

## VIII.43 Agni

VIII.43.1: With Old I take *ástrta-yajvan-* as a karmadhāraya, not the bahuvrīhi of Ge and Re, who seem to ignore the evidence of the accent (on which see AiG II.1.80).

VIII.43.3: Ge takes *ārokāḥ* (only here in RV) as “Maschen” (mesh), and this does seem to be the meaning in late Vedic. This idiomatic sense presumably developed from ‘light flashing through openings’ to the ‘openings’ themselves. However, mesh or netting does not seem a particularly apt comparison here, and I prefer to take the word in a more literal, but still concrete, sense, esp. since *rocate* appears several times in the hymn (8c, 10b). By ‘brilliant’ I mean gems or gem-like objects (rhinestones, e.g., had they been invented then) that catch and flash light. A more abstract sense, like ‘flashes’ or ‘flares’, risks near identity with what it’s being compared with (*tvíṣaḥ*).

The force of the particle pile-up *ghéd áha* is not entirely clear to me, but this poet is partial to it. See *ghéd ... áhā* in 30, as well as *ghéd* in 29, *áha* in 8. I have not found *ghéd (...)* *áha* elsewhere in the RV.

VIII.43.4–5: *vṛthak* is found only in these two vss. It is generally considered to be a formal cross of *vṛthā* ‘at will’ with *pṛthak* ‘separately’ (see EWA s.v., AiG III.231, Re ad loc.), a form of which appears in repeated pādas later in the hymn (18b=29b), and to maintain the semantics of the former (Ge ‘jäh’ [‘precipitously’ -- a rather extended sense], Re ‘à leur gré’). Sāy, however, simply glosses it as *pṛthak*. I am reluctantly sympathetic to Sāy’s opinion, as ‘at will’ does not fit the contexts well, esp. 5a. (Both Ge and Re tr. it with pāda b in 4, not in its proper place.) X.91.7 *ā te yatante rathyò yáthā pṛthak*, adduced by Ge, echoes our 4c. The publ. tr. reflects the Sāy gloss. However, on returning to this passage, I find the Sāy solution too convenient and entirely unmotivated, but still remain unsatisfied with the connection with *vṛthā* and its suggested crossing with *pṛthak*. That the formation of both *vṛthā* and *pṛthak* is murky does not help. I do not have anything resembling a solution, but I’m inclined to think that *vī* ‘apart’ is somehow implicated. Perhaps via an (unfortunately unattested) *-añc*-stem, *\*vīyañc-* ‘facing separate directions’, whose neut. adv. *\*vīyak* could have been assimilated to *pṛthak* given their similarity of meaning. Cf. the similarly formed *vīṣvañc-* ‘facing in separate directions’, whose neut. appears two hymns later in a suggestive collocation, VIII.45.8 ... *vīṣvag yáthā*.

VIII.43.8: On *jañj* see comm. ad I.168.7.

xVIII.43.9: Assuming with the Pp., Macd. (VGS §48a), and Lub (s.v. *sá*) that *saúṣadhīḥ* represents *sá(h) óṣadhīḥ*, this sandhi contravenes the standard treatment; cf. I.103.5, X.88.10 *sá óṣadhīḥ*. The *sá* with 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. reference also does not conform to my rules for this usage, as it is not in an imperatival clause. I do not have an answer, though poetic factors may have had some influence: note the preceding pāda (*ap*)*sú ... sádhi(ṣ) ...*, which is a good match for the three syllables in *saúṣadhī(r)*.

VIII.43.10: I prefer to maintain the older gloss ‘kiss’ for *nīṃs* rather than flg. Gotō (200–201; cf. EWA s.v., Lub s.v.  $\sqrt{nas}$ ) in the colorless substitution ‘approach’. Even if *nīṃsa-* is in origin a redupl. pres. to  $\sqrt{nas}$ , passages like this, with *mūkhe* ‘on the mouth’, support the richer semantics, which could have developed from an earlier ‘approach’, used metaphorically or euphemistically.

VIII.43.12: *īmahe* is formally ambiguous and could also mean ‘approach’; Ge’s “wir nahen dir bittend” seems to represent a blend of the two.

VIII.43.14: *agne* has to be tr. “Fire,” rather than the usual “Agni,” because otherwise the verbal play is lost. The constant interplay in the RV between physical fire and the god Agni is hard to render in tr. because of the PN problem.

VIII.43.17: Despite the case disharmony between acc. *tvā* in a and the dat. phrase in b, I take them both as referring to Agni (so also Old). Ge takes the dat. in b as part of the simile in c, referring to a calf awaiting the cows coming to its stall. (Re’s tr. seems to combine the two.) But vs. 2a *ásmai te pratiháryate* (and cf. VIII.44.2 *práti ... harya*) establishes Agni as the primary referent here, though a secondary connection with a calf (via the bellowing) isn’t impossible. As for the case difference, vs. 2 provides a possible solution, since the verb there is *jánāmi* ‘I generate’, construed with the dat. of benefit. Hence my “(praises generated)” here.

VIII.43.30: *vísṡvā(h)* was carelessly omitted in the publ. tr., which should read “may we all be ...”

VIII.43.31: *śīrá-* occurs 4x in the RV in the same pāda, *śīráṃ pāvakásociṣam*, and twice more in the compound *śīrásociṣ-* (also acc. *-am*). My tr. ‘sharp’ follows the current standard, but not strongly held view (see Ge, Re, KEWA, EWA), with a possible connection with  $\sqrt{śā}$  ‘sharpen’ (see EWA).

## VIII.44 Agni

VIII.44.10–11: The contents of the imploring mentioned in 10c seems to be given in direct speech in 11.

VIII.44.11: With Ge I supply *daha* in b, with the preverb *práti*, since *práti* is not otherwise found with  $\sqrt{pā}$ , the verb of pāda a, but is common with  $\sqrt{dah}$  ‘burn’. Cf. esp. I.12.15 *práti śma rīṣataḥ daha*. VII.15.13b is identical to our pāda, and the verb in pāda c of that vs. is *daha*, which governs the acc. in b.

VIII.44.26: As noted in the publ. intro., Agni is repeatedly referred to as both ‘inspired poet’ (*vīpra-*) and ‘sage poet’ (*kaví-*) in this hymn, sometimes with the

words in the same vs. (12, 21). Here *-vépas-*, belonging to the root of *vípra-*,  $\sqrt{vip}$  ‘tremble, become inspired’, co-occurs with *kaví-*, filling the contrastive *vípra-* role.

VIII.44.27: The root affiliation of *iṣema* is not entirely clear. Lub puts it with  $\sqrt{iṣ}$  ‘send’, but the case frame is wrong. But an affiliation with  $\sqrt{iṣ}$  ‘desire’ is even less likely. With Ge and Re I take it as meaning ‘hasten’ or the like and note the connection of the pāda, *stómair iṣemāgnāye*, with VIII.43.11c *stómair vidhemāgnāye* in the immediately preceding hymn, with *iṣema* a near-rhyme with *vidhema* in an otherwise identical pāda. Re suggests that the form and the syntactic construction have been borrowed from VIII.43.11, but doesn’t explain what verb we’re starting with (though I surmise ‘send’). So perhaps substituting for “we would send praises to Agni.”

### VIII.45 Indra

VIII.45.4: The bunda bow is the weapon Indra uses to kill the boar Emuṣa, in a rarely told myth. (See esp. VIII.77.1–2.) Its phonology sets a non-Indo-Aryan scene.

Ge renders *ké ha śṛṇvire* as “Wie heissen sie?” This is certainly possible, although I prefer my tr.

VIII.45.5: Śavasī is taken by many as the name of Indra’s mother, but there is no particular reason not to take it in its lexical sense, referring to the same woman.

The Pp. text divides the beginning of b into *girāv āpso*, with the second word the *s*-stem *āpsas-* ‘breast’, a word otherwise used of Uṣas (I.124.7, V.80.6). But even in a proverbial expression such as this seems to be, where semantic latitude is to be expected, “like a/the breast/chest at a mountain” (or Ge “Wie mit der Brust gegen den Berg ...,” taking *āpsaḥ* as a truncated instr. *\*āpsasā*) doesn’t make any sense. Old suggests a different word division: *girā vāpso*, with the latter being the word for ‘wasp’ found elsewhere in Indo-European, though not directly in Indo-Aryan (except, quite possibly, in I.181.8); see EWA s.v. *vāpsas-*. This does allow sense to be made of the expression: the extraordinary size difference between a wasp and a mountain dooms the wasp, but wasps are notoriously belligerent and therefore willing to take on any opponent, however unlikely they are to defeat it. In the same way, anyone who is foolhardy enough to take on Indra will ensure certain defeat for himself.

VIII.45.6: The rest of Indra’s mother’s advice (if she is the speaker) implicitly contrasts the person who approaches Indra with requests (and, presumably, homage) and whom Indra may decide to favor with the pugnacious wasp of the previous verse that only wants to fight.

VIII.45.7: The publ. tr. may not make it clear that I think that Indra is also the “setter of contests” of the subordinate clause.

VIII.45.8: Assuming that the syntagm of the simile is *vīṣvag yáthā* “as if *vīṣvak*,” that is, “as if asunder,” I have slightly reconfigured the expression to conform to an English idiom. Ge seems to take the *yáthā* as expressing purpose, “dass sie zerschellen” (be smashed to pieces) but I do not understand how *vīṣvak* can be configured as a verb.

Note the alliteration *vī śú vīśvā ... vājrin vīṣvag ... vṛha*, esp. *vī śú vīśvā ... vīṣvag*.

VIII.45.10: Ge takes b and c together as a single clause and has *gómataḥ* modify *te* (“zu deiner, des Kuhbesitzers, Schenkung”), but *gómant-* is not regularly used of gods (though it occasionally is) and is frequently found with *vāja-* ‘prize’, as in vs. 28 below. And *áram* is used elsewhere as predicate of a nominal clause.

VIII.45.11: There is no expressed referent in this verse, and Gr (s.v. *áśvāvant-*, etc.) indicates that it is “we” of vs. 10. However, Ge supplies “soma drops,” esp. on the strength of VIII.49.4 and the fact that *vivákṣana-* is always used of soma. This seems correct. The question is the meaning and root affiliation of *vivákṣana-*. Ge tr. ‘redselig machend’, connecting it thus with  $\sqrt{vac}$ , while I prefer to take it to  $\sqrt{vakṣ}$  ‘become / make strong’, as a transitive *-ana-*nominal, beside *vákṣana-* also ‘strengthening’. The connection with  $\sqrt{vakṣ}$  is asserted by Old ad X.21.1 (fld. by AiG II.2.198). See also EWA s.v. *VAKṢ*, esp. p. 487; he does not decide.

VIII.45.14: Pāda c takes one aback, but the next verse explains.

VIII.45.18: The first two pādas contain two perfect optatives: *śuśrūyāḥ* and *cakriyāḥ*. On the surprising dominance of perfect optatives in the RV, see Jamison 2009.

VIII.45.19: The logical relation between the subordinate clause (ab) and main clause (c) is somewhat indirect. The point seems to be that though we think that our behavior towards Indra has not been entirely straightforward and proper, we hope that he will continue to be generous to us despite our failings.

VIII.45.24: *mahé* was mistakenly omitted in the publ. tr. Substitute “to great generosity.”

I follow Old in taking *góparīṇasā* as standing for *-āḥ*, nom. pl. to a thematic stem, rather than, with Ge (and Pp.), as *-ā* and instr. sg. of the *s*-stem. In the simplex both *pārīṇas-* and *parīṇasá-* exist, though the latter occurs only once. Old points out that soma is generally the subject of  $\sqrt{mand}$  (as in 14b *mandantu ... índavaḥ*), and taking *góparīṇasā(ḥ)* here as modifying a plural form of soma drinks or drops would save having to supply another element in the instrumental. However, Ge’s interpretation does have in its favor that the more common simplex is *pārīṇas-* and that it is regularly found in the instrumental.



VIII.45.25–27: The proclamation of Indra’s deeds called for in 25c is presumably contained in the following two verses.

VIII.45.26: Gr takes *sahásrabāhve* (with distraction, *-bāhuve*) as belonging to a *u*-stem and as a poetic synonym for ‘battle’. I find this suggestion quite attractive, though this type of kenning is somewhat unusual for the RV. Ge and Old (see also EWA s.v. *bāhú-*; Mayrhofer PN) take it as a thematized *-bāhva-* in the locative as a PN (Ge: “bei Sahasrabāhva”). Though Gr’s interpretation gives the richer semantics, the problem is of course that the dative sg. should be *-bāhave*, not *-bāhve*. AiG III.139 also identifies it as a thematic locative, but allows a lexical meaning “in der tausendarmigen Schlacht,” flg. Sommer). I still think it may be a dative, with the alternative *-ve* ending (e.g., *pásve* beside *paśáve*), but a locative with lexical value is also possible.

VIII.45.27: Ge takes *vidānaḥ* as belonging to  $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$  ‘know’ and construes it with the preceding PNs: “Das ist wahr, bei Turvaśa und Yadu bekannt.” It is true that the participle *vidāna-* ordinarily belongs to  $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$  ‘know’, but it is usually passive and appears with a predicate, “known as X.” The idiom envisioned here, “known to,” I’m not at all sure is a Sanskrit expression, though it works well in German and English. I therefore take the participle as belonging to  $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$  ‘find’, whose middle generally means ‘acquire’, with the soma “not to be spurned” (*ahnavāyyám*) as object. Turvaśa and Yadu offer soma to the gods elsewhere; cf. VIII.9.14 *imé sómāso ádhi turváše yádau*. Ge takes *ahnavāyyám* with *vy ānaṭ* (“hat er nicht Abzustreitendes erreicht”), which prevents him from construing that verb with *turváṇe* as it is in the parallel he himself cites (VIII.12.19 *ádhā yajñāya turváṇe vyānaśuḥ*). His rendering of the last two words of the pāda as purpose infinitival clause (“dass der fromme Dienst triumphiere”) involves what seems to me a dubious construal of *śámi*.

VIII.45.28: *jánānām* may go with *tarāṇim*, as Ge takes it (“Den Durchhelfer der Menschen”); I construe it with *b*, because *tarāṇi-* doesn’t otherwise take a genitive.

VIII.45.30: The lexeme *nír*  $\sqrt{\text{i}}$  ‘go out’ is specialized for birth contexts, to go out of the womb, so *yonyá-* as a descriptor of the mountain is particularly apt.

VIII.45.31: For the odd sentiments of this verse and what follows, see the intro. Both Ge and Old supply an object to the first verb (*dadhiṣe*), an object drawn from ritual (Ge “das Opfer,” Old “Lob u. degl., Somatränke”), but this seems unduly restrictive. I think that the poet is apprehensive about the consequences of whatever Indra might undertake.

VIII.45.37–38: For my interpretation of this bit of dialogue, see the publ. intro.

VIII.45.37: On the basis both of the content of the verse and the use of the voc. *maryāḥ*, I consider this verse to be Indra’s address to the Maruts. The plural of *maryá*

in all clear cases refers to the Maruts. And in VIII.96.7–8 the Maruts address Indra, reminding him that all the other gods but them deserted him, using the same  $\sqrt{t\bar{s}}$  ‘shrink from’ as is found here.

Ge takes *ámithitaḥ* as “ohne Zank” (without a quarrel), but I think it refers instead to Indra’s potentially friendless state --‘unpaired’ – a fear expressed by the poet in the immediately preceding verse (36). The hypothetical speaker still has a comrade (*sákhā sákhāyam*), but, like one unpaired, threatens to say to this comrade “I’m leaving.”

The form *jahā* is taken by Ge (and others) as a 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. pf. to  $\sqrt{hā}$  and therefore, implicitly, a precious example of a 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. pf. to a long-*ā* root without -*au* ending. However, Old very persuasively suggests that it is a 1<sup>st</sup> sg. subjunctive in the direct speech introduced by *abravīt*. Although to the reduplicated present of  $\sqrt{hā}$  we would expect accent on the reduplication (\**jáhā*), Old argues that the fluctuation of accent in IIIrd class presents makes the accent irrelevant. I would alternatively suggest that it could be a subjunctive to the perfect stem. See Old’s extensive discussion of the various previous proposals about this form.

VIII.45.38: I consider this verse the Maruts’ insulted response to Indra’s insults, couched in a very slangy register. The first sign of this speech level is the voc. *are* (to *arí-* ‘stranger’), a vocative not otherwise found in the RV, but remember the Pāli and Pkt. “interjections” *are*, *ale*, clearly derived from this voc. (Thieme, *Fremdl.* 3–4), as well as the famous shibboleth *he* ‘lavo of ŚB III.2.1.23, consisting of an *l*-form of the plural voc. of this word in MIA guise (see EWA, KEWA s.v.). Its use as a shibboleth and with an *l*-form suggest popular speech.

Note also the lengthened voc. *vṛṣabhā* (also in 22a). Lengthened vocatives are quite rare in the RV; AiG III.96–97 cites only these two forms, but remarks that pluti vocatives were surely a feature of living speech, found in the Brāhmaṇas and in Pāli and the Prākṛits. The use of the well-known gambling term *svaghnī* also marks the speech as low register. The substance of the Maruts’ counter-accusations is that Indra greedily drank up the soma offered to him below (that is, among men). I’ve used the expression “lower depths” to refer to the louche aspects of a gambling place (and also possibly to the depression in the ground where the dicing happens). Indra carried on arrogantly and without sharing the soma, but then, they say, when he got into a jam in the Vṛtra battle he suddenly remembered he had pals and upbraided them for desertion.

VIII.45.39: Unfortunately this last verse of the *ṛca* does not seem to have any connection with the foregoing Indra-Marut dialogue. The “I” is presumably not a Marut, but the poet or other ritual officiant, and it’s difficult to know how his holding on to the horses will bring about Indra’s gifts. Is he holding them hostage, as it were, not allowing them to leave the ritual ground and return to heaven (recall the “Fallow-bay-yoking libation” that ends I.61–63 and sends Indra and his horses back home at the end of the sacrifice) until Indra distributes the goods? Or is he helpfully holding

them to leave Indra's hands free? Given the aggressive tone of the previous two verses, I favor the former idea.

VIII.45.42: *viśvāmānuṣa-* should, by accent, be a bahuvrīhi; it is also difficult to separate from *viśvāmanus-* in the next hymn (VIII.46.17). However, most interpreters take it implicitly as a karmadhāraya: Gr 'die ganze Menschengeschlecht', Ge 'jedermann', and Wackernagel (AiG II.1.266) explicitly identifies it as a tatpuruṣa with irregular accent ('Gesamtheit der Menschen'). But this seems unnecessary: *mānuṣa-* regularly modifies *jāna-* (so 'human race' / or 'folk consisting of the descendants of Manu'), and here we can supply an underlying *jāna-*, modified by the compound, hence '(races) consisting of all the people of Manu'. The publ. tr. seems to reflect the tatpuruṣa interpretation because the more literal tr. is simply too awkward.

### VIII.46 Indra

VIII.46.6: As in VI.54.8, 55.2 I take *rāyāḥ* as a morphological pun – both genitive sg. depending on *īśānaḥ* and accusative pl. as object of *īmahe*.

VIII.46.8–9: A thematic and syntactic modulation. The *yāḥ* clauses of vs. 8 (which lacks a main clause) clearly refer to Indra's *māda-* 'exhilaration', and the *yāḥ* which opens vs. 9 seems simply to continue this construction. But the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich is couched in the 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. and refers to Indra, and it is possible to assume that Indra is also the subject of ab (despite the 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. construction and the 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. vocative), because the qualifiers in 9ab are better suited to Indra than to his *māda-*. (As Old says, "Übergleiten von Indras māda zu I. selbst.") In the end, though, it is better to assume a covert identification of Indra and his *māda-*, which allows a smooth transition from describing the latter to describing the former.

VIII.46.10: Despite appearances, *gavyó* is entirely parallel to *aśvayā* and *rathayā* later in the verse, since it consists of *gavyā* + *u*.

VIII.46.14: Ge takes *vāco yāthā* as a truncated clause: "soweit (es) die Rede (vermag)," but, although accented *yāthā* is seldom pāda-final, unaccented *yathā*, the simile marker, is almost always so placed. Therefore pāda-final *yāthā* here must also be a simile marker at least in my view, but see Old for contrary opinion.

VIII.46.15: Very condensed expression. The first two long pādas characterize Indra as a giver (*dadī-* 3x) of various desirable things. The third pāda, a mere four syllables, implicitly calls on Indra to actualize this identity by making the gifts.

The expression "legacy to/for the body/self" (*rékṇas tanvè*) probably stands for a son, as Ge points out in his n.

The short final pāda *nūnām ātha* is curiously formed. There are no other examples of this word sequence, but *nūnām* has a tendency to be followed by a di- or

trisyllable beginning with *a-* (though usually heavy syl), e.g., *nūnām aśyāḥ*, *nūnām anyā*. Moreover, *átha* is almost always initial in pāda or clause, so its presence in this position must be signalling something special, which I take to be a peremptory command (English “now then!” corresponds nicely). Note that it echoes verse-final *yáthā* of 14 and that it again takes final position at the end of 16.

VIII.46.16: Following Old, I supply the verb “sing to” (*abhí ... gāya*) from 14 to govern the accusatives here.

I also follow a suggestion of Old in taking *kṛpayatāḥ* as acc. pl. governed by *áti*, rather than gen. sg. dependent on *várpaśaḥ* (Ge: “über diese Gestalt des Erbarmenden”). But the syntactic distribution of elements in this verse is very uncertain, due in part to the unclarity of the meter, where even pāda boundaries cannot be certainly determined. However, I think that what confronts us here is a sort of syntactic śleṣa of *irajyánt-*, with the uncompounded participle as usual governing the genitive in pādas a and b (*vísveṣām ... vāsūnām* and *asyá vārpaśaḥ*), while with *áti* in pāda c it takes the accusative. Cf., with  $\sqrt{rāj}$ , a root with which *irajyá-* becomes entangled, III.10.7 *ví rājasi áti srídhaḥ*.

What “this form” refers to is not clear to me. I assume that it is Indra’s form, quite possibly one of the multiforms that he takes on at will

Since *nūnām ... átha* reprises 15c, I find the interpolation of the *áti* puzzling, especially if it governs a previous nominal form. However, the poet (who seems to have little conscience about syntax) may have inserted *áti* here because *áti[y]átha* would echo the *yáthā* that ends vs. 14.

VIII.46.17: Another very disturbed verse. My interpretation follows Old in great degree, but with crucial deviations.

In the first pāda I read, with Gr, Old, and Scar (61), a compound *áram-iṣe*, rather than two separate words with Ge (also Pp.), who is forced to take this as a parenthetical 1<sup>st</sup> ps. declaration (“ich beeile mich recht”). This compound qualifies Indra in the dative and matches *araṃgamāya* in b quite nicely.

The accent on the verb *stávāmahe* can be accounted for (in a somewhat ad hoc fashion) as Old does, as a separate four-syllable pāda, following an eight-syllable opening.

In de (if this is the correct division), I take gen. pl. *viśvámanuṣām* with *yajñébhīr gīrbhīḥ* “through the sacrifices and the hymns of all the peoples of Manu.” This has the somewhat awkward consequence of separating it from the immediately following gen. pl. *marútām*, though if the pāda break follows *viśvámanuṣām* rather than *gīrbhīḥ* as Old takes it, the syntactic separation would be less problematic. (This would produce a pāda of 10 or 11 syllables [with distraction of *-manuṣām*], followed by one of 8 syllables [also with distraction of gen. pl. *-ām*].)

Ge takes the subject of *iyakṣasi* to be the poet addressing himself, while I think that it is Indra, who is the subject of the same verb in the immediately preceding hymn (VIII.45.31). The question then is what the object is. Ge supplies the pronoun “dies,” but the referent of this pronoun isn’t clear to me. I suggest rather

*sumnám* ‘favor’: the stem *īyakṣa-* several times takes *sumnám* as object (I.153.2, II.20.1. X.50.3), and it appears here in the next verse (18d), where I supply this verb. If this assumption is correct, we must then ask why Indra would seek to attain the favor of the Maruts. The key to that is probably the odd snatch of dialogue in the last hymn (VIII.45.37–38), in which Indra complains that the Maruts deserted him in his time of need; here he seeks their good will as support in the Vṛtra battle.

VIII.46.18: The referents of the plurals in this verse continue to be the Maruts of the previous verse, and I think that the same situation obtains: Indra is seeking the sacrifice and favor of the Maruts. I therefore supply *īyakṣasi* in this verse, again with *sumnám* as object. Thus one half of the VP is found in each verse: *īyakṣasi* in 17, *sumnám* in 18. (Ge also supplies the same verb stem, but in the 1<sup>st</sup> sg., referring to the poet.)

The medial transitive-causative *pātáyante* I take as a reflexive: ‘cause themselves to fly, launch themselves in flight’.

VIII.46.19: For wealth as a ‘shatterer’ (*prabhaṅgá-*), see VI.68.3 where it is the implied subject of *prá ... bhanákti*.

VIII.46.20: Note the full hemistich of vocatives, all accented because there is no inherently tonic word to follow.

As Old points out, all the accusatives of the second hemistich should be grouped with *rayīm* in 19, and the verb of that verse *ā bhara* continues to have domain over this one.

VIII.46.23: On *ṛdhád-rī/i-* see Thieme 1958 (Fs. Turner): 157, EWA 118 (s.v. *ARDH*). Thieme tr. ‘luckily reaching wealth’. The nearby passage VIII.48.2 *śraúṣṭīva dhúram ánu rāyá ṛdhyāḥ* seems to confirm a connection between *-rī/i* and *rayí*. I tr. 48.2 “like an obedient mare the chariot pole you should follow riches to fulfillment” and adopt that interpretation here.

Their tails are presumably straight because they are going so fast their tails are horizontal.

Ge takes *mathrá-* as a geographical designation: Mathra horses. But I see no reason not to connect it with  $\sqrt{\text{math}}$  ‘churn, agitate’, hence ‘skittish’. See also I.181.5.

VIII.46.24: The final pāda contains a pun on the patron’s name *Prthuśravas*. See Watkins 1995: 73–74.

VIII.46.25: I take *tāne* and *pājase* as complementary concepts, vertical and horizontal – our descendants and our synchronic extension.

VIII.46.26: This verse gives the impression of being constructed from random constituents, although some cohesion can be wrested from it.

Following Old I take b as further specifying the horses in a (*ásvebhiḥ*), with the bare numeral *saptá* substituting for the non-existent instrumental *\*saptábhiḥ* as elsewhere. It could also specify the number of soma drinks in c (*sómebhiḥ*), and the position of the phrase between those two instrumental expressions allows it to be construed with both. The gen. pl. *saptatīnām* of course simply depends on the numeral.

In c I supply a form of  $\sqrt{\text{mad/mand}}$  to be construed with the instr.; so also Ge (ermunter).

In d I supply a form such as *maṁhase* ‘you are ready’, which is common with *dānāya*, although Ge’s solution, to have the infinitive depend only on the “ermunter” is certainly possible and probably neater. See also Scar 313.

VIII.46.27: Another verse with unclear referents and no main clause. I take the subject to be the god Vāyu, who has inspired the human patron (*imám* in a) to give the poet a splendid dakṣiṇā. If Vāyu (deified wind) is the subject, *tmānā* ‘by his breath’ is a nice touch.

In c Ge takes *araṭvé ákṣe* as a PN, and it is certainly tempting. But, although the second part of that pāda is a PN, interpreting all difficult phrases as names is a practice to be avoided, and Mayrhofer (EWA s.v. *araṭvá-*; also *PN* s.v.) rejects the name interpretation in favor of “aus dem Holz der *araṭu*-Baumes” (Wagenachse). There is no way to be certain.

VIII.46.28: Another virtually impenetrable verse. Rather than discuss my deviations from others’ interpretations, I will just set out the considerations that produced my own translation.

I take the referent of the *yáḥ* in the relative clauses that dominate vss. 26–28 to be Vāyu in all cases. In this verse there’s the embarrassment of the voc. *vāyo*, but since there is no verb in 28 nothing prevents it from being couched in the 2<sup>nd</sup> sg.

The *utá* in b I take as connecting *ucathyè vápuṣi* and *ghṛtasnāḥ*, both used of the *svarāt*, despite their different cases.

I think cd represents a new clause, with implied “your”; the *prājma* is rather like *prādhvaré* in 18, with verb extruded from the *prá*. The last little bit *idám nú tát* is a separate clause (like *nūnám [áty] átha* in 15–16).

VIII.46.29: After the puzzling detour into Vāyu, this verse reunites us with the dānastuti of vss. 21–24 by means of *asanam* ‘I won’ in b, found also in 22a.

“Gelding” is supplied on the basis of vs. 20.

VIII.46.31: I supply *ā dade* from 32b, though *asanam* from 29a would also be possible.

### VIII.47 Ādityas

VIII.47.1: Although only Mitra and Varuṇa are mentioned in the first hemistich, *vo mahatām* is gen. pl. and must refer to all the Ādityas, who are addressed in the next clause (pāda c).

VIII.47.5: The simile is slightly skewed, though, as in English, the case frame with ‘avoid’ works either way. It might be expected that “we” would be compared to the (presumably) nominative *rathyāḥ* ‘charioteers’, but grammatically “we” are parallel to the hard places (*durgāṇi*). Of course technically both *durgāṇi* and *rathyāḥ* can be either nom. or acc. pl., so that the skewing could be avoided: “Evils will avoid us, as hard places avoid charioteers.” But this produces an unintentionally comic picture, and I follow Ge and Re in the case distribution.

VIII.47.6: This verse is contrastively complementary to the preceding one. Both *pāri* √*vṛj* and *pāri* √*hvr* mean ‘swerve, turn aside, avoid’, but in vs. 5 *pāri* ... *vṛṇajan* is a beneficial action, whereas here *parihvṛtā* (on accent see Old, Scar 708) refers to turning aside from the proper course, an action that causes a man to lose out on the Ādityas’ gift. How substantial this gift can be for someone whom the Ādityas favor is expressed in cd.

VIII.47.9: Ge and Re take *revātaḥ* with Aryaman, not Mitra. It is true that the adj. is positioned between the two names and could in principle modify either one or both, but it belongs to the same pāda as *mitrāsya*, and the following pāda containing *aryamṇāḥ* is a repeated pāda (=I.136.2e), in a verse where *revānt-* is not found. Since, further, *revānt-* is not a standard epithet of Aryaman, it seems wise to take it with Mitra.

VIII.47.10: I have not rendered the four nominal *yád* clauses, the last three of which merely introduce further adjectival qualifiers of *śárma*. The configuration is perilously close to an izafe-type construction, though syntactically nominal clauses are perfectly workable.

VIII.47.15: The accent on *kṛṇávate* is somewhat puzzling. Re explains it as a reflection of the implicit subordination following on vss. 13 and 14, but perhaps better is the implicit contrast of the *vā* ... *vā* construction.

### VIII.48 Soma

VIII.48.1: I take *svādóḥ* as dependent on *váyasaḥ*, not qualifying it (contra, e.g., Ge’s “von dem süßen Krafttrunk”). Note that Soma is called *vayodhāḥ* in the final vs. (15a) and is therefore not *váyasaḥ* himself.

*s*“*vādh’yo* opening pāda b echoes *svādór* opening a.

VIII.48.2: The first pāda is a paradox, in that confinement within leads to boundlessness. Following Ge et al., I take *ca* as a subordinator; the accentuation of

*prāgā(h)* is ambiguous: the Pp. reads *prā agāḥ*, but *pra-ágāḥ* is equally possible (so Old).

How to resolve the sandhi in *śraúṣṭīva* is discussed by Old at some length; with him I take it as a fem. nom. sg. *śraúṣṭī*. The Pp. analyzes *rāyá* as *rāyé*, but *rāyáḥ* is also possible, either as gen. sg. or acc. pl. I take it as the latter. My tr. of this pāda is closest to Re's.

VIII.48.4: Note the faint echo *pītá ... pité(va)*.

VIII.48.5: On *anāha* see Kü's length and useful disc. (289). Flg. Old (accepted by Kü), I take it as a 3<sup>rd</sup> sg., not 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. with Ge, Re. The nom. pl. *imé ... pītā yaśása uruṣyávaḥ* of pāda a is (silently) resumed by sg. "soma." In order to demonstrate the change in number of the subject, my tr. appears to treat pāda as a separate clause, which of course it is not. Among other things, the *mā* in Wackernagel's Position in a is the obj. of *sām anāha* in b.

Like 2a this hemistich is a paradox: the soma drops "seeking wide space" nonetheless tie the drinker together.

VIII.48.6: *didīpaḥ* must be a redupl. aor. corresponding to trans.-caus. *dīpáyati*, despite the light redupl. We expect \**dīdīpaḥ* or even \**dīdīpaḥ* (BE acdg. to Whitney's Rts).

Pāda-final *naḥ* serves as object to both verbs in b.

All standard treatments take *prā carā* as 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. impv., but I think it works better as 1<sup>st</sup> sg. subjunctive.

VIII.48.9: Because of its accent *niṣasátthā(h)* must still be under the domain of *hí* in pāda a, contra Ge, who takes a as a nominal clause and b as independent.

VIII.48.10: The voc. *haryaśva* (always elsewhere of Indra) is presumably addressed to a previously absent Indra, who surfaces by name in d -- though it could also be referring to soma's color.

VIII.48.11: *ánirā-* is lit. 'want of nourishment'. Since *írā-* sometimes seems specialized for liquid nourishment, I considered 'thirsts' here, and indeed in VIII.60.20, conjoined with *kṣúdham* 'hunger', 'thirst' works well. But in this passage such a translation sounds as if it refers to desires or cravings, and I think the passage refers to external threats rather than those generated within the person.

VIII.48.14: On *īśata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

## Vāḷakhilya

### VIII.49 Indra



This hymn is twinned with VIII.50. Parallel aspects of the two hymns will be treated in the comments on the latter.

VIII.49.3: *mádā yé* in b appears to be a pseudo-izafe construction, specifying *índavaḥ*, as Ge takes it.

VIII.49.4: On *vivákṣaṇa-* see VIII.45.11.

Ge takes pāda d as a separate clause and supplies a verb, while taking *kṣudrā* as “small animals”: “auf dass du ... leibhaftig wie kleine Tiere (?) brav ver(mehrest)” – an interpretation that seems to me both unnecessary and bizarre. The other RVic example of *kṣudrá-* (I.129.6), which he claims also to refer to a small animal I take to mean ‘speck’. It seems more sensible to take d as belonging with c, with the simile *kṣudréva* serving as object to *kirāsi*. The only evidence I can see against this is that  $\sqrt{kr}$  ‘scatter’ doesn’t otherwise appear with *prá* in the RV, but that lexeme is common later. I take *kṣudrá-* here to refer to small particles of dust; see IV.38.7 *kirate reṇúm*.

VIII.49.5: Phonological figure *svadhāvan svadāyanti*.

VIII.49.6: The simile marking in pāda a seems unnecessary: why is Indra *like* a powerful hero, rather than, as usual, simply being one. Perhaps the tendency for many verses and half-verses in this hymn to begin with similes enforced that pattern here.

In c the double marking of the simile (*udrīva ... avató ná siñcaté*) also seems to serve no purpose.

*kṣárantī ... dhūtáyah* is very close to *kṣárantī dhūtáyah* in the matching hymn VIII.50.4.

VIII.49.7: The reason for the three *yád*’s in ab isn’t clear. It may be that the duplications and unnecessary markings noted in this verse and the preceding one are signs of apprentice compositions.

VIII.49.8: Ge interprets the first relative clause as only consisting of *yé te* “die du hast,” but all things being equal, I try to avoid interpretations that require embedded relative clauses (though see the pseudo-izafe in 3b above), and in this case a relative clause that extends to the end of b is perfectly possible. That 50.8 has the same structure is an additional support for this interpretation.

The corresponding verse in the twinned hymn, VIII.50.8d, contains *yébhiḥ svàḥ parīyase*. I therefore think that *parīyase* in our c also has domain over d, also containing *svàḥ*. Ge, by contrast, supplies *kṛṇóṣi*, to produce a periphrastic causative “mit denen du die ganze Welt die Sonne schauen (lässest).”

VIII.49.9: Ge takes *gómataḥ* with *te*, not *sumnásya* as I do. This is possible but not necessary, especially since the adjective isn’t exclusively, or even generally, used of beings, and since neuter *gómat* is found in the following verse (probably modifying

an unexpressed word for spoils or the like, though I suppose neut. *sumnám* might be possible).

### VIII.50 Indra

VIII.50.1: This verse is very close to 49.1 in structure and lexicon. Some items are identical and positioned identically: a: *surādhasam*, c: *yáh*, (-)vasu, d: *sahásreṇeva*. Others are identical words but placed differently: ab: (*abhí*) *prá ... arca*. Then there are synonyms with the same function: c: *jaritṛbhyaḥ* / *suvaté stuvaté*. Root connections deployed differently: 49d *śíkṣati* / 50b *śakráṁ*; 49c *maghāvā* 50d *mámhate*. The only items that don't have any correspondents in the other hymn are 49a *abhí*, *vaḥ*; b: *índram ... yáthā vidé*; c: *purū-* / 50a *sú śrutám*; b: *abhíṣtaye*; c: *kāmyam*.

VIII.50.2: The two versions of this verse deviate slightly more than vs. 1: identical and identically positioned: a: *śatānīkā* (though difference in number concealed by sandhi), a/c: *asya*; more or less identical, but with inflectional difference: c: *giréḥ* / *girír*, *pinvire* / *pinvate*; root connections: 49d *-bhójasah* / 50c *bhujmā*. Otherwise the verses are distinct, but notice that 50a *śatānīkā hetáyaḥ* allows the noun with *śatānīkā* in 49a to be supplied.

