

## Commentary III

### [III.1-7 JPB]

#### III.8 Sacrificial Post

On the structure of this hymn, see the publ. intro.

III.8.1: Note the future impv. *dhattāt*.

III.8.4: Kane (HDS II.1.269) suggests that the image in this vs. is that of a young boy, well dressed and encircled with his sacred thread (*yúvā suvāsāḥ párivītaḥ*), at his Upanayana, whom they “lead up” (*ún nayanti*), in an idiom close to the *úpa √ nī* of the Upanayana. Acdg. to Kane, several gṛhya sūtras employ this mantra in the Upanayana.

III.8.6: There is number disharmony between the 2<sup>nd</sup> plural enclitic *vaḥ* (a) and the voc. singular *vānaspate* (b). The simplest way to account for this is to assume that the voc. has simply been repeated from the 1<sup>st</sup> vs. of the hymn (1b) in this 1<sup>st</sup> vs. of the 2<sup>nd</sup> (half of the) hymn, which switches its subject from a singular post to plural posts. Or Lord of the Forest may refer to the forest itself or a single tree that produces multiple posts.

III.8.8: The rarer dual dvandva *dyāvā-kṣāmā* substitutes for the more common *dyāvā-pṛthivī*, with *pṛthivī*, perhaps in its lit. meaning ‘broad one’, pleonastically following the dvandva.

III.8.10: Contrary to the standard tr., I think there is a change of subject in the 2<sup>nd</sup> half-verse. Rather than calling on the posts to help us, we turn again to the gods, who are the likely subject of *avantu*, just as they were in 8c. The types of help we ask them for are distinct but complementary: help for our sacrifice in 8c, help in battle and competition in 10d, a theme introduced by the *vihavā*- ‘competing invocation’ in 10c. The *vā* of 10c signals this disjunction and the return of the gods as subject. Although Klein (DGRV II.203) suggests reading *vā* here as if for *vaí*, given that the hymn contains several loosely construed *vā*-s (1d, 6b), this does not seem like a good idea.

### [III.9-29 JPB]

#### III.30 Indra

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn is characterized by hapaxes and very rare words, often with affective suffixes, and unusual phonology. These words include *dhāyuh*- (7a), *gehyà*- (7b), *kúnāru*- (8b), *píyāru*- (8c), *alātrṇá*- (10a), *yāmakosá*- (15a), *salalūka*- (17c).

III.30.1: The desid. *títikṣante* used to be assigned to  $\sqrt{tij}$  ‘sharpen’ (e.g., Wh Rts, Gr), but has for quite awhile been taken to  $\sqrt{tyaj}$  ‘abandon’ instead. See EWA s.v. *TEJ* and *TYAJ*, Gotō (1<sup>st</sup> cl., 165–66 n. 268), and in some detail Heenen (Desid. 59–60 and 147–48). Curiously WG render it as (if) an intensive to  $\sqrt{tij}$ : “Sie schärfen (sich) immer wieder (gegen) ...,” despite Gotō’s own published views to the contrary. (In the WG tr., acdg. to the title pg., Maṇḍala III is Witzel’s responsibility, however, which may account for the discrepancy.) The desiderative stem has the idiomatic sense ‘endure, support’, and the semantic channel from (putatively) ‘desire to abandon’ to this idiom is not entirely clear. I am not convinced by the suggestions of either Gotō or Heenen (59–60). Instead, I think the middle voice is the key: if we assume a reflexive ‘abandon oneself to’, ‘give oneself over to’, it is not difficult to imagine this development.

The sense of the final pāda depends on the meaning of *praketāḥ*, and like many derivatives of  $\sqrt{cit}$  this word is slippery. In my view, it means both ‘sign’ and ‘insight’ (that is, it reflects both the ‘appear’ and ‘perceive’ values of  $\sqrt{cit}$ ). In this particular passage I take it in the former value; the point is that Indra is showing no sign of his presence or imminent arrival, and so we are subject to abuse from our rivals. For a similar usage cf. II.17.7, where the poet beseeches Indra for good fortune, and then demands *kṛdhī praketām* “make a visible sign,” further asking for him to bring the good fortune here. In X.104.6 Indra is himself called the *adhvarāsyā praketāḥ* “the visible sign of the ceremony.” Ge interpr. the word as Losung (‘motto, watchword, password’), which is, I suppose, possible, but I don’t understand what it would mean here; Re as “le signe-pré(monitoire),” which is somewhat opaque to me, but seems closer to my interpr than Ge’s; Old as “Helle” (light, brightness). WG take it as an agent noun: “Wahrnehmer.”

III.30.2–3: The next two vss. develop the theme sounded in pāda d of vs. 1.: Indra’s absence. In vs. 2 we point out that for Indra nothing is very far away, so he could, and should, easily come here, where the sacrifice is invitingly set out for him. In vs. 3 we provide a flattering description of Indra’s great powers and then plaintively ask where these powers are now.

III.30.3: The 2<sup>nd</sup> member of *tuvikūrmī-*, an epithet of Indra, is generally now derived from the set root  $\sqrt{car}$ , a derivation already found in AiG I.24, 141, 152 -- hence my ‘powerfully ranging’. See EWA s.v. *tuvikūrmī-*. The older deriv. from  $\sqrt{kr}$  (e.g., Gr., Wh Rts; explicitly rejected by AiG II.2.776) is nonetheless still reflected in the standard tr.: Ge “der Tatenreiche,” Re (with hesitation) “aux actes (?) puissants,” WG “der mächtig Wirkende” -- even though AiG I (1896) predates all of them by a good margin, well over a century in the case of WG!

There is number incongruence between the neut. sg. *yád* of the rel. clause and neut. pl. *tyā ... vīryāṇi*. The *yád* is, as it were, an anticipatory collective: “what(ever) you did ... where are those deeds?”

III.30.4: As has often been pointed out, the redupl. pres. to  $\sqrt{han}$ , *jíghnate*, almost always takes plural objects, and so, at least in this formation, reduplication seems correlated with repetitive action. This semantic nuance is strengthened here by the syntactic construction, with the redupl. pres. in the participle (*jíghnamānaḥ*) construed with a quasi-auxiliary *cárasī*. (Cf. 14b below.) Although *cárasī* does have lexical meaning ('you range/roam/wander'), the lexical value is weak enough here that the verb can seem to be a marker of the progressive present: "you go about / keep / are (constantly) smashing." On the other hand, it is possible that  $\sqrt{car}$  in its lexical value may be resonating with *tuvikūrmí*- 'powerfully ranging' in 3b (see comm. there). However, it is hard to know whether that root connection would still be perceived by the contemporary audience -- it certainly has escaped most of the modern audience -- given the phonological distance between the two words and the fact that *tuvikūrmí*- is simply an epithet of Indra and its own lexical value may have become attenuated.

There is a faint phonological echo between *vr̥trā* in b and *vratā(ya)* in d, which occupy the same metrical position.

III.30.5: I am not certain how to construe *śrávobhiḥ*. The publ. tr. takes it with the voc. *puruhūta*: "much invoked with acclamations." But I am not entirely happy about construing a full noun with a voc. that ordinarily stands alone (as in, e.g., 7d, 8a). Ge tr. "rühmlich," which seems designed to be as untethered to the sentence as possible. Re takes it with the speaking of pāda b: "... seul avec tes remons tu as parlé (un langage) ferme," but I don't understand what that means; WG like Re, except tr. "mit Ruhmes(taten)," which again I don't follow.

I have given the idiom *dṛḥám*  $\sqrt{vad}$  a mildly slangy turn (similarly in X.48.6); the collocation of a verb of speaking and an adverb referring to a physical quality seems to invite it. "Speak firmly" would be a more neutral rendering than "talk tough," but pāda d, which describes heaven and earth as a mere "handful" for Indra, also seems to belong to a vivid and informal register.

The participial phrase *vr̥trahā sán* contains, unusually, a non-concessive nominative of the pres. part. of  $\sqrt{as}$  'be'. It seems here to be definitional and to pick up and summarize 4b *éko vr̥trā cárasī jíghnamānaḥ* "you alone range about [/keep] smashing obstacles." As discussed immed. above, the redupl. pres. part. combined with a quasi-auxiliary depicts this as repetitive, indeed habitual, action -- and the *ékaḥ* indicates that only Indra engages in it. Our phrase here, *vr̥trahā sán*, comes to the appropriate conclusion: since you and you alone keep smashing obstacles, you are The Obstacle-Smasher, par excellence.

III.30.6: Sāy. supplies 'chariot' as the subj. of pāda a, and in this he is followed by the standard tr. as well as Old. Although this is perfectly harmless and certainly possible, I do not understand why supplying a subject not found in the context is desirable, much less necessary. I admit that it would allow us to use the *etu* of *prá* ... *etu* in b as the gapped verb with the *prá* of a, but Rigvedic poetic syntax is flexible enough to allow a 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. substitution in such a gapped phrase (*prá* ... \**ihi*,

anticipating *prá ... etu*). The fact that 2b has a similar phrase with Indra as the 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. supplied subject -- *ā tú prá yāhi ... háribhyām* -- also supports my assumption that the default subject is Indra.

Unfortunately the voc. *indra* in 6a was omitted in the publ. tr. The pāda should read “(Come) forth along an easy slope with your two fallow bays, o Indra.”

III.30.7: *dhāyuh* is a hapax. The stem is generally listed as *dhāyu-* (so Gr) and would therefore have to be a masc. nom. sg. here, but the standard tr. render it as obj. of *ádadhāḥ*. This interpr. requires it to be a neut. -us-stem, which is easily possible (see, e.g., Old). Old suggests that it belongs to  $\sqrt{dhā}$  and that *dhāyur ádadhāḥ* is an etymological figure like *ábhaktam ... bhajate* in b. I prefer the analysis suggested in AiG II.2.470 linking it to  $\sqrt{dhā(y)}$  ‘suckle, nourish’, thus a neut. -us-stem exactly parallel to neut. *dhāyas-* ‘nourishment’. This analysis seems to be reflected in Re’s “tu as accordé la satisfaction-nourricière,” though Re’s (in)famous hyphenated portmanteaus are capacious enough to include many possibilities.

I am not entirely sure what pāda b is about: is this a legal issue, having to do with what is held in common? or with what hasn’t (yet) been divided by inheritance? Or is it simply that nobody has distributed the goods yet? X.112.10d, adduced by Ge, is similar: *ábhakte cid ā bhajā rāyē asmān*, but that pāda follows one in which Indra is urged to do battle and so the most likely interpr. there is that we are asking for a share in the as-yet-undivided spoils of war. Here, however, the goods are specifically identified as *gehyà-* ‘belonging to the household’. This is the only occurrence of this stem in the RV; it is found in AVP (VI.14.8, VII. 11.3; see Arlo Griffiths ed. and tr.) and later, and *gehá-* ‘house’, from which it is derived, first occurs in VS. The etymology of *gehá-* is quite unclear (cf. EWA s.v.), as is its relationship to synonymous *grhá-*. The former is quite widespread in MIA, beginning already in Aśoka, but it cannot be simply a Middle Indic form of *grhá-* at least acdg. to the standard sound laws (*pace* older accounts such as AiG I.39), though it is quite possible that it has *guṇa* in an adj. derived from MIA *gihi(n)* ‘householder’ (<\**grhin-*), (*a-*)*giha-*. In any event it seems likely that the word was imported into Vedic from MIA and that the use of this unusual stem here signals a particular social or legal institution for which we have no other evidence.

III.30.8: This vs. contains two difficult words, *kūṇāru-* (b) and *píyāru-* (c). It is surely no accident that they appear pāda-final in successive pādas and are rhyme forms. The former is a hapax (though the vs. is repeated in the VS [Mā XVIII.69, Kā XX.5.2]). It has been glossed ‘lame in the arm’ on the basis of a supposed connection with Ep, Cl *kuṇi-* ‘id.’ (cf., e.g., AiG II.2.288, KEWA s.v. *kuṇih*, EWA s.v. *kūṇāru-*). But the chronological and morphological distance between the two words speaks against this connection, as does the fact that *kuṇi-* is likely a Dravidian borrowing (see KEWA). Moreover, since Vṛtra is a snake and is specifically called ‘handless’ here, it is unlikely that he would have an arm to be lame in. Wiser heads generally take it as a PN (so the standard tr., as well as Mayrhofer PN [though with ?]). However, this cautious course is not very satisfactory either. The enemy is most definitely Vṛtra:



his name appears in c, his mother's (Dānu) in a. Why would he be called by a different name, esp. one that never appears elsewhere? Unfortunately I do not have a strong alternative. However, I would point to *kūṇapa-*, which means something like 'carrion, corpse' (AVŚ XI.9.10, 10.10.4, 8; MS IV.9.19;  $\cong$  *kuṇapá-* TS XI.2.10.2, where human and equine *kuṇapá-*s are distinguished) on which various nasty critters are invited to feed, and to various later forms of *(-t)kuṇa-* referring to various bugs (cf. Kuiper [Aryans passim], Turner [CDIAL s.vv. *kūṇapa-*, *kuṇa-*], and Pāli *mankuna-*). On the basis of these shaky parallels I suggest that *kūṇāru-* means something like 'vermin' or perhaps even 'corpse'. It owes its pejorative *-āru-* suffix to *pīyāru-*; cf. also *śarāru-* in X.86.9, which I tr. 'noxious creature'. Of course, *ku-* is a common pejorative prefix as well. Perhaps the word is simply constructed of pejorative affixes with a hiatus-breaking *ṇ*! Or -- a better possibility -- it may represent *\*ku-nara-āru-* 'ill-manly', with haplology and MIA retroflexion of the nasal. My point here is not to claim any of these suggestions as definitive, but to show that this completely opaque word resonates with other words in several different directions and therefore assuming a lexical meaning rather than taking it as a PN is the better course. However, in the publ. tr. 'vermin' should be followed by a question mark.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> difficult word, *pīyāru-*, is by comparison much simpler. It must be derived from  $\sqrt{pī}$  'sneer, taunt', whose pres. *pīyati* is attested 3x already in the RV. It contains the same pejorative *-āru-* suffix as *kūṇāru-*, *śarāru-* -- though it should be noted that not all *-āru-* suffixed words are pejorative: *vandāru-* is quite positive, and the mysterious hapax *jābāru-* (IV.5.7) is at worst neutral but probably positive.

III.30.9: The pf. of  $\sqrt{sad}$  is generally intrans.(/reflex.) 'sat (oneself) down', but in several instances must be trans. 'set down', as it is here. See Kü 542–43.

There is no agreement on the meaning of the adj. *sāmaná-*, found in the RV only here and in the wedding hymn (X.85.11). Gr 'gemeinschaftlich' (fld. by WG), Ge 'gütige (?)', Re 'abondante' (but in EVP XVI, ad X.85.11, he suggests that in our passage it means 'attelée-avec' with which 'heaven' should be supplied), AiG II.2.136 'reich'. I suggest that it's a vṛddhi deriv. of *sāmana-* 'gathering', meaning 'related to the gathering/aggregate', hence 'whole'. This does not work so well in X.85.11, but there there is a pun on *-sāman-* 'tune', and the word seems simply to mean 'together' vel sim.

III.30.10: On *alātrṇá-* see comm. ad I.166.7. In this passage though 'unquiet' does not seem a normal feature of Vala, it can be applied proleptically, characterizing its opening up in fear of Indra's blow.

Note the phonetic figure in ab: *alā.. vala ... vrajo ... vy āra*, with *-trṇ-* ... -*ndr-* nestled in the 1<sup>st</sup> pāda; the d pāda also has phonetic rep.: *prāvan vāniḥ*.

The standard tr. all supply the Maruts with *vāniḥ* 'choir'. But as Schmidt (B+I 141) points out, the Maruts do not ordinarily participate in the Vala myth; it is the Aṅgirasas who are Indra's back-up band. See III.31.4ff.

III.30.11: Pāda a begins with an elementary numerical figure: *éko dvé* “the one the two,” subject and object of *ā paprau* respectively, both of which are identified in the 2<sup>nd</sup> pāda. The juxtaposition of the two numbers is responsible for my tr. *éka-* as ‘the one’, rather than ‘alone’ as elsewhere in the hymn (vss. 4, 5).

Because of the voc. *sūra*, at least pāda d (and probably also c) shows a switch to 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. from the 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. of ab. Since there are no verbs in cd, at least one needs to be supplied. Most tr. (Ge [/WG], Klein [DGRV I.442], Scar [431]) take c and d as separate clauses, supplying impvs. “come” and “bring” respectively. This is possible, but I follow Re in taking cd as a single clause -- though do not follow his interpr. of *iśāḥ* as a verb (‘envoie’, presumably to  $\sqrt{iṣ}$  ‘send’).

All tr., incl. Re, take *samīké* as “in battle” (or, closer to the root sense in my opinion, Scar “Treffen”). Although this noun generally has the meaning ‘encounter’, it is a straightforward derivative of *samyác-* ‘united, conjoined’, and here I take it to refer to the “join” of Heaven and Earth, which would define the midspace. Note that pāda-final *samīké* matches pāda-final du. *samīcī* in a, referring to Heaven and Earth.

I supply ‘bring’ as the verb of cd, with *sayújah ... vājān* as obj. There are several possible interpr of *iśāḥ*. As just noted, Re takes it as a verb. Assuming (with everyone else) that it belongs to the root noun *iṣ-*, there are two possible analyses, as gen. (/abl.) sg. or nom./acc. pl., although in the latter case we would prefer it to be accented *iśaḥ* (cf. the acc. pl. *iśaḥ* in 18b). Both Klein and Scar take it as acc. pl.; I agree with Ge (/WG) in construing it as gen. sg. with *rathīḥ*.

III.30.12: The grammar of ab is so straightforward that it is easy to overlook how odd the statement is. It is not surprising that the sun does not confound the quarters or directions (*díśaḥ*); after all, the layout of the cosmos is not likely to be altered by the sun as it passes through. But what does it mean that these same *díśaḥ* are *prasūtāḥ* every day by Indra? The ppl. can only belong either to  $\sqrt{sū}$  ‘propel’ or  $\sqrt{sū}$  ‘give birth’, far more likely the former (*pace* WG, who seem to take it to the latter): only the former is found with *prá* and in fact 9d contains an exactly parallel expression, *tváyā ... prasūtāḥ* “propelled by you.” Ge tr. “vom Falbenlenker bestimmten,” but ‘determined, fixed, set’ seems the exactly opposite of what *prá*  $\sqrt{sū}$  ordinarily means, including in nearby 9d. Such a meaning makes more sense of this vs. but at the expense of arbitrarily assigning a unique meaning to this rather common lexeme. If we take the idiom seriously, the hemistich seems to be saying that while the sun respects the placement of the parts of the cosmos, Indra pushes them around in some fashion, remaking or reconfiguring the cosmos daily. I simply do not understand this; I must be missing something. Perhaps Indra arranges the *díśaḥ* every day in a slightly new way for the sun’s road?

The sun is presumably the subj. of *ānaṭ*; so the standard tr.

The cmpd *háryaśvaprasūta-* technically has three members -- that is a 2<sup>nd</sup> member ppl. (*prasūta-*) whose 1<sup>st</sup> member is itself a cmpd. This would be somewhat unusual for the RV, where cmpd size is quite limited. But the bv. *háry-aśva-* is so frozen as an epithet of Indra that it was probably not fully perceived as a cmpd. Cf. the exactly equivalent *indra-prasūta-* (1x).

Ge (/WG) seems to interpr. *ádhvanaḥ* as acc. pl. (“Wenn sie ihre Wege vollendet hat”). Because I am not at all certain that  $\sqrt{naś}$  can be used that way with an acc., I take *ádhvanaḥ* as gen. sg., with a supplied ‘end’; cf. V.54.10 *ádhvanaḥ pāráṃ aśnutha* with the same root. So apparently also Re.

*ásvaiḥ* is an instr. of separation with *vimócanam*.

III.30.14: *carati bíbhratī* is another instance of quasi-auxiliary  $\sqrt{car}$  + pres. part. (also to a redupl. pres.); cf. 4b. Here, *carati* seems to have more lexical value than in vs. 4.

III.30.15: The sense of the hapax *yāmakóśa-* is unclear. Ge takes it as traveling trunks: “Die Reisetruhen sind bereit”; sim. Old. But the image of Indra standing by overseeing the loading of his luggage verges on the absurd. Old suggests rather that it is *we* who have come with empty suitcases, hoping Indra will fill them. Re takes *yāma-* to  $\sqrt{yā}$  ‘beseech’ rather than  $\sqrt{yā}$  ‘drive, travel’, yielding “les vases de la prière.” Since there is no comm. in EVP XVII, we will never know what he meant by that; it is certainly not transparent. My tr. “journey-bucket” is meant as a slangy term for chariot (‘bucket’ can be so used in English for an old or badly maintained car); certainly the use of *kóśa-* ‘bucket, cask’ to refer to (a part of) a chariot is clear from VIII.20.8, 22.9. WG’s “Wagenkörbe” is similar.

I also think that the chariots in question belong to the enemies mentioned in cd; this might account for the slangy designation of their vehicles -- rather like referring to a rival’s car as a jalopy. In any case it would seem odd to command Indra to stand fast and then immediately get on a chariot and go traveling.

III.30.16: The standard tr. all take the *ghóṣa-* to be emanating from the foes, but the instr. *amítraiḥ* with *śṛṇve* should make it an agent of the hearing (“is heard by ...”) not a source of the sound. Ge’s (/WG’s) “von” and Re’s supplied “(faite) d’ennemis” show their need to overrule the syntax. I see no reason why it should not be Indra’s battle-cry, striking fear in all who hear it.

III.30.17: *salalūka-* is yet another peculiar word that brings our interpr. to a standstill. The current standard interpr. is “indulgence, patience” vel sim. (Ge [/WG] “Nachsicht”). I do not understand where such a meaning would come from. Mayrhofer (KEWA s.v.) suggests  $\sqrt{sṛ}$  in the meaning ‘sich erstrecken’, but the semantic channel from one to the other seems blocked to me. Although a deriv. from  $\sqrt{sṛ}$  seems likely, a more literal sense of that root, ‘run, flow’, provides better sense. (The older interpr. of the word was ‘zerfließen’ or ‘umherschweifend’ [Gr, etc.].) Both the *l*’s and the affective *-ūka-* suffix suggest a slangy or low-register word -- hence my “send scooting.” Gr suggests a preform *\*salsalūka-*, presumably because *-ūka-* is often added to intensively reduplicated stems (see AiG II.2.498)(cf. *jāgarūka-* III.54.7). This seems possible (though not, of course, necessary), and “send scooting” is also meant to reflect an intensive/iterative sense. Note that *salalūkam* phonologically resembles *sahāmūlam* in pāda a (in almost the same metrical

position), which may help account for the presence of *salalūkam* in the vs. and could also have facilitated a dissimilation from *\*salsalūkam*.

III.30.18: It is difficult to know how to construe the first pāda of this vs. I take it as a nominal main clause expressing the purpose of the subordinate clause in b. Ge (/WG) as a parallel subordinate clause with pāda b, for which a verb (ausziehst ‘set out for’) must be supplied -- all dependent on pāda c. Re as part of a single subord. cl. introduced by *yád* in b, also all dependent on c. Each of these solutions has drawbacks. Mine requires nothing to be supplied (Re’s supplies less than Ge’s), and it also avoids two problems produced by Re’s interpr: a worrisomely late position of *yád* and an untethered *ca* in the middle of pāda a. But mine comes with a certain awkwardness of expression and an ill-assorted conjoined pair (“for well-being and with horses”).

However the various interpr. of ab differ, they all agree in taking *āsátsi* as the verb in the subor. cl. introduced by *yád*, thus showing the older non-imperative (that is, subjunctive) value of the so-called “-*si* imperative.”

