stem, is produced frequently and easily? Re prefers taking putative *udnáḥ* as a gen. sg., which has the merit of not arbitrarily changing the stem's gender, but requires supplying an acc. (*kṣódaḥ*) for it to modify. Old's objection to the instr. sg. is that it isn't parallel to the accusatives over which the mortal is crossing. But instr. *udnā́* is the idiomatic expression for traversing water (cf. V.45.10 *udnā́ ná nā́vam anayanta*), and we have already had another instance of case disharmony in parallel expressions (see comm. on vss. 11–12).

VIII.19.15: Note the near mirror-image *dyumnám* (a) and *manyúm* (c).

VIII.19.16: Ge and Re take *cáṣṭe* here as 'appears', but this sense is otherwise not found for this stem, and I see no reason why the gods are not seeing by means of the illumination (*dyumná-*) that Agni provides. (Ge allows for the possibility of 'sieht' in n. 16a.)

It is the same illumination that we wish to acquire, in order to become the best path-finders (*gātuvíttama-*), presumably since it's impossible to find one's way in the dark. My interpr. of *vidhemahi* reflects this desire for acquistion and differs from the standard rendering 'honor, do reverence to' (so Ge/Re). My interpr. depends first on the analysis of √*vidh* as historically derived from *ví* √*dhā* 'divide, ritually distribute' (see EWA II.555–56) and further on the observation that our form is the only real medial form to this secondary root (*vidhanta* in III.3.1 is an *-anta* replacement). While act. *vidhéma*, etc., means "may we distribute ritual shares (→ do honor to),"

the contrastive middle can mean "may we receive ritual shares" -- much like the functional distribution of *bhájati* / *bhájate*. It might be argued that we should not take the middle form seriously because *vidhemahi* has been artificially created to produce an iambic cadence out of a Triṣṭubh cadence, given that act. *vidhema* is most commonly final in Triṣṭubh pādas. But in I.36.2 and I.114.2 the enclitic *te* serves this purpose: … *vidhema te* #, a solution that would have been available here.

There is some phonetic play between the pāda-final (*gātu-*)*víttamā(ḥ)* and *vidhemahi*.

VIII.19.17: The first hemistich resembles VIII.43.30 *té ghéd agne svādhyò, 'hā víśvā nṛ́cákṣasaḥ*, but in my opinion has a very different meaning. Given vs. 16, in which Agni's brilliance produces the light by which gods and men see, I take *nṛcákṣas-* here as 'providing sight for men', as opposed to its usual senses 'having (one's) eyes on men' or 'having a manly gaze'.

VIII.19.18: Ge takes *diví* as 'at day(break)', but this loc. is almost always used of heaven (so also Re), save for a few expressions like *pūrvyám diví* "early in the day" (II.22.4, VIII.22.6) and *diví pārye* "on the decisive day" (VI.17.14, etc.), and the cmpd. *diviyáj-* (IX.97.26) 'sacrificing in the day'. To make this locative work, I see the hemistich as containing two slightly different constructions, both involving *cakrire*. I supply that verb from b to govern the accusatives in pāda a, where it has the straightforward sense "made X." But in pāda b, governing the acc. + loc., it means rather "make X (to be) in Y," i.e., "put X in Y." It is possible that the second acc. in a, *ā́hutim*, also participates in that construction ("make the poured oblation [to be] in heaven"), but it is unlikely that *védim* does: the altar is surely earthbound. And since Agni is said to be 'bepoured' (*ā́hutaḥ*) in the next vs. (19a, also 22d, 23a, 25c), the poured oblation may well stay on earth too.

VIII.19.19: Both Ge and Re take this verse as expressing a wish (Ge "Glück bringend (sei) uns Agni …"). This is possible, but there is no overt modal, and a straight equational reading is perfectly fine.

VIII.19.20: Ge takes *sthirā́* simply as 'Kräfte', but (with Re) on the basis of the bahuv. *sthirá-dhanvan-* 'having sturdy bows' and phrasal instantiations thereof, e.g., in the next hymn, VIII.20.12 *sthirā́ dhánvāni*, I supply 'bows'.

VIII.19.23: Ge takes pāda a as the dependent clause and b as the main clause, but this causes a difficulty: why is *bhárate* accented? I follow Re in taking ab as the dependent clause and c as the main clause. This accounts for the verbal accent. It also solves another problem: *yádī* is hard to render as 'if', but if analyzed as *yád ī* (for this phenomenon see Jamison 2002 [Fs. Cardona]), the *ī* can, as often, double the object, in this case *vā́śīm*. But if *vā́śīm* is not part of the dependent clause, *ī* has no obvious function.

The question then arises, what is pāda c doing? It consists of a nom. (*ásuraḥ*), a simile marker (*iva*), and an acc. (*nirṇíjam*). What binds them together? With Re, I supply **bharate* as the verb, from *bhárate* in b. The verb is used in two different senses: in b it describes the up-and-down motion of Agni raising and lowering ("bearing") his axe, i.e., his flames, when ghee is poured on the fire, but in c 'bears' means 'wears', of a garment. This is a standard idiom; cf. I.25.13 *bíbhrad drāpiṃ hiraṇyáyaṃ váruṇo vasta nirṇíjam* "Bearing [=wearing] a golden mantle, Varuṇa dons his cloak." This is yet another example of the fondness the poet of this hymn has for parallel but disharmonious constructions.

Rather than trying to identify a particular divinity as the *ásura-* in this simile (Re: Varuṇa; Ge: "die Asura"), I concur with Hale (Asuras, 68–69) that this probably refers simply to a rich human lord who would be distinguished by his fine clothing. In the frame the *nirṇíj-* would be the ghee with which Agni is bepoured. Cf. V.62.4 *ghṛtásya nirníg*; sim. VII.64.1, IX.82.2.

VIII.19.27: Ge and Re take this brief verse as a self-contained sentence, but this requires that masc. *súbhṛtaḥ* modify neut. *havíḥ*. Though the masc. can be explained as attraction to *putráḥ* in the simile, the sentence still doesn't yield compelling sense. In this vs., a brief pendant to the preceding pragātha, I prefer to take pāda a as completing, contrastively, the thought of 26cd. In the fantasy role reversal depicted in vss. 25–26, where "I" am the god and "my praiser" is Agni, my praiser would not be ill-established (*dúrhitaḥ* 26c), but well-kept (*súbhṛtaḥ*) in my house (27a). The two adjectives are complementary, and I therefore take the subj. of 27a to be the praiser (not the oblation nor, as Ge also suggests [n. 27ab] Agni). (This is more or less Old's view.) Pāda b is then an independent ritual instruction.

VIII.19.29: The three *táva*'s morph from subjective to objective genitives: the will (*krátvā*) is definitely exercised by Agni, hence subjective genitive, while the lauds (*práśastibhiḥ*) are those praising Agni, hence objective. The gifts (*rātíbhiḥ*) can be either those given by or given to Agni. This sequence is framed by two exx. of *táva* (…) *ūtíbhiḥ* "with your help(s)" (28a, 30a), with subjective genitive.

VIII.19.30: On *ā́varaḥ* see comm. on I.143.6. It may be better to tr. it as 'grant', rather than 'choose' -- hence "(the man) to whom you grant companionship." The general sense is essentially unaffected either way: a man who is Agni's companion thrives.

VIII.19.31: The voc. *siṣṇo* is a hapax. Flg. Gr (hesitatingly endorsed by EWA, s.v.), I take it as a nonce *u*-adj. to a reduplicated form of √*san*^{i} 'gain, win'. Although an analysis as a desiderative *u*-adjecive is morphologically impossible (there being no trace of a desid. suffix), I still wonder if that is the semantic nuance here -- as if it were an aniṭ variant of *siṣāsú-*. Ge tentatively follows Ludwig's connection with √*sā*/*si* 'bind' ("du Fänger"); Re tr. it as a PN and considers it an imitation of *viṣṇo*. It might also be a deformation of **śiśo*, the expected but unattested voc. to *śíśu-* 'child',

a frequent epithet of Agni. The context does not strongly favor (or disfavor) any of these hypotheses, and none of them is particularly strong.

ā́ dade is variously interpreted; even its root affiliation is disputed: to √*dā* 'give' (which with *ā́* in the middle means 'take') or √*dā* 'bind'. I take it to the former and assume an idiomatic meaning 'take' of a fire just "catching hold," starting to burn -- an idiom also present in English (at least my English). If it also has its standard meaning 'take [goods, etc.]', the kindled and spreading fire could be "taking" everything in its path, and the 'desire to gain' sense I imputed to *siṣṇo* might be weakly supported.

Gr, Ge, and Re take *kṣapáḥ* as gen. sg. dependent on *vástuṣu* (Ge: "beim Hellwerden der Nacht"), though Re raises, and rejects, the possibility that it is acc. pl. -- the analysis I favor. The acc. pl. of *kṣáp-* is found elsewhere in extent-of-time usage. Case disharmony (here between acc. and loc. pl.) is esp. common in temporal expressions, and, as we've seen, there are a number of other disharmonious phrases in this hymn.

VIII.19.34–35: These two vss. are so interrupted by heavy voc. phrases addressed to the Ādityas that it is difficult to follow the thread. The poet identifies a mortal who is especially favored by the Ādityas (34b) and who therefore holds power among men (35b) and then expresses the hope that "we" might be "they" (*vayám té … syā́ma*, 35cd), that is, the fortunate man just identified. The switch in numbers is somewhat disconcerting, but can presumably be ascribed to attraction to the 1st pl. pronoun: "might we be he/that one" doesn't work well in either Sanskrit or English.

VIII.19.37: *túgvan-* is a hapax. Ge and EWA (hesitatingly) take it as 'ford', following one suggestion of Gr's; Old and Hoffmann (Injunk. 234–35) as 'Stromschnelle," following another. Of the two, 'ford' would make better sense in context: all this giving would be better at a place where the animals aren't likely to be swept away by a rapidly flowing river. On the other hand, the likely root etymon, √*tuj* 'thrust', is not really conducive to 'ford'. Re's 'source', which I follow, solves both problems: a river at its source is generally a fairly placid affair, and √*tuj* is used esp. of the thrusting forth of progeny, a situation to which the arising of a river could be assimilated.

VIII.20 Maruts

VIII.20.2: *sudītíbhiḥ* could also modify the chariots (so Ge), but Re suggests that it is a separate nominal when in the instr. pl., rendering it as "avec (vos) beaux éclats," and I am inclined to agree on the basis of VI.48.3d *sudītíbhiḥ sú dīdihi*.

VIII.20.3–4: Pādas 3a, 3c, and 4a all begin with *vi*, with the last example doubled *ví (d)vī*. This sequence is anticipated by 2a *vī*.

VIII.20.4: The vs. describes the effects of the monsoon. The first hemistich contains three injunctives (*pāpatan*, *tíṣṭhat*, and *yujanta*) and the last pāda a present (*éjatha*), but pāda c contains the apparently augmented *airata*. Given this collection of verbs, it is difficult to produce a consistent temporal interpretation. The injunctives can harmonize either with the preterital *airata* or with the presential *éjatha*, but those two are incompatible. A way out of this dilemma was shown by Hoffmann (Injunc, 210), who suggests that the "cacophonous hiatus" *dhánvāni *īrata* was avoided by substituting the augmented form. The whole verse can then be interpr. as presential or "general." This temporal value continues in vs. 5, also describing the effects of the storm, with two present tense verbs.

The second clause in pāda a*, tíṣṭhad duchúnā*, has been interpreted in two opposing senses. Ge supplies the *ví* of the first VP and tr. "das Unheil breitet sich aus." But without the *ví* the verb would mean 'stand (still)' or 'stop' (so Re "stoppe le misère"). I favor this latter interpretation. Since the monsoon brings desired rain, which makes the plants grow and produces food and attendant well-being, it stops misery in its tracks, as it were. This stoppage contrasts with the movement of the features of the natural world in pādas a and c.

VIII.20.5: There are several ways to treat pāda a. The simplest (and to my mind the least satisfactory) is simply to take *ácyutā* as another subject of 3rd pl. *nānadati* (so, e.g., Schaeffer, Inten.). With Ge and Re, an intrans. 'shake' (vel sim.) can be supplied, on the basis of passages like VI.31.2b *ácyutā cic cyāvayanta rájāṃsi*, whose d-pāda ends *ájman ā́ te,* very like this pāda. I favor a different solution: simply continuing *yád éjatha* "when you stir" from the preceding pāda (4d). Although the two verses do not belong to the same pragātha, the continuity of theme is clear.

VIII.20.6: Given that the Maruts are displaying their *tvákṣāṃsi* on their own bodies (*tanū́ṣv ā́*), I wonder if there is a little pun on *tvác-* 'skin'.

VIII.20.7: I read *ánu* both with what precedes (*svadhā́m*) and what follows (*śríyam*) and do not, contra Ge, take the latter as obj. of *váhante.* Med. forms of *váha-* are several times used reflexively of the Maruts' progress (V.58.1, V.60.7, V.61.11, X.77.6) without obj.

My tr. of *vṛ́ṣa-psu-* and *áhruta-psu-* (as well as *vṛ́ṣa-psu-* in 10a) are owing to Thieme. See reff. at comm. ad I.49.3.

VIII.20.8: Against most tr., I take pāda a as an independent nominal clause and construe b with c. The locc. in b refer to the chariot and its box, onto which the Maruts are mounting. The same phrase two hymns later, VIII.22.9 *ā́ hí ruhátam …, ráthe kóśe hiraṇyáye*, with a verb of mounting, seems to clinch this interpr., though Ge (n. 8b) explicitly claims that the two nearby phrases, in hymns by the same poet, are used differently.

I think *gó-bandhu-* 'having a cow/cows as kin' is a pun, an interpr. not registered in the publ. tr. On the one hand it refers to the Maruts' mother Pṛśni; on

the other, on the basis of *vā́ja-bandhu-* 'having prizes as kin' (VIII.68.19) and the word play in the adjacent hymn, VIII.21.4 (see comm. there), it is also a clever way to say that the Maruts have cows at their disposal to give to us. These are the same cows with which the music is anointed in pāda a.

I do not see any way around supplying a verb of motion or mounting in bcd: the Maruts mount their chariot or come in order for us to enjoy the nourishment they bring (cf. 2c *iṣā́ nah … ā́ gatā* "come here to us with nourishment") and to gain other desirable things, in two parallel infinitive phrases (*iṣé bhujé … na spárase*).

The root noun *íṣ-* is tr. two different ways in 2c ('refreshment') and 8c ('nourishment'). These should have been harmonized.

VIII.20.9–10: The 'bull' stem (*vṛ́ṣa(n)-*) is dominant in these verses (9b, 9c, 10a [twice], 10b), with this sequence phonologically inaugurated in 9a with *vṛṣad(-añji-*) 'raining unguents', a synchronically distinct word.

VIII.20.12: Ge takes *tanū́ṣu* as attenuated to something close to a reflexive ("sind nicht auf sich selbst eifersüchitig"), but in vss. 6 and 26 it is lexically robust. I think the point here is to contrast the adornment of their bodies with that of other locations associated with them (their chariots and their faces).

VIII.20.13: That their name can be "broad/widespread like a flood" may at first seem odd, but the point is simply that it is widely known.

Pāda b expresses another common point about the Maruts: they do not have individual names (though see V.52.10–11), but "Marut" serves for each one of them. I differ from Ge and Re in taking gen. pl. *śáśvatām* 'of each and every one' as referring to the Maruts, not to the mass of people; therefore in my view the subj. of the inf. *bhujé* is the Maruts, not these same unidentified people.

I do not know if *pítrya-* here refers specifically to the Maruts' ancestors (esp., presumably, Rudra), as I have taken it, or whether this is a more general statement: "like ancestral life force" (so, more or less, Ge and Re).

VIII.20.14: As Old points out (and as is reflected in Ge's and Re's tr.), *ná* must stand for **ná ná*, i.e., the simile marker followed by a negative. The same no-last-spoke image is found in V.58.5 with alternative realizations of both simile marker (*iva*) and negative (privative *a-*): *arā́ ivéd ácaramā(ḥ)*.

The pāda break between c and d goes counter to the syntactic parallelism:

syntax:	tád eṣām dānā́	meter:	... tád eṣām,
	mahnā́ tád eṣām		dānā́ mahnā́ tád eṣām

This produces a syncopated effect, emphasized by the different positions of the parallel instr. *dānā́* and *mahnā́* in their nominal clauses.

VIII.20.15: In c the presence of both *vā* 'or' and *utá* 'and' is curious, as is the position of the latter. Klein (DGRV I.450) suggests that the placement of *utá* after

nūnám means that it should be construed with that adv., and so *vā* and *utá* each retains its own force.

VIII.20.16: The *yásya vā* opening this verse, parallel to *yó vā* in 15c, shows that this clause is still dependent on the main clause in 15ab *subhágaḥ sá* "very fortunate he …" The main clause in 16c may refer only to the *vājín-* of ab or to the various *subhága-* folk of vss. 15–16.

The hapax *gatha* in b is an anomalous form, with a present 2nd pl. ending (*-tha*) on a root aorist stem. It is clearly a nonce form generated beside 2nd pl. impv. *gata* in 10d. The pādas are otherwise almost identical: 10d *havyā́ no vītáye gata*, 16b *ā́ havyā́ vītáye gatha*.

VIII.20.17: The identity and distribution of forms in pāda b are oddly unclear. Is *diváḥ* dependent on *ásurasya*, or are they coreferential, or are they independent of each other? In the first instance this produces "lord of heaven" (as I have it; see also W. E. Hale [Asura, p. 75] "of the asura of the Sky"); in the 2nd "Lord Heaven" (so Ge: "Asura Himmel"); in the 3rd Re's "(les hommes) du ciel, de l'Asura." Do these genitives qualify Rudra (gen. *rudrásya* in a), as I take it, or *vedhásaḥ* (so Ge: "die … Meister des Asura Himmel," sim. W. E. Hale), or, with Re, are they direct qualifiers of the Maruts? I opt for the first solution because *vedhás-* does not usually govern anything and because Rudra is called *ásuro mahó diváḥ* in II.1.6, *divó ásurāya* in V.41.3, and probably *diváh ... ásurasya* in I.122.1 contra Ge. And in fact is *vedhásaḥ* nom. pl., as it's universally taken, or another gen. sg., perhaps qualifying Rudra? Parallels cut both ways. Rudra is in fact called *vedhás-* in VII.46.1, but the Maruts are so called in V.52.13, 54.6.