VIII.50.3: This verse deviates from its correspondent even more than the last. Identical are *sutāsa índavo* (a) and *āpo ná* (c); root identity: 49b *mádā yé* / 50ab *yád ... ámandiṣuḥ*. In addition the simile in 49.3, where waters fill a pond, allows the underdetermined simile in 50.3 to be interpreted: it seems more likely that the pressing has been deposited in Indra than that it has been set out for him. Ge follows the latter interpretation and is forced to supply a recipient in the simile that has no textual support: "... dargebracht wie Wasser (dem Durstigen)." See Ge's n., which argues for his interpretation and explicitly for a different sense in the simile from that in 49.3.

VIII.50.4: The two verses differ from each other almost entirely, except that the openings of the first two pādas are identical: *anehásam* (a), *mádhvaḥ* (b). Still, reference to 49.4 aids in the interpretation of this verse: in 49.4 the referent of *anehásam* is clearly soma; here that is less immediately clear, but surely correct.

See Old for considerable discussion of this verse, though without reaching firm conclusions.

VIII.50.5: Yet another type of variation, whereby the poet plays on distinct but phonologically or semantically similar words. In 49a *ā na stómam* / 50a *ā naḥ sóme* the common play on *sóma-* and *stóma-* is found. In 49b (*d*)*hyānó áśvo ná* / 50b *iyānó 'tyo ná* the phrases are identical in sense and in morphology (medial athematic participle, *a*-stem nom. sg.) but use two different lexical realizations for both. In 49c *yám te svadhāvan svadáyanti* / 50c *yám te svadāvan svádanti* the clauses are

identically constructed, the verbs are identical and have identical meanings, though one is a Class I stem, the other an *-áya*-transitive, and the vocatives are lexically distinct, though rhyming and identically formed. Finally, both d-pādas contain a locative indicating the person(s) at whose sacrifice Indra is.

VIII.50.6: The two versions are closer together than the last few verses: 49a *ugrām ná vīrām* / 50a *prá vīrām ugrām* / b: *vībhūtim* / c: *udrīva vajrinn avató*. In addition 49b has *-vasum* and 50c *vasutvanā*, and 49d is almost identical to 50.4b.

I supply *ārcā* on the basis of *prá* and vs. 1, but any verb of praising or the like will do.

VIII.50.7: The somewhat awkward tripling of *yád* in 49.7 is avoided here with a simple *yád ... yád vā*, but the two versions still echo each other exactly: *yád dha nūnám ...* (a) / *yád vā pṛthivyām ...* (b), as also in c *mahemata*. The d-pādas are identically structured, but lexically distinct: nom. sg. + instr. pl. (to same stem) *ā gahi*.

VIII.50.8: The versions pattern closely together despite variant semantics: (a) *irāso* / (rath) *irāso hārayo yé te ...* (a); *vātā... /...vātasya ...* (b); *yébhīr ... mānuṣaḥ* (c); *yébhiḥ (...)* *svār ...* (d).

The poor transmission of the Vālakhilya is probably responsible for the faulty accent of *nighóṣayaḥ* (for *\*nighoṣáyah*)(so Old). There is also unnecessary doubling of the preverb *ní* (which does not affect the meter, however).

VIII.50.9: Read, with Gr and Old, *\*ávaso* (that is, *te 'vaso*), which also repairs the meter.

The corresponding verses are structured identically, with *etāvataḥ* opening the first hemistich and its rhetorical partner *yáthā* opening the two pādas of the second hemistich. In each verse we seek the same thing for ourselves that Indra provided to two clients, named in the second hemistich. There is also some matching phraseology: *etāvatas te* (a), *yáthā prāvo* (c), *yáthā* (d), as well as *dhāne* in 49d and 50c.

VIII.50.10: Again the two versions are almost entirely parallel, with named examples of the beneficiaries of Indra's bounty given in *yáthā* clauses, including some with very close similarities in wording: *yáthā kánve maghavan LOC LOC...* (a) / *yáthā gósarye*  $\sqrt{\text{SAN}}$  ... (c) / d: *gómādhíraṇya-* (49d) / *gotrām hari-* (50d).

I differ from Ge in my interpretation of pāda b. He takes *dīrghánīthe dāmūnāsi* as another PN (so also Mayrhofer, *PN*, for the first but not the second), and I admit that parallelism with 49b, which contains a PN, is in his favor. However, here there is no *yáthā* marking the pāda as a different segment, and furthermore *dāmūnas-* 'domestic leader, master of the house' is never otherwise used of mortals, but almost always characterizes Agni. Since *dīrghánīti-* is perfectly understandable in its literal

meaning, I take this pāda as referring to Agni and as parallel to the locatives in pāda a indicating the sacrifice.

### VIII.51 Indra

VIII.51.1: As indicated in the intro., this verse replicates the structure of the final verses (10) of VIII.49 and 50.

VIII.51.2: It is difficult to understand what is going on in the first hemistich, which is filled with words apparently referring to positions of the body: *sám asādayat* ‘made to sit up’, *śáyānam* ‘lying down’, *úddhitam* ‘set upright’. I have tr. all of these literally. Ge. takes the first lexeme figuratively, with *sám asādayat* meaning ‘invited to a sattra (sacrificial session)’. I consider this to be a secondary sense in this verse, but because of the body-position language, I think something more literal is meant, quite possibly a revival or healing of Praskaṇva by ritual means. But without further context, it remains unclear.

Ge and Old suggest that Dasyave Vṛka is the same person as Pārṣadvāṇa and the sacrificial patron of Praskaṇva. (Dasyave Vṛka is celebrated in *dānastutis* in VIII.55.1 and 56.1.) This seems reasonable but unprovable. In that case Praskaṇva is probably the ṛṣi of pāda c.

VIII.51.3: With Ge I read *aviṣyāntam*, not *āriṣyantam*. See his n. on 3d. Old rejects the emendation, but since the *āviṣyantam* is found in the Khila collection and in “die gute ind. Ausgabe des Pp.,” I think the reading is justifiable, esp. given the poor transmission of the Vāḷakhilya. The publ. tr. should have an asterisk before “a man greedy for food.”

VIII.51.4: Although the first hemistich clearly describes ritual activity, its exact reference is unclear. Ge plausibly suggests that the chant is “seven-headed” (*saptāśīrṣānam*) because it issues from the mouths of seven priests. “Threefold” could refer to the three pressings of the soma sacrifice or perhaps the three fires, but neither of these interpretations imposes itself. As for the “highest footstep,” see discussion at I.21.6 and I.22.21. The highest footstep is usually Viṣṇu’s, and Viṣṇu does stride his three steps in the immediately following (and twinned) hymn, VIII.52.3. As elsewhere, the “highest footstep” seems to be the celestial counterpart of the ritual ground on earth, and the same types of ritual activities are performed there as on earth.

Ge suggests that the referent of *sá* in c is the chant, not Indra, but the *yásmai* ... *sá* construction virtually demands that the referent of *sá* be the same as that of *yásmai*, which cannot be the *arká-*. Indra is the most likely referent of both (though Viṣṇu might be barely possible). Note that no god’s name appears in the verse, leaving the reference apparently deliberately undefined. However, *paúṃsya-* in d is almost always a characteristic of Indra’s, and both the preceding and following verses (3, 5) open with definitional relative clauses, like that of 4ab, where the

relative pronoun is explicitly identified as Indra in the main clause (3c, 5b *índram tám*), which imposes the same identification here.

VIII.51.6: After the three verses whose *yá-* ... *sá/tám* constructions refer to Indra, the same construction now identifies Indra's client.

VIII.51.7: Notice the over-the-top piling up of particles and similar items in c: *úpa-úpa íd nú ... bhūya íd nú*, with the actual topic postponed till the next pāda.

The lexeme *úpa* √*prc* generally has a sexual connotation (see disc. I.40.6), and given the barren cow and the going dry of ab, 'becomes engorged' better captures the contrast than Ge's anodyne "nimmt ... zu und zu" (increases).

VIII.51.8: The final pāda is identical to 4d, save for the final word, which serves as subject. The identity of *pārthivaḥ* here isn't certain. It cannot be Indra, who is the subject of the preceding clauses and whose action in c grounds and precedes the birth of the 'earth-dweller' in d. The idea may be that Indra's cosmogonic actions in c allow the creation of the humans on earth, which has just been separated from heaven. This interpretation is supported by the following verse.

VIII.51.9: A syntactically problematic verse, which has produced multiple interpretations, not all of which can be treated here. It is further complicated by the fact that three different related stems to the highly charged *arí-* word are found in it: *ārya-* (a), *arí-* (b), and *aryá-* (c).

I take ab as an independent nominal possessive clause, with Indra the referent of *yásya*. The clause follows nicely on 8d: since Indra's cosmogonic deeds led directly to the birth of the earth-dwelling people, it is said in 9ab that all of them, Ārya and Dāsa alike, belong to him.

The expression *tiráś cid aryé* in c resembles a number of passages containing *tiráś cid aryá-*, including several in VIII: 33.14 *tiráś cid aryám sávanāni* ... and 66.12 *tiráś cid aryáḥ sávanā*. In such passages Indra is urged to pass over the pressings (and so forth) associated with the stranger and come to our sacrifice. I believe that the same thing is being urged here. This requires supplying a verb of motion and also assuming a word haplology of some sort, such as *\*(aryám/aryáḥ) aryé* (so also Ge, though we differ on much of the rest of the interpretation).

Unlike all other interpretations known to me (including Thieme *Fremdling* 70–71 and two alternatives given by Scar, p. 308), I take d as a separate clause because *tubhyét só* seems very much a clause-initial sequence. Note that verse-final *rayíḥ* echoes the last word of b, *aríḥ*.

VIII.51.10: *arkám āṇṛcuḥ* matches the same expression in 4a, where it had cosmogonic implications. Presumably the association adds luster to the more mundane efforts of the current poets.

## VIII.52 Indra

VIII.52.1: This verse is almost identical to 51.1 in its first half, save for Manu's patronymic; the structure of the second halves is very similar, with locatives expressing the various sacrificers, past and present, where Indra has enjoyed or will enjoy the sacrifice.

VIII.52.2: The pattern of the first verse is continued here.

VIII.52.3: A series of relative clauses without a main clause. It cannot be connected with the next verse because the relative pronoun has a different referent there.

VIII.52.4: This verse is structurally a mess. It seems at first to have made the same shift of the referent of the relative pronoun from Indra (vs. 3) to Indra's client (vs. 4) as was made in the preceding hymn in vs. 6: *yásya stómeṣu* "in whose praises" refers to the praiser. But the resumptive pronoun *tám* refers *not* to the praiser but to Indra, as the phrase *tám tvā* makes explicit, and the single praiser of 4a, implicitly in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person (though see Scar 225, who supplies "Zu mir"), corresponds to the 1<sup>st</sup> pl. *vayám* in c.

Ge (followed by Scar 225) takes *vāje* as part of the voc. phrase in b: "du im Kampf Sieghafter, Ratreicher." This is possible, I suppose, and even favored by the pāda boundary, but I take it as one of those locative absolutes without expressed participle, like common *dhāne* "when the stake (is set)."

VIII.52.5: On *īśānakṛt* see I.61.11. Here the point is that Indra does what masters are supposed to do: give.

In c *áyāman* is universally taken (as far as I know) as 'not on a journey', but it makes much more sense as a derivative of  $\sqrt{yā}$  'beg', indicating that even without prompting Indra should do the right thing by us.

VIII.52.6: Although this hymn does not at all correspond to its predecessor to the same degree as VIII.49 and 50, this verse shows real responsion to 51.6: *yásmai tvám vaso dānāya* [2<sup>ND</sup> SG. VERB] (a) / *sá rāyás póṣam* [3<sup>RD</sup> SG. VERB] (b) / ... *havāmahe* (d).

VIII.52.7: Though the verse starts like its counterpart, 51.7, with *kadā caná* [2<sup>ND</sup> SG.], the verses go off in different directions.

The elements in the second hemistich can be variously distributed. Like most interpreters I take *hāvanam* as the mortals' call to the gods and the subject of *ā tasthau*, but I take *indriyám* as modifying it, meaning (unusually for this stem) 'destined for / appropriate to Indra' (so, approximately, Old), while Ge instead makes it the goal and supplies "name": "... bis zu deinem indrischen unsterblichen (Namen) im Himmel..." This is not impossible, but I do not understand why our invocation would go to Indra's *name*. I supply *bhúvanam* or similar with *amṛtam*.

The vocative “fourth Āditya” (*túrīyāditya*) is somewhat surprising, but as Old suggests it must identify Indra as fourth, after the standard trio Mitra, Varuṇa, and Aryaman. Why Indra is called an Āditya in this particular context is not clear to me.

VIII.52.8: Another “improper” relative in ab, where the pious man who is the referent of *yásmai* is then implicitly identified with the emphatic fronted “us” (*asmākam*) in cd.

VIII.52.9: The verse deploys a number of words for verbal offerings: *mánma* (a), *bráhma* (b), and *medhāḥ* (d). In c a feminine term needs to be supplied in the phrase *pūrvīr rtásya bṛhatīḥ* “the many lofty \_\_\_\_ of truth.” I have supplied *gírah* ‘songs’ from vs. 8, as it also shows up with *pūrvīḥ* elsewhere (VI.34.1, VIII.96.10, IX.85.11, X.29.5) -- though oddly when we get *pūrvīḥ* ... *bṛhatīḥ*, it's with *íṣaḥ* ‘refreshments’ (VI.1.2, IX.87.9), which wouldn't fit here because it is not a verbal product. But note *gíro bṛhatīḥ* with the same verb in III.51.1 *índraṃ gíro bṛhatīr abhy ànūṣata*. Ge supplies ‘words’, which would also work semantically, though he doesn't specify which feminine noun he thinks it is (*vācaḥ* perhaps?).

VIII.52.10: I don't really understand the idiom *sám √dhū* ‘shake together’. Its intent seems to be ‘produce, create’, but the semantic mechanism is unclear to me. It's possible that *sám* occurs with *√dhū* here only because of the *sám* in the second hemistich. A straight ‘shake out’ or ‘shake loose’ could more easily develop to ‘produce, create’. Though cf. *sám √dhū* in I.10.8 (where I do tr. ‘shake loose’).

### VIII.53 Indra

VIII.53.1: On *rāyāḥ* see VIII.46.6.

VIII.53.3: Ge takes *vísveṣām* as referring to the soma drops (“... den Saft des Honigs all der Somasäfte”), and this interpretation has the advantage of providing a plural referent in the main clause for plural *yé* ... *índavaḥ* in the relative clause.

Nonetheless, I take it instead as qualifying *naḥ* ‘us’, to indicate the totality of the Ārya sacrificial community, near and far, as described in cd (and also 4cd). As indicated in comments on the previous Vāḷakhilya hymns, improper relatives abound, with mismatch between number and person, and so the lack of a plural referent for *yé* ... *índavaḥ* would not be problematic. However, Ge's interpretation is certainly possible.

VIII.53.4: The “all” of b is undefined. I tentatively think it refers to us (that is, the entire Ārya community), but Old suggests it is the soma drops of 3cd. Ge doesn't specify in the tr., but refers to the *vísveṣām* of 3 in his n.

I know nothing about the Śīṣtas.

VIII.53.5: Ge tr. *mitámedha-* as “die die Gedanken aufrichten,” but I do not see how a transitive reading of *mitá-* would work in a compound so constructed.

VIII.53.6: I supply “lifetimes” (*āyūṃṣi*) in c, because *āyus-* is the standard object of *prá√tṛ*. Ge assumes that the object is the referent of the following relative clause (*yé ta ukthínah* ... (“Fördere fein ... die, welche als deiner Lobsänger...”). This is possible, but ignores the usual idiom.

What it means to “purify (Indra’s) resolve” isn’t clear to me, but the phrase occurs elsewhere (cf. VIII.12.11, 13.1). In any case the father of the patron Dasyave Vṛka is Pūtakratu (see VIII.56.2, also 4), so this is a pun.

VIII.53.7: If read with what follows, the relative clause in pāda a is even more irregular than those we have already met in the Vālakhilya. However, there is a simple solution. The identical pāda occurs as V.35.1a, where it clearly modifies *krátuḥ* in b: *yás te sādhiṣṭhó ‘vasa, índra krátuṣ ṭám ā bhara* “Your resolve to help that best brings success, Indra, bring that here.” Since *krátum* is found in the last pāda of the preceding verse, 6d, I take the relative clause of 7a as dependent on the *krátum* in 6d. Unfortunately this straddles a pragātha boundary, but I find it hard to believe that the *krātu* association played no role in the repetition of this pāda. It is even possible that the somewhat odd *bhāreṣu* in 7b was influenced by *bhara* in V.35.1b (though see 8d).

VIII.53.8: Ge takes *ājīm√yā* as a phrasal verb (“mache ich ... einen Wettlauf”) that can take an accusative (“einen Wettlauf um...”). I do not see any other way to construe *bráhma*, though I am a bit dubious about the construction.

The opening of c, *tvām íd evá tām* is an inflated version, with tonic 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. pronoun, of *tām tvā*, which is found several times in this group of hymns (our 2c; also 51.6c, 52.4c). This inflation seems to have driven the preverb *sám* into post-verbal position (*áme sám*).

Old and Ge accept the Kashmir reading *\*matīnām*, but Narten (1960: 132 n. 34 = KISch 22 n. 34) makes a convincing case that the transmitted *mathīnām* is correct and means ‘robbings/plunderings’. This works well with *vājayúḥ*, *aśvayúḥ*, and *gavyúḥ* in this verse, as well as *bhāreṣu* in 7b.

## VIII.54 Indra

VIII.54.1: As Old points out, the accent on *grṇánti* is unnecessary. It may have been borrowed, with the pāda, from VIII.46.3, where the accent is correct because the pāda is part of a relative clause.

VIII.54.2: *índram* in pāda a, apparently 3<sup>rd</sup> ps., is co-referential with the 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. subject of *mándase* in the relative clause of b, but this kind of slippage is common.



VIII.54.4: In pāda a it would also be possible to supply ‘hear’ from 3d (governing *hāvanam*, as it did *hāvam* in 3d), with *āvantu* the verb only of b.

VIII.54.6: I take pāda a as a nominal clause, with b separate, in order to account for the unaccented verb in b following *hí* in a. This requires taking *ājipate nṛpate* as predicated vocatives, a rare but still attested construction; see, e.g., I.15.2. This should also require *naḥ* at the end of pāda a to be construed with that clause, which the publ. tr. does not do. I would now add “for us” after “lord of men” and in the second clause make “us” parenthetical. Ge takes ab as a single sentence, which avoids the predicated vocative but has an unaccented verb in a *hí* clause. Old mentions the problem but decides that the lack of accent can be attributed to faulty transmission of the Vāḷakhilya. This is of course possible.

Both Old and Ge accept the Kashmir *ā bhakṣi* for *ā vakṣi*, though Old admits that the latter also works. I do not see the need to change the text.

Although VIII.54 has little in common with VIII.53, note 6cd ... *hótrābhir utá devāvītibhiḥ, sasavāṃso* ... and 53.7c ... *hótrābhir utá deváhūtibhiḥ, sasavāṃso* ...

VIII.54.7: With Old, Ge, Thieme (*Fremd.* 26), I read *aryāḥ* against Pp. *aryé*.

In b *índra* can stand for either *índraḥ* or *índre*. Either will work; I have chosen (with Ge) the locative, but see Thieme’s “Indra ist das Leben der Leute.”

### VIII.55 Dānastuti

VIII.55.3: Though this vs. continues the list of gifts begun in vs. 2, it is entirely in the accusative, while vs. 2 is in the nominative. There is no verb governing vs. 3, and I simply tr. as part of the list.

In the publ. tr. “ewes” should be in parens.

Ge. tr. *áruṣṇāṃ cátuḥśatam* as “hundertundvier rötliche (*Schafe*)” (my italics), which makes one wonder about his barnyard experience. Wikipedia tells me that there does exist something called the Armenian red sheep (or Armenian mouflon, etc.), native to Iran and Armenia. But since the gifts celebrated in dānastuti are domestic animals, this information doesn’t seem helpful. There is also something called the California red sheep, but this hybrid was only developed in the 1970s and half a world away from Dasyave Vṛka. On the other hand, “black” sheep are often more brownish than black and in certain lights could appear reddish. There is also a (recent?) breed of Indian sheep known as Bannur or Mandya, some of which appear (on Google Images) reddish.

VIII.55.5: Ge takes *sāptá-* as “der treuen Freundschaft,” presumably as a derivative of *sāpti-* ‘team’ (see his sim. derivation in VIII.41.4 and my comm. thereon). But it does not make sense to deny a numerical value for *sāptá-* here, since it is found in clearly numerical sense in nearby VIII.59.5 (Vāḷakh.) *trībhiḥ sāptébhiḥ*.

### VIII.56 Dānastuti

VIII.56.4: Old and Ge opt for the Kashmir Khila reading, nom. sg. *pūtákratāyī*, but it hardly makes sense that Dasyava Vṛka would be giving away his mother. It makes better sense to take the Saṃhitā reading *pūtákratāyai* (for *\*pūtákratāyyai*), dat. (for gen.), “(the female one) of Pūtákratāyī,” namely her daughter and Dasyava Vṛka’s sister, who would be a more likely gift-in-marriage.

*yūthyām* is probably a faulty reading. The Khila has *yūthyām*, but Ge’s suggestion, *yūthyā*, seems plausible.

VIII.56.5: I suggest reading *\*brhát-sūro* here, that is, a bahuvrīhi meaning ‘possessing a lofty sun’. The point is the usual one, that Agni is another form of the sun, and his flame as it rises is like the sun. The publ. tr. should have an asterisk before “having his own sun aloft.”

### VIII.57 Aśvins

VIII.57.1: Ge and Old both suggest reading *\*yuktvā* for *yuktā*, and Ge further suggests *ráthe ná* for *ráthena*. Although such emendations are legitimate in the poorly transmitted Vākhilya, I see no reason to change the text if we can make it make sense as it stands.

VIII.57.2: Once again Old, Ge, and Re are in favor of various emendations (for which see the relevant discussions), but it is possible to make sense of the text, with the only alteration from assuming that *dadṛśe* stands for a dissimilated *\*dadṛśre*.

VIII.57.3: I do not know who the bull (*vṛṣabhāḥ*) is; Old suggests Indra, Ge Agni.

### VIII.58 Fragment

VIII.58.1: As indicated in the publ. intro., this verse probably treats the Tānūnaptra. Although Ge suggests that the *yām* and *yāḥ* simply show the free use of the relative pronoun for general subordination, tr. both as ‘wenn’, I think *tátra* in d is the correlative of both: the Sacrificer has a compact with both the sacrifice itself (ab) and the priest who carries it out (c).

VIII.58.3: As Old points out, *adhijajñe* should be accented (*-jajñé*) and *huve* should not be.

### VIII.59 Indra and Varuṇa

VIII.59.1: I do not think it nec., with Ge, to supply a new verb with *prá* in b, since  $\sqrt{sr}$  regularly appears with *prá*.

I supply *rādhase* with *mahé*. This phrase is frequent, esp. in VIII (I.139.6, III.41.6, VIII.2.29, 24.10, 45.24, etc.), and *rādhase-* is a favorite word in the Vāl.

VIII.59.2: The Khila *ābhyām* should be read for *āstām*.

*pāré* can be read with both genitives, *rājasah* and *ādhvanaḥ*, separately (so also Ge) and is positioned between them.

Despite the morphological peculiarity of *sísratuḥ* (on which see Old, Narten [see Kü's ref.], Kü 553), I see no reason to substitute the Khila *tasthātuḥ* with Old, Ge. Both Narten and Kü endorse the nonce form *sísratuḥ*.

VIII.59.4: On the incomplete clause with *dhattam* see publ. intro.

VIII.59.6: The three gifts in ab seems to show a developmental sequence: they first have an inspired thought, which develops into thought (in the form) of speech, which is then heard.

With Ge (and Old) I read the Khila *tāni chándhāṃsi* for *yāni sthānāni*, which makes things considerably easier.

## End of Vālahilya

---

## VIII.60 Agni

VIII.60.3: Most take *yákṣ'yaḥ* as a deriv. of  $\sqrt{yakṣ}$  'appear, display', *yákṣa-* 'apparition', hence Ge's 'wunderbar'. I am taken instead by Old's suggestion (considered also by Re) that it incorporates the *si*-impv. *yakṣi* 'sacrifice!' regularly addressed to Agni, and my tr. reflects this. At the very least it is likely to play on  $\sqrt{yaj}$ , given its proximity to *yájiṣṭha-* (1d, 3c) and *yajñéṣu* (2d).

VIII.60.4: I take *ádrogham* adverbially with Gr and (apparently) Re, while Ge supplies an acc. of the 1<sup>st</sup> sg. pronoun to serve as goal for *ā vaha*: "(Zu mir), der ohne Falsch ist, fahre ..." The accent, against adj. *adroghá-*, may support an adverbial interpr.

*hitāḥ* is ambiguous: it can belong either to  $\sqrt{dhā}$  'place' (see *súdhitā* in c) or  $\sqrt{hi}$  'impel', and both may be meant. It also plays off immediately preceding *dhītíbhīḥ*, though it cannot belong to  $\sqrt{dhī}$ .

VIII.60.5: *ṛtāḥ* here is one of only two masc. forms of this extraordinarily common neut. stem, the other of which also qualifies *kavīḥ* (IX.62.30). (Gr's three masc. acc. *ṛtām* are actually neut., and the apparent du. masc. *ṛtā* appears in X.106, a hymn constructed of gibberish, in vs. 5, which I refused to tr.) In these two passages it must be a secondarily adjectivized application of *ṛtá-* 'truth', facilitated by its past participle shape (and origin). Hence the special-effect tr. 'entruthed'. Its appearance here may also be motivated in part by the semi-palindromic *trātar ṛtás*.

The trio *kaví-*, *vedhás-*, and *vípra-* recurs from vs. 3. There Agni was both *kaví-* and *vedhás-* attended to by *vípras*; here his attendants are *vípras* and *vedháses*, while he remains a *kaví-*.

VIII.60.9: I am a little uncertain why/how Agni protects us with hymn(s) (*gír-*), which are what we usually offer to him. Ge and Re soften the expression by tr. ‘word(s)’, but that is not what *gír-* means. Perhaps Agni’s “hymns” are the crackling noises of the fire, or else the instrumentals express cause: “protect us by reason of (our) hymns.” I prefer the former of these solutions. (See 18a below.) The various instrumentals cannot directly take up the *pāyúbhiḥ* of 8d, because *pāyú-* is masc. and all four number instrumentals (*ékayā*, etc.) are unambiguously feminine, as is *gír-* when it finally shows up in c.

VIII.60.11: A verb like ‘bring’ needs to be supplied with the first hemistich based on the numerous passages containing *ā bhara* governing *no rayīm* (e.g., I.79.8 *ā no agne rayīm bhara*); cf. also 18cd below.

On *upamāte* see VIII.40.9.

The publ. tr. “very glorious” is a careless error for “self-glorious,” misreading *svāyaśastaram* as *\*sūyaśastaram*. I am evidently not alone in this, as the SV reads this instead. If this were the correct reading the accent should probably have been *\*suyāśastaram*, given forms like *suśrávas(-tama)-*.

VIII.60.12: Ge and Re take *vardha* as intransitive/reflexive “wachse du,” “renforce toi,” but active forms of *várdha-* are about as reliably transitive as Vedic verbs get.

VIII.60.16: The sense of *sutyájam* is disputed. I ascribe to it the same metaphorical meaning as ‘abandon’ acquires in English, namely acting without constraint. This fits nicely with *áhrayas-* ‘unabashed, immoderate, unrestrained’. A fire blazing up out of control is presumably meant; in the next pāda it manages to split a rock -- a sudden glancing allusion to the Vala myth, in which Agni usually has no role.

VIII.60.18: In a hymn of rare clarity, this verse provides a sudden stumbling block. Re’s comment, “Galamatias [gibberish] en *dānastuti*,” does not provoke optimism. My interpr. is very far from the standard ones. The problems arise from the grammatical and semantic interpr. of *suṣāmāṇi* and of the hapax *cikitvánā* and the construal of *sacate* and of *túbhyam*.

The differently accented *suṣāman-* is a PN, and both Ge and Re take *suṣāmāṇi* as such here (so also Mayr. PN) -- Ge as a nom. (“eine der rätselhaften Nominativformen auf *i*”) and Re, more sensibly, as a loc. Because of the accent difference and because a PN does nothing for us, I prefer Gr’s suggestion that it has real lexical value (‘good melody’ or ‘having good melody’), though I confess I do not understand why it would have this particular accent. It modifies loc. *sárman*: a “shelter made of good melody” would either be the protective power of the sung portion of the rite or the protection given by the “singing” fire (see vs. 9 above, with Agni’s hymns).

As for *cikitvánā*, most interpr. take it as an instr. modifying *kétena* and derived in some way from  $\sqrt{cit}$ . Old takes it as a deformation of the instr. of the pf.

part. *cikituṣā*, which is metrically impossible in the cadence; others set up a nonce stem *cikiván-*. By contrast I think *cikivánā* should be divided into two words: *cikit vánā*. The first belongs to the stem *cikít-* ‘perceptive, observant’ (4x) found only otherwise in the nom. sg. (likewise *cikít*), twice of Agni (VIII.102.2, X.3.1). This would be its vocative, differing only in its lack of accent. What remains is *vánā*, which can be the neut. pl. of *vána-* ‘(piece of) wood’ (see 15a above), which is found here in a possessive constr. with dat. *túbhyam*. In external sandhi we should, of course, have expected *\*cikiḍ vána*, but I think the multiple exx. of *cikivān*, *cikivās*, etc., could have produced a redactional change, once voc. *cikit* was no longer clearly understood. (In the publ. tr. an asterisk should precede “O perceptive Agni” as well as “pieces of wood.”)

Taking *túbhyam* as part of an independent clause solves another problem in the other interpr., for there is no good way to construe it with pāda a. Ge must take it as an honorary gen. with *śárman* (“in deiner Obhut”), but though the dative can express possession in predicative usage, I do not think this is possible in attributive usage. Re construes it instead with *sacate*, “(le poète) t’obéit,” positing what I consider an unprecedented case frame (dat. only) and meaning for *sacate*. (The parallel he adduces, V.43.15, is to be taken differently, and in fact Re does not tr. it in parallel fashion himself.)

With *túbhyam* belonging to another clause, *sacate* is free to be construed with the instr., as it regularly is. The instr. in question is *kéta-* ‘will, intention’, which is regularly governed by *ánu √i* ‘follow’ (IV.26.2, etc.), semantically very close to ‘keep company with, be accompanied by’; cf. also *keta-sáp-* (V.38.3) ‘serving the will’.

Ge renders *iṣanyáyā* as ‘nach Wunsch’, hence presumably to *√iṣ* ‘desire’, but it seems arbitrary to separate it from the verb stem *iṣanyá-* ‘send, impel, drive’.

VIII.60.20: The voc. *āghṛṇīvaso* is taken lit. by Ge and Re (‘Glutreicher’ and ‘riche en ardeur-de-feu’ respectively). But *āghṛṇi-* is an epithet exclusively of Pūṣan, and it is highly unlikely that it would be used only here, in this awkward compound, without that reference. So it must mean ‘who has the goods of Pūṣan’ -- presumably the cows and other domestic stuff that’s appropriate to this last pragātha.

### VIII.61 Indra

VIII.61.1: The *ca* in pāda a is subordinating, as the accented verb (*śṛṇávat*) shows. See Klein DGRV I.245-46.

Ge, flg. Sāy, suggests that the twofold speech (*ubháyaṃ vácaḥ*) is Gesang and Vortrag. This is certainly possible, though I wonder if it might be refined to words and melody – that is, not separate performances of songs and recitations, but words set to music – accounting for the grammatical singular.

VIII.61.4: On *áprāmi-satya* see Scar 388, inter alia. With him and others (see already Gr) I take the first member as derived from *prá √mī*, but in the common idiom

‘confound’. In my view the compound concerns a regularly expressed anxiety about Indra – does he exist? See, e.g., VIII.100.3 *néndro astīti néma u tva āha* “‘Indra does not exist,’ so says many a one.” Our compound addresses this by calling him one “whose reality cannot be confounded.” Ge’s “der sein Versprechen nie bricht” assumes a meaning ‘promise’ for *satyá-* that I don’t think is justified for the RV. Scar’s “dessen Wahrheit unwandelbar ist” is closer to mine, but I don’t think his rendering of the first member is sufficiently pointed.

VIII.61.6: Although *paurá-* is generally a PN in the RV (see Mayrhofer, *Die Personennamen in der R̥gveda-Saṃhitā* s.v.), reflecting the patronymic it is morphologically, here it cannot be so meant. Among other things, Indra cannot be a descendent of Puru! In this passage it puns on *puruk̐t* in the same pāda, as well as *purūvaso* in 3a, *purū* in 8a. Ge’s tr. takes account of this word play (“Mehr der Rossherde”), but I don’t think that it should be construed with a genitive as he takes it. I take both genitives (*áśvasya ... gávām*) with *puruk̐t* (so also Scar 76) and interpret *paurá-* as ‘stemming from / related to much(ness)’, that is, ‘muchness itself’; “multiplicity ... multiplier” is an attempt to capture the pun in English without undue awkwardness.

In c Ge (also Old) takes *dānam* as subject: “bei dir bleibt die Gabe niemals aus,” but the verbal forms to  $\sqrt{mṛdh}$  are otherwise always transitive. Old cites VII.59.4 as parallel, but the parallelism is only apparent and the verb there is also transitive.

VIII.61.7: The two verbs in ab, *éhi* and *vidā*, seem to conform to the quasi-serial-verb construction (on which see A. Yates 2014 [UCLA IE Conference proceedings]), but *hí* makes trouble for this assessment and trouble in general for the interpretation. Since *hí* triggers verb accentuation, the first imperative should be accented *ehí* (that is, *ā + ihí*), not *éhi* (that is, *ā + ihi*), as Old points out. He suggests that *éhi* is parenthetical. This is possible, though ad hoc, but this still leaves the function of *hí* in question. It could be interpreted in the mode of Brereton 2012, as marking the first of two imperatives (in this case *vidā*, if *éhi* is parenthetical) as the basis of the action of the second. Such an interpretation is barely possible here; however, it seems excessively complex, since it requires banishing the truly first imperative *éhi* from structural consideration. My own ad hoc suggestion is that *hí* is over-represented in this part of the hymn (2a, 2d, 3c, 5c, 6c) and has been inserted here without its usual function and without triggering verbal accent. But this is of course not a satisfying solution, though it does allow the QSV analysis to be maintained.

For the hapax *céru-* see EWA s.v. An association with  $\sqrt{ci}$  ‘perceive’ seems possible. Ge is uncertain, tr. ‘seeking’, but in n. suggests ‘traveling’ (to  $\sqrt{car}$ ).

Morphologically *vāvr̥sasva* is somewhat problematic: Lub takes it as the medial perfect imperative to a subjunctive stem, Kü (474) more cautiously as a “thematically built” imperative. (It is worth pointing out that a properly built pf. mid. impv. would come out as *\*vāvr̥k̐sya* and would be multiply ambiguous.

Thematicization would be a good strategy under these circumstances. For further

disc. of this set of “thematic” perfect imperatives see my forthcoming art. on the perfect imperative.) As is generally noted, this imperative cannot be separated from the medial participle *vāvr̥ṣāná-*, which in two of its three occurrences also appears with *úd*. Following Neisser (1893, also Gotō 1987), Kü (474–77) assigns these forms to a root  $\sqrt{2}varṣ$  ‘sich ermannen, sich (tatendurstig) erheben’ (associated with the present *varṣāyáte*, which however appears to be a denominative, not a root formation) separate from  $\sqrt{1}varṣ$  ‘regnen’ and translates our passage rather like Ge’s “Ermannen dich...” I think this separation is unnecessary and also ignores the *ā vr̥ṣasva* in 3a. I find the liquid semantics of  $\sqrt{1}vr̥ṣ$  ‘rain’ not only possible in all the *úd*  $\sqrt{1}vr̥ṣ$  passages but productive of a striking image: ‘bubble/boil up’, expressing Indra’s irrepresible excitement and energy.

VIII.61.9: Thematically and lexically connected with the preceding verse (9) despite straddling the pragātha boundary. In 8c we identify ourselves as *vīpravacas-* ‘having inspired speech’, and in 9ab it is said that either a *vīpra* or a non-*vīpra* might offer his *vācas-* to Indra, with good results either way. Although this seems like a non-RVic sentiment (esp. after 8c), since ordinarily only good poets (like us) are meant to achieve success, perhaps the “inspired poet” is being implicitly contrasted with a non-inspired but still skillful poet. In the other occurrence of *aviprá-* in the RV (VI.45.2), Indra “places vitality even in the uninspired,” so perhaps, alternatively, here even the uninspired poet achieves success simply by dedicating his product to Indra and acquiring luster by this contact.

The accusative of the offering with  $\sqrt{1}vidh$  is a bit unusual, but not unprecedented (see, e.g., I.189.1), and Ge’s rather deviant tr. “die Rede recht gemacht hat” and his alternative suggestion that *vācaḥ* represents *vācasā* at the end of the pāda are both unnecessary.

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

The voc. *ahaṃsana* is surely rightly explained (Old ad V.75.2, AiG II.1.327, III.437) as a univerbation of a VP *ahám sanā* “I shall win” (see V.75.2 for another instantiation of this phrase). (AiG II.1.327 suggests *ahám saneyam*, but the thematic subjunctive matches the compound better.)