III.30.19: Gr analyses *dhīmahi* as passive, but this is rightly rejected by all standard tr.: the numerous other examples of this form are all transitive. What then should we supply as object? I take the line of least resistance, importing *bhágam* from the preceding pāda. I take the b pāda to mean that we hope to take the portion Indra brings us now and put it together with the superfluity of his previous gifts (and those to come) (*deṣṇásya ... prareké*). Ge (sim. WG) does not construe these two nouns together, but takes *deṣṇásya* as a partitive genitive, supplying the obj. of *dhīmahi* (“Wir möchten von deiner Gabe etwas auf Vorrat zurücklegen”), while Re takes the verb as reflexive: “puissions nous nous placer ...”

The Pp. and all standard analyses take *ūrvá* as underlying nom. *ūrváh*; I, however, take it as loc. *ūrvé*. Though Ge and Re tr. the word as ‘sea’, it really refers to the container, in this case the sea-basin, and so logically what stretches out is not the container itself but the liquid in the container. (WG tr. Behälter, but keep it as nom.)

III.30.20: The conjoined verbs in ab, *mandayā ... papráthaś ca*, are in different moods, imperative and subjunctive respectively. Or so it seems: in the sandhi context *mandayā góbhiḥ* the apparent impv. *mandayā* could represent subjunctive *\*mandayās*. However, I don’t think this is necessary; impv. and subj. are both future-oriented moods, and in fact in this passage the pairing functions as a sort of covert conditional: “(if) you invigorate it, it will spread.” Kü (321), fld by WG, construes *candrátatā rāddhasā* with the 2<sup>nd</sup> verb, but both the accent on *paprátthaḥ* and the position of the *ca* make it clear that *paprátthaḥ* must begin a new clause.

III.30.21: Schaeffer (136) sees no particular repetitive function in the well-attested intensive *dárdar-*; she considers it simply lexicalized. Therefore my “keep breaking open” may impose a semantic nuance that does not belong to this stem. However, at

the very least it takes pl. objects here (*gotrā, gāh*), so it could be considered “objektsdistributiv” (for which term see Schaeffer 86–87).

### III.31 Indra

As indicated in the publ. intro., the hymn presents multiple difficulties, esp. in its first three vss. I will not attempt to represent the many conflicting interpr. of these vss., but simply lay out some parts of my own and point to some of the many puzzles that remain. As also noted in the publ. intro., I think the cosmic incest theme imposed on these vss. by others is faint at best, and also think that the ritual occasion depicted is not the original generation of the ritual fire but the removal of the Āhavanīya fire from the Gārhapatya.

In the publ. intro. I say that Indra is not named in the narrative of the Vala myth until vs. 11, but this is false: the last word of the 1<sup>st</sup> verse of the Vala treatment, 4d, is *īndrah*. He is also named in the last vs. of the Vala section, 11b -- thus producing a satisfying ring.

Vss. 3 to the end are tr. and discussed by H.-P. Schmidt in *Bṛhaspati und Indra* (pp. 166-75).

III.31.1: The female line of descent implied in the 1<sup>st</sup> pāda, *duhitúr nāptyām* “the (grand)daughter of the daughter,” is striking. As noted already, I believe that this kinship succession refers to the production of the offering fire (Āhavanīya) from the householder’s fire (Gārhapatya) and the removal to the east of the former. Obviously, however, this can’t refer directly to the fires, because *agní-* is masc.; it is rather, I think, a reference to the hearths, which word (*dhiṣānā-* in some uses) is fem. The conveyor (*vāhniḥ*) who has come (*gāt*) is the fire itself (often called *vāhni-*), which has made the journey from the Gārhapatya hearth to the Āhavanīya hearth. The offering is being made there by the father (*pitā*), whom I take as the priest. I do not see allusion to the cosmic incest of Heaven and his daughter, in part because it is difficult to identify who the granddaughter would be. (See Old.) The ritual identifications of *vāhni-* = Agni and *pitā* = priest are pretty standard; it is the identity of the females that causes dispute.

III.31.2: I do not see sufficient evidence in this vs. for the legalistic interpr. having to do with inheritance rights advanced by Old and Ge (fld. by WG). Again, my interpr. involving the two fireplaces is at least thinkable, though there are a number of loose ends (in everyone’s interpr). In the first pāda in my interpr. the fire that has been taken out of the Gārhapatya leaves nothing behind. The two other occurrence of *āraik* have womb as obj. + a dative (as if it were our pāda b): I.113.1 *evā rātry uśāse yónim āraik* “so night has left behind the womb for dawn” and I.124.8, which even has a sister: *svāsā svāsre jyāyasyai yónim āraik* “The (one) sister has left the natal place to her older sister.” In both the idea seems to be that one has vacated the space for the other -- not left as legacy, as the legalistic inheritance interpr. requires. Problematic for my interpr. is the fact that *rikthām* should be the equivalent of the womb itself (the fireplace), not the detritus that the fire might leave in it. Moreover,

the two hearths that had been daughter and granddaughter now become sisters -- but a certain fluidity in modeling kinship relations would not be surprising.

In b the site of the new fire, the *Āhavanīya*, is the womb of this new fire and “the repository of the winner” (the winner being the fire itself).

The second half-verse is fairly clear (for this hymn) in its description of the churning of the fire: the mothers are the fingers, the two good workers are the two kindling sticks. See the fire-churning passage with kindling sticks in nearby III.29.1.

The *yádī* opening the second half-verse is better taken as *yád ī*, with the enclitic pronoun. See 6a below.

III.31.3: In the first pāda the instr. *juhvā* can be read simultaneously as “with his tongue,” construed with *rējamānaḥ* and referring to the flame(s) of the fire, and as “by the offering-spoon,” construed with *jajñe* and indicating that the ghee poured from the spoon “begets” the fire by making it flame up.

The second pāda is likewise ambiguous and initiates the transition to the Indra-Āṅgiras-Vala myth portion of the hymn. The “sons of the great ruddy one” (*mahās putrāṃ aruṣāsyā*) can be the flames of the fire, that is, of Agni himself -- and the infinitival *prayākṣe* ‘to display’ is esp. appropriate to this interpr. But they can also be, as they are identified by most commentators, the Āṅgirasas, the sons of Heaven, who will figure in the Vala myth about to be related, but who are also associated with Agni, who is sometimes called *āṅgirastama-* (e.g., I.75.2; see Macd, *Vedic Myth*. 143). The “birth of these” (*jātām eṣām*) in c can likewise refer to both the flames and the Āṅgirasas. Indra’s appearance in d strengthens the Āṅgiras reading and provides a transition to the next portion of the hymn.

The lexeme *prá √yakṣ* has been variously interpreted. For ‘display’ see Gotō (1<sup>st</sup> class, 153 and n. 572), EWA s.v. Curiously WG tr. it as if to *√yaj* ‘sacrifice’, despite Gotō’s own disc. just cited -- though the other possibility is suggested in the n.

III.31.4: Pādas a and c contain feminine plural nom./acc. forms: *jaítṛīḥ* and *jānatīḥ* ... *uṣāsaḥ* respectively. Although the default assumption would be that they are coreferential and both refer to the Dawns, the familiar plot line of the Vala myth suggests rather that they identify two different subjects: the (unexpressed) Āṅgirasas in ab, the (expressed) Dawns in c. (So Ge, Re, Schmidt [B+I, 167]; Old agrees that the Āṅgirasas should be supplied as subj. in a, but takes *jaítṛīḥ* as obj. [presumably alongside clear acc. *sprdhānām*], while WG take the Dawns as subj. of a, but supply the Āṅgirasas as subj. of b.) The Āṅgirasas are Indra’s back-up band in the Vala myth, as noted above ad III.30.10, and would be expected to accompany him, as pāda a depicts, while the Dawns are still confined within the Vala cave and only in c recognize Indra’s song and come out of the cave. The problem for an Āṅgiras reading of pāda a is of course the fem. gender of *jaítṛīḥ*. Here it is probably best to follow Sāy. in supply *viśaḥ* ‘clans’ (so Ge, etc.); cf. I.121.3 *viśām āṅgirasām*. However, note that the Āṅgirasas are referred to by the fem. pl. *vāñīḥ* ‘choir’ in the preceding hymn, III.30.10, and that noun could be supplied here.

The cows of d are surely the dawns, as often; Indra becomes their *pāti-*, a word meaning both ‘lord’ and ‘husband’. On the naming of Indra here, see the intro. remarks above.

III.31.5: The Aṅgirasas, now presumably in the masc. (though both *dhîrāḥ* [a] and *vîprāḥ* [b] are technically ambiguous), remain the implicit subjects of abc, with Indra, also unnamed, taking this role in d. The cows, also not identified, are represented in pāda a by the fem. pl. part. *satîḥ*. In fact, though these identifications are fairly easy to make for those familiar with the story, they remain covert, and, further, both b and d have unidentified objects as well. In b Ge (/WG) tr. *āhinvan* without object; I have supplied the cows (so apparently also Lü [Varuṇa 510–11], Schmidt [B+I 167]), while Re’s parenthetic “(I’)” in “(I’)incitèrent” presumably refers to Indra.

In d there is an expressed object, but it is merely a 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. pronoun, which is, furthermore, ambiguous in sandhi: *tā* in *tā nāmasā* can represent either neut. pl. *tā* or fem. pl. *tāḥ*. The Pp. opts for the former, a decision endorsed by Old. The issue is further complicated by the fact that the form could be construed with either (or both) of two verbal forms, part. *prajānān* or pf. *ā viveśa*. Old takes *tā* to refer vaguely to things that Indra knows and construes it with *prajānān*; sim. Re: “sachant ces choses.” Ge [/WG], contra Pp., restores *tāḥ*, which he takes to refer to pl. *pathyāḥ*, generated from *pathyām* in c. My tr. is closer to Schmidt and to Lü, in restoring *tāḥ* (like Ge), but assuming its referent to be the cows, into whose company Indra enters. With Lü and Schmidt, I also take *prajānān* as having an implicit object inspired by *pathyām* in c, but *prajānān* is generally used absolutely to mean “knowing (the way)” and so a form of *pathyā-* need not be supplied. The publ. tr. should have parentheses: “knowing (the way).”

III.31.6: Ge (/WG) interpret ab as a direct quotation from the gods, for reasons that are unclear to me. Although an immediate past reading might help account for the injunctive aorists *vidāt* (a) and *kaḥ* (b), in fact the second hemistich also contains two injunctives, *nayat* (c) and *gāt* (d), the latter of which is also an aorist. So there is no clear grammatical distinction between the two half-verses, and the subject (Saramā) also remains the same throughout (by most interpr.), with all four pādas focusing on the same narrative. Other interpreters (Re, Lü, Schmidt) ignore this odd decision of Ge’s.

In a *yādī* should be read *yád ī*; see 2c above.

In b *pāthaḥ* ordinarily means ‘fold, pen’, but here refers to the herd confined in the fold: the shift from container to contained is a common one in semantic change.

*ākṣarāṇām* in c most likely has double reference, both to the cows that are being released from the Vala cave and the syllables of the Aṅgirasas’ song that effects that release.

Ge makes the point (n. 6d) that *rāva-* in this context otherwise only refers to the Aṅgirasas’ song; this leads him to switch the subject to Uṣas, as the first out of the cave, coming in response to the sound of the Aṅgirasas. This seems, on the one hand, over-finicky -- why introduce another female character in the middle of a vs.

without signaling it? -- and, on the other, rather deaf to the possibility of multiple meanings that always lurks in RVic discourse. One of the points of the Vala myth in general seems to me the mirroring of sounds: the song that releases the cows and their joyous counter-mooing in response -- an obvious place for a poet to allow a single word to do double duty. This same double reference is found in the preceding pāda in *ākṣarāṇām*. Schmidt (B+I 167) also takes the *rāva*- to be that of Indra and the Aṅgirasas and in fact makes Uṣas the subject of the whole 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich. I do not see the need for this.

III.31.7: Note that all pādas begin with 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. preterite verbs: a *ágachat*, b *ásūdayat*, c *sasāna*, d (modified initial pos.) *áthābhavat* (which most likely represents *átha abhavat*, though *áthā bhavat* is possible). All but the perfect in c are augmented imperfects; this contrasts markedly with vs. 6, which, as was just noted, contains four 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. injunctives, three of them aorists. Three of the four pādas of vs. 7 also end with nom. sg. masc. pres. participles: a *sakhīyān*, c *makhasyān*, d *árcan*.

Pāda b configures the release of the cows from the Vala cave as a birth, but a birth overlaid with metaphor (“brought to sweetness”).

In c the standard tr. (save for Re and Klein, DGRV II.67) take *makhasyá*- as ‘being generous’ vel sim. But in all three occurrences of this verb stem (here and IX.61.27, 101.5) the ‘do battle’ sense is primary. Since it co-occurs with *sasāna* ‘won’ in this pāda, the ‘battle’ sense seems esp. appropriate. So Re “comportant-en-combattant.”

My tr. of d, *áthābhavad aṅgirasāḥ sadyó árcan*, differs in an important way from the standard. In my opinion it states that Indra became an Aṅgiras as soon as he sang; the others that the Aṅgiras [=Indra] right away became a singer (e.g., Ge “Da ward sogleich der Aṅgiras zum Lobsänger”). On the one hand, I’m not certain that  $\sqrt{bhū}$  + pres. part. can yield this sort of predication, esp. with the pres. part. standing in, in effect, for an agent noun. So -- a syntactic argument, though I have not examined the evidence in detail. Another syntactic/lexical argument: *sadyāḥ* + participle is frequently used to indicate the circumstances under which the action of the main verb takes place. This is esp. common with *sadyó jātāḥ* “just born” / *sadyó jajñānāḥ* “having just been born” -- e.g., the next hymn, III.32.9 *sadyó yáj jātō ápibha sómam* (≅10) “Just born, you drank the soma” (and cf. III.29.3). But the prevailing interpr. here requires the *sadyāḥ* to go with the main verb, despite its position directly before the participle -- e.g., Klein “And then did the Aṅgiras straightway become a singer.” And finally a semantic objection: the proposed tr. seems to me thematically backwards. Indra joins the category of the Aṅgirasas because he joins them in song, which is their principal function in this myth; he is not an Aṅgiras by nature who happens to start singing. (This point is made, more or less, by Schmidt [173], despite his contrary tr.)

III.31.7–8: Given the thematic weight the part. *árcan* carries (see comm. immed. above) and given that it occupies pāda-final position in 7d and 8c, it should have been tr. the same way in these two vss. I would emend the publ. tr. to ‘chanting’ in



7d, or else 8c to ‘singing’ and *arkaīḥ* in 9b, 11b to ‘songs’. The instr. *arkaīḥ* reappears in pāda-final position in 11b.

III.31.8: Ge (/WG) take this vs. as a quotation of the Aṅgirasas’ praise-song of Indra. I do not see why. The vs. seems to follow easily from the preceding one, and in fact at the end of vs. 7 it’s Indra who’s singing (/chanting), not the Aṅgirasas. We might expect such a quotation to be signposted in some way. I do not consider the 1<sup>st</sup> pl. enclitic *naḥ* in c to be a sufficient signal.

The presence of Śuṣṇa in b is a bit puzzling, since the smiting of Śuṣṇa is not part of the Vala myth. Perhaps with Schmidt (173) he is mentioned because Indra is uncontestably Śuṣṇa’s killer, and this extra-mythic (or extra-Vala myth) association makes it clear that the unnamed subject of this vs. must indeed be Indra.

The standard tr. take c as a separate clause from d and supply a verb of motion with *prá* (e.g., Ge “[ging] ... voran”). This is certainly possible, but cd can also be read as a single clause (so Schmidt, 168), since *prá* is frequent with  $\sqrt{muc}$ . This interpr. allows, but does not enforce, a coreferential interpr. of *naḥ* (c) and *sákhīn* (d), as in my tr. (flg. Schmidt).

What calumny? Ge (n. 8d) suggests the dishonor because of the loss of the herd.

III.31.9: Ge’s suggestion that this vs. concerns the Aṅgirasas’ Sattrā, a months-long ritual, seems completely convincing. I am less convinced by his interpr. of c (fld. by Re, WG), that this Sattrā is frequently (*bhūri*) repeated now, though I admit that both the hic-et-nunc prn. *idám* and the particle *nú* might support his view. I prefer Lü’s interpr. (Varuṇa, 511, fld. by Schmidt 168), who takes *bhūri* as ‘long’ and the hemistich as a further description of the Aṅgirasas’ Sattrā in the Vala myth.

My interpr. of d (based on Lü and Schmidt) deviates further from Ge (Re, WG). All of the latter take *yéna* ... *ṛténa* as coreferential and the equivalent of ... *\*ṛtám*, *yéna* -- that is, *\*ṛtám* in the main cl. as antecedent to *yéna*. The main cl. *\*ṛtám* would be an appositive to *sádanam* “the Session, (that is,) the *ṛtá* by which they ...” However, I separate the two instr. in d and take the antecedent of *yéna* to be *sádanam* (“the Session by which ...”), leaving *ṛténa* to mean ‘by/through truth’ as so often. They also take *māsān* as the obj. of *ásiṣāsan* (“they sought to win the months”), but this acc. pl. can easily be an acc. of extent of time (again, as so often), and the true object of their desire to win can be supplied as the cows.

III.31.10: What “the milk of the age-old semen” means is unclear to me. Ge suggests that they’re milking their old cows, but the rhetoric seems rather overblown just to express that. Lü (620–21, fld. by Schmidt 168) identifies the semen as *ṛtá*- and the milk as the Kultlied of the Aṅgirasas. This may well be, but nothing imposes this explanation, and Schmidt in fact worries briefly (173) that logically the Aṅgirasas should already have their Kultlied since they should have used it to free these very cows.

On *niṣṭhā*- ‘outstanding’ see Old, Scar (648–49). The word must be derived from *nís* √ *sthā*, not *ní* √ *sthā* and in fact goes literally into English as ‘stand out’, with the same idiomatic meaning. In addition to two occurrences of the simplex (this and IX.110.9), it is found in several compounds: *karma-niṣṭhā*- X.80.1 a hero who stands out through his work, *puruniṣṭhā*- V.1.6 (of Agni), VIII.2.9 ‘standing out among many’ of soma. Ge (unaccountably) takes it as ‘Verteilung’ (fld. by Re, Lü 528–29, Schmidt 168), an interpr. about which Old comments rather acidly. Old’s own interpr. is essentially reproduced here and was also adopted by WG.

Note the partial responsion between *ghóṣa* in c and *góṣu* in d, in the same metrical position.

III.31.11: My interpr. of the first hemistich differs from the standard; I take it as consisting of two separate clauses, each identifying Indra in one of his most important mythic roles -- in the Vṛtra-slaying and in the freeing of the Vala cows -- along with his associates in those enterprises, the Maruts and the Aṅgirasas respectively. It is important to note that this naming of Indra, in conjunction with the first appearance of his name in 4b (see comm. there and in the intro. remarks), frames the treatment of the Vala myth, and, by mentioning Vṛtra, it also sets the stage for the opening out of this hymn to treat other exploits of Indra.

Others take *vṛtrahā* in pāda a simply as an auxiliary epithet of Indra in this account of the Vala myth, but I do not think that Vṛtrahan would be so prominent in a treatment of the Vala myth, and I also cannot otherwise account for the *séd u* in the middle of pāda a without assuming that a new clause begins there. (Lü [517] gets out of this difficulty by accepting Ludwig’s emendation to a bahuvrīhi *svéduhavyaiḥ* ‘having sweating oblations’ [=Aṅgirasas], but though this is ingenious, esp. as sweat figures in the same myth in X.67.6–7 as Ge points out, it requires too much alteration for a sequence that can make sense on its own.) In the first brief clause, *vṛtrahā* is the predicate, and *jātébhiḥ* refers to the Maruts, who are well known for being ‘born (together)’ (e.g., V.55.3 *sākām jātāḥ*). Ge suggests, but rejects, an emendation here to *sajātébhiḥ* (for transmitted *sá jātébhiḥ*), an idea also of Alsdorf’s (see Schmidt 169); I would modify that by proposing haplology from *sá \*sajātébhiḥ*. The rest of ab concerns the Vala myth, which has been the subject of the past seven vss. The myth is readily identifiable by the VP *úd usríyā asṛjat* “sent the ruddy (cows) surging up” and by the *arkaīḥ*, repeated from 9a. Since the chants in 9a clearly belonged to the Aṅgirasas, there need not be any even oblique reference to the Aṅgirasas here: the bare *arkaīḥ* will be enough.

III.31.12: The first pāda contains two datives, *pitré* and the prn. *asmai*. Because of its lack of accent, *asmai* cannot be a demonstr. adj. with *pitré*. Ge gets out of the difficulty by interpr. *pitré* as a simile, which allows *asmai* to be independently construed, but this depends on his frequent assumption that *cid* can be a simile marker, a role I do not think it can have. Instead I give the VP *cakruḥ sádanam* a double reading: acdg. to the first the Aṅgirasas perform a Sattrā for their father (see 9c), but in the 2<sup>nd</sup> they also prepare for him a literal seat. Because *cakruḥ sádanam*

participates in two clauses, each can have an independent dative, though in my opinion the datives are coreferential.

It is unclear what the referent of the object in b is, described as *máhi tvíṣīmat* “great and turbulent.” Ge, flg. Sāy, takes it as a further reference to the seat, Re the all-purpose “quelque chose,” Schmidt the eye of the sun, WG sim. the sun-god. My own candidate is the *pāthah* of 6b, also described as *máhi* there. In vs. 6 the word is used to indicate the herd, which is contained in the fold (see comm. there); here I think it is the container, the fold or pen, itself -- representing the cosmic space and also the ritual ground. When they survey it they see that this space needs organizing, which they proceed to do -- by propping apart Heaven and Earth (a deed usually ascribed to Indra) and preparing and propping up a seat for Indra. They thus make the whole cosmos into Indra’s ritual ground, and in the next vs. (13ab) Earth herself serves as the emplacement allowing Indra to pierce Vṛtra.

The position of the *hí* is somewhat anomalous: since the whole b pāda forms a single clause, we would expect the *hí* in Wackernagel’s position. However, there is a general tendency when a preverb precedes its verb late in the clause for *hí* to intervene between them, as here: ... *ví hí khyan*#. More specifically, 1) when there’s a *hí* in a clause containing a verbal form of  $\sqrt{khyā}$ , it always immediately precedes the verb -- sometimes in normal Wack. pos. (e.g., I.81.9), sometimes not (as here and, e.g., VI.15.15). 2) With one exception, all injunc. forms of  $\sqrt{khyā}$  are preceded either by *hí* or by a preverb ending in -i, which prob. led to a sense that  $\sqrt{khyā}$  should be so preceded. Note also in this passage the phonetic echoes #*máhi* ... *ví hí khyan*#, which also resonates with pāda d ... *ví minvan*#. It is perhaps worth noting in this connection how many pādas in this hymn begin with *máhi* or *mahī*: 3d, 4b, 6b, 12b, 13a, 14a, 14c, 15a (esp. clustered here); cf. also *mahás* 3b, *mahān* 3c, 18d. I assume that a pāda opening \**máhi hí* would be avoided; in any case there are none in the RV.

In d most tr. take the sun as the referent of the object. I instead supply the seat. The root  $\sqrt{mi}$  often takes ‘seat’ as obj.: not our *sádanam* admittedly, but *sádman*-II.15.3 (with *vī*), X.20.5, I.173.3, IX.97.1, *sādana*- X.18.13. This is a fairly large percentage of the attested forms of the verb, and since ‘seat’ is already present in this vs., it is easily supplied here.

III.31.13: I take *yádi* here as a shortened form of *yád* \**ī* with enclitic pronoun (as in 2c and 6a), though it unfortunately appears before a word beginning with a single consonant. An “if” makes no sense here, and it is also desirable to have an acc. pron. in this pāda to serve as obj. of *dhāt* and subj. of the infinitival *śiśnátthe*. This putative \**ī* may anticipate and double the heavy acc. phrase of b, assuming that the latter refers to Indra.