VIII.20.18: Syntactic problems continue in this verse. Contra most interpr., I take ab as a continuation of vs. 17, still couched in the 3rd ps., and cd as a new clause directly addressing the Maruts in the 2nd ps. The first hemistich consists of two parallel relative clauses, with the two forms of *yé* positioned at the extreme ends, opening and closing the half-verse. The clauses are connected by an inverse *ca*: #*yé ca … yé*#. This inversion is phonologically motivated, producing a mirror image figure: #*yé cā́rhanti … cáranti yé*# (Saṃhitā text, but metrically to be read *ca árhanti*).

There are further problems. *árhanti* has no expressed object -- unless *marútaḥ* is taken as acc., with the subj. being unexpressed human worshipers; see Old's reff. This seems a thoroughly bad idea, given the rhetorical structure of this pragātha. Ge supplies "zu heissen" (that is, "deserve [to be called]"), which seems a fairly radical addition; Re "notre hommage" (so also Klein, DGRV I.186), which is somewhat easier to justify semantically but for which there is no parallel. My "soma drink" is based on a number of passages where some expression containing *pītím* 'drink' (+/- 'soma') serves as obj. of √*arh* (I.134.6, II.14.2, IV.47.2, V.51.6); this is the most common expressed obj. to √*arh*.

In b *mīḷhúṣaḥ* is the problem. Technically speaking, this cannot be a nom. pl. as I have rendered it. The correct form should be *mīḷhvā́ṃsaḥ*, which is found only

once in the RV, though nearby (VIII.25.14, but not attributed to the same poet). Most take it here as the accusative pl. it appears to be, referring to the generous (human) patrons whom the Maruts approach (e.g., Ge "und die zu den Lohnherrn insgesamt(?) kommen"). This is certainly possible, but, with Old, I nonetheless take it as a nominative, because the stem is often used of the Maruts, including in this very hymn (3c gen. pl. *mīḷhúṣām*). The misinterpretation could be aided by passages like VI.66.3 *rudrásya yé mīḍhúṣaḥ sánti putrā́ḥ*, where the adjective technically modifies gen. sg. Rudra, but could be interpr. as going with *putrā́ḥ*. Cf. also VII.58.5, which is entirely ambiguous. It is indeed barely possible that *mīḷhúṣaḥ* here actually *is* a gen. sg., picking up the *rudrásya* of 17a, but I think this unlikely. The weak nom. pl. here might also be favored by phonological motivations, in order to produce a form similar to *marútaḥ* in the previous pāda in the same metrical position (i.e., immediately preceding a four-syllable cadence).

yúvānaḥ here is a voc.; the identical form in 17c is most likely a nominative. The acc. to the same stem, *yū́naḥ,* opens the next vs. (19a).

In d the Saṃhitā *vavṛdhvam* must be read **vavṛd-dhᵘvam* with both distraction and a heavy root syllable (√*vṛt* 'turn'). For a similar situation, see *ácidhvam* in VIII.7.2, which must be read **ácid-dhᵘvam* (√*cit*).

VIII.20.19: As was pointed out in the publ. intro., pāda c contains a pun: the intens. part. *cárkṛṣat* can belong straightforwardly to √*kṛṣ* 'plough', and in this reading the simile depicts a person engaged in ploughing singing or otherwise verbally encouraging his team, just as Sobhari sings to the Maruts. (In this case *gā́ḥ* would probably be better rendered "oxen.") But it can also be secondarily associated with the root √*kī́r* 'celebrate, praise', which has a curiously formed 3rd sg. *-se* medial intensive *cárkṛṣe* (3x), beside act. *carkar-/carkir-*. For purposes of word play a nonce stem *cárkṛṣ-* could be extracted from the isolated *cárkṛṣe*. In this reading Sobhari is praising the Maruts like cows (see vs. 21); in other words this is a sort of reverse dānastuti. That the Maruts are called bulls in pāda b simply adds to the play.

Note also the phonological echo in *gā́ya gā́(ḥ)*.

VIII.20.20: Ge plausibly explains the sg. *hávyaḥ* as attraction to the number in the simile (sg. *muṣṭihā́*). One might also add that *hávya-* is overwhelmingly nom. sg, and there are no masc. pl. forms attested. There seems no obvious reason for this grammatical restriction, but it may have contributed to the somewhat anomalous form here.

All standard interpr. (including mine) take the simile in b to be *vṛ́ṣṇaś candrā́n ná* "like lustrous bulls," despite the displaced simile marker -- in part presumably because "like lustrous/brilliant ones" doesn't make much sense as a simile. I have no explanation for the placement of *ná*, nor do I understand why this needs to be a simile at all, since the Maruts are regularly called bulls without such marking (see nearby 19b, e.g., as well as 9–10, 12). Perhaps it indirectly continues the pun in the simile in 19c, which in turn is continued in vs. 21.

VIII.20.21: The cow imagery of vs. 19 (and implicitly 20) continues here. Ge and Re take this as a simile ("like cows"), but this requires interpr. *cid* as a simile marker, a function for *cid* that I do not believe in. It is even less likely because the next verse begins with a parallel structure (*mártaś cid*), where the *cid* is definitely not a simile marker. I do, however, think that the Maruts are identified with the cows here. There are several themes intertwined. The most obvious point of comparison between cows and Maruts is their common birth (*sajātyèna … sábandhavaḥ*) as a herd/flock and consequent lack of individual differentiation, a characteristic of the Maruts treated earlier, in vss. 13–14. But the Maruts also have a cow for a mother; this was asserted in 8c, and the phraseology there (*góbandhavaḥ sujātā́saḥ* "akin to a cow, well-born") is echoed here (*gā́vaḥ … sajātyèna … sábandhavaḥ*), thus alluding to the Maruts' kinship with cows. Hence *sábandhu-* here has two senses: both cows and Maruts have common birth within the group (that is, cows with cows, Maruts with Maruts), but cows and Maruts have a common birth with each other (cows with Maruts). This type of kinship is treated also in 22ab. I also identified a secondary meaning in 8c: being akin to cows is a way of saying that the Maruts have cows to give, and I think that is slightly hinted at here.

I don't quite understand the relevance of "they lick each other's humps." Lü (Varuṇa 90) suggests that the vs. praises the unity (Eintract) of the Maruts, and, if somewhat sharpened, this may be the correct explanation. "Lick each other's humps" may be the equivalent of English "watch each other's backs": individuals act reciprocally (*mitháḥ* here) and protectively for the common good of the group.

Note the echo of the final words in a and b: … *samanyavaḥ*# … *sábandhavaḥ*#. The opening *gā́vaś cid ghā* also faintly echoes *gā́ya gā́* opening 21a.

VIII.20.22: The theme of cross-species kinship in vs. 21 continues here, with the mortal seeking brotherhood (*bhrātṛtvám*) with the Maruts.

The verse as a whole, balancing brotherhood (*bhrātṛtvám*) and friendship (*āptivám*), should be evaluated in conjunction with vs. 13 of the next hymn (VIII.21, by the same poet) *abhrātṛvyó anā́ tvám, ánāpir indra janúṣā sanā́d asi / yudhéd āpitvám ichase*, where Indra is said to lack either See comm. thereon.

VIII.20.23: *bheṣajásya* appears to be a partitive genitive.

VIII.20.24: Note the relatively elementary figure in c *máyo (no) bhūta … mayobhuvaḥ*.

The voc. *asacadviṣaḥ* has given rise to multiple competing analyses, well summarized by Scar in his detailed treatment of this hapax (246–48). Most start with *dviṣ-* 'hatred, hater' as 2nd member and some form of √*sac* 'follow, accompany' as its first, governing the second. The problem is *what* form of √*sac*? It cannot be a straighforward thematic verbal stem or participle/injunctive (*saca-* or *sacat-* [though **asacad-dviṣaḥ* is a phonologically possible underlying form]) because the Class I pres. of √*sac* is resolutely middle. (Debrunner [Nachtr. AiG II.1.87] also disputes this analysis on the basis that the accent is wrong for a verbal governing cmpd of that

sort, but since the form is a voc. and unaccented, this argument is inapplicable. [It does apply to the other form he mentions, *jaradvíṣ-*, but these forms do not have to be parallel.]) It is also possible to take it as a standard type of root noun cmpd with the root noun governing the 1st member ('hating the *asaca*' or 'not hating the *saca*'; at some point I toyed with the idea of 'hating the non-aligned'), but this still founders on the puzzle of *asaca-*. Scar's own solution is to divide the cmpd differently, as *asacad-víṣ-*, with √*viṣ* 'bring about' as 2nd member and a form of √*sac* (2) 'dry out' as 1st member, hence 'not bringing about drought' or 'bringing about non-drought'. Unfortunately getting *-sacat-* from this root requires a lot of not too plausible machinery -- it is no more straightforward than deriving *-saca(t)-* from √*sac* (1) -- though I am sympathetic to his argument that the meaning would fit well with the Maruts' character. My own 'who do not partner hatred' rests essentially on a loose interpr. of the verbal governing analysis presented first above, though I hold no particular brief for it. I would point out that if it does contain √*sac* 'accompany', it could pair contrastively with *sakhāyaḥ* in the preceding vs. (23c). A very weak argument for √*sac* (1) and √*dviṣ* could be constructed on the basis of VIII.22.2, a hymn to the Aśvins but also composed by Sobhari. There the Aśvins' chariot is described as *sacanāvantam* 'provided with companions' vel sim., the first word of pāda c, and as *vídveṣasam* 'free of hatred', the first word of pāda d, with the same two roots. But I would not make much of this.

VIII.20.26: The voc. *marutaḥ* in c was carelessly omitted in the publ. tr.

VIII.21 Indra

VIII.21.2: *dhṛṣát* is ordinarily an adverb, originally probably the neut. of a VIth class present of which there are no finite forms – except, possibly, this one. The relative pronoun *yáḥ* invites *dhṛṣát* to be read as a 3rd sg. injunctive (and of course in a relative clause its accent would be correct). I would suggest that either the neut. part. *dhṛṣát* has been misanalyzed and pressed into service as a finite form or that *yáḥ* is serving as a loose izafe connecting this adverbial qualifier with the subject.

Old suggests that the "youth" is King Citra, whose dānastuti ends the hymn. This seems perfectly plausible but nonetheless unprovable.

VIII.21.4: The publ. tr. should have a close parens after "[horses, etc.]."

I interpret this verse in the context of its pragātha. The question is who are the kin that Indra has and we do not. I suggest that Indra's "kin" are the horses, cows, and so forth named in vs. 3. In VIII.68.19 the patrons are called *vā́ja-bandhu-* 'having prizes as kin', as a hint that they should give them to us. I think the same image is at work here: we lack kin, and you have these desirable kin (horses, etc.) that could become akin to us too.

In the second hemistich these kin become *dhā́māni*. The stem *dhā́man-* is of course a highly charged and multivalent word, but in this case I think it comes close

to its literal sense: ‘deposits’, that is, things put or set down (√*dhā*), which Indra is to bring to deposit on the ritual ground.

VIII.21.5: A verse that makes less sense the more one thinks about it, since the bird simile does not seem to fit the context: birds don't normally sit either next to or in honey, nor do they normally roar. The simile must have as its third term “in a nest” or “in a tree” (cf. *dru-ṣád(van)* several times of birds) as the parallel to the loc. honey phrase.

VIII.21.6: In pāda a *ca* must have subordinating value because of the accent on *vádāmasi*. So also Klein (I.245), though he considers the *ca* originally to have signalled interstanzaic conjunction.

VIII.21.9: The 2nd pl. reference is to the poet’s fellow ritual celebrants.

VIII.21.10: The first pāda, in the accusative, continues 9c, hanging off *índram* there. The second pāda may be attached to the first, as Ge takes it, or to cd, as I take it. There are no strong arguments either way, but I assume the causal clause in b grounds the expectations we have in cd: because he has reached exhilaration *with us* (this last bit unexpressed), he will provide for us.

VIII.21.11: The image in this verse is of a contest for cattle, where a competitor challenges us (ancient trash talk) and we can successfully respond, thanks to having Indra as our ally. The word qualifying the competitor, *śvasánt-* ‘snorting’, calls to mind Indra’s enemy Śuṣṇa (on the etymological connection see EWA s.v. *śúṣṇa-*) and therefore makes our human competition sound more formidable.

VIII.21.12: Continues the thought of vs. 11, that with Indra on our side we can take on all challenges and challengers. I therefore tr. the 1st pl. optatives as potential “we could” rather than the voluntative “might we” (Ge “wir wollen”). The 2nd sg. verb *aveḥ* in d does not work well in this schema, at least in its ordinary interpretation as an optative to the 1st class pres. of √*av* ‘help’. Although “you should / might you help our visions” is possible, esp. given that *dhī-* is not infrequently the object of √*av* (cf., e.g., I.117.23 *víśvā dhíyaḥ … prāvatam me*), I have taken it instead as the imperfect of the root pres. of √*vī* ‘pursue’. Although ‘thought, vision’ is not a regular object of √*vī*, it does occur; cf. I.77.4 *agnír gíro ’vasā vetu dhītím* “let Agni with his help pursue our hymns, our visionary thought” (note the presence of *ávasā* ‘help’ as well). This *aveḥ* would pick up the subjunctive *vayati* of 10c, also with Indra as subject, also performing this action in our service, and the visions he pursues here are those announced in 6d. I interpret the word *dhī-* in both places as referring to our fantasies about what we want out of Indra and how we could be victorious. In 12 Indra seems to have fulfilled these fantasies. Against the interpretation of *aveḥ* as belonging to √*av* we might note that the optative to the extremely well-attested thematic present *ávati* is almost non-existent. If the form here is otherwise analysed, the only secure

form is *avet* in VI.47.15; *ávet* in V.34.8 I also take to √*vī*. However, I do not consider the standard interpretation of *áveḥ* here as belonging to √*av* entirely excluded.

VIII.21.13: The use of *bhrā̃tṛvya-*, lit. 'nephew, cousin', as 'rival' is exceedingly common in Vedic prose, but only really begins in the AV; this is the only such example in the RV. The passage here seems to be an expansion, with lexical renewal, of I.102.8 *aśatrúr indra janúṣā sanād asi* "You are without rival, Indra, by birth from of old," but I would also suggest that the use of an explicit kinship term *a-bhrātṛvyá* (as opposed to the generic *a-śatrú-*) is deliberate, given the web of relationships the poet develops in this hymn (see publ. intro.) It is possible that *-bhrātṛvya-* here is meant to be taken in both the negative sense that is standard later (rival < rivalrous nephew/cousin) and in a positive one, simply naming a blood relation. Thus the hemistich could mean both "you have no nephew *and* no friend" and "you have no rival *but* no friend"). As a kinship term *abhrātṛvyá-* would contrast with the *bándhumant-* of 4a, where Indra is explicitly credited with having kin.

VIII.21.14: The motivation for some of these statements needs some explication. The first hemistich concerns two negative figures; the second one, in pāda b, the man who swells up on surā, the secular and disreputable drink -- in other words a drunk, a lush, or in Ge's felicitous tr. "die Schnappshelden" -- is implicitly contrasted with a man who handles the much-honored drink soma in a ritual context. But why should a rich man (pāda a) be disfavored? Perhaps because he has what he needs and need not enter into partnership with Indra, whereas we, more needy, are willing to engage in the reciprocal activities involved in honoring Indra. I reluctantly abandoned my tr. of *revántam-* as 'fat cat', primarily because *revánt-* is not usually used in slangy contexts.

I'm afraid that I don't understand the second hemistich at all, primarily because I don't know whether the omitted object of *sám ūhasi* should be the negative figures of ab or positively or neutrally viewed humans in general. The sentiment of pāda d would support the latter idea: that when Indra enters into battle, he puts everyone together (under his protection), thereby behaving like a father. But the only other instance of *sám* √*ūh* (I.131.3), also with Indra as subject, has him shoving the two opposing sides into fighting each other, with a come-what-may attitude. This seems more likely here, in which case pāda d would express the opposing sides' competing calls to Indra to help them.

VIII.21.15: Again the cultural content here is somewhat elusive and therefore the relation of the simile to the frame not entirely clear. The woman who grows old at home (*amājúr-*) must be a spinster (see II.17.7 for the clearest context of this word), but what aspect of her activity we wish to avoid isn't defined. It may simply be that we should not sit still and inactive at the soma sacrifice when we should be busying ourselves serving Indra. (Although one wonders whether an ancient Indian spinster was allowed just to sit around, rather than being a virtual servant to her parents and the rest of the extended family. I would think she'd be busy enough.) Or perhaps

there is a pun embedded in *ní √sad*; in later Sanskrit this lexeme can mean 'sink down (mentally), be depressed' and so perhaps it's the spinster's mental state that's at issue. It is even possible, if we read this verse with its pragātha partner, vs. 16, to take "let us not miss out…" of 16a as a gloss on what aspect of the spinster's life we wish to avoid in 15: she missed out on marriage, but we do not want to miss out on Indra's gifts.

VIII.21.16: The connection between pādas a and b must be that were we to miss out on Indra's gifts, we would be likely to complain about him.

On d see Scar 196. Ge's "Gaben" cannot be right for *dāmā́naḥ*, which should be a personal designation; see Scar's "die Geschenke machen / Geschenke bekommen." Perhaps like *somā́nam* (I.18.1) it contains a Hoffmann suffix.

VIII.21.17: There is no overt question marker, but the verse works better with vs. 18 as a series of deliberative questions, to be answered by the emphatic declaration of Citra's preeminence in 18.

VIII.21.18: The clustering of demotic *ka*-forms in dānastutis (see Jamison 2008, 2009) is nicely illustrated by *rājakā́ íd anyaké, yaké*, with the suffix even attached to the relative pronoun.

tatánat must be a pun on the two roots √*tan* 'thunder' and 'stretch'. See Old. Parjanya of course thunders, but he also stretches through the midspace with his rain. Citra will likewise both make a big noise and extend his largesse.