VIII.61.10: Ge tr. *yádi* as ‘So’, which does not seem legitimate to me. It might be possible to read it as *\*yád ī*, even without a following cluster (see Jamison 2002) “when he will hear my call,” but I don’t see that this appreciably improves sense.

VIII.61.11: Kulikov (339–40, flg. Gotō) does not allow a passive reading for medial forms of  $\sqrt{1}man$ , but aside from Gotō’s dictum I see nothing against such an interpretation, which fits the passage better than a reflexive one.

The hapax *árāya-* is plausibly taken as a negated form derived from the root  $\sqrt{1}rā$  ‘give, bestow’ by Mayrhofer EWA s.v. *rayí-*.

*jálhu-* (i.e., *jádhu-*) is also a hapax with no agreed-upon etymology or meaning. Ge leaves it untr. and Old simply comments “dunkel.” See EWA s.v. for references to previous discussions and suggestions. I wonder if it is not related to

*jaṭhára-* ‘belly’, with MIA voicing of intervocalic obstruent between vowels (cf. Pkt. *jaḍhara-* ‘belly’ cited in EWA s.v. *jaṭhára-* [though not registered in Turner]), with “belly” as the designation of a greedy, voracious person.

The point of the verse seems to be that we don’t want to get a bad reputation for being selfish by grabbing Indra to be our exclusive companion.

VIII.61.12: The second member of the hapax compound *ṛṇá-kāti-* belongs with *kāmakāti-* ‘desiring desires’, and I therefore produce a more volition tr. than the usual ‘Schuld fordernd’.

The interpretation of the second hemistich depends on the interpretation of *bhṛmám*. Gr takes it as ‘error’, Ge as ‘impatience’ (Ungeduld), and see EWA s.v. for other suggestions. I consider it a derivative of  $\sqrt{b}hram$  ‘whirl’, and see it here as qualifying the *vājín-*, the prize-winning horse. The point is that a good charioteer recognizes a good horse even when it’s going so fast it becomes a whirling blur. And this fast horse is the one that the knowledgeable charioteer wants and will obtain. Ge’s interpretation is very different: “Der Gewinner ... versteht die Ungeduld, die den Sieggewohnten erfasst.” He takes *bhṛmám* as a noun, the object of *védā*, and the referent of the relative pronoun in d. Since he considers that rel. pronoun the subject of *násat*, he must account for acc. *yám* by assuming attraction to *vājínam* from expected nom. *\*yáh*. My interpretation avoids this unappealing change and also accounts better for the position of the particles *íd ū*, since *vājínam* belongs to the main clause not the relative clause, by my reading. Moreover, *násat* should be a subjunctive, but his tr. fails to register that.

VIII.61.13: Pāda b would literally be “make lack of fear of that for us,” which is overly stilted.

Pāda c reprises 5ab.

VIII.61.14: Old takes *rādhaspate* as a predicated vocative, presumably with at least *rādhaso máhaḥ* and possibly *kṣáyasya* dependent on it. Ge (whom I follow) supplies a “lord” for those dependent genitives, which may amount to the same thing.

VIII.61.15: The sandhi form *índra* that opens pāda a can be either vocative or nominative. Because of the 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. verbs of cd, I take it as nominative.

## VIII.62 Indra

VIII.62.3: Gr, Ge take *áhita-* as ‘useless’ (untauglich), the negation of what I think of as a later specialized sense of *hitá-* as ‘useful, beneficial, friendly’, which is not, as far as I know, found in the RV. In his n. Ge allows the possibility of connection with  $\sqrt{h}i$  ‘spur on’ (which is Sāy’s view), and this seems the better choice. Parallel phraseology supports it: IV.7.11 *hinvé árvā*, V.36.2 *árvato ná hinván*, plus the numerous exx. of  $\sqrt{h}i$  + *ásva-*, *átya-*, and other words for horses. Ge’s cited parallel, VI.45.2 *anāsúnā cid árvatā* “even with a steed lacking speed,” also provides support.



I use the “be about to” sense, always possible for desideratives, to tr. *siṣāsati*, rather than ‘desires to win’. The question is not whether Indra wants to win – of course he does – but that he is about to win despite unfavorable circumstances. The ‘about to’ sense also works better with the future part. *kariṣyatāḥ* in d.

VIII.62.5: The interpretation of this verse rests on whose mind (*mānas-*) is at issue. Ge. considers it to belong to the mortal worshiper and makes it the object of *kṛṇóṣi*: “Da du ... selbst des Kühnen Sinn (noch) kühn(er) machst ...,” which also entails interpreting plain *dhṛṣāt* as a comparative. By contrast I consider the mind to be Indra’s and take pāda a as a separate nominal sentence. This has the advantage also of putting *yád* in b in a more acceptable syntactic position. In V.35.4 the *dhṛṣán mānaḥ* is unarguably Indra’s; the full expression in I.54.3 *dhṛṣatō dhṛṣán mānaḥ* “the bold mind of the bold one” also refers to Indra.

As for the rest of the verse, I take the gen. participles *saparyatāḥ* (c) and *pratibhūṣataḥ* (d) as genitives of benefit. This has the slight disadvantage of positing different referents for these two participles and for *dhṛṣatāḥ* in a, but it would hardly be the first time that a RVic verse contained genitives referring to different entities, and there is considerable distance between *dhṛṣatāḥ* and the others.

VIII.62.6: As Ge suggests, the object of Indra’s gazing should be the soma, parallel to the wells (*avatān*) of the simile. As he also suggests, the *avatān* can simultaneously refer to soma-springs (Somabrunnen), and so I have tr. the word twice, in simile and frame.

Ge construes the gen. phrase *dākṣasya somínaḥ* with the gerund *juṣṭvī*. This is probably correct; my “make X [acc.] of Y [gen.]” goes suspiciously easily into English, but in Sanskrit the construction would probably involve a double accusative. I would thus change the publ. tr. to “Finding pleasure in the skillful provider of soma, he makes (him) a partner ...”

VIII.62.8: Ge takes the dat. *devātātaye* with cd: “dass du für die Götterschaft mit Übermacht den Vṛtra erschlägst.” This has some immediate appeal, but I am reluctant to adopt it because both the hemistich-break and the *yád* intervene. Moreover, the use of present tense *hāṃsi* suggests that the Vṛtra-smashing continues in the present day and is perhaps separate from the primal act performed for the benefit of the gods in mythological time.

VIII.62.9: There are various ways to configure the nominals in the first hemistich, *sámaneva vapuṣyatāḥ* ... *mānuṣā yugā*, and their relation to the verb *kṛṇávat*. Most interpreters assume (I think correctly) that *kṛṇávat* takes a double accusative here (“make X into Y”), but which is the X and which the Y? Ge takes *mānuṣā yugā* as the first object and *sámaneva vapuṣyatāḥ* as the second: “Er soll die menschlichen Geschlechter gleichsam zu anstaunenden Versammlungen machen,” but does not explain how masc. *vapuṣyatāḥ* can modify neut. *sámanā*. Old discusses the passage at length, but in all four translations he suggests as possible he also takes *mānuṣā*

*yugā* as the first object. However, this phrase is almost always an accusative of extent of time “through the human generations” (I.144.4, II.2.2, V.52.4, VI.16.23, VIII.46.12). If we take it that way here and thus exclude it from one of the two accusative object slots with *kṛṇávat*, the remaining two nominals can each take one of the slots. The point then is that generation after generation people/gods marvel at Indra, and all these people oohing-and-aahing are like big festive parties.

VIII.62.11: The full specification of the subject of the 1<sup>st</sup> dual verb *sám yujyāva* as *ahám ca tvám ca* is noteworthy, since generally the subject is reduced by gapping, as in VII.88.3 *ā yád ruhāva váruṇas ca nāvam* “When we two, (I) and Varuṇa, mounted the boat ...” VIII.34.16 *índras ca dádvahe* “We two, (I) and Indra, took ...,” VIII.69.7 *úd yád ... gṛhám índras ca gánvahi* “when we two, (I) and Indra, go up to his house....” (Of course all those examples involve 1<sup>st</sup> ps. exclusive, rather than inclusive as here.) The increasing emphasis in this hymn on partnership between god and human discussed in the publ. intro. accounts for the explicit “both I and you” here.

VIII.62.12: *satyám íd vā u* is found as a unit at V.73.9, and I therefore think that *tám vayám, índraṃ stavāma* should be detached from both what precedes and what follows. See also expressions like *satyám tát* (III.39.5, VIII.59.3), *satyám ít tát* (VI.30.4), introducing a separable statement of truth.

### VIII.63 Indra

VIII.63.1: The two parallel perfects *ānaje* and *ānajé*, each final in its hemistich, require two different functional interpretations, the first passive, the second transitive, with a double accusative. Kü (95–96) recognizes more or less the same two functions (patientiv and agentiv-reflexiv) for this perfect stem, but curiously claims that the perfect to this root is found only in Maṇḍalas I and X, though offering no alternative interpretation of these forms here.

Various referents have been suggested for the *vená-*: Indra (Old), Soma (Ge). I favor Agni, for the following reasons. First, the actions of ab and cd, whose correspondence is signalled by the identical verbs, take place in the divine realm in ab and in the human one in cd, where Manu directs his action to the divine. This situation suggests a ritual scene, and the Vena, who is the target of both acts of smearing, should then be a middleman between the divine and human in the ritual. This figure can only be Agni or Soma. As for the rest of the vocabulary, *pūrvyá-* can be used of Agni, Soma, and Indra, but is most regularly Agni. Likewise Agni is often the object of *√añj*; cf. esp. III.14.3 *yát sīm añjánti pūrvyám havírbhiḥ*. And Agni several times opens doors (e.g., I.128.6, III.5.1, VIII.39.6). With Agni covertly mentioned in this verse and Soma overtly in vs. 2, the whole ritual scene is set.

VIII.63.2: The sense of *māna-* here is disputed. Ge takes it as “Melodie,” explained ad I.39.1 as via “Tonbemessen, Intonation”; Old “Himmelshaus.” Although my

interpretation of *māna-* as ‘measure’ shares a root etymology with Ge’s (at least as he sees it, but cf. EWA s.vv. *māna*<sup>-2</sup>, *māna*<sup>-3</sup>), namely  $\sqrt{mā}$  ‘measure’, I take it in a fairly literal sense — the measure of heaven is the distance to it — and as an acc. of goal. See also 7d.

As far as I can see, *úd*  $\sqrt{sad}$  occurs only here in the RV. Ge takes it as “make a pause,” but gives no grounds for this interpretation. Although already in the BYV *Samhitās* this lexeme can mean ‘go out, (tr.) put out [of fire]’, here a literal meaning ‘sit up’ fits the context very well. The pressing stones are raised up in preparation for pressing; note that the *grāvan-*, also ‘pressing stone’, are *ūrdhvā-* ‘erect’ in X.92.15, a situation also embodied in the compound *ūrdhvā-grāvan-*.

VIII.63.3: *stuṣé* could alternatively be 1<sup>st</sup> sg. ‘I shall praise’. I interpret it as an infinitive, with Ge, because there has been so far no personal reference to the poet. But this is not a strong argument, esp. since “we” make an appearance in vs. 4.

The mention of the opening of the Vala cave may allude to the dawn, and therefore to the dawn happening at this sacrifice now.

VIII.63.4: *vakṣāni-* is derivationally ambiguous: Gr takes it to  $\sqrt{vakṣ}$  ‘grow, increase’, Ge to  $\sqrt{vah}$  ‘convey’, though not with entire confidence (“Wortführer (?)”), AiG II.2.207 allows both. Both are possible in the realm of RVic discourse. I opt for  $\sqrt{vakṣ}$  because the expression is parallel to *kavivṛdhāḥ* ‘strengtheners of poets’, but I certainly don’t rule out a derivation from  $\sqrt{vah}$ .

Another ambiguous word is *hóman-* in c; this stem can mean either ‘invocation’ (to  $\sqrt{hū}$ ) or ‘pouring, oblation’ (to  $\sqrt{hu}$ ). Gr takes it to the latter, Ge, apparently (‘Darbringung’) to the former. I agree with Ge: the trope of pouring out praise is common in the RV.

VIII.63.5: The syntactic association of *vārasya* is disputed; see Old’s discussion for various possibilities. I follow Ge in taking it as dependent on *krátum*.

It also seems necessary to supply a verb with ab. I import *anūṣata* from cd, with *svāhā* the cry that the sacrificers cry out; however, Ge’s ‘entsprechen’, utilizing the preverb *ānu* present in pāda a, is also possible, though he must take *svāhā* as a syntactic absolute (“unter Svāhāruf”).

Ge takes *śvātrām* as the content of the call (“... haben ... den Drang eingeschrien”), but  $\sqrt{nu}$  ordinarily takes as object the being towards whom the cry is directed, and I therefore take *śvātrām* as referring to Indra. (This standard construction of  $\sqrt{nu}$  does make some trouble for my interpretation of *svāhā* as construed with supplied  $\sqrt{nu}$  in ab, but perhaps the fact that *svāhā* expresses the cry itself makes the difference. See comm. on I.6.6, however.)

Note the phonological echoes: *ā(d ū) nú ... ānu* (a) / *anūṣata* (c).

VIII.63.6: I see no reason to attenuate the identification of Indra with the *adhvarā-* that the grammar seems to demand, by a contrivance like Ge’s “den die Preislieder als (Gegenstand) des Gottesdienstes kennen.” See I.178.4, where Indra is identified

with “the laud of the sacrificer” (*yájamānasya śáṃsah*), and the immediately following verse (63.7d), where he is identified with peaceful dwelling (*kṣáyah*).

VIII.63.7: The second hemistich has been subject to various interpretations. See, inter alia, Old’s discussion, also Thieme (*Fremdl.* 42–43). The primary points of difference are the case/number of *vipáh* (gen. sg. or acc. pl.) and of *aryáh* (gen. sg. or acc. pl.), the sense of *māna-* (as also in vs. 2), and the syntactic structure of the final pāda. I opt for gen. sg. *vipáh* (as Old points out, the acc. pl. should be accented *vípah*), acc. pl. *aryáh*, and the same sense for *māna-* as in vs. 2, namely ‘measure’ – in this case the measure, i.e., the sheer size, of Indra. I construe both genitives (*vipáh* and *mānasya*) with *barhāṇā*, and take the last two words *sá kṣáyah* as a separate clause, as the position of *sá* might suggest – contra all other interpretations I am aware of. It makes sense that Indra should be identified as “peaceful dwelling,” because he has killed the strangers and thus brought peace to the Five Peoples.

VIII.63.8: As noted in the publ. intro., “the turning of the wheel” (*cakrásyā vartaním*) recalls the later designation for a universal monarch *cakra-vartin* ‘turner of the wheel’. The association of *cakráṃ* with  $\sqrt{vrt}$  ‘turn’ is found elsewhere in the RV (*cakráṃ ná vṛttám* I.155.6 = IV.31.4 = V.36.3; and a number of VPs, e.g., I.164.11 *várvariti cakráṃ*, II.11.20 *ávartayat sūryo ná cakráṃ*), but this seems the passage most implicated in power and sovereignty.

VIII.63.9: Pāda a contains a textual problem: whether to read the transmitted *vyódana* (-e [so Pp.] or -ah, out of sandhi) ‘moistening/moistener’) or to emend to *òdaná* (i.e., -é) ‘rice-porridge’, the food associated with the Emuṣa myth that is treated virtually only in this part of VIII (the *odanám* in 69.14; 77.6, 10). See Ge and Old ad loc. I follow Ge in the emendation; it is very difficult to make sense of the ‘moisten’ interpretation, and the rarity of *odanám* might have lead it to be changed. In the publ. tr. there should be an asterisk before “to the rice-porridge.”

VIII.63.10: Supplying ‘praise-hymn’ or the like as object of *dádhānāḥ*, which goes back to Sāy, is supported by VII.73.1 *prāti stómaṃ devayānto dádhānāḥ*.

As Ge points out *yusmābhiḥ* may refer either to the gods or to the other singers. On the basis of 11, I think the latter is more likely (so also Ge), although note the gods in 12d.

VIII.63.11: Ge takes *ṛtvīyāya dhāmane* as referring to the Maruts (as the “pünktlichen Geschlechten” [timely race], a phrase that doesn’t make a lot of sense to me) or Indra. On the basis of V.48.1 *priyāya dhāmne ... svákṣatrāya sváyavase* “or the self-ruling, self-glorious one ... for his own dear establishment,” I take this as referring to the establishment of Indra at the sacrifice, governed by the sacrificial order, which the singers are hoping for. This establishment is then stated as accomplished in 12c *yáh ... dhāyi* “who has been established ...”

*ṛkvaḥ* reminds us of the insistent *arká* of the 2<sup>nd</sup> trca (4c, 5c, 6c); the same verb *√nu* ‘cry out’ is repeated here, from 5c.

VIII.63.12: I have no idea what the mountains have to do with anything and why they and the Maruts should be in agreement. (Ge takes *sajóṣāḥ* only with the mountains, but this doesn’t help.) Since there is in fact no overt ‘and’, it is possible that the Maruts are being referred to as mountains (“... the Rudras, ‘mountains’ in their profusion, are of one accord...”).

The relativization in cd is somewhat shift: the *yáḥ* should refer to Indra, who is the first member of the compound in the main clause *índrajyeṣṭhāḥ* ‘having Indra as chief’.

### VIII.64 Indra

VIII.64.4: I take *kṣáyo diví* as a nominal sentence, parenthetically inserted, rather than interpreting *kṣáyah* as a 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. verb form, as most others do. See Old on the two possibilities. Although it makes some complications for the syntax, I prefer the nominal interpretation both because *kṣáya-* is, as Old says, a favored noun in this group of hymns, and because a verbal *kṣáyah* should be a subjunctive and I do not see what the subjunctive would be conveying here. (Ge tr. it as a straight indicative, which avoids the difficulty but contravenes the morphology.) Stating that Indra’s dwelling is in heaven makes clear why we command him to “go forth” in order to “come here.”

VIII.64.10: On c as a quasi-serial-verb construction see Yates 2014. Also 12c.

### VIII.65 Indra

VIII.65.5: The morphological identity of the forms *gr̥ṇīṣé* and *stuṣé* is disputed. Ge takes them as 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. passives (favored also by Old), though he mentions the possibility that they are 1<sup>st</sup> sg. *-se* forms in his n.; Lub identifies them as 1<sup>st</sup> singulars. I take them as infinitives rather than 1<sup>st</sup> sgs, primarily because they are accented. However, it is possible that a finite verb would bear the accent after the accented initial voc. *índra*, and that the second form would be accented contrastively, so 1<sup>st</sup> sg. is certainly not excluded. Since the “you” of the publ. tr. (/ “dich” of Ge’s tr.) is not overtly expressed, either interpretation fits the text.

### VIII.66 Indra

VIII.66.1: The nominative plural pres. part. *gāyantaḥ* in c and the 1<sup>st</sup> singular *huvé* in d are grammatically incompatible but conceptually harmonious: this is the usual situation where the poet speaks both for himself and for the group of officiants he represents. Ge takes abc together and supplies a 1<sup>st</sup> plural verb (rufen wir), while I

assume that the *huvé* of d has domain over the whole verse, with the plural participle in c a grammatical interruption.

VIII.66.2: My tr. of pāda b sounds in English like a loc. absol. or a relative clause, but is simply an attempt to keep the pāda together in tr. The acc. *suśiprām* of course simply picks up the rel. prn. *yām* that opens the verse.

Ge tr. *ādītyā* as “fürsorglich” and so must assign it to a separate root  $\sqrt{dr}$  ‘pay heed’. I instead take the form to  $\sqrt{dr}$  ‘burst, tear’ (a possibility Ge registers in his n.). See EWA s.v. *DAR'* for the likelihood that the later *ā*  $\sqrt{dr}$  ‘pay heed’ forms developed as semantic specializations of ‘tear out’.

VIII.66.3: The first hemistich contains two hapaxes with which Indra is identified. The meaning and etymology of neither of them can be certainly determined.

The first one, *mṛkṣā-*, is the easier, because a root etymology suggests itself (though without imposing itself) and because the adjective qualifying it, *ásvya-* ‘belong to a horse, equine’ narrows the semantic field. If the form belongs to the root  $\sqrt{mrj}$  ‘wipe, groom’, a *mṛkṣā-* can be a curry comb (so Ge, EWA s.v. *MARJ*, both with uncertainty) or other tool for grooming a horse. (The supposed root  $\sqrt{mraks}$  ‘comb’ to which Gr and AiG II.2.71 assign it does not exist.) Possibly connected is the hapax *mṛkṣínī-* (X.98.6), where the word seems to describe the tracks on the earth made by a hard rain – possibly envisioned as the regularly spaced impressions left by a comb. Why calling Indra a curry comb would be flattering to the god is not clear. Perhaps it’s one of those cultural mysteries like (semi-)modern Engl. “you’re the cat’s pajamas.”

The second hapax, *kīja-*, is harder, because there is no apparent root etymology, no similar forms attested in the RV, and, although it is also accompanied by an adjective, that particular adj. ‘golden’ (*hiranyāya-*) leaves the field very wide. Note also that, properly speaking, the velar should have yielded a palatal before *i*, but there are enough secondary *ki/i* forms to keep this from being a useful diagnostic. Ge suggests, tentatively, “Sporn” (spur) (sim., and similarly tentative, EWA), but gives no support. I very hesitantly adduce the later (Ep+) *kīcaka-* ‘hollow bamboo’ and suggest that *kīja* might be a ‘stake’. Note the *hiranyāyo vetasāḥ* “golden reed” in IV.58.5. Being called a golden stake seems a bit better than being a horse’s curry comb.

VIII.66.4: Since *vásat* is a subjunctive, strictly speaking it should be tr. “as he will wish.”

VIII.66.4–5: Note the cross-pragātha lexical agreement: 4a *purusambhṛtām*, 5c *sám bharāmasi*.

VIII.66.7: The balance of opinion (Gr, Kü, Lub, etc.) takes *apīpema* to  $\sqrt{pī}$  ‘swell’, which morphologically makes sense. But Ge seems to take it rather as a redupl. aor. to  $\sqrt{pā}$  ‘drink’ (“Wir haben ihn ... hier getränkt...”), though without explicitly

saying so. See also the very parallel passage VIII.99.1, with *ápīpyan*. Despite the difficulties (amply treated by Kü), I prefer to associate these two forms with  $\sqrt{pā}$ . The transitive *-āya*-formation *pāyāyati* ‘makes drink’ is well attested in the RV. It is a little difficult to figure out what a corresponding reduplicated aorist should look like. Since  $\sqrt{pā}$  is not an orthodox long-*ā* root, it doesn’t make a *p*-causative (type *sthāpayati*) and therefore would not import the *-p-* into the redupl. aorist (type *ātiṣṭhipati*). One might expect, based on its *-āya*-stem, to produce *\*ápīpayat* if thematic (type *dīdharat*) and *\*ápīpet* (type *dīdhar[t]*) if athematic, with the weak form to be expected *\*ápīpima*. Whether the form belongs to *pī* or *pā*, the full-grade in the root syllable of this form must be secondary, and if it’s not a problem to extend the full grade to the weak form of *pī*, it should likewise be unproblematic with *pā*. It is true, however, that the ‘swell’ root is possible and that the forms of the perfect of  $\sqrt{pī}$  and the putative redupl. aor. of  $\sqrt{pā}$  would be hopelessly mixed up formally and not terribly separate semantically. For *ápīpyan* in VIII.99.1 see disc. there.

VIII.66.8: Ge takes the wolf of ab as a simile, compared with the unexpressed Indra: “Wie der wilde Wolf ... wartet er auf seine Zeiten.” But this requires taking *cid* as a simile marker, which I am loath to do. I consider it a general statement about nature — wolves follow their own patterns, however much they appear to be acting randomly. Indra, though he is apparently uncontrollable, attends to our ritual patterns and will come when called (which is similar to what vs. 7 says -- same yesterday, same today). So, although the behavior of the wolf is a point of comparison for Indra’s behavior, it is not a simile in the narrow sense. A similar comparison but in a real simile is found in VIII.33.8 ... *mṛgó ná vāraṇāḥ, purutrā carātham dadhe* “Like a wild elephant he has established his wandering [= his territory] in many places,” where Indra is compared to a wild beast and the territory is somewhat like the *vayúna*- here.

Ge takes d as a separate clause, apparently supplying a form of  $\sqrt{cit}$  ‘appear’ (“erscheine ...”), presumably based on *citráyā* and to be construed with *prá*. Although the position of *prá* is suggestive, I do not see that separating the *pādas* is necessary, since d fits easily with c.

VIII.66.9: Because *asya* is unaccented, it needs to be construed separately from *indrasya*. So also Ge.

VIII.66.10: My interpretation of *pāda* a is quite different from Ge’s and starts from the rhetorical structure of the four questions in vss. 9–10. Three of these (9ab, 9cd, 10b) are negative questions, in which the negative is part of the predicate: 9a *ákṛtam*, 9c *ná śúśruve*, 10b *ástṛtam*. 10a also contains a negation, *ádhrṣtāḥ*, but in Ge’s tr. it is not predicated: “Was sind seine grossen, unangreifbaren Kräfte?” Furthermore his tr. implicitly equates neut. sg. *kád* with fem. pl. *táviṣīḥ*. These problems can be fixed by taking *kád* as a question marker, not an interrogative pronoun, and by assuming that the powers in question are not Indra’s (as Ge takes them), but those of Indra’s enemies. The implied answer to the rhetorical question is “no, there exist no powers

that Indra can't assail." For *táviṣī* belonging to others, see, e.g., I.80.10 *índro vṛtrásya táviṣīm nír ahan ...*

The hapax *bekanāṭa-* is an almost textbook example of non-Indo-Aryan phonology (see Kuiper, *Aryans*), and it seems safest to take it as the name of a people, rather than in the traditional interpretation (going back to the Nirukta VI.26 *bekanāṭāḥ khalu kusīdino bhavanti*) as "Wucherer" (usurer, profiteer) as Ge does. For disc. see KEWA and EWA s.v.

VIII.66.11: *ápūrvyā* [sic, not, as in Aufrecht and HvN, *ápūrvya*] and *purūtāmāsaḥ* play off each other. *We* may be the latest of many, but our formulations have no predecessors – a variation on the usual theme of the "newest hymn."

VIII.66.12: Ge and Old make heavier weather of ab than seems necessary, motivated in part by *tvé* rather than *tvā* in a and the positioning of the verb in b rather than a, near to *ūtāyaḥ*. Ge supplies a form of  $\sqrt{dhā}$  in a, "Zwar werden viele Hoffnungen auf dich (gesetzt)," and takes *hāvante* as passive, "und werden deine Hilfen ... anrufen." But the stem *háva-* is overwhelmingly transitive. Old suggests taking *ūtāyaḥ* as accusative pl., which would do even more violence to the grammar. I take the subject of *hāvante* to be *āśásaḥ* 'hopes'. As for *tvé*: although  $\sqrt{hū}$  ordinarily takes the accusative, I can imagine a locative *tvé* in a more distanced usage: they call towards you, but they do not actually succeed. (Alternatively the *tvé* could have been influenced by *tvé* in 13a, in the same metrical position, though metrically distracted.) I then take *ūtāyaḥ* as a separate existential clause.

VIII.66.14: *citrāyā dhiyā* occurs also in 8d, and the tr. should have been harmonized. As in vs. 8, I take the *dhī-* to be ours, rather than Indra's, as Ge takes it.

### VIII.67 Ādityas

VIII.67.5: A predicative voc. in a question.

VIII.67.7: *ādbhutainasaḥ* is generally taken as a gen. sg., parallel to *ānāgasah* in b. But since the only other ex. of this stem modifies the Maruts in V.87.7, I think it likely that it is a nom. pl. modifying the Ādityas. Moreover there is no NOM + *āsti* construction in c as there are in a and b. There is perhaps too much machinery in the tr., to indicate that it is not the Ādityas' offenses, but those of others, that cannot deceive or mislead them (=the gods), but given the Ādityas' character, I think the internal structure of the cmpd would be clear to the audience.

VIII.67.8: What to supply with *mahé* is somewhat up in the air, but some equivalent of Ge's "Glück" seems harmless enough.

I don't understand Indra's role here. Is the idea that Varuṇa & Co. should not be getting any ideas about tying us up, because only Indra gets to do such things? But



this would run counter to Varuṇa's role, at least in later Vedic, of binding offenders. In any case the theme of binding recurs in this hymn; cf. vss. 14, 18.

VIII.67.9: In ab I supply a transitive form of  $\sqrt{mṛc}$  'harm' to be construed with the cognate instr. root noun. The fact that the verb of pāda c, (*abhí prá*) *mṛkṣata*, though derived from  $\sqrt{mṛś}$  'touch', could technically be an *s*-formation to  $\sqrt{mṛc}$  makes the generation of a verb from that root easier, and in fact we might consider *mṛkṣata* as representing both 'harm' and 'seize'. Old notes the phonological play.

In its other two occurrences *aviṣyú-* has the negative sense 'greedy' and is clearly related to *avasá-* 'food', etc. (see EWA s.v. *avasá-*), but here it must be positive. I assume a portmanteau pun, combining 'greedy' with an association with  $\sqrt{av}$  'help', resulting in 'greedy[=eager] to help'.

VIII.67.12: Since *anehás-* is an adjective, a noun needs to be supplied with it (contra Ge, Re). I supply 'shelter' on the basis of VIII.18.21 (also a hymn to the Ādityas) containing *aneháh ... trivárūtham ... chardīḥ*, with the *várūtha-* and *chardís-* found in our vss. 3b, 6b.

VIII.67.12–13: The correlative of *yé* in 13 is *té* in 14, but this unremarkable pairing actually conceals a bit of trickery: *yé* has 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. reference, but *té* has 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. reference, with the impv. *mumócata*, with a change in person in midstream that is not evident until the verb is reached at the end of pāda b.

VIII.67.15: The doubling of 1<sup>st</sup> pl. pronouns, *naḥ ... asmát* can be interpr. in two different ways. On the one hand, *naḥ* can be just a Wackernagel-position placeholder, doubled by the more emphatic (and case-marked) *asmát* later in the vs. Of course enclitic *naḥ* is not technically supposed to represent an ablative, but I think that all bets are off with Wackernagel-position pronominal enclitics. Or the *naḥ* can actually be an accusative, construed with *ájaghnusī*.

VIII.67.18: On the phrase *návyam sányase* see comm. ad VIII.24.26, with argument for supplying 'life' with *návyam*.

VIII.67.21: The preverb *ví* is excessively represented in this vs., with 5 occurrences (including *víṣvak*) and its usual contrastive partner *sám* in the middle. Note also the figure ... *aṃhatím# ... sámhitam#*.

*aṃhatím* also makes a faint ring with the same word in 2a.

## VIII.68 Indra

VIII.68.2: With Old (and implicitly Ge), read as a compound *víśvayāmate*; this requires no emendation to the Saṃhitā text, only the erasure of the word boundary in the Pp.

VIII.68.3: The hapax participle *jmāyánt-* is clearly built to the adverbial instr. *jmā* belonging to the ‘earth’ word (*kṣám-*, etc.). The *pári* preceding it can be read both with the verb *īyatuḥ* and with *jmāyánt-*. Cf. *párijman-* and EWA s.v. As for what it means for a mace to encircle the earth, it is probably a measure of its size, which then indicates that Indra’s hands are even larger because they encircle the mace.

VIII.68.4: Although the sense of this verse is fairly clear, the second half-verse displays some syntactic intricacies, namely, what I consider two conjoined NPs that interact with each other in various ways and for which there is only one overt conjunction, *ca* in somewhat anomalous position. I take the two pāda-initial instrumentals *évaiḥ* and *ūtī* as forming one NP, with both indicating qualities of Indra’s (differently Ge, who takes *évaiḥ* with the verb: “rufe ich ... mit Eifer”), and the two pāda-final genitives *carṣaṇīnām* and *ráthānām* as a second NP, dependent on either *ūtī* alone or *évaiḥ ... ūtī* jointly. The single *ca* connects the two instrumentals in an *X ca Y* construction. This seems to me superior to Klein’s interpretation (DGRV I.172, 192–93) as a *ca XY* construction, with the *ca* conjoining the two genitives. For *évaiḥ* as the quality of a god, not an adverb, see, e.g., X.67.11.

VIII.68.7: The accusative phrase in c, *pūrvyām ānuṣṭutim*, makes syntactic trouble here. See disc. by Old, who lays out various possibilities. Ge takes the hemistich as containing a zeugma, with (as far as I can determine) *īśe* read differently with the two pādas -- taking an accusative in c and meaning “Anrecht haben,” while taking a genitive in d and meaning “herrschen über.” But among the numerous occurrences of *īś-*, I know of none with the meaning or case frame proposed for c. Old suggests either supplying another verb (*acodat?*) or taking the phrase as an Inhaltsakk. (though in what sense of that term I don’t understand). I take it either as a haplogitized *\*ānu ānuṣṭutim* or as an acc. of respect. (Note that Old rejects Ludwig’s suggestion to read *\*ānu ṣṭutīm*, but this would be another possibility in my opinion. What perhaps speaks against that is the other occurrence of *ānuṣṭuti-* in nearby VIII.63.8.)

VIII.68.8: I add a parenthetical “other” in ab, because Indra’s fellowship is something we always aspire to (see vs. 11 below), and so to state baldly that no one has achieved it seems defeatist.

VIII.68.10: I take *īmahe* to  $\sqrt{yā}$  ‘beseech’, not ‘drive’ (contra Ge “... nahen wir...”).

There is a missing middle term between ab and c, namely what we are imploring Indra for – presumably the same help that he gave to Purumāyya.

VIII.68.14: Ge supplies ‘horses’ with the numbers of pāda a, separating them from the men of b: “... sechs (Rosse), je zwei und zwei, (und) die Herren...,” because the next verse definitely has six horses. But Hoffmann’s (1967: 233) suggestion that there are six men, who are the leaders of the horses, makes the verse less jerky and avoids having to supply both a noun (horses) and a conjunction (and).

VIII.68.15–17: The donors of the various gifts are generally in the locative here and so would be properly translated “bei,” “chez,” “at (the hands of) ...” or the like, but a series of locatival tr. is simply too heavy and awkward.

I have made no effort to sort out the internal relationships among the patrons – a topic more than amply discussed in the sec. lit.

VIII.68.17: *vadhūmant-* means literally ‘having women, brides’, but Ge raises the question whether in this context it really refers to mares. I think this unlikely. Dānastutis regularly lump horses and female humans together. Very parallel is I.126.3 *śyāvāḥ ... vadhūmantaḥ ... rāthāsaḥ*, “dusky (horses) and chariots carrying brides.”

VIII.68.18: I take the ruddy female (*āruṣī*) as a reference to Dawn, with the bull accompanying her as the sun. This makes sense in a dakṣinā context, since the priestly gifts are distributed at the dawn sacrifice. Ge rather as a mare.

### VIII.69 Indra

VIII.69.1: It is necessary to supply a verb for ab; Ge “Traget” but I supply “chant” on the basis of the beginning of the second ṛca, 4ab *abhī prá ... arca*, and the insistent repetition in vs. 8: *ārcata prārcata, ... ārcata# / ārcantu ... arcata#*. Pāda a is essentially identical to VIII.7.1a *prá yád vas triṣṭúbham íṣam*, where the verb governing the acc. is *ākṣarat* ‘has let flow’ (pāda b), which is not possible here. The “Triṣṭubh refreshment” is obviously the praise hymn; interestingly neither this passage nor VIII.7 is in Triṣṭubh meter.

The second hemistich is somewhat obscure, in part because, as Ge points out, it is not clear who the subject is. Perhaps the “Triṣṭubh refreshment” (that is, the praise), or the drop (that is, the soma) to which it is chanted, or the poet. (I favor the praise hymn.) The pair *dhī-* and *púraṇdhī-* appears elsewhere together (VIII.92.15, X.65.13–14). Ge takes them here as names of the goddesses of religious poetry and of the dakṣinā respectively. In VIII.92.15 I take them as qualities that Indra confers on us, but here at least the *dhī-* is probably that of the poet(s). Perhaps they are a reciprocal, rather than parallel, pair: we receive plenty in exchange for insight (as in V.41.6). The interpretation is further complicated by the fact that *ā vivāsa-* everywhere else takes an accusative, often in conjunction with an instr. of means: “seek to attract X with Y” (e.g., VIII.15.1 *índraṃ gīrbhís taviṣám ā vivāsata*), but there is no accusative immediately available. (Though *vaḥ* could technically be an accusative, that interpretation seems unlikely here.) However, this is of course an Indra hymn, and in thinking about this verse again, I have concluded that Indra should be supplied here as the default object, and therefore for the publ. tr. I would substitute “With your visionary thought and with plenitude it [=hymn] is seeking to entice (Indra) here, in order to gain wisdom.” Cf. VIII.3.18 *imé hí te kārāvo vāvaśúr dhiyā, víprāso medhāsātaye* “For these bards, inspired poets, have bellowed for you

[=Indra] for the winning of wisdom with their insight,” with both *dhiyā* and *medhāsātaye* in a similar context, where poets seek Indra.

VIII.69.2: Another verse with unclear reference: neither the 2<sup>nd</sup> singular subject of *iṣudhyasi* nor the bull and cows are clearly identified, and it is complicated by the fact that there are also two occurrences of 2<sup>nd</sup> plural *vaḥ* in the verse. I take the subject to be the same as that of *ā vivāsati* in 1d, namely the praise hymn, with the common switch of persons. That the praise hymn is in reality inanimate is not in RVic discourse an obstacle to addressing it. The 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. *vaḥ* is then the same group of poets / ritual officiants as in 1a and 1c. As for the bull (*nadā-*, a and b) and the *pāti-* (c), I agree with Ge (n. 2) that it can be either Indra or soma. In the latter case, the referent is then the same as the *indu-* ‘drop’ that was the target of the hymn in 1ab; in the latter, the same as the unexpressed object of *ā vivāsati* in 1cd. The cows are easier to account for if soma is the referent: they would then be the mixing milk as so often. If the bull is Indra, the cows may be the cows he brings us as largesse or praise hymns conceived of as cows (many words for hymn are feminine), and the sexual tinge of ab would be a nod to Indra’s hypersexuality. Probably both referents are meant.