As noted just above, Earth herself serves as the foundation from which Indra can launch his attack. Our passage is very similar to I.102.7 ... *tvā dhiśāṇā titiṣe mahy, ádhā vṛtrāṇi jighnase* ... “The great (Earth), the Holy Place has sparked you .... So you keep smashing obstacles ...,” with the same *mahī* ... *dhiśāṇā* as here and even a form of  $\sqrt{tviṣ}$ , like *tvíṣīmat* in 12b; cf. also VI.19.2 *índram evá dhiśāṇā sātáye dhāt* “The Holy Place positioned just Indra for winning,” with  $\sqrt{dhā}$  + inf. as here. The

same  $\sqrt{dhā}$  + inf. construction is found in 19d below: *svàs ca naḥ ... sātāye dhāḥ* “and set us up to win the sun.”

Although Gr assigns the hapax *śísnathe* to a them. stem *śísnátha-*, as Old clearly states we expect a datival infinitive here, and so it more likely belongs to an athem. stem *śísnáth-*; cf. *abhiśnáth-*.

Re takes b as describing Vṛtra, Schmidt Indra; Ge’s tr. is not clear, though Schmidt (169 n.) claims it’s to Vṛtra. I follow Schmidt in assigning the phrase to Indra, though the poet may have intended its referent to be ambiguous, indicating that the opponents are almost evenly balanced.

I follow the current standard view (represented already by Ge and Re) that *ánutta-* is the ppl. to the lexeme *ánu*  $\sqrt{dā}$  ‘concede’; Schmidt and WG follow the older deriv. from  $\sqrt{nud}$  ‘push’, hence ‘unpushable’ vel sim.

III.31.14: Because *vaśmi* is unaccented, the first pāda would be more accurately tr. “I long for your companionship ....” since *vaśmi* cannot begin a clause. I tr. as I did to capture the parallelism of pādas a #*māhi* ... *sakhyām* and c #*māhi stótram*, as well as 15a *māhi kṣétram*.

III.31.15: Ge takes *nṛbhiḥ* as the agent with the part. *dīdyānaḥ* (“von den Männern entflammt (?)”), but this participle never elsewhere takes an agent. Better an instr. of accompaniment, with most other tr. That Indra is described as shining may be connected to the fact that three of the four things he generates shine too: the sun, the dawn, and fire. There is some disagreement about who the men are: the Aṅgirasas or the Maruts. Given the general prominence of the Vala myth earlier in the hymn, but the more recent concentration on the Vṛtra myth, I imagine the ambiguity is intentional and both sets of Indra’s helpers are to be thought of.

III.31.16: My interpr. of this vs. differs significantly from the standard, beginning with the disposition of the pādas. Most take abc together, with d as a separate clause, while I divide the vs. into two hemistichs, which express parallel notions. In ab, in mythological time, Indra sends the waters surging; this is the standard happy denouement of the Vṛtra myth. In cd priests (even perhaps the Aṅgirasas) impel another collection of liquid, the streams of soma -- the ritual equivalent of Indra’s cosmogonic release of the waters. Although the standard interpr. tacks pāda c onto ab, as describing the waters, it contains vocabulary that is strongly associated with soma: *mádhu-* ‘honey, sweet’,  $\sqrt{pū}$  ‘purify’, and *pavítṛa-* ‘filter’, and I cannot offhand think of another instance in which *waters* are said to be purified, though they are purifying.

In ab note the return of several lexical items: *vibhū-* (13b) and *sadhryāñc-* (6b). The *cid* ‘also’ also links this vs. with a previous part of the hymn, namely 11b where Indra sends surging another group of fem. entities (ruddy [cows]): *úd usrýā asrjad índro arkaṭh*.

I do not understand why Indra is called *dámūnāḥ* ‘master of the house’. The word is generally an epithet of Agni (understandably), and there is nothing in this passage that seems to me to link Indra to the domestic sphere.

In c *mádhvaḥ* is taken by most as fem. acc. pl. (by Schmidt as masc. nom. pl.). Several exx. of this form are analyzed by Gr as either masc. nom. pl. or fem. nom./acc. pl. However, none of these supposed examples is convincing, and it is best to take it here as the gen. sg. it usually is. It then needs a head noun. Old adduces nearby III.36.7 *mádhvaḥ punanti dhārayā pavitraiḥ* “they purify it in a stream of honey with purifying filters,” which is very similar to our pāda c. I therefore supply, with Old, a form of *dhārā-* ‘stream’ upon which gen. *mádhvaḥ* depends. The precise form I supply is acc. pl. *dhārāḥ*, modified by the (fem. acc.) part. *punānāḥ* and coreferential with *dhānutriḥ* ‘runners’ at the end of the vs. The conceit in the phrase *hinvarianti ... dhānutriḥ* is that the priests are spurring on the streams of soma (like) horses. As for the subj. of *hinvarianti*, I take it as (the current) priests (as in the sim. passage III.36.7 just quoted; also III.46.5, where Adhvaryus are the subj. of *hinvarianti*). It could also be, with Re, the Aṅgirasas, who have been operating as priests in the Sattra depicted earlier.

Ge (/WG) take *kavibhiḥ* as an adjective with *pavitraiḥ* (Ge: “mit geistigen Filtern”), but in my opinion there are no adjectival uses of *kaví-*. Instead it is used as a defining appositive (poets as filters), as I take it, sim. Re, or it is a separate agent with *punānāḥ* (“being purified by poets with filters”), with Schmidt (170).

III.31.17: As Ge points out, pāda a is very similar to IV.48.3 *ānu kṛṣṇé vásudhitī, yemāte viśvāpeśasā* “The two black treasure chambers [=Night and Dawn], with all their ornaments, have directed themselves after each other in turn.” Bloomfield (RR ad III.31.17) cleverly comments, “The words *kṛṣṇé* and *vásudhitī* are both dvandva ekaṣeṣa ‘black (Night) and (Uṣas)’ is a way of saying *náktoṣāsā*; conversely ‘treasure-giving (Morn) and black (Night)’ is *uṣāsānákta*.”

“The magnanimity of the sun” is a slightly surprising expression. Is it that the sun makes the succession of Night and Dawn possible by his transit across the sky, and this is considered generous on his part? Or is it an indirect reference to the distribution of the *dakṣiṇā* at dawn. A related, but opposite, sentiment is found in VII.81.4 *uchāntī yā kṛṇóṣi maṁhānā mahi, prakhyai devī svār dṛśé* “You who in dawning make through your magnanimity the sun to be visible for seeing,” with the magnanimity credited to Dawn.

The only other occurrence of pl. *ṛjipyá-* (II.34.4) is at least indirectly used of the Maruts; the standard tr. all assume they are the referents of *cd*, which seems correct. Here they seem to be functioning as priests, attempting to bring Indra to a sacrifice.

III.31.18: Note the alliteration in b (... *viśvāyur vṛṣabhó vayodhāḥ*) and the rather elementary etymological figure in d (*maḥān mahībhiḥ*); although *sakhyébhiḥ śívébhiḥ* is neither the one nor the other, it seems to function as a bridge between the two.

III.31.19: Pāda b, *návyam kṛṇomi ... purājāṁ* “I make new (the hymn) born of old,” is about as succinct a summary of the RVic poetic enterprise as we can find in the text: the poets’ focus on ever new expressions based on traditional techniques and

themes. In this particular case, Ge suggests that *purājā-* refers to the Preislied of the Aṅgīrasas, about which we heard in vss. 7–8.

On the  $\sqrt{dhā}$  + inf. construction, see vs. 13 above.

III.31.19–20: Note the echo of 19d  $\#s^{u}vaś\ ca\ naḥ$  in 20b  $s^{u}vastí\ naḥ$ .

III.31.20: The mists are probably in part metaphorical -- menacing threats and mental darkness -- but may also refer physically to morning mists, which are clearing as the dawn sacrifice begins. Note also that pāda-initial *mīhaḥ* is a mirror image of *māhi*, which opens so many pādas in this hymn (see comm. ad 12b).

III.31.21: I follow Schaeffer (Intens., 133–34) in taking the medial intens. *dēdiṣṭe* in the meaning ‘display (one’s own X)’ -- hence my different tr. of *ādediṣṭa* (a) ‘has put on display’ and *diśāmānaḥ* ‘allotting’.

I interpret. b as having a more complex construction than the standard interpr. The trouble is the *antār* phrase: when *antār* governs the acc., it is only used with dual (or plurals conceived as duals -- *jātān ubhāyān* [IV.2.2], e.g.), but *kṛṣṇān* has no overt partner here. I suggest that it is an elliptical plural-for-dual: “black (nights) and (bright days)”; cf. VIII.41.10 *śvetān ... kṛṣṇān* used for days and nights. The elliptical *kṛṣṇé* used of Night and Dawn in 17a would support this, and in 20a the clearing of the mists at daybreak (if I’m right) might provide the other half of this elliptical duality. If this is correct, Indra *comes between* (*antāḥ ... gāt*) the nights and days *with* the entities appearing in the instr. (*aruṣāḥ dhāmabhiḥ*). *aruṣā-* ‘ruddy’ can of course be used of Dawn and her various associates, esp. her “cows”; *dhāman-* is a frustratingly multivalent word, but here I think it means ‘manifestation’ vel sim, and the phrase refers to the dawns, who of course come temporally between night and full day.

The positioning of *ca* in d is somewhat disturbing, but I see no other way to explain it than Klein’s (DGRV I.225, II.102 n. 28): it conjoins the first and second half-verses, but takes Wackernagel’s position in the 2<sup>nd</sup> pāda of the 2<sup>nd</sup> half-verse “following an intervening participial phrase.”

*svāḥ* ‘his own’ is in a very prominent position, as the last word in the last real vs. of the hymn (before the refrain, vs. 22). Why it should be emphasized that the doors that Indra opens are his own I do not know, beyond the fact that anything belonging to Indra is highly noteworthy. But I would point out that *svāḥ* may be a pun on  $s^{u}vaś$  ( $s^{u}vaḥ$  in pause) ‘sun’ initial in 19d (though unfortunately *svāḥ* is not distracted here as it so often is).

### III.32 Indra

III.32.1: The impv. *pība* is accented, though it is located mid-clause. There is no obvious reason for this. Old suggests weakly (ZDMG 60: 736) that it is an emphatic accent, but this is of course a circular argument: any verb bearing an unexpected accent can be called emphatic. I find the accent esp. disturbing because the identical

phrase, minus the initial voc. *índra*, is found without accented impv. elsewhere: #*sómam somapate piba*# (V.40.1=VIII.21.3) versus our #*índra sómam somapate píbemám*#. There are several possible contributing factors. First, three pādas at the beginning of this hymn begin with accented *pībā* (2b, 3d, 5b), and our form may have had its accent added redactionally. However, I think that *pība* has special status and can be accented in positions that strict syntactic rules would not allow. (This is rather like Old’s “emphatic” argument, except that I limit the effect to a single verb form.) See esp. I.15.1, II.37.1–3 and comm. there. The unsanctioned accent may arise partly because *pība* ‘drink!’ is a particularly rousing verb in RVic discourse. It also often occurs in non-initial position when it nonetheless legitimately has accent -- after init. vocatives (e.g. *índra pība* III.36.2, etc.) or at the beginning of a clause after another short clause (or clauses) (e.g., VIII.4.8 *tūyam éhi drávā pība* “Come here swiftly! Run! Drink!”), and this may have led to the sense that it can be accented in non-initial position in general. I also note in Lub’s conspectus that unaccented *piba* generally occupies either final position in its pāda or second position, while accented *pība*, besides being common and expected in initial position, tends to avoid both those positions except when 2<sup>nd</sup> position follows an initial voc. (as in III.36.2, etc.) or final position opens a new clause (as in VIII.4.8). Note that if this distribution holds, the “identical” phrases I cite at the beginning of this comment are not the same after all, because unaccented *piba* is pāda-final and our accented *pība* is followed by another element. However, there are a few counterexamples with pāda-final *pība* not beginning a new clause (e.g., VIII.4.3, 65.5). One can speculate on why 2<sup>nd</sup> and final position would favor the unaccented verb while full medial favors the accented form: namely, that 2<sup>nd</sup> position is of course Wackernagel’s position, where enclitics typically migrate, and, assuming a basic SOV underlying order, absolute final position is the default position for unaccented main-clause verbs. Still, the full medial position where we find accented main-clause *pība* does not otherwise favor or impose accent on other verbs that appear there, so if this hypothesis holds, it is only for this special verb.

Ge rather charmingly suggests that *praprúthya* represents “brr machend” to stop the horses. Although “whoa” would be the equivalent English word/vocal gesture, given the object ‘lips’ (*śípre*), I wonder if it’s the “horse training voice command” (gleaned on the internet) called “smooching” -- defined as “kissing sound with lips used to ask a horse to move on or up a gait.” I rather like the idea of Indra smooching to his fallow bays.

III.32.4: Ge (and in part Re) take *mádhumat* as referring to speech (“... wurden beredt in süßen (Worten)”), but though *mádhumant-* occurs several times with *vácas-* and the noun *vípra-* ‘inspired poet’ demonstrates that  $\sqrt{vip}$  ‘become inspired’ can have a strong verbal component, still the focus of this hymn is soma -- and the default referent of *mádhumant-* ‘honeyed’ is soma. Here the underlying word must be neut. (which *sóma-* of course is not), but the neut. *sávana-* ‘pressing’ is found elsewhere with this adj. (cf. X.112.7 *mádhumattamāni ... sávanā*), and *sávana-* is found three times in the first five vss. of this hymn (1b, 3c, 5a).

Note the insistent repetition of *ma* in pāda d (*amarmāṇo mānyamānasya mārma*), anticipated by *mādhumad* in a and *marútaḥ* in b, and continued by the first word in 5a *manuṣvād*. This phonetic figure may be signaling the **Maruts'** name. See also vs. 7.

III.32.5: The rendering of *vavṛtsva* in the publ. tr. ("let yourself be turned hither"), a sort of passive reflexive, now seems over-elaborate to me; I would substitute "be turned." The other examples of this mid. pf. impv. seem more straightforwardly simply "turn" or "turn yourself," but if *yajñāḥ* has true instrumental force, a passive rendering is more natural. Possible, however, is Re's "grâce à (nos) sacrifices."

The referent of *saraṇyúbhiḥ* is not totally clear. Sāy. (fld. by Re) suggests the Maruts, while Ge adds horses or waves as possibilities. The other ex. of a plural to this stem (also instr.) in I.62.4 is in a clear Vala context, with the Navagvas and Daśagvas in the same vs., which would suggest the Aṅgirasas -- but, although the Vala myth and the Aṅgirasas were prominent in the preceding hymn III.31, they are not found in this hymn, which is dominated by the Maruts and which mentions only the Vṛtra myth (here and in the following vs.). I therefore think it likely that Sāy. was correct. Note that *saraṇyú-* ... *sisarṣi* is an etym. figure, continued by *sártavaí* in the next vs. (6b).

The rendering of the phrase *apó árṇā* as "the flooding waters" in the publ. tr. assumes an emendation to fem. pl. *árṇāḥ*, with Gr and numerous others (see Old), contra the Pp and not reflecting the expected sandhi of such a form, which should be *árṇāḥ*. As Old points out, the emendation is not nec.: *árṇā* could easily be a neut. pl. to the thematic stem *árṇa-*. In this case the tr. would better read "the waters, the floods."

III.32.6: This vs. appears to have no main clause. I take it as loosely attached to the preceding vs., while Ge attaches it to the next one. Old (fld. by WG) disputes the Nebensatz analysis, pointing first to the odd doubly accented Pp. analysis of *prāsrjah* as *prá ásrjah*: if the verb is accented, we would expect univerbation with the preverb and loss of the preverb accent. He instead suggests that *yád* is to be construed with the participial phrase *vṛtrám jaghanvān*, as if it contained the finite verb *jagántha* -- a mixed construction. I am in general reluctant to allow a subordinating conjunction to have domain over a participle, and in this particular case this assumption would further require bits of the main clause and the subordinate clause to be interwoven in a fashion unprecedented (as far as I know) even in RVic syntax: the major part of the subordinate clause would be plunked down between the object of the main verb, *apáḥ*, and that verb (*prāsrjat*), and the 2<sup>nd</sup> half verse would consist of NPs modifying the object of the subordinate clause but following the end of the main clause. I do admit that the position of *yád dha* in pāda a suggests a close relation with the participial phrase, but I do not consider that position sufficient to override the arguments against that analysis.

The vs. contains several nice oppositions: *śáyānam* ... *cáratā* "(him) lying (still) with (your) moving (weapon)" and the etymological *devîr ádevam* "the



goddesses, godless ...” In addition note the etymological pun: *vṛtrám* ... *vavrivāṃsam*.

III.32.7: The *ma-* phonetic figure that dominated 4d returns in this vs.: cd ... *mamátur* ..., ... *mahimānam mamāte*. This figure is reinforced by the first words of pāda a, *yājāma* in *nāmasā*, and the uninterrupted sequence of *-am* acc. singulars in ab: ... *vṛddhām indram*, *bṛhāntam ṛṣvām ajāram yūvānam*. Although a side-effect of the grammar, it is my impression that a skilled RVic poet would break the monotony of such a string -- *unless* it served some other poetic purpose, here to provide the mirror-image *-am* to *ma-* and perhaps to evoke the Maruts.

The two forms of the perfect to  $\sqrt{mā}$  ‘measure’ in the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich, act. *mamātuḥ* and med. *mamāte*, share the same subj. and obj., with the 1<sup>st</sup> clause positive and the second negated. Clearly the poet is playing with two different senses of  $\sqrt{mā}$ . Gr, Ge, and Old neatly convert the word play to “messen” (‘measure’) versus “ermessen” (‘gauge, grasp, realize’)(or so I understand them). My “measure” / “measure up to” is a similar attempt whose purport is close to Kü (378) and WG: “sich messen.”

III.32.9: The juxtaposition of *adroghá-* ‘undeceptive’ and *satyá-* ‘real, true’ is also found in III.14.6 *adroghéna vácasā satyām*.

The standard tr. take pādas a and b together, with cd separate. I think it makes more sense to take b with cd, as supplying the reason (Indra’s early soma drinking) that he couldn’t be obstructed.

The standard tr. also take *dyāvah* as ‘days’, whereas the publ. tr. agrees with Hoffmann (Injunk. 242) in tr. ‘heavens’. The problem, as I saw it then, was its co-occurrence with *āhā* likewise ‘days’, which led to awkward duplication. However, I have now rethought this; the series of temporal expressions in this hemistich (*āhā*, *māsāḥ śaradaḥ*) invites a temporal reading of *dyāvah* as well and makes “heavens” seem out of place. In X.7.4. and 12.4 the two stems also co-occur and I tr. “daytimes and days.” I would now substitute that tr. here as well.

*varanta* here and in 16b is formally ambiguous; it can be either an injunctive or a subjunctive to the root aor. (see Hoffmann 239–40); Hoffmann takes it as a subjunctive. It does not work terribly well as either one; in both passages I tr. it as a preterital modal (“could obstruct”), but this interpr. is not firmly based in the morphology. I sense that in this vs. and the next the poet is struggling to express a verbal category that isn’t found in the Skt. verbal system, namely anteriority: modal anteriority here, temporal anteriority in 10cd.

III.32.10: As just noted, this vs. contains an apparent attempt to express anteriority: the pluperfect *āviveśīḥ* seems to function like an English pluperfect (rather than the standard Vedic plupf., a past tense to a presential perfect), to express an action that happened before the action of the main verb, an interpr. more or less endorsed by Kü (500).

III.32.11: The standard tr. (save for Hoffmann, Injunk. 100, sim. to my interpr.) take ... *sphigyā kṣām āvasthāḥ* as “you covered/ clothed the earth with your hip,” but the medial root pres. to  $\sqrt{vas}$  means ‘wear’ and takes an acc. of the garment rather than an acc. of the entity being clothed (the construction found with *vāsāya-*). See the similar ex. at VIII.4.8 and the comm. there, as well as the similar sentiment found in I.173.6, where Indra wears Heaven and Earth as various accessories. The point of course is to emphasize Indra’s vast size by making Earth (and Heaven) seem puny in comparison. A similar point was made in vs. 7d, as well as in the immediately preceding pāda 11c.

III.32.12: *yajñā-* is the focus of this vs., with 5 occurrences of it or a transparent deriv.

I take *vārdhanah* as the predicate of pāda b as well as pāda a (“the meal is also your strengthener”); the standard tr. take b as an independent nominal clause with *priyāḥ* as its predicate (“the meal is dear to you”). There is no way to tell for certain; the absence of *te* in b gives some support to my interpr., but that support is undeniably weak. The difference between the two tr. is also not large and has no effects on the interpr. of the rest of the vs.

The second hemistich expresses the reciprocity of the sacrificial enterprise, neatly shown by the balanced verb forms to the same root  $\sqrt{av}$  ‘aid, help’: impv. *ava* (c), impf. *āvat* (d). But the reciprocity is curiously indirect: Indra is asked to aid the sacrifice (rather than the sacrificer[s]), and the sacrifice aided Indra’s mace (not Indra himself). In both clauses the direct object is an inanimate entity standing in for an animate one, and in the second clause the subject is inanimate as well. Only Indra is animate and capable of acting.

The nom. sg. pres. part. *sán* ‘being’ is not used concessively (“although being ...”) as it normally is. I think it may have the same force as it does in III.30.5, a “definitional” one: Indra is by definition the one deserving of / derivationally associated with the sacrifice, and therefore he is the one who should aid it.

III.32.13: The reciprocity expressed by complementary verbal forms to  $\sqrt{av}$  found in the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the last vs. is here wrapped up in one word, the instr. *avasā*, which I tr. twice: I use the aid provided by the sacrifice (cf. 12d) to bring Indra here with his aid (cf. 12c). In Ge’s tr. it is only Indra’s aid, but he allows for the other possibility in n. 13a. Re and WG also associate it only with Indra. Given the balanced expression of 12cd, I think it is *meant* to have a double reading.

III.32.14: The standard tr. (see also Kü 186) take the two verbs *vivéṣa* and *jajāna* as parallel in the *yád* clause, with *mā* obj. of the first and possibly of the 2<sup>nd</sup>. I prefer to take *vivéṣa* as the main clause verb, followed by the *yád* clause, whose (sole) verb is *jajāna*. *vivéṣa* then owes its accent to its initial position in the pāda. This interpr. allows *mā* to take a more natural place, and it also saves us from positing a personal object to *vivéṣa*, which otherwise is not so construed. (Note that Kü’s second tr. of this passage [p. 502] is entirely different from his first: he distributes the clauses as I

do, but takes *vivéṣa* as *first* sg.) And what does it all mean? In my view the *dhiṣāṇā* ‘holy place’ is here the ritual ground, and she is credited with the “birth” of the poet qua poet. After this birth, the poet can produce the praise of Indra that he is credited with in pāda b, and this in turn leads to the good results in pāda c.

Pāda c contains two different subordinators, *yātra* ‘where, when’ and *yáthā* ‘so that’, with a single verb, subjunctive *pīparat*. Ge’s explan., that we simply have a doubling of relatives, seems to me the best account; this is reflected, more or less, by Old’s “wo (und) wie ...,” though Old goes on to suggest a complex crossing of two different constructions, which seems over-elaborate. In the publ. tr. I have rendered *yātra* as a temporal adv. (“at that time”) with no subordinating force, since I think *yáthā* expresses purpose and controls the subjunctive.

Rather than taking *āṃhasaḥ* as an ablative, with most others, I supply *pārām* ‘far shore’, a word related to *pārya-* in pāda b and to the verb *pīparat* itself, and found in this context elsewhere; cf. II.33.3 *pārṣi ṇaḥ pārām āṃhasaḥ*. Here as well *āṃhasaḥ* is then a gen. dependent on *\*pārām*. Although it unfortunately involves a breach of the pāda boundary, I also take *nāvēva* with the preceding pāda, because this simile is almost entirely limited to passages containing verbal forms to  $\sqrt{pr}$  (I.46.7, 97.7, 99.1, V.4.9, 25.9, VIII.16.11, 18.17, IX.70.10). I also find it hard to imagine Indra traveling by boat, even metaphorically.