VIII.22 Aśvins

Esp. towards the end of the hymn, pāda-initial *(C)ā* becomes an insistent marker: *ā́* (8c, 9a), *yā́(bhiḥ)* (10a, b), *tā́(bhiḥ)* (10c, 12a), *yā́(bhiḥ)* (12d), *tā́(u)* (13a, b, c, 14a, b), *mā́* (14c), *ā́* (15a), *prā(tā́)* (15b), *ā(rā́ttāc)* (16c), *ā́* (17a). The most concentrated sequence is in vss. 13–14 with the repeated dual prn. *tā́(u)* 'these two', referring to the Aśvins.

VIII.22.1–2: This pragātha contains poetic self-address at a distance. Vs. 1 begins *ā́ … have* "I have called here …," while 2c ends with the voc. *sobhare.* (On poetic self-address see Jamison [Fs. Skjaervø, 2009].)

VIII.22.2: The reading of the first word of this vs. is uncertain. The Saṃhitā text apparently reads *pūrvāyúṣam* but the Pp. *pūrva-āpúṣam*, accepted by Sāy as well as Old and edited in all the standard editions (MM, Aufr., HvN). This seems to be a genuine variant reading. For disc. see Old ad loc. and Scar 320–22. I generally follow the Old analysis for the 2nd member; the objection that with a 2nd member *āyuṣ-* the accent should be **pūrvā́yuṣam* or **pūrvāyuṣám* seems cogent to me. But I have not adopted Old's suggestion that *pūrva-* stands for **puru-* (hence 'prospering many', vel sim.), with the *ū* introduced under the influence of *pū́rvyam* at the end of the hemistich. This is not impossible, but since *puru-spṛ́ham* intervenes, it might

have helped maintain an original **puru-* in the initial word. Scar suggests several further analyses, which seem too fussy to me.

sacanā́vant- is construed with the instr. *sumatíbhiḥ*: "provided with favors as accompaniment."

VIII.22.4: For *īrmā́* 'at rest, standing still', contra Gr 'rasch', etc., Ge 'zurück', see Nargen IIJ 10 (1967–68) and EWA s.v.

iṣaṇyá- is ordinarily transitive, so I take *vām* as its obj. (so also Gr), contra Ge and Re. This must be a paradox: the motionless chariot wheel is the one that propels them, not the speedy one in pāda a. I do not have a vision of how this would work in practice, though.

VIII.22.6: On ploughing with a wolf, see the publ. intro.

VIII.26.11: Although *ádhrigu-* is simply a *-u*-stem, the negated form of Aves. *drigu-* 'poor' (see comm. ad I.61.1), in the nom. pl. it is treated as if it were a cmpd. with 'cow', with *ádhrigāvaḥ* (also I.64.3) instead of expected **ádhrigavaḥ* (see AiG III.158). But things may be more complicated, for, as Gr notes, in I.61.1 the dat. *ádhrigave* would be better metrically as **ádhrigāve.* In this case it does not match the 'cow' word, whose dative is *gáve*. However, Wackernagel (AiG III.149) considers the change to *-gāve* unnecessary and refers to Old (Prol. 90 and Noten ad loc.) for the meter. It's also possible that I.61.1 just borrowed the length from I.64.3, both Nodhas products, because the stem was not entirely understood.

VIII.22.12: On *viśvápsu-* see comm. ad I.148.1.

Old explains 3rd pl. *vāvṛdhúḥ* as metri causa for du. **vāvṛdháthuḥ*, and this is accepted by Ge. But the only other passage in which *krívi-* is found as a clear PN (though cf. V.44.4, VIII.51.8 [Vālakh.], IX.9.6 for more dubious exx.) is in a nearby Sobhari hymn, in which he is favored by the Maruts (VIII.20.24 *yā́bhir daśasyathā krívim* "with which you favor Krivi"). The *yā́bhiḥ* there has the same referent as here, namely *ūtíbhiḥ* 'forms of help' and *vāvṛdhúḥ* is a semantic variant of *daśasyathā*. I therefore think it very likely that the plural verb is correct and that this is an allusion to the Maruts' aid to Krivi. Recall that in vs. 1c, at least by my interpr., the Aśvins also follow the Maruts' lead, also and identically 14b, and they are addressed as Rudras (that is, Maruts) in 14c.

VIII.22.15: The vs. begins with an echo of the first vs., or rather the first pragātha, in which the poet called on the Aśvins' chariot (1a *ó tyám ahva ā́ rátham*), here reprised by *ā́ … súgmyam … / huvé* "I call the easily moving (chariot)." But in pāda b the poet thinks better of it and addresses the Aśvins directly. This change of heart is signalled by *vā* 'or'.

Ge, flg. Sāy, takes *sakṣáṇī* to √*sac* 'accompany', but as Re points out, all other forms of *sakṣáṇi-* (incl. those separated by Gr into a separate lemma derived from √*sac*) belong to √*sah*, and this etymon works fine here.

The echo of the first pragātha continues with the poet's self-identification as *sóbharī* at the end of the verse, echoing his self-address with voc. *sobhare* at the end of 2c. *sóbharī* here is one of two occurrences of this PN that have apparently fem. endings (the other is gen. sg. *sóbharyāḥ* in VIII.103.14). Ge questioning suggests that we might be dealing with a female poet, but this seems highly unlikely, esp. given the voc. *sobhare* in vs. 2 and elsewhere in this group of hymns (VIII.19.2, 20.19). See AiG III.183 on masc. *-ī*-stem PN and their transfer to the *i*-inflection.

VIII.22.18: On *suprāvargám* see comm. ad VIII.4.6.

VIII.23 Agni

VIII.23.1: The hymn begins with a *hí* clause. Flg. JPB, the *hí* signals that the action in this clause precedes and forms the basis of the action in b.

On *pratīvyàm* see Scar 500.

VIII.23.2: With Ge I take ab as a continuation of vs. 1, with c starting a new clause. The vocc. in ab are the self-address of the poet, as in VIII.22.1–2. Here the poet first exhorts himself with 2nd ps. imperatives (1ab) and then switches to a pseudo-modal 1st ps. *-se* in c. The first voc. *viśvacarṣaṇe* (2a) is a bit of a red herring, since this stem is otherwise used of gods. But he addresses and thus identifies himself with his speaking name Viśvamanas in b, making it clear that he was simply appropriating the divine epithet for himself.

I supply *váhnīn* to govern *ráthānām* in c, on the basis of *váhniḥ* in 3c and *váhnī ráthānām* in VIII.94.1. I surmise that this is also Re's thinking behind "(comme conducteurs) des chars," though he makes no comment.

VIII.23.3: Ge (n. 3c) takes *upavídā … vindate* as simply equivalent to *upavindate*, which is esp. puzzling because *úpa* is not otherwise construed with √*vid* in the RV. My 'close' in the tr. 'close searching' is meant to convey the intimate nuance of this preverb.

Note the *v* alliteration in c: *upa**v**ídā **v**áhnir **v**indate **v**ásu*.

VIII.23.5: I take *abhikhyā́* in the sense of 'glance' rather than 'appearance' (as Gr, Re, and Scar 99 do). The finite forms of *abhí* √*khyā* all have the meaning 'look at', as do the 2 occurrences of the gerund *abhikhyā́ya* (I.155.5, II.30.9). *abhikhyā́* occurs 3 times (here + I.148.5, X.112.10, all compatible with a meaning 'glance' [pace Gr]). It may either be the instr. sg. of a root noun or (with AiG II.2.782) a haplologized form of the gerund *abhikhyā́ya.* Both possibilities are considered by Scar (98–99).

VIII.23.6: Contra most interpr., I take Agni as driving to the gods to present them with our praises as well as our oblations, rather than coming here (e.g., Re "arrive avec les belles louanges").

The impv. *yāhí* is accented because it follows an initial voc.

VIII.23.9: Both Ge and Re explicitly identify the subj. of *jujuṣuḥ* in c as those seeking truth (voc. *ṛtāyavaḥ*), the human ritualists addressed in a. Although switch between 2nd and 3rd ps. even within a verse is not rare, I think the gods are the more likely subject, as they generally are to forms of √*juṣ*. This verse depicts the ritual model whereby Agni brings the gods to the ritual ground to receive oblations, with this location specified by *námasas padé* -- in contrast to vs. 6, where Agni conveys the oblations and praises to the gods (presumably in heaven), the other model of sacrificial interaction.

VIII.23.16: The point of this verse seems to be that Vyaśva (the poet's father) got the goods, either directly from Agni or via the patron Ukṣan, and we hope this will provide a pattern for us.

VIII.23.18–19: Just as vs. 16 provides an ancestral pattern for the poet to gain goods from Agni and/or his patron, these vss. take the gods' establishment of Agni as their messenger as the prototype for mortals' doing the same.

VIII.23.21: On the bad cadence produced by *ávidhat*, see (despairing) remarks ad II.1.7.

VIII.23.24: The hapax *sthūrayūpavát* may be a pun. On the one hand, formations of this sort, with neut. *-vát* suffix, generally mean 'like X', 'as X did', with X a PN. The presence of an undoubted ex. in the same position in the immediately preceding vs., *vyaśvavát* 'like Vyaśva', strongly supports this interpr. The poet addressed by the impv. *arca* is being urged to chant 'like Sthūrayūpa'. Gr and Re interpr. the form thus. But *sthūrayūpa-* also has lexical meaning, '(having?) sturdy posts' (in the absence of accent we cannot tell whether the cmpd is a bahuvrīhi or a karmadhāraya). The yūpa is both the post to which the animal to be sacrificed is tethered and a crucial post or beam in the construction of dwellings. In this lexical meaning the comparison could either be between the praise songs and sturdy posts or someone who possesses them, *or* between Agni and the post or post-possessor. Note that it is Agni *dámya-* ('of the household') who receives the chant. If the comparison is to the praise songs, they would be conceptualized as the uprights that help make the house solid. The parallel adduced by Ge, I.51.14 … *stómo dúryo ná yū́paḥ* "a praise-song like a door-post," is particularly apt. This is the sense reflected in my tr. and also in Ge's and assumes a karmadhāraya. If the comparison is to Agni, a bahuvrīhi would be better: "to Agni of the household, like one [=a house] having sturdy posts." The kinship asserted between Agni and trees in the next verse may give some support to this last interpr.

VIII.23.26: The syntax of this vs. is very difficult; Re even suggests that it consists of fragments "non syntaxisés" -- a coinage I would like to introduce to English. The standard interpr. take the NP in pāda a as acc. pl., more (Old) or less (Ge) parallel to

havyā̆ni in b and then either supply a verb to govern them (Ge: "bring [X to Y]") or cobble together a very implausible syntactic bond between the verb *ní satsi* in c and the accusatives in ab (e.g., Re "En direction de tous ... assieds toi"). I take a very different route, first by interpr. *maháḥ … satáḥ* not as acc. pl. but gen./abl. sg. This phrase seems to have some special status: cf. I.36.3 *mahás te satáḥ* "since you are great," same phrase in VIII.101.11 "of you who are great." I take the referent of the abl./gen. phrase to be Agni, and I also interpr. *abhí ṣatáḥ* in the usual idiomatic meaning of *abhí √as* 'be superior to', construed here with the acc. *víśvān*. In b I simply supply a different form of the root *√as*, namely *santu*, to be construed with the *abhí* in the same meaning. The point of the sentence is that since Agni, who is superior to everything, is our Hotar and the conduit of our offerings to the gods, our oblations cannot help being superior as well.

VIII.23.27: I am not happy with the partitive gen. with *√van* in cd, but I do not see any way out of it.

VIII.23.30: The abrupt introduction of Mitra and Varuṇa may look forward to the next hymn but one, VIII.25, devoted at least in its first part, to these two gods. The last pāda of the first verse of VIII.25 (*ṛtā́vānā yajase putádakṣasā*) is almost identical to the last pāda here (*ṛtā́vānā samrā́jā putádakṣasā*).

VIII.24 Indra

VIII.24.1: Ge takes *stuṣé* here as an infinitive, but the nearby parallels he cites (VIII.21.9, 23.7) are unaccented and clearly 1st person. The switch between 1st pl. (*ā́ śiṣāmahi*) and 1st sg. (*stuṣé*) is not unusual in this kind of context, where the poet speaks in the 1st plural jointly for himself and his fellow ritual performers and in the 1st singular for himself alone, with a 2nd pl. address to those same comrades (*vaḥ* in b).

VIII.24.2: Two etymological figures: *vṛtrahátyena vṛtrahā́* (b) and *maghaír maghónaḥ* (c).

VIII.24.4: Another figure: *dhṛṣatā́ dhṛṣṇo*.

This verse echoes vs. 3 in reverse order: 3a *stávāno ā́ bhara* / *3c nirekám* // 4a *nirekám* / 4c *stávamāna ā́ bhara*. These echoes straddle a tṛca boundary.

VIII.24.5: "hindrances" (*āmúraḥ*) and "repulsions" (*paribā́dhaḥ*) are complementary notions, the equivalent of "thrust and parry" (or rather parry and thrust). Unfortunately they do not go well into English, esp. in the plural. On *āmúr-* see Scar 391-92.

VIII.24.6: The matching instrumentals in frame and simile are phonological variants: *góbhir* (a) / *gīrbhir* (b).

VIII.24.7: The poet of this group of hymns (VIII.23–26) is Viśvamanas, but *visvámanasaḥ* here can be read both literally and as the PN. Note also the cross-tṛca echo, 6c *mánaḥ* / 7a *-manasaḥ*, and the initial figure *víśvāni viśvá-*, which together make up the poet's name.

VIII.24.8: The opening word of c, *váso*, is read as *vásoḥ* by the Pp., followed by Old and Ge – that is, with the lost of underlying final *-s* before the cluster *sp-* -- hence a gen. sg. belonging with the long gen. sg. NP ending with *rādhasaḥ*. This is of course possible, but the presence of undoubted voc. *vaso* in 7c in a hymn that is over-partial to vocatives and given to repetitions across verses, supports a voc. interpretation here.

VIII.24.10: A verse full of figures: *mahāmaha, mahé* (ab), *dṛḷháś cid dṛhya* (c), *maghavan magháttaye*. There is also an inter-tṛca echo between voc. *nṛto* (9b) and voc. *nṛtama* (10b), with *nṛto* returning in 12a.

VIII.24.14: The expression *dákṣam pṛñcántam* is somewhat peculiar, and Ge takes the two words as separate qualifiers of Indra: "dem Verständigen, Spendenden." However, I.141.1 *bhágaṃ dákṣaṃ ná papṛcāsi* suggests that *dákṣam* should be the object of the pres. participle. By the tr. "engorging skill" I mean that Indra fills his latent quality (skill) with energy (perhaps derived from soma and praise) and makes it available to use.

Acdg. to the Anukramaṇī, our poet Viśvamanas has the patronymic Vaiyaśva (vs. 23), that is, son of Vyaśva ('without horses'), and the poet mentions his family in vss. 22, 28–29 with the distracted stem *v^{i}yaśva-*. But in this verse he refers to himself instead as *aśv^{i}yá-*, also distracted, which, on the one hand, is simply an anagram of the family name with the first two syllables reversed, but, on the other, credits him with possession of (or at least relationship to) horses, whereas the unmetathesized version announces him as horse-less.

VIII.24.15: The expression *naíváthā* (that is, *ná eváthā*), placed between the two instrumentals, is opaque: *eváthā* is a hapax. Old helpfully adduces IV.30.1 *nákir indra tvád úttaraḥ .. .nákir evā́ yáthā tvám* "There is no one higher than you, Indra … no one who is exactly as you are," and our *eváthā* appears almost to be a blend of *evā́ yáthā* or some abbreviation thereof.

VIII.24.16: I supply *siñcá* from b as the verb also of a, and supply *madíntaram* of a as the object of b, with *ándhasaḥ* dependent on it as *mádhvaḥ* is in a. Ge by contrast (fld. by Klein II.183) supplies "bring" in a and takes *ándhasaḥ* as a partitive genitive in b. This is not impossible, but my interpretation requires less extraneous material.

Another cross-tṛca connection: *evā́* in c echoes *eváthā* in 15c. More cleverly, 16ab *éd u m(ádhvo)… siñcá* picks up 13a *éndum … siñcata* (note that *édum* and *éndum* are almost identical).

VIII.24.19: The a-pāda is repeated twice elsewhere in VIII: 81.4, 95.7. The reason for the accent on *stávāma*, which does not begin the pāda and probably not its clause, is unclear, though it may well be connected with its relationship with the exhortative 2nd pl. impv. *éta* "come on!" It would, in fact, be possible to construe *índram* with *éta nú* and begin a new clause with *stávāma* ("Come now to Indra; let us praise the superior man…"), but this seems unnatural. It is curious that Old does not comment on the accent here or in the other passages.

VIII.24.22: Here as elsewhere (II.5.1, III.27.3, both with pl. *vājínaḥ*) *yámam* governs the accusative.

VIII.24.23: A very cute pun, with *návam* meaning, as often in a hymnal context, 'anew', but in conjunction with *daśamám* 'tenth' evoking *náva* 'nine'.

caráṇi- is a hapax, but most likely derived from the root √*car* 'wander' (see EWA s.v. *CAR*^{I}, though AiG II.2.207 considers it of unclear meaning). It must have been created to contrast semantically with the very frequent near-rhyme form *carṣaṇi-* 'settled/boundaried peoples', whose gen. pl. *carṣaṇīnā́m* occurs 35x in the RV, always at the end of the pāda as here (including VIII.23.7 *hótāram carṣaṇīnā́m*, the adjacent hymn by the same poet). That the short initial syllable of *caráṇīnām* produces a bad cadence surely draws more attention to the word it was created in opposition to.

VIII.24.25: Elliptical and with some syntactic puzzles. See Old on the verse in general and the multiple solutions proposed in earlier lit.

In b I supply "be there" as the verb; Ge, to more or less the same effect, "beistandest."