VIII.69.3: The first two pādas seem rather briskly to clear up the uncertainties of the previous verse, or give at least one reading thereof: soma, the cows that give the milk to mix with soma, and Indra (though not by name) are all present, and their relationships are clear.

The connection of the last half of the verse to what precedes is not clear, as Ge also points out. The birth is likely to be that of soma, but why are we now concerned with “the clans of the gods”? I tentatively assume that the gods are awaiting their invitation to the soma-drinking in their usual abodes. Somewhat later in the hymn (11b) all the gods partake of the soma.

There is number discrepancy between pl. *triṣú* and sg. *rocané*, as also in the identical pāda in I.105.5b. On the basis of expressions like I.102.8 *trīṇi rocanā*, V.69.1 *trī rocanā*, I.149.4 *trī rocanāni* the two words must be construed together and a truncation of *rocanéṣu* must be assumed. I don’t quite know why, but Bloomfield (RR ad I.105.5) points out that *rocané divāḥ* is a frequent cadence, and it therefore may have imposed itself formulaically in this phrase. Also the alternation between *trī* and *trīṇi* and *rocanā* and *rocanāni* in the formula may have made an alternative *rocané* to *rocanéṣu* seem acceptable. In fact loc. pl. *rocanéṣu* is only attested once.

VIII.69.4: Although this verse belongs to a different ṛca, it seems to provide an alternative resolution to the puzzle of vs. 2, somewhat different from that given in 3ab. Here Indra is definitively identified as a *gópati-* ‘lord of cows’, paraphrasing 2cd *pátim ... ághnyānām dhenūnām*.

Ge takes *yāthā vidé* as “wie er bekannt ist,” but this tag phrase regularly refers to the traditional way of producing poetry or performing ritual. See, e.g., I.132.2, VIII.13.14, IX.86.32.

*satyásya sátpatim* is probably a pseudo-pun, given that by many accounts (including ours) *sát-pati-* derives from *sáts-pati-*, with the first member a reduction of *sádas-* ‘seat, settlement’. See EWA s.v. If *sát-* belongs to  $\sqrt{as}$  (as some think), it is a real pun.

VIII.69.6: Pāda c is presumably a reference to the Vala cave, as Ge points out.

VIII.69.7: Another elliptical 1<sup>st</sup> dual construction; for disc. see VIII.62.11.

Ge and Hoffmann, inter alia, take *bradhnásya viṣṭāpam* to refer to the height or top of the sun. The phrase occurs also in IX.113.10. *bradhná-* in VIII.4.13–14 seems to refer to soma. Since *viṣṭāp-* several times occurs with *samudrásya* (VIII.34.13, 97.5=IX.12.6, IX.107.14), something liquid makes sense, rather than wandering around on top of the sun. Furthermore, at least in IX.12.6 (and probably IX.107.14) the “sea” in this expression is clearly soma. I also think that it works better as acc. of extent, rather than as goal, since the goal is the *grhām*.

For the ceremonial aspects of the second hemistich see publ. intro. Note that *sákhi-* is an integral part of the “seventh step” mantra at the wedding ceremony: *sakhā saptapadī bhava* “Become a comrade of the seventh step” (ŚGS I.14.6, etc.; see Jamison 1996: 121). Contra Hoffmann (1967: 255) I separate *trīḥ* from *saptá*, and consider the former to refer to drinking soma at the three pressings (so also Ge). I also take the cardinal *saptá* as if it were the ordinal *saptátha-*. For the corresponding verse, see 16 below.

VIII.69.9: It is likely that all three of these obscure words, *gárgara-*, *godhā-*, and *pīngā-*, are musical instruments, but further specification is difficult.

VIII.69.11-12: I do not understand why Varuṇa is mentioned specially. Perhaps because of the waters of 11d and the rivers of 12b?

VIII.69.12: I take *sudevá-* as a bahuvrīhi, as *su-*compounds with this metrical shape and accentuation generally are (contra Ge’s “ein guter Gott”). The gods mentioned in 11b may be part of Varuṇa’s retinue.

VIII.69.13: Interpretations of this verse vary, and cd is characterized as “dunkel” by both Ge and Old. I take the verse as a series of relative clauses referring to (unnamed) Indra, leading up to the proclamation of Indra in 14ab. The relative clauses are interrupted by an exclamatory *tád íd vápuḥ* “just this is the marvel!” in c.

Ge takes *takvāḥ* as a PN (rejected by Mayr. PN; see also EWA s.v. TAK), but I see no reason to separate the stem from *tákvan-*, *takva-vī-*, and *takvavīya-*, all of which seem to refer to the movements of birds of prey.

I take *upamā* (so Pp., or *upamāḥ*) in the same way as in I.31.15, viz., as a root noun compound ‘measure’. See disc. there.

VIII.69.14: Ge takes *ohate* as reflexive, but I prefer a passive interpretation here.

The second half of the verse segues into the Emuṣa myth prominent in this part of VIII. For disc. see publ. intro.

VIII.69.15: Note the extreme diminutivization in *arbhakó ná kumārakāḥ*, signalled by the two *-ká*-suffixed forms. Presumably the point, in this account of Boyhood Deeds, is to emphasize how small and weak he was to accomplish such deeds.

Both Ge and Old are troubled by *vibhukrátu-* as a qualifier of the buffalo. Old goes so far as to suggest it should be nominative, but was attracted into the accusative by the preceding accusatives (which, note, are not even adjacent or in the same pāda). This seems unlikely (and unworthy of the usually punctilious Old). Ge also manoeuvres the adjective into referring not to the *krātu-* of the buffalo, but rather to that of the father and mother: “Er kochte das Büffeltier für Vater und Mutter, das ihrem Verlangen genügte.” I do not understand how he is interpreting the *vibhu-*, nor do I see any difficulty with assigning the quality named in the compound to the buffalo: that the buffalo is formidable makes the feat of a tiny boy cooking it (and presumably first catching it) all the greater.

VIII.69.16: The first hemistich seems addressed to the present-day Indra, recalling his boyhood deeds recounted in 15ab.

The second half matches vs. 7, with the same proposition that Indra and I (=poet, in my opinion; Ge rather Viṣṇu) should become comrades (both times with *sacevahi*). The referent of the multiple accusatives in cde is disputed. Old suggests the sun, in part because *sahásrapād-* is used of the sun already in AV VII.41.2. Ge also considers the sun the referent of the accusatives in cd, “den himmlischen, tausendstrahligen, rötlichen (Sūrya),” but separates those in e into a separate constituent (as far as I can tell), “den fehlerlosen, zum Heile führenden (Weg) folgen,” because pāda e is found in VI.51.16ab *āpi pānthām aganmahi, svastigām anehásam* qualifying ‘path’. I prefer to read all the accusatives together and take the path (of VI.51.16) as the referent. This also involves interpreting *sahásrapādam* as ‘having a thousand steps’, not ‘... a thousand feet’. This recalls vs. 7 “... become comrades at the seven(th) step...,” and I would suggest that the “thousand step” version plays off the previous one, indicating that our comradeship will last even longer. The path itself may be the soma (see disc. of 7) that facilitated the establishment of our comradeship; see 7c.

VIII.69.17–18: Note the responsion of 17b ... *āsate*# and 18d ... *āśata*#.

### VIII.70 Indra

VIII.70.2: Pādas b and c are difficult. The superficially most natural interpretation is to take the two together, as Ge does (“in dessen Hand ... die gerngesehene Keule gelegt ward...”; so also Old), but the putative verb in this relative clause, *dhāyi* in c, is unaccented. If we take this lack of accent seriously, and I think we should, some other solution has to be found for the relative clause in pāda b, a task made all the

more challenging by the disputed form *vidhartári*. This particular form appears twice (also IX.47.4), but formally belongs to the agent noun *vidhartár-* (voc. sg. 1x, nom. sg. 4x) ‘distributor, apportioner’. The *-tári* forms are nonetheless generally taken as infinitives. Tichy (1995: 59–61), by contrast, takes them as loc. sg. of a verbal abstract (here “in dessen Hand, *wenn es ans Verteilen geht*, ein weiteres Mal die sehenswerte Keule gelegt wird” [p. 60]), and others as nom. sg. neut. (See disc. of these various possibilities with earlier lit. in Old and in Keydana 196–99.) Keydana, at least for this verse, suggests that *vidhartári* is the (infinitival?) subject of the nominal relative clause, *yásya* its specifier, and *dvitā* a predicate adverb: “Der Hand wurde die Keule dargereicht (pāda c), *deren Austeilung ein weiteres Mal [erfolgt]* (pāda b)” (199 n. 31). I consider the form to be a locative (like Tichy), but a locative not to an abstract but to the agent noun it appears to be and coreferential with Indra in pāda a. Alternatively it could refer to a third party, who is responsible for the return of Indra’s mace; this seems to be Old’s favored solution: “beim (Welt)ordner,” who is responsible for equipping Indra with the mace. In the absence of mythical context, we cannot be certain. Though I have added the parenthetical “(in the hand of),” this tr. is an English makeshift for the German *bei* or French *chez*, which both render such locatives more efficiently. The statement in b, that the mace has been returned to Indra, is then restated in pāda c more clearly.

The datives *hástāya* and *divé* instead of the locatives that might be expected are curious.

VIII.70.3: The identity of “him” in “No one will catch up with him...” is not sufficiently signalled in the publ. tr. I take it to refer to the successful sacrificer (cf. VIII.31.17), who ritually strengthens and thus “has created” Indra. However, the perfect *cakāra* could instead signal mythic time; both Ge and Old believe this refers to the original creator of Indra, as in IV.17.4. The reference to Indra’s birth in 4cd may support their position.

VIII.70.4: In my view this verse is structurally parallel to vs. 2: pāda a continues the previous verse; b is a nominal relative clause; and cd may or may not go with b, but have unaccented verbs. Ge (n. to 2b) and Old also consider the verses parallel, but in the case of both verses they think that bc belong together despite the unaccented verbs of c(d). In separating b and c here I must supply a noun with fem. adjectives *mahīr urujráyaḥ* -- and choose ‘waters’, since pl. *āpas*, *apás* is common with *mahīḥ*; ‘rivers’ would also be possible, so Ge, who seems to take *mahīḥ* simply as a designation of rivers (“die breitströmenden Flüsse”) without comment.

VIII.70.5: The conjoined NPs in ab display a neat chiasmus: *dyāvah ... śatām, śatām bhūmīḥ*. This may help account for the placement of the *utá* after the second term. Although XY *utá* structures are by no means uncommon (see Klein DGRV I.344–53), they are considerably rarer than the standard X *utá* Y type.

In cd there are two parallel nominal subjects, pl. *sahásraṃ sūryāḥ* and du. *ródasī*, and neither matches the sg. verb *ānu ... aṣṭa* in number. Several solutions

have been proposed. BR (see Old) and Gr take *ródasī* as singular, but all other examples of sg. *ródasī* (and more common *rodasī*) refer to the goddess of that name; when *ródasī* refers to the world-halves, it is always dual. Old also cites Ge Komm for the view that the sg. verb was influenced by *sahásram*. I am inclined to assume that the sg. verb split the difference between the plural and dual subjects, and it is also possible that the construction was somehow syntactically calqued on the inherited neuter plural subject + singular verb construction (though neither of the subjects is neuter). It's also worth noting that the root aor. 3<sup>rd</sup> du. middle of  $\sqrt{(n)}aś$  is not attested, and in fact, acdg. to Macdonell, *Vedic Gr.*, the only 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> du. mid. root aor. attested is *adhītām* (X.4.6,  $\sqrt{dhā}$ ), so the poet may have been a bit insecure about what the du. form ought to be (*\*aśātām?* *\*aṣtām?*), and the pl. *sūryāḥ* may have been too distant to allow the 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. *aśata* to be used instead.

VIII.70.6: Ge takes the loc. *gómāti vrajé* as a loc. absolute (“wenn es sich um rindergefüllte Hürde handelt”). By using the Engl. idiom “help someone to something” I may be stretching Sanskrit syntax further than is legitimate. Though see Gr, definition 4 s.v. *av*: “jemandem [A.] wozu [D., L.] verhelfen.” Unfortunately this is the only passage he places under that rubric with a loc.; the others have datives. However, in *Rivelex* vol. I the Deep Case Frame for *av*<sup>i</sup>, subsection 1d / 1da, tags a number of other possible such passages with this structure (not all of which I would so interpret).

VIII.70.7: For *étagva-* as ‘winning dappled cows’, see Thieme, *Studien* 67–68 and EWA s.v.

The second hemistich is unconnected to the first; its two rel. clauses attach to the next verse.

VIII.70.8: Though as just noted, 7cd should be construed with this verse, the main clause to which those rel. clauses should be attached is incomplete – having a referent *tām* for the *yāḥ* of 7c, but no main verb. Ge supplies “rufet,” which seems the simplest solution, extracted from the two forms of *havyaḥ* in cd.

Gr, Ge take *āraṇa-* as ‘depths’, presumably as a contextual antonym to *gādhā-* ‘ford’, putatively < \*‘shallow’ (but see EWA s.v.). But there seems no good reason to separate *āraṇa-* from *āraṇa-* ‘alien, foreign’ and its relatives, esp. since a ford is a ‘shallow’ only indirectly. The other occurrence of *āraṇa-* (I.112.6) is not in an antonymic context; Ge renders it “in der Grube” (pit), but there is no external support for this tr.

VIII.70.9: The lexeme *ud*  $\sqrt{mrś}$  is found only here in early Vedic, but like other combinations of  $\sqrt{mrś}$  ‘touch’ + preverb, it seems to have a slightly slangy sense. Gr “jemand [A.] emporheben zu [D.],” but the sense of touch is lost. Ge “Streck fein (die Hand) für uns aus,” which fails to render both the root meaning and the preverb. My “shape us up” attempts to render both, with the sense “make us ready/worthy to



receive.” The insistent *úd* here, opening pādas a, c, and d, may be meant to contrast with *ní* in the following verse (pādas b, d).

Note the alliteration: ab ... *mahé*, *mṛśasva* ... and esp. cd ... *mahyaí* *maghavan maghāttaye*, ... *mahé*# This is the culmination of a play on *mah-* and *magha-* forms in the central part of the hymn: 6a *mahinā*, 6c *maghavan*, 8a *mahó mahāyyam*.

VIII.70.10: The lexeme *ní*  $\sqrt{trp}$  occurs only here (in all of Sanskrit, as far as I can tell). I interpret the *ní* as reversing the meaning of the root verb, as sometimes elsewhere (see Jamison 1983: 86 for some other examples) – hence ‘be unsatisfied’ <  $\sqrt{trp}$  ‘be satisfied’. Scar also seems to interpret the verb in this fashion (“... bist du unzufrieden”), but does not comment on why. Gr ‘verzehren’ (consume), Old ‘sich sättigen’. Since *tṛmpāti* is ordinarily construed with a genitive, I take *tvānídaḥ* as a gen. sg., not acc. pl., as Gr and Ge take it. Scar allows either possibility, and Old favors the gen. My interpretation is thus rather distinct from Ge’s “du hast deine Schmäher satt” (have your fill of), though his also conveys a negative sense.

The girding motif of c must indicate some kind of preparation for battle, but what exactly the equipment and procedure were is not clear.

I have, reluctantly, interpreted the injunctive *śiśnathaḥ* in d as an imperative, as also in VIII.24.25. So also Ge in both passages. It would be possible here (less so in VIII.24.25) to interpret it modally “you will jab down...” or even as a timeless statement “you jab down...”

Note the play of #t“vám..., #t“vanído ... / ... *tuvinṛmna*

VIII.70.11: Ge takes the *sváḥ sákhā* to refer to the enemy’s comrade, but given the dual dvandva voc. *índrāparvatā* (3x) “o Indra and Mountain,” it seems more likely to be Indra’s. In those passages I take “mountain” as a designation of Indra’s mace.

VIII.70.12: Indra’s generous handful of cows in this final verse before the sarcastic *dānastuti* implicitly contrasts with the stinginess of Śara, who gives only one calf (vs. 15).

VIII.70.15: See comment on 12. The thematic connection between the verses is underscored by the presence of the verb ‘grab’ in each, but note that vs. 15, part of the hymn proper, has the older form  $\sqrt{grabh}$  (*sám gṛbhāya*), while the *dānastuti*, belonging to a more popular level of language, has the younger  $\sqrt{grah}$  (*-gṛhya*).

### VIII.71 Agni

VIII.71.2: The 2<sup>nd</sup> *hí* pleonastically doubles the one in *nahí*.

VIII.71.5: I would delete “the” before “wisdom” in the publ. tr.

I consider *gántā* a possible, but not necessary ex. of a periphrastic future.

VIII.71.6: Supply ‘give’ from 3c *rayím dehi viśvāvāram*, with the same obj. and an adj. echoed by *puruvāram* here.

VIII.71.12: I supply “we beseech” as the verb, from the twin pragātha vs. 13c *īmahe*, despite the interruption by a clause containing nom. *agnīḥ* (13ab).

*kṣaītrāya sādhasē* has to be interpr. in connection with the cmpd. *kṣetra-sādhas-* (III.8.7, VIII.31.14). Ge’s interp. “zur Schlichtung (des Streites) um ein Feld” [for the settlement (of conflict) regarding a field] seems unnecessarily specific and contextually unsupported.

### VIII.72 Agni or Praise of Oblations

See the publ. intro. for the general structure and manifold difficulties of this hymn. For disc. of the possible ritual details, see Old, Ge, Re, etc. For the most part I will not comment on such here.

VIII.72.2: *asya* could also refer to Manu’s companionship and be tr. “in his companionship,” but in IX the companionship of soma is mentioned (IX.61.29=66.14, 107.19; cf. also I.91.14, IV.28.1).

VIII.72.3: There are various ways to configure the places where “they seek.” I take *antār* in a pregnant sense, referring to the interior of the subject; the search expands to *jāne*, and finally to the place “beyond inspired thought” (*paró manīṣayā*). Since this phrase is also found in V.17.2, the two words must go together, whatever they are trying to convey.

VIII.72.4: *atītape* has been subject to a number of conflicting analyses (esp. passive or transitive with unexpressed subj.), but all seem to start with a 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. with anomalous ending *-e*. I see no reason why it cannot be a 1<sup>st</sup> sg., with the proper ending for a thematic medial reduplicated aorist. Although there are no other 1<sup>st</sup> singulars around, referents are ricocheting around everywhere in this hymn, and as indicated in the publ. intro., the vss. do not show close connections to each other.

VIII.72.6: Gr. assigns *dāmā* to an otherwise unattested long-*ā* stem and glosses it as ‘Seil’, but it could just as well be the nom. sg. masc. to an *-n*-stem *\*dāmán-* ‘binder’ formed to neut. *dāman-* ‘bond’ (like m. *brahmán-* to neut. *bráhma-*).

VIII.72.11: The hapax *abhyāram* is glossed by Gr “zur Hand, bereit,” and Ge and Re follow suit. Old suggests that it’s an absolutive, without specifying to what root or what it should mean. Still I think he has a better chance of being right than the others. The *-am* gerund takes vṛddhi of the root and accent on the root syllable (see, e.g., Whitney Gr. §995, and AV *abhyākrāmam*). This form could well belong to *abhí√ṛ* (as in fact Gr also suggest) and mean ‘going towards’.

VIII.72.12: The first pāda contains a lovely sound sequence: (g)āva (up)āva(t)āva(tam).

The hapax *rapsúdā* is difficult. Ge refuses to tr.; Old suggests a connection with the rare *lapsudín-* (TS, etc.) ‘having a beard’. Although the phonology would obviously work, the semantic connection is shaky, and *lapsudín-* has no etymology either. I favor a suggestion of Re’s, that the word here is connected with the secondary root  $\sqrt{\text{rapś}}$ , extracted from *virapśá-* ‘abundance’, which in turn derives from *\*vīra-p(a)śu-*, by most lights (see comm. ad I.122.4). The first part of the word (*rapsú-*) can be seen as preserving the *-u-*, which the other forms don’t, but losing the *vī* (for which cf. *rapśád-ūdhan-* ‘with teeming udders’ [II.34.5, of dhenus]). The palatal sibilant cluster (*-pś-*) was also regularized to one containing the dental sibilant (for possible parallel ex. see *rāspiná-* I.122.4, with metathesis as well). The second part of the word would be the root noun to  $\sqrt{\text{dā}}$  ‘give’, in the nom. sg. fem., modified by *mahī*, indicating a vessel (perhaps *ukhā?*). Although we should expect a nom. sg. *-dāḥ*, the final may have been lost either because it was simply reanalyzed as a fem. stem with suffixal *-ā-* or because it was lost in continuous recitation (before the pāda-initial vowel of pāda c) and not restored redactionally.

VIII.72.15: I take *kṛnvatē* as governing three different objects, *dhariṇam*, *nāmaḥ*, and *svāḥ*, each with a slightly different relationship with the verb.

VIII.72.17: *ā dade* is ambiguous between 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. Ge. opts for 3<sup>rd</sup>, Re for 1<sup>st</sup>, and Old waffles. I have chosen “I” but with no strong preference either way.

### VIII.73 Aśvins

VIII.73.9: The curious phrase “honed with hope” is probably motivated in part by the phonological similarity in the Skt. *āsāsā# ... asāyata#*.

VIII.73.11: Some of the interpretive questions in this vs. are 1) whether *kím* is a neut. interrog. pronoun (as I take it) or a question particle (so Ge), and 2) what the referent of *idám* is. I supply ‘deed’, since that’s something regularly proclaimed. Ge and Re assume the referent is *ávaḥ* ‘Gnade’/‘faveur’ from the refrain. Since the refrain otherwise has no connection with the rest of the verse in this hymn, I think this solution is unlikely, but I hold no particular brief for my ‘deed’.

### VIII.74 Agni

VIII.74.1: Nom. pl. part. *vājayántaḥ* (b) and 1<sup>st</sup> sg. *stuṣé* (d) represents the not unusual number mixture of a singular poet speaking for and with the other ritual officiants. Cf. VIII.66.1 for similar number mismatch.

Pāda-final *vācaḥ* I take (with Ge) as a truncated instr. standing for *vācasā*. For disc. see comm. ad VIII.39.2. However, in this context, since  $\sqrt{\text{stu}}$  can, though rarely, take an acc. of the praise, it is possible (with Old and Re [though Re seems to recant

in his n.]) to take it as obj. of *stuṣé* in a construction different from the dominant *agním ... stuṣé*. However, the acc. of the god praised continues in the next two verses, and I think it unlikely that this focus would be interrupted by “I speak a speech as praise.”

VIII.74.4: *édhate* is a pun. Though its general purport is ‘thrive’, it is still transparently related to  $\sqrt{idh}$  ‘kindle’, and the thriving is a result of flaring up, as of a flame.

VIII.74.9: The publ. tr. should read “Brilliant with its brilliance ...” and “at the overcoming of obstacles.”

VIII.74.10: The vs. is structured as an acc. phrase referring to Agni, with no governing verb. It is probably best to take it as loosely anticipating the rel. clauses beginning with *yám* in the other two verses of the *ṛca* (*yám tvā* 11a, 12a). That the accusatives in ab, d belong in a virtual rel. clause is signalled by pāda c with a rel. clause in the gen. (*yásya* ...).

My interpr. of pāda a differs from the standard, which takes *-prā-* as ‘fill’ and construes *ásvam ... gām* as a simile: “filling the chariot [with goods, vel sim.] (as) a horse (or) cow (does).” This conjures up an unintentionally comic picture in a physical sense, and even in the attenuated sense this interpr. presumably sketches, that a winning horse or productive cow generates goods that would fill a chariot (see Ge’s n. 10a), the structure and meaning of the phrase are muddy. I follow a suggestion of Re’s, given in his n. to the passage but not reflected in his tr., that the sequence is a reduction of *\*aśvapráṁ íd goprāṁ rathaprāṁ* and that *prā-* belongs with forms like *pūrdhí* ‘give!’ (Mayrhofer’s *PAR*<sup>12</sup>).

The *u*-present *tūrvatha* here is enclosed by two occurrences of related (*vṛtra-*)*tūrya-* (9c, 12c) ‘overcoming of obstacles’, but though *tūrva-* does on occasion take an acc. of what is overcome (cf. the same VP in VIII.99.6 *vṛtrám ... tūrvasi*), here “overcome (Agni’s) claims to fame” is excluded by sense, since the poets shouldn’t seek to outdo Agni, and it must mean something like “help to triumph.”

In pāda d I supply *\*gṛṇánti* as the verb with nom. *kr̥ṣṭáyaḥ* on the basis of the next hymn VIII.75.10 *gṛṇánti deva kr̥ṣṭáyaḥ* (see also *girā* in the next vs. of this hymn, 11a). It is possible that this subj./verb complex governs the whole verse, save for pāda c with its 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. verb and gen. rel. cl. -- thus, “(whom) the separate peoples (hymn) as the one bestowing the chariot ...”

VIII.74.11: The hapax *cániṣṭhad*, though fairly clearly a 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. act. injunctive, is not regularly formed. Whitney (Roots) calls it “plainly corrupt”; Old discusses it at some length and floats various possibilities. Whatever its source, it clearly patterns with the superlative *cániṣṭhā* in the same metrical position in 8b (so Old, Re). The standard solution, which comes in various guises, has been to posit a more regularly formed verb that has been re-formed (/corrupted) because of the proximity of the splv., either at the time of composition or redactionally. This is the tack Old chooses;

of the various underlying possibilities he considers, he favors an *-iṣ*-aor. subjunctive \**cāniṣat* (cf. 2<sup>nd</sup> du. *caniṣtām*). See also Hoffmann (MSS 2 [1952/1957] = Aufs. 367; repeated by Narten, s-aor. 111), who considers the contamination a product of the poet.

VIII.74.13: Contra Gr, but with Ge and Re, I take *huvānāḥ* as passive.

I take *mṛkṣā* to  $\sqrt{mṛj}$  ‘stroke’ and in the same slangy sense as *úd*  $\sqrt{mṛj}$  in I.126.4.

VIII.74.15: The intensive *áva dedīsam* here seems to have real “intensive” force; a frequentative reading seems excluded or at least forced, as if the poet were constantly scolding the River (“I keep pointing out to you ...”).

### VIII.75 Agni

VIII.75.1: Although it might at first seem odd that Agni’s horses best summon the gods, the horses are presumably the plumes of smoke, and as they ascend to heaven, they inform the gods of the sacrifice.

VIII.75.2: This is the only occurrence of *śrād-* outside the inherited unverbated idiom *śrād*  $\sqrt{dhā}$  ‘trust/put trust in’. As I have discussed elsewhere, ‘trust’ is often specifically trust in the efficacy of the sacrifice, and I think that’s the meaning being tapped here: realize our trust in the sacrifice’s success with tangible results.

VIII.75.3: The pleonastically suffixed *yáviṣṭh’ya-* beside the regular splv. *yáviṣṭha-* owes its suffix entirely to metrical considerations. All 15 occurrences of the stem are pāda-final in a Jagatī or dimeter line and thus provide a text-book iambic cadence. The unextended *yáviṣṭha-* is not as rigidly placed, but is still often pāda-final in a Triṣṭubh cadence.

VIII.75.5: The standard tr. take *tám* as a ref. to Agni, who is then the equivalent in the frame of *nemím* in the simile; so “bend him here as craftsmen bend a felly.” In the publ. tr. I take the frame/simile relation to be an example of case disharmony, with *ā namasva* intransitive/reflexive in the frame (“bend (yourself) here”) and transitive in the simile (“as craftsmen bend a felly”). This is based in part on the fact that medial forms of  $\sqrt{nam}$  (outside the 1<sup>st</sup> ps.) are intransitive, and this interpr. also makes better sense of the voc. *aṅgiraḥ*: in the sg., *āṅgiras-* is used almost exclusively of Agni and never, as far as I know, of a human poet/priest as it would be here if a poet/priest is the subj. of *ā namasva*. But I failed to remember that *nemí-* is said to be feminine, and therefore *tám* should not qualify it. I am still unwilling to give up my interpr., however, and would note first that at least in the RV there are no diagnostic passages where *nemí-* must be feminine, that is, no passages containing unambiguous feminine adjectives modifying it. And as a short *-i*-stem, it does not look feminine.

So I would claim either that it is being treated as a masc. in this passage or that redactionally initial *\*tām* was changed to *tām*; there are no metrical implications.

VIII.75.7: On *ápāka*- see comm. ad I.110.2.

VIII.75.8: Ge sees cows as the referent of the fem. bathers in b, which are, in his interpr., leaving their calves behind as they bathe. Although I do not know about the bathing habits of cows before modern animal husbandry (and Google is no help here), I doubt that they abandoned their calves to go splash in the river -- and I also doubt that Ge knew much about this topic either. Moreover, having bathing cows abandoning their calves in b and non-bathing cows doing the same in c seems poetically clumsy. Rather I follow Re in taking the rosy bathers of b to be the dawns (though he still sneaks in the cows in his tr. “vaches-aurores”). As he points out, Dawn arises from her bath in V.80.5, and *usrá-* in the fem. pl. is regularly used of dawns. I think there is a hint of coquetry and teasing here: a group of girls bathing in a river, surprised by some young men, flashing a bit of skin and then running off in fits of giggles. The girls-bathing motif is fairly widespread: the Gopis and Kṛṣṇa come to mind, as well as Nausicaa and her friends in the Odyssey, and nearer to home, the Apsarases engage in water play in X.95.7–9.

VIII.75.10: The standard tr. take *nāmaḥ* as obj. of *gṛṇānti* and ab as a single clause (“they hymn homage to ...”). But  $\sqrt{gṛ}$  doesn’t otherwise take as object the content of the hymn; Gr must make up a special category (8) for this passage. And *nāmaḥ* + DAT is a well-represented construction.

VIII.75.11: The publ. tr. “...you will toil for wealth for us, for our quest for cattle” makes the two “for” phrases sound parallel, though they are not in Sanskrit (acc. *rayīm*, dat. *gāvīṣṭaye*). The intent is that Agni should work hard to obtain wealth for us, which we can use in our quest for cattle (that is, further wealth).

Pāda c is an almost comically economical etymological figure: *úrukṛd urú naḥ kṛdhi*.

VIII.75.12: This vs. relies on an untranslatable pun on the root  $\sqrt{vrj}$  ‘twist’, in two different idioms: *pārā*  $\sqrt{vrj}$  ‘shun, avoid’ (< ‘twist around’) and *sám*  $\sqrt{vrj}$  ‘twist together’ → ‘gather up’ of winnings at dice (hence my ‘takings’).

VIII.75.14: Technically speaking, the genitives *yásya ... namasvínah ... ádurmakhasya vā* depend on *sámīm*, but it is almost impossible to render this in parsable English (“the labor of which homage-offerer or not stingy one Agni has enjoyed ...”).

## VIII.76 Indra

VIII.76.1: The position and function of *ná* in c are somewhat troubling. If, as seems likely, it is the simile marker, its position should mark *marútvantam* as the simile “like one accompanied by the Maruts,” but this makes no sense, since Indra’s being accompanied by the Maruts for real is the insistent point of this hymn. It therefore must be construed with the following infinitival *vr̥ñjāse* and have an “as if” sense (so Ge), rather than participating in a strict simile structure. It might also be possible to take *vr̥ñjāse* as a truncation of *\*párivr̥ñjase* and the *ná* as the negative, “for (him) not to avoid (us),” but there is no model for this nor any reason to assume truncation.

VIII.76.12: The last pāda presents some difficulties: the function of the ablative *índrāt*, the syntactic affinity of *pári* (preverb with *mame* or postposition with *índrāt*?), and the sense of *tanvām*. Ge takes *índrāt* as an ablative of comparison (“habe ich im Vergleich mit Indra zu klein bemessen”). His “zu klein” must render *tanvām*, which I assume he takes, with Gr, as belonging to an adj. *tanú-* ‘thin’ in the fem., rather than to the fem. noun *tanū-* ‘body, self’. But even if we were to accept this analysis of *tanvām*, it would still be a positive, not a comparative. It would be possible to take *pári* as a postposition with *índrāt* in the meaning ‘from’, but despite the positioning I am inclined to take it with the verb *mame* because *pári*  $\sqrt{mā}$  is found in a very similar context in the riddle hymn, with numerology: I.164.45 *catvāri vāk párimitā padāni* “Speech is measured in four feet (/quarters).” As for *tanvām* I take it as referring to the “body” of the speech, perhaps the physical realization in sound measured out in time. Scar (667) takes the *tanvām* as reflexive: “Die ... Rede ... habe ich von Indra ausgehend mir angemessen,” which seems to treat the form as a dative. In n. 948 he does recognize the possibility that the poet sees his hymn as “Corpus.” I take *índrāt* as abl. of cause, though it could be a simple starting point: “I measure the speech (starting from) Indra.”

### VIII.77 Indra

VIII.77.2: For this verse cf. VIII.32.2, 26–27. Gr takes *niṣṭúraḥ* as nom. pl., and Ge apparently follows this analysis, taking it as indicating the designated destroyers of Indra (“Diese sollen ... (deine) Niederstrecker sein”; sim. Scar 539, 642, though with more machinery). But I consider it rather a gen. sg. modifying a gapped gen. sg. referring to Indra – quite possibly by haplology from *té* *\*te*. The only other occurrence of the stem is in the dative and modifies Indra, in a verse immediately following an Emuṣa verse: ... *ugrāya niṣṭúre* “... to the strong one who lays low.”

VIII.77.3: Note both the phonological figure *khé ... khédayā* and the etymological figure *akhidat ... khédayā*. The sense ‘hammered together’ attributed to *sám ... akhidat* may seem strange, given that  $\sqrt{khid}$  means something like ‘tear (out/apart)’. I assume that the lexeme and sense here were generated acdg. to the common *sám / ví* opposition to *ví*  $\sqrt{khid}$  ‘tear out/apart’, attested in AVP XVI.73.5 and KS XVII.15, as well as Śāṅkh. Br. II.9.

VIII.77.4–6: The name *índrah* is identically positioned in all three verses of this *ṛca*, at the beginning of the final *pāda*.

VIII.77.4: The hapax *pratidhā-* is connected by Gr to  $\sqrt{dhā}$  ‘suck(le)’, presumably because of the soma-drinking context. But I take it rather to  $\sqrt{dhā}$  ‘place’ (so also Scar, though with different semantics). The lexeme *prāti*  $\sqrt{dhā}$  means ‘set (an arrow on a bow), aim’, and from ‘aim’ to ‘shot’ seems an easy semantic path. Consider also English ‘shot’ for a quickly downed drink. That a bow and arrows figure in the Emuṣa myth (see vss. 6–7) may support this derivation.

The other hapax in this verse, *kāṇukā* is not so easily handled. All tr. and comm. (including MM, EWA, s.v.) essentially give up. Gr calls it a “Beiwort zu *sáras-*” (the ponds in *pāda* b) and takes it as an acc. pl. neut., which seems reasonable, though it could also in principle be an old instr. sg. of an *-a-* or *-ā-* stem (as *pratidhā* is). Unlike some other passages containing opaque hapaxes, there is no phonological motivation visible. It resembles the hapax participle *kaṇūkayánt-* in X.132.7, but that is of no help because that form is even more puzzling than this one. It also resembles *kāṇá-* ‘one-eyed (RV X.155.1, AV+), and Edgerton (1911, *The -k-suffixes of Indo-Iranian*, 13) suggests it is derived from that word and means ‘jug’ — a jug “with a small opening and a large bulging body,” though he’s not happy about the *-u-*. I have also considered the possibility that it’s derived from a MIA form of *kárṇa* ‘ear’ and also refers to a vessel for liquids, this time because of its eared handle(s). The Eng. tr. ‘hogshead’ is an attempt to replicate the possible derivation of a word for liquid measure from a word for a part of the head. A hogshead contains a prodigious amount of liquid. One contributor to the word’s appearing here might be a pun on the *vṛddhi* derivative *kāṇvā-* ‘descendant of Kaṇva’, which is several times read as *kāṇ"vā-* (VIII.2.40, 4.20); the Anukramaṇī attributes this hymn to Kurusuti Kāṇva. So, something like “(the vessels) of soma provided by the Kāṇvas.”

VIII.77.5: I have no idea who or what the Gandharva represents here. Ge suggests that it can be the Gandharva as Somabewacher or, alternatively, the sun, but the context gives no particular support to either identification. It would be desirable to connect this verse with the Emuṣa myth, but I do not see how to do that either. It should be noted, however, that the datival phrase *brahmábhyaḥ ... vṛdhé* “to strengthen the composers of sacred formulations” is reminiscent of the datival phrase in vs. 8, an undoubted Emuṣa verse, *stotṛbhyaḥ ... nṛbhyo nāribhyo áttave* “for the praisers, the superior men and their ladies, to eat.” Note in our phrase the “attraction” of the obj. *brahmábhyaḥ* into the dat. to match the inf. *vṛdhé*. Unless we wish to interpr. the phrase as passive, “for the composers ... to be strengthened.”

The one clear connection to the Emuṣa myth within the hymn is the adj. *abudhná-* ‘bottomless’, which anticipates the name of the bow, *bundá-*, in the next vs.