III.32.15: The agent noun *séktar-*, which forms an etymological figure with *sisice*, presumably refers to a habitual or practiced ‘pourer’. So Tichy (*-tar-*stems, 159, fld. by Kü 570). I have taken *kóśam* as the obj. in the simile rather than the frame, contra the standard tr., though it could certainly go in the frame or in both without appreciably affecting the sense.

III.32.16: On *varanta* see comm. ad vs. 9.

Ge (fld. by WG) takes *sákhibhyaḥ* as a dat. of benefit, but I think it more likely that it’s an ablative with agentival force. See Re, who simply tr. it as an agent. The mythological episode is surely the Aṅgirasas’ energetic help to Indra in the breaking of Vala.

### III.33 Viśvāmitra and the Rivers

III.33.2: *indreṣite* echoes *vīṣite* in 1b, though they belong to two different roots:  $\sqrt{iṣ}$  ‘impel’ and  $\sqrt{sā}$  ‘tie’ respectively. The basis for calling the rivers *indreṣite* is given in 6ab.

In c *ūrmībhiḥ* can be construed with both participles, *samārāṇé* ‘clashing together’ and *pīnvamāne* ‘swelling’, between which it is positioned.

Although by my rule (“Vedic *anyá-* ‘another, the other’ ...”; Fs. Beekes 1997, 111-18), forms of *anyá-* found initial in the pāda should be indefinite (‘another’) not definite as here, the *anyó-nyam* (“the one ... the other”) construction works differently.

III.33.4: The reference of the rivers switches from dual to plural here and remains so (save for two singulars in 10cd). There is no obvious reason for this change, though it may reflect the fact that when the two rivers merge into each other they form a third.

III.33.5: Ge renders voc. *ṛtāvarīḥ* as ‘ihr Immerfliessenden’ without comment. But this is simply the fem. stem to the possessive *ṛtāvan-* ‘possessing *ṛtā-*’, which he elsewhere tr. “gesetzestreuen” (e.g., I.160.1, III.54.4) et sim.

In 5c *avasyú-* ‘seeking help’ answers the question posed by the rivers in 4c *kiṇyú-* ‘seeking what?’ and in the same position in the vs.

III.33.6: In this vs. the rivers indirectly respond to Viśvāmitra’s command “Stop!” (*rāmadhvam*) in the previous vs. (5a), by asserting that they flow because of the efforts of and at the pleasure of the gods: Indra dug their channels and, by smashing Vṛtra, removed the barrier to their movement; Savitar led them and they flow at his impulsion. Without explicitly refusing Viśvāmitra’s request, they make it plain that they won’t comply by stopping.

The stem *prasavá-* ‘forward thrust, impulsion’ occurs here for the third time in this hymn (2a, 4c, 6d; see also 11c) and is here associated with its etymological divinity Savitar, the Impeller.

III.33.7: This is the central vs. of the hymn; in it Viśvāmitra practices the kind of praise poetry that the rivers will ask him to reproduce in perpetuity in vs. 8, couched in high formal style. In fact it can be seen as a variant of the opening of the great Indra hymn I.32.1: *índrasya nú vīryāṇi prá vocam, yāni cakāra* ... Here we have the gerundive *pravācyam* for *prá vocam*, *vīryām* matching *vīryāṇi*, *índrasya* as in I.32, and the nominalization *kárma* for the pf. *cakāra*. The serpent, the mace, and the signature verb  $\sqrt{han}$  are then found in the rest of b and in c, as they are in I.32.1. As Watkins points out (Dragon, 309), here the verb  $\sqrt{han}$  has been displaced from its standard formulaic role, with *áhim* as object, to an adjacent part of the myth. Watkins also points out (86 n. 2) that there is “a veritable constellation of inherited words and roots relating to poetry in this passage” (apropos vss. 7–8).

Note the etymological and phonetic figure *āyan* ... *āyanam* in d.

III.33.8: Though med. *juṣáte* overwhelmingly means ‘enjoy’, the addition of the preverb *práti* yields a transitive ‘favor in return’.

III.33.10: Although the two rivers refer to themselves collectively in the 1<sup>st</sup> pl. in ab, the second hemistich consists of two contrasting statements in the 1<sup>st</sup> sg., each presumably made by one of the rivers. This balanced contrast accounts for the accent on the 2<sup>nd</sup> verb *śaśvacáí*.

III.33.11: As in the immediately preceding hymn III.32.9–10, the poet here seems to be trying to express verbal nuances that are not coded systematically in the Vedic verbal system, in particular another variety of anteriority. Here the sequence of

moods is unusual: pres. optative in the subord. cl. (*saṃtāreyuḥ*), pres. subjunctive in the main cl. (*ārṣāt*). With the optative he seems to be aiming at a future perfect (“will/would have crossed”) whose prospective action precedes that of the main verb, namely the subjunctive referring to future time. Although I have not examined the entire RV with this in mind, these experiments in anteriority seem confined to -- or at least especially pronounced in -- the work of this poet. Note also that the poet makes no attempt to generate an opt. to the pf. *tatāra* or to use the already existing pf. opt. *tuturyā-* (RV 5x). This provides further evidence, if more were needed, against Dahl’s claim that the pf. opt. denotes “epistemic possibility and anterior aspect” (*Time, Tense and Aspect*, p. 402 and in general pp. 392-402). If this were a stable function of the pf. opt., surely Viśvāmitra would have availed himself of that formation.

The vs. reprises much of the vocabulary from earlier in the hymn: *iṣitā indrajūtaḥ* is an elaboration on *indreṣita-* in 2a; the oft-repeated *prasavā-* returns again in the expression *prasavāḥ sārgataḥ* repeated from 4c.

III.33.12: The prospective action expressed by the opt. *saṃtāreyuḥ* in 11a is announced as completed by the aor. *ātāriṣuḥ ... sām* ‘they have crossed’, and the poet urges the rivers to flow again with a sequence of imperatives, elaborating on the subj. *ārṣāt* in 11c.

III.33.13: Hoffmann (Injunk, 93 n. 184) thinks the first impv. is concessive: “Mag eure Welle an die śamyās schlagen, die Geschirre lasst frei” -- this may well be, but a little hard to tell given our lack of teamster texts.

### III.34 Indra

III.34.1: Gotō (1<sup>st</sup> class, 173–74) posits a separate root  $\sqrt{di}$  ‘destroy’ to account for 5 occurrences of *dāyate* ordinarily taken to mean ‘divide’ with the other occurrences of *dāyate*. (The forms in question are found in III.34.1, IV.7.10, VI.6.5, 22.9, and X.80.2.) He is followed by Lub and (at least in this passage and IV.7.10) WG. I see no reason to split the present into two and posit a second root; *vī dayate* ‘divide into pieces, fragment’ is simply another of the vivid images of destruction that RVic poets gloried in.

III.34.2: I have tr. the nominal phrase *asi ... pūrvayāvā*, which comes out rather stiffly in English (“you are the fore-traveler”), into a smoother verbal expression.

III.34.3: The first two pādas of this vs. are rhetorically parallel, consisting of an etymological figure of augmented verb plus some part of the object (*vṛtrām avṛṇot a, māyīnām amināt* b), ending with a bv. formed with *-nūti-* ‘leading, control’.

This interpr. of *vyāṃsa-* follows Schmidt (KZ 78 [1963]); see EWA s.v. *āṃsa-*.

In the second half-verse the subject takes an odd turn: after mention of Indra's iconic deed (besides the explicit mention of Vṛtra in a, see the echoes of the great Indra hymn I.32 in b *māyínām amināt* [I.32.4 *māyínām ámināḥ prótá māyāḥ*] and c *áhan vyàṃsam* [I.32.5 *áhan ... vyàṃsam*]), there is an abrupt switch to Agni phraseology. The same phrase *uśádthag váneṣu* “burning at will in the woods” (?) is used of Agni in the Agni hymn III.6.7; cf. also *uśádthag vánāni* also of Agni in the Agni hymn VII.7.2. The final pāda concerns the appearance of visible entities from the night, which also better fits an Agni context. For this reason I see a syntactic break in the middle of pāda c and take *uśádthag váneṣu* with d, contra the standard tr. On the curious and problematic word *uśádhak-* see Scar (197–99) at length.

On *dhénā-* ‘milk-stream’ see comm. ad I.2.3 and Schmidt (Gs. Nyberg). Schmidt there suggests that the referent in this pāda is the dawns emerging out of the dark of the night. This occurs of course at the same time as the kindling of the ritual fire and would account for the shift in diction to Agni phraseology. This image can then be secondarily applied to Indra bringing the dawn cows out of the nocturnal darkness of the Vala cave.

III.34.4: The phonetic echo of *uśádthag* (3c) in *uśígbbhiḥ* (4b) reinforces both the thematic connection between these two vss. -- Indra's production of light -- and the superimposition of Agni traits on Indra. As Schmidt (B+I 59) points out, the Uśij-priests, ordinarily associated with Agni, sometimes substitute for the Aṅgirasas in the Vala myth, but we should also note that it is esp. in Maṇḍala III that Agni is himself identified as an Uśij (III.2.4; 3.7,8; 11.2, 27.10); note also the Uśij-priests attending on him in III.2.9, 15.3.

III.34.5: The metaphorical use of *viveśa* ‘entered’ + an action (‘thrusts’) reminds me of the somewhat slangy English “get into” for “become enthusiastic about / energetically do (some action).”

The stem *barhánā-* otherwise only appears as an adverbial instr. ‘mightily’, and I am tempted to take it so here (as WG seem to do), rather than as the acc. pl. assumed in the publ. tr. However, the sandhi context is against this interpr.; note Old's tart “Gewiss nicht *barhánā* Adverb (Hiatus!).”

As Ge points out, the referent of fem. gen. pl. *āsām* must be *dhíyah* ‘insights’. For insights having bright color or hue, see the passages adduced by him (n. 5d): I.143.7 *śukrávarṇām dhíyam* and III.39.2, where *dhî-* wears silver garments. The *várṇam* here plays off *áryam várṇam* in 9d.

III.34.6: Another etymological figure appears in c: *vrjánena vrjinān* “... the bent ones [i.e., morally twisted or corrupt] with his band [i.e., his circle of helpers bent around him],” both derived from  $\sqrt{vrj}$  ‘twist’, though the semantic connection is somewhat less obvious than in the etymological figures in 3ab.

There is another, thematic connection between vss. 3 and 6. As there, Indra here achieves his victory first with his comrades (*śárdha-* 3a), then with his tricks (that is, by “out-tricking” [*amināt*] with his shape-shifting abilities, *várpa-* 3b). In

such cases his overwhelming strength might be almost superfluous -- hence my parenthetical “(though).” Note that *abhíbhūti-* (*abhí√bhū*) is a different lexical realization of *abhiṣṭi-* in 4b (if to *abhí√as*, as is the common opinion; cf. EWA s.v.).

III.34.8: The intense concentration on the root *√san* ‘win’ noted in the publ. intro. and the concomitant *s*-alliteration begins here.

III.34.9: The slightly awkward tr. “of many benefits” for *purubhójasam*, modifying the cow in d, is meant to capture its etymological relationship with *bhógam* in c.

The contrastive pairing of *dásyu-* and *ārya-* is striking here.

III.34.10: I do not see any semantic/functional difference between the imperfect *asanot* in a and b and the insistent pf. *sasāna* of vss. 8–9, though we might assume that the poet made the choice apurpose. Both Ge and Re render the forms in the same way (as do I); WG tr. *sasāna* as ‘er hat erlangt’ and *asanot* as ‘gewann’. Although I find the idea of rendering the two different grammatical forms differently appealing, I’m not sure that losing the root connection is worth it.

### III.35 Indra

III.35.1: The first pāda is somewhat oddly expressed: Indra is urged to mount the horses yoked to the chariot, but not only is horseback riding very rare in the RV, but no one is likely to mount a horse being used to pull a vehicle. This must be an awkwardly expanded version of the usual “mount the chariot” (see 4c below).

The *niyút-* ‘team’ is generally associated with, indeed belongs to, Vāyu, who is regularly called *niyútvant-* ‘possessing *niyúts*’. However, the word is sometimes used in a reciprocal value: just as Vāyu and Indra drive to us with their *niyúts*, so do our *niyúts*, the ‘teams’ of poetic thoughts, drive in return to the gods, in passages where *niyút-* is parallel to words for ‘thought, hymn’, etc. Cf., e.g., I.134.2, 135.2, VI.35.3, 47.14, VII.23.4, 90.1, X.26.1. It is therefore not nec., with Bloomfield (RVReps ad loc.) to assume that “*niyúto* is for *niyúdbhiḥ*.”

III.35.2: The most natural reading of *yáthā* in c is as a subordinator in a purpose clause (‘so that’) with the subjunctive *ā vahātaḥ* in d, and this is how the standard tr. take it. But there is a major stumbling block: the verb is unaccented. Old seems willing to emend to an accented verb; Ge suggests that if the unaccented verb is bothersome, assume an ellipsis in c. I have, in somewhat ad hoc fashion, taken *yáthā* as a sort of simile marker with *dravāt*. I am not entirely satisfied with this solution, but it does more or less fit category 4) in Gr’s lemma *yáthā*, and I am quite reluctant to put an unaccented verb into a subordinate clause. A similar phrase in the next hymn, where *yáthā* marks a localized comparison, gives support to the interpr. here; see III.36.6 *prasavāṇ yáthā* ‘like a shot’ (tr. similarly by all).

III.35.3: Medial *nayasva* is one of the relatively few middle forms to this pres. stem. It is presumably used here because Indra is leading his own horses.

The crux in this vs. is the hapax cmpd. *tapuṣpā-*. Gr glosses it ‘warmes trinkend’, perhaps referring to the gharma drink; in this he is tentatively fld by Mayrhofer (EWA s.v. *tāpuṣ-*). But this *-us-*stem, *tāpuṣ-*, refers only to heat, generally menacing scorching heat, and in any case the horses shouldn’t be drinking the gharma drink (or probably any hot drink at all). The word is discussed by Scar (305–6), who offers several possible interpr. The interpr. is made more difficult by the uncertain grammatical identity of the form. It appears in sandhi as *tapuṣpótém*, is taken by the Pp. as *tapuḥ’pā*, and is generally analyzed as a dual, modifying the bullish (horses) -- so Ge, Re, Scar, WG. However, Ge suggests in n. 3a that the form could represent irregular sandhi for *tapuṣpā(h) utá* (that is, a double application of sandhi, first losing the final *-s* before vowel and then coalescing the vowels) and therefore be a nom. sg., modifying Indra. I have adopted this solution; it doesn’t make much sense for the horses themselves to be doing the protecting, but Indra’s protective role would fit with the impv. *ava* ‘help’ in the next pāda.

In the last pāda Indra is urged to eat the roasted grains (*addhi dhānāḥ*). The same grains are prepared for the horses to eat in vs. 7: it seems somewhat surprising that Indra and his horses receive the same fodder, as it were -- though calling the horses Indra’s “comrades in joint revelry” in the next vs. (4b) suggests that they consume the offered meal together. I also don’t understand why the grains should be “of the same appearance every day.” This phrase is essentially repeated in III.52.8, which also contains 5 occurrences of *dhānā-* (or deriv.). Perhaps the point is that we unfailingly make the same offering to Indra daily; he needn’t worry that we will substitute inferior food.

III.35.4: The double etymological figure in pāda a is almost awkwardly heavy: *bráhmanā te brahmayújā yunajmi*, an awkwardness necessarily reflected in the tr.

III.35.7: All the clauses in this vs. are nominal sentences with past participle as predicate (*sīrṇám*, *sutāḥ* a, *kṛtāḥ* b, *rātāḥ* d). It is therefore misleading to tr. the last as “are given” (versus “has been strewn,” etc.) as in the publ. tr. I would change to “have been given.”

III.35.8: *prajānán vidvān* repeats 4d. The particular relevance of this phrase in either vs. isn’t clear to me.

III.35.9: Kü (477–80) discusses the stem *vāvaś-* at length, rejecting the usual connection with  $\sqrt{vaś}$  ‘desire, want’ and assigning it instead to  $\sqrt{vās}$  ‘bellow’. (WG follow this interpr. in our passage; Lub still assigns this form to  $\sqrt{vaś}$ .) Kü’s morphological arguments -- lack of *u*-redupl. and of root ablaut -- are strong. However, although I would concede that the form was derivationally original only to  $\sqrt{vās}$ , I would argue that once a stem *vāvaś-*, built to  $\sqrt{vās}$  ‘bellow’, became established, it was available to “migrate” to  $\sqrt{vaś}$  ‘desire’, especially because the



shortening of the root syllable in this metrically driven formation makes the form look more like  $\sqrt{vaś}$  than  $\sqrt{vāś}$ . Although the meanings of the two roots might seem so far apart that it would be hard to confuse one for the other, in fact the usual context of  $\sqrt{vāś}$  forms narrows the semantic gap considerably: cattle bellow because they want something.

III.35.10: The occurrence of 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. act. pres. impv. *pība* and aor. impv. *pāhi*, both to  $\sqrt{pā}$  ‘drink’, in a disjunctive *vā* construction should give us a good opportunity to discern the functional distinction between the imperatives to these two tense-aspect stems, esp. since, as far as I can see, both imperatives would fit either of the metrical slots occupied. I have in fact tr. as if there is a functional difference: ‘drink’ versus ‘take a drink’, but I am not at all convinced that this is correct. Cf. the disc. of the positional tendencies of *pība* ad III.32.1 and note that the same pāda opening *indra pība* is found in the next hymn, III.36.2d. However, the same sequence of pres. and aor. to  $\sqrt{pā}$  is found in III.36.3, so it may well be meaningful. (The standard tr. render *pība* and *pāhi* identically here.)

I take *prāyatam* in c with *yajñām* in d, contra the standard tr.

### III.36 Indra

III.36.1: I confess to being somewhat puzzled by the first half vs., beginning with the identity of the 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. subject. My assumption is that it is the priest setting out the offering for Indra, not Indra himself, who is the 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. subject in cd. Pāda b (“being united with help”) would then express the priest’s receiving of Indra’s help, though the expression seems a little odd. The only similar passage I can find is V.42.8 *tāvotībhiḥ śācamānāḥ* ... “being accompanied by your help,” of the ritual patrons. It might instead be possible to take b with cd, modifying Indra “being at one with his (own) help.” The dvandva *śāśvac-chaśvat* in b matching *suté-sute* in c might weakly support such an interpr. (contra the standard tr. as well as my publ. tr.). Unfortunately the pres. *yādate* is not well enough attested to allow us to determine its usual subjects; of its 5 occurrences, 3 involve rivers uniting with the sea (as in 7a in this hymn).

The other question in this half-verse is how exactly to construe *sātāye dhāḥ*. The standard tr. take *prābhṛtim* as the subj. of an active infinitive *sātāye* -- perhaps most clearly in Keydana (Infinitive, 317 n. 132) “Mach, dass diese Darbringung siege,” taking Indra as the subject of *dhāḥ* (contra my identification of the priest as subj.). But I doubt that the *prābhṛti*- itself is the agent of winning. My publ. tr. takes *sātāye* as a passive, with (perhaps) Indra the implied agent: the offering is to be won by him. This interpr. may be supported by 2c *prayamyāmānān prāti śū gr̥bhāya* “Grasp at (the drinks) being offered,” with *prā*  $\sqrt{yam}$  expressing the same notion as *prā*  $\sqrt{bhṛ}$  in 1a and Indra’s gaining control of them in both passages. It might also be possible that *sātāye* is not being used as a real infinitive, and the phrase should be tr. “set this offering here for (our) gain” -- that is, when Indra takes the offering set out by the priest, there will be general gain for all of us but neither the offering nor Indra

is the agent of an infinitival use of this dative. (This seems to be close to the WG interpr.)

III.36.2: *vidānāḥ* is another -- very clear -- example of a tense-stem participle serving as predicate. *Pace* Gr (fld. by Re) it most likely belongs to ‘know’ rather than ‘find’.

III.36.3: Both the pres. and the aor. stems of  $\sqrt{pā}$  ‘drink’ occur here, as in III.35.10. The situation is in fact even a bit more complex: as in III.35.10 both stems deploy imperatives here, *pība* opening pāda a, *pāhi* in d, but the latter is also in a complex diptych with the impf. *āpibaḥ* (“just as you drank [*āpibaḥ*] ..., so [take a] drink [*pāhi*] today ...”). As in III.35.10 I have translated as if there is still an aspectual difference between the two stems, but I am not certain this is the case.

III.36.4: Indra in pāda a is identified with a large drinking vessel, in this vs. that emphasizes his size and capacity.

The b pāda begins and ends with etymologically related words: *ugrām* (adj.) and *ójaḥ* (noun), though each is part of a different NP.

As Kü demonstrates (503–6), the pf. of  $\sqrt{vyac}$  is always presential.

III.36.5: The vs. begins with the two words that began the first two pādas of the last vs.: 4ab *mahāṁ* ..., *ugrām*; 5a *mahāṁ* *ugró*.

Ge (/WG, Scar [209]) take *samācakre* in b as transitive and supply ‘cows’ as object, from c. Although it is true that the middle pf. of  $\sqrt{kr}$  is generally transitive, in this context, parallel to intrans. *vāvṛdhe* in pāda a, a nonce passive value can be imagined. In fact see (in this same maṇḍala) III.1.8 *vṛṣā yātra vāvṛdhé kāvyena* “where the bull has grown strong through our poetic craft,” of which this pāda seems to be a variant, with the *vāvṛdhe* there anticipated in our previous pāda. Cf. Re “il s’est empli ... de pouvoir-poétique,” also intransitive. (Ge suggests this possibility in his n. 5b.)

Scar (209–10) makes heavier weather of *vājadā(h)* then seems necessary. He points out that the cows shouldn’t be giving prizes, which is logically true enough, but surely the point is that Indra is so generous that even the prizes he gives, the cows, give prizes of their own (the trickle-down gift economy). Their gifts are presumably, on the one hand, milk products and, on the other, new calves.

III.36.6–8: The next three vss. ring changes on the theme of large bodies of water and large containers of soma.

III.36.6: On *prasavām yāthā* see disc. of *dravād yāthā* ad III.35.2.

In b the problem is the simile *rathyēva* -- more precisely what the nominal in that sequence represents. The Pp. resolves it, not surprisingly, as *rathyā*. Gr takes this as an instr. to *rathī*- ‘charioteer’; Ge also takes it as an instr. but to a stem *rathyā*- ‘Fahrstrasse’ (see Old, ZDMG 61 [1907] 831–32 = Kl.Sch.262–63). Old himself (so apparently also Re) favors a nom. pl. *rathyāḥ* with double application of sandhi. This

is possible (see similar possible situation in III.35.3), but I wonder if it does not reflect the du. *rathyā* it appears to be. This hemistich reads like a brief reprise of Viśvāmitra and the rivers (III.33). For one thing, the past tenses (impf. *áyan* a, pf. *jagmuḥ* b) don't make much sense if the point of the half-vs. is simply to serve as the standard of comparison for Indra's width (pāda c), whereas the past tense does work in a brief re-narration of the situation in III.33. The word *prasavá-* here also echoes III.33, which contains 4 occurrences of that stem. And III.33.2 contains an undoubted example of the dual *rathyā* also marked as a simile in a similar context: *áchā samudráṃ rathyēva yāthaḥ* "you two drive like two charioteers to the sea," referring to the two rivers, the Vipāś and the Śutudrī. The mixture of numbers, with pl. rivers in the frame and du. charioteers in the simile, is not surprising; even in III.33 the dual reference to these rivers soon gives way to plural. This mythic snatch having been told, the sea, so filled, is available to be compared, unfavorably, to Indra. Kü (77, 156, fld. by WG) also takes it as du, but as referring to two chariot horses.