In c I supply Śuṣṇa as the object of both verbs, since he is the demon Indra ordinarily slays for Kutsa. The problem here is that the verbs are not parallel: injunctive *śiśnathaḥ* followed by imperative *ní codaya*. Somewhat reluctantly I ascribe imperatival value to *śiśnathaḥ* (so also Ge without comment), possible because of the functional shape-shifting ability of injunctives. (See the same form in VIII.70.10.)(However, I am not certain how often regular injunctives can show imperatival value, as opposed to lexicalized forms like *dā́s* and *dhā́s*.) The root √*cud* does not otherwise appear with *ní*, a fact that makes its value here even less clear. Ge supplies "horses" as object, while Old suggests importing *ávaḥ* 'help' from a.

VIII.24.26: Again elliptical. In ab the semantic opposition between new and old is obviously the point, but what new thing are we begging Indra for? Ge supplies "deed" ("… eine (Tat), die auch dem Älteste neu ist"). In III.31.19 the same expression *návyam … sányase* refers to the making of a new hymn, but it makes no sense to beg *Indra* for a new hymn. I tentatively supply *ā́yuḥ* 'life', which occurs several times with *návyam* (I.10.11, III.53.16, VII.80.2). The other occurrence of *návyaṃ sanyasé* (VIII.67.18) is found immediately after a periphrastic causative "you make live" (VIII.67.17c *dévāḥ kṛṇuthá jīváse*), and a "new life" works reasonably well in that

passage. But this is all circumstantial, and I do not know why such a wish would be expressed here, beyond the usual Vedic desire to live a full and vigorous lifetime.

The *sá tvám* in c does not conform to the rules for 2nd ps. *sá* reference developed in Jamison 1992. I would therefore prefer to supply an imperative "(be) victorious …," which would, I think, also fit the context better. However, the offending *sá* might be explained by the 3rd ps. verb (*mucát*) in the following verse (27ab), whose relative clauses hang off 26c, in my view. In other words, the construction of the whole sentence fluctuates between 2nd and 3rd ps. subject.

VII.24.27: As noted just above, I take the relative clauses in ab as hanging off 26c. Both Ge and Old make 27bc into a single clause, but the verb in c (*nīnamaḥ*) is unaccented although b begins with a relative pronoun *yáḥ*. I therefore take ab as being two parallel relative clauses sharing a single verb *mucát*; cleverly the poet has exploited the fact that √*muc* participates in two different syntactic constructions with accusative and ablative: "release ROPE vel sim. [acc.] from VICTIM [abl.]" and "release VICTIM [acc.] from ROPE [abl.]. (Perhaps not surprisingly, English has the same two constructions.) In 27a we find the first, though without overt expression of the VICTIM (=us or perhaps the Ārya); cf., e.g., X.97.15 *tā́ no muñcantu áṃhasaḥ*. In b we find the second, though without overt expression of the ROPE. Here I supply *áṃhaḥ* adapted from abl. *áṃhasaḥ* in pāda a. Cf. IV.12.6=X.126.8 *evó ṣv àsmán* [i.e., *asmát*] *muñcata vy áṃhaḥ*.

VIII.24.30: In contrast to the first two fairly straightforward verses of the dānastuti (28–29), this one bristles with slangy jokes and their attendant puzzles. It is also the only verse in the hymn not in uṣṇih meter. The verse opens with the sacrificer (*ījānáḥ*, lit. the pf. mid. participle to √*yaj*) asking "you" an abrupt question *kuhayā́ kuhayākṛte*, consisting of an extended form of *kúha* 'where' (the extended form found only here) and an oddly formed, nonce vocative made up of the same adverbial interrogative plus (probably) *-kṛti-* (though *-kṛtā-* would also be possible). Judging from vs. 28, the beginning of the dānastuti, which contains a vocative addressed to Dawn, she is also the addressee here, though a reversion to the default Indra is certainly not excluded. So, literally, "where? you where-actor." Ge takes *ījānáḥ* as the subject of the question ("where is the sacrificer?"), rather than the questioner. I follow Old: "Die Opferer fragt die Morgenröte …," although Ge's interpretation is by no means excluded. The question is whether Varosuṣāman is the sacrificer himself or his patron, and without a better knowledge of the distribution of roles in RVic sacrifice, we cannot know for sure.

It is generally assumed (I think correctly) that the second hemistich is the response of the addressee to the question in ab, and it is an extended pun. He calls the subject, about whose whereabouts the question was just asked, "Vala," that is, the name of Indra's opponent and the cave that contained the stolen cows. But Vala is also a phonological variant of Vara, the first part of the name of the patron Varosuṣāman. He is said to be "set apart" (*ápaśritaḥ*) along the Gomatī (River), but *gómant-* literally means 'possessing cattle' and can also qualify the Vala cave itself

(see I.11.5 *valásya gómataḥ*). Thus this line appears to be a subtle reminder to Varosuṣāman not to withhold his cattle within himself, like his phonological multiform, but to be generous to his clients. The whole line reminds us of the dānastuti in V.61.19: *eṣá kṣeti ráthavītir maghávā gómatīr ánu, párveteṣv ápaśritaḥ* "This Rathavīti dwells in peace, a bounteous patron throughout the cow-rich (clans) [/along the Gomatī river], set back among the mountains," containing one of the only two other occurrences of *ápaśrita*. I do not know the significance of this.

VIII.25 Mitra and Varuṇa

VIII.25.1: For the connection of the last pāda of this vs. with VIII.23.30, see comm. there.

VIII.25.2: The du. *mitrā́* is used in two different senses: on the one hand, in its appellative sense it refers to the two gods as allies; on the other *mitrā́* is a pregnant dual PN, meaning "Mitra (and Varuṇa)," with the "and Varuṇa" then pleonastically supplied in pāda b in an "X and which Y" construction (*váruṇo yáś ca*).

Most take *tánā* as another dual (to thematic *tána-*), but struggle to interpr. it. I take it as the instr. sg. of the root noun *tán-* and in this context as indicating the "(home) stretch" of a race course. The image is of two charioteers running neck and neck and therefore evenly matched.

tánayā of course echoes *tánā*, though it belongs to a different stem (whichever interpr. of *tánā* is followed). In this case I accept the general interpr. as du. to *tánaya-*.

VIII.25.3: Because the phrase *asuryā́ya prámahasā* is found also in VII.66.2 (also of Mitra and Varuṇa), the two words must be construed together -- though in both instances Ge construes them separately (as do Re and W. E. Hale). Moreover Ge's minimalist tr. of *prámahas-* ("Die … Erhabenen") does not reflect its bahuvrīhi status: it should mean something like 'having their greatness forth/in front'. In combination with the dat. *asuryā́ya*, some forward motion seems indicated.

VIII.25.4: This is a particularly good passage to demonstrate that the unending rivalry between the two opposed groups Devas and Asuras so characteristic of middle Vedic literature cannot be backprojected into the core RV, since Mitra and Varuṇa are called simultaneously *devā́v ásurā*.

The phrase 'grandson of strength' (*śávaso nápāt-*) is used a number of times of the Ṛbhus (I.161.14, IV.34.6, 35.1, 8, 37.4) and only here of other divinities. It seems based on the more common *śávasas páti-* (I.131.4, IV.47.3, V.6.9, etc.), with *(ná)pāt-* echoing *pát(i-)*.

VIII.25.5–6: The usual problem with (-)*dānu-*: 'gift' or 'drop' or both? In this case the first cmpd member *sṛpra-* 'fatty, luscious' and the dwelling "in the house of refreshment" (in vs. 5), and the refreshments and rains (in vs. 6), favor 'drop',

though both Ge and Re opt for ‘gift’ (Ge with an outdated rendering of *sṛprá-* as ‘ausgedehnt’). On *sṛprá-* see comm. ad I.96.3.

VIII.25.7: “your herds” of the publ. tr. should rather be “their herds.”

VIII.25.8–9: Both these verses have a subject / VP construction that’s an etymological figure: 8c … *kṣatríyā kṣatrám āśatuḥ*, 9c … *nicirā́ ní cikyatuḥ*. The latter is reinforced phonologically by the pāda-opening *ní cin miṣántā*. The unusual tmesis of preverb and participle, interrupted by the particle *cid*, may be (partly) accounted for by the desire to produce a *ni ci-* sequence matching the two that follow in that pāda.

VIII.25.10–12: This tṛca takes a break from Mitra and Varuṇa, introducing a somewhat random collection of other protective divinities. See also vs. 14.

VIII.25.11: The lexeme *ní √sac* is found only here in the RV and indeed, judging from MonWms, in all of Sanskrit. I consider the *ní* here intrusive, having crept in from passsages like VII.38.3 *víśvebhiḥ pātu pāyúbhir ní sūrîn*. The lexeme *ní √pā* is fairly well attested, and so I think *ní* has, as it were, hitched a ride on *pāyúbhiḥ*, which is ordinarily found with a form of the cognate verb as in the just cited passage. The insistent *ní*’s of 11c may also have played a part.

VIII.25.12: A verb needs to be supplied for ab to be a clause. On the basis of *śrudhí* in c, I supply ‘sing’, but any verb of service to a divinity that takes a dative would work. Ge “serve” (dienen), Re, somewhat more elaborately “apportons notre prière.” Ideally we would supply *sacemahi* on the basis of *áriṣyantaḥ … sacemahi* in 11c, but *√sac* doesn’t accommodate this case frame. (The few exx. with dat. given by Gr are to be explained otherwise.)

VIII.25.13: Alliteration in the etymological figure *vā́ryaṃ vṛṇīmahe, váriṣṭham*, anticipating *váruṇaḥ* in c.

VIII.25.14: In the publ. tr. I supply “let … grant,” flg. Ge, Re, Klein (DGRV I.403). But I would now change that to “protect,” assuming that the *tád* + divinities in the nom. simply continues the rel. cl. in 13c *mitró yát pā́nti …*

VIII.25.15: The standard interpr. take *bhū́rṇayaḥ* with the frame (Ge “diese eifrigen Herren”), but its position at the end of the verse, far from its supposed NP leads me to put it in the simile. (Sim. Re.) Passages like IX.17.1 … *iva síndhavo, ghnánto vṛtrā́ṇi bhū́rṇayaḥ* “like turbulent rivers … smashing obstacles” give support to this assignment. The simile then consists of a nom. + acc. matching those of the frame. It might be objected that rivers don’t strike against their own surge, but the image may be of fast water catching up with itself and overtopping a wave.

VIII.25.16: *itthā́* is not sufficiently represented in the publ. tr. I would now insert "just so" after "the many."

ánu … carāmasi could also be subjunctive (so Ge), "we shall proceed," though the undoubted indicative *ánu … saścima* in the parallel phrase in 17ab supports an indicative interpr. here.

VIII.25.17: Flg. Kü I take the pf. of √*sac* as presential in value.

sāmrājyásya is in the same position as *sā́mrājyāya* 'sovereign kingship' in 8b but differently accented. The form here must be an adj. 'related to sovereign kingship'. This makes sense: its referent, the Sun, is not a sovereign king himself, but associated, as their eye and spy, with Mitra and Varuṇa, who are.

The form of *dīrghaśrút* is problematic. It appears to be a nom. sg., but the subj. of this sentence is plural ("we"). Gr takes it as a neut. pl. modifying *vratā́*, as do Ge (without comment) and Re; Scar identifies it as a neut. pl. but with a query. AiG III.65–66 suggests that it follows the model of short neut. plural forms that are identical to the neut. singular belonging to other stems (type *nā́ma* 'name(s)'). I think we can sympathize with the plight of a poet who's trying to figure out how to make a neut. pl. out of a root noun ending in *-t*: it's simply impossible. In VII.16.8 we get *śárma dīrghaśrút*#. Since *śárma* there could technically be plural (and there were presumbly other such expressions with neut. n-stems, etc.), it's not hard to see the poet assuming, rightly or wrongly, that *-śrút* can be a neut. pl. Old also adduces VIII.61.2 *vípro mánmāni dīrghaśrút*, where the adj. modifies nom. sg. *vípraḥ* but could be interpr. as going with *mánmāni*.

VIII.25.18: I would now substitute 'limits' or 'boundaries' for 'ends' in tr. *ántān*.

VIII.25.20: On *dīrghápraṣadman-*, see comm. ad VIII.10.1.

I don't quite understand "non-poisonous food": is this an understated way of referring to good food, or is it a real fear? In VI.39.5 we call upon the king (Indra or Soma) to give (√*rā*) non-poisonous plants. I also don't understand the use of *hí* here, since c does not seem to be the cause or grounds for ab, but rather a parallel clause.

VIII.25.21: This is presumably the speech referred to in vs. 20 that controls good things.

VIII.25.23: This vs. is puzzling, in part because the identity "these two" (*tā́*) is not clear nor is the sense of *nitóśana-* + GEN. The lexeme *ní* √*tuś* means 'overflow with, spill down' with an acc. of the largesse so spilled. See, e.g., IX.63.23 *ní tośase rayím* "You (soma) spill down wealth" (cf. IV.38.1, VIII.54.8). I take the genitives here as objective gens., corresponding to the acc. in the VP. Since both *áśvyānām* and *hárīṇaṃ* refer to horses, we might want the two that are overflowing with them to be the human (or possibly divine) givers. This is possible, if we take them as the two patrons who give horses in 22ab (and not the one who gives a chariot in 22c). Or it could be a reference to Mitra and Varuṇa (so Re). But du. *nṛvā́hasā* 'carrying men'

in 23c and *vājínāv árvantā* "prize-winning chargers" in 24c must surely be horses (probably the silvery and silver horses of 22ab), and this suggests that the duals earlier in vs. 23 should have the same referent. This is Ge's solution, and he considers this expression shorthand for saying that the two horses given are worth as much as a whole herd of horses. This may be correct, but it is a bit difficult to wring it from the text.

kṛ́tvya- 'effective, getting results' is several times used of horses (VI.2.8, IX.46.1, IX.101.2), and in this context that should be the default interpr. as well.

VIII.25.24: With Old I take *víprā* as instr. sg. fem. with *matî*, contra Ge's voc. pl. See I.82.2.

VIII.26 Aśvins and Vāyu

VIII.26.2: *mahé táne* 'for great extension' presumably refers to his extending his lineage.

VIII.26.3: *havāmahe havyébhiḥ* "we call with oblations" is a word play between the the roots √*hu* 'pour, libate' and √*hū/hvā* 'call' and economically refers to the two complementary aspects of Vedic sacrifice, the verbal and the material. It is the mirror image of the trope 'pour prayers'.

iṣáyantau can belong either to trans. *iṣáyati* to √*iṣ* 'send' (so Gr, Lub) or intrans. *iṣáyati* 'prosper'. I tentatively opt for the latter, with a cognate acc. of respect, *iṣáḥ*, hence "prosper, become refreshed with respect to refreshments." It is not entirely clear to me which affiliation is represented by Ge's "spenden" (probably 'send'?) or Re's "sécrétant à titre de jouissance" (probably 'prosper'?).

I suggest that *áti kṣapáḥ* "beyond the nights" refers to the Atirātra soma ("overnight soma") offered to the Aśvins the morning after, as it were.

VIII.26.8: This vs. is somewhat curiously constructed. It contains, probably, a du. dvandva whose 2nd member is itself dual: *índra-nāsatyā* 'o Indra and the two Nāsatyas'. Since the form is in the voc. it is actually impossible to determine if it is in fact a dual dvandva or two separate vocc., *índra nāsatyā*, sg. and du. (Although in most dual dvandvas the first member also has dual inflection (type *índrā-váruṇā*), see *indra-vāyū́*, with stem form in the first member and a single 2nd member accent; its voc. is *índra-vāyū*, which would match the template found here. In any case, the verb is dual (*gatam*), and the rest of the verse (pāda c) is couched in the dual. This either means that Indra is being ignored (which is possible, since the hymn is dedicated to the Aśvins) or that the dual dvandva *índra-nāsatyā* is being treated as if it contained two entities, rather than one+two (which is also possible). For another number mismatch, see vs. 11.

VIII.26.9: *vayám … ukṣaṇyánto vyaśvavát* is a play on words. *ukṣanyántaḥ* is read doubly, in one sense in the frame ('seeking bulls') and another in the simile ('seeking

Ukṣan'). Unusually the simile is conveyed by *-vát*. On the poet Vyaśva seeking his patron Ukṣan, see VIII.23.16 *vyàśvaḥ … ukṣaṇyúḥ*, where *ukṣaṇyúḥ* can also be read as a pun.

VIII.26.11: Pāda c *sajóṣasā váruṇo mitró aryamā́* "the two of one accord (and) V, M, A" is reminiscent of the number disharmony in vs. 8. It can be seen as a syntactic blend of 8c *devā́ devébhiḥ … sacánastamā* "the two gods joined with the gods" and a putative plural *sajóṣasaḥ* that includes the Aśvins with the other gods mentioned.

VIII.26.12: I take *sūríbhiḥ* as an instr. of accompaniment "for me along with my patrons," but Ge's view, that the patrons are the middlemen distributing the goods, is possible: "do your best for me by means of / through my patrons."

VIII.26.13: I take the referent of ab to be Agni. Cf. III.3.5 *táviṣībhir ā́vṛtam* 'swathed with [=in] his powers"; given Agni's ritual role it makes sense for him to be swathed in sacrifices. Making a god the referent avoids the role reversal Re notes in *saparyántā*, with (in his view) the gods serving humans rather than the usual situation -- though he then tr. *śubhé cakrāte* as reflexive or self-involved: "ils se sont fait (pour eux-mêmes une parure -- contrapartie de b)," rather than supplying a human object. But surely it is better (with Ge) to supply as obj. of *śubhé cakrāte* the being referred to in the relative clause of ab.

VIII.26.14: With Ge I take ab as a continuation of vs. 13, still with Agni as referent. Agni is regularly called *cikitvā́n*, to the same stem as *cíketati* here. Clearly *vartíḥ* 'circuit' is to be supplied as object; it not only appears in pāda c but also in 15b, where it is modified by *nṛpā́yyam* as here.