VIII.77.6: Ge takes *bundám* in c as the object of *nír āvidhyat* ‘pierced’ that opens the verse. This requires assuming an aberrant meaning for the verb (‘abschiessen’ [shoot]), and I find it unlikely (so does Old, who also feels that the object should be



the target of the verb). Instead, though it requires supplying a first object for the verb in a and a verb to govern the acc. in c, I take the three pādas as relatively syntactically independent and supply the boar as one object of *nír āvidhyat*, in addition to *odanám* in b. I take the first two pādas as shorthand for killed the boar, pierced the mountain, and got the porridge – the three signature actions in the Emuṣa story. Note that *odanám* is the object of *bhinat* ‘split’ in another condensed allusion to the Emuṣa myth in VIII.69.14. As for what verb to supply to govern *bundám*, I supply ‘took’ from yet another abbreviated version in VIII.45.4, the only other hymn in which *bundá-* is found: *ā bundám ... dade*. For a possible long-distance syntactic/formulaic relationship between 6a and 10d, see comments on vs. 10.

I take the phrase *giríbhya ā* as expressing the freeing of the *odanám* from the mountains (pāda b), but it could also be read with pāda a with the sense of *ā* + abl. “all the way to,” though in that sense the ablative usually follows (see Gr s.v. *ā*), hence “He pierced the boar all the way to/through the mountains.”

As noted ad vs. 5, *bundá-* is reminiscent of (*a*)*budhná-* in the immediately preceding mysterious Gandharva verse.

VIII.77.7: *bradhná-* is otherwise a color term (‘coppery, ruddy’) or a substance characterized by that color (soma, in nearby VIII.69.7), but in this hapax bahuvrīhi, *śatá-bradhná-* it must refer to something capable of being counted, hence my ‘ruddy glints’. Gr’s ‘hundert Metallspitzen habend’, Ge’s ‘mit hundert Spitzen’ seem to stray too far from the color term. The appearance of this word here may be owing to its phonological similarity to *bundá-*.

VIII.77.8: As indicated in the intro., I take this verse as the speech of Indra’s mother, picking up from the dialogue in vss. 1-2 that began (1a) *jajñānó nú* “just born,” which is echoed here by *sadyó jātāḥ* (“just born right now”). In VIII.45.4 Indra took the Bunda bow just before his dialogue with his mother, and in VIII.69.14-15 he’s a tiny child when he gets the porridge and cooks the buffalo for his mother and father.

I supply *odanám* ‘rice porridge’ as the object of *ā bhara* (and *áttave*). Note that in the summary verse 10 various foodstuffs, including *odanám*, are objects of *ābharat*.

The inclusion of ‘ladies’ (*nāribhyaḥ*) alongside superior men (*nṛbhyaḥ*) is quite rare in the RV. See I.43.6, where it seems to refer to humankind in general. Here it seems to have a more restricted sense and could actually refer to the gods and their wives: *nṛ-* is often used of divinities. For goddesses beside gods see nearby VIII.80.10, though it is attributed to a different poet.

The voc. *ṛbhuṣṭhira* is a little surprising. Both Gr and Ge take it as implicitly comparative: Gr ‘stark, tüchtig wie Ṛbhu’, Ge ‘... stark wie die Ṛbhu’s’. I take it rather as parallel to *ṛbhuṣán-* ‘master of the Ṛbhus’, which is regularly an epithet of Indra.

VIII.77.10–11: On these verses as possible explanatory additions to the Emuṣa version given earlier in the hymn, see publ. intro.

VIII.77.10: Old and Ge (see his n. 10d) read loc. *indre* contra the Pp. nom. *indraḥ* and interpret the verse as meaning that Viṣṇu brought Emuṣa to Indra, along with the food named in pāda c. But this seems unlikely: the central fact of the myth is that *Indra pierced the boar*. Cf. I.61.7d *vídhyad varāhām tiró ádrim ástā* “He pierced the boar through the stone, (Indra) the archer.” This last pāda contains both Indra and the boar and ends with the boar’s name as if as the solution of a riddle (remember that this is the only occurrence of the name in the RV), and it would seem rhetorically anticlimactic for the image merely to be one of Viṣṇu lugging the corpse of the boar, along with some food, *to Indra*. Instead it seems the encapsulation of the myth, and I would further argue that it finally closes the incomplete syntactic circle begun in verse 6. In 6a we find *nír āvidhyad girībhya ā* “(he) pierced from/to/through the mountains,” with the signature verb and the signature locale (see *ádrim* in I.61.7 just quoted), but neither subject nor object. But in 10d we have both subject (reading nom. *indraḥ* with the Pp.) and object, but no verb. This seems a clever variant on ring composition, where a structure begun at the beginning of a section is completed at the end. Even if, as I suggest in the intro., vs. 10 is a tacked-on addition to the original Viṣṇu-less version of the myth found in the rest of this hymn (and other mentions in VIII), the poet has cleverly made use of the underdefined treatment in 6a to attach vs. 10 more closely to vss. 6–9 by supplying the missing pieces in 10d.

VIII.77.11: *sūmāya-* is generally analyzed as having the adverbial prefix *su-* ‘good’, hence ‘aus gutem Stoff’ (Ge). However, AiG II.2.770 reports a suggestion of Thieme’s (apparently only reported in AiG, not publ.) that it’s ‘aus Eber(-zahn) verfertigt’, with an unextended root noun *sū-* ‘(wild) pig, boar’, which is the basis of *sūkará-* ‘boar’ (already RV VII.55.4) and which has numerous IE cognates. Although Mayrhofer explicitly rejects this suggestion (KEWA, s.v. *sūkará-*; EWA, s.vv. *MAY*<sup>1</sup>, *sūkará-*), context favors Thieme’s suggestion. The boar Emuṣa was clearly a formidable opponent of Indra’s, and the use of a weapon made from the same animal to defeat it makes good sense from the point of view of sympathetic magic. Consider also the association of boars with ritual of kingship, and note, in particular, that using parts of the boar for the armor and weaponry of warriors is found elsewhere (cf. Odysseus’s boar’s tusk helmet and general disc. in Jamison 1999 [Penelope and the Pigs], ClAnt. 18: 258–70). The unextended root noun *sū-* could be preserved in this old myth, esp. since it could be assimilated to the prefix *su-*.

My interpretation of pāda d essentially follows Scar (301, 516); see also EWA, s.v. *ARD*.

### VIII.78 Indra

VIII.78.1: There seems no alternative to the problem posed by the ungoverned nouns in pāda a than Ge’s – to supply a verb, probably a form of  $\sqrt{juṣ}$  ‘take pleasure’ (perhaps mid. part. *juṣāṇāḥ*). This verb seems particularly suitable since it can take

both acc. (*purolāśam*) and gen. (*ándhasaḥ*). Ge, however, seems to be taking *ándhasa* as a dative (*ándhase*), contra Pp.: “(Koste) unseren Reiskuchen zum Somatrank.” The nominals in pāda a cannot be the object of *ā bhara* because Indra doesn’t *bring* the cake or the stalk, but enjoys them and brings objects in return to those who provided them.

VIII.78.2: *vaso* is a predicated vocative; the tr. renders the predication rather than the vocative, since the combination doesn’t work in Engl.

VIII.78.4: The first pāda is somewhat puzzling, though I may have made more of the puzzles in the tr. than was necessary. The issue is the hapax *vr̥dhiká-*. The standard tr. and comm. take this, with the Pp., as nom. *vr̥dhikáh* and interpret it as an agent noun: Ge, AiG II.2.428, EWA (s.v. *VARDH*), Scar (211, 584) ‘Bereicherer’ (though cf. Gr ‘gewachsen’), parallel to the nominatives in b and c. But uncompounded *-iká-* stems are often neuters and sometimes used in the loc., which would be possible here (*vr̥dhiké*), contra Pp. Cf. VIII.48.12 *mṛṇīké asya sumataú syāma* “May we be in his mercy and good grace.” I was also troubled by three other facts: 1) Taking the whole verse as a single clause, as Ge does, runs into the problem that *te* in pāda a is coreferential with *tvát* in c, and the two pronouns should, in my opinion, have two different functions. (Ge, n., says *te* is pleonastic.) 2) I would prefer that *nákīm* (a) and *nānyáḥ* (c) not simply be conflated, as Ge seems to do. 3) The next verse also begins with *nákīm* (the only two occurrences of this form in the RV), which is followed by a nominal in an oblique case, in that case a datival infinitive *nīkartave* (and its parallel in b, *párisaktave*), and I would prefer that 4a have a structure that at least also involves an oblique case. A similar impulse may account for Re’s apparent derivation of *vr̥dhiká-* from the infinitive *\*vr̥dhé*, as reported in AiG II.2.418 (BSL 38: 80 n. 1 [“Infinitifs et dérivés nominaux dans le R̥gveda”]). Putting all this together, I take *vr̥dhika* as loc. *vr̥dhiké*, somewhat in the sense of *mṛṇīké* in the passage quoted above (“in the sphere of your increase,” that is, in the abundance of your giving), with *te* dependent on it. However, on re-examination of the passage I think I may have overthought it, and an interpretation more like Ge/Scar may be less fussy – though the reservations expressed above remain. I must also admit that my publ. tr. requires *anyáḥ* of c to be read also with a.

VIII.78.7: I consider the genitives in pāda b, *turásya ... vidhatáh* to modify Indra, whereas Ge takes them with the ‘resolve’ (*krátvah*), which he considers to be the soma, of pāda a. The problem, in his view, is that *vidhánt-* doesn’t easily qualify Indra (*turá-* regularly does), but since the root  $\sqrt{\text{vidh}}$  ‘honor’ is an old derivative of  $\text{ví} \sqrt{\text{dhā}}$  ‘apportion’, taking it in its etymological sense allows it to modify the god.

### VIII.79 Soma

VIII.79.1: Both *kṛtnú-* and *udbhíd-* appear to be gambling terms here. For *kṛtnú-* in a gambling context see I.92.10, for *udbhíd-* X.116.9. *udbhíd-* means literally

‘bursting/breaking out [/up]’. The semantic development may be something like “break out of the pack /burst to the finish.” *viśvajít-* ‘all-conquering’ can also fit the gambling scenario, as, arguably, can *ágr̥bhīta-* ‘ungraspable’ -- that is, who is too far ahead to be caught or caught up to. The hymn is ascribed to Kṛtṇu Bhārgava; Bhārgava is of course a fairly common patronymic, but Kṛtṇu appears only here, clearly lifted from the hymn’s first pāda.

The final pāda consists entirely of the three most resonant words for poet/poetic activity: *ṛṣi-* ‘seer’, *vīpra-* ‘inspired poet’, *kāvya-* (standing for *kavī-* ‘sage poet’). The juxtaposition of the gambling focus of the first two pādas with the poetic lexicon of the last is striking, but sets the tone for the rest of the hymn, which catalogues the variety of Soma’s skills.

VIII.79.2: In *c īm* seems functionless. Though technically it could serve as object to *prá ... khyat* (“the blind man sees it/them”), it is much more likely that the verb is used in absolute function, to indicate the blind man’s recovery of his vision, not his sight of some particular (but unspecified) object(s). Vs. 6c also begins *prém a-VOWEL*, though there the *īm* could double the object *āyuh̥*. However, in both cases I think *īm* is simply introduced to avoid hiatus.

VIII.79.3: By my interpr. (and Ge’s), pādas ab contain a series of adjacent *-bhyaḥ* plural nominals, which by sense must be sorted into dative pl. *tanūkṛdbhyaḥ* (“for the body-makers”) and ablative pl. *dvéṣobhyo anyákṛtebhyaḥ* (“from hateful things done by others”). The pāda break assists in splitting up these formally identical forms. A different interpr., going back to the MS (see Ge’s n. 3a) and followed by Re, however, takes *tanūkṛd-* in passive sense ‘done by oneself’ and contrastively parallel to *anyákṛta-* ‘done by others’; in this case, *tanūkṛdbhyaḥ* is also ablative. The deliberate contrast between the root noun *-kṛt-* in the first compound and the past passive participle *-kṛta-* in the second and the usual active, transitive sense of *-kṛt-* in compounds (including the other occurrence of *tanūkṛt-*) make this interpr. unlikely. See Old for disc.; he opts for the active sense, but considers the *tanū-* in question to belong to the doers/makers referred to by *-kṛt-*: “(den Frommen), die tätig sind sich die eigne *tanū* zu schaffen.” (Scar weakly favors this.) This seems unnecessarily complex, though the usual polarity between *tanū-* ‘self’ and *anyá-* ‘other’ is an argument in its favor.

VIII.79.4: This vs. flips the syntactic roles found in the preceding vs. In 3 Soma produces a defense (acc.) *from* (abl.) hateful things (*dvéṣobhyaḥ*); here he keeps the hateful thing (*dvéṣaḥ*, acc.) *from* (abl.) the entities protected (heaven and earth). The producer of the hateful thing is in the gen. (*aghásya*), whereas in 3b he (/they) were the first member of a compound, *anyá(-kṛta-)*.

VIII.79.5: The most difficult verse in the hymn by far and perhaps not accidentally the middle verse. It is striking among other things for its use of indicative (*yánti*), subjunctive (*gáchān*), and optative (*vavr̥jyuh̥*) in the same sentence, and for the

juxtaposition of the two roots  $\sqrt{i}$  and  $\sqrt{gam}$  with the same subject in an if-then construction. For the latter, see Re's disc.: he suggests persuasively that  $\sqrt{i}$  with acc. indicates the goal towards which one is proceeding, but  $\sqrt{gam}$  with acc. the attainment of the goal, though I am not at all sure this functional division holds throughout the uses of these presents in the RV.

I interpr. the verse within Ge's general scheme: that the subject throughout is the soma priests and the thirsting man (*tṛṣyataḥ*) of c is a competing priest -- or at least someone who covets the largesse of the giver (*dadúṣaḥ*) in b that rightly belongs to the hard-working priests named in a (*arthínah*).

The sense of the pf. opt. *vavṛjyuh* in c is a bit difficult to grasp, primarily because the root  $\sqrt{vrj}$  'twist', etc., so seldom appears without a preverb. I think 'deflect' or 'thwart' is what is intended. As usual, I do not think that the fact that the optative is built to the perfect stem adds any particular "perfect" nuance, though I do have to admit in this case that there are optative forms built to another tense/aspect stem, namely the root aor. (*vrjyām* 1x, *vrjyās* 3x, *vrjyāma* 1x), all in the idiom with *pári*.

VIII.79.7: With Gr I take *avātá-* as the negated ppl. of  $\sqrt{vā}$  'become extinguished', in the sense 'unextinguishable, unquenchable', also in I.38.7, 52.4, and 62.10. It is separate from the homonymous *avātá-* 'without wind, windless' in VI.64.4 and X.129.2 and also from differently accented *ávāta-* ( $\sqrt{van}$  'win') 'unvanquished'. Ge takes the *avātá-* forms here and in I.38.7 as 'windless' (as well as those in VI.64.4 and X.129.2) and in I.52.4 and 62.10 as 'unvanquishable'. Re takes this occurrence as 'invincible'; see his disc. ad loc. My interpr. rests partly on semantic, partly on formal grounds. On the one hand, "windless Soma" (or, as Ge has it, "ohne Wind zu machen") makes no sense to me; on the other, though 'invincible' does make sense, I prefer to respect the accent otherwise found with that form, noting also that occurrences of that stem almost always appear with the participle *vanván* belonging to the same root. As for the occurrences in Maṇḍala I, *avātá-* once modifies mist (*míh-* I.38.2), once 'streams' (*avánīḥ* I.62.10, with phonological play), and once Indra's *śúṣmāḥ* (I.52.4, there tr. 'gusts'). In all cases (even, or esp., the last) 'windless' does not work; the point in all three cases is, I think, that the entity does not "go out" -- dissipate or disappear. Exactly how this applies to Soma here is less clear, but I assume that the point is that Soma is reliably present and available.

VIII.79.9: Ge's tr. is very different: he takes *áva* not as a preverb in tmesis but as the 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. impv. to  $\sqrt{av}$  'help' and *īkṣe* as the 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. med. pres. to  $\sqrt{īś}$  'be master of' rather than the 1<sup>st</sup> sg. to  $\sqrt{īkṣ}$  'see', hence "Hilf ... wenn du ... vermagst." His n. 9ab allows for the possibility of the other tr., however -- the interpr. favored by Old and found in Re and in the publ. tr.

## VIII.80 Indra

VIII.80.1: The particle *bád* seems to mean ‘in truth, for certain, yes indeed’ and, despite appearances, may have Avestan cognates. *baḷā* here is clearly based on it. Hoffmann (Aufs. II.355) takes the expression here as a kind of internal quotation: “nicht habe ich ja zu einem anderen gesagt: *bád*, du bist ein Erbarmer,” though the direct speech is only represented by the particle and then only indirectly. My tr. is an attempt to capture Hoffmann’s sense while sticking closer to the grammar.

VIII.80.2: Ge takes b in semi-independence of a: “... für die Lohngewinnung nicht gering zu schätzen.” This seems to be because of VII.67.5, which, however, doesn’t seem to be parallel enough to require this interpretation here.

Note the phonological similarity of the value-heavy words *marḍitāram* (1b), *mṛḷaya* (1c, 2c), belonging to  $\sqrt{mṛḍ}$  ‘have mercy’, and *ámṛdhraḥ* ‘not shirking, not neglectful’.

VIII.80.3: Ge takes c as a statement “Gewiss wirst du, Indra, es für uns doch möglich machen,” while I think it continues the questions of ab. The status of *kuvíd* clauses is somewhat murky, in that *kuvíd* is clearly built to an interrogative stem, but it also generally conditions accent on the verb (as here, *sákaḥ*) giving it also the appearance of a subordinator. See Delbrück (AiS 550–51), Hettrich (*Hypotaxe*, 142–55), Etter (*Fragesätze*, 219–30). An interpretation, like Etter’s, that *kuvíd* marks an implicit indirect question such as “is it not the case that...?” seeks to capture these two somewhat contradictory features of the particle’s syntax, though a full rendering of this in tr. is often too heavy (as it would be here).

VIII.80.5: The emphatic interjection *hánta* is presumably originally the 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. imperative to  $\sqrt{han}$  ‘smite’ (flg. Thieme, *Fremdl.* 2–3, though EWA s.v. expresses doubts) with full-grade root – hence my tr. ‘blast it!’. It occurs only 3x in the RV, the other two in X, in direct speech contexts and in hymns identified by Arnold (*Ved. Metre*) as popular. Here it continues the slangy tone set by *baḍā* (1) and the questions in 3.

Ge supplies a verb in c: “(uns bring) ... Ruhm,” while I take the acc. neuter phrase there as a loose goal: “put ... first for ... fame.” Note that the *vājayú* qualifying *śrávaḥ* reappears in the next verse as a masc. modifying *rátham*.

VIII.80.6: The abrupt commands and almost insolent asides addressed to the great god continue the tone established in the earlier verses. Again the tr. is meant to capture this tone.

VIII.80.7: A clever image that modulates from b to c. In b a lucky female is going to an assignation with Indra, playing on Indra’s known character as a hyper-virile pursuer of women. But in c this female is identified as a *dhî*- a visionary thought (embodied as a poem), a word that is of course feminine. The adj. *ṛtvíyāvatī* is suitable for both the woman in b (‘conforming to her menstrual cycle’) and the poem

in c (‘conforming to the ritual sequence’). This adjective is also found at VIII.12.10 with the same double application (though with *dhītí-* rather than *dhī-*).

VIII.80.8: The referent of *sīm* in pāda a is not made clear, and the fact that *sīm* can stand for all genders and numbers doesn’t help. Given the racing theme of b (and in my interpretation c), I assume that it is our chariot, about which we have been worrying previously (vss. 4–6), though it could possibly be the *dhī-* of the immediately preceding verse.

The lexeme *apa-ā √ vrj* is attested only here, and the interpretation of the pāda is made more difficult by the noun to which it is applied, *aratnī-*, lit. ‘elbow’, but potentially also ‘corner’ or ‘barrier’ (Schränken, see Old and Ge n.) or a unit of measure (like Engl. ell). I take it to be the body part (as does Ge tr.) and interpret it as a driving posture, with elbows turned out, indicating that the chariot racers are ready to start. For other suggestions see Ge n. and Old.

VIII.80.9: For speculation about the meaning of the “names,” see publ. intro.

### VIII.81 Indra

VIII.81.1: The apparent etymological play between ‘handful’ and ‘hand’ is unfortunately only found in the English: ‘handful’ is *grābhām*, ‘hand’ is (*mahā*)*hastī*.

VIII.81.2: Despite Ge’s appealing “an Gnaden Reichbemessenen” for *tuvimātrām āvobhiḥ*, *tuvimātrā-* is a bahuvrīhi built to *mātrā-* ‘mass, size’, with accent shift to final syllable (see AiG II.1.297). Ge’s tr. also breaks the pattern of *tuvi-* compounds.

VIII.81.4: On the accent on *stāvāma* see disc. ad VIII.29.14.

VIII.81.5: Ge suggests that the verbs in pāda a (*prā stoṣat* and *úpa gāṣiṣat* respectively) show that Indra is acting as Prastotar (the first assistant to the Udgātar, responsible for chanting the prastāva) and *Upagātar* (subordinate chanter, at least four of whom sing “ho” continuously in a low tone), priestly titles not found in the ṚV, though their functions may be. Both roles would connect him with the Sāma Veda, as does his listening to the sāman in pāda b. Old thinks rather that the priest is the subject of pāda a, but this seems unlikely in this strong Indra context.

VIII.81.6: The verbs *ā √ bhr̥* and (*abhī*) *prā √ mṛś* are also paired in VIII.21.16 *dṛḍhā cid aryāḥ prā mṛśābhy ā bhara* “Seize hold of even the firmly fixed (goods) of the stranger and bring them here.”

VIII.81.8: I make *sānitvaḥ* the predicate of a main clause (b) on which the relative clause (a) is dependent, because I am reluctant to take *āsti* as a mere auxiliary with the gerundive. This requires taking c as a separate sentence. Ge takes ab as a single dependent clause, with c as the main clause.

VIII.81.9: Ge, Mayr (PN), followed by Klein (DGRV I.104) and Scar (175), take *vásaiḥ* as a PN (“by the Vaśas”). This is possible, but not necessary; as Ge (n.) reports, Sāy takes it in its usual sense, as I do.

The verb *jarante* is taken by Gotō (150) to ‘awaken’, an interpretation I follow. Although the notion of prizes “awakening” may seem strange, since the Dakṣiṇā is distributed at the dawn sacrifice, it makes ritual sense. Others (Ge, Klein, Scar) take it rather to ‘sing’, but this requires the form to be passive (Klein “and in the morning are sung of by the Vaśas”; Ge’s tr. is actually a “‘Kompromiss’-Übersetzung,” in Gotō’s phrase [150 n. 226] “... werden ... wachgesungen,” incorporating both ‘wake’ and ‘sing’, but still as a passive). However, *járate* ‘sing’ is always active in value.

I take *ca* in c as inverse “X *ca* Y” connecting the two adverbials; Ge, Klein as connecting the two clauses, ab and c.

### VIII.82 Indra

VIII.82.4: The *ca* in b is baffling both as to position and function. Ge seems to take it as conjoining the imperatival clause in a with the present indicative clause in b (“Komm ... und du wirst ... gerufen...”); Klein (DGRV I.233) is disturbed by the “illocutionary difference” between the moods of the two clauses and suggests, “Perhaps the particle is merely a weak, untranslatable transitional element,” which, I’m afraid, is no help at all. Even if it is supposed to be conjoining the clauses, it is positioned wrong for this function. My instinct is that, in this hymn built of clichés, we are dealing with a truncated formula: X *ukthā(ni) ca* (“X and hymns”). Cf. VIII.2.30 *gíraś ca ... ukthā ca*, VIII.33.13 *bráhmokthā ca ...* (and the converse VIII.63.2 *ukthā bráhma ca*), as well as the overfull VI.38.4 *bráhma gíra ukthā ca mánma*. Note that VIII.1.1 *múhur ukthā ca śamsata* also contains *ukthā ca* with *ca* in the wrong position and not clearly conjoining anything, though there it is easier to interpret it as conjoining two modally harmonious clauses.

VIII.82.4–5: (*ní*) ... *hūyase* (4b) and (*prá*) ... *hūyate* (5c), though built to identical stems, belong to the roots  $\sqrt{hvā}/hū$  ‘call’ and  $\sqrt{hu}$  ‘pour’ respectively.

### VIII.83 All Gods

VIII.83.2: *viṣpitá-* occurs only twice in Skt., here and in VII.60.7. In both occurrences it is the obj. of  $\sqrt{pr}$  ‘carry across, deliver’, and in both cases there is watery/nautical imagery. Its general value is clear -- a danger that is conceptually like a perilous water crossing -- but it has no good etymology. See EWA s.v.

VIII.83.5: Pādas ab appear to be a single clause with the middle part. *īśānāsaḥ* predicated to function as main verb. [Note in passing that Aufr’s typo *īśānāśo* with palatal, pointed out by Old, has been taken over uncorrected into the HvN text.]



My tr. of c roughly follows Ge's, though I have rendered *īm* ("it"). He supplies a form of  $\sqrt{\text{naś}}$  'reach', on the basis of VIII.47.1 ... *ném aghám naśat* "evil will not reach him." I am hesitant about this interpr. because it requires supplying a main verb with no support in context, but I don't see a viable alternative. Re takes c as contrastive with ab, with *aghásya* parallel to *vāmásya* ("vous êtes...les régisseurs de la grace / non point ... ceux du maléfice"), but he doesn't explain the syntax, esp. what he does with *yát*, which certainly shouldn't represent his "ceux."

VIII.83.9: I do not understand the position of *utá* here. Although Klein cites this passage several times, he doesn't comment on the position of *utá* except implicitly, by pointing to its interaction with *ádihā* (DGRV II.97–98).

### VIII.84 Agni

VIII.84.1: I take *védyam* to  $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$  'find, acquire' rather than  $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$  'know', contra the standard view. I think it more likely that Vedic people (read, men) wanted to get a chariot rather than know about it, and the renderings of the adj. show translators' discomfort with the root assignment: Ge "wie ein Streitwagen denkwürdig," Re "reconnaissable comme un char," Klein (DGRV II.122) "conspicuous like a chariot." None of these senses is really proper to  $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$  'know'. For the image, see II.2.3 and VIII.19.8.

VIII.84.2: According to Ge (probably correctly), this vs. refers to Agni's flight and subsequent discovery and reinstallation by the gods.

VIII.84.4: This vs. lacks a verb to govern *úpastutim*. I supply a form of (*prá*)  $\sqrt{\text{bhr}}$  'present, bring', which takes *úpastutim* as object elsewhere (+*prá* IV.56.5, VIII.62.1; simplex I.148.2). There is, unfortunately, no contextual support for it within the hymn, however. Ge supplies 'make', which is not impossible but has no contextual support, and the putative VP *úpastutim*  $\sqrt{\text{kr}}$  is not otherwise found. Re's tr. "(présenter)" seems to agree with mine, but in his n. he claims to be supplying *vocah* on the basis of vs. 5 (where the form is actually, per Pp [and most tr., incl. Re] *voce*). Although this contextual support would be good to have, oddly enough no verbs of speaking take *úpastuti-* as obj. (and, as just noted, Re's tr. doesn't reflect his statement in the n.).

VIII.84.7: The standard tr. take *párīṇasaḥ* as a partitive abl. ("from whose profusion do you quicken the thoughts"). My interpr. ("in profusion") could support an *adverbial* ablative of this neut. noun, but I think it's also possible that *párīṇas-* was reinterpr. as an adjective, on the basis of expressions like *rāyā páriṇasā* (4x), originally appositives ("with wealth, with profusion"), but reanalyzable as noun-adj. "with abundant wealth" by way of noun+instr. adv. "with wealth in profusion." If *párīṇasaḥ* is an adjective, it can be an acc. pl. fem. agreeing with *dhíyah*.

Contra the standard interpr., I do not take *yásya te* as coreferential, but interpret *yásya* as coreferential with *kásya* in the main clause and take *te* separately as either dat. or gen. My supplied “(presented)” is just there for ease of English parsing: pāda c is easily interpretable as a nominal clause, “(the man) whose hymns are for you at ...” / “... whose hymns are yours ...”

VIII.84.8: The small interpretive issue in this verse is who is the referent of *svéṣu*. Ge/Re take it as Agni, while I think it’s the unidentified pl. subjects of *marjayanta*, presumably the priests (so also Scar 417). An argument for my position might be the fact that we might expect the reflexive adjective to be controlled by the syntactic subject, but it is my *sense* that this is not a hard and fast rule in Rigvedic syntax. More to the point, in my opinion, is that 6ab ... *káro, víśvā asmábhyaṃ suksitīḥ* “... you will make all dwellings lovely for us” and 9a *kṣéti kṣémebhiḥ* “he [=the favored mortal] dwells peacefully in peaceful ways ...” associate dwellings with the mortal worshippers.

### VIII.85 Aśvins

VIII.85.3–4: The Anukramaṇī identifies the poet as Kṛṣṇa Āṅgīrasa.

VIII.85.5: The phrase *chardīḥ ... ádābhyam* is tr. “shelter that cannot be cheated” in VIII.5.12, which rendering seems preferable to “undeceivable protection” here.

### VIII.86 Aśvins

VIII.86.1: Following Kü (344) I take the pf. *babhūvātuḥ* as presential.

For the possible connection of the verb in the refrain, object-less *mumócatam*, with other appearances of Viśvaka and Viṣṇāpu in the RV, see the publ. intro.

VIII.86.2: The danger of imposing an after-the-fact narrative explanation onto a RVic hymn is shown by Ge’s tr. of *vīmanāḥ* here as “Betrübte” (distressed, afflicted). Although a negative reading of this compound is possible (“without a mind, with a mind [gone] away”), the only other occurrence of the word in the RV (X.82.2) is as a positive attribute of Viśvakarman, “vast in mind.” There is no reason that this sense cannot be found here as well; the next pāda states that the Aśvins gave him insight (*dhíyam*), and the question in our pāda -- how (*kathā*) to praise the Aśvins -- need not be “how can someone with a disordered mind manage to praise them?” but rather “which of the many possible ways should someone with a capacious mind choose for praising them?” The questions in VIII.84.4–7, a hymn that belongs with ours though the Anukramaṇī attributes them to different poets (see remarks before VIII.81 in the publ. tr.), are similar.

VIII.86.3: The thematic connection between VIII.84 and our hymn suggested ad vs. 2 continues here: *edhatú-* ‘radiance’, only here in the RV, echoes *edhate* in VIII.84.9,

which characterizes the successful devotee of Agni -- there tr. ‘thrives’, though ‘blazes brightly’ or sim. would be more vivid and literal.

VIII.86.4: Though Ge identifies the *vīrá-* ‘hero’ as Viṣṇāpu, as Re points out *ṛjīśín-* ‘possessing the silvery drink’ is almost exclusively used of Indra (and never of humans), and we are more likely to call upon this god than upon a rather vaguely defined mortal.

VIII.86.5: What the truth is doing here insistently in this final verse isn’t clear to me.

As Re points out, though the rare verb *śamāyá-* is derived from the root  $\sqrt{\text{śam}}$  ‘labor’ (presumably as a deverbative from a 9<sup>th</sup>-class \**śamñāti* [see, perhaps, *ścamnan* I.104.2]), it participates in a secondary word play between *śáma-* ‘hornless’ (I.32.15, 33.15) and *śṛṅga-* ‘horn’ -- hence the rather surprising appearance of the enigmatic “horn of truth” in b.

### VIII.87 Aśvins

VIII.87.1: On the difficult word *krívi-*, see comm. ad I.30.1. Though *krívi-* is found in a discouraging variety of contexts, our passage is similar to I.30.1, in that the root  $\sqrt{\text{sic}}$  ‘pour’ is associated with it.

This verse modulates rather cleverly from praise for the Aśvins (*stómaḥ*, pāda a) to pressed soma for them (*mádhvaḥ sutásya*, pāda c), pivoting on *séke* ‘at its outpouring’, which is literally applicable to the soma but, as is well known, metaphorically applicable to the praise.

VIII.87.1–2: The d pādas of these two vss. apparently begin with the same verb: 1d *pātám*, 2d *ní pātám*, but these two almost certainly belong to the two homonymous roots  $\sqrt{\text{pā}}$  ‘drink’ and  $\sqrt{\text{pā}}$  ‘protect’ respectively, *pace* Ge. Re’s arg. that the latter belongs to ‘protect’ seems pretty decisive: *ní*  $\sqrt{\text{pā}}$  ‘drink’ is not found till the Rām., whereas *ní*  $\sqrt{\text{pā}}$  ‘protect’ is quite well attested in the RV. I imagine the poet signaled the change of root by including this preverb while enjoying the etymological play (see also *pībatam* beginning 2a, 4a, as well as *pātám* 5d).

VIII.87.6: Note the *v*-alliteration in ab with repetition of *va/ā* at the beginning and end and *vīp* in the middle.

*vayám hí vām hāvāmahe vipanyavo, viprāso vājaśātaye*

### VIII.88 Indra

VIII.88.3: Pāda c can be subordinate either to ab or to d; Ge chooses the former, I the latter, but there are no implications either way.

VIII.88.4: I construe *asi* in a with *abhí* in b and take *yóddhā* as part of the subject phrase, not predicated. Contra Ge, I also separate *majmánā* in b from the

instrumentals in a, *krátvā śávasotá daṃsánā*, on the basis of both the pāda break and the position of *utá*. (Klein I.229 follows Ge by including *majmánā* in the conjoined NP, but three pages later [232] this NP is cited with only the first three members.) VIII.100.4b gives support to both of these decisions: *viśvā jātāni abhy àsmi mahnā*, with the finite form of  $\sqrt{as}$  adjacent to the preverb and a single instr. construed with this verb. See also in the immediately following hymn VIII.89.6 *tád viśvam abhibhūr asi, yáj jātām yác ca jántvam*.

### VIII.89 Indra

As was noted in the publ. intro., every verse in this hymn, except the two anuṣṭubhs (5–6), has a form of *bṛhánt-* in it: 1a *bṛhát*, 2c *bṛhadbhāno*, 3a *bṛhaté*, 4b *bṛhát*, 7d *bṛhát*. The meters of these verses are *bṛhatī* or *satobṛhatī*. There is also some transformational phonological play based on this word: 2b *bhavat*, 2d *-bhāno*, 3b *bráhma*, 4a *bhara*.

VIII.89.1: A neuter word for a verbal product needs to be supplied with *bṛhát* in a; Ge suggests either *bráhma* (from 3b) or *sāma* (after Sāy). The latter is more likely, since *sāmans* are sung (cf. VIII.98.1 *índrāya sāma gāyata*, which is almost identical to our pāda), and since loc. *sāman* is found in the last verse, 7c, it produces an implicit ring.

VIII.89.2: The tr. of pāda a is meant to capture the etymological figure *abhíśastīr aśastihā*.

I take the verb *ābhavat* as the predicate, rather than as an auxiliary with predicated *dyumnī* as Ge does (“Indra bleib der Glanzreiche”).

VIII.89.3: Note *bṛhád índrāya* of 1a has been transformed into ... *índrāya bṛhaté*, with the adj. now qualifying Indra.

VIII.89.4–5: *jāyathā(h)* in 5a echoes *jáyā(h)* in the immediately preceding pāda (4d), though they belong to entirely different roots.

VIII.89.4: Ge’s suggestion (n.) that this verse constitutes the Maruts’ direct speech to Indra is a persuasive one.

VIII.89.6: Ge takes *háskṛti-* as qualifying the ritual fire – again a good suggestion. The fire’s crackling is the “laughter.” Unfortunately Ge bleaches the metaphor, tr. “der helle Schein (des Opferfeuers),” which substitutes an unremarkable visual image for the striking auditory one.

### VIII.90 Indra

VIII.90.1: Ge takes the loc. phrase *viśvāsu ... samátsu* with *hávyaḥ* and construes *bhūṣatu* in b with the accusatives in c. This is certainly possible and this disposition

of the loc. may make better, or smoother, sense. However, because of the verse structure, I would prefer to keep *bhūṣatu* interpretationally in the first hemistich, and *ā√bhūṣ* can take the loc. (cf. VIII.66.7d, 8b, X.160.5). I then also supply *bhūṣatu* with the second hemistich, to be taken with the preverb *úpa* and the accusatives, since *úpa√bhūṣ* does take the acc. (e.g., V.75.8, VI.62.4).

VIII.90.2: I tr. *satyáḥ* separately from *īśānakṛt* on the basis of 4a.

VIII.90.3: The common trope of hymns as horses, teamed to bring Indra to the sacrifice.

VIII.90.5: For the sense of this verse, see publ. intro. Both Ge and Old (ad I.165.9 n. 1) suggest, tentatively, that Varuṇa is the referent of *carṣanīdhṛt-*, and VII.85.3cd, in a hymn dedicated jointly to Indra and Varuṇa, supports this suggestion: *kṛṣṭīr anyó dhārayati prāviktā, vṛtrāṇy anyó apratīni hanti*. Here in a balanced “the one ... the other” construction, Indra’s characteristic deeds are described in d almost as in our passage, while Varuṇa’s activity in c, *kṛṣṭīh ... dhārayati* ‘sustains the peoples’, is expressed in a VP that is a variant of our compound.

VIII.90.6: The frame takes a double acc.: “beseech s.o. (*tvā*) for s.th. (*rādhah*), and I take the simile as implicitly having both roles filled: *bhāgām* ‘portion’ fills the 2<sup>nd</sup> acc. slot, but also evokes the god from which it is derived, *bhāga-*, to fill the 1<sup>st</sup> acc. However, Bhaga should properly be in parens. in the publ. tr.