III.36.7: The standard tr. take pāda a as a simile, with the rivers *compared* to the priests of cd. I instead take the rivers as referring to the soma-purifying waters and consider b the predicate to a, with the pres. part. *bhárantaḥ* substituting for the main verb. At least in the transmitted text their simile would be unmarked, though most interpreters manipulate the text to produce a marker. Bl (RRs ad loc., referring to an earlier art. of his) suggests emending to *samudré ná* as in the otherwise identical pāda VI.19.5, a suggestion seemingly endorsed by Old and fld. by WG. However, the instr. *ūtíbhīḥ* with *yādamānaḥ* in 1b supports the instr. reading of *samudréṇa* here, and in 4 of its 5 occurrences *yādamāna-* is construed with an instr. This suggests that VI.19.5 has altered the formula, rather than vice versa. Ge follows a different path to a simile marker, haplology of *samudréṇa \*ná*. Since the text makes sense as is, I see no reason to change it.

The verse contains two parallel morphological word-plays: *bhárantaḥ* ... *bharítraiḥ* and *punanti* ... *pavítraiḥ*, each containing a neuter *-tra-* instrument noun. The latter, *pavíttra-* lit. 'instrument for purifying', is of course very well attested in the RV, referring to the soma-purifying filters, but *bharíttra-* is a hapax, obviously generated to match *pavíttra-*, including the *-i-*liaison vowel appropriate only to the set root  $\sqrt{pū}$ , not to anit  $\sqrt{bhr}$ . It is tr. 'arm' by all (going back to the Naigh.), but milking with the arms doesn't make sense in either life or metaphor. I think it means rather 'hand' and participates in a different word-play within its pāda: an 'instrument for carrying' can easily be a hand, and so it is synonymous with *hásta-* 'hand' found in the immediately preceding word *hastín-* 'hand-ed'. There is a further implied verbal twist, at least with my interpr. of ab: the rivers don't have hands but carry anyway, while the priests do have hands but use their carrying appendages for something else. I'm afraid the publ. tr. needed to be quite heavy-handed to convey the deftness of this little play.

III.36.8: On *kukṣí-* as 'cheek', not 'belly', see Jamison 1987 (Ged. Cowgill).

As Ge also comments, the chronological sequence of pāda d seems reversed, assuming (as I generally do) that the perfect participle regularly expresses anteriority: Indra drank the soma before smashing Vṛtra. The primary VP here, *avṛṇīta sómam* is found in the great Indra hymn I.32.3, but with a different opening (*vṛṣāyámāṇaḥ*).

III.36.9: Most tr. take Indra as the implied obj. of *mākiḥ ... pári ṣṭhāt*, thus displacing *etát* into an adverbial role (Ge/WG ‘dabei’). This is possible, but I take it as anticipating *dátram* in c.

On the form of *dátra*- see comm. ad IV.17.6.

III.36.9–10: Note that the vocabulary of the beginning of the hymn is being turned around reciprocally at the end: *bhara* (9a) and *prá yandhi* (9d, 10a) are imperatives addressed to Indra, urging him to bring/offer things to us, whereas in 1a *prábhṛtim* (at least in my interpr.) and 2c *prayamyámānān* the same lexical expressions refer to things we offer to Indra. Other ring compositional echoes are the *dhāḥ* + datival infinitive (1a *sātāye dhāḥ* and 10c *jīvāse dhāḥ*) and the stem *śásvat*- (1b, 10d).

### III.37 Indra

I have endeavored to preserve in tr. the consistent position of *índra*- in each vs., for which see the publ. intro. Other elements have had to be juggled; as is often the case, it is harder to honor the half-verse division in Gāyatrī than in trimeter.

III.37.3–4: As Ge also suggests, Indra’s names (*nāmāni*) in vs. 3 form a complementary pair with his hundred *dhāman*- ‘forms, embodiments’ in 4.

III.37.5: Given *vājeṣu* beginning vs. 6, *vājasātaye* would have better been tr. “to win prizes.”

III.37.6: And here a plural “when the prizes (are set)” would be more accurate.

III.37.7: The vs. contains 5 locatives, 4 of them plural, and so the issue -- though not a particularly pressing one -- is to sort out what goes with what. I have taken them pāda by pāda. Different tr. distribute them slightly differently.

III.37.9: On the *indriyāṇi* dispersed among the five peoples, see Proferes (2007: 65).

III.37.10: Note the alliteration in pāda b: *dyumnám dadhiṣva duṣṭáram*.

The root  $\sqrt{tṛ}$  contributes two forms here: *duṣṭáram* (b) and *úd ... tirāmasi*. It is difficult to convey their root connection in Engl.

### III.38 Indra

In addition to the usual tr., it is worth consulting Re’s alternative tr. in his *Hymnes spéculatifs* (29–31 + nn.), in addition to his later one in EVP XVII.

My interpr. both in detail and in overall outline differs significantly from others, but it is internally consistent and attempts to fit the many puzzling details into an overall schema. That this sometimes requires making interpretive leaps is a price I'm willing to pay. I lay out and support my choices in the comments on individual vss., though I do not chart every deviation from the various other tr. and defend them against those tr.

III.38.1: The 1<sup>st</sup> sg. pf. *dīdhayā* is taken by all as a straight indicative; the Pp. reads *dīdhaya* with short final vowel. My tr. "I ponder" reflects this analysis (Kü [257–60] having demonstrated that the indic. pf. of this root is always presential). However, I now wonder if this form could be a subjunctive with the unextended 1<sup>st</sup> sg. subj. ending *-ā*. Although lengthened forms of the indic. pf. ending *-a* do exist (e.g., *védā* 9x), they are relatively uncommon. And a subjunctive "I shall ponder ..." would open this speculative hymn nicely.

The standard tr. take *priyāṇi* ... *pārāṇi* as coreferential (e.g., Old "die fernsten, lieben (Dinge, Ereignisse)"). I prefer to take the two as contrastive, the nearby familiar things dear to the poet and far-away matters almost beyond his ken -- with the intensive (i.e., frequentative) part. *mārmṛśat* conveying the restless activity of his mind. Realizing that he needs the steadying hand of poetic tradition to help control his racing but fertile thoughts, in d he expresses his desire for poets belonging to that tradition to give a full account of what he is seeing -- though he does not deny that he himself has wisdom.

III.38.2: As I see the movement of the verse, in pāda a the poet sets himself to question the older generations of poets about their creative activity. Pāda b concerns this activity in the past and identifies *mānas-* 'mind' as the foundation ( $\sqrt{dhr}$ ) for the creative act. (I might now alter the tr. to make this clearer, to "making their minds the foundation.") In cd we turn to the present time and to the poet (*te*) (who addressed himself in a); the *prañī-* in c (on which see further below) are the products or models derived from the creative activity in b. In d it is made clear that these precedents, actively sought by the current poet's mind, rest on the *dhárman-* 'foundation' not only of the mental activity of the former poets but also of his own mind.

The first technical issue in this vs. is whether *pr̥cha* + ACC. here means "ask X" or "ask about X" (in German terms "fragen" vs. "fragen nach"); both uses of the accusative are possible with  $\sqrt{pr̥ch}$ . Related to this question is what *jānimā* means in this context: 'births', 'generations', 'races'? With Ge and Klein (DGRV I.453–54), I take *jānimā kavīnām* to be the personages addressed, not (with Old, Re, Hoffmann [Inj. 225], Scar [276, 288], WG) the topic of the question. The poet is widening his range of interlocutors from the current poets (1d) to the long series of generations, back to the poets who themselves participated in the creation (2b).

With all modern tr./comm, I take *takṣata* as a med. 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. middle to the athematic present to  $\sqrt{takṣ}$ , rather than a 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. act. of the thematic stem, as Gr classifies it. I have added the self-beneficial "for themselves" to the tr. because,

though the root  $\sqrt{takṣ}$  is abundantly attested, this appears to be the only middle form in the RV. In keeping with my larger interpr. of the hymn as concerning two creations, the second of which was the product of poets conjuring up the differentiated cosmos by their verbal powers, I think the medial *takṣata* here signals the intimate engagement of the poets in the act of creation and the interpenetration of the things created and the creators themselves. Note also that our current poet lays some claim to this primal act by calling himself in 1a a *táṣṭar-* ‘craftsman, fashioner’, the agent noun to the root  $\sqrt{takṣ}$ , which supplies the verb of creation in 2b.

The root-noun cmpd. *prañt-* is found only here in the RV, but the lexeme *prá*  $\sqrt{nī}$ , lit. ‘lead forth’, is very common as a verb form and in other cmpds. The word here has received a not particularly instructive variety of renderings, which I will not repeat. I think it means ‘precedent’ -- that is, the work of creation engaged in by the kavis of old provides the model for the current poet. This seems a reasonable semantic extension of ‘leading forth’. The precedents keep “growing stronger / increasing” both because the elements of creation keep proliferating and because the current poet becomes more familiar with them and adept at employing them.

In the last pāda these precedents that the poet has sought with his mind take up their position in his mind, ready to serve for his own creative endeavors. The older generations of poets were called “firm in mind, holding their minds firm” (or, see above, “making their minds the foundation”)(*manodhṛt-*) in b; it is fitting that their models, which he “sought with his mind” (*mānovāta-*), should now in turn take up their position on his own mind’s support (*dhármaṇi*). On the basis of the cmpd. *manodhṛt-* in b I supply ‘mind’ as the possessor of *dhárman-*. Most tr. (Ge, Re [twice], Hoffmann [Inj. 225], Klein DGRV I.453-54) interpr. the loc. *dhármaṇi* as a rather vague adverbial (Ge, Hoff “in rechter Weise,” sim. Klein). I think it needs to be interpr. in full locative sense; Scar (276) and WG in separate ways do give it a locative interpr. but their tr. do not reflect its connection with *manodhṛt-* in b.

III.38.3: Before addressing the question of what pādas a and b have to do with each other thematically, we must first consider the small technical issue of the placement of *utá* at the beginning of pāda b. Since pāda a contains a participle (*dádhanāḥ*) and pāda b a main verb (*sám añjan*), it is unlikely that *utá* is conjoining the two pādas. Instead, with Klein (DGRV I.396–97), I think it is probably conjoining this hemistich with the preceding vs., with *utá* displaced to the beginning of pāda b after the participial phrase in a. This is very reminiscent of III.31.21, in this same Indra series, where the same explanation accounts for a rightward displacement of *ca* into the beginning of the second pāda of the clause.

As indicated in the publ. intro., I think this vs. describes the role of the poets in the second creation. It fleshes out the laconic *takṣata dyām* “They crafted heaven” in 2b. But what are they depositing in pāda a, and why? The first question can be restated as -- what should be supplied with *gúhyā*? The most common nouns appearing with that adjective are *nāman-* ‘name’ and *padá-* ‘traces, track’; either of these could work here because both can be used of the esoteric verbal production of the poets. “Secret names” would refer to the act of creation that involves dividing

and naming the inchoate mass of material pre-creation; “secret traces” would refer to the esoteric poetry more generally. Here they seem to have pooled and deployed these secret elements, to use in their poetic ornamentation -- that is, in their detailed elaboration -- of the originally undifferentiated matter of the two worlds. Note that the participle is middle: it is their own names/traces that are in play.

In both Hymnes spéc. (1956) and EVP XVII (1969) Re tr. *sám añjan* as “ont consacré,” as an allusion to royal unction. The dat. *kṣatrāya* ‘for dominion’ makes this a tempting idea, though *sám √añj* is not a standard technical term in the royal consecration. I certainly think this is a secondary meaning of this pāda, but in keeping with the rest of the hymn, I think the primary meaning must be creation through poetic elaboration. Since royal consecration does in fact make the person in question a new entity, the king, it can be conceptualized as a creation as well.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> half-verse is more clearly concerned with creation. The root *√mā* ‘measure’ is of course regularly used in this connection, and as I said in the publ. intro. the separation of the two worlds in d is a standard cosmogonic image. Ge’s interpr. of c is rather aberrant and in part dependent on a passage in the PB, and his interpr. has not become the standard. Because of the accent on *mamiré*, I have supplied ‘when’ with the first half of pāda c, though the accent may simply result from the adjacency of the two verbs *mamiré* and *yemúh*.

The verb in d, *antáh ... dhuḥ*, is not a standard expression for ‘separate’ and in fact might be expected to mean ‘place between’. WG tr. in that way, supplying “Luftraum” (*antárikṣa*-): “Zwischen die beiden ... (Welten) setzten sie (den Luftraum) ...” This is a clever solution and it may be the original sense of the lexeme, which, however, I believe has evolved to mean, without an object, ‘place apart’, that is, separate by putting something in between.

I take *dhāyase* as belonging to *√dhā* ‘suckle, nourish’, like the rest of the occurrences of this -as-stem. Re (EVP), Kü (395), and WG all follow this root assignment, but Ge and Re (Hymnes spéc.) take it to *√dhā* ‘place’: “damit sie (die Herrschaft) ausüben” and “pour qu’ils se tiennent stables,” respectively. The separation of the two worlds is often presented as a boon for humans, so the ‘nourish’ interpr. seems more fitting, and the usual analysis of *dhāyas*- supports it.

III.38.4: As noted in the publ. intro., I believe that this vs. turns to the first creation, before the poets’ intervention that was presented in vss. 2–3. It is appropriate that the entities described here are unidentified, for this is the time before the poets brought their verbal skills to bear. The central figure in this vs. is introduced merely by an acc. participle (*ātīṣṭhantam* ‘mounting’). The form makes it clear that the referent is masculine and singular, but no other information is given; there is not even a pronoun. Likewise the subj. of the verb *pāri ... abhūṣan* ‘they tended’ is given only as *vísve* ‘all’. Again we know the gender (masc.) and the number (pl.), but not the identity: poets (from vs. 2)? gods (the frequent default referent of *vísve*)? Rather than suggesting referents for these two entities as the standard tr. do, I think we should accept that the lack of referential clues is deliberate.

Certainly it continues through the verse, though some details accumulate. In b the ‘mounting’ entity of pāda a is now presumably the subject. He wears beauties (*śríyo vásānah*) and is self-luminous (*svárociḥ*); these descriptions begin to narrow the field, but not enough. (The only other occurrence of *svároci-* modifies the Maruts, who are not likely to be in question here. And a number of different gods acquire *śrī-*.) In c he is identified as both a bull (or bullish one, *vṛṣan-*) and a lord (*ásura-*), neither particularly diagnostic, and the pāda claims to provide us with his “great name” (*mahát ... nāma*). Indeed d seems at first to give us that name: *viśvārūpaḥ*. But the joke is on us, for not only is *viśvārūpa-* not a name but an epithet, but its literal meaning tells us that the lack of a single identifiable referent in this verse is the point. The word means “having all forms,” and so the entity we’ve been chasing through the vs. is in fact protean and cannot be pinned down to a single identity. He/it is creation before differentiation. (For a similar figure in a similarly mystical hymn in this maṇḍala, see III.56.3, where the androgynous figure is also called both a bull and *viśvārūpa*.)

The final pāda forms a tight ring with the first, in that the verb *ā√sthā* returns, and this time we get some indication of what he is mounting. But even this further specification falls short: it is simply *amṛtāni*, a neut. pl. adjective with multiple possible referents. This repetition makes the unfolding creation seem somewhat circular, but also incremental, in that new details accumulate, if slowly. But what seems to me an important clue has generally been ignored in the standard interpr. I find it impossible to believe that the repetition of *ā√sthā* was not deliberate, but all the standard tr. (save in part for Re, Hymnes spéc, though he fell in line in EVP) render the two occurrences quite differently: the first literally (‘mount’), but the second with the idiomatic meaning ‘assume’, with Ge and WG supplying ‘names’ with the adj. ‘immortal’ (Ge “... hat er unsterbliche (Namen) angenommen”). There are two obvious things wrong with this interpr: 1) the lexeme *ā√sthā* is extremely common and I know of no passage where it means ‘assume’; 2) translating it thus completely ignores the intra-vs. repetition, which at least to me is extraordinarily salient: the first word of the vs. is *ātiṣṭhantam*, the last *tasthau*. I therefore assume that the pf. in d also means ‘mount’ and that the referent of the pl. ‘immortal’ is deliberately unspecified, but is something one could stand on -- in this case probably ‘worlds’ or some kind of solid ‘things’. Cf. VIII.52.7 (Vālakh.) *ā tasthāv amṛtaṃ diví* “[it] has mounted to the immortal (world?) in heaven” and (with *adhí√sthā*) I.35.6 *amṛtādhi tasthuḥ* “they have taken their place on his immortal (foundations?).” The specification of a place to stand on enlarges the cosmic picture. Consider also 9c below with *tasthúṣo vírūpā* “of him surmounting the various forms,” with *√sthā* and *-rūpa-*.

III.38.5: The unidentified creature in vs. 4, finally identified as a bull or as bullish (*vṛṣan-* 4c), returns in this vs., with a slightly different ‘bull’ designation (*vṛṣabhá-*). Here it is depicted as androgynous: though masc. in gender and called a bull, it gives birth (*ásūta*). Androgyny is a powerful signal of the lack of differentiation I have



been discussing, since perhaps the fundamental, universal binary contrast is male : female.

The bull's act of birth results in the desired differentiation that characterizes creation. This is expressed both by 'many' (*pūrvīh*) in b and, indirectly, by the address to the two sons of heaven (*dīvo napātā*) in cd. These two then seem to establish control over what has been created in the earliest time (*pradīvaḥ* 'from olden days') and therefore implicitly preside over time.

I would now be inclined to interpr. pāda b as an expression of possession, "His are these many proliferating riches." Cf. VI.3.3, also IV.23.8. However, the context is not definitive.

I interpr. and construe *vidáthasya* in c differently from most, who take it with *dhībhiḥ*, with the interpr. further complicated by variant renderings of *vidátha-* (Ge "im Geiste der Weisheit"; Re [EVP] "grâce aux visions-poétiques de la cérémonie"; WG "mit den Einsichten der (Beute-)Verteilung"). None of these makes a lot of sense to me, and therefore, despite the adjacency of *vidáthasya* and *dhībhiḥ*, I construe the former instead with *kṣatrám* "dominion of/over the (cosmic) division." On this sense of *vidátha-* see comm. ad VIII.39.1: though the word generally refers to the ceremonial distribution of wealth and then to the ceremony where this happens, it can also refer to other types of division, including the parts of the cosmos. It may be somewhat more daring to assume that *kṣatrá-* can take a genitive of what is ruled over -- I do not now have parallels -- but keep in mind that the root  $\sqrt{kṣā}$  from which *kṣatrá-* is derived regularly takes such a genitive. If my interpr. is correct, the *vidátha-* refers to the cosmic divisions produced by the 1<sup>st</sup> creation.

As noted in the publ. intro., a number of referents have been suggested for the two sons of heaven, and as I also said there, I think this is missing the point. We remain in the realm of the 1<sup>st</sup> creation where entities may begin to proliferate but they are still not named. I suggested there that the two may be the two world halves (note that *kṣatrá-* was associated with them in vs. 3b and see 8c below), but it is also quite possible that the focus should be on the "two," not on who exactly the two are: the first splitting of the primal unity.

III.38.6: The first half of vs. 6 simply expands on vs. 5. The same two kings have as their sphere of activity an increasing number ("three, many, all" *trīṇi ... purūṇi ... víśvāni*) of "seats," that is (in my opinion), separated places, in the cosmic division (*vidáthe*) also repeated from vs. 5. Note that the same verb *pári*  $\sqrt{bhūṣ}$  'tend to' returns from 4a, where 'all' was the subject, not the object as here.

In the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich the poet, who has been absent since vs. 2, returns, with his mind (*mānasā*), and sees the whole of creation in detail (or so I surmise), down to the wind-haired Gandharvas -- all subject to the commandment of the two kings.

III.38.7: This vs. summarizes both creations. The first is dealt with glancingly in the first pāda. I take the neut. prn. *tád* 'this' as a reference to the not-yet-differentiated proto-creation, which belonged to and arose from the androgynous bovine of 5a, here explicitly identified first as masculine (*asya*: since this pronoun is unaccented, it does

not modify what follows but functions as an autonomous pronoun), then as both bull (*vr̥ṣabhāsya*, as in 5a) and milk-cow (*dhenóḥ*). This is the first appearance of any explicit feminine principle in this hymn.

The rest of the vs. concerns the second creation, with the original unitary *tád* divided and fitted out with names and forms. Note the return of the creation verb  $\sqrt{mā}$  ‘measure’, with *ā ... mamire* (b) and *ní ... mamire* (d) echoing *sám ... mamire* in 3c. The curious phrase *sákmyaṃ góḥ* has caused some puzzlement among interpr. Although by formation the hapax *sákmya-* appears to be a neut. abstract derived from  $\sqrt{sac}$  ‘accompany’, the standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG) take the phrase as the equivalent of an animate creature, remarking that the companion of the cow must be the bull. But this not only ignores the abstract nature of *sákmya-* but also assumes that *góḥ* here refers narrowly to a female bovine, though the stem is regularly used as a cover term for bovines of both sexes. I take the phrase as meaning “the fellowship of the cow” (or better, though more awkwardly, “the fellowship of the bovine”) as a poetic description of what was depicted in pāda a, the joint activity of the bull-and-cow and its product. This undifferentiated creation is then measured out into individual parts and equipped with names. The subject of *ā ... mamire* in b is not identified, but I assume it is the same *māyínah* as the subject of *ní ... mamire* in d, whom I take to be the age-old poets we met in vss. 2–3.

Just as pāda b refers to the individual names, so does d refer to forms: the classical pairing of name-and-form (*nāmarūpa*) is thus distributed across the vs., as Ge already pointed out (n. 7b). I take *asmin* here as referring to the creation (it), rather than to a putative ‘him’ (as most tr. do). In the course of their creative activity the poets assume various powers (pāda c) to enable their individualizing work.

III.38.8: As was indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. is in certain ways a rephrasing of vs. 7, but updated, as it were, to the present day. The vs. begins exactly as vs. 7 did: *tád ín nv āsya*, followed by a genitive specifying the identity of the *asya* (*vr̥ṣabhāsya* 7a, *savitúḥ* 8a), a signal that vs. 8 is a second version of the immediately preceding vs. Hence, by my interpr., *savitár-* is the equivalent of the original creator, the bull-cow of 5a and 7a. I therefore do not think that this refers to the god Savitar, but is rather to be taken in its literal sense as “the impeller.” Or rather, since b = VII.38.1b (a Savitar vs.), the poet is identifying Savitar in his most generic sense with the Ur-creator, the one who “set in motion / impelled” the creation.

The poet disclaims any part in that original creation (*nákir me*), and the firmly fixed golden emblem of b seems to me to represent the static, undifferentiated result of the first creation. It reminds us of the *hiraṇyagarbha* of X.121, another image of undifferentiated creation.

But in cd (at least in my view -- the interpretations vary quite a lot) the poet identifies himself with the poets of old (of 7bcd). In c most tr. supply a verb, with the *ródasī* phrase as its object. I think, by contrast, that this is a nominal sentence with *ródasī* as subject. The two world-halves are credited with a role in the second creation, the same role they may play in 5cd (see comm. there): they set everything in motion. But they do so through the stimulus of a *sus̥tutí-*, a ‘good praise-hymn’,

and I take this praise-hymn to be the product of the 1<sup>st</sup> ps. poet, who disavowed a role in the first creation in 8a, but takes credit for contributing to the second creation in 8c.