VIII.26.15: *viṣudrúheva* (that is, *ā*+*iva*) is quite problematic. Ge refuses to tr., as does Scar (245–46), though by classing it with *-druh*-compounds, he indicates a root affiliation. Acdg. to Re, it's the equivalent of **druhó viśuvṛ́t* "opposé au Mal" or "qui met le Mal en déroute"; somewhat sim. Kü 484 "Wie die nach verschiedenen Seiten Trügenden (?)." What all these suggestions have in common is the assumption that the 2nd member belong to √*druh* 'deceive'. I suggest a different analysis, *viṣud-rúh-*, where the 2nd member is the root noun to √*ruh* 'mount', and the first (*viṣud-*) is a deformed version of the already deformed adverb *viṣvadryàk* 'facing in different directions', with the complex adverbial suffix found also in *asmadryàk* 'facing towards us'. The empty *-d-* (*/-t-)* has been suffixed to the combining form *viṣu-* (*/viṣū*) underlying the adjective *víṣvañc-* 'facing in different directions'. For the suggested phrase, cf. IX.75.1 *ráthaṃ víṣvañcam aruhat* "he mounted the chariot that faces in different directons" (with √*ruh*) and, with √*yuh* and horses not chariot, VI.59.5 *víṣūco áśvān yuyujānā́ īyate*; X.79.7 *víṣūco áśvān yuyuje vaneja̍ḥ*.

VIII.26.16: The publ. tr. does not make sufficient clear that the messenger (*dūtáḥ*) is our praise song, not "you."

VIII.26.17: The *íd* of c surely limits *me*, but has been displaced to the left into Wackernagel's position; "just listen to me" is less likely.

VIII.26.18: I don't understand what the Sindhu is doing here. Is it a third place (besides the two in 17ab) where the Aśvins might find exhilaration? Or is it a metaphor for the "good praise" and/or "bright insight" (both fem., as *síndhu-* is) in vs. 19? The agreements in vocabulary, *śveta-* and the *–yāvan/r-ī* cmpds, speak for the latter, but the former makes more sense to me.

VIII.26.20: As often, *hí* + IMPV marks the action of the *hí* clause as the grounds for the subsequent clause (in this case c, as b is presumably parallel with a).

VIII.26.22: *rāyá(ḥ)* can be both gen. sg. and acc. pl., the former to be construed with *ī́śānam*, the latter with *īmahe*, between which it is positioned. So already Old.

VIII.26.24: I do not think that Vāyu is being compared directly to the pressing stone, but rather than we call on Vāyu as we call on the pressing stone. Unfortunately this attenuates the force of the simile, but the various suggestions (Old, Ge, Re) as to why Vāyu is like a horse-backed stone are so convoluted that I find them difficult to accept. The stone may be called horse-backed for two reasons: first, since the stones are also called *sóma-pṛṣtha-* (VIII.63.2) and soma is commonly identified as a horse, the identification has been transferred. It may also be that it also means 'having the back of a horse', that is, bowed or made for carrying.

VIII.26.25: Ge takes *apáḥ* for *ápaḥ* 'work', but this seems arbitrary. I tr. it as the acc. pl. 'waters' it appears to be.

VIII.27 All Gods

VIII.27.1: I take both *ukthé* and *adhvaré* as functional loc. absolutes. Cf. *śasyámāna ukthé* (VI.23.1, also IV.20.10, X.45.10), *prayaty ádhvaré* (I.16.3 [=VIII.3.5], V.28.6 [=VIII.71.12], etc.). The latter expression appears as a full phrase in 3a *prá sú na etv adhvaráḥ*.

VIII.27.2: *uṣā́sā náktam* is a curious variant of the dual dvandva *uṣā́sā-náktā*, occurring only here. Old suggests that it is an ex. of a singular 2nd member following a dual in the 1st (cf. AiG II.1.154), which seems a description not an explanation. I think two factors entered into its creation: on the one hand, all forms of *uṣā́sā-náktā* precede a consonant; here that form would be in hiatus with vowel-initial *óṣadhīḥ*. (Acdg. to Old, BR think that the original form was in fact *náktā*, but it was altered to avoid hiatus.) But all forms of *uṣā́sā-náktā* are also initial in trimeter verse, where a heavy fifth syllable is fine. But this is dimeter verse, and a heavy fifth syllable would produce a bad cadence; light *-am* ∀ allows an iambic cadence.

Here and elsewhere through the hymn I render *viśvávedas-* as 'affording all possessions', not 'possessing all knowledge', because it is usually found in the context of the gods' generosity.

VIII.27.6: The syntax of ab is oddly muddled for what seems on the surface a banal sentiment. The problem is the position of the relative and its relationship both to the *priyā́* earlier in the verse and accented verb *prayāthána* later. The key, I think, is neut. pl. *áśvyā* 'equine'. Contra Ge I don't think that it should be construed with *havyā́* (equine oblations) as a reference to the Aśvamedha -- an interpr. that Re rightly calls "adventurous." The stem *áśvya-*, esp. in the neut. pl., is generally used of gifts (*rā́dhas-*, *maghá-*) consisting of horses that gods (or patrons) give to mortals (e.g., VII.16.10 *yé rā́dhāṃsi dádaty áśvyā maghā́*), whereas *havyā́* are of course oblations given by mortals to gods. I think we therefore must reckon with two different constructions in this hemistich, which accounts for the fractured word order. On the one hand I see a nominal clause (or rather a nominal clause whose subject is itself a relative clause): "which equine gifts are yours (i.e., come from you), (they) are dear (to us)." On the other, the same predicate *priyā́* has as subject a full rel. clause whose verb is *prayāthána*: "which oblations you drive to, (they) are dear to you." The *vaḥ* is used both as a genitive (in the first construction) and as a dative (in the second). Unfortunately it is wrongly placed in the relative clause for this second interpr., but I can only imagine that the poet allowed this small breach to avoid doubling the *vaḥ*, or rather that the dative could be integrated into the rel. cl.: "which oblations for you you drive to, they are dear." Note that two different entities are dear to two different groups of beings. I have not yet solved the problem of *abhí*, however. Re's interpr. requires *prá √yā* to be transitive and also intermingles the main and relative clauses in an illegitimate way and should be rejected: "Di(riger) vers (nos) oblations les chères troupes de chevaux que vous mettez en marche."

Ge takes *turā́ náraḥ* as a qualifier of the immediately following Ādityas. Although both *turá-* and *nṛ́-* can sometimes apply to the Ādityas, they are more frequently used of the Maruts, who are somewhat dominant in this part of the hymn (1c, 3d, 5c, 6a, 8a).

VIII.27.11: On *ánʲyām* see comm. ad VIII.1.10.

VIII.27.15: I assume that Aryaman is tacitly included with Mitra and Varuṇa in c, given the *vaḥ* in d (and a). In the phrase *varuṇa mitra mártʲyam*, trisyllabic *mártʲyam* is a sort of scrambling of Aryaman.

On the bad cadence produced by *ávidhat*, see (despairing) remarks ad II.1.7.

VIII.27.16: *prá prajā́bhir jāyate* is a nice figure in which *prá* doubles the first part of the cmpd. and *jāyate* the second.

dhármaṇas pári receives quite varied interpr. I take it as a spatial metaphor: the fortunate pious man is propagated through his progeny "from his foundation," that is, starting from himself and spreading out by children and grandchildren (etc.).

VIII.27.18: The 2nd hemistich presents some niggling syntactic and lexical problems. To start with the latter, by most interpr. *ásredhantī* is transitive (Ge "ohne Schaden anzurichten," Re "sans causer de nuisance"). But the verb to which this negated participle belongs is consistently intransitive, meaning 'fail', not 'cause to fail', and though Gr glosses *ásredhant-* (and related stems) as transitive 'nicht schädigend', hence 'heilsam', all passages are compatible with intransitive 'unfailing, unfaltering'. Although in this particular case 'not harming' might be tempting, the point here must be that the missile should go to destruction without pause or deviation in its trajectory.

I am disturbed by the pleonastic pāda-final *sā́*, doubling initial *eṣā́*, as well as what looks like a self-contained clausette in which it is found: *paró nú sā́*. Neither Ge nor Re takes any notice of the oddly constructed c pāda; Ge takes c and d as independent clauses, while Re treats cd as a unified clause. My tr. tries to mirror the construction by taking *asmāt … paró nú sā́* as a parenthetical. I remain concerned about two things: 1) This is the only passage in which *paráḥ* seems to mean 'far from'; other passages containing *paráḥ* + ABL. mean 'beyond, other than' (see also the 1st verse of the next hymn, VIII.28.1, with *paráḥ* 'beyond' without abl.). However, 'far from X' and 'beyond X' are close enough semantically to allay my concerns, and in fact a tr. "it is now beyond him" would work fine. 2) I do not like the position of *asmāt*, but I must assume that it was extracted from the *paró nú sā́* clausette in order to conform to the pattern set in pāda a: x x *cid asmai* matched by c: x x *cid asmāt*.

I have reluctantly rendered *cid* in c as 'also' (so also Ge), though it does not match the two *cid*s in a and b ('even') because I cannot make 'even' work. (I suppose "even this missile …" is possible, but it is not favored.)

VIII.27.20: Most interpr. take *mádhya ā́* as indicating "in the midst (of the shelter)" (*chárdiḥ*, of pāda b). This is certainly possible, though I weakly prefer my own rendering.

VIII.27.21: The hapax *ātúc-* is difficult. See EWA s.v. Mostly for contextual reasons it is generally taken as referring to evening or night, and it has been connected to *tvác-* 'skin', with the sense of 'covering over'. I have followed this interpr., though with full awareness of how fragile it is. For one thing 'cover as if with skin' (which must be the presumed semantic channel, one way or another) is not an altogether compelling way to get to 'evening'. For another, *tvác-* 'skin' has no zero-grade forms. Scar (182–83) discusses several possibilities. Besides the 'covering' hypothesis, he suggests, citing Schindler and Kü, that *tvác-* may belong with a root √**tu̯ek* 'sichtbar werden' to which *ātúc-* could also belong, and that *ātúc-* might better be taken as an adj. with *madhámdini* "when midday is clearly visible." He is less disturbed than I am that this would leave the verse without a third temporal period; furthermore, given that midday is the most "clearly visible" of the three standard time periods, it seems unnecessary to mark it as such. Another problem with *ātúc-* is that one is reluctant to separate it from the dat. *tucé* "for progeny" in 14c. However, it is

difficult to connect them and still maintain sensible semantics in our verse. Scar makes a creative attempt: evening is the time when one goes back to one's children, so 'zu den Kindern hin' becomes 'Rückkehr nach Hause'. I admire the ingenuity but I think the unlikeliness speaks for itself.

VIII.28 All Gods

VIII.28.1: Ge unaccountably takes injunctive *vidán* as modal: "Die sollen wirklich (etwas) vorfinden," but *asanan* (flg. Pp.) as preterital. As Old points out, however, the latter need not be augmented (with Pp.) but represent *dvitā́ sanan* with an injunctive, a reading favored by the apparent parallelism with *vidán*. I follow the injunctive reading, but take both *vidán* and *sanan* as preterital. I also don't think that an object should be supplied with either of these verbs, contra Ge ("etwas," which he further specifies in n. 1 as "die Opferspenden") and Re ("un trésor pour l'Homme"). The absence of objects with two verbs that are standardly transitive must be deliberate. Note the absolute use of *vindate* in VIII.27.17.

VIII.28.2: The Gift Escorts (*rā́ti-ṣā́c-*) are rather shadowy divine figures. In II.1.13 they escort (*saścire*) Agni at the ceremonies, a situation that may be reflected here. Otherwise they mostly show up in All God hymns (esp. a run of them in VII) as fairly uncharacterized minor divinities. See Scar 593.

In III.6.9 Agni is urged to bring the 33 gods (see our 1a) to the sacrifice along with their wives (*pátnīvant-* as here), a ritual situation that can link our vss. 1–2.

VIII.28.3: Ge hesitates between cardinal points and relative directions ("behind, above," etc.), but cardinal points are most likely better because they provide totalizing protection, which is then summed up by *sárvayā viśā́*.

VIII.29 All Gods

On the intricate structure of this hymn see publ. intro. and my *Rigveda between Two Worlds* (75–77).

VIII.29.1: The description given is apt for Soma. The soma twigs start out brown, but when they are pressed, the golden juice comes out and, as it were, anoints them.

VIII.29.2: This vs. depicts in fairly straightforward terms the installation of Agni on the ritual hearth.

VIII.29.3: Tvaṣṭar as referent of this verse is not so clear as some of the others, but in his capacity as "shaper" and with his secondary association with the root √*takṣ* 'hew, carve, build', it makes sense for him to have the axe as his emblem. The pairing with the next verse, clearly of Indra, may also make sense, since by many accounts Tvaṣṭar is Indra's father. Oberlies (Relig. I.336) claims that this has to do with battles

over settling places, which must first be made habitable by felling and burning trees, but I think this reads too much into the passage.

VIII.29.5: On *jálāṣa-* see comm. ad I.43.4.

The 2nd pāda has 10 syllables rather than the expected 8. Unfortunately deleting the somewhat pleonastic *jálāṣa* will not work because of its syllable count. It would be possible to delete either of the first two adjectives -- *śúcir ugráḥ* -- but I see no justification for that. It could be noted, however, that the other occurrence of *jálāṣabheṣaja-* is found at the end of an 8-syllable pāda, preceded only by *rudrám* (I.43.4).

VIII.29.6: Ge tr. *pīpāya* as 'bewacht' and assigns it to √*pā* 'protect' (via a byform √*pi*), because he finds "swell the paths" semantically difficult. But 'swell' in the RV universe of discourse is associated with prosperity and abundance, and swelling the paths can simply refer to making them productive and full of the treasure mentioned in the 2nd pāda. Since Pūṣan, the referent of this verse, ensures that livestock finds its way home, is associated with paths, and is called "lord of the path" (VI.53.1 *pathas pate*), the metaphorical expression "swell the paths" makes sense as a description of his activities.

What may have tipped the balance for Ge is the simile in this pāda, "like a thief," for it hard to explain how a thief would "swell the paths" -- whereas keeping a close watch on the path (as a semantic extension of 'protect, guard') is something a thief, or highwayman, would naturally do. Old is forced to suggest that the thief makes the paths prosperous for himself in his own way, presumably by robbing people who are traveling on them (sim. Re). But there is a simple solution to the simile problem: take it with the 2nd pāda as I have done (sim. Macd., Maurer). Although up to this point in the hymn, pāda boundaries coincide with syntactic boundaries, the poet is starting to shake up the structure, which has been quite static so far, and breaching the pāda break is his first step. Bolder moves follow in the next vss.

VIII.29.8: I do not understand the apparently tautological 2nd pāda, *prá pravāséva vasataḥ*, with the same type of double etymological figure as in VIII.27.16. Renderings like Old's "wie Reisende reisen sie" (sim. Ge, Re) are literally correct but give no hint as to what the simile is conveying. There must be some wordplay here, perhaps an astronomical reference? In later Skt. *prá* √*vas* can refer to exile or banishment, and already in RV III.7.3 the causative means 'cause to live apart, banish'; in II.28.6 the poet expresses the hope that we won't have to go to *pravasathā̆ni* 'foreign dwellings' and in VIII.60.19 Agni is a house-lord *áproṣivān* 'who doesn't go abroad' (or, I suppose, just out of the house). Assuming that this meaning is also operative in *pravāsá-* accounts for my "like exiles."

VIII.30 All Gods

For the rhetorical distance between vss. 1 and 2 see publ. intro.

VIII.30.1: The *-ka-* suffix on *arbhaká-* and *kumāraká-* mark these words as belonging to a lower register than normal Rigvedic discourse.

VIII.30.2: As indicated in the publ. intro. I take the introductory *íti* here as a mark that the preceding vs. is the quoted praise referred to by *iti stutā́so asathā* "thus shall you be praised." Re comments that this is a relatively rare passage with *íti* not close to direct speech. But my interpr. avoids that.

The 33, the (or a) canonical number of gods, were mentioned in a nearby hymn by the same poet, VIII.28.1.

VIII.30.4: Ge takes *víśve vaiśvānarā́ utá* as "and all the Vaiśvānaras" (so also Klein, DGRV), but it is the gods who are *vaiśvānará-*, as Ge clearly states in his n. 4b. (Interestingly, this is the only pl. form of this stem, which otherwise, save for one passage [IX.61.16, referring to light], is used only of Agni.) The terms that are being conjoined are *ihá* 'here' and 'belonging to all men', not gods and Vaiśvānaras; the point is that they are here and available to us because they belong to all of us. There is also complementary contrast between "all gods" and "(belonging) to all men," and the *víśve* of the former phrase has been postponed so that it can adjoin the latter: *devāsaḥ …, víśve vaiśvānarā́ḥ.*

VIII.31 Yajamāna and patnī, etc.

VIII.31.2: The word order of c is slightly skewed. All things being equal, forms of the *sá*/*tám* pronoun, esp. in correlative usage, tend to take 1st position in the pāda/clause. This expectation is reinforced here by 2nd position *íd* 'just, only', which really should limit *tám* (as my tr. reflects), but the verb *pā́t* seems to have displaced the pronoun to the right of *íd*.

VIII.31.5: As noted in the publ. intro., vss. 1–4 and 5–9 present loosely parallel treatments of the rewards of sacrifice, with 1–4 applying to the sacrificer alone and 5–9 to the sacrificer and his wife. In this vs. *sunutáḥ* (5b) reprises *sunávat* of 1b, and the structure of those two b pādas are roughly the same: *sunávac ca pácāti ca* and *sunutá ā́ ca dhā́vataḥ*, with two ritual verbs conjoined by *ca*(s). The *nítyāśirā* 'with its own proper milk-mixture' referring to soma echoes *sómam … āśíram* in 2b.