Ge takes *śaraṇā* as a fem. adj. with *kṛtīh* “Du hast gleichsam ein ... schützendes Fell [Schild],” but this leaves nothing for the hide to be compared to. I think rather that *śaraṇā*, which is usually in the neut. sg., is a neut. pl., lacking semantic motivation (a not unusual situation), or, alternatively, that it has been attracted to the fem. sg. simile.

## VIII.91 Indra (/Apālā)

VIII.91.2: Narten (Yasna Haptaṇhaiti, 146 and n. 45) identifies *vīrakā-* as a word belonging to women’s language (Frauensprache) and thinks it should be tr. “mein lieber Held” rather than “Männlein.” But I don’t see why the diminutive of affection can’t be an element here; Apālā is also trying to domesticate him and make him more approachable.

The substances Apālā offers to Indra to accompany the soma form a ritually defined group of offerings elsewhere (III.52.1), the Savanīya-puroḍāṣa-. For disc. see Jamison 1991: 162–63, 172–73. Note that, judging from *dhānāvāntam karambhīnam / apūpāvāntam ukthīnam* “possessing grain, possessing gruel, possessing cakes, possessing hymns” with *-vant-* and *-īn-* suffixes respectively, it is difficult to maintain the often suggested semantic difference between *-vant-* and *-īn-*, with *-īn-* marking inherent possession and *-vant-* more contingent possession.

VIII.91.3: As noted in the publ. intro., the first hemistich contains pedagogical vocabulary, the contrastive “we wish to comprehend” (*ā ... cikitsāma*) and “we will not ‘recite’ you” (*ádhi caná tvā némasi*). The lexeme *ádhi* √*i* lit. ‘go over’ (which goes nicely into Engl. in its idiomatic sense); in later Vedic it means ‘study (a text)’, which is an oral culture means ‘recite aloud’, and this appears to be its meaning here (contra most tr., incl. Ge and Schmidt). Followed directly by *cd*, where Apālā insistently asks the soma to flow “softly” (*śánaiḥ ... śanakaīḥ*), this hemistich indicates that Apālā wants to learn and understand Indra’s intentions, but she will not reveal his presence by announcing him aloud. (See disc. Jamison 1991: 164 and n. 43.)

VIII.91.4: The compound *patidviṣ-* is usually tr. with passive sense (Ge: ‘vom Gatten gehasst’), but this has more to do with the scenario for the hymn constructed by the tr. and comm. than with the structure of the compound. Grammatically speaking we would expect an active sense: passive value is fairly rare in root noun compounds, and, as Scar points out (249), though he does not abandon a possible passive value, the other *-dviṣ-* compounds are all active in sense. An interpretation guided by the compound structure would give ‘hating husbands’, a perhaps not unlikely sentiment in a pre-adolescent girl about to be married off in ancient India. The verse expresses the anxious excitement of a girl on the cusp of marriagability and adulthood (Jamison 1991: 170–71).

VIII.91.5–7: On the connection between hair growth and skin disease, see Jamison 1991: 146–70.

## VIII.92 Indra

VIII.92.1: I separate the predicates of pādas a and b because √*gā* ‘sing’ seems to be used in two different senses, with two different sets of preverbs: *ā* in a, *abhí prá* in b – the first “sing (s.o.) to (come to) X [acc.],” the second “sing to s.o.”

VIII.92.3: The first two pādas contain a remarkable set of rhyming words: *puruhūtám puruṣtutám, ... śánaśrutam*.

VIII.92.2–3: 2c begins *índra í(ti)*, while 3a begins *índra í(n no)*.

VIII.92.3: What posture *abhijñú* designates is not clear. Ge thinks it involves bending the knees and sinking down, Scar (345) that Indra crouches down because he is so large. I think rather that, as in I.37.10, it indicates a slightly crouching position, with knees bent, for driving a chariot (note I.37.10 *abhijñú yāṭave* “*abhijñu* to drive”), in this case to bring the prizes to us. The word *nṛtúḥ* ‘dancer’ at the end of b is suggestive, so that *abhijñu* might instead, or also, be a dancing posture.

VIII.92.4: The first pāda of this new *ṛca* matches that of the first *ṛca* (1a):  $\sqrt{pā}$  (*pāntam* (1a) / *ápāt* (4a) ... *ándhasaḥ*).

*índor índro* is an example of the word play, much beloved in IX, between *indu-* ‘drop’ and *indra-*, but this case is particularly nice because sandhi allows the two words to be identical, save for the reversal of the final two sounds (*or ~ ro*).

VIII.92.5: *abhí prá*  $\sqrt{rc}$  picks up *abhí prá*  $\sqrt{gā}$  of 1b.

VIII.92.6: The two gods are, of course, Soma and Indra respectively.

VIII.92.7: I’m not entirely sure of the sense of *āyatam* in b. Ge tr. “auf alle Lobreden Gespannten” (intent on / excited about), which makes nice contextual sense, but which I find difficult to reconcile with the other occurrences of  $\tilde{a} \sqrt{yam}$ , including, in this hymn, *ā yamat* in 3c and (*abhí*) ... *ā yaman* in 31b. Elsewhere  $\tilde{a} \sqrt{yam}$  means ‘to hold (reins, etc.), hold fast, guide’. Here the sense may be that Indra is held (that is, kept) at the sacrifice by our songs, and there is then a contrast between his (temporary) immobility and the rousing we hope to give him (c: *ā cyāvayasi*).

VIII.92.8: This verse then showcases a different kind of immobility for Indra: *ānapacyuta-* ‘unbudgeable’; Indra here is not held, as it were, against his will, as perhaps in 7b, but because of his immense power he cannot be moved by lesser powers. Since in the immediately preceding verse (7c) the hope was to cause him to stir  $\sqrt{cyu}$  (*cyāvayasi*), it is striking that here it is asserted that he cannot be made to  $\sqrt{cyu}$ . (The relationship between these two forms should probably have been signaled in the Engl: perhaps “you rouse ... unrousable.”)

VIII.92.11: Old and Ge take *áyāma* as expletive “let’s go!” and construe the rest of the verse with *jáyema* in c (“might we conquer the poems of the poet ...”). Although this is possible, it requires the poet (*dhīvant-*) in question to be a rival poet (so explicitly Old), and I wonder if we would flatteringly refer to a rival poet as “visionary.” I think rather that we are appropriating the visionary thoughts of our own poet and configuring them as steeds for vicotry in battle. For *dhī-* = *ārvant-* cf. VI.45.12 *dhībhír ārvadbhiḥ... jeṣma* “With visionary thoughts as our steeds might we conquer...” Construing *áyāma* with acc. of goal is very similar to *āganma ... āśasaḥ* “we have arrived at our hopes” in 13c.

VIII.92.12: Case disharmony between simile and frame, as discussed in Jamison 1982, facilitated by the syntactic ambivalence of *raṇāya-*, which has both causative and non-causative uses. Here the frame is causative, “we make you take pleasure in hymns” (*vayám u tvā ... ukthéṣu raṇayāmasi*), while the simile is non-causative, “as cows (do) in grain” (*gāvo ná yāvaseṣv ā*).

VIII.92.13: Ge takes *anukāmā* as ‘in accord with *our* desires’, but it seems to me unlikely that we are claiming that everything goes as *we* want it; rather that man

proposes, Indra disposes, and in this case he has disposed as we had hoped. This is supported by vs. 14 also, where the desirous ones turn to Indra (for him to fulfill their desires, presumably).

VIII.92.20: I follow Scar (574–75) in taking *saṃśád-* here as an agent noun.

VIII.92.23: Following Kü (503), I take the act. pf. of  $\sqrt{\text{vyac}}$  as a presential stative.

VIII.92.24–25: On *kukṣí-* as originally ‘cheek’, not ‘belly’, see Jamison 1987; also for the pun on *dhāman-* ‘foundation’, hence ‘fundament’, that is, ‘buttocks, bottom’, in vs. 24, but, in vs. 25, ‘foundation, establishment’ in the sense of ‘bestowal’; also the jocular name Śrutakakṣa in 25.

VIII.92.25–26: *áram ... dāvāne* “fit(tingly) for (Indra’s) giving” makes more explicit the implication of 25c *áram ... dhāmane* “fit for (Indra’s) foundation/establishment.” Ge (also BI RR) supplies “we” as implicit subj. of c: “(wir sind) bereit für deine Schenkung,” but the playful parallelism with 24c seems to me to exclude this interpretation. The heavy phrase in 29 ... *rātīḥ ... dhāyi dhātṛbhiḥ* “(Indra’s) giving has been ordained by the ordainers” also establishes the link between Indra’s giving and the root  $\sqrt{\text{dhā}}$ .

VIII.92.28: Klein (318) takes *utá* as linking *śūrah* and *sthiráḥ* “Certainly (thou art) heroic and firm,” but this assumes that *śūra-* can be adjectival, which, *pace* Gr, I don’t. Instead, despite its position, I take the *utá* as conjoining *vīrayúḥ* and *śūrah ... sthiráḥ*, a variant on the complementary pairing of *vīrá-* ‘hero’ and *śūra-* ‘champion’.

VIII.92.28–29: Ge tr. *rādhya-* as “leicht zu gewinnen,” but I take it rather as “to be realized, brought to success.” What the content of Indra’s thought is may be clarified by V.39.3 *yát te ditsú prarādhyaṃ mánah ...* “your thought ... which is eager to give, should be realized.” The giving theme is made explicit in the next verse. His intention (the *mānas-* of 28c) is to give, and this intention will be realized, because giving (*rātí-*, 29a) has been ordained as part of his nature. Then 29c reaffirms the ritual partnership of mutual giving between Indra and his worshipers. I consider Ge’s “und doch (bist du), Indra, bei mir” not sufficiently specific, esp. given the strong assertion of connection between us and Indra in the *tvā yujā* (31c), *tváyéd ... yujā* (32c) “with you as yokemate” found in following verses, not to mention 32c *tvám asmākaṃ táva smasi* “You are ours; we are yours.”

VIII.92.31: A difficult hemistich, whose uncertainties include the function of *abhí*, the meaning of *ā yaman*, and the grammatical identity and use of *śūrah*. Contra Gr I do not take *abhí* as another preverb with *ā*  $\sqrt{\text{yam}}$ . The only other example of *abhí-ā*  $\sqrt{\text{yam}}$  is in a gerundive in a curious idiom in an Aśvin hymn (I.34.1). Moreover, if it is a preverb, it has taken an odd position: we generally find preverbs in tmesis at the beginnings of pādas. I instead take it as governing *naḥ*. As for *ā yaman*, it needs to be



considered in connection with other  $\tilde{a}\sqrt{yam}$  forms in this hymn, particularly  $\tilde{a}yamāt$  in 3c (also  $\tilde{a}yatam$  7b). In 3c the lexeme means ‘guide’, and I take it so here as well, with  $naḥ$  (read twice) as its object. In this interpretation  $sūraḥ$  is ablative of  $svār$ , rather than gen. to this stem (Gr, Old, with the latter suggesting it might be a temporal gen.) or nom. sg. to  $sūra-$  (Ge).

In c the referent of  $tāt$  is not specified. Ge thinks it’s the sun, which is certainly possible.

### VIII.93 Indra

VIII.93.2: Ge (flg. Gr) takes  $bāhvòjasā$  as an abstract tatpuruṣa (“mit Armes Stärke”), but it has bahuvrīhi accent and the other three occurrences are clearly bahuvrīhis. I follow Old in so interpreting it and supplying  $vájra-$  as the head noun.

The Pp. analyses  $vṛtrahāvdhīt$  as containing an unaccented  $avadhīt$ . I prefer to read it with accented  $āvadhīt$ , which allows the  $ca$  to conjoin two parallel relative clauses. Since in this interpretation the verse consists entirely of relative clauses, it must be dependent on either the preceding or following verse. Either would work, but the presence of an apparently resumptive  $sá$  beginning 3a favors the latter.

VIII.93.3: Slight phonetic figure:  $sá \dots śívāḥ sákhā, áśvāvad \dots$

VIII.93.4: The two vocatives addressed to Indra,  $vṛtrahan$  (a) and  $indra$  (c), flank that to the sun ( $sūrya$ , b), with the first embedded in a 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. clause with  $Sūrya$  as subject. Only the unambiguous reference of  $vṛtrahan$  to Indra saves it from being applied to  $Sūrya$ , but the effect is still somewhat unsettling.

The verb  $udágāḥ$  reprises  $úd \dots eṣi$  expressing the same action in vs. 1. In fact 1a  $\#ud ghéd abhí$  is echoed by 4b  $\#udágā abhí$  with the actual verb  $agā(h)$  substituting for the intervening particles of the former.

VIII.93.4–6: I do not understand the force of the  $vā$  in 5a, since this verse does not seem to me a logical alternative to vs. 4. Nor do I understand the  $utá-u$  beginning 5c, which should not be conjoining the dependent clause of ab with the main clause of c. However Klein’s discussion (I.450) of  $utá$  appears to be on the right track and probably can account not only for the  $utá$  but also for the  $vā$ , if the explanation is fleshed out a bit. It seems that the three verses in this  $\tau\epsilon ca$ , esp. the first two, are loosely parallel to each other, esp. in their third pādas. Vss. 4 and 5 begin with a two-pāda  $yád$  clause (though the two  $yád$ -s are functionally different), with the third-pāda main clause resuming with a  $tád$  that is asserted to be in Indra’s domain: 4c  $sárvam tád indra te váśe$  “all that is under your will” and 5c ( $utá$ )  $tát satyám ít táva$  “just that (comes) true for you” — with  $te$  matching  $táva$  and with  $sárvam$  and  $satyám$ , the referent and predicate respectively of the two  $tád$ -s, phonologically similar. Thus both the disjunctive  $vā$  and the conjunctive  $utá$  serve rhetorical purposes, marking parallel structures, even though those structures do not have parallel or contrastive content. The third verse (6) varies the structure a bit: instead of  $yád$  there are two  $yé-$

s in ab and instead of *tád* pāda c has *tān*; moreover, c is not a nominal sentence attributing all to Indra but requires Indra himself to make a move (*gachasi* ‘you go’). But *sārvāms tān indra* ... semi-duplicates 4c *sārvaṃ tād indra* ..., and the same total control is implied.

VIII.93.8: Unusual syntactically, in having three non-initial *sá*'s; what special effect is being aimed at is not entirely clear.

VIII.93.10: The contrastive *dur-gá-* ... *su-gá-* effect is not easily captured in English because “easy going” is blocked by the English idiom.

In c *ca* in the sense ‘if’ conditions the accent on the verb *vásāḥ*. See Klein (I: 238–56, esp. 250–51, on subordinating *ca*.

VIII.93.11: The implicitly conjoined nouns *ādís-* (‘aim, intention’) and *svarājya-* (‘sovereignty, self-rule’) do not seem to me to form a natural class. It is possible that the rendering of the former should be adjusted, to harmonize with the finite verb in 15b. The Pp. analyzes that verb as simply *adiṣṭa* without preverb, but in its sandhi situation it could also reflect *ā-(a)diṣṭa*, with the same lexeme as here. Even so, the middle voice of that verb would separate its semantics from the standard active idiom *ā √ diś* ‘point to, aim at’.

VIII.93.13–15: The connection among the verses in this *ṛca* eludes me, though the fact that they are all set in an apparent mythic past and are joined by logical and/or temporal connectors (14a *ádha*, 15a *ād u*) suggests that they should form a thematic unit.

VIII.93.14: The positioning ... *yád ... ádha ...* is unusual, though Klein (II: 111) simply takes it as a variant of more common *ádha yád ...*

VIII.93.15: Judging from Ge’s tr. of the first pāda, “Davor sei mir Bewahrung,” he takes *āt* as an ablative pronoun referring to *ámaḥ* in 14c (his “Panik,” my “onslaught”), but as far as I can tell, *āt* is elsewhere only adverbial, as opposed to the fuller pronominal form *asmāt*. I also question his modal, indeed imperatival interpretation of *bhuvat* in this preterital context; thematic forms belonging originally to the root aorist stem (*á*)*bhū-* can be either subjunctive or a secondarily thematicized injunctive. See Hoffmann 1967 passim, esp. 214–15.

VIII.93.17: The verse is syntactically incomplete, consisting of an instrumental phrase (pāda a), a vocative phrase (pāda b), and a subordinate clause with a verb in the imperfect (*ā-abhavaḥ*, so Pp.) or possibly injunctive (*ā bhavaḥ*). In order to provide a main clause for the *yád* clause, Ge supplies “geschah es” (“it happened”). I prefer to borrow the verb of the preceding verse, *ā śuṣe*, though transposed into a past tense.

VIII.93.18: The curious hapax *bodhín-manas-*, with, per Pp., 1<sup>st</sup> member *bodhít-*, may be built on the model of semantically similar *cikivít-* / *cikivín-manas-*; see AiG II.2.322.

VIII.93.19: This verse presents both a conceptual difficulty (in ab) and a syntactic one (in c). As for the first, Indra should not be reaching exhilaration through his help for us, but rather through our soma. Ge sidesteps the difficulty by simply reinterpreting the lexeme *abhí prá √mand* as meaning ‘draw near’ (“ziehst du her zu uns”) without comment, but this relatively common collocation elsewhere always has the meaning expected of *√mad / mand*, a meaning that *abhî ... mandasānáḥ* in 21ab would reinforce. In order to avoid the conceptually unlikely “by what help for us do you become exhilarated?” I have supplied “coming” with the *kayā ... ūtyā* phrase – re-establishing the usual balance between what Indra bestows on his worshippers and the soma they offer him in return.

As for the syntactic problem, imperatives (here *bhara*) should not appear in interrogative sentences, and pāda c begins with interrogative *káyā*. Ge suggests that the 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. imperative here is used in analogy to the 1<sup>st</sup> ps.; in other words, since the subjunctive is perfectly at home in interrogative clauses and the 1<sup>st</sup> ps. subjunctive ultimately comes to serve as the 1<sup>st</sup> ps. imperative, its use in interrogative clauses could serve as a model for the introduction of 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. imperatives in such clauses. But I doubt that the 1<sup>st</sup> ps. subjunctive had been reinterpreted as an imperative at this era, since the full subjunctive paradigm in all three persons was still very much alive, and in fact Old comments that he does not know of other examples in the older language. To avoid the syntactic clash I assume that *káyā stotṛbhyaḥ*, parallel to *káyā ... na ūtyā* in a, ends the sentence, and *ā bhara* constitutes a new, abrupt imperational clause. Old cites a similar solution, though taking *stotṛbhyaḥ* with the imperative not the *kayā* clause, found in Grassmann’s tr., also in Caland/Henry’s, which he dismisses as “künstliches Ueberspringen der Schwierigkeit.” This hardly seems fair, since it does in fact avoid the difficulty, and seems no more artificial than many interpretations of syntactically awkward passages. As for my division into clauses as opposed to that of Gr and Cal/Hen, although *stotṛbhya ā bhara* is found several times elsewhere as a syntagm (V.6.1 [and reps.], nearby VIII.77.8), pāda-final *ā bhara* is extraordinarily common and could easily be construed independently, especially since *stotṛbhyaḥ* would naturally pair with *naḥ* in these parallel expressions.

VIII.93.21: “Bring” can be supplied here on the basis of *ā bhara* in 19c.

VIII.93.22: Though *vītāye* is translated as if it were a loc. (“in pursuit”), it is of course a dative, and “Indra” or “you” should probably be supplied as object of the infinitive. The “wives” of the pressed drinks are, acdg. to Sāy and followed by Ge (and me), the waters; in this soma context cows, standing for cows’ milk, are also possible, though the occurrence of waters in c supports Sāy’s suggestion.

Pāda c is difficult, primarily because of the uncertain *nicumpunāḥ* but also because of the genitive case of *apām*. To take the latter issue first, Ge assumes the

referent of the nominative phrase is Indra, as “der ... Besucher der Gewässer” (*apām jāgmiḥ*). Since *jāgmi-* in the singular is ordinarily used of Indra, this identification makes sense, but *jāgmi-*, like other nominals of the same formation, always takes verbal rection, and the goal is expressed in the acc. (*āhavam* II.33.11, *nṛṣādanam* VII.20.1) or loc. (*vidātheṣu* I.89.7) – not the gen., as Ge’s tr. requires. For the baffling *nicumpuṇá* (and its mantra variants *-cuṇkuná-* and *-caṇkuna*) see EWA s.v. with lit. Mayrhofer cites there an etymological suggestion of Werba’s based on a proposed MIA form, meaning ‘always filling’. Though there is, of course, no certainty here, I have adopted this suggestion for want of anything better, though ‘gushing downward’ or Ge’s ‘sprudelnde (?)’ vel sim. would also work; consider also Old’s “vielleicht ein dem Wasser innewohnender lustrierender Genius.” In any case, meanings in this sphere do not fit Indra terribly well (as Ge’s “?” in part indicates), and, coupled with the problem of the case form of *apām*, this suggests that a different referent be sought for the nominatives in this pāda. I tentatively suggest supplying *ūrmí-* ‘wave’, regularly found with *apām*, esp. in soma contexts.

VIII.93.23: The first word of the verse, *iṣṭāḥ*, can belong either to  $\sqrt{iṣ}$  ‘desire’ (or the other  $\sqrt{iṣ}$  ‘send’) or  $\sqrt{yaj}$  ‘sacrifice, offer’ and should be read as a pun. With Ge the publ. tr. takes *índram* as governed by *vr̥dhāsaḥ* (“strengthening Indra” / “den Indra ... stärkend”). I took it so because *asṛkṣata* has a clear acc. goal in c and does not need another one. However, I am increasingly uncomfortable with this interpretation, since *vr̥dhá-* otherwise takes the genitive (see nearby VIII.98.5 *sunvató vr̥dháḥ* and 6 *mánor vr̥dháḥ*), and I would now take *índram* as another goal with *asṛkṣata*, hence “... libations, strengthening at the ceremony, have surged to Indra, to his down-stroke”).

The word *avabhṛthá-* in c is found only here in the RV. In classical śrauta ritual the *avabhṛtha* is the “final bath” taken by the sacrificer and his wife at the conclusion of the ritual, and it is interpreted thus here by Gr and, although Ge doubts that it is the *final* bath, he still takes it as a “Reinungsbad.” I am dubious for a number of reasons, not least that no one should be bathing in libations (*hótrāḥ*) and that the participants in the final bath of later ritual are not gods (as Indra would be here) but mortals. Instead I think that the verbal lexeme *áva*  $\sqrt{bhṛ}$ , lit. ‘bear down’, provides the interpretational context for this noun. In the RV verbal forms of this lexeme sometimes take a weapon in the acc., depicting Indra’s bringing this weapon down on his opponent (e.g., I.32.9 *índro asyā áva vādhar jabhāra* “Indra brought his weapon down upon her”; also *vájram* X.113.5), or, with an accusative of the opponent or one of his body parts, of Indra bringing down his enemy (e.g., II.20.6 *áva ... síro bharad dāsāsaya* “he brought down the head of the Dāsa”). Here I think it refers concretely to Indra’s “down-stroke,” which is strengthened by the soma offered to him.

VIII.93.25–27: The c pādas of all three verses in this ṛca have the same structure: dat. pl. *stofbhyah*, a form of *índra-* (acc. 25–26, voc. 27), 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. imperative.

VIII.93.25: The verse begins with a 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. pronoun *túbhyam*, and the content of what follows, until the end of b, seems entirely consonant with Indra as the 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. referent. However, the vocative closing b, *vibhāvaso*, otherwise used only of Agni, and the fact that Indra is the 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. object of the imperative *ā vaha* in c, whose subject should be Agni, call the interpretation of the earlier part of the verse into question. Yet it is next to impossible, in my view, that the announcing of the soma drinks in a is made to anyone but Indra, and so we must reckon with a half verse that changed horses in midstream, as it were, without any poetic benefit accruing.

VIII.93.26: I do not understand Ge's assertion (n. to 26a), that this verse only makes sense if Agni is the speaker, a view shared by Old. I certainly agree that Agni is the subject: I take 26ab as dependent on 25c, where Agni is the 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. addressee, and take the participle *dádhat* of b with the objects found in both a and b, with slightly different senses ('diffuse' in a, 'distribute' in b, both with preverb *vī*).

The VP "diffuse your skill" refers to Agni's sending his light upward and outward; the "skill" in question is presumably his ritual skill, his ability to conduct the oblations to heaven.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. impv. in c must be addressed to the whole set of ritual participants. Ge. insists (n. to 26c) that *stotṛbhyaḥ* must be read with pāda b, parallel to *dāśūṣe* "die Kleinode verteile für den Opfernden, für die Sänger," but the rigid parallelism of the c pādas in this ṛca suggests rather that it belongs with its pāda. Presumably the full set of participants are chanting on behalf of the subset of "praisers."

VIII.93.27: Again I read the verb *ā ... dadhāmi* with both pādas, with slightly different senses with the two different objects and with *te* read as gen. with pāda a and dat. with pāda b.

VIII.93.28–30: A variant of the final pāda of the last ṛca (27c *stotṛbhya indra mṛṣaya*) becomes the refrain of this ṛca (*yád indra mṛṣáyāsi naḥ*).

VIII.93.31–33: As noted in the publ. intro., the first pāda of the first verse of this ṛca provides its refrain, a slightly odd effect. Only in 31 is the refrain syntactically integrated into the verse. There are also echoes of previous verses: *śatakrato*, which ends 27b and 28b, appears as nom. *śatákratuḥ* at the end of 32b. The voc. *vṛtrahantama* of 30a is echoed by nom. *vṛtrahántamaḥ* in 32a and voc. *vṛtrahan* in the same metrical position in 33a. The end of this hymn is very tightly constructed.

VIII.93.34: As noted in the publ. intro., this verse falls outside the ṛca structure and seems unconnected to the rest of the hymn. As Ge points out, it plays on two of the names of the Ṛbhus, *ṛbhú-* itself and *vāja-*. Note also the alliteration, esp. in pāda b: *ṛbhukṣāṇam ṛbhúṃ rayīm*.

## VIII.94 Maruts

VIII.94.1–2: For the somewhat peculiar imagery of these vss., see the publ. intro.

VIII.94.2: Curiously, *vratā* ... *dhārāyante* seems to be the only full VP with *vratā-* as obj. of a verbal form of  $\sqrt{dhr}$ , despite the common (nearly 20x) bahuvrīhi *dhṛtā-vrata-* ‘whose commandments are upheld’.

There are several ways to construe the dual dvandva *sūryāmāsā* of c. Ge takes it as a separate obj. of *dhārāyante*, Re. as an additional subj. of the same verb, while I take it as the subj. of the purpose inf. *drśé*.

VIII.94.3: The first pāda has been subjected to a dizzying number of different interpretations, primarily because of the uncertain sense of the resonant word *aryāḥ* in context, which is complicated by its ambiguous grammatical identity: it can be gen. or abl. sg. or nom. or acc. pl. of *arí-* or even nom. sg. of *aryá-*. In addition to the standard treatments, see also Oldenberg ZDMG 54 (=KlSch. p. 79), Bl RR ad VI.45.33, Thieme Fremdling 74ff. I won’t discuss the various suggested alternatives, but simply present my own. I take *aryāḥ* as abl. sg.; as for the immediately following *ā*, I give it a double interpr. On the one hand it is a postposition with *aryāḥ* in the meaning ‘from’; the phrase *aryā ā* is found elsewhere and always in this sense (VIII.34.10, IX.61.11, X.191.1, in addition to the repetition of our pāda in VI.45.33). Any interpr. that requires *aryāḥ* to be some other case than abl. sg. needs to confront this formulaic evidence. But in my interpr. *ā* is also a preverb with *grṇanti*. I take the lexeme *ā*  $\sqrt{gr}$  to be built on the model of the common *ā*  $\sqrt{yaj}$  ‘bring here by sacrifice’ and mean ‘bring here by song / sing here’. Our bards attract the Maruts away from the stranger (*aryāḥ*) to our soma-sacrifice.

“All the bards” (*vísve* ... *kārāvaḥ*) here contrasts with “all the gods” (*devāḥ* ... *vísve*) in the preceding verse, both sets of beings operating in the same territory, the ritual ground.

The publ. tr. fails to tr. *sádā* ‘always’; it should read “... always sing them here ...”

VIII.94.4: The opening of this vs. seems unnecessarily over-annunciatory, with both *ásti* and *ayám*, each equivalent to “here is.” One would have been enough.

There is some dissension about the referent of *svarājāḥ*, which cannot, of course, modify the (dual) Áśvins. Gr, flg. Ludwig, takes it as a gen. sg. referring to soma. The stem modifies the Maruts in V.58.1, and as a nom. pl. could match *marútaḥ* in b, except that the *utá* is then wrongly placed. Ge and Old are surely right that it refers to the Ādityas (as in VII.66.6), who appear individually in the next vs. and who are esp. associated with *vratā*’s, mentioned already in vs. 2. Klein (DGRV I.439), however, essentially rejects this solution for reasons that aren’t clear to me and calls the issue “unresolved.”

VIII.94.5: For the phrase *tánā pūtāsya*, cf. I.3.4 *tánā pūtāsaḥ*, IX.16.8 *tánā punānāḥ*.

*jāvant-* is a hapax and is surely a truncation of common *prajāvant-*, likewise ‘possessing/granting offspring’, which occurs elsewhere in iambic cadences. In the

IXth Maṇḍala Soma is asked on a number of occasions to bring or produce substances that are *prajāvant-*, e.g. *prajāvad réta ā bhara* “bring here semen producing offspring.”

VIII.94.6: The “(drinks)” supplied in ab is not strictly necessary, since the genitives could be construed with *matsati* in c (so Ge/Re). I have supplied it because  $\sqrt{pā}$  ‘drink’ is the signature verb of this *ṛca* (*pībanti* 4b, 5a), but I am not wedded to it.

VIII.94.7–8: I take the initial *kád* in both verses as a question particle, introducing a rhetorical question. Ge, Re, and Etter (p. 236) take the *kád* in 8 as a neut. acc. interrogative adj. modifying *ávaḥ* (“which help?”), though they all take the *kád* in 7 as a question particle. I do not see the justification for violating the evident parallelism of the two verses, and I also wonder if we get a choice of the kind of help the gods are going to provide us.

VIII.94.9: With Ge and Old, I borrow *huve* ‘I call’ from 10 to govern pāda c. See also vs. 3 above with the same c pāda, there governed by (*ā*) ... *gṛṇanti*.

### VIII.95 Indra

VIII.95.1: Though Gr identifies *rathîḥ* here as a nom. plural, thus a devî-type form beside the correct *vṛkî*-type *rathîyāḥ* found elsewhere, there is no reason not to take it as the nom. singular it appears to be, since number agreement in similes is not so strictly carried through in RV as in Classical poetics. So also AiG III.179 (though taking it as nom. sg. *used as* nom. pl.).

The image itself is somewhat striking: the songs mounting Indra as their chariot. Indra is usually the active charioteer figure.

VIII.95.2: HvN restore the sandhi in a (*asyāndhasa*) as *asya āndhasa*, but *asyā* should surely be accented, with the Pp., because it modifies *āndhasaḥ* rather than being used pronominally.

I follow Ge in supplying *vikṣú* with the fem. *vīśvāsu* in c, on the basis of 3d. But other nouns are possible: just in nearby hymns *vīśvāsu* is found with *samātsu* (‘battles’, VIII.90.2), *gīṛṣú* (‘hymns’, VIII.92.7), and *kṛṣṭīsu* (‘communities’, VIII.92.18), and a semantic case could be made for each of these, even the first.

VIII.95.4: Tiraścī Āṅgīrasa is the poet of VIII.95-103, according to the Anukramaṇī.

VIII.95.5: The verse consists entirely of a relative clause with no main clause, but the referent of the relative must be Tiraścī of 4a, despite the intervening matter in 4c, as the similar structures of 4b and 5a indicate: # *īndra yās tvā* and # *īndra yās te* respectively.

Note the interplay of *návīyasam* ‘newer’ and *pratnām* ‘age-old’, expressing the standard RVic poetic trope of making an old song new again. So also Ge (n. to 5cd).

VIII.95.7–9: See the intro. for the curious density in this *ṛca* of the ppl. *śuddhá-* ‘cleansed’, which is not normal soma vocabulary. I do not understand what ritual or conceptual feature is at issue. Ge cites Sāy’s story about the purification of Indra after his killing of Vṛtra. This may be relevant, but there is no reference to Indra’s deeds or activities in this *ṛca*, save for the final hemistich in vs. 9, where we find *vṛtrāṇi jighnase* “you keep smashing obstacles” – an allusion to Vṛtra but couched in present time and plural number.

VIII.95.7: Instead of HvN’s restoration *nu índram* (for *nv índram*), *nú* should of course be accented.

VIII.95.7-8: These two vss. contain successive occurrences of the pf. act. impv. built to  $\sqrt{\text{mad}}$ : 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. *mamattu* (7d), 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. *mamaddhi* (8d). Despite their apparently parallel formation, they have distinct transitivity values: the 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. is transitive, the 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. not. This difference is consistent in the usage of the two forms: the other instance of *mamaddhí* (X.96.13) is also intransitive, the 10 of the other 11 occurrences of *mamattu* are transitive (save for late X.59.2) The difference may have arisen from the fact that, while *mamattu* is a properly formed impv. to the pf. of  $\sqrt{\text{mad}}$  with expected full grade of the root syllable, in the 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. we should expect zero grade, hence *\*ma-md-dhí*, which would probably simplify to *\*mandhí*, with the superficially unredupl. weak perfect stem *mand-*, which is reinterpreted as a secondary root. Hence *mamaddhí* must be secondarily formed. I do not understand why this would affect its valency, though.

### VIII.96 Indra

VIII.96.1: I read *ātiranta* as preverb *ā* plus injunctive *tiranta* (and so better transcribed as *ā tiranta*), contra Pp. and Gr. This allows a presential, general reading for the injunctive, which will match the pf. *tasthuḥ* in c (usually presential, acdg. to Kü), and describes the general cosmic obedience to Indra, rather than a particular historical event. With Ge I take this verb as providing the framework for pāda b as well, though I consider *nāktam* adverbial, rather than the object of the verb, as Ge and Old take it.

VIII.96.2: In d “deeds” needs to be supplied, to account for the number differential between *tád* (c) and *yāni* (d).

VIII.96.3: The Pp. reads *śrútyai* in d (so also Ge, Schmidt *B+I*), but I follow Gr in taking it as *śrútyāḥ*, agreeing with *krátavaḥ* in c. Ol considers both interpretations possible and does not make a determination.



VIII.96.4: Since *yajñīyam* is not a superlative, the “the most” of the publ. tr. should be in parentheses.

VIII.96.5: The verbal counterpart to 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. *dhatsé* in the relative cl. (ab) is augmented *ánavanta* in the main clause (cd). I would therefore prefer to take *dhatsé* as a medial, preterital perfect, rather than as a present. Gr and Lu identify it as present, Ge translates it as one, and Kü (p. 275) explicitly claims that *-i-*liaison forms belong to the perfect, while those without the *-i-* are presents. Nonetheless, I think we can interpret *dhatsé*, the only such 2<sup>nd</sup> sg., as a perfect, next to very common *dadhiṣé*, esp. as only this form would fit in a Triṣṭubh cadence.

The accent on main-clause *ánavanta* must result from its membership in the repeated *prá* subclauses.

I take the formulators in d as the Maruts; Ge suggests either *Āṅgirasas* or *Maruts*. Since the next *ṛca* (vss. 7–9) clearly contains the 1<sup>st</sup> ps. speech of the Maruts, and the next verse (6) has 1<sup>st</sup> ps. speech that can reasonably attributed to the Maruts, their introduction here would not be surprising.

VIII.96.6: Ge (so also Gr) takes *ávarāṇy asmāt* as temporal: “die nach ihm kommen,” whereas I interpret it spatially. Though “later than him” is possible, it seems pleonastic, in that if Indra begat them, they would *have* to be later than him. The idea is rather that they exist here on earth, below him,, and also that he begot them as subordinates. Cf. *vrjānemāvarāṇi* “these communities here below” (IX.96.7) and *bāndhūṃr imāṃ ávarān* “these bonds here below” (IX.97.17), which both seem spatial, not temporal, also.

VIII.96.8: Although the med. pf. of  $\sqrt{\text{vṛdh}}$  is ordinarily intransitive or reflexive, *vāvṛdhānāḥ* is here best interpreted as transitive in the frame (“increasing you,” with *tvā* in a as obj.) but intransitive in the simile (“as ruddy throngs increase,” with the nominative NP *usrā iva rāśāyaḥ*). See X.78.8 for a similar example of case disharmony.

VIII.96.9: However tempting it might be, the juxtaposed phrase *ásurā adevāḥ* is most likely not to be interpreted as an early instantiation of the Asura/Deva conflict of middle Vedic times. Instead it probably refers to human or semi-divine lords (for the former see W. E. Hale, 1986: 83) who do not have the gods on their side. Hale points out that *adevā-* is the only form in the RV so accented (contrasting with *ádeva-*), and it must be a *bahuvrīhi* meaning “not having gods, without gods.”

VIII.96.10: In d *tanvè* might be more comfortably rendered “for his own person” with Ge (“für seine Person”), but *tanvì* in the following verse seems to require a ‘body’ reading.

VIII.96.13–15: As indicated in the intro., the identity of the “droplet” (*drapsá-*) and the purport of this *ṛca* are quite unclear. Ge takes both *drapsá-* and *kṛṣṇá-* (‘black’) as PNs and the *ṛca* as their “saga.” Since such a saga is otherwise unknown and both words have lexical meaning, such an approach does not seem to gain us much. Old’s discussion is, as usual, very sharp, but his own interpretation, that Indra is helping an embryonic version of Bṛhaspati, in the form of a drop of semen, to come to birth, also does not convince. Schmidt (1968: 112–13) rejects Old’s interpretation and suggests that it describes in mystical fashion the freeing of the soma-drop in the form of the sun, but declines to tr. the *ṛca* because of the many uncertainties. I am inclined to see it as a treatment of the ritual step of rinsing the soma in water, as I said in the publ. intro., though much remains murky.