The puzzling pāda to me is d, and my publ. tr. is opaque even to me. I have now rethought it and will propose here a modified tr. and interpr. First, I suggest returning to Gr's grammatical analysis of *vavre* as a 1<sup>st</sup> sg., not a 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. (as all subsequent tr. have taken it, incl. my publ. tr.). I take the pāda now as the current poet's boast, asserting his place in the poetic lineage. The lexeme *ápi √vr̥* means 'swaddle, cover over', as the simile of the woman and her children (one reading of *jānimāni* here) makes clear. But such a meaning can both be protective and somewhat arrogant or threatening. To understand the sense of the frame here, we need to go back to 2a, where the tremulous poet asked the previous generations (*jānimā*) of poets about their creative acts. I think these same poetic generations are what's referred to here, but here our newly confident poet "covers" them -- on the one hand, in a protective sense, like the young woman swaddling her children. He protects their legacy by continuing it. But 'cover over' can also mean 'conceal', and in this sense the poet boasts that he will (or has?) become more skilled than they and cover up their achievements with his own. I would therefore retranslate the pāda as "I have covered over / swaddled the (poetic) generations like a young woman her children."

III.38.9: As discussed in the publ. intro., I take this vs. as showing both contributors to the second creation -- the two (world-halves) from 8c and the masters of artifice (*mayínah̥*) from 7d -- bearing witness to our poet's new skill. In the first half of the verse the two (world-halves) begin by bringing to success the first creation of "the age-old great one" (*pratnásya ... maháh̥*). I supply the equivalent of *tád* in pāda a, picked up by *yád* at the end of the pāda and further specified by *daívī svastíh̥* beginning b. The standard tr. instead take a and b as separate clauses, with *daívī svastíh̥* somewhat loosely construed with b.

In c the sequence *gopājihvasya* is variously interpr. Ge (/WG), Re (Hymnes spéc.), and at least partially Old read it as two words, the first nom. *gopā*, the 2<sup>nd</sup> emended to *jīvásya* (Ge, WG) or *jagatas* (Re; he gives no accent, but it should be *jágatas*) -- attaching pāda c to b and taking d as a separate clause. I see no reason in this case to go against the Pp, which considers the form a cmpd, much less to emend the text so severely. Instead I take the two apparent genitives in c (*gopājihvasya tasthúṣah̥*) as referring to the current poet: he boasts that his tongue is a herdsman -- that is, it marshalls words -- and that he surmounts the various forms (*vírūpā*) -- that is, he has (verbal) control over the differentiated forms of the second creation. The poet has achieved his vocation. For the tongue, see vs. 3 of the following hymn (III.39.3b), where the poem, the hymnic vision, "mounts the tip of (the poet's) tongue." A form of the root *√sthā* is also found in the same pāda.

### III.39 Indra

Though nowhere near as obscure as the previous hymn, the first three vss. of this one also portray poetic craft and, especially, poetic inspiration.

Morphological parallelism and lexical repetitions dominate the rest of the hymn.

III.39.1:  $\sqrt{vañc}$  means ‘move crookedly, meander’, but encompasses a number of different types of such motion, including circular or wave-like motion. Here I think it refers, rather charmingly, to a bending, curling movement made in order to come out of a small opening. (English ‘scrunch’ might be accurate, but is also inelegant.) The poet’s heart is thus configured as a smallish container from which his thought must gracefully exit -- a characteristically female gesture perhaps. I very much doubt that she is galloping, à la WG.

The publ. tr. should be altered to “when being recited” to reflect the present participle and to match the identical phrase in 2b.

III.39.2: Ge (/WG), Scar (142) take *divāḥ* as temporal (“noch vor Tag geboren”). This is possible and would fit with the *jāgrviḥ* ‘wakeful’ and, perhaps, with the silvery garments of c (if they refer to dawn). Nonetheless, with Re (see also Ge’s n. 2a, where he suggests that the spatial interpr. is better), I take it as spatial “from heaven.” The vs. contrasts the immediate presence of the *dhī* (*séyām asmé* “this one right here in us”) with her origin as a product of age-old divine and ancestral inspiration (*sanajā pītryā*), and *divás cid ... pūrvyā* seems to me to participate in this balanced contrast.

III.39.3: The first pāda of this vs. is a definitional truism: the cmpd. serving as subject, *yama-sūḥ* ‘twin-bearing’, is split into its component parts in the VP, *yamā ... asūta* ‘bore twins’. The question is who are the twins. Given the context, I find Old’s suggestion (fld. by Re) that this is a metaphor for speech production and that the twins are, perhaps, the verse (*ṛc-*) and *sāman* more plausible than Ge’s interpr. (flg. Sāy.) that the twins are the Aśvins and the birth-giver is Uṣas. I take the mother to be the *dhī-* who was the subject of the previous vs.; note that *dhīḥ* is the last word of vs. 2.

Since I take the same noun to be subject of b, *pátat* emerges as a problem, since it is presumably a neut. nom./acc. act. participle but qualifies the action of the proposed fem. subj. Given the tendency for neut. NA forms to be used adverbially, I so interpr. it here (as Re also seems to: “en volant”), rather than (with Ge [/WG]) introducing neut. *mānaḥ* ‘mind’ here for it to modify.

This hemistich echoes some of the vocabulary and themes found in the previous hymn. *asūta* in pāda a matches *ásūta* in III.38.5a, and note that the apparent product of this birth is also a dual in III.38.5c. As noted ad III.38.9c, both the tongue and the mounting in that pāda are found in our 3b. I do not think the same events and entities are referred to in these passages, but they do seem to have a similar view of the relation between poetic speech and creation.

The standard tr. interpr. c as meaning that the pair just born associate with some kind of generic beauty (Ge “Schönheit,” Re “les formes-de-la-beauté”), but *vápūṃṣi* are esp. associated with Agni in Maṇḍala III, where he assumes or bears

these wondrous forms (cf., e.g., III.1.8, 18.5, 55.9, 57.3; though admittedly he is not the only entity that has such forms). I think the *vápūṃṣi* of Agni are at issue here, and the pair -- verse and *sāman* -- accompany them as the ritual speech being recited when the ritual fire is blazing.

Unfortunately the verse-and-*sāman* interpr. does not fit as well in pāda d, where we might wish the dual “smashers of darkness” to be endowed with light one way or another. The only other occurrence of this stem modifies Agni, and Agni is several times subj. of the phrase *támaḥ √han* (V.14.4, VIII.43.34). This phrase once has a dual subj. (VI.72.1 *viśvā támāṃsy ahatam*), but the subj. there is Indra and Soma, whom we surely do not want to introduce here. It is worth noting that the *Aśvins*, the subjects here acdg. to Ge et al., are not found as subj. of this expression. Since I think there is good support for the verse-and-*sāman* interpr. in the rest of the vs., I would argue that these forms of ritual speech are called smashers of darkness because of their role in the dawn sacrifice.

III.39.4: The next part of the hymn seems driven by the rhetoric of morphology, both parallelisms and contrasts. In this vs. note the heavy *-i/anā-vant-* forms *māhināvān* and *daṃśánāvān* stationed at the end of successive pādas (c, d), which are followed by *dákṣiṇāvān* at the end of 6d and the neut. *barhánāvāt* at the end of 8d.

Pādas a and c contain what appear to be matching sequences that conceal morphological differences:

#(*nákir*) *eṣām ninditā* ...

#(*índra*) *eṣām dṛṃhitā* ...

The two *-itā* forms are respectively an agent noun (*ninditā*) and a neut. pl. ppl. (*dṛṃhitā*), though the two *eṣām* have the same grammatical identity and referent and the first word in each pāda is the subject.

III.39.5: The interweaving of lexicon and morphology continues in this vs. Pāda a contains two forms of the same stem: *sákhā* ... *sákhībhiḥ*, and the instr. pl. is found four more times in the vs. (adjacent *návagvaiḥ*, b *sátvabhiḥ*, c *dasábhīr dásagvaiḥ* the last pair with their own etymological play). Pāda-final *dásagvaiḥ* also parallels *návagvaiḥ* ending pāda a, and *sátvabhiḥ* of b is more subtly connected with *satyám* beginning c.

On *abhijñú-* see Scar (344–45).

III.39.6: The 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich has intensely alliterative (partially) etymological figures: *gúhā hitám gúhyaṃ gūlhám apsú, háste dadhe dákṣiṇe dákṣiṇāvān*. The first half is more restrained but note the morphological pair *padvát* ... *śaphávat* and the repetition of *viveda* from 5d.

The phrase *náme goḥ* is puzzling; Ge refuses to tr. *náme*. Old suggests ‘Sichneigen’, which is essentially literal and not very helpful; Re ‘domaine’, which makes sense but is not clearly related to its supposed etymon; WG “beim Zuteilen der Kuh,” also without accounting for the semantic development (or assuming a derivation from the separate PIE root *\*nem*, as in Greek νέμω ‘distribute’?). Like

Old I also take it literally, as the loc. sg. of a thematic noun to  $\sqrt{nam}$  ‘bend, bow’, but suggest that “the bend of the cow” is some sort of homely spatial metaphor drawn from knowledge of cow anatomy indicating a hidden or protected place. English ‘oxbow’ for a U-shaped configuration of a river is a similar application of pasturage terminology to physical space. Cf. also *ukṣṇó rándhram* (VIII.7.26) “the loins of the ox,” which I also think is a way of referring to the Vala cave. See comm. ad loc.

III.39.7: The IXth class *vṛṇīta* in pāda a is ambiguous: it can be either injunctive or optative; the standard tr. take it as the former, expressing straight past time. I instead interpr. it as optative, primarily because of the parallelism with 8a, where the light chosen in 7a, “should suffuse the two world-halves” with opt. *ánu syāt* (note also *syāma* in 7b, 8b). However, the ambiguity of *vṛṇīta* allows it serve as pivot between the past-time narration of vss. 4–6 and the expressed wishes of 7–8.

The rendering of *purutámasya* in the publ. tr. makes it seem to qualify the hymns, not the bard. The tr. could be slightly emended to “... of the bard, who is the latest of many.”

III.39.8: Pāda b seems to pose an almost deliberate syntactic challenge. The adverbial *āré* ‘at a distance’ is normally construed with an ablative, as in 7b *āré syāma duritāt*, but in 8b we have the same phrase but with the noun in the genitive: *āré syāma duritásya bhūreḥ*. Or so it is taken by everyone, including me. But I now wonder if the ambiguous form *bhūreḥ*, which could be genitive or ablative, is in fact the latter and is not modifying *duritásya* but rather governing it: “May we be at a distance from an abundance of difficulty.”

### III.40 Indra

III.40.1–2: The difference, if any, between *pāhi* (1c) and *píba* (2c) is as usual not clear. See disc. ad III.35.10. If we are looking for ways to distinguish them, *ā vṛṣasva* “drench yourself in it,” immediately following *píba* in 2c, might support a more durative interpr. of the pres. impv., as perhaps would the. adj. *tātrpi-* if it has intensive semantics ‘ever satisfying’.

III.40.3: The adj. *dhitāvan-* is not entirely clear. It is a possessive *-van-* stem to the ppl. *dhitá-* ( $\sqrt{dhā}$ ); as Debrunner points out (AiG II.2.560), it unusually preserves the *dh-* that is found in this ppl. only as 2<sup>nd</sup> member of a cmpd or under certain sandhi conditions. The final has been lengthened as is normal in these stems: in the RV only *maghāvan-* has a short final vowel before the *-van-* suffix. Cf. also the numerous *-āvant-* formations in the previous hymn (III.39.4, 6, 8). But what does it mean? The form occurs only here and in III.27.2, modifying Agni. Gr (flg. BR) glosses it as ‘gabenreich’, Ge “der das Erwartete (?) bringt,” whose connection to  $\sqrt{dhā}$  I don’t understand. Both Re’s “pourvu (d’offrandes) présentées” and WG’s “das Vorrat habend” may be closer to the mark. But what is most characteristically *hitá-* at the sacrifice is the ritual fire, *ā*  $\sqrt{dhā}$  being the technical term of establishing that fire,

and I therefore suggest that the sacrifice with its fires established is at issue here. Some support for this interpr. may come from the last phrase *stavāna viśpate* “o you who are praised as clan-lord.” The epithet *viśpāti-* is ordinarily used of Agni, so Indra is here being praised as Agni, and it is Agni who both is and oversees the ritual fires.

III.40.5: This is the first vs. that doesn’t begin with voc. *índra*; the voc. surfaces only in the middle of b, an unprominent position. But its place is somewhat taken by phonologically similar *índavaḥ* at the end of the vs., and initial *índra* reappears in 6c.

III.40.7: Contra Old and WG, I agree with Ge and Re that *vanínaḥ* is the ‘wooden’ word and is not a derivative of  $\sqrt{van}$  ‘win’. The focus in this hymn is very narrowly on the ritual situation.

III.40.8: This is the only vs. in the hymn without a form of *índra-* (7 of the 8 of those forms being vocatives, the lone exception *índram* in 7b). Here voc. *vṛtrahan* is substituted.

III.40.8–9: On the “magic square” of these vss., see publ. intro. Vs. 9 actually seems to be covering the logical possibility that Indra might not be either far or near but somewhere in between, and in that case the exhortation in vs. 8 to come from nearby or far away might not work.

### III.41 Indra

III.41.1: The 1<sup>st</sup> persons *naḥ* and *madryàk* are somewhat awkwardly doubled. With Ge I take *naḥ*, found in (modified) Wackernagel’s Position in pāda a, with *sómapītaye* in b, and *madryàk* ‘in my direction’ with the verb of motion in c.

III.41.6: It is curious that the impv. *mandasvā* is not accented in this clause, despite the *hí*, nor is it in the identical vs. VI.45.27 or in VI.23.8 also with *sá mandasvā hí* ... I have no explanation; Old notes the lack of accent and gives a ref. to his treatment in ZDMG 60, but in fact there he does nothing more than note the passages.

III.41.7: The 1<sup>st</sup> pl. them. *jarāmahe* is perfectly ambiguous between ‘(be) awake’ and ‘sing’, and all other tr. assign it to ‘awake’ -- incl. WG, though Gotō (1<sup>st</sup> class, 154) assigns it with certainty to ‘sing’. I have also tr. as ‘sing’, though nothing is at stake between the two renderings.

III.41.8: Most take *hári-priya-* as ‘loving the *hári*’ (e.g., Re “qui aime les alezans”); I have reversed the direction of affection: “dear to the fallow bays,” primarily because better attested *puru-priyá-* means ‘dear to many’ not ‘loving many’, though the accent difference between them may signal a difference in meaning. (However, the special accentual behavior of *puru-* muddies the waters.)

### III.42 Indra

III.42.1: The relative clause in c is somewhat tricky. The standard tr. (though Ge hesitates in his n. 1c) take the subject to be soma and take *háribhyām* with ab, starting the rel. cl. with *yáh* in 2<sup>nd</sup> position (type “come with your fallow bays to our soma, which is for you and seeking us”). I am reluctant to break the pāda in that way -- though given *ukthébhiḥ* at the beginning of 4c, which must go with the preceding pāda, with a new clause beginning *kuvíd*, this is not much of an argument. More importantly, since *tvám asmayúḥ* in the immediately preceding hymn (III.41.7) has Indra as the referent, I am reluctant to have identical *asmayúḥ* modify soma here. (Old cites some passages in IX where this adj. does modify soma, but those cases describe the preparation of soma and his/its journey towards us, the priests, whereas here the soma is stationary and Indra is journeying towards it and, as its preparers, us.) My interpr. leaves *te* as the problem -- where to construe it and whether it can be coreferential with *yáh*. The 2<sup>nd</sup> question can be answered affirmatively; nothing forbids *yáh* from 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. reference here. As for the first, I take it with *háribhyām*, a solution I find somewhat unsatisfying, since possessive genitives are not usually necessary in these situations. But cf. *māma* in 3a below, also in a situation where the possessor doesn’t need to be overt.

III.42.3: Note the alliteration framing the first two pādas: *#índram itthā ... iṣitā itāḥ#*.

### III.43 Indra

The publ. tr. attempts to convey the density and distribution of the many words for ‘here’, ‘nearby’, ‘close’.

III.43.1: The standard tr. take *úpa barhíḥ* with the next pāda (“call you to the ritual grass”); Sāy. agrees with my version (see Ge’s n. 1c). There is no principled way to decide, and very little depends on it.

It is not easily possible to register the pun of *havya(vāhaḥ)* ‘oblation’ (to  $\sqrt{hu}$  ‘pour’) and *havante* (to  $\sqrt{hvā}$  ‘call’).

III.43.4: The reference to Indra changes from 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. in ab to 3<sup>rd</sup> in cd. It would be possible to attach ab to the preceding vs., which also has Indra in 2<sup>nd</sup> ps., and take cd as a new sentence. But the fact that both ab and cd have subjunctives (*vāhātaḥ* and *śṛṇavat*) suggests that the two clauses go together.

Because of the accent on *vāhātaḥ*, the *ca* is likely subordinating, as in fact the standard tr. (and I) take it. However, the sequence *ā ca (...)*  $\sqrt{vah}$  shows unexpected accent on the verb form elsewhere (I.74.6, X.110.1), so it is possible that ab is a main clause with the verbal accent produced by this curious formulaic usage; see comm. ad I.74.6.



III.43.5: 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. reference to Indra returns here, in *kuvíd* clauses otherwise parallel to the one in 4cd with 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. ref.

Ge (fld. by WG and by me) takes the pf. part. *papivāṃsam* as expressing the cause of Indra's action.

The transmitted Saṃhitā text *ma řṣim* must be read contracted, as *mārṣim* (so HvN) to achieve a Triṣṭubh line; the Pp. correctly analyzes this sandhi sequence as *mā řṣim*.

III.43.6: The final word of this vs., *mūrāḥ*, is generally taken as distinct from *mūrā-* 'stupid, foolish' and as an acc. pl. fem. with *ātāḥ* (e.g., Ge "die verschlossenen (?) Töre"). I follow Old's final suggestion that it belongs to the normal stem *mūrā-* and refers to the horses; English "dumb beast" is a reasonable analogue.

### III.44 Indra

III.44.2: The two pāda-final *-āya*-causatives, *arcayaḥ* (a) and *arocayaḥ* (b), are also near phonological matches.

III.44.3: This is the middle vs. of the hymn and (comparatively) more complex than the rest. As in 2ab, the first two pāda end with morphologically parallel formations, the accusatives *hāri-dhāyasam* (a) and *hāri-varpasam*, both with *-s*-stems as 2<sup>nd</sup> member and *hāri-* as 1<sup>st</sup>. The standard tr. obscure this parallelism by giving them quite different interpr., with *hāri-* in the first cmpd serving as apparent obj. to *dhāyas-* (Ge "der den Goldigen nährt," sim. Re and WG; also Gr), while the second cmpd is rendered as a straight bahuvrīhi. By this interpr., in the first cmpd. *hāri-* refers to soma (so Gr, Re) or soma or the sun (Ge [/WG]), while the *hāri-* in the 2<sup>nd</sup> is simply a term of color or material. Given the structure of this vs. and the parallel structure in vs. 2, I think the two cmpds should be interpr. in a similar manner and that the "golden nourishment" of heaven would be the sunlight. However, I do concede that in other *X-dhāyas-* cmpds the 1<sup>st</sup> member may be the recipient of the nourishment (e.g., *arí-dhāyas-* 'having nourishment for the stranger', *kārú-dhāyas-* 'having nourishment for the bard'), and so I would consider a tr. 'having nourishment for the golden', though I think this is the less likely possibility.

In c I assume a clause break after *ádthārayat* and take the rest of cd as a nominal cl. with *bhójanam* as subj. For a similar constr. with *bhójanam* cf. VII.68.5 *citrām ha yád vām bhójanam nv ásti*.

The poet has cleverly managed to gather the root  $\sqrt{dhṛ}$  into the pervasive verbal play of the hymn, by stationing the dual form *hárītoḥ* in a sandhi position where its initial surfaces as *dh*, hence *ádthārayad dhárītor*. This *dh* repetition resonates with (*hāri-*)*dhāyas-* in pāda a. Meanwhile in c the double *dh*-alliteration of the first two words is matched by double *bh*-alliteration in *bhūri bhójanam*.

III.44.4: Pāda-final *rócanam* (b) echoes pāda-final *arocayaḥ* (2b) symmetrically around the central vs., as well as rhyming with pāda-final *bhójanam* in 3c.

III.44.5: As noted in the publ. intro., the insistently golden vajra of vs. 4 (*háritam* ... *āyudham* ... *vájram* ... *hárim*) is transformed into a silvery one (*árjunam*, *vájram*), but keeps the *har* phonology in the participle *haryántam* ‘gladdening’, also modifying the vajra. A different color-type term, *śukrá-* ‘gleaming, bright’ is also used of the accoutrements of the weapon; the instr. pl. *śukrañh* is again a surprise: we would expect *háribhiḥ*.

And in fact we get two forms of the latter in the last hemistich. In one of them the poet uses the sandhi trick he employed in 3c to produce an initial *dh*: (*ápāvṛṇod*) *dháribhiḥ*, which allows the sequence *dháribhiḥ ádribhiḥ* to read as a virtual anagram.

This last half-verse introduces Vala-myth phraseology (*ápāvṛṇot*, *úd gāḥ* ... *ājata*) in a hymn that otherwise lacks any mythic references. This Vala theme seems particularly out of place because the soma and the vajra play little or no role in the Vala myth but are strongly associated with the Vṛtra myth. I am uncertain of the identity of the *háribhiḥ* who participate in the driving up of the cows in d. Ge and Re confidently supply ‘horses’, and that is of course the default interpr. of this form in an Indra context. But Indra’s horses are not actors in the Vala myth elsewhere, as far as I can remember. His helpers in the Vala myth are the Aṅgirasas, so perhaps they qualify as golden here. Or perhaps it refers to the golden lights of the dawns and is an instr. of accompaniment with *gāḥ* (“drove up the cows along with the golden [dawn lights]”).

### III.45 Indra

III.45.1: Although I use the Engl. word ‘gladdening’ here as in the last hymn, the repetition is misleading. The Skt. word here tr. is *mandrá-*, whereas in the last hymn it was *haryatá-*.

The simile concerning the bird and the snare is reminiscent of the much more obscure image in I.125.2, in which an animal of some kind seems to be bound out and captured.

III.45.2: In the string of agentive phrases that entirely make up this vs. the poet manages a certain variety of syntactic patterns: standard tatpuruṣa with 1<sup>st</sup> member obj. (*vṛtrakhādá-*), tatpuruṣa with acc. 1<sup>st</sup> member (*valamṛujá-* [note that without the acc. marker it would be a metrically unfavorable four light syllables]), agent noun with genitive (pāda bc, 4x with 3 separate agent noun types: *purāṃ darmá-*, *apām ajá-*, *sthātar- ráthasya*, *hāryor abhisvará-*), agent noun with acc. (*dr̥ḷhā* ... *ārujá-*). The relentless repetition of nom. sg. agent phrases makes it quite certain that the Pp. loc. sg. reading *abhisvaré* should instead be taken as nom. sg. *-aḥ*, with Old. All standard tr. agree. The only argument against this that I can see is that *hāryor abhisvaráḥ* would be the second GEN + simple *-á-*stem agent phrase (after *apām ajáḥ* in b), and if the poet was serious about producing the phraseological variety I have just catalogued he might have avoided a repetition by couching this phrase in the loc. (“at the calling of the two fallow bays”). The only other occurrence of *abhisvará-* is

in the loc. (-e in sandhi, also pāda-final) and means ‘call’, not ‘caller’ (X.117.8). Still, I do not think this arg. is strong enough to counter-balance the pressure of the nom. sg. sequence.

III.45.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this is the middle vs. of the hymn, and it contains four similes, which are interlocked in interesting ways. In the first half-verse both similes target *krátum* ‘resolve, will’. In the first the term held in common (*gambhirān* ‘deep’) has been attracted in number to the upamāna (*udadhīn* ‘pools’), though the position of the *iva* probably shows that ‘deep’ lies outside the simile proper (*gambhirāṃ udadhīṃ iva, krátum ...*). This simile is not dependent on the verb, while the second one (*krátum puṣyasi gā iva* “you foster it like cows”) requires the fosterage of the verb *puṣyasi* for the comparison to make sense. That is, Indra’s will is like cows only in that he cultivates it and helps it prosper, whereas it is “deep” regardless of any verb that might govern it.