VIII.31.6: *prāśavyā́n* has been subject to various analyses. Sāy suggests 'nourishment', which is tentatively accepted by Re. Ge tr. "die für die Pünktlichen bestimmten (Belohnungen)" without comment, leaving it unclear (at least to me) even what root he assigns it to. With Old (also EWA s.v. *ŚĀV*^{I}, Hoffmann apud Gotō 304 n. 723, Scar 539–40), I take it to the root √*śū* 'swell' and connect it to the root noun compd *prāśū́-* in the following hymn (though attributed to a different poet), VIII.32.16. (Contra Re explicitly.) In both passages the lexeme seems to have a negative connotation, 'swollen (with pride), puffed up'. Here the sacrificing married

couple successfully ‘go up against’ (*práti √i*), that is, compete with, these puffed-up rivals. The passage reminds us of the Agastya and Lopāmudrā hymn, I.179.3 … *víśvā spṛ́dho abhy àśnavāva / … yát samyáñcā mithunā́v abhyájāva* “Let us two take on all contenders … when as a united couple we will drive on,” depicting another sacrificing pair competing with rivals. Our vs. and I.179.3 contain the only two masc. du. *samyáñcā* in the RV. The triumph over hostile rivals is also expressed in the parallel section of this hymn (vss. 1–4) in 3c *víśvā vanvánn amitríyā* “winning all (the things) of the enemy.”

VIII.31.7: *vivāsataḥ* ‘the two seek to win’ is matched in the parallel by 3c *vanván* ‘winning’.

VIII.31.8: *putríṇā … kumāríṇā* “possessing sons, possessing children” expands on *prajā́vatī* ‘possessing offspring’ in the parallel, 4a.

VIII.31.9: With Ge and Re, I take pāda c as referring to sex, though in a devotional context (Ge: “Kinderzeugung als verdienstliches Werk”). The point of the Agastya and Lopāmudrā hymn I.179, already cited ad vs. 6, is of course that ascetic practice must yield to sex as a duty even for the very devout.

VIII.31.10: Flg. Ge, I take *svastí sarvadhā́tamaḥ* as if containing a dvandva *svasti-sarva-*. Ge convincingly cites other *svastí √dhā* passages. It might be possible to take it instead as a (short) instr.: “best establishing wholeness along with well-being,” though the status of *svastí* as an instr. seems shaky to me. Scar (264) takes it as an acc., with *sarva-* in the cmpd functioning as a predicative acc. to it: “der am besten das Glück vollständig macht.”

VIII.31.12: This vs. consisting entirely of nominals is surprisingly hard to interpret, primarily because of the unclear grammatical identity of *anarváṇaḥ* and the lack of parallelism between the animates of ab and the neut. *aneháḥ* of c.

To deal with the first problem first, beside the *-n*-stem *anarván-* we must reckon with a thematized form *anarváṇa-* (so Gr, Lub), the latter of which is attested twice as nom. sg. masculine *anarváṇaḥ* (V.51.11 [or pl?] and this passage) and once as acc. sg. masculine *anarváṇam* (X.92.14). Unfortunately all three forms immediately follow feminine singulars (*áditiḥ*, *arámatiḥ, áditim* respectively). Despite this clear pattern, I am quite reluctant to interpr the apparent masc. forms as fem., esp. in the case of the nominative forms, and have therefore contrived ad hoc fixes for those passages. Here the fix is not too difficult: the immediately following word (beginning the next pāda) is masc. *víśvaḥ*. I take this as referring to another entity who should come here, with *anarváṇaḥ* modifying it, rather than *arámatiḥ*. The referent is in fact open-ended: “every” or “any” one with the mind of a god. Note the evocation of the All Gods through the phrase *víśvo devásya*, though the words are in different cases.

Although this will work, on reexamining the evidence I am not at all sure that it is worth denying the apparent pattern of feminine reference with this stem, and I might substitute (with Ge) "Aramati, the unassailing one," though in this passage that leaves masc. *víśvaḥ* orphaned. Both Old (ad V.51.11; see his careful disc. there) and Re in their different ways take *anarváṇaḥ* here as a nom. pl., but the nom. pl. to the athem. stem is *anarvāṇaḥ*, and in this passage the immediately following sg. *víśvaḥ* makes further trouble.

As for *aneháḥ*, Ge and Re supply 'protection' (Ge "der unfelhbare (Schirm) der Ādityas") on the basis of VIII.18.21, while Old (ad V.51.11) takes it as an adv. (construing *ādityā̃nām* with *víśvaḥ*), though in his comm. on this passage he rescinds this in favor of its depending on *aneháḥ* (without tr.). On the basis of I.185.3 *anehó dātrám áditer anarvám* "the faultless gift of Aditi, which is unassailable" I tentatively supply 'gift' (note the presence also of another variant stem, *anarvá-*). However, the Ge/Re solution is quite possible.

VIII.31.14: The 1st sg. *īḷe* in b does not match the nom. pl. part. *saparyántaḥ* in c. I take the pl. as including the *vaḥ*, the fellow ritualists for whom the poet invoked the god. As Ge points out, V.21.3 has *saparyántaḥ ... īḷate*, with number congruence.

VIII.31.18: A nice etymological pun in *āśv-áśvya-*.

VIII.32 Indra

VIII.32.2: Ge takes *ánarśanim* and *ahīśúvam* as PNs, in addition to *sṛ́bindum* and the familiar *píprum*. Mayrhofer (2003, *Personennamen*) is uncertain about *ánarśani-*. Scar (538–39) tr. all as PNs as well, but discusses the possible interpretations of *ahīśū́-*. On the basis of the parallel he cites in IV.16.13 *píprum mṛ́gayaṃ śūśuvā̃ṃsam* "Pipru Mṛgaya, swollen with power," with the pf. part. to √*śū*, I prefer to take *ahīśū́-* as a meaningful epithet. The question is then what the first member *ahī-* represents. Although it would be easier to identify it with *ahī́-* 'fertile cow', which matches it exactly, I prefer to take it as a metrically lengthened version of *áhi-* 'snake', which makes more sense in the designation of a demon. See Scar (loc. cit.), also EWA s.v. *ahī́-*. All four occurrences of this stem would have four short syllables if the second weren't long *ī*, but I do not otherwise have an explanation of the lengthening. But note *prāśū́-* below (16b) with the same lengthening before *śū́-*.

As for *ánarśani-* I would again prefer to give it full lexical value, relating it (as Gr does) to *ánarśa-rāti-* (VIII.99.4) 'possessing non-harmful gifts'(?), *arśasāná-* designation of another demon. See EWA s.v. *arśasāná-*. However, the root etymology (supposed √*arś/ṛś* 'harm') is not strong, and the analysis remains uncertain. If it does mean 'harmless', the adjective is used proleptically, as is not uncommon.

The name of the first demon, Sṛbindu, displays non-Indo-Aryan phonology. See Kuiper (*Aryans* 40–41).

VIII.32.3: I have nothing useful to say about the morphology of *kṛṣé*.

VIII.32.4: With Ge I supply both "bring" and "soma," though I would prefer to have more formulaic or textual support for providing this extraneous material – however, cf. II.14.8 *gábhistipūtam bharata śrutā́ya* "Bring what is purified by your hand [=soma] to the one who is famed," adduced by Ge. The preverb *práti* occurs with √*bhṛ* (see, e.g., VIII.20.9 *práti … śárdhāya mā́rutāya bharadhvam / havyā́ …*), but is not common.

tū́rṇāśa- is a hapax without etymology (though Old's literal gloss, "was dem Ueberschreitenden Verschwinden, Untergang bringt," implies √*tṝ* and √*naś*, without attempting to explain the morphology). I follow the consensus, that the word refers to a watercourse of some sort, since that makes sense in context. As often, verbal play may have had a role in its appearance here: 4b #*tū́rṇāśaṃ ná* ... is partly echoed by 5c *púraṃ ná śū́ra …* (*ūr/ur na am ś*, though not in the same order in both).

VIII.32.6: An alternative syntactic analysis of ab would take everything through *vā* in b as part of the *yádi* clause with *rāráṇaḥ* as verb, and start the main clause with *dádhase*, accented because it's clause-initial: "If you will take pleasure in my pressed (soma) or in my solemn speech, you will find delight." There are no strong arguments either way.

VIII.32.8: I do not understand Ge's tr. of *saṃrarāṇaḥ* as 'mitteilsam' (communicative, talkative) and as if it were an adjective modifying food ("bring us mitteilsam Speise…"). Kü (421) suggests that this participle means "bereitwillig, spendefreudig," implying that it is used absolutely and doesn't take an object. This certainly is possible here, but doesn't bring us to Ge's rendering. In any case, the form here (*-rarāṇaḥ* to √*rā*) echoes *rāraṇaḥ* (to √*ran*) in 6a.

VIII.32.10: *bṛbáduktha-* is a hapax and has aggressively non-Indo-Aryan phonology (not one, but two *b*'s). My rendering is adopted from Weber (1891, cited by EWA s.v. *bṛbú-*; see also s.v. *bṛbáduktha-*). The word must deliberately evoke the name and epithet *bṛhád-uktha-* but should not be emended thereto; see Old and Ge. If Weber's suggestion is correct, this may be a little joke, implying that Indra is powerful but not very good with words.

VIII.32.11: A novel construction, at least as interpreted by Ge (fld. by Klein and accepted also by me). The word *-kratu-* 'intention, resolve' is extracted from Indra's epithet *śatá-kratu-* and implicitly made object of *kṛnóti*, represented by the enclitic pronoun *īm*. See Ge's "der … hundertfach Rat weiss und ihn ausführt".

VIII.32.12: A similar type of construction as the immediately preceding verse, though the connection between epithet and its dynamic manifestation is clearer: the epithet *śakráḥ* 'able' is transformed into the verb *śakat* 'he will be able'. For an almost identical construction see I.10.6 and discussion there.

In both 11 and 12 I take *cid* as marking the epithet to be transformed, though in 11a it is displaced to the left.

Ge interprets the hapax *antarābharáṣ* as "der zwischen den Kämpfen steht," presuming an analysis *antarā-bharáṣ*, rejected by Old, who favors the Pp *antara-ābharáṣ*. This fits the context better.

VIII.32.14: Ge takes *máhi sthirám* as the neut. obj. of *āyantā́ram*, supplying 'bow': "Der den grossen starken (Bogen) spannt." There are several objections to this. First, it's *ā́ √tan*, not *ā́ √yam*, that is the standard idiom for stretching or spanning the bow, including in the passages he cites as parallels. Moreover, suffix-accented *-tár-* stems (like *āyantár-* here) ordinarily govern the genitive not the accusative, and although this rule is often violated, the fact that *niyantár-* in the following verse (15), an agent noun to the same root, does take the genitive makes it unlikely that this one would take an accusative. I therefore take *sthirám* as a modifier of Indra (as in the next hymn, VIII.33.9, and elsewhere) and *máhi* as adverbial. *āyantár-* here is best interpreted in the context of *ā́ yachantu* in 23b below.

VIII.32.16: On *prāśū́-* see Scar (539–40) and vs. 2 above, as well as comm. ad VIII.31.6.

This verse is oddly couched as an impersonal. Ge's interpretation of it is conventional: the humans have fulfilled their obligation (*ṛṇám*) to the god and he correspondingly fulfills his to them. But the curiously detached affect of the expression gives me pause, and the temporal relations between ab and c are backwards for this interpretation: *nūnám* 'now' situates the first two pādas temporally after the action of the third, whose verb is the perfect *pape*, and the perfect of *√pā* is generally preterital. I therefore interpret the verse quite differently from Ge. I take the debt to be Indra's, what he owes to the human worshippers who praise and press soma for him. But he has preemptatively fulfilled it: his soma-drinking is always accompanied by his gift. The reason for the indirect and impersonal expression is to avoid saying directly that Indra could owe a debt to humans. This interpretation requires taking the genitives in ab as quasi-datives, but this is quite common.

On *apratā́* see Old.

VIII.32.17: The loc. *pánye* as beneficiary/target of the verbs *√gā* 'sing' and *√śaṃs* 'recite' is peculiar: these verbs generally take the dative or, esp. with certain preverbs, the accusative. But loc. *pánya* in sandhi matches the nominative *pánya* in sandhi (that is, underlying *pányaḥ*) that begins the next verse (18a), and this match accounts for the unusual case usage. A small, but telling, example of how rhetorical motivations can override strictly grammatical issues.

VIII.32.18: The intensive (that is, iterative-frequentative) *dardirat* is appropriate to the multiple objects implied.

VIII.32.20: The curious term *svádhainava-* appears to mean 'having its own milk/milk-cows', with vṛddhi of *dhenú-* (see AiG II.2.114). It echoes *svadhā́ ánu* in 19a, and, as often, this echo may help account for its deployment here. Its referent is presumably soma-pressings or soma-drinks.

The relation between pāda a and the relative clauses of bc is, at best, "improper." That is, the two singular forms *yáḥ* in b and c must have as their (rough) antecedent the gen. plural of pāda a referring to the pressings/drinks.

VIII.32.22: I take *áti* only with b: Indra is not supposed to pass *over* the three realms, but through them on his way to us. It is only the (other) peoples he is to pass over.

VIII.32.23: Pāda a plays on the ambiguity of *raśmí-*, both 'ray' and 'rein'.

Although the simile in c seems to match the frame in b in case (nom. *gíraḥ* / *ā́paḥ*, acc. *tvā* / *nimnám*), there is a functional mismatch: the waters are not guiding the deep as the songs are guiding Indra. It therefore seems best to take *ā́paḥ* as one of the occasional examples of nom. for acc. in this stem, corresponding to *tvā* in the frame, with *nimnám* a further specification of goal. Ge clearly recognizes the problem and supplies a verb for the simile in c, "wie die Gewässer … (fliessen)," but this violates the structure of the RVic simile.

VIII.32.24: The *hí* in the first imperative clause provides the logical basis for the second one. See Brereton 2012.

VIII.32.26: On *ṛ́cīṣama-* see I.61.1.

As in 2b *ahīśúvam* may be a PN, but I prefer to take it with lexical value. The same problem is encountered with *aurṇavābhá-*. Arbuda, however, is a known enemy of Indra, but this episode, with snow as the weapon, is otherwise unknown. Note again the non-Indo-Āryan phonology.

The return of the theme of Indra's smashing named enemies from vs. 2 suggests a ring, and the fact that the following verses (27–28) sketch a ring with vs. 1 strengthens this impression.

VIII.32.27: The "who lays low" of the publ. tr. might be better "who lays (enemies [vel sim.]) low," to make clear that a transitive sense is required.

VIII.32.27–28: These two verses form a sort of ring with vs. 1. There *gā́thayā / máde sómasya vocata* "with a song proclaim … in the exhilaration of soma"; here *bráhma gāyata* // … *sómasya máde* "sing a formulation … in the exhilaration of soma."

VIII.33 Indra

VIII.33.1: This verse has at least one clear subject (*vayám* 'we' in a) and one clear verb (3rd pl. *pári* … *āsate* 'sit around' in d), but they do not match grammatically. There are (at least) two solutions: either to supply a 1st ps verb with ab (or abc) (so

Ge) or to assume a modulation from 1st ps to 3rd ps. because of the nom. pl. *stotāraḥ* 'praisers' in d, which, by this interpretation, would be in apposition to *vayám*. (Ge acknowledges this possibility in his n.) Despite the awkwardness I prefer the second option, in part because there is no obvious verb to supply, though I admit that Ge's "anbrausen" (√*svar*) is possible, given *sváranti* opening vs. 2 and the parallels he cites in his n. for singers and waters as subjects of √*svar*.

The other problem is the application of the simile "like waters" in b. It is not immediately clear why we are like waters. I would like to connect the simile to the phrase *pavítrasya prasrávaneṣu* in c and suggest that the waters go in circles at this outpouring just as we take our seats in a circle. It is also possible that the waters are being compared to the pressings in the adjective *sutāvantaḥ* "provided with pressings, (which are) like waters."

On both difficulties in this verse, see detailed discussion by Old.

VIII.33.3: Phonetic figure in ab *dhṛṣṇav ... dhṛṣád ... darṣi*

Ge supplies "gepreisen" with the instr. *káṇvebhiḥ*. He is probably correct that the Kaṇvas are not likely to be assisting Indra in his conquests, but I still resist supplying material without a clear basis.

VIII.33.4: "Drink!" is an imperative that the poet Medhyātithi should not be addressing to himself, as opposed to "sing!" I therefore take it as the content of his song, addressed to Indra.

In d Ge takes the last two words *rátho hiraṇyáyaḥ* as a separate nominal clause "golden is his chariot." This is possible, but I think it is far more likely a phrase qualifying Indra, despite its slight oddness. Indra can be called a chariot because he comes with lots of goods, like a chariot (see, e.g., I.125.3 *vásumatā ráthena*), and also because he's "linked" (*sáṃmiślaḥ*) to the two horses, as if he were the chariot they are yoked to and pull. Moreover, starting with 4c the rest of the tṛca (4c–c) consists only of descriptions of Indra in the nominative, arranged in relative clauses. A nominal clause with a different subject would interrupt this structure.

VIII.33.5: I take the phrase *suṣavyáḥ sudákṣiṇaḥ* as referring to Indra's two horses, since it follows immediately on a hemistich (4cd) concerning those horses and his chariot. But 'sides' or 'hands' are also possible. Ge simply fails to supply a referent ("Der eine gute Linke, eine gute Rechte hat"). I.82.5 *yuktás te astu dákṣiṇa utá savyáḥ* ... supports my interpretation as horses.

VIII.33.6: The expression *śmáśruṣu śritáḥ* "embedded within his beard" is striking. It seems to be a slightly jocular expression, meaning perhaps that Indra has such a big bushy beard that it's as if he's been embedded into it -- one sees it before him.

VIII.33.7: The presupposition behind the questions of ab seems to be that Indra becomes so formidable when he drinks soma that he becomes unrecognizable. Shape-shifting of heroes under such circumstances is widespread.

VIII.33.8: I think the idea behind the simile is that elephants establish a large territory in which they wander, and that Indra has established a similarly large territory by giving to sacrificers scattered all over the map. Ge's "mit seinem Bruntsaft" ('rutting liquid') stems from an idea of Pischel's (see Old, Kl. Sch 306) connecting this passage with the later (Epic+ *dāna-* meaning elephant's rutting liquid (see EWA s.v. *dāná-*). This seems unlikely and it is hard to see how simile and frame would work together.