VIII.96.16: The identity of the “seven” is unclear; ordinarily that number refers to rivers or priestly offices, but neither makes sense here. However, Ge (n. to 16a) points to seven enemies destroyed by Indra in X.49.8, 120.6.

Ge takes *vibhu-mánt-* (only here) as ‘die in dir einen Gebieter hatten’; this might be plausible, because Indra is characterized as *vibhū* in 11 and so creatures associated with him might possess him as *vibhū-*. But the problem is that *vibhū-/ū-* is only adjectival, as far as I can tell, and does not have the ‘lord, master’ meaning presupposed here. Though possessive *-vant-/mant-* stems should be built to nouns, Debrunner (AiG II.2.877–78) allows for pleonastic use of the suffix with adjectives in this and a number of other cases.

VIII.96.19: As indicated in the publ. intro., I interpret this verse as containing a riddle (a-c) and its answer (d), an interpretation at odds with Ge (flg. Sāy), who takes all of the verse until its last word as part of a single description of Indra. His rendering of d, “der Vṛtratöter ist (jedem) anderen gewachsen, so sagen sie” is grammatically impossible because *āhuh* ought then to be accented; the *prátīd anyám āhuh* must be a separate clause (as Old also takes it, though with implausible semantics). In my interpretation the first three *pādas* present several different descriptions of Indra’s characteristics and activities. Although these descriptions are fairly transparent, they do not name Indra, whereas the first two words of *pāda* d, *sá vṛtrahā*, names him by his standing epithet and serves as answer to the implicit riddle posed by the first three *pādas*. Although this interpretation is more complex than Ge’s, it allows us to account for the odd finale of d and especially for the *anyám*, which by my rules (Fs. Beekes, 1997) should have a definite reading, “the other.” I take this “other” to be the poser of the riddle, and the unidentified speakers of d triumphantly respond to him with the solution. That the first two words of the final two verses of the *ṛca* (and the hymn) repeat *sá vṛtrahā* of 19d, followed by the actual name of the god, lends support to my interpretation of vs. 19.

I tr. loc. *sutésu* in a as if it were a genitive; “enjoyer at the pressings” would be possible, but just a little less parsable in English.

I am somewhat puzzled by the simile of b: *yó áheva revān*. Ge takes the *áhā* (so Pp.) as the comparandum with Indra and *revān* as the shared quality (“der wie die

(neuen) Tage prangend ist”), but *revānt-* doesn’t mean ‘resplendent’; rather, as a derivative of *rayí-* ‘wealth’, it means ‘rich, wealthy’. Moreover, in similes, *áhā*, marked by *iva*, several times precedes the actual comparandum and serves as adverbial qualifier – e.g., I.130.2 *áhā víśveva sūryam* “like the sun through all the days” (cf. also *áheva* in VI.61.9), and so I interpret it here, though I admit it is still not a compelling image.

In c the Saṃhitā text reads *náryápāṃsi* (as also in I.85.9), with five syllables, suggesting a word separation *nári ápāṃsi* and so analyzed by Pp. (followed by Aufrecht and HvN). But this must represent, one way or another, the collocation *náryā + ápāṃsi*, found in opposite order even in this same *ṛca* (21c *ápāṃsi náryā*; see also IV.19.10, as well as *ápāṃsi ... náryāni* VII.21.4; also the *bahuvrīhi náryāpas-* in nearby VIII.93.1). Grassmann suggests reading *\*náryāpāṃsi*, as does Old (ad I.85.9) (see also Macdonell Vedic Reader ad I.85.9), and this “slight emendation” (Macdonell’s words) not only fixes the morphology but also restores a more standard break ( ◡ ◡ ◡ ) for the three shorts ( ◡ ◡ ◡ ) found (though the latter break is by no means uncommon). However, Lubotsky apparently takes *nári* here as the loc. to the noun *nṛ-* (the *náryápāṃsi* passages would contain the only locatives to this stem in the RV), and Ge adduces the somewhat parallel case of *vṛṣṇi ... śávaḥ* (V.35.4, VIII.3.10), *vṛṣṇi paúṃsyam* (VIII.7.23). Like our *nári ápāṃsi / ápāṃsi náryā*, the former collocation exists alongside one with a properly formed *-iya-* adjective, *vṛṣṇ(i)yaṃ śávaḥ* (VIII.3.8 [same hymn as one of the truncated occurrences], VIII.51.10 IX.64.2). But the easy fix available to the *nári ápāṃsi* case (lengthening the vowel of *ápāṃsi*) is not available for the *vṛṣṇi* examples.

I do not know quite what to do with all this. The *vṛṣṇi* case looks to me like an artificial truncation that nonetheless was original to the text, while I’m inclined to see *nári* as a redactional change, perhaps on the model of *vṛṣṇi*. I am thus willing to follow Gr, Old, and Macdonell in emending to *\*náryāpāṃsi*. However, these are, to say the least, quite subjective criteria, and I am not at all convinced these views are correct. It is nonetheless possible to sketch a possible but problematic scenario for these developments. The two examples of *vṛṣṇi te śávaḥ* are nominal clauses. Cf. VIII.3.10 *tád indra vṛṣṇi te śávaḥ*, rendered in the publ. tr. “that is your bullish vast power, Indra,” with *vṛṣṇi* nominally a neut. sg. to an otherwise non-existent *i-*stem adj. But it might be possible instead to take it as the loc. sg. of *vṛṣan-*, with *vṛṣṇi ... śávaḥ* “the power is in the bull.” Though in a cursory look I have found no *śávaḥ + LOC.* constructions in the RV, other abstract words for power do figure in such syntagms (including in our hymn, VIII.96.3). See, e.g., V.33.6 *paprṁśéṇyam indra tvé hí ójaḥ, nṛmṇāni ca ...* “For, Indra, in you are strength to be nurtured and manly powers.” There are two fundamental problems with this suggestion: 1) the zero-grade loc. *-ni* to *-an-* stems is not found in the RV; we find only full-grade *-ani*; 2) it is hard to construe the *te*, since the bull and 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. Indra are coreferential. “This power of yours is in (you,) the bull” is awkward and unlikely. A bolder hypothesis – bolder than I would venture – would link these two problems and reconstruct an underlying syntagm *\*vṛṣaṇi śávaḥ* with full-grade loc. and no enclitic pronoun. When the posited *vṛṣaṇi* reduced to *vṛṣṇi* (perhaps because of association with adjectival *vṛṣṇ(i)ya-*), *te*

was introduced to maintain the metrical shape. There are no other attested examples of the loc. sg. of *vṛṣan-* in the RV to support the trisyllabic reading. In any case, in this scenario the old loc. would be reinterpreted as an endingless adjectival or adverbial element in this collocation, alternating with syntactically impeccable *vṛṣṇ(i)yaṃ śávaḥ*. With this set up, we can get *nári* on this model:

*vṛṣṇ(i)yaṃ śávaḥ : vṛṣṇi ... śávaḥ*  
*ápāṃsi náryā : nári ápāṃsi*

I believe this development was redactional rather than found in the ur-text. First because *vṛṣṇi ... śávaḥ* is a plausible neut. sg. phrase, but with the pl. *ápāṃsi* an endingless *nári* is more difficult. Moreover, an abstract quality located in a being (like “strength is in the bull”) is a much more likely notion than “labors are in the man.” And the metrical evidence strongly favors an original *\*náryāpāṃsi*, though it does not entirely rule out the short vowel.

But I lay out this scenario very skeptically, primarily because of the wrong grade in the posited loc. sg. Here I would point out that the same trouble would afflict any attempt to explain *vṛṣṇ(i)ya-* as a thematic descasulative derivative from a locative by pointing to the two synchronically alternating syntagms here. Such a derivation for *\*(i)yo-*possessive adjectives in general has been proposed (see Balles, *Sprache* 39 [1997 (2000)] 141-67, cited from Meier-Brügger, *Indo-European Linguistics*, 283-84, for which ref. I thank JL). I do not believe that the last word has been said about this issue.

VIII.96.21: Note the full syntagm *ápāṃsi náryā* responding to the *náryāpāṃsi* in 19c.

Gerundives occasionally take dative agents, like *sákhībhyah* here. Cf., e.g., I.33.2 *stotṛbhyo hávyah*.

### VIII.97 Indra

VIII.97.1–3, 4–6: All three verses of the first *ṛca* begin with a form of rel. *yá-* followed by voc. *indra*. Pāda 2c mimics this opening with *yá(jamāne)*. The first two verses of the following *ṛca* (4-6) continues this pattern, if somewhat raggedly: 4a *yác cakra*, 5a *yád*, 5c *yát*.

VIII.97.1: The relative phrase *yāḥ ... bhújah* “which delightful things” has no obvious correlative expression in the main clause of cd. Ge supplies “(mit denen),” which is certainly possible and perhaps the default option. But following a suggestion of Old’s, I take the *asya* of c, otherwise unaccounted for, as the functional correlative, despite the difference in number and gender. Because it is unaccented, *asya* should be pronominal and refer to something already present in the discourse, and there are few candidates, esp. because *stotár-* doesn’t seem to take a genitive. It would not be surprising to resume the fem. expression “delightful things” simply with “that (stuff).” The masc. singular referring to the goods Indra has acquired continues in vs. 2, with the *yám ... tám* pair. I tr. *asya* “from that” rather than “of that,” since the latter doesn’t parse well in English.

In cd *stotāram ... yé ca ... vṛktābarhiṣaḥ* is a nice example of the “X and which Y” construction.

VIII.97.2: Ge tr. *avyayam* as ‘ohne Einbusse’ (loss), rather than ‘ovine, belonging to sheep’ (contra Gr, etc.), presumably because of its initial accent (against the normal accent in *avyāya-* ‘ovine’). This seems unnecessary. The other occurrence of *avyaya-* (IX.86.34) modifies the soma filter and Ge renders it “aus Schafwolle” without comment. In our passage he is following Sāy’s *vyayarahitam*, but *vyaya-* ‘disappearance, loss, outlay’ is not attested until the epic/Classical language, as far as I know. Furthermore, sheep fit nicely into this equine and bovine context, with the three terms *ásvaṃ gām bhāgām avyayam* displaying a classic Behagel’s Law configuration. As for the aberrant accent, Debrunner (AiG II.2.213) attributes it to the influence of semantically identical *avya-*.

Ge takes the locative phrase in c with ab, “Welches Ross und Rind du ... als Anteil ... bestimmt hat für den Opfernden ...” Again this seems odd and unnecessary. The locatives of c are summarized by *tásmin* in d, and contrast with *paṇaú* at the end of that pāda. Moreover the middle voice of *dadhiṣé* in the relative clause contrasts functionally with the act. imperative *dhehi* in the main clause. First Indra acquires goods *for himself*, then confers them *on others*. By placing the recipient in the rel. clause with the middle verb, Ge erases this neat voice contrast. Pāda c then seems to represent a heavy preposed NP picked up by initial *tásmin* in d.

VIII.97.3: Note the doubling of pres. *sásti* ‘sleeps’ with the adverbial gerund *anuṣvāpam*. In Jamison 1982/83 I argue that the gerund is used here because the poet wanted to use a pres. tense of  $\sqrt{svap}$  but didn’t really know one, since the various presents to this root are secondary and to some extent improvisational.

The end of the verse ... *dhehi táṃ tátah* with its two final pronominals is striking, but clearly constructed as the mirror image of 2d *tásminn táṃ dhehi*. The good sacrificer of 2cd is contrasted with the godless, vowless man of 3, and it may not be entirely fanciful to suggest that the unusual word order — *tá*-forms ordinarily occurring at the beginning of clauses — is a syntactic expression of his perverse nature.

VIII.97.4: Following Ge I take *keśíbhīḥ* “hairy-maned (horses)” as an appositional simile with *gīrbhīḥ*: the hymns serve as the team that brings Indra to us along “heaven’s way.”

This latter form, *dyugát* ‘heaven-going’ vel sim., is extensively discussed by Scar (106–7), who ultimately concludes that it is “unklar,” though he favors taking it as a nom. sg. modifying the soma presser (*sutāvān*). This seems odd: the soma-presser is the one element in this verse who is likely to stay put. I take it, with Gr and (implicitly) Old, as adverbial, referring to the movement of the hymns, as metaphorical horses, through heaven. In his note Ge endorses Sāy’s interpretation of it as a shortening of *dyugádbhiḥ*, which (as Wolff’s suggestion) Old dismisses

without argument. This explanation by truncation certainly does not seem necessary, since a neuter adverb works well enough.

VIII.97.7–9: The da capo-like structure of the verses in this *ṛca*, with the first *pāda* repeated verbatim as the last one, is quite unusual.

VIII.97.7: I have chosen to read the impv. *bhāvā* in b with the two small clauses in c as well, though it is certainly possible to interpret those with Ge as straight indicative nominal clauses: “you (are) there with help ...; you (are) friendship ...”

VIII.97.10: Although they belong to different *ṛcas*, 10ab responds to vs. 9: in both Indra is characterized by the lexeme *abhí√bhū* ‘dominate, surmount’ (9c *abhibhūḥ*, 10a *abhibhūtaram*), with each governing an NP beginning with *vísva-*. Moreover, in vs. 9 it is said that gods (as well as mortals) have not attained (*āśata*) Indra, while in 10ab the gods appear to be the implied subject of the verbs *tataksuḥ* and *jajanuḥ* “fashioned and begot” – in other words, paradoxically, though they do not attain him they are credited with creating him.

In c there is pseudo-etymological play between *vāriṣṭham vāre*, which not only are unrelated but also belong to two different NPs, despite their adjacency. There is some uncertainty about the position of *utá* or even what it is conjoining. Klein (DGRV I.346, 349) considers the *pāda* an XY *utá* construction, joining the two complex NPs that precede it, with the adjectives in d “merely strung on to the basical phrasal syntagm” (346).

The etymological figure *ugrám ójiṣṭham*, with a positive and its superlative, is reminiscent of the simplex followed by comparative in 9c / 10a *abhibhūḥ ... abhibhūtaram*. The rest of *pāda* d, *tavásam tarasvínam*, almost mimics an etymological figure via phonological scrambling, although the words are of course unrelated.

VIII.97.11: There is phonetic play between *asvaran* (a; see also *abhisvárā* 1b) to *√svar* ‘sound’ and *s<sup>u</sup>var(-pati)(c)* containing the ‘sun’ word, although the latter of course has a distracted *sv* cluster.

VIII.97.12: I use two different English tr. for *namanti*, ‘bend’ and ‘bow’, depending on the object; this is merely an English problem, as the passage adduced by Ge shows: VII.23.20 *ā ... índram ... name girā, nemīm tāṣṭeva*.

In cd I supply ‘cry out’ (*√svar*) on the basis of 11a *sám ... asvaran* (note the *sám* in 12d) and 12b (*abhi*)*svárā*.

Ge takes *tarasvínah* as nom. pl., which is grammatically possible, but I prefer Old’s gen. sg. (an alternative also for Gr), since the same adj. modifies Indra in 10d.

VIII.97.13: The *ca* in c is one of the rare examples of subordinating *ca* in the RV, as shown by the accent induced on the verb *vavártat*; see Klein DGRV I.240–41. Its position, about which Klein does not comment, is peculiar, but it can probably be

accounted for metrically. In this particular Atijagatī line (13 syl.), there is a natural break after the first two words (5 syllables), *mámhiṣṭho gīrbhír*, and the rest of the line behaves as if it were a dimeter (8-syl.) line, *ā ca yajñīyo vavártat*, with initial preverb followed by the enclitic conjunction.

VIII.97.14: The final word in a, *enā*, is taken as *enāḥ* by the Pp., a reading followed by Gr, Ge, Old, and Lub; in this interpretation it modifies or doubles (since *ena-* is a pronominal, not an adjectival demonstrative stem) fem. acc. pl. *púrah* earlier in the pāda. I do not rule this out, but wonder whether it can be the enclitic instr. sg. *enā* to *ayám* in the meaning ‘in that way, i.e., how’. See *enā* ‘thereby’ in V.2.11, in addition to personal uses (‘with him’) in IX.96.2, X.108.3.

Pāda b collects several words that have been prominent in the characterization of Indra earlier in the hymn: *ójasā* (*ójiṣṭham* 10d), *śaviṣṭha* (*śavasas pate* 6b, *śávasā* 9c), and *śakra* (*śakra* 4a). It is esp. clever that the grammatical identities of the first two terms have been switched: *s*-stem instr. to superlative and vice versa.

Note that though cd forms a single clause with two different subjects (“all the worlds” and “heaven and earth”), the dual verb *rejete* agrees with the nearer one, the decomposed dual dvandva *dyāvā ... prthivī ca*.

VIII.97.14–15: Both Lü (Var. 20, 506) and Schlerath (Kö. 139) consider this sequence to be a satyakriya. I can see the point, but if it is a truth-formulation, it is a muted one. The concept is clearest in 15a “Let this truth be protective of me,” esp. since this is the last verse of the hymn. The truth-formulation itself could be either the preceding verse (so Lüders) or the whole hymn (Schlerath allows both possibilities). In the absence of the standard instrumental *ṛténa* (later *satyena*) that signals a satyakriya I am reluctant to label it as such, though certainly it is akin. Schlerath also point out that the last word of the hymn is *rājan*.

“The distillate of all mother’s milk” for *viśvápsnya-* assumes the etymological connection between *-psnya-* and *stána-* ‘breast’, which is now standard doctrine. See EWA s.v. *stána-*.

## VIII.98 Indra

VIII.98.2–3: Parts of these two verses reappear, verbatim or slightly modified, in X.170.4, a hymn to Sūrya: 3ab = X.170.4ab, while the first two words of 2c nom. sg. *viśvákarmā viśvádevaḥ* correspond to the instr. sg. phrase *viśvákarmaṇā viśvádevyāvatā* in X.170.4d. In our hymn the subject of 3ab is Indra, who is also the referent of the nom. sg. phrase in 2c; in X.170.4 the referent in both cases is Sūrya. Because of the verbatim correspondence of 3ab and X.170.4ab save for the identity of the subject, I think they should be translated in the same way. I therefore take *svār* in a as nominative and an implicit simile and *rocanám* in b as an accusative of goal. Ge by contrast takes *svār* in our 3a also as an accusative of goal, parallel to *rocanám*: “Im Licht erstrahlend gingst du zur Sonne, zum Himmelslicht,” whereas in X.170.4 he takes them both as nominatives: “Im Licht erstahlend kamst du als Sonne als

Himmelslicht...” Although of course nothing forbids different interpretations of identical phraseology in different contexts, in situations where identical interpretations are possible (as here) it seems best not to vary the translations.

The bahuvr̥hi epithet of Indra *viśvákarmā* (2c) is of course a play on the divine figure of the same name, whereas the bahuvr̥hi *viśvádeva-* (also 2c) makes reference to the corporate entity the All Gods (*viśve devāḥ*). The former is simply applied directly to Sūrya in X.170.4d, whereas *viśvádeva-* has gone through some derivational shenanigans, producing a doubly (or triply) marked *viśvádevyā-vant-*.

VIII.98.4: The impv. *gadhi* is a hapax, beside *gahi*, which occurs 84 times (per Lub.). The latter is almost always pāda-final and, when internal, never occupies this precise metrical position (4<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> syllables from end), but although this slight indication of complementary distribution might ordinarily not be sufficient to account for the different endings, the distribution of the two forms fits a more general pattern. The *gahi* / *gadhi* question is obviously part of a larger phenomenon, or rather two: 1) the distribution of *-hi* vs. *-dhi* in the 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. imperative, 2) the conditioning for the general loss of occlusion in voiced aspirates, esp. *\*dh > h*. As for the former question, various generalizations work for various defined groups of forms – e.g., that *-dhi* occurs after consonants – but other groups show fluctuation, particularly disyllabic imperatives. Re (GLV §58) suggests that in this class *-hi* should be the preference after long vowel and *-dhi* after short vowel, but that the forms “usées,” *stuhi*, *ihī*, and *gahi*, have generalized *-hi* “mieux propre évidemment à l’elocution rapide.” This is not particularly satisfactory.

The most recent discussion of the whole phenomenon that I know of is Lubotsky’s “Sanskrit *h < \*dh, bh*” (*Sthāpakaśrāddham*, Professor G.A. Zograph Commemorative Volume, ed. N. V. Gurov and Ya. V. Vasil’kov. Pp. 124-44. St. Petersburg: Orientalia, 1995 [1997], available at <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/14207>), showing his characteristic thoroughness and clarity of presentation. Dismissing previous claims that the phenomenon is dialectal since the *\*dh > h* change is found in grammatical forms and unlikely to be due to borrowing, he suggests that it must be due to a conditioned sound law and that apparent exceptions to this sound law must be explained on a case-to-case basis. The sound law he proposes is *\*-VdhV# > -VhV#*. I will not discuss how he handles exceptions to this rule in other grammatical and lexical categories, but obviously the rule defines forms like *śrudhi*, *kṛdhi*, and our *gadhi* as exceptions. Again, I will not treat all his explanations of non-conforming *-dhi* imperatives, but concentrate on disyllables with *-dhi* after short vowel. For *kṛdhi* and other forms in *-ṛ* (*vṛdhi*, *spṛdhi*), he assumes that *ṛ* blocks the application of the rule, on the assumption that the older pronunciation of *ṛ* was [əṛ] (p. 136), while for *śrudhi* he examines distributional factors. Most important for him is the fact that *śrudhi* most often shows up in the formula *śrudhī hāvam* (with lengthened final vowel) and therefore the phonological conditions for *\*-dh > h* are not met, because the imperative “formed a whole with the following word” and “does not normally stand in *pausa*” (p. 134). He also notes that *gadhi* “stands in the interior of a pāda” (p. 134), while *gahi* is overwhelmingly pāda-final, and that *stuhi* is also often pāda-final.



(I would add that, in addition to a number of initial *stuhí*, the pāda-internal examples of *stuhi* never occupy the 4<sup>th</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> position.)

I am in agreement with Lub that the metrical position of the form shows a strong correlation with the *-dhi* vs. *-hi* alternate and also that *kṛdhi* and other forms in *r* are a special case (whatever the reason: I am not convinced that the older pronunciation was [ər]), since the metrical distribution of *kṛdhi* tracks that of *gahi* and other forms in *-hi*, not *śrudhi*. He does, however, shift his explanatory ground for *śrudhi* and company without signaling the change. For *śrudhi* the most important factor for him at first appears to be the formulaic evidence, that it forms a phonological phrase with *hávam*, that this phonological bonding is demonstrated by the lengthened final vowel of the imperative, and that therefore the imperative was not really in pausa and therefore not subject to the *\*dh > h* rule. But later in the same paragraph he seems to argue that its position internal to the pāda, in contrast to pāda-final *-hi* forms like *stuhi* and *gahi*, provides the conditioning and the formulaic argument is no longer foremost. Although the *śrudhī hávam* formula is certainly pervasive, I would contend that it is the metrical position, not the formation of a formulaic phonological phrase, that is the key factor and, moreover, that the lengthening of the final vowel before *hávam* (also *gírah*) is the low-level result of metrical factors, to avoid four shorts in the cadence. Certainly our *gadhi* is not formulaically or syntactically connected with the word that follows it: ... *gadhi priyáh* (“come, as dear one”). If we do want to claim that bonding with a following element kept the *-dhi* from final position, it would surely be better to focus on sequences involving enclitics (e.g. VIII.66.12 ... *śrudhī me hávam*), which would create a phonological word ending with the enclitic. Unfortunately, such sequences are rare, compared to the *śrudhī hávam* type.

Pāda-internal position also appears to condition the occurrence of another *-dhi* imperative, *bodhi* to *√bhū*, as I discussed some time ago (“Syntactic Constraints on Morphological Change: The Vedic Imperatives *bodhi*, *dehi*, and *dhehi*,” in *Syntaxe des langues indo-iraniennes anciennes*, ed. E. Pirart. Pp. 63–80, esp. 69–75. Barcelona: Editorial Ausa, 1997). The parallel imperatives *bodhi* and *bháva* are almost in complementary distribution, with *bodhi* once again standing internal in the pāda and *bháva* either initial or final.

The last word has not been said about this complex issue.

VIII.98.5: As in the previous hymn (VIII.97.9c, 10a), this one deploys two forms of the lexeme *abhí √bhū* ‘dominate’ to describe Indra – here 2a *abhibhūr asi* and 5ab *abhí ... babhūtha* – although the two hymns are ascribed to different poets from different lineages.

As for the perfect form here, Kü (344–45) remarks that the perfect of *√bhū*, both as simplex and with *abhí* and *pári*, is generally presential in value, and such a value works well here. There is another issue with this perfect. This verse contains the 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. *babhūtha* without *i*-liaison, but 11b has *babhūvitha* with the liaison. It is striking to encounter both forms in the same hymn, esp. since, as Kü points out (344 n. 618), *babhūtha* is the older, *babhūvitha* the younger form, found only once

elsewhere in the RV, while *babhūtha* is quite common. Metrics must have encouraged the use of younger *babhūvitha* here, since it is final in a 12-syllable line, where the older form would not fit. The other *babhūvitha* (VIII.33.19) occurs in an Anuṣṭubh cadence, where iambic rhythm is also favored. It is worth noting that thirteen of the twenty-one occurrences of *babhūtha* are final in Triṣṭubh lines, so the insertion of the *i*-liaison simply converts this common cadential form into one appropriate to Jagatī.

VIII.98.7: With Ge I take *udā* in c as the acc. pl. neut. of *udān-*, rather than instr. sg. to a root noun *úd-* with Gr, despite Old's championing of the latter analysis and explicit rejection of the former. See also AiG III.316 and Schindler (*Das Wurzelnomen im Arischen und Griechischen* [unpubl. diss., Würzburg 1972], pp. 12–13), which both affirm the nom.-acc. *-n*-stem interpretation.

VIII.98.8: The simile *vār ná ... yavyābhiḥ* is syntactically ambiguous, in that *vār* can be the comparandum of either subject or object, though it probably makes better sense as an object, as Ge takes it: (a body of) water growing with floods of (tributary?) water. However, a nominative interpretation is by no means excluded, as waters not infrequently swell things and make them grow; cf., e.g., I.65.4 *vārdhantīm āpaḥ ... sūśīśvim* “The waters strengthen the lovely child.” For an overelaborate interpretation see Oberlies (*Relig.* I.521).

VIII.98.9: This verse may refer to the “Fallow-bay yoking libation,” which serves as the occasion for the first-maṇḍala Indra hymns I.61–63, 82. However, this libation is ordinarily the final act in a ritual, but is not final here.

### VIII.99 Indra

VIII.99.1: The redupl. form *ápīpyan* is implicitly assigned by Ge to  $\sqrt{pā}$  ‘drink’ as a redupl. (causative) aorist: “Dich haben ... die ... Männer getränkt,” an analysis I follow. However, the majority opinion is that it belongs to  $\sqrt{pī}$  ‘swell’, which is not out of the question. The competing claims and morphological possibilities are discussed above ad VIII.66.7 with regard to *apīpema*. Our form here could have the expected zero-grade to an athematic stem (*ápīpy-an*), and the long reduplication could be correct for a causative reduplicated aorist, although since the cluster *-py-* is undistracted here, a short reduplication might be expected (type AV *atitrasan*). However, since most of the forms of the act. redupl. aorist paradigm would not have such a cluster (*\*ápīpet*, etc.), the long reduplication would surely be generalized. For further disc. of the proposed formation see VIII.66.7.

VIII.99.3: The simile in the first pāda of this verse is quite problematic: not only is the image intended quite unclear, but the verbal stem *śrāya-* in participial *śrāyanta(h)* (so Pp., Gr. rather *śrāyante*) is a near hapax (only here in the RV, other instances in MS I.8.2, TĀr. IV.2.5 = ĀpŚS XV.3.7). Most tr. take it as transitive ‘cooking’ (so Ge,

e.g.); Old argues that *sūryam* should be the object: “like those cooking the sun, as it were,” while Ge takes *bhakṣata* as the governing verb (“As [people] cooking use [nutzen] the sun, they enjoy [geniessen] all [the goods] of Indra” – ‘nutzen’ and ‘geniessen’ must be his alternative tr. of *abhakṣata* depending on the object). However, Narten (“Vedic *śrīṇāti*, gr. κρείων, κρέων,” KZ 100 [1987]: 270-96 = *Kl Sch* 340-66, cited after latter) points out (p. 342 n. 3) that the stem is elsewhere intrans. with the meaning ‘gar werden’ and tr. the hemistich “wie gar werdende (= sich erhitzende) Leute (Anteil) an der Sonne (haben), so haben sie Anteil an allen (Gütern) des Indra,” flg. a suggestion of Hoffmann’s. The TĀ=ĀpŚS passage explicitly connects “getting done/cooked” with the sun: *sūryasya harasā śrāya* “become cooked by the glow/heat of the sun.”

The Narten–Hoffmann interpretation is followed here, though I am still somewhat puzzled both about the content of the simile and about its relevance to the frame. For the first, getting cooked does not usually require the mediation of the sun but rather of fire, so literally “having a share in the sun” at best ought to mean the “share” of the sun that is actually fire. This is not terribly satisfactory, so, with Narten we must therefore interpret “getting cooked” metaphorically (but not *too* metaphorically), as indicating heated or excited people whose state is likened to heating by the sun. But even with this interpretation of the simile, there seem far less tortuous ways to indicate that people share in Indra’s goods than to compare this to heated-up people sharing in the sun. However, the tr. interpretations do not improve the sense: Old’s cooking the sun would require quite a lot of metaphor to rescue it, and the same problem with Narten’s interpretation – that cooking doesn’t require the sun – affects Ge’s transitive version.

The only reason I can see for the sun to make this distinctly odd appearance in the simile of pāda a is to prepare us for its implicit appearance in the second hemistich. With Ge I assume that the subject of the loc. absol. in c is the sun, which is born every day, and whose “birth” at dawn sets the early morning ritual in motion, the rite at which the dakṣiṇās are distributed. Ge suggests that *jāte jānamāne* is metri causa for an āmreḍita *jāte-jāte*, but this seems unlikely. This is the only occurrence of the middle participle to *jāna-* and indeed one of the only middle forms of this rare 1<sup>st</sup> class pres. stem (most of the others are *-anta* 3<sup>rd</sup> plurals that are re-marked actives; see Jamison “Voice Fluctuation in the Rig Veda: Medial 3rd plural *-anta* in Active Paradigms”, *IJJ* 21 [1979] 146-69). I would hesitate to suppose that a Rigvedic poet would create a new participial stem simply to avoid a metrical problem. Instead I think he is making a temporal point: the sun has been born previous (*jāte*) and when he is *being* born again, that is, at the moment the ritual commences, we think about the goods that will come to us in the ritual.

Note that *bhakṣata* of the first hemistich is reprised by a nominal derivative of  $\sqrt{bhaj}$ , *bhāgām*, in the second, and that the “goods” that need to be supplied in ab are present as *vāsūni* in c. This interdependence of the two half-verses supports the notion that the *sūryam* of a is a pretaste of the unexpressed sun of c. The next pragātha, vss. 5–6, may show the same covert interdependence; see disc. ad 5c.

VIII.99.4: The meaning and root etymology of the first compound member *ánarśa-* are very uncertain; see EWA s.v. *arśasānā-*. It is here translated as if it belongs to a putative root  $\sqrt{arś}$  /  $\sqrt{rś}$  ‘harm’; see the disc. of *ánarśani* ad VIII.32.2. By contrast, Ge’s “der seine Gaben nicht verschliesst” rests on his tentative connection of it with Lat. *arceō* ‘keep close, confine’. A contrastive pair qualifying *rātí-* ‘present’ as ‘not harmful’ (pāda a) (but) ‘beneficial’ (*bhadrá-*, pāda b) is rhetorically more satisfying than ‘not shut, closed’ / ‘beneficial’, though I confess that “not harmful (but) beneficial” seems somewhat flat-footedly obvious for a Rigvedic poet.

Whose mind is being bestirred to give in pāda d? I assume that it is Indra’s, whose presents are celebrated in the first hemistich, as well as in the previous verse (3), with which this verse is paired in the pragātha. But Ge, followed by Gotō (1987: 276), takes it as the patron’s, supplying “(des Gönners).” Although for my interpretation I might prefer a middle form rather than the act. part. *codáyan* and although I.48.4 (not adduced by Ge) ... *yuñjáte máno dānāya sūrāyaḥ* gives some support for his tr., most instances of *dānāya* involve gods (esp. Indra) as giver, esp. in VIII, but also, e.g., I.55.7 *dānāya mánah somapāvan astu te* “Let your [=Indra’s] mind be on giving, soma-drinker.”

VIII.99.5–6: This pragātha is tightly bound lexically. Note first *viśvāḥ spṛdhah* in both 5a and 6c. But more striking are the six occurrences of the root  $\sqrt{tar}$ : *prātūrtiṣu* (5a), (*viśva-*)*tūr* (5c), *tūrya taruṣyataḥ* (5d), *turáyantam* (6a), *tūrvasi* (6d). In this group not a single stem is repeated: there are two different nominal stems and four different verbal stems. (See also *átūrtam* in 7d, to yet another stem.) On the formulaic use of this root and its Indo-European background, see Watkins, *Dragon* 344–46.

VIII.99.5: The lexeme *abhí*  $\sqrt{bhū}$  ‘dominate’, in play in the previous two hymns (VIII.97.9c, 10a, 98.2a, 5ab), is matched by synonymous *abhí*  $\sqrt{as}$  here. See also VIII.100.4 in the next hymn.

Ge renders the phrase *aśastihā janitā* as “der die Hohnreden niederschlägt und hervorruft”; that is, he construes the 1<sup>st</sup> compound member *aśasti-* also with *janitā*, flg. Sāy’s gloss of *janitā* as *asurebhyo* ‘śastīnām janayitā, and also ascribes an aberrant meaning to  $\sqrt{jan}$ , ‘call out, evoke’. It is certainly true that the normal value of  $\sqrt{jan}$ , ‘beget’, seems somewhat out of place in this otherwise hostile context, but I am reluctant to push both the syntax and the semantics as far as Ge’s interpretation requires. I think rather that Indra’s general positive role as cosmic begetter is being alluded to, in addition to his specific role as all-victorious dominator. In fact, the paired verse in this pragātha may give us the clue. In 6ab Heaven and Earth (the underlying referents of the dual *kṣoṇī*) run after Indra “like two parents after their child” (*śísuṃ ná mātārā*), which reverses an image found elsewhere of Indra as the begetter of Heaven and Earth, as in VIII.36.4 *janitā divó janitā pṛthivyāḥ*. In other words, I think we should read *janitā* in 5c pregnantly, as “begetter (of Heaven and Earth)” in opposition to 6ab, where Indra is the child and Heaven and Earth the parents. Alternatively, the pregnant usage might be “begetter (of all),” with *viśva-*

borrowed from the first member of the following compound *viśvatūr*. Watkins (*Dragon*, 345) roughly follows the Ge interpretation, though with more persuasive semantics: “you smash the un-song (for the loser) and engender (it for the winner)”; presumably the parenthetic “it” should be not the “un-song,” but its de-negated counterpart, *śastí*- ‘laud, praise’.

I tr. *taruṣyant*- as a pseudo-desiderative, contra Ge (Wettstreiter, sim. Gr). The stem is a hapax, and its formation isn’t entirely clear. But the most orthodox way to explain it is as a denominative to *tárus*-, ‘power/desire to overcome’; since ‘seeking’ is a standard sense associated with -yá-denominatives, a desiderative sense is certainly possible.

VIII.99.6: Following Thieme (KZ 92 [1978] 46), *kṣoṇi*- is literally a ‘shout’ or ‘war-cry’. But in the dual it evolves to refer to Heaven and Earth, presumably by way of ‘(two) opposing war-cries’ → ‘opponents’ → complementary pair → the archetypal complementary pair, i.e. Heaven and Earth.

Though both duals, *pitārā* and *mātārā*, can refer to both parents, it is surely no accident that in this tender image of childhood it’s literally “the two mothers” rather than “the two fathers” who pursue the errant toddler.

With Gr and Old I read *\*śrathayanta* for *śnathayanta* ( $\sqrt{\text{śnath}}$  ‘pierce’), flg. Sāy and the Kashmir ms; see Old ad loc. Although Ge retains *śnathayanta*, in his note he allows for the possibility of the variant reading. As Old points out, the rhyming *śnath* form could have been introduced because of the mention of enemies.

VIII.99.7–8: The verb *havāmahe* of 8c must be read with both verses (so also Ge) and is a mark of the unity of the pragātha. This pragātha is, furthermore, cunningly constructed, with a number of rhetorical pairs: variants on “X and non-X” are found in 7b *prahetāraṃ āprahitam* and 8a *iṣkartāraṃ āniṣkṛtam*, both pairs with the same morphological structure; adjacent rhyming agent nouns *jētāraṃ* and *hētāraṃ* in 7c join the other two agent nouns just cited, though with different accent; the negated ppl. *ātūrtam* in 7d (whose root links it to vss. 5–6) matches previously cited *āprahitam* and *āniṣkṛtam*; there are several pairs of adjacent compounds with one identical member: *āniṣkṛtaṃ sāhaskṛtam* (8a) and *śatāmūtiṃ śatákratum* (8b), as well as the pair *vāsavānaṃ vasūjívam* (8d) with the first an -āna-formation built to *vasu*- with full-grade of the suffix (for which type see AiG II.2.275); and the second member of *śatām-ūtim* (8b) picks up *ūtī* (7a), whatever the source of the latter (see below). It may also be that the sequence in 7c ... *jētāraṃ hētāraṃ rathītāmam* playfully evokes a sequence of two comparatives in -tara- culminating in a superlative.