The second hemistich contains two parallel similes, both bipartite, with a nom. pl. referring to entities that reach an acc. goal: cows / pasturage, brooks / lake. The first, the bovine one, seems generated from the cow simile of pāda b, esp. as the adj. *sugopá-* (c) contains the same *gó-* as *gāḥ* in b. The interesting thing about this half-verse is that the frame, the upameya, is not expressed at all. There is neither an overt nom. of the entity(/-ies) in motion nor an acc. goal -- simply the simile marker *iva*. The comparison is wide open. Sāy. suggests that soma drinks are the subj. to be supplied, and he is followed by the standard tr. (and Old). Old suggests that the goal is either “you” (=Indra) or his *krātu-*; Re shares his uncertainty, while Ge (/WG) supply “dich.” Although it is true that *āśata* takes soma drinks as subject in other passages (see Ge’s n. 3cd), this hymn does not otherwise mention soma, and I am wary of supplying it out of nowhere. I prefer to take *krātu-* as subj., either in the pl. (‘resolves’ as in the publ. tr.) or, as Ge. suggests in n. 3cd, as a sg., with the verb attracted to the number of the subjects of the two similes. And I take *āśata* in a different sense in the frame than in the similes -- without expressed goal as “reach fulfillment, achieved (their goal),” although I recognize that the overwhelming number of occurrences of this verb do have expressed goal.

III.45.4: The simile in b is not clear, in great part because *prāti √jñā* appears to be employed in some technical sense that we have no handle on. The lexeme is not common in Vedic and seems to mean ‘greet, welcome’ (or perhaps just ‘recognize, acknowledge’) in the Vastoṣpati hymn, VII.54.1, and in other texts ‘acknowledge, respond’ vel sim. In post-Vedic Skt. it means ‘promise’ or the like. Since *āṃśa-* ‘portion’ may also have a technical or legal sense, this phrase may belong to a stratum of language that we have no access to at this period. My feeling is that it has to do with the acceptance or rejection of something offered, as *prati √grah* signals acceptance of a properly given gift (see Sac. Wife 199–201). But I cannot get further than that.

III.45.5: The first hemistich contains three forms with *sva-* ‘self’: *svayúḥ* ... *svarāṭ* ... *sváyaśastaraḥ*, and the second hemistich opens *sá v-*, with a scrambling of the phonetic elements. Other patterning is seen in the comparative *sváyaśastaraḥ* ending the first hemistich and the superlative *suśrávastamaḥ* ending the 2<sup>nd</sup>, both built to *-as-* stems and compounded with the phonological variants *sva-* and *su-*.

*smáddiṣṭi-* occurs 4x in the RV. It is a compd. of *smád-* ‘altogether, together with’ and the *-ti-* abstract of  $\sqrt{dis}$  ‘direct, assign, allot’, and as Ge says (n. 5b), it appears to be a technical term in *dānastutis*. In its other three occurrences (VI.63.9, VII.18.23, X.62.10) it modifies the gift, while here it qualifies the giver, Indra. As Old points out, medial  $\sqrt{dis}$  is used of the allotting of gifts in V.36.6, and such a sense seems to fit here as well. For further see Old’s detailed disc.

The splv. *suśrávastamaḥ* is rendered by the standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG) as ‘best listener’. Since it is built to the noun *śrávas-* ‘fame’ rather than directly to the root  $\sqrt{śru}$ , I find this meaning unlikely. In some other passages the word simply means ‘most famous, having the best good fame’ (e.g., VIII.13.2). Here because of the involvement of ‘us’ (*naḥ*), I take it as ‘receiving the best good fame’, i.e., with ‘fame’ being the praises we offer him. In only one passage does ‘best hearer’ seem a likely interpr., and there that meaning is induced by the presence of the verb *śṛṇuṣvā*: I.131.7 *śṛṇuṣvā suśrávastamaḥ* “listen (to us) as the one who listens best.”

### III.46 Indra

III.46.1: This vs. is cunningly constructed, in that until the very last word of the third pāda it consists entirely of genitives with nothing to depend on; neut. pl. *vīryāṇi* at the end of c breaks this string and provides the necessary grammatical support -- joined by the matching adj. *mahāni* at the very end of the vs.

III.46.3: All four pādas begin with *prá*; the verb of a, *ririce*, should be supplied with the other three pādas.

Note the phonological plays in a: *prá (mā)trā(bhī)* and *ririce roca(mānaḥ)*.

III.46.4: The string of untethered accusatives in the first 3 pādas reminds us of the string of genitives in vs. 1. Here the syntactic tension is resolved only by the verb *āviśanti* that ends the verse and allows the accusatives to serve as its goal.

I do not entirely understand the function of *abhí* in pāda a. It matches nearby III.48.4c ... *janúṣābhībhūya#*, where *abhí* is part of gerund. It may also recall *abhíbhūtim ugrām* (I.118.9, IV.38.1, sim. VI.19.6), which in turn is a variant of *abhībhūty-ójas-* (cf. nearby III.48.4a, the vs. just cited for the gerund). In any case the *abhí* seems pretty functionless in this passage; my “over(whelmingly)” is an attempt to give it some function.

### III.47 Indra

III.47.3: The aor. impv. *pāhi* here implicitly contrasts with the pres. impv. *píba* in 1b, 2b, 4d. As usual, it is difficult to know how much semantic or functional difference to read into this contrast. See disc. ad III.35.10. In this particular case the root noun cmpd. *ṛtupāḥ* may have triggered the immediately following *pā(hi)*.

Re tr. *ṛtupāḥ* as ‘gardien des temps-rituels’, with  $\sqrt{pā}$  ‘protect’ rather than  $\sqrt{pā}$  ‘drink’. I think it unlikely in a dull little hymn like this that there would be a pun of that sort, and the sequence *ṛtúbhir ṛtupāḥ pāhi*, with the two elements of the cmpd. extracted from it and flanking it, seems to impose etymological identity.

The second hemistich refers to Indra’s allowing the Maruts a share in the soma because of their support in the Vṛtra battle. For a dramatization of this ritual situation, see I.165 and associated hymns.

III.47.5: The first word of this final vs., *marútvantam* echoes the first word of the hymn, *marútvān*.

### III.48 Indra

III.48.1: Though Gr classifies *prábhartum* as an infinitive, and Old’s and WG’s tr. seem (indirectly) to reflect this analysis (“dass man ihm darbrachte ...”), the form seems to be simply a *-tu*-abstract (somewhat concretized)(so tr. Ge and Re). As is well known, the *-tum* form that serves as the only infinitive in Classical Sanskrit is hardly found in early Vedic. Macd. (VG §586b) registers only five in the RV (not including this one) and an equal number in the AV. *prábhartu-* here seems more or less equivalent to *prábhṛti-* or *prábharmān-*, though the *-u*-stem datives *bhártave* (IX.97.50) and *ápabhartavaí* (X.14.2) are infinitival.

Notice the near rhyming openings to the two half-verses, a: #*sadyó h(a)*, c: #*sādhóḥ*.

III.48.2: It is appropriate that the “beestings” (*pīyūṣa-*), that is, the colostrum or first milk, should be given to the new-born Indra.

The preverb *pári* in pāda a is presumably to be construed with *āsiñcat* in b, a verb with which it is frequently found. I do not understand the position of this *pári*, in the middle of the pāda, right after the caesura but breaking up the NP *mātā ... yóṣā jānitri*.

III.48.3: It is not clear who the “others” (*anyān*) are whom he keeps away, but the medial pf. in the next pāda (*cakre*) implicitly claims that he did the great things (*mahāni*; cf. *vīryāṇi ... mahāni* in III.36.1cd) by himself, that is, without the help of others.

III.48.3–4: I assume that *purudhā-pratīka-* in 3d refers to Indra’s shape-shifting powers; the cmpd seems to be “unpacked” in 4b “he made this body as he wished” (*yathāvaśāṃ tanvāṃ cakra eṣāḥ*).

These two vss. are noteworthy for containing 3 gerunds, *upasthāya*, *abhibhūya*, and *āmúṣyā*. The quest of the poet(s) of the Indra hymns in III to find a way to express anteriority (see disc. ad III.32.9–10, 33.11) is successful at least in this passage.

### III.49 Indra

III.49.1: The first word *śámsā* is read *śámsa* by the Pp., i.e., as a 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. impv. This is quite possible, of course, and is the interpr. of Ge (/WG) and Old. With Re I take it as a 1<sup>st</sup> sg. subjunctive because this is more in keeping with the 1<sup>st</sup> ps. diction in annunciatory initial praise vss. like I.32.1 *índrasya nú vīryāṇi prá vocam*, but nothing depends on the analysis either way.

III.49.2: The 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich is universally tr. (save for Scar, 656) as a single rel. clause, but *amināt* is unaccented and so d must be a separate clause.

In c the standard tr. (incl. also Scar) construe the instr. pl. *śūṣaṁh* with instr. pl. *sátvabhiḥ* (e.g., Ge “mit seinen mutigen Streitern”). This of course would be the default assumption. However, in almost every occurrence of the stem *śūṣá-*, including all the other examples of the instr. pl., it refers to hymns or praises, whether with a limiting noun or not. I therefore separate it from the other instr. in the pāda and take it as having its usual referent. The poet claims that Indra’s strength is at least partially dependent on our strengthening praises.

III.49.4: The ppl. *prṣṭá-* ‘asked (about)’ is a little odd. Ge tr. ‘gesucht’, which would make it less odd, but I don’t think  $\sqrt{prach}$  means that. It may be referring to the fact that Indra’s existence and whereabouts are often questioned in the RV.

In b Ge and WG take the simile to be *rátho ná vāyúḥ*. This of course conforms well to the structure of the pāda and of similes in general, but it has the undesirable consequence of requiring *rátha-*, a word whose meaning is about as well known as any in the RV, to stand not for ‘chariot’ but for ‘chariot-warrior’ (vel sim.; cf. Ge’s Wagenheld). I therefore, somewhat reluctantly, follow Re. in taking the simile to be *ūrdhvó, rátho ná* “erect like a chariot.” Re then takes *vāyúḥ* as a (pseudo-)genitive: “(se tenant) droit comme le char (de) Vāyu,” which is unacceptable for this clear nominative. I instead take *vāyúḥ* as the beginning of another, unmarked simile. Cf. IX.88.3 *vāyúr ná yó niyútvān*, with simile marker.

### III.50 Indra

III.50.2: On *dheyuḥ* and related forms, see my “... *dheyām* revisited” (Ged. Schindler, 1999).

III.50.3: The first hemistich poses some difficulties: the subject is not expressed, and it is not clear what it should be; there is an abundance of acc. sg. masculines, not all

of which are coreferential; the root affiliation of *dhāyase* is disputed; the value of *grṇānāḥ* is unclear.

To begin with the last, which has implication for some of the other questions: the standard tr. take *grṇānāḥ* as transitive, with Indra as object. But of the over 50 examples of this middle participle, only one other occurrence is transitive, I.181.9, where this value was induced by contextual pressure (see comm. ad loc.). I therefore take it as passive here as well.

If it is passive, then the missing subject must be something capable of being praised. Gr takes the subject to be the horses of vs. 2; since they were the overt subject of a form of  $\sqrt{dhā}$  in 2c (*dheyuh*) and would be the subj. of another one here (*dadhire*), this makes implicit sense. And it is possible that they might be praised or sung. However, the question is whether the horses can be thought to establish or deposit soma, as 2a requires. Priests would make more sense for this action (so Re), but priests would not ordinarily be praised -- hence the anomalous transitive interpr. of *grṇānāḥ* by most tr. In the end I would opt for the horses, but not very happily -- the contextual arguments pull in opposite directions.

Now, as for the accusatives: *mimikṣúm ... supārām, índram*, I agree with the standard tr. that the first refers to soma, seeking to be mixed with milk, and of course that the last, *índram*, is separate from it. The question is where *supārām* belongs. The standard tr., in different ways, take it with soma. Since in all its singular occurrences the word refers to Indra, I take it with *índram* here as well.

The final question is the root affiliation and value of *dhāyase*. The standard tr. all take it to  $\sqrt{dhā}$  ‘place’, construed with *jyaíṣṭhyāya* and with Indra as implicit subj. (e.g., Ge “dass er [=Indra] die Oberhoheit ausübe”). However, all clear cases of *dhāyas-*, which mostly appears in the dat., belong to  $\sqrt{dhā}$  ‘suckle, nourish’ (incl. at nearby III.38.3 (though see the minority opinion discussed in comm. ad loc.)). I take it as such here, with *índram* as its object (thereby avoiding the necessity to construe this acc. with either *dadhire* or *grṇānāḥ*). The procuring of soma to nourish Indra is a logical progression -- though I’m still concerned that the horses might be the agents.

III.50.4–5: On the sequence of two repeated vss. see publ. intro.

### III.51 Indra

III.51.1–2: These two vss. have the same structure: pādas acd are just accusatives qualifying the acc. *índram* in b, and the b pādas are essentially the same, with nom. pl. *gírah* + a verb that governing the accusatives. Though vs. 3 breaks the syntax, Indra still appears first by name in pāda b.

III.51.2: The standard tr. take *arṇavám* as an unmarked simile, serving as goal to the verb in b: “my songs go to Indra, *as if* to the sea [Ge “(wie) zu dem Meere,” Re “(tel) un océan,” WG more accurately but less persuasively “(wie) zu wallender Flut”]. The word is therefore only indirectly associated with Indra: they are both goals but need have nothing else in common. But given the parallelism in structure of vss. 1

and 2, I am reluctant to break the pattern of accusatives characterizing Indra by introducing this syntactic disjunction, and further the simile only makes good sense if *aṇavá-* really is a sea or the like, not an undulating flood. I think instead that Indra is directly described as a flood, the flood itself being characterized as *sākín-* ‘possessing powers’.

The water-crossing mentioned here may simply be a reference to Indra’s general leadership in crossing rivers and gaining new territory, but it may more specifically point to the famous crossing of King Sudās dramatized in III.33 and referred to again in III.53.9, even though the poet Viśvāmitra, not Indra, is the major actor there. The crossing is mentioned again in 9a.

III.51.3: Although *panasyate* might make more sense if tr. “expresses admiration,” the other occurrences of this denom. stem and the related adj. *panasyú-* all mean ‘attract/invite admiration’. Here the poet is hoping for a good reception from the recipient of his hymns, which he indeed receives in pādas b and c. I have tr. the loc. phrase *ākaré vásoḥ* as if ablative, to make the sense clearer. It could have been rendered “... seeks admiration at (the hands of) him ...”

III.51.4: Though this vs. begins a new *ṛca* in a different meter, it partially restores the syntactic structure of vss. 1–2: the first pāda presents Indra in the acc., the second one directs praises to him. Note also that *nṛṇām ... nṛtamam* picks up *nāram* of 2a. The structure is somewhat complicated by the fact that both (unnamed) Indra in pāda a and the (unnamed) subjects of the impv. *arcatā* in b are addressed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. This leads both Ge and Re to separate the two pādas: Ge pronounces pāda a an anacoluthon or ellipsis, while Re supplies “(je te chante).” This fastidiousness seems unnecessary to me: the two referents of the 2<sup>nd</sup> persons are in different grammatical numbers and unlikely to be confused with each other for other reasons, and in a ritual situation both should be present (“at the seat of Vivasvant,” 3c) and could both be directly addressed. The two instrumentals in pāda a (*gīrbhír ukthaiḥ*) also go better with the verb in b; cf., e.g., VI.22.1 *índram tām gīrbhír abhy àrca ābhíḥ*.

III.51.5: The stem *niṣṣídh-* and related forms are difficult (see, inter alia, Scar 596–97). As Scar points out, there is no obvious direct way to connect it with either  $\sqrt{sādh}$  ‘succeed’ or  $\sqrt{sidh}$  ‘repel’, and neither of these roots appears with *nīḥ* in the RV (though the latter does in post-RVic texts, but without relevant meaning; see Gotō, 1<sup>st</sup> Kl., 328). On the other hand, the semantic range of the word itself in context is relatively clear. It usually refers to something offered by inferiors to superiors. Ge’s Tribut (see his brief disc. in n. 5b) works pretty well. If we want to connect it to the root  $\sqrt{sādh}$  ‘succeed, realize, reach the goal’, it may be seen as the material representation of the fulfillment (this is the  $\sqrt{sādh}$  part) of an obligation, and the *nīḥ* ‘forth’ may reflect the proffering of these material goods.

I supply ‘streams’ with *jīráyaḥ* on the basis of the other occurrence of this pl. in II.17.3 *prá jīráyaḥ sisrate ...* as well as the well-attested *jīrá-dānu-* ‘possessing



lively drops’. There is general agreement in the standard tr. that *jīrī-* refers to flowing water.

III.51.6: Note the chiasmic structure *túbhyam bráhmāṇi gírah ... túbhyam*. Ge persuasively identifies *ávaso nūtanasya* as a genitive of quality.

III.51.7: This vs. contains yet another implicit contrast between the aor. and pres. of  $\sqrt{pā}$  ‘drink’: *pāhi ... yáthā ... ápibaḥ*. See comm. ad III.35.10, 36.3, 40.1–2, and 47.3. It is not clear whether a contrast is also meant between the acc. *sómam* with *pāhi* (also 8a) and the (potentially partitive) genitive *sutásya* with *ápibaḥ* and, if so, whether it is signaling some sort of aspectual distinction.

The verb *ā vivāsanti* lacks an object here, though it usually is construed with one. Ge (/WG) interpret it as ‘invite’ (presumably supplying ‘you’), while Re supplies the gods as object. I think the object slot has been intentionally left blank: with Indra’s guidance and in his shelter they hope to win whatever they fancy, hence my somewhat awk. tr. “seek their win.” Oberlies (Rel.RV I.403) suggests that this is a poetic contest, but I don’t see any evidence of this beyond the plural.

Given the usual rendering of *kavī-* elsewhere in the publ. tr., I would change the tr. here to ‘sage poets’ or just ‘poets’.

III.51.8: The connection between the two hemistichs in this vs. is not clear. The first unambiguously presents the here-and-now of the sacrifice, with an impv. and the adv. *ihá* ‘here’, while the second harks back to Indra’s primordial birth and the gods’ attendance on it, expressed by an augmented imperf. (*ābhūṣan*). There is no way to reconcile the temporal disjunction directly, so I have adopted Ge’s makeshift: supplying “(wie damals),” though there is no overt representation of my “as” (or his “wie damals”). There does not seem to be much semantic connection between the two halves either, unless we, the pressers and offerers, are being identified with the gods who served Indra at his birth.

III.51.9: The abrupt temporal shifts continue in this vs., exacerbated by shifts in person. The poet first addresses the Maruts in the 2<sup>nd</sup> ps. and asserts something about Indra in the present time (or so I [and the other standard tr.] take the nominal sentence without overt copula). In pāda b the Maruts are then referred to in the 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. -- though they are not named in this pāda, the other two occurrences of *dāti-vara-* refer to them, and *ānu*  $\sqrt{mad}$  is a signature verb of theirs -- and in the past, in the augmented impf. *āmandan*. (Though the Saṃhitā text transmits ‘*mandan*’, the augment is metrically guaranteed.) This pāda seems an aside, reminding the audience of the Maruts’ previous involvement with Indra. The vs. then shifts to the present time again, with the Maruts remaining in the 3<sup>rd</sup> ps., as potential drinking companions for Indra.

In 6c Indra was urged to become “a friend of present help”; what that present help was/should be is spelled out here, a friend “at the water-crossing.” For water-crossing see comm. ad vs. 2 above. It is presumably *not* directly related to the Maruts’

applause in pāda b, for they provide material and moral support at the Vṛtra-smashing, not in crossing waters.

III.51.9–10. Note that *pibatu* takes an acc. in 9cd, but a gen. in 10c, as with *ápibaḥ* in 7b.

III.51.10: The first two pādas of this vs. are variously translated. The problems are 1) the referent of *idám* and 2) the absence of a verb. My interpr. is closest to Ge's. If the referent of *idám* is the soma, we need only find a synonym for soma that is neuter; *sávanam* fits the bill and is elsewhere modified by *sutá-*, as it can be here. As for the verb, I assume a form of  $\sqrt{as}$ : the idiom *ánu*  $\sqrt{as}$  means 'be at hand'.

### III.52 Indra

III.52.2: *pacatyà-* occurs only here; it does not seem to have any gerundival sense, nor does its base *pacatá-*, though *-ata-* adjectives often do (*darśatá-* 'sightly', not just 'seen'); see AiG II.2.168. I assume *pacatyà-* is a nonce creation to provide an extra syllable here in the versified recipe. And perhaps *pacatá-* was fashioned as a clearer alternative past participle to *pakvá-*, which can of course also mean 'ripe', though it's quite commonly applied to cooked food.

III.52.3: The accent of *ghásah* is unexpected, but it presumably results from its juxtaposition with immed. following *joṣáyāse*, which can owe its accent to its pāda-initial position. Although *ca* can be subordinating ('if') and induce verbal accent, that doesn't seem to be its function here.

III.52.8: The phrase *vīrātama- nṛṇām* 'most virile of men' is a variant of the fairly common formula *nṛṇām nṛtama-* 'most manly of men', an occurrence of which is found in the preceding hymn, III.51.4. This vs. is repeated at IV.32.16.

### III.53 Indra, etc.

III.53.1: The curious dual dvandva *indrā-parvatā* 'o Indra and Mountain', only in the vocative and therefore unaccented, occurs 3x: I.122.3, 132.6, and here. As discussed ad I.122.3 and 132.6, I believe that the 'mountain' is Indra's *vájra-*.

III.53.2: The verb in pāda b, *yakṣi*, is simply an injunctive 1<sup>st</sup> sg. *s*-aor. to  $\sqrt{yaj}$ , but it is rendered as a future/modal in all the standard tr. (including this one). This value seems also found in the identical form in X.52.5, though not in X.4.1. (Gr's ex. in VI.16.8 is better taken as a 2<sup>nd</sup>-sg. act. *-si* impv.) I don't know why this particular form should have this value, save for the general functional flexibility of the injunctive. But perhaps the fact that the formally identical 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. act. *-si* impv. is so common and (as an old *s*-aor. subjunctive) is used in both imperatival and

subjunctive-future value may have allowed that value to spill over onto its formal twin.

III.53.3: The 1<sup>st</sup> dual subjunctive (*śámsāva*) coupled with a sg. voc. (*adhvaryo*) is a rough and ready way to express a 1<sup>st</sup> ps. inclusive. This type of construction contrasts with the 1<sup>st</sup> ps. exclusive found in phrases like VII.88.3 *ā yád ruhāva váruṇas ca nāvam* “When we two, Varuṇa and I, mounted the boat ...” with a nominative explicitly conjoined with *ca* to an implicit *ahám*.

The injunctive *bhūt* in d must also, like *yakṣi* in 2b, be modal/prospective or even imperatival, since the *áthā ca* indicates that it temporally and/or logically follows the impv. *sīda* in c.

III.53.4: The dismissal of Indra and the sending him off home comes rather early in this hymnlet; he just got here (vs. 1) and at that point we urged him to stay put (vs. 2). Vs. 3 seems to depict the sacrifice proper, and the remaining 3 vss. of this portion of the hymn (vss. 4–6) are an extended farewell. In this vs. the poet seems to be reassuring Indra that if he goes home, he still won’t miss out on anything here: we’ll send Agni to fetch him whenever we press soma.

III.53.5: *pārā yāhi* “drive away” comes awfully soon after 2a *mā pārā gāḥ* “don’t go away.”

The genitive phrase *vājīno rāśabhasya* is ambiguous: does it refer to two animals or one? Re opts for the former: “... du (cheval) gagnant-du-prix (et) de l’âne.” But the same phrase in I.34.9 makes it likely that the two words belong together as the designation of a single animal. So Ge (/WG).