I have toyed with another possibility that remains tantalizing hard to realize: *dānā́* may indeed be a pun, but a different one: an instrumental both to *dānā́*, as it's taken here, and also to *dāmán-* 'rope' (whose inst. is indeed regularly *dānā́*). In this second reading *ná* would be 'not', not 'like', and *vāraṇáḥ* would be some derivative of √*vṛ* 'hold back, restrain' in addition to 'wild'. The meaning of the second reading would be "a beast not (to be) restrained by a rope," in addition to "Like a wild elephant … by his giving." The second reading would harmonize with 6a, 10b *ávṛtaḥ* 'unobstructable' and be paraphrased by the next pāda in its own verse, 8c *nákiṣ ṭvā ní yamat* "No one will restrain you." However, I have been unable to find a way to make *vāraṇá-* a plausible form of √*vṛ* in the correct sense and so have not pursued this possibility further.

VIII.33.9: At first glance it is hard to find a concessive sense for the pres. part. *sán* in pāda a, despite its usual value. Indeed Ge takes ab as an independent nominal clause and begins a new sentence in c. However, the idea may be that although Indra is very tough and primed for battle, he'll drop everything and come when we call him to the sacrifice.

The sense 'perfected' for *sáṃskṛta-* may be anachronistic; if so, 'entirely readied' or the like can substitute.

VIII.33.12: On *ṛjīpin* see comm. ad IV.26.6.

"In the waters" in the publ. tr. should be corrected to "in the rivers."

Ge and Kü (256) take *dadhanve* as transitive (Ge "… liess … laufen," Kü "… hat laufenlassen…"), but the other examples of this medial perfect are intransitive (VIII.19.1 also taken by Kü as transitive can be interpreted in the same way as this one), and the accusative can easily be a goal.

VIII.33.13: On *nā́yám* see VIII.2.28. After my reexamination of the evidence (Jamison 2013) I would now rephrase the translation of the first three pādas as "Drive here, most powerful Indra, to the somian honey to drink it, as bounteous one, all on your own," eliminating "to the landing site" and construing *áchā* with *mádhu … somyám* in the preceding pāda.

A new clause begins with *śṛṇávat* in the middle of c. Ge takes all of cd together, but the accentuation of *śṛṇávat* is unexplained in this interpretation. Moreover *áchā* is not otherwise found with √*śru* but is common with √*yā*.

VIII.33.16–19: As discussed in the publ. intro., in my view this strange pendant to the hymn is an oblique attack on what I consider a late RVic ritual innovation, the introduction of the Patnī, Sacrificer's Wife, as a required role in standard ritual. For both general discussion of this situation and some detailed consideration of passages throughout the RV, including this one, that fight this doctrinal battle, see Jamison 2011 and forthcoming a. The division of speakers, again in my view, is that the poet, who opposes the new ritual model, speaks the first (16) and last (19) verses, while 17–18 are put in the mouth of Indra, who is a proponent. These verses are extensively discussed by Old and Ge, with Old somewhat more in line with my own interpretation; I will not consistently signal my agreements and disagreements with them in what follows.

VIII.33.16: I take the disgruntled speaker to be the poet and the subject of *ráṇyati* to be a rival ritualist, who has accepted the new doctrine. The "you or me" of pāda a is rather like the English expression "the likes of you and me," meaning "ordinary people." I take the *nahí … nó* (= *ná u*) as having domain only over *táva* and *máma*, not the *anyásya* of pāda b. By my rules (Jamison 1997) *anyá-* in this position should be definite (not Ge's indefinite "oder eines anderen…"), and I take its referent to be Indra. The referent of the *yáḥ* in the rel. clause in c I again take to be Indra (that is, *anyásya*), rather than the subject of *ráṇyati*, as Ge does. The designation *vīrá-* is of course regularly applied to Indra, and "led us here" can refer both to Indra's leadership in the acquisition of new territory and to his role in introducing the ritual innovation. And Indra starts off the next verse.

VIII.33.17: Indra begins, cleverly, with concession: he admits that women's mental powers are not as strong as they should be. I take this as Indra's direct speech, even though pāda c is in the accusative (and pāda b could be), since I think such mixed constructions (X said "abc" / said that abc) are found elsewhere. However, little is lost if it is taken as indirect discourse.

VIII.33.18: In my interpretation Indra's speech continues here, and having admitted the drawbacks to employing women in the ritual, he introduces the model of the yoked pair (that is, the married couple) drawing the chariot of sacrifice, a pair that must be more or less equally matched, but with the pole of the male somewhat higher than that of the female. (Some animals are more equal than others.) The image of the sacrifice as a chariot is of course a common one, and the word *mithunā́* 'complementary pair, sexual pair' seems to me the tipoff that this is about the married couple. (Old is in general agreement.)

VIII.33.19: The poet returns in his own voice to mock the new model, by imitating in the first three pādas the speech of a mother to her little daughter, inculcating proper behavior. *kaśaplakaú* in c is a hapax, but its *-ka-* suffix suggests that it belongs to a low register (note also *pādakaú* in b) and the fact that it is in the dual limits its possible applications. Old suggests "weibl. Geschlechsteile" (though he moves on to

breasts), and the fact that keeping one's feet together keeps them from being seen makes the labia a good possibility.

The poet then unleashes a devastating insult on his addressee, a brahman – that he has turned into a woman. I take this unfortunate figure to be the ritualist favoring the new model, and our poet is suggesting that too much association with and sympathy for women, too much emphasis on equality, will unman a man.

VIII.34 Indra

On the formal structure that dominates this hymn see the intro. The hymn is awkward to translate and, I have to say, sometimes seems awkwardly composed.

VIII.34.1: I do not understand the accent on *yayá* in the refrain, but it may be implicitly contrastive with *yāhi* in a.

VIII.34.3: Note the syntactic disharmony between simile and frame, exploiting the variant valencies of the verb, with *dhūnute* an intrans.-reflexive in the frame ("felly shakes [itself]") but transitive in the simile ("as a wolf shakes a lamb"). See Jamison 1982.

VIII.34.5: Since the referent of *te* is Indra, explicitly comparing him to a bull in the simile *vṛ́ṣṇe ná* seems odd, since he is ordinarily simply identified as such. Ge seems to think it's a real bull, exhibiting thirst.

VIII.34.16: See the intro. for the relation between the PN Vasurocis and the vocative addressed to Indra through the first fifteen verses, *divāvaso.*

An example of the rare 1st ps. dual construction "(I) and X" as subject of a 1st dual verb, with the "I" unexpressed: *índraś ca dádvahe* "(I) and Indra took …" For further discussion see VIII.62.11.

VIII.34.18: The apparent PN Pārāvata ('who comes from afar') apparently naming the patron makes sense as a speaking name in this hymn, which emphasizes the *coming here* of Indra from distant places and allows the identification of patron and Indra.

Note that the last word of the hymn is *ā́*, as it was the first (and it opens twelve of the hymn's verses).

VIII.35 Aśvins

See the publ. intro. for the pattern of repetitions in this very repetitious hymn. The c pāda of every vs. save for the last three (22–24), "in concert with Dawn and the Sun" (*sajóṣasā uṣásā sū́ryeṇa ca*), of course refers to the Aśvins participation in the dawn sacrifice.

VIII.35.10–12: The first hemistichs of the three verses in this tṛca are excessively provided with *ca*'s, as well as 2nd du. act. impvs in *-tam*. Cf., e.g., 10ab *píbataṃ ca tṛpṇutáṃ cā̆ ca gachatam*, *prajā̆ṃ ca dhattám dráviṇaṃ ca dhattam*.

VIII.35.11: The distribution of *ca*'s in pāda a is somewhat puzzling or, perhaps, syncopated, with the 2nd *ca* following preverb+verb (*prá stutaṃ ca*), though the other two preverb/verb combinations in this tṛca place the *ca* after the preverb (*ā̆ ca gachatam* 10a and immediately following *prá cāvatam* 11a). This does not seem to be metri causa, or at least not in some obvious way.

VIII.35.13: Exactly what *dhármavant-* is conveying here is unclear, but it is highly unlikely to be, with Ge, "von Dharma [den Gesetz] … begleitet," since 'law' is quite anachronistic for *dhárma(n)-*. I also do not think Re is correct in seeing it as a proper noun, despite its appearance in a *-vant-*stem parallel to those containing gods' names. Rather, the repetitive template of the tṛca imposes the *-vant-*stem here, on the abstract principle *dhárman-* generally associated with Mitra and Varuṇa -- here perhaps referring to their authority and its manifestation (their statute) by which they impose order on the world.

VIII.35.15: *vā̆javant-* may mean -- instead of, or in addition to, 'accompanied by prizes' -- 'accompanied by Vāja' (name of one of the Ṛbhus) or '… the Vājas' (as a designation of all the Ṛbhus). Certainly the juxtaposition with *ṛbhumánt-* is meant.

VIII.35.16–18: A verb needs to be supplied with the d pādas of this tṛca (*sómaṃ sunvató aśvinā*). On both general grounds and the d pādas of vss. 1–3 (*sómam pibatam aśvinā*)(see also 22b *píbatam somyám mádhu*), 'drink' makes the most sense, though 'drive to', which dominates the middle part of the hymn, is certainly possible.

VIII.35.23: On *vivákṣaṇa-* see comm. ad VIII.45.11. Contra Ge and Re, I take it with √*vakṣ* 'strengthen', not √*vac*.

VIII.36 Indra

VIII.36.2–3: Somewhat unusual 2nd ps. reflexive using the standard 2nd ps. pronoun: 2a *áva tvā̆m* "help yourself," 3a *ávasi … tvā̆m*. The accent on the verb in 3 is probably the textbook example of an implicitly contrastive accented verb, with predicates preceding and following.

VIII.36.6: Note *átrī… adri…*

VIII.36.7: This verse breaks out of the rigid structural mold of the first six verses, but note that it also echoes vs. 1: 1a *avitā̆si sunvatáḥ* / 7a, c *sunvatáḥ … āvitha.*

VIII.37 Indra

VIII.37.1: Although this hymn of the twinset of VIII.36–37 is the domain of the *kṣatrā́ni* 'lordly powers', it begins with the *bráhman-* that ended the last hymn and provided its key word, also echoing that verse in other ways (*āvitha*, *sunvatáḥ*).

Ge takes *sunvatáḥ* as acc. pl., but given the connections between the two hymns and the fact that *sunvatáh* in VIII.36 is gen. sg. in both first and last verses of VIII.36, I find this unlikely.

There are some difficulties in distributing the words in the refrain pādas. Given its regular recurrence, *sacīpate* 'o lord of power' should be the first word of the refrain, but given its lack of accent it must be the last word of the non-refrain pādas. Nonetheless I have tr. it with the refrain. Also problematic is unaccented *anedya*, which comes at the end of a pāda already twelve syllables long and should therefore not belong to it. Old discusses but doesn't really solve.

VIII.37.2: Note that *sehānáḥ … pṛ́tanāḥ* in the new material of this verse picks up a phrase in the refrain of VIII.36 *víśvāḥ séhānáḥ pṛ́tanāḥ*.

VIII.38 Indra and Agni

VIII.38.1–3: The referent of *tásya* in the refrain pāda is not specified. It must fall into the cultic sphere, but could be 'sacrifice' or 'hymn' or, perhaps best, since it's explicit in a nearby hymn by the same poet, 'call': VIII.35.4 *bódhataṃ hávasya me*.

VIII.38.2: I adopt Brugmann's suggestion (presented and generally endorsed by Old, also Scar 417–18) to read **tośā́ *sarathayā́vānā* for *tośā́śā ratha…* Scar assembles an impressive number of passages involving *saráthaṃ/saráthā* and √*yā*, incl. I.108.1 dedicated to Indra and Agni. The suggestion has the merit of eliminating the supposed *s*-stem *tosás-* with its apparent anomalous *uṣás*-like inflection with lengthened grade in the strong form *tośā́saḥ*. The dual to the thematic *tośá-*, *tośā́* exactly as here, is found in an Indra and Agni hymn III.12.4. The change does require going against the Pp. and also emending *sā* to *sa*. The publ. tr. should have an asterisk before "driving on the same chariot."

As for *tośá-*, Gotō discusses it at length (166–68), rejecting the old gloss as 'drip' in favor of 'hasten'; his redefinition is accepted by Mayrhofer (EWA s.v. *TO�need*, replacing KEWA's 'drip'). Because the anodyne 'hasten' can fit almost any verb in the RV (and in fact the old RVicist joke is that, acdg. to Ge et sim., all verbs in the RV mean 'shine', 'hasten', or 'sing'), there is nothing in the usage of the forms of this root that imposes 'hasten' (or excludes it). That Gotō labels his reinterpretation "plausibler" than the older one shows once again a certain deafness to metaphor and a penchant for the semantic lowest common denominator. Moreover, that most of its subjects are liquids supports the old rendering 'drip'. The only preverb with which it is found is *ní* 'down'. Verbs of hastening (etc.) generally take a variety of directional preverbs, of which *ní* is one of the rarest and most specialized; dripping, on the other hand, goes in only one direction, down. Gotō's 'hasten' gets little or no support from

the Iranian evidence he adduces *168 n. 275), which is quite weak and questioned even by himself. Although as 'drip' √*tuś* has no good etymology either (see KEWA s.v. *tóśate*), I see no reason to replace it with 'hasten' without better evidence. In our passage 'streaming' probably reflects the same metaphor in English for speed. Or, like *nitóśana-* in VIII.25.23, it could mean 'overflowing' (with goods) and refer to the anticipated generosity of the gods.

VIII.38.3: Pāda a can of course be in the acc. (not nom. as I take it) and form a single sentence with b (so Ge). There are no implications either way, but I prefer to take fronted forms of *ayám* as annunciatory ("here is …") if at all possible. However, given initial *imā́* (5a) and *imā́m* (6a), which can't be so tr., this is not a strong arg.

VIII.38.5: Pāda b is somewhat awkward because it states that both Indra and Agni carry oblations. Ge gets out of the difficulty by making the oblations an acc. of goal with an intransitive reading of *ūháthuḥ* ("… ihr zu den Opfergaben gefahren sind"), but Old convinces me (ad I.84.18, with a number of parallel passages) that we cannot sidestep the transitivity in these expressions (√*vah* + oblation(s)). In this particular case we can attribute the transitive phrase to a feature of Indra and Agni hymns noted in the publ. intro., that both gods get credited with actions or qualities appropriate to only one of them, and Agni is of course the conveyor of oblations par excellence.

VIII.38.6: Both Ge and Re take *gāyatrá-* as a technical reference to the Gāyatrī meter and poems composed in it (also vs. 10); this is possible, but the stem is often used just of a song.

VIII.38.7: On *jenya-* see comm. ad I.128.7.

VIII.38.8: I construe the Śyāvāśva genitive phrase directly with the verb, rather than supplying 'call' (*hávam*) with Ge, on the basis of VIII.36.7, 37.7. But either is of course possible.

VIII.39 Agni

VIII.39.1: Ge tr. *vidáthe* as "den beiden gelehrten Stände," commenting (n. 1de) that *vidátha-* "ist die Autorität in gelehrten Sachen." Following Thieme (Unters. 37ff.; see also EWA s.v.), however, I take the stem as derived from *ví* √*dhā* 'divide, distribute'. In most instances (esp. in the loc. *vidáthe*, identical to the form here) *vidátha-* refers to the ceremonial distribution of goods and, more loosely, to the ceremony itself, but it can also refer to cosmic divisions (for other passages see Thieme's collection; one ex. is 9b below), and that is the referent here. The presence of *ubhé* helps mark the form as a neut. dual, as opposed to the ubiquitous loc. sg.

VIII.39.2: In c I read, with Old but contra Pp, *árātīr árāv^{a}ṇām*. This does not require emending the Saṃhitā text, but simply redividing the words.

With most interpr. I take *vácaḥ* synchronically as a truncated form of the instr. *vácasā* to be construed with *návyasā* (also II.31.5, VI.48.11 in the same pāda-final position; versus medial … *návyasā vácasā* … VI.62.5). However, I do not regard it as an inherited instrumental showing deeply archaic morphology (with Hale, Fs. Melchert, esp. 93–95), esp. since Hale sets out very persuasively the cost of assuming such a preserved archaism (87–88), thus undercutting his own view of *vácaḥ* in these passages. I am not entirely certain what gave rise to what in my view is a synchronic, poetically generated variant. On the one hand, the expected instr. sg. *vácasā* would not fit the end of any cadence in Vedic meter; the form is almost invariably found in the break after an opening of either 4 or 5. The instr. pl. *vácobhiḥ* is, by contrast, quite common pāda final in Triṣṭubh (8 of 13 forms), and I wonder if our "instr." *vácaḥ* did not originally start out from a truncation of the *-bhiḥ* ending to fit into an iambic cadence (Jagatī or dimeter vs.). This of course does not get us the instr. *singular* with *návyasā*, however. Another factor that may have contributed is contexts in which a nom./acc. *vácaḥ* would be grammatically possible, with *návyasā* an adverbial instr. 'anew'. Ours is such a passage; *vácaḥ* here can be parallel to *śáṃsam* 'laud', hence "(set) down … anew a speech, a laud …" (also suggested by Scar 392 n. 544). Then analyzed as an abbreviated instr. because of its proximity to *návyasā*, the phrase could be used in passages in which a nom./acc. *vácaḥ* is excluded.

The tr. just suggested depends crucially on accepting my interpr. of pāda b, against that of Ge (see also Gr, Scar 392). The questions are the positive or negative value of *śáṃsam* and the referent of unaccented *eṣām*. Most take the latter as referring to the *árāvṇām* of the following pāda, but strictly speaking unaccented forms of *ayám* should refer to something already in the discourse. Although the proximity of the two forms might allow *árāvṇām* to "count" as already in the discourse, I would prefer to find a referent preceding *eṣām*, and *devā́n* in 1c is available. This also allows us to interpr. *śáṃsa-* in its more common positive usage 'laud', rather than the rare (though definitely attested) negative sense (see, e.g., III.18.2 *śáṃsam áraruṣaḥ*, with a gen. akin to our *árāvṇām*).