The phrase *itá ūtī* (also, as *itá ūtīḥ* I.119.8, I.130.5) cannot be separated from the compound *itáūti*- (6x). The latter has an apparent Old Avestan cognate *utaiiūiti*- ‘youthfulness’, probably containing a *\*yūti*- related to *yúvan*- ‘youth’. The Vedic compound clearly lost its transparency and has undergone some deformation, resulting, finally, in the folk-etymology “help from here / from then on” represented by the phrasal *itá ūtī*-. Both the compound and the phrase can co-occur with *ajāra*-

‘unaging’ as here; see also I.146.2, X.31.7. For disc. and lit. see EWA s.v. *itāūti*-. Here in this Anhangslied it is likely that *ūtí*- ‘help’ has captured the de-compounded phrase, but that the phrase is still associated with the notion of constancy, hence my compromise “with enduring help.” Ge tr. “zu eurem unmittelbaren (immediate) Beistand,” but in n. allows “den durch Fortdauer (oder Verjüngung) Alterlosen.”

### VIII.100 Indra

On the hymn in general see the publ. intro., as well as Old (*Noten* ad loc. and “Indra, Vāyu, der Vṛtrakampf und die Erschaffung der Sprache” [pp. 54–60 in “Ākhyāna Hymnen im Ṛigveda,” *ZDMG* 39 (1885): 52–90 = *KlSch.* 474–512]) and Ge’s long and rather despairing intro.

VIII.100.1–2: As I argued in the publ. intro., the heavy emphasis on Indra’s designating a portion of soma at the beginning of the sacrifice for “you,” the speaker of vs. 1, points strongly at Vāyu as this speaker, rather than Viṣṇu, as Ge suggests. Old also considers it an Indra-Vāyu dialogue.

VIII.100.1: I take *dīdharaḥ* as the subjunctive of the redupl. aor., whose indicative forms are generally athematic (*dīdhar*, etc., though cf. augmented thematic *ádīdharat* in the very late hymn X.173.3). The sequence *yadā ... dīdharaḥ ... ād íd ... kṛṇavaḥ* with aorist subjunctive in the protasis and present subjunctive in the apodosis seems a rough-and-ready attempt to express anteriority (“when you will [have] ..., only after that will you ...”) in a language that does not, as far as I can see, have either a formalized system of sequence of tense in conditionals or a standard way to express anteriority with *finite* verb forms (as opposed to participles and, somewhat later, the gerund).

VIII.100.2: Ge (followed by Klein, DGRV I.242, II.108) takes pāda c as a subordinated conditional clause with d, with the subordination marked by *ca* (i.e., “if you will be my comrade, then we will ...”). This is certainly possible, but it is impossible to tell formally if c is subordinated to d or coordinated with b (as I take it) because the accent on the verb *ásaḥ* can result from its initial position. Perhaps in favor of the Ge/Klein interpretation is the fact that both c and d contain subjunctives, while b has an imperative. On the other hand, in a related passage (also adduced by Ge), the two expressions are parallel, not in a subordinate/main clause relation: X.83.7 ... *dakṣiṇatō bhavā me, ádhā vṛtrāṇi jaṅghanāva bhūri* “Be on my right side. Then we two will keep smiting obstacles in abundance.”

VIII.100.3: Despite the gender, I take the second *satyám* in pāda b as equated with Indra, contrary to Ge, who interprets it implicitly as referring to the true praise (*stómam ... satyám*) earlier in the hemistich or to truth in general: “... ein Loblied ..., ein wahrhaftes, wenn es Wahrheit ist.” Lüders (*Varuṇa*, 639) argues convincingly that the second hemistich supports the reference of the conditional clause in b, *yádi satyám ásti*, to Indra and tr. “wenn er wirklich ist” (somewhat different tr. p. 566).

VIII.100.4: Indra clearly announces his epiphany, after the doubts expressed in vs. 3.

The opening *ayám asmi* echoes the opening words of the hymn (1a) *ayám ta emi*.

*víśvā jātāny abhy àsmi* is reminiscent of vs. 5 in the preceding hymn, VIII.99.5b *abhí víśvā asi spṛdhaḥ*, and belongs to the formula *abhí √bhū/as* found in this group of hymns. See disc. add VIII.99.5.

On *ṛtásya ... pradísah* see Lü (*Varuṇa*, 566–67), which he considers to be *Lieder*.

The duplication of intensive forms in nominal *ādardirāḥ ... dardarīmi* is taken by Ge (also Lü, 566–67) as merely an etymological figure (esp. clear in Lü’s “zerschmetternd zerschmettere ich...”). This is of course possible, but I wonder if the preverb of the nominal form does not signal more. The lexeme *ā √dṛ* is often used for breaking open cowpens and tearing out the cattle, esp. in the Vala myth (cf., e.g., III.30.21), and so Indra may be not only announcing his current actions but also alluding to his regular mythological role as opener of the Vala cave full of cows.

VIII.100.5: For my view of the complexities of the participants in this verse, see the publ. intro. I take the speaker to be Indra, the immediate addressee to be the singer (speaker of vs. 3), and the addressees of the speech recounted in pāda d to be the Maruts.

One of the first difficulties in this verse is the perennial mystery word *vená-*, which I render ‘tracker, seeker’. The word is esp. associated with X.123, to which the Anukramaṇī assigns Vena as both poet and deity. There *vená-* is singular, not plural as here. In the singular Vena appears to be identified with the sun and/or Soma; in the plural (see esp. IX.85.10–11) the word often seems to refer to poets or their hymns. That seems to be the case here: the trackers of truth are poets or their products, then probably further identified with the Maruts, who are also the referents of *sákhāyah* in pāda d, in my view. The use of *vená-* to refer both to the deity and his/its praisers presumably rests in part on the reciprocal relationship between them and also perhaps on the notion that just as the deity is sought by those below him, so he also is pursuing something higher.

Both in the singular and the plural *vená-* is associated with heights. Here the trackers “mounted” (*áruhan*) to Indra; cf. the same root in I.56.2 *girīm ná venā ádhi roha téjasā*. The heights are indicated in various ways. In IX.85.9–10 a bull mounts heaven and then the Venas milk him who is standing on a mountain (*giriṣṭhām*) in the vault of heaven (*divó nāke*), and this vault is mentioned in the remaining two verses of the Vena section of this hymn (IX.85.11–12). The vault recurs in the Vena hymn (X.123.6, 7), probably also as “the highest distant heaven” (*paramé vyòman* 5b), and there are other indications of a high position: some female figures bestride “the back of truth” (*ṛtásya sānau* 3c, also 2c) while poets mount on the stream (*síndhum* 4c). In particular in X.123.2b we find the same phrase *prṣṭhām haryatásya* “the back of the delightful one” as in our 5b, where Indra is seated thereon.

The question is who or what is the “delightful one.” Ge supplies “heaven,” Lü (567) simply tr. *haryatásya* as “Himmel,” and Old (1885: 56–57) as “Weltall.” I am dubious about this rendering; although *diváh* is found with *prsthá-* on a number of occasions, *haryatá-* never qualifies ‘heaven’, but is regularly used of soma, and in fact in X.123.2 Ge thinks that soma is the referent. However, it is perhaps difficult to imagine Indra sitting on soma’s (or Soma’s) back (such is apparently Ge’s objection in his n.), and so it is possible that this is a reference to one of Indra’s fallow bay horses *hári-*. In V.61.2 *prsthé sádaḥ* “the seat on the back” refers to the Maruts’ seat on the back of their horses. Hence the tentative bracketed identifications in the publ. tr. “[=fallow bay / soma?].” Perhaps best is to combine these two possibilities – the real referent is soma, as signalled by *haryatá-*, but since sitting on a liquid is hard to envision, the soma is made conceptually solid by configuring it as a horse, mediated through the common use of *hári-* for soma; cf., e.g., IX.65.25 *haryató háriḥ*.

In c the Pp. reads dat. *hr̥dé*, followed by Ge., but I prefer the ablative since *hr̥dá ā* with underlying ablative is an idiom and used in similar contexts with verbs of speaking (cf. II.35.2 *imāṃ sv āsmai hr̥dá ā sūtaṣṭam, mántram vocema* ... “This well-crafted spell we would speak to him from our heart”).

The possessive adj. *śísūmantah* appears to introduce a child or children that seem to have no place here. I follow Lü’s (567 n. 3) idea that the *-mant-* suffix functions here as the neut. sg. *-vát* sometimes does, as a simile marker “my comrades like children,” not “my comrades along with their children.” The *-mant-* for *-vant-* would of course be by rule after a stem ending in *-u-*. Considerably more problematic is the precise form: ordinarily these *-vant-* simile forms are adverbial neuters and show accent shift to the suffix, so *-vát* (e.g., *manuṣvát* ‘like Manu’, *jamadagnivát* ‘like Jamadagni’). Here we have a case form (nom. pl.) and no accent shift. However, Whitney (§1233f) allows for a sense ‘like to, resembling’ for some *-vant-* stems, and therefore, though Lü’s interpretation may be a bit over-tricky, I follow it since I think it gives better sense. Support for this interpretation is found in the parallel IX.74.1 *śísur ná ... cakradat* “like a child he has cried out” with a verb built to the same stem as in our passage *ácikradañ chíśūmantah* ...

VIII.100.6: Here the singer of vs. 3 seems to be convinced by Indra’s assertions in vss. 4–5 and promises a proper recital of Indra’s deeds, in contrast to the conditional praise of vs. 3.

I take *pārāvatam* in c as a vṛddhi adjective derived from *parāvát-* ‘distance’, rather than as a PN as Ge does (flg. Sāy, followed tentatively by Mayrhofer, *Personennamen* s.v.). As an adj. it works nicely with *purusambhṛtām* ‘brought together by many’, and there is no other mention of human opponents in this hymn.

VIII.100.7–9: I take these three Anuṣṭubh verses as the singer’s performance of the recital of deeds promised in 6ab, but cast in the language of dramatic immediacy – almost “you are there” – with the singer himself as the supposed witness, addressing the waters in 7ab. Ge (in his intro.) also seems to assign the verses to the singer, while Old (1885: 57 n. 2) refuses to speculate.



VIII.100.8: The stealing of the soma treated here logically precedes the outcome of the Vṛtra battle treated in 7 and 9, since Indra needed to drink the soma in order to fight Vṛtra, as is well known. I suggest that the theft is intercalated here, between two hemistichs about the *vájra*- (7cd, 9ab), not only because Rigvedic narratives are famously shattered chronologically, but also to play a trick. The *vajrá*- was let fly (a in 7d (*apīpatat*); in the next half-verse (8ab) the unspecified subject goes at the speed of thought. The default assumption would be that it is the flying mace, but cd disappoints our expectations by introducing the bird and the familiar soma-theft.

VIII.100.9: The poet now plays another trick. The first pāda “within the sea he/it lies” (*samudré antāḥ śayate*) returns us to the Vṛtra myth and, we would think, to Vṛtra, who, in the most famous treatment of the myth, I.32, lies ( $\sqrt{śi}$ , Vṛtra’s signature verb there) submerged in water after his smiting (e.g., I.32.8 ... *amuyā śáyānam ... āti yanty āpah* “The waters go across him lying in that way”). Here we have both the signature verb and the water – but it’s the *vájra* that is lying in the water, not Vṛtra, as we discover in the next pāda. Moreover, in that pāda the mace is ‘covered’ (*abhīvṛtaḥ*) with water, using the same root (at least synchronically, whatever its source) as the transitive verb expressing Vṛtra’s obstruction of the waters in 7b (*āvīvarīt*). Both forms of course also evoke Vṛtra himself, “obstruction” embodied. As far as I know, this image of the submerged mace receiving tribute from the waters is found nowhere else in the Vṛtra myth complex, and seems to have been invented here for the purpose of verbal trickery.

VIII.100.10–11: For the possible mythological background of these verses, as adumbrated by Old, see the publ. intro.

VIII.100.10: Ge is understandably reluctant to construe *avicetanāni* with *vādantī*, since this attributes unintelligible speech to Speech herself, but his solution, to construe the neut. pl. loosely with *niśasāda* (“... sich bei den unvernünftigen (Geschöpfen) niederliess”), does not work syntactically. Old’s mythological explanation is preferable.

VIII.100.12: For my hypothesis about the relevance of this verse to the rest of the hymn see the publ. intro. The verse is consciously modeled on vs. 2: the voc. *sákhe* in a picks up *sákhā* of 2c; *hánāva vṛtrám* in c echoes *vṛtrāṇi jaṅghanāva bhūri*. But, at least in my view and Old’s (though not Ge’s), the two addressees are not the same: Vāyu in 2 and Viṣṇu in 12. As I argued in the publ. intro. Viṣṇu may have been introduced here because his association with three may allow him to represent the Third Pressing in this hymn-length sketch of the ritual day. And, also presented in the intro., the apparent superimposition of Viṣṇu on Vāyu via the close similarity of vss. 2 and 12 may have been an attempt to integrate the newly ascendant god Viṣṇu into the older inherited religion in which Vāyu is prominent.

### VIII.101 Various gods

VIII.101.1: The first word of the hymn, *śdhak* ‘separately, one by one’, may be stationed there to indicate that the hymn (or hymn collection; see publ. intro.) to follow praises a number of gods individually, who collectively are summed up in *devātātaye* ‘for the conclave of the gods’ at the end of the same hemistich.

VIII.101.2: The abstract *bāhūtā-* ‘arm-ness’ or ‘collectivity of arms’ occurs twice in the RV (otherwise in I.41.2). I think it must refer to the quintessential quality of arms, namely strength (see *bāhv-ōjas-* ‘having the strength of arms, armstrong’). Here, in the simile I think the point is that Mitra and Varuṇa guide the chariot with their supernatural skill (*daṃśānā*) as if with physical arms, the tools that less exalted charioteers would use. The arms of the two gods are found in the next pragātha, 4d.

VIII.101.4: I take *tāsmāt* as referring to the unnamed weapon, coreferential with *yāḥ* in the rel. cl., and ascribe its ablative form to case attraction to infinitival *sāmṛteḥ*. The weapon is probably the *śāru-* ‘arrow’ associated with the Ādityas in VIII.18.11, 67.15, 20, as Ge notes. It might therefore have been better to tr. *yāḥ* in pāda a as ‘which one’ not the animatized ‘who’.

VIII.101.5: This verse contains two minor disharmonies: 1) the recipients of the praise song are in the dat. in pāda a (*mitrāya ... aryamṇé*) but the loc. in cd (*vāruṇe ... rājasu*); 2) the verb is 2<sup>nd</sup> plural (*prā ... gāyata*) but paired with a vocative in the singular, the hapax *ṛtāvasaḥ*. Ge separates the vs. into abc and d, supplying a verb (“(trage) ... vor”) with the former. This solves the number problem, by isolating the plural verb in a separate clause, but not the case problem. Moreover, since the hymn is composed in pragāthas, I would prefer to construe the doubled *prā* in a with the impv. *gāyata* in d, for a meta-pun on the name of the verse pairing. Chopping the verse into two clauses is not appealing, particularly since it only addresses one of the disharmonies, in my opinion the lesser one.

As for *ṛtāvaso*, Re suggests that *ṛtāvasu* [*sic*] is a simple variant of *ṛtāvan-* (or, better formulated, voc. *ṛtāvaso* is a simple variant of voc. *ṛtāvah* (/vo) to the stem *ṛtāvan-*). This seems somewhat convincing. As a 2<sup>nd</sup> member of bahuvrīhis of the shape X-*vasu-*, the noun *vasu-* can become semantically bleached, from ‘having X as goods’ to ‘rich in X’ and even further to just ‘having X’. Cf. the pair *vibhāvan-* / *vibhāvasu-*. The Vedic voc. in -*vas* to -*van-* stems makes the singular vocatives even more similar; to the just-cited pair, compare *vibhāvo* [before vd. sounds] and *vibhāvaso*, with the latter offering a convenient way to generate a Jagatī/iambic cadence from a Triṣṭubh. This does not solve our number problem, however; it is unfortunately altogether too artificial to suggest that a singular vocative to the -*van-* stem, *ṛtāvah* (<-*vas*), was reinterpreted as belonging to a real *s*-stem and a plural voc. in \*-*vasas* (/vaso) was built to it. The existence of clearly singular *vibhā-vaso* (4x) beside singular *vibhāvo* (1x) shows that the morphology was still intact. I would point out, however, that there is no way to produce a plural voc. to either the -*van-*

stem or the *-vasu-* stem that will fit in a cadence, either Triṣṭubh or Jagatī: *ṛtāvānaḥ* and *ṛtāvasavaḥ* are both out. It is therefore possible that the hapax *ṛtāvaso* was a quick-and-dirty fix for the metrical problem. Or else it represents the not rare situation of a poet addressing himself in the singular but his fellow singers in the plural. I would also point out that *vāsu* occurs pāda-final in the next verse (6a) and du. voc. *vājiniṅvasū* pāda-final in 8b. Ge, by the way, tr. *ṛtāvaso* as a PN (though allowing for the lexical value in his n.); this doesn't help one way or the other and can, I think, be dismissed.

I do not understand the change in case from dat. to loc. either. The verb  $\sqrt{gā}$  (+/- *prā*) elsewhere takes only dat., never loc., as far as I know. It might be possible to take the locatives as functionally different from the datives -- “chez or bei Varuṇa (and) the kings.” But since Mitra, Varuṇa, and Aryaman are an almost inseparable trio and Mitra and Aryaman are in the dative in pāda a, it is highly unlikely that Varuṇa would be functionally separate from them in this verse. And it is insulting to the grammatical knowledge of our poet even to suggest that *vāruṇe* owes its ending to a superficial matching with *aryamṇé* two pādas before, particularly since *rājāsu* with a non-rhyming loc. ending follows soon after. I think the poet changed cases just because he thought he could and craved a bit of novelty. For another tricky problem of case, see 8ab below.

VIII.101.6: The identity of the three mothers of Agni, the likely referent of the acc. phrases in ab, isn't clear. Ge suggests the three Opfergöttinnen (Idā, Sarasvatī, Bharatī) of the Āprī hymns. Agni is called *trimātār-* in III.56.5, but the three are not identified there either. Since our vs. is the 2<sup>nd</sup> vs. in a pragātha whose 1<sup>st</sup> vs. concerns the Ādityas, esp. Varuṇa, Mitra, and Aryaman, I am inclined to think that these three male deities have been slotted into the “three mothers” role just here because of the coincidence of the numbers.

The Pp reads masc. nom. pl. *amṛtāḥ* in c, and Ge so tr. (“Die unbetörten Unsterblichen beobachten das Tun der Sterblichen”). Against the Pp I take it as neut. pl. *amṛtā*; the sandhi situation allows either, of course. Ge's tr. assumes that the *dhāmāni* belong to mortals, but wherever it's possible to tell, *dhāman-* is something belonging to gods. Cf. also III.55.10 *dhāmāni amṛtā*.

VIII.101.8: The apparent doubling of the du. pronouns *vām ... yuvābhyām* is complicated by the fact that at least the second one violates the usual case frame of the verb. Pāda a contains the verb *hāvāmahe* and an undoubted acc. obj., the inanimate *rātīm* ‘giving’, as well as an animate pronoun *vām*, which could be acc., gen., or dat. This 2<sup>nd</sup> du enclitic is matched by tonic 2<sup>nd</sup> du *yuvābhyām* in pāda b, which can be instr. or dat. (Note in passing that Macdonell [VGS, p. 105; VG p. 300] only allows instr. for this form, but there is at least one undoubted dat. example elsewhere, I.109.4, as well as several of nearly identical *yuvābhyām*. Cf. AiG III.464, which points out that the older instr. form was *yuvā*, which is preserved in cmpds like *yuvā-datta*.)

The only case intersection between *vām* and *yuvābhyām* is dative, but there is no standard case-frame idiom with  $\sqrt{hvā}$  with the structure “call for (s.o. dat.) for (s.th. acc).” Gr classifies the passage under his no. 8, “etwas [A] erbitten,” thus eliding the pronoun(s) entirely under this rubric, though in the lemma he cites it as *rātīm vām*, including the enclitic but not the more intractable tonic form. Ge. takes *vām* as gen., and declares in his n. 8ab that *yuvābhyām* is also “in Sinn des Gen.,” which would be convenient but is remarkably cavalier about morphology. A further complication is that pāda b is a repeated pāda (=VIII.5.3), one not registered in Bloomfield’s Rig-Veda Repetitions. The case value of *yuvābhyām* in VIII.5.3 isn’t entirely clear, but the context is probably compatible with a dative, but not with either instr. or gen. -- an acc. might be the best.

I confess I don’t entirely know what to make of this. There are no standard uses of  $\sqrt{hvā}$  that take a personal dative, though inanimate datives abound. I am inclined to take pāda a as containing a double acc. (with *vām* in acc. function): “call you two for giving.” The *yuvābhyām* in the next pāda could be the result of repeating this short pāda from elsewhere without integrating it into the syntactic frame of the rest, or show the case variation (what we might call “case creep”) observed also in vs. 5, with the poet inventing an idiom “call for s.o. (dat.)” based on other verbs of speaking, like  $\sqrt{vac}$ , which can take either acc. or dat. of the addressee.

Another slight oddity in the first pāda is the characterization of the gods’ giving as *arakṣās-* ‘undemonic’. I have softened this somewhat to ‘without animus’; Ge tr. ‘ohne Falsch’, which seems more distant from the literal sense of the stem.

VIII.101.9: With Gr I take *sumānmabhiḥ* as a bahuvrīhi, contra Ge’s karmadhāraya “mit guten Gedanken” (though he allows the other alternative in n. 9b). This stem is attested in the nom. sg. masc. in VII.68.9 and therefore must be a bahuvrīhi, since *mānman-* is neut., and the parallel *durmānas-* (2x) is found only in the masc. and so must be a bahuvrīhi as well.

Against Ge, I take the second hemistich as referring to two different soma drinks, the one mixed with milk in c, the pure one in d. The offering of two types of soma is made clear in 10cd; note esp. the ‘both’ of c, *ubhāyasya naḥ piba* “drink of both of ours,” which is immediately followed by the definitional d, *śūciṃ* [matching *śukrāḥ* in our 9d] *sōmaṃ gāvāśīram* [matching *śrīṇānāḥ* in our 9c] “the pure soma (and) the one mixed with milk.” In 9c the present participle *śrīṇānāḥ* “is being mixed” (my italics) makes it clear that it is not yet ready to be offered, whereas the pure soma (in d) has just that moment been offered, as the passive aor. *ayāmi* indicates. This reflects the ritual procedure whereby Vāyu is first offered pure soma.

Assuming that my separation of c and d is correct, this adds another ex. of a predicated non-past participle to the dossier.

Note the phonetic figure *ayām ... ayāmi*.

VIII.101.11–12: As noted in the publ. intro., the banality of these vss. is a surprising aberration in RVic style. I will note that pāda-final *mahām asi* “you are great,” found

5x in these two vss. (once mid-pāda), is something of a signature of the late VIIIth Maṇḍala (60.6, 19; 64.2, 95.4, 98.2), though it's found occasionally elsewhere.

VIII.101.12: Presumably the sun's light is 'undeceivable' (*adābhyām*) because the sun is witness to everything.

VIII.101.13: The referent of the fem. sg.s in this vs. is not entirely clear. Ge interprets as the offering spoon or the butter offering, Old as the cow. I think Ge's 2<sup>nd</sup> alternative is correct, with *āhuti-* or a similar fem. noun as the word underlying. Pāda b, "her form is created by a/the ruddy (cow)," because butter is a milk product. (Ge supplies 'flame' rather than 'cow' with *róhiṇyā*, but *róhiṇī-* elsewhere refers to cows [see nearby VIII.93.13].) Pāda c is more or less VII.81.1a *práty u adarśy āyatī*, and since the referent there is Dawn, the simile *citréva* (i.e., *citrā iva*) must be comparing the bright butter offering (bright because it is whitish yellow or because it makes the fire brighter) to Dawn. As for the ten arms, Old and Ge both suggest that these are the arms of the five Adhvaryus. However, it seems possible to me that we're dealing with body-part inflation, and the ten "arms" are the ten fingers (of a single priest) regularly referred to in ritual contexts.

VIII.101.14: This difficult and enigmatic vs. is found in slightly variant form in the AV in the mystical skambha hymn X.8.3, is repeated in other Vedic texts, and receives an explanation in ŚB II.5.1.4–5. The interpr. of the verse in this context here has been influenced by its later deployments, esp. the ŚB exegesis — in my opinion misleadingly. The ŚB takes it to refer to the passing of generations or races, expressed by the *prajāḥ ... tistrāḥ* of pāda a, and this basic understanding is reproduced by Ge and by Re (Hymnes spéculatifs 165, though of AV X.8.3, not the RVic passage). Old sensibly disdains tr. and explanation ("Erklärung dieser Mystik versuche ich nicht.").

I think the vs. must be taken within its RVic context, which is ritualistic; it is paired in its pragātha with vs. 13, a depiction of the butter offering. Although in the first 3 pādas the wording is obscure, the final pāda seems to suggest the solution to the mystery, in that its first word *pávamānaḥ* 'self-purifying' can hardly refer to anything but soma. (It is probably not an accident that in the reuse of this verse in the AV pāda d is quite different [*harīto hāriṇīr ā viveśa*] and does not contain the telltale word.) The identity of the *harītaḥ* is less secure. In the publ. tr. I follow Ge in supply 'flames', but this is ritually problematic: soma doesn't seem to be offered into the fire. Maṇḍala IX twice refers to *harīto dáśa* "ten tawny ones" (IX.63.9, 69.9), which appear to be the fingers of the ritual officiant. I would now emend the translation to "has entered within the tawny (fingers)," pointing out that "with the ten arms" of 13d may refer to the same phenomenon.

Guided by the clinching word *pávamānaḥ* in pāda d, an interpr. grounded in soma ritual fits pāda a very well. The most important clue is the compound VP *atyāyam īyuh* "have made their traversal"; the lexeme *āti* √i 'go across' is regularly used of soma's trip across the filter (IX.85.9 *pāvitrām āty eti*, etc.). The three *prajāḥ*

can be the three soma pressings (or perhaps the soma for the first three soma cups); soma drinks are called *prajā divyāśya rétaśaḥ* “the offspring of the heavenly semen” in IX.86.28, a hymn that contains several passages (IX.86.14, 39, 45) in which soma is “fitted into among the worlds/creatures” (*bhūvaneṣv ārpitaḥ*), similarly to our pāda c *bhūvaneṣv antāḥ*.

The relevance of pāda b to the soma theme is less clear to me. By my rules, *anyāḥ* should be definite “the others” (contrary to the standard rendering “others”) and contrastive to the three offspring of pāda a. I am not sure what “the others” would be (though presumably some other set of soma drinks), nor what “settling down around the chant” would involve. As for pāda c, I’ve already pointed out soma’s position *bhūvaneṣu* elsewhere, and the towering quality of cosmic soma is also emphasized elsewhere.

I do not feel I have solved all the problems with this verse, but the lexical clues of pādas a and d seem to me to anchor it in a soma context, with this ritual context reinforced by its pragātha twin.

VIII.101.15: Note the phonetic figure in pāda d *mā gām (á)nāgām*.

VIII.101.16: According to the transmitted text, this hymn ends on a downbeat: the small-witted man (*dabhrācetāḥ*), the last word of the hymn, has taken possession (*avr̥kta*) of the cow that has been so extravagantly praised in vss. 15–16, whose right to safety was proclaimed to “observant people” or “the observant man” (*cikituṣe jānāya* 15c), the opposite of the small-witted man of 16d. This sad finale seems unlikely to me, and a small emendation to the text will change the tone entirely. Instead of *ā māvr̥kta* at the beginning of pāda d, I suggest reading *\*mā mā vr̥kta*. The second part, *mā vr̥kta*, instead of the Pp. *mā avr̥kta*, does not alter the Saṃhitā text. As for reading the prohibitive negative *mā* for preverb *ā*, note that the preceding pāda ends with *gām*, and in the sequence ... *gām mā* the pāda-spanning *-m m-* could well have been degeminated. The posited *\*mā* may or may not also contain the preverb *ā*. Since  $\sqrt{vr̥j}$  generally appears with a preverb, it probably does. Restoring *\*mā* also makes the pāda more parallel to 15d *mā gām* ..., which also contains a *mā* prohibitive with a cow as obj.

## VIII.102 Agni

VIII.102.2: The standard interpr. are agreed that the referent of the fem. instr. phrase *īlānayā ... duvasyúvā* is some form of speech. This makes sense and is certainly not excluded. However, the only other fem. form of the participle *īlāna-* in V.28.1 refers to the ghee-filled offering ladle, and I therefore prefer that interpr.

VIII.102.7: This vs. consists of two ungoverned sentence fragments, both referring to Agni: an accusative phrase in ab, a dative phrase in c. The former could continue the syntax of the preceding vss., although the intervening *ṛca* boundary makes some difficulties. The dative phrase is entirely untethered except that it adjoins *āchā*,

which ordinarily takes the accusative, and the next vs. makes a fresh syntactic start with Agni in the nominative. Ge suggests that there are two Agnis in question in this verse, but this seems to be overthinking it. I think we're dealing with two false starts, with the first perhaps simply carrying on from the previous vs.

VIII.102.8: The lexeme  $\sqrt{bhū}$  generally means 'stand by, be at hand'; this works fine for pāda a, but not so well for pāda b. Neither Ge's "eingehe ... in" nor Re's "s'intègre à" seems to work any better.

VIII.102.11: My construction of this vs. follows Ge's. Re by contrast takes b as a nominal rel. clause and c as the main clause. Since the verb *dīdāya* is initial in its pāda and, as a main-clause verb, could owe its accent to this position, there is no way to tell and no semantic implications. In slight favor of Ge is the fact that  $\sqrt{dī}$  is frequently construed with the loc., as it would be with *dāmeṣu ā* in b.

VIII.102.13: The standard interpr. take *jāmāyo gīraḥ* as a nominative NP (Ge "die verschwisterten Lobreden"), modified by the intens. part. *dēdisatīḥ*. Although I see the advantages of this, it leaves the participle with little to do (Ge "die dich herausstreichen," Re "indiquant avec force (leur intention)," Scar (82) "die immer wieder auf dich hinweisen"). I separate *gīraḥ* from *jāmāyaḥ* and take it as the acc. obj. of the intens. participle. The question then is the referent of *jāmāyaḥ* 'kindred, siblings'. I tentatively suggest it is the waters, who appear in the next vs. as ritual actors. The waters are called *jāmí-* elsewhere (I.23.16). Because waters are always gurgling, they can be considered to be the deliverers of hymns.

VIII.102.14: I don't really understand this verse, but it seems to conjoin technical ritual references with an allusion to the myth of Agni's flight and his concealment in the waters -- and these two interpretive strains are somewhat at cross purposes. According to the śrauta sūtras, the darbha grass, that is, the barhis, is gathered into three or more bundles (cf., e.g., MŚS I.1.1.42, ĀpŚS I.4.10, BŚS I.2) in preparation for the sacrifice; hence pādas ab seem to depict a situation in which the preliminaries for the sacrifice have not been performed. This may well be because Agni has fled and so the regular ritual procedures have not been carried out. In c the waters in which Agni hides are said to have set down/deposited his footprint; in other words they have established him within themselves to hide him. Agni is regularly the obj. of *ní √dhā*; for his *pādam* being set down, see VIII.72.19, III.7.7, I.72.6, etc., and for *ní √dhā* in the context of Agni's concealment X.32.6a *nidhīyāmānam āpagūḷham apsú*. But in ritual context the water's setting down Agni's footprint may refer to the sprinkling of the fire with water after it has been surrounded by barhis (see Ge's n. 14c and Hillebrandt, Rit. Lit. 110), and therefore from a ritual point of view the preparations are proceeding smoothly. The next verse gives support to this alternative.

VIII.102.16: Although the other occurrence of the med. part. *tepāná-* (VIII.60.19) is transitive, a passive interpr. works better here.

The gen. *ghṛtásya* is best construed with *dhītíbhīḥ* “with visions/thoughts of ghee.” Both Ge and Old suggest that this refers to what we would now call “virtual ghee,” not the real physical substance -- anticipating the purely mental sacrifice of the last *ṛca* (19–21). But this *ṛca* (vss. 16–18) seems otherwise to depict a more standard ritual, and I think it more likely that “with visions of ghee” is a shorthand way of referring both to the physical stimulus of Agni’s flame, namely melted butter, and the mental one, the hymns accompanying the libation.

VIII.102.17: It is not clear who the mothers are and whether they are, with Sāy, identified with the gods mentioned in pāda b. Re’s “(tels) des mères” seems to follow this interpr., but in his n. he suggests that the mothers are the waters. The mention of the waters in vs. 14 might support this latter alternative, but given the “three (mothers)” of Agni in the preceding hymn, VIII.101.6, which I take to be the (male) gods Mitra, Varuṇa, and Aryaman (see comm. ad loc.), I am inclined towards Sāy’s interpr., though it is not clearly reflected in my publ. tr.

VIII.102.19–22: See publ. intro. for my general interpr. of these verses.

### VIII.103 Agni

VIII.103.2: Ge takes the verb of ab to be *prá ... tasthau*, with the *tasthau* long postponed to pāda d and pāda c (which has its own verb) parenthetical. This seems too fussy. It is perfectly easy to supply a verb of motion with *prá* in a (so also Re, Kü 464).

VIII.103.3–4: In both these vss. *tmánā* ‘by himself’ contrasts with the vast number (thousands) that the action of this sole individual wins or prospers.

VIII.103.5: HvN split the hemistich between *vājam* and *árvatā*, producing two pādas of 11 syllables each. But since the b pāda then has a bad cadence and since the pāda, minus initial *árvatā*, is found also at I.40.4, where the iambic cadence is fine in a dimeter line, it seems best to follow the standard view that *árvatā* belongs with pāda a, which is then hypermetric (so Old).

The famous formula “imperishable fame” (*ákṣiti śrávaḥ*) ends the second pāda.

VIII.103.7: Ge/Re take *rathyām* as an adjective with *ásvam* in the simile (e.g., Ge “Wie ein Wagenross ...”). This is possible, if it is derived from the thematic stem *rathyā-*, rather than *rathī-*, where Gr classifies it. However, the interposition of *gīrbhīḥ* distances it from the simile, and I prefer to take it as the acc. of *rathī-* ‘charioteer’. Agni is often called the charioteer of the sacrifice (etc.), e.g., I.44.2 *ágne rathīr adhvarāṇām*, and his description as “controller of chariots” (*ráthānām yāmam*)



a few vss. later (10c) seems like a paraphrase of such a formula. In that case the poetic figures are more complex than the standard interpr.: there is a metaphor (Agni as charioteer), and this metaphorical identification is then compared explicitly in a simile to a horse, which is closely connected conceptually with the charioteer -- a kind of figurative chaining.

The words *toká-* and *tánaya-* regularly appear together; cf., with the same verb as here, the acc. sg. pairing VI.48.10 *párṣi tokāṃ tánayam*. When ending with *-e* they are typically locatives, as shown by other parallel locatives; cf., e.g., VI.25.4 *toké vā góṣu tánaye yád apsú* (also I.114.8, VI.31.1, 66.8, X.147.3). Here, however, I think they are dual accusatives, as if elliptical duals from a dual dvandva. (That is, *toké tánaye* doesn't mean "two progenies and two prosperities.") The presence of *ubhé* 'both' serves to mark them as duals (see also I.147.1), since, given the passages just cited, the usual expectation for *toké tánaye* is locative. So also Old and Re, while Ge takes *toké* as du and *tánaye* as loc.: "(Erhalte) beiderlei Samen in der Nachkommenschaft," a splitting of the usually conjoined phrase that seems very unlikely.

Taking *párṣi* as the verb governing both *ubhé toké tánaye* (as VI.48.10 strongly encourages us to do) and *rādhah* in d requires slightly different interpretations of the verb. Re, almost predictably, calls it a zeugma.

VIII.103.10: I follow Old, Ge, and Re in taking *āsāva* as the voc. of a (hapax) PN, though it could be simply 'o presser' (*ā√su*) as Gr takes it (and perhaps implicitly Mayrhofer, since it does not appear in his PN book). There are no implications either way.

VIII.103.11: Note the playful *úditā ... nīditā véditā*, already pointed to by Old, in which the three rhyming words are grammatically entirely different: fem. loc. sg., neut. acc. pl., and masc. nom. sg. agent noun respectively.

What is being compared to the waves (*ūrmāyaḥ*) in c? Ge supplies "Absichten" (intentions), presumably on the basis of *dhiyā* in d, but the *dhī-* of Agni should not be considered negative or hostile. Re's suggestion, "flames," is far more persuasive, but I think this idea should be combined with Old's view that *ūrmāyaḥ* belongs with both simile and frame. That is, Agni's flames are already metaphorically waves and then can be compared with real waves. Cf. the cmpd descriptor of Agni in I.58.45 *rúśad-ūrmi-* 'possessing gleaming waves'.

VIII.103.12: Pāda-final *eṣāḥ* is less rare than I would have predicted, though the usual position of nom. sg. *eṣá(h)* is pāda initial.

VIII.103.12–13: Both vss. end identically with *svadhvarāḥ*, but in 12c it refers to Agni, in 13d to the weakling (*kīrī-*) who is offering homage to Agni. The use of the same term for both of course implicitly spreads the power and prestige of Agni to his worshiper.

VIII.103.14: On the fem. form *sóbharyāḥ* referring to the poet, see comm. ad VIII.22.15.