We thus have two parallel expressions, pādas ab and cd, each beginning with *ní* and lacking a verb. I supply √*dhā* for both, with slightly different senses: 'set down (upon)' for ab and 'put down' in the idiomatic sense also found in English (though without the English specialization to speech) for cd. For √*dhā* with *tanū́ṣu*, see, e.g., I.85.3, III.19.5, III.53.18; for *śáṃsam* √*dhā* + loc. of god, see X.42.6a *yásmin vayáṁ dadhimā́ śáṁsam índre* "Indra, upon whom we have set our laud" (lit. "upon which Indra …").

VIII.39.3: *prá cikiddhi* presents the usual problem of forms of √*cit*: does this fall in the intransitive 'appear, be perceived' range or I/T 'perceive'? I have opted for the latter, since Agni is regularly called *prácetas-*, which I interpr. as 'discerning, provident'. But Ge and Re go for the former, which is certainly not impossible and might be supported by *ciketa* in 5a.

VIII.39.4: Ge supplies a different subject ("singer") for *kṛpaṇyáti* in the rel. clause than for *dadhe* in the preceding main clause: "so viel Kraft verlieht Agni wie immer (der Sänger) bedarf." This is novel, but seems unnecessary and supported neither by context nor by parallels.

The Pp. analyzes *ūrjā́hutiḥ* as *ūrjā́ ā́hutiḥ*, that is, probably with an instr. 1st member, but Old prefers to see the 1st member as a stem form, either *ūrjā́-* or *ūrjá-*. The latter is marginally attested in cmpds and in the verb stem *ūrjáya-*, probably originally a denom. (see Jamison, *-áya-*, 50, 81). By Ge's interpr. (which I follow), gen. pl. *vásūnām* limits the first member of this cmpd. *ūrjā́huti-*. This is common in later Sanskrit, but somewhat rarer in the RV. Re (and Klein) render it backwards (Klein, DGRV I.205–6 "whose nourishment is the oblation of the gods"), but still with the gen. pl. limiting only one of the members. It may not be sufficiently clear in the publ. tr. that I take the cmpd as a bahuvrīhi.

Note that both *-ā́huti-* (√*hu* 'pour') and *-hūti-* (√*hū* 'call') appear in this vs.

VIII.39.5: The standard interpr. take *pratīvyàm* as the obj. of *inóti* (e.g., Ge "er befördert die Darbringung"), and this is certainly the simplest way. But *inóti* means 'impel', and *práti* √*vī-* refers to the gods' reception of mortals' offerings, not the offerings themselves (see the root noun in quasi-infinitival usage in VIII.23.1, 26.8, and finite passages like VIII.101.10), so the simpler syntax requires attenuating the meanings of both words. I therefore complicate the surface syntax somewhat by supply an obj. to *inóti* extracted from *dákṣiṇābhiḥ* in pāda c and making *pratīvyàm* the goal. If the infinitival sense of *pratīvyàm* in its other two occurrences is maintained here, it could be tr. "impels (them) to be received."

VIII.39.6: As pointed out in the publ. intro., pādas ab contain a pun -- which Ge fails to note and Re mentions in his n. but fails to render in his translation. Agni "knows the races" (*jātā́ … veda*) of gods and men. Those two words in that order produce his common epithet Jātavedas. I take *apīcyàm* 'hidden, secret' at the end of b as a separate clause, alluding to this pun: "(this is his) secret (name)." (The publ. tr. should have "name" in parentheses.) *apīcyàm* (*-āni*) almost always qualifies 'name', including two hymns later by the same poet (VIII.41.5 … *apīcyā́ / véda nā́māni gúhyā*). Both Ge and Re instead take *apīcyàm* as a separate object of *veda*, construed with *márt(ⁱy)ānām*, while *jātā́* is limited only be *devā́nām* ("knows the races of the gods and the secret [/Re 'specificity'] of mortals"), though gods and mortals are frequently a merism. My view that *apīcyàm* is a separate clause is supported by the meter. Mahāpaṅkti consists only of 8-syllable pādas, and 6b should end after *márt(ⁱy)ānām*. In fact, Old in his Prol. suggested deleting the following *apīcyàm*, but in the Noten thinks better of it, allowing a 4-syllable pendant to this line. This pendant is, in my interpr., syntactically independent and a sort of meta-comment.

In e Ge supplies ghee with *návīyasā*: "mit erneutem (Opferschmalz)." This of course is more semantically harmonious with *svā́hutaḥ* 'bepoured', but betrays a sad lack of poetic sensibility. The stem *návīyas-* is regularly used of verbal products, and it narrowly echoes *návyasā vácaḥ* of 2a. Moreover, 3ab contains an example of the

trope "pour prayers" (there explicitly compared to ghee: *mánmāni … ghṛtáṃ ná juhve*). This expression *svā̃huto návīyasā* economically combines the "newer speech" of 2 and the "pouring prayers" of 3, using both √*hu* (from 3) and *náv(ī)yas-* (from 2). The poet could hardly have made his metaphorical intent clearer. (Re is only a bit less flat-footed than Ge; he gives *návīyasā* the correct referent [hymne], but still sneaks in a supplied beurre fondu to construe with *svā̃hutaḥ*.)

VIII.39.7: Gr derives *sáṃvasu-* from √*vas* 'dwell', and Ge's "Hausgenosse" reflects this derivation (see also AiG II.1.75). But Old argues that it contains *vásu-* 'good(s)' and compares *sahávasu-*, *vásubhiḥ sáha*, an analysis accepted by Debrunner (AiG II.1 Nachtr. 24, AiG II.2.471), Re, and me.

With the standard tr., I take *víśvam bhū́meva* as a two-member simile, acc. + nom. A passage two hymns away in the same cycle, VIII.41.5 *sá kavíḥ kā̃vyā purú, rūpáṃ dyaúr iva puṣyati* "he is a poet who fosters the many poetic arts, as heaven does its (concrete) form," makes this analysis pretty much inescapable. But I am still somewhat concerned by the position of the *iva* (in both passages), following the 2nd element of the simile, and *víśvam bhū́ma* 'the whole earth' would also be a possible NP.

VIII.39.8: "Seven" here is probably a loose indication of totality (so Oberlies, II.74) rather than a precise enumeration. The number may have been displaced from *síndhuṣu*: the rivers are generally seven.

VIII.39.8, 10: I do not understand the sudden prominence of the rivers/waters, esp. the waters that in 10e are *svásetu-* 'having/being their own bridges/dams'. Ge (n. 10de) thinks it alludes to the ritual sprinkling of the fireplaces with water, which may well be, but which does not explain the descriptor. In its other occurrence (X.61.16) *svásetu-* refers to a poet who crosses the waters (*apáḥ … tarati*) by having or making his own bridge. Are the waters providing Agni with a bridge for him to cross them? It may (or may not) be relevant that the waters/rivers are fairly prominent in the next hymn (VIII.40) to Indra and Agni.

VIII.39.9: On *vidátha-* as 'cosmic division' see comm. ad vs. 1 above.

VIII.40 Indra and Agni

VIII.40.2: The hapax *vavráyāmahe* is somewhat puzzling. It appears to be a denom. to *vavrá-* 'hole', with accent retraction because it is transitive (so Jamison, *-áya-*, 88–89). This deriv. goes back to Bartholomae and is endorsed by Old, for want of anything better. But what is its point in context? Here Re seems to show the way, taking it as oppositional to the following pāda, which begins with the contrastive particle *átha*: "But we sacrifice just (/especially) to Indra." The idea is that, though the hymn is dedicated to both Indra and Agni, we don't put the two gods in the same undifferentiated category, "in the (same) hole," as it were, but treat them individually.

As noted in the publ. intro., the two gods *are* treated with more independence than in most Indra and Agni hymns (which isn't saying much).

VIII.40.3: The clauses ab and cde begin identically, with *tā́*. It is only with the last two words of the final pāda, *aśnutaṃ narā*, that it becomes clear that a change of person has been effected between 3rd (ab) and 2nd (cde). Unfortunately this change has to be signalled much earlier in the Engl.

VIII.40.4: I take cde as consisting of two relative clauses, both introduced by *yáyoḥ* in c. The first is only pāda c and is a statement of ownership ("whose is this whole moving world," phrased in the publ. tr. as "to whom … belongs"); the second comprises de, with *yáyoḥ* construed with *vásu* and Heaven and Earth the subj. of the dual verb *bibhṛtáḥ*. (Re's tr. is sim.) Ge's tr. differs from mine in taking cde as a single relative cl., with "this whole moving world" as a parallel subj. to Heaven and Earth. He must assume that *bibhṛtáḥ* has been attracted into the dual by the nearer paired subject. I prefer to take the dual verb seriously, and I also wonder if the moving world (which usually refers to the animate beings therein) has a collective lap. For the lap of Heaven and Earth, see nearby VIII.42.2 *pātáṁ no dyāvāpṛthivī upásthe* (in the same hymn cycle).

Judging by word order, *iyáṃ dyaúḥ* should belong together and I have so tr. them. But *iyám* has the wrong deixis: *iyám* expresses near deixis and, when indicating a cosmic division, ordinarily characterizes the earth (cf., e.g., X.60.9 *iyám pṛthivī́ mahī́*). It also has the dispreferred gender: *dyaúḥ* is ordinarily masc., though occasionally fem. Since demonstratives are often separated from their nouns, I am tempted to take it with *pṛthivī́* here ("heaven and this great earth"). But a series of passages in which the feminine near deictic does seem to belong with 'heaven' (*pṛthivī́ṃ dyā́m utémā́m* III.32.8, 34.8, X.88.3, 9, 121.1) gives me pause, and IX.96.3 *dyā́m utémā́m* is even worse, because it is not conjoined with an 'earth' word. So I have honored the word order.

VIII.40.5: What this is about is not entirely clear. Ge suggests Vala, while Lüders, fld. by Re, thinks of the heavenly ocean (as usual).

That *-bāra-* 'bank' is a MIA dev. of *pārá-* '(far) shore' (KEWA s.v. *jihmáḥ*, EWA s.v. *pārá-*) seems plausible.

VIII.40.6: Both *vratáti-* and *guṣpitá-* are found in the RV only here, but are attested later -- the latter already AV.

The meter of de is faulty, with two extra syllables. Which pāda is hypermetric depends on which one *vásu* is assigned to: Old (Prol.) and Lub put it final in d, HvN initial in e. In favor of the former is *vásu*'s general preference for pāda-final position and, in particular, the final of 4e, with a form of √*bhṛ* + *vásu* (*bibhṛtó vásu*). Old (Noten) explicitly counsels against omitting it as others have suggested. It would be possible to eliminate another disyllable, e.g., pleonastic *vayám*, but there is no strong reason to.

VIII.40.7: Ge and Re tr. *indrāgnî* as voc., without commenting on accent. I assume this is simply a lapse on their parts.

VIII.40.8: Ge and Re take *uccárātaḥ* as the verb of all of ab, whose action unfolds "under heaven" (unterhalb des Himmels), but the contrast between *avấḥ* 'down' and *úd* 'up' invites an interpr. of cyclical complementary action -- the rising and setting of the two heavenly bodies. I therefore supply a verb of motion with pāda a.

I read pāda c with both ab and d.

VIII.40.9: In my interpr. the verse is structured by two complementary pairings of reciprocal gifts between "us" and Indra. Both involve Indra's gifts (*úpamātayaḥ* a, *āpṛ́caḥ* d) and our praiseful thoughts (*práśastayaḥ* b, *dhíyaḥ* e).

úpamāti- is variously rendered, but I take it to *úpa √mā* 'mete out'; cf., e.g., VII.26.5 *sahasríṇa úpa no māhi vấjān* "mete out prizes to us in thousands." Ge's 'Zuwendungen' ('contributions, donations', but also 'care') could belong either to *√mā* or to *√man*, but I surmise he links it to the former. Both Gr and Re connect it to the realm of speech/thought ('Anrede' and 'pensées-appliquées' respectively) with Gr explicitly positing a root affiliation with *√man*. Re gives no disc. in his comm. ad loc. (EVP 14), but in EVP 16 (ad IV.43.4) he rejects a root affiliation with *√mā*. Cf. also his comments in EVP 13.155 (ad VIII.60.11). A root syllable *mā* cannot be derived from the aniṭ root *√man* in any straightforward fashion, though AiG II.2.630 derives both *úpamāti-* and *abhímāti-* from *-mati-* via metrical lengthening, citing Meillet. Metrical lengthening is, of course, a non-explanation except under very controlled conditions, and the fact that other compounds with *-mati-* (e.g., metrically identical *ánumati-*) maintain the short vowel make it even less likely in this case.

In both d and e I supply 'many', based on the parallelism with ab *pūrvîḥ …, pūrvîḥ ...* HvN's loosing of the sandhi in d as *vīrásya **a**pṛ́caḥ* is incorrect: the initial vowel is *ā-*, which is supported by the meter and so given by the Pp (see Scar 324). Ge takes *āpṛ́caḥ* as adjectival modifying *dhíyaḥ*, but I follow Old's interpr. (so also Scar 324–25) as a nom. act.; the *vásvaḥ* with it is an objective gen., the *vīrásya* a subjective gen.

VIII.40.10: The "eggs" of Śuṣṇa are probably his progeny (so Old, Ge); see X.68.7, adduced by Ge, also X.22.11 *śúṣṇasya ...jātáṃ víśvaṃ* and X.61.13 *śúṣṇasya .. puruprajātásya*. They can't be testicles, given the number.

The standard interpr. takes *jéṣat* (e) as parallel to *bhédati* (d) and still part of the rel. clause beginning in c, whereas I take it as the verb of the main clause to which the rel. clause is attached. Either is grammatically possible because, if *jéṣat* is the verb of a main clause, its accent is owing to its initial position. The rel. cl. interpr. requires that cde all hang off the *tám* of a, despite the *utá*. Klein (DGRV I.302) seems to suggest that the verse is structured as an "X and which Y construction" (*tám … utá … yáḥ*), but as far as I know, the X and Y in such constructions always have different referents.

VIII.40.11: This verse, dedicated to Agni, is constructed entirely parallel to vs. 10 to Indra; note, e.g., the end of the b-pādas: 10 … *sátvānam ṛgmíyam*, 11 … *sátvānam ṛtvíyam*. It therefore seems important to construe the exactly parallel cde in the same way in both verses. The only differences between the two are *ójasā* (10c) / *óhata* [= *-e*] (11c), the order of Śuṣṇa and his eggs in d, and the tense/mood of the verb in e (*s*-aor. subj. *jéṣat* in 10e, *s*-aor. indic. *ájaiḥ* in 11e). My tr. reflects this strict parallelism, but others do not. Ge, e.g., takes d as the main cl. to c and e as a second independent cl., whereas in 10 he takes cde as a single rel. clause (see above). Klein, DGRV I.302, calls 11 "an awkward attempt to create a vertical parisyllabic responsio to 10a–e. My tr. is made possible by taking *óhate* as passive ('is proclaimed as …') (or possibly reflexive 'vaunts himself as'; see V.42.11).

VIII.41 Varuṇa

VIII.41.2: Given *práśasti-* in VIII.40.9, rendered 'encomia', the *práśasti-* here should probably be so tr. as well, rather than 'panegyrics'.

VIII.41.3: I don't understand the purport of this vs., esp. de. Ge and Re suggest various possible referents for the *vénīḥ* and for the three dawns, all possible and none particularly compelling.

I supply *sasvaje* with the *pári* in c, on the basis of *pári ṣasvaje* in a. Ge and Re construe the pāda without a verb (e.g., Ge: "er ist rings um die Welt sichtbar"). This is possible.

VIII.41.4: The hapax *sáptya-* is problematic. Most (though not Ge) take it as a derivative of *saptá* '7' (e.g., Re 'la septuplicité', a fine coinage) and point to Varuṇa's 7 sisters in 2e. His control over the 7 in 9e is perhaps more relevant. Ge tr. "treue Freundschaft"; though he does not comment, he must derive it from *sápti-*, though the standard view of the meaning of the latter is now 'team' and those meanings seem quite distinct. If the word belongs with *sápti-*, which I think more likely than a connection with *saptá* (though 9e now gives me pause), it should mean something like 'teamwork, cooperation'. The problem is that in this hymn Varuṇa is credited with doing everything on his own; his usual companions, Mitra and Aryaman, are absent. I therefore tentatively suggest that it is based on a syncopated form (*sa-pti-*) from a putative **sa-páti-*, hence 'joint leadership/lordship' → 'leadership, master-ship'. This is a very fragile suggestion, I realize.

VIII.41.5: On the displaced simile particle here, cf. comm. ad VIII.39.7.

VIII.41.6: The *iva* in the simile is also displaced to the right, as in the previous vs. The simile is also more complex than it first appears. The obvious way to render it is "In whom are fixed all poetic arts like the nave in a wheel," with Varuṇa the wheel

and the poetic arts the nave, but the more likely image is that the spokes are fit into the nave -- with Varuṇa the nave and the unexpressed spokes the poetic arts.

I have no idea what or who *tritá-* stands for.

The images in de are also somewhat skewed. Ge takes the two pādas separately, with d a nominal sentence with infinitival *saṃyúje* as predicate, despite the yoking vocabulary common to both pādas. He must do that because the *gā́vaḥ* in d must be nom., but correspond logically to the acc. *áśvān* in e. I take the two pādas together, classifying it as another example of case disharmony in a simile (Jamison 1982), enabled by the syntactic multifunctionality of the infinitival *saṃyúje*, *yujé*. Scar's attempt (431) to construe the two pādas together and also account for the cases shows the pitfalls, as it wanders off into fanciful territory.

VIII.41.7: The purport of his verse and the referents of the unidentified fem. pl. (*āsu*, pāda a) and masc./neut. pl. (*eṣā́m*, pāda b) are completely unclear to me, and multiple suggestions have been made about the identities of these entities and the ways they might fit together. I roughly follow Old's interpr., but cannot carry it further.

VIII.42 Varuṇa and Aśvins

VIII.42.4: Pl. *víprā(ḥ)* 'poets' is taken as a second conjoined subj. by Ge ("die Presssteine … (und) die Redekundigen"), but given how often the pressing stones are said to speak, I take it (with Re) as characterizing the stones.