III.53.6–7: See the publ. intro. for the thematic and lexical connections between these two vss., despite their belonging to different sections of the hymn. See there also for the connection of vs. 7 with III.31, via the identification of the current poet with the Aṅgirasas, ur-sacrificers and givers of dakṣiṇās (on which see Ge’s n. 7a).

III.53.8: As Schaefer points out (p. 162), the intens. *bobhavīti* construed with an āmreḍita *rūpām-rūpam* must signal repetitive function (“Gestalt um Gestalt”).

In c I read *divāḥ* twice: once as ‘day’ with *trīḥ* in the meaning “three times a day” (cf. nearby III.56.5, 6 *trīr ā divāḥ*, also X.95.5 *trīḥ ... áhnaḥ*), once as ‘heaven’ with following *pári* “from heaven.” The latter reading, adopted by Sāy., is rejected by Old and Ge (n. 8c) because we should expect the close sandhi *divás pári*. This argument is subject to criticism on two grounds. First, I think the double reading of *divāḥ* would preclude close sandhi for one of the readings. Moreover, none of the other cited exx. of *divás pári* is broken over the caesura as here. As Mark Hale has discussed at length, close sandhi of NOUN + POSTPOSITION is blocked at the caesura. See “Preliminaries to the Study of the Relationship between Syntax and Sandhi in Rigvedic Sanskrit,” *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 51, pp. 77-96, 1990; this view is cited here after the 1995 draft, *Wackernagel’s Law in the Language of the*

RV, pp. 38-50.

The ritual situation in the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich is puzzling for several reasons. First, Indra's appearance at the sacrifice "three times a day" is what we expect, since there are three soma pressings. Then why is he characterized as *ánṛtupāḥ* 'drinking out of season'? Ge (/WG) gets out of this bind by supplying a parenthetical "(oder)": he either comes three times a day *or* drinks unseasonably. This works, but the "or" is of course a complete invention. More problematic is the fact that Indra is drinking unseasonably at all. In this same Indra cycle he has been apostrophized as *ṛtupāḥ* (voc., III.47.3). The apparent breaking of the ritual rules here is esp. striking because he is called *ṛtāvan-* 'possessing the truth, truthful' at the same time, made more striking because this is the only place in the RV where *ṛtāvan-* qualifies Indra. Lüders (*Varuṇa* II, 547–48) suggests that *ṛtāvan-* is used here only as word play with *ánṛtupā-*, since Indra has essentially no connection with *ṛtá-* ("dass er zum Rta so gut wie keine Beziehung hat," p. 548). But this seems unlikely, esp. given that the unnegated expression *ṛtupāḥ ṛtāvā* in the same metrical position is used of Agni in this same maṇḍala (III.20.4). Some point is being made, that Indra can be *ṛtāvan-* despite his un-rule-governed behavior.

I think the clues to a solution are found in the first half of the verse, where Indra is depicted as constantly shape-shifting and enveloping himself in *māyāḥ*. Perhaps Indra is impersonating other gods through the various *rūpa-*s he assumes, and his unseasonable drinking involves his taking their places in the rota (*ṛtú-*) of soma-recipients (the Ṛtugraha treated in I.15 and II.36–37). What then are "his own mantras" (*svaír mántraiḥ*), which accompany the unseasonable drinking? Lüders (p. 548) suggests that when he drinks outside of the three pressings he has to recite his own mantras. Though this is clever, I do not think it is correct, nor do I follow my own published tr. "by (the power of) his own (magic) spells" -- though I do think the mantras may be semantically linked to *māyāḥ* here. But my current thinking is that the phrase should be tr. "with *their* own mantras," referring to the mantras appropriate to the gods whose forms he has appropriated and whose turns he takes in the drinking. As to how he can be called *ṛtāvan-* when his behavior seems not to be precisely aboveboard, perhaps he has gained the epithet from the gods whose identities he's stealing: Agni, Tvaṣṭar, and Mitra and Varuṇa, all called *ṛtāvan-* elsewhere in the RV, all occur in the Ṛtugraha sequence (I.15; II.36–37). Or perhaps the epithet alludes to Indra's most enduring adoption of another identity, that of Bṛhaspati. Though Bṛhaspati is called *ṛtāvan-* only once in the RV as far as I am aware (VI.73.1), the role of *ṛtá-* in association with Bṛhaspati in the Vala myth is very significant; see, e.g., Lüders p. 549. Or perhaps we can simply say that Indra's "truth" -- his inherent nature -- is his ability to assume other forms and act out of turn and impose his will without following rules.

III.53.9-10: The use of somewhat inappropriate epithets continues in these vss. The subject of 9ab, the "great seer" (*mahāṁ ṛṣiḥ*) is Viśvāmitra, mentioned by name in c. A mortal, he is described as 'god-begotten' (*devajā-*) and 'god-spēd' (*devājūta-*) but 'possessing a man's sight' (*nṛcákṣas-*); the last is also used of the Kuśikas,

Viśvāmitra's family, in the next vs. Curiously it is the epithet with *nṛ-* 'man' that appears to be misapplied, not those with *devá-* 'god': the stem *nṛ-cákṣas-* is found approximately 40 times in the RV, and in all other occurrences (with the possible exception of the next hymn, III.54.6) it qualifies a god, who either has his (divine) gaze on men or attracts the gaze of men. Thus, the status of Viśvāmitra and his kin is implicitly raised by receiving a descriptor usually used of gods. That the Kuśikas drink soma with the gods in 10cd is a sign of this enhanced status. What the adj. means here is unclear to me: is it that they too attract the gaze (and thus admiration) of other men, or that they, despite possessing only a man's sight, still manage feats sufficient to match the gods, esp. Viśvāmitra's stopping the rivers in full flood?

III.53.10: The publ. tr. does not recognize or render the idiom *ví√pā*, found generally in the middle, for which see also comm. ad VII.22.3. As is indicated there, in later Vedic and already in late RV, the idiom is specialized for the separation of *surā* from another liquid in the Sautrāmaṇī ritual, but earlier can refer more generally to the extraction ("drinking out") of a liquid from another source, e.g., by the pressing stones in IV.16.3 and VII.22.3. What the idiom is doing here is less clear to me. Ge (n. 10d / WG) thinks this is a reference to the (much later) notion that *haṃsas* can separate liquids and so it belongs with the Sautrāmaṇī passages -- the *haṃsa* being found in pāda a, though only in a simile unrelated to drinking. I think this unlikely. It may simply be that the pressing stones are involved: the Kuśikas may be "drinking out" the soma by means of the pressing stones found in pāda a (*ádribhiḥ*). However, it is also possible that the *ví* represents the cross-species aspect of the drinking party: the mortal Kuśikas are urged to drink along with the gods, but the gathering may be segregated. So perhaps a tr. "drink apart, along with the gods"; such a notion seems to underlie Re's "Buvez séparément avec les dieux." It would contrast with a true symposium expressed by *sám√pā* also in the middle (see IV.35.7, 9) and in fact might allude to that idiom, given the well-known polarization of *ví* and *sám*. Another possibility is Sāy's *parasparavyatihāreṇa* 'by mutual interchange, alternately'. I am weakly inclined towards the pressing stone interpretation, though also somewhat drawn to the cross-species one. And I would also point out the resonance of the preverb *ví* with *viśvāmitraḥ* (9c) and *viprāḥ* (10c).

III.53.11: This vs. is supposed to depict the Áśvamedha of King Sudās, and the releasing of the horse in b and the smiting of obstacles in all directions in c, followed by a sacrifice in d, certainly support this interpr.

*ceṭáyadhvam* is variously rendered, but most generally as 'pay attention' vel sim. I instead take this middle full-grade *-áya*-formation as a reflexive transitive "make yourselves known" based on the 'make perceive' sense of *ceṭáya-*. Re's alternative "faites vous remarquer" is closest to mine.

As Watkins points out (Dragon, p. 208), although this form of the intens. of *√han* has a singular object (somewhat unusually), it is "serially plural," in that the *vrtrám* is located in one cardinal direction after another; see also Schaeffer 204–5.

III.53.12: The first hemistich, couched in the 1<sup>st</sup> ps., consists only of a rel. clause, which breaks off. The “I” is clearly Viśvāmitra, whose name opens the hemistich and whose protective *brāhman-* is mentioned there -- making it very likely that pādas ab constitute this *brāhman-*, though it’s not quite clear what is protective about this truncated utterance.

The plupf. *ātuṣṭavam* should not exist, at least in my opinion, since the two forms of the indicative pf. *tuṣṭuvīḥ* (VIII.6.12, 18) also appear to have preterital value. However, the contexts in VIII.6 do not guarantee that value -- it is possible that they are presential “they praise” (see comm. ad VIII.6.12). The existence of a pf. subj. *tuṣṭávat* at VIII.98.16 also suggests that the indicative pf. is, or originally was, presential. The only other pf. forms in the RV, the act. part. *tuṣṭuvāms-* (3x) and mid. part. *tuṣṭuvāná-* (1x) are generally tr. as preterital, but again context does not dictate this rendering.

III.53.13: The tr. of the last pāda might better begin “Just he will make ...” to reflect the *íd*.

III.53.15–16: As indicated in the publ. intro., the subject of these two vss. is the mysterious feminine *sasarparī-*, which has been interpr. as differently as “Kriegstrompete” (BR, fld. by Gr), “Sangesgeweise” of the Viśvāmitras (Ge), and Vāc (Anukramāṇī, Sāy.). The interpr. of these vss. has been further complicated by the later tradition that sees them as concerning the supposed rivalry between Viśvāmitra and Vasiṣṭha, for which I see no evidence at all in the RV.

Although I do not think all the puzzles are ultimately solvable, some clues can get us some distance. First, *sasarparī-* is a *vrkī*-type fem., and as Debrunner points out (AiG II.2.369), the major use of this inflectional type is for female beings (human and animal). This lends some credence to the opinion that the *sasarparī-* is a cow of some sort (e.g., Re “La (vache) Sasarparī”). That vs. 14 concerns the ritually worthless cows of the Kīkaṭas would also support a contrast with an eminently worthy cow found among us. Second, these two vss. sound rather like a *dānastuti* (see *jamádagnidatta-* in 15b and *yām me palastijamadagnáyo dadūḥ* in 16d), and since the next part of the hymn goes off in a completely different direction, this could serve as a hymn-capping *dānastuti* for what precedes. Cf. I.126.2, a *dānastuti* hymn, where, after Kakṣīvant is given cows, he stretches the king's unaging fame to heaven: *diví śrávo ‘járam ā tatāna*, highly reminiscent of our 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich ... *tatāna, śrávo devéṣv amṛtam ajuryám*.

Even if this sketch of the function of the vss. and of Sasarparī is accepted (a big if), it remains to analyze the word. I consider it a portmanteau pun. On the one hand it is a kind of anagram for the intensive of  $\sqrt{srp}$  ‘creep’, found in the RV only as the hapax adj. *sarīṣṛpá-* (X.162.3), which I tr. ‘squirming’. On the other hand, it is also phonologically reminiscent of *sabar-dúgha-*, *-duh-* ‘sap-yielding’, of milk cows -- two occurrences of which are found in nearby III.55 (vss. 12, 16) qualifying Night and Dawn, one of whom bellows (*mimāya* as here) in vs. 13. (Acdg. to Griffith, Gr associates Sasarparī with Sabardughā, though this is not registered in the dictionary.)

Just as the Sasarparī brings fame in 16, so does a *sabardúh-* in VI.48.12-13 “milk out immortal fame” (*śrávò ‘mṛtyu dhúkṣata*). Another possible association is *sarpís-* ‘melted butter’, adduced by Mayrhofer as a possible relative of *sasarparī-* (EWA s.v. *sarpís-*). My tr. “squirming, sappy (cow called) Sasarparī” reflects my sense that all of these words have contributed to the designation *sasarparī-* and these contributions are positive: *sabardúgha-* and *sarpís-* reflect the fecundity and richness associated with juice and fat, *sarīsrpa-* the uncontrollable vitality of a squirming young animal. Needless to say, this is highly speculative and does not rest on properly chaste etymological principles, but it is difficult to see what could with regard to this maddening but phonologically delectable word.

The next question to ask is why Sasarparī “banishes neglect” (*ámatim bādhamānā*). Again this phrase supports the notion that the referent of *sasarparī-* is a cow. In I.53.4 and X.42.10 *ámati-* is overcome by cows; the word is paired with hunger (*kṣúdh-*) in VIII.66.14, X.42.10, and X.43.3. Hunger and neglect can be combatted with cows and their nourishing products, and one of the combatants is Sasarparī.

III.53.16: Besides the continuing problem of *sasarparī-*, the other difficulty is the hapax *pakṣyā* in c. Gr takes it as ‘aus Monatshälften bestehend’ (flg. BR), Ge (/WG) ‘auf meiner Seite stehend’, Re as ‘ailée’ or ‘prenant parti (pour moi)’. The publ. tr. strikes out on its own (though closest to Re’s first alternative). It involves reading *sāpakṣyā* against the Pp (but involving no change in the Saṃhitā text), to be divided *sā apakṣyā*. The latter would be the instr. of a nominal abstract in *-yā-* (see AiG II.2.840), a rare but attested type built primarily to *-a-*stems. Here potentially to *apakṣá-* ‘wingless’ (cf. AV XI.5.21), hence ‘winglessness’. What might this bizarre confection have to do with the passage? The rather flimsy connection is via the daughter of the Sun (*sūryasya duhitā* in 15c) and a possible reference to Dawn in 16c: the same phrase *návyam āyur dádhānā* is used of Dawn in VII.80.2). (Like) the former, Sasarparī has stretched the Kuśikas’ fame to the gods; (like) the latter, she has brought fame to all the five peoples. These feats might be expected to require special forms of transport, such as wings, if the agent is not a supernatural traveler like Dawn or the Sun’s Daughter. But Sasarparī is a cow, hence wingless.

I realize how fragile -- and potentially ludicrous -- this suggestion is, however, and it might be better to play it safe with something like ‘on my side’.

III.53.17: As noted in the publ. intro., this verse and the rest of this little section are reminiscent of the final vs. of III.33.13, against disaster on a journey, specifically there a river crossing.

The hapax *pātalyè* is entirely unclear, besides being a dual referring to some part of the chariot.

On the thematic medial stem *dáda-* in the sense ‘hold, keep safe’, see Gotō (1<sup>st</sup> Class, 171–72, flg. Wackernagel).

III.53.19: The loc. *spandané* is generally taken as a third type of wood (besides *khadirá-* and *śimśápā-*), but while the other two words are standard designations of trees, *spandaná-* is ordinarily not, but rather refers to a type of motion -- jerking or kicking. I take it to refer here to the elasticity or flexibility of *Dalbergia sissoo* (*śimśapā-*), a quality it has (at least acdg. to the internet).

III.53.20: On the problematic *āvasā ā* (Saṃhitā) / *ā ava'saí ā* (Pp.), see detailed disc. by Scar (576–77), who lays out the various phonological and morphological possibilities. As he points out, the reading of Holland van Nooten, *ā āvasā ā*, with accent on the first *a* (possible on the basis of the Saṃhitā text) and deaccentuation of the final *ā* of the noun (contra both Saṃhitā and Pp), makes no sense (and does not conform to the transmitted text). The nominal form between the two *ā*'s is by most accounts a root noun cmpd of  $\sqrt{sā} + āva$ . The question is what the case form is. I follow Whitney (§971a) and Old in reading *-ās*, contra the Pp., interpreting it (with Whitney and Old) as an irregular abl. sg. to this root noun cmpd. (expect *\*avasās*) in infinitival usage. The parallelism in the hemistich supports this interpr., but see the other possibilities offered by Scar.

III.53.21–24: As noted in the publ. intro., these vss. are traditionally taken as depicting the rivalry between Viśvāmitra and Vasiṣṭha, but I see no sign of this here; certainly Vasiṣṭha is not mentioned. The verbal link is supposed to be VII.104.16 *adhamās padīṣṭa* “let him fall lowest,” a curse uttered in a Vasiṣṭha hymn that echoes our 21c *ādharah sās padīṣṭa*. But in neither case is the opponent named, and there is no reason to assume that Vasiṣṭha directs this at Viśvāmitra or vice versa.

The first vs. of this sequence (21) is quite straightforward; vs. 22 is more complex, but I feel fairly confident in its interpr. But vss. 23–24 are very difficult, and my interpr. is correspondingly quite provisional.

III.53.22: With Old, I reject the interpr. of *cid* in abc as a simile particle (contra Sāy and Ge); in all three cases the *cid* can be interpreted in its usual ‘even, even though, just’ sense. However, I differ from Old on the purport of the vs. He thinks it describes concrete events, possibly as a “Beschreibung von Zauberhandlungen,” while I think it contains two figurative descriptions of the impotence of the enemy -- in this I am closer to Ge’s notion of similes than to Old. I also find myself in the odd position of being in general agreement with Griffith’s interpr. (based on Ludwig’s). Each hemistich describes an action involving great effort and drama that produces trivial and insubstantial results. In ab an ax is thoroughly heated, but this formidable weapon only cuts off the blossom of a silk cotton tree. (That silk cotton tree flowers are a vivid red might remind the audience of the real blood that might have been shed by a blazing hot ax.) In cd a pot, also heated, is boiling (*yéṣantī*), indeed has boiled over (*práyastā*), but all it produces is foam.

III.53.23: In my opinion, at least the first half of this vs. continues the sentiment of vs. 22: the enemy is powerless, despite bluff and bluster. In pāda a older translations



supply an unidentified subject (“he”) for *cikite*, but the medial perfect of  $\sqrt{\text{cit}}$  is always pass.-intrans. and with Kü (176) I take the verb as an impersonal passive with an oblique subj. in the genitive; cf. I.51.7 *táva vájraś cikite* with the subject in the more normal nom. The point here is that the opponent’s missile (*sāyaka-*) is so inconsequential as not to attract or deserve notice.

In b the first problem is the hapax *lodhá-*, which is universally taken as a red animal of some sort, a horse (Ge, Re), fox (Gr), or goat (Old, tentatively EWA). My quite different tr. ‘clod’ assumes (again, very tentatively) an association with a loose set of words for lump, clod, etc.: *loṭṭha* (Pkt., etc. = Vedic *loṣṭá-*, perhaps by hypersanskritization) (Turner 11157), *\*lottha* / *\*loddā* / *\*loddha* (Tu. 11137), *\*luṭṭa* (Tu 11077). The point would then be that “they” (whoever they are) lead (to sacrifice?) a lump of earth or the like, thinking that it’s an actual (sacrificial?) beast. This situation reminds us of the chariot race of Mudgala and Mudgalānī (X.102) in which a block of wood is yoked with a bull, and the oddly assorted pair still wins the race (X.102.8–9). It might also remind us of X.28.9 in which an earth clod (*logá-*, not too distant phonologically) splits a stone. The other morphological fact of note in this pāda is that *páśu* is neut. and initially accented (versus the ubiquitous masc. *paśú-*). This may be a deep archaism, matching Lat. *pecu*, Goth. *faihu* (cf. AiG II.1.20, II.2.474), or it may be a nonce attempt to de-animatize the word in this peculiar context.

Like vs. 22 and 23a, 23b describes an undesirable situation exactly contrary to what was aimed at: having mistaken a lump for a sacrificial animal, the actors will surely not get the results they wanted -- although X.102.8–9 and X.28.9 may point to success in unlikely circumstances. But the second hemistich depicts situations in which, though a mistake was possible, it was not made: they don’t set a bad horse (*ávājin-*) to race with a good one; they don’t put a donkey before the horses. The question is whether the subjects of the three 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. verbs (*ṇayanti* b, *hāsayanti* c, *ṇayanti* again d) are the same, or are the deluded weaklings of ab being contrasted with more clear-headed and successful actors in cd? Common sense suggests the latter, but the morphologically identical sequence of verbs with no overt subject or change of subject the former (as Old points out). I cannot make up my mind, esp. because the following vs. muddies the waters even further.

III.53.24: The good sense / bad sense problem continues, or returns, here. The sons of Bharata are ceremonially presented to us, with the here-and-now deictic *imé*. And we know from vs. 12 that the Bharata people (*bhārata- jāna-*) are our people. But here they (or the subjects of the three 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. verbs: *cikituḥ* b, *hinvānti* c, *pāri ṇayanti* d) seem to make the same bad choices that were visible in vss. 22–23, esp. 23b. The continuation of the 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. verbs invites us to make the Bharatas subjects also in vs. 22. Is this a jokey anti-dānastuti? Are the “bad choices” I just mentioned meant to show that even if they do stupid things, they will still beat the incompetents depicted in vs. 22? Or that bad choices can still sometimes unaccountably lead to good? I am baffled.

The mealtime *prapitvá-* is well attested in the RV, but *apapitvá-* is found only here. Both Ge and Re take the words in some kind of figurative sense (e.g., Re

*apapitvá-* ‘la retraite’, *prapitvá-* ‘l’élan-en-avant’), but since the *-pitvá-* compounds are otherwise only used of meals and the times of day associated with them, it seems best to maintain that sense here; so WG ‘die Nachessenzeit’, ‘die Voressenzeit’. In its contrast with *pra* here, I take *apa* as meaning ‘leaving the meal, post-prandial’ and therefore ‘non-meal’. My interpr. is influenced by my sense that the lesser choice is the one being made in each case in this vs.

In c the standard tr. take *ná* as a simile marker: “they incite their own horse like an alien one.” But given the paired negative clauses in 23cd and the undoubted negative (or at least undoubted by the standard tr.) in the immediately preceding pāda (24b), where the *ná* takes the same position as in c, the pattern seems to impose another negative here. Under either interpr. the action is not a very smart one: spurring your own horse like an alien one should presumably mean that you don’t spur it at all.

The accentuation of *ḡyā-* in the bahuvrīhi *ḡyā-vāḡa-*, against simplex *ḡyā-*, is attributed to the shift to initial accent in some other bahuvrīhis: AiG II.1.293 with Nachtr. 81. The standard tr. avoid the problem of the sense of this cmpd by attributing to *-vāḡa-* a sense it doesn’t otherwise have: Ge (WG; cf. Gr) Schnelligkeit, Re la force. But *vāḡa-* means ‘prize’ and bahuvrīhis with it as 2<sup>nd</sup> member ‘having X as prize’. I here assume that winning only a bowstring would not be a glorious outcome.

### III.54 All Gods

III.54.1: All four pādas contain a distracted *-ḡya-* form immediately after an early caesura.

The expression “listen with his ... faces” is somewhat comic, though clearly domestic and heavenly “faces” refer to Agni’s aspects in those two places.

III.54.2: With Ge (/WG) I supply “to those two” in b, to provide both a goal for *ichāñ carati* and an antecedent for *yāyoh* in c.

III.54.3-4: The co-occurrence of *ṛtá-* and *satyá-* in these two vss. (3a, 4b) is striking. In keeping with my estimation of the difference in meaning between the two, I tr. the first as ‘truth’ and the latter as ‘real(ity)’. In both cases here the sense of *satyá-* is close to the English idiom “come true,” that is, “become real.” In 3a the poet is asking that the cosmic truth(s) associated with Heaven and Earth be realized in our own sphere, that H+E put themselves out, as it were, for our benefit. 4ab also concerns the truth(s) associated with H+E -- hence the adj. *ṛtāvarī* ‘truthful’ -- and the older poets, in finding these two entities that possess their own truth(s), spoke words (presumably about and in praise of H+E) that both reflected the reality of those truths and that also came true (*satyavācaḡ*). This vs. esp. emphasizes the poets’ process of discovery of the truths about H+E.

As Re points out, the vs. contrasts the priests or poets in ab with the warriors in cd.

III.54.5: The first pāda is also found in the famous cosmogonic (or anti-cosmogonic) hymn X.129, as 6a. The final pāda of that hymn, X.129.7d, ends with an incomplete sentence “or if he does not know ...?” (*yādi vā nā véda*). Though all the standard tr. of this vs. here find a way to incorporate our 5d into the syntax of the verse, I by contrast think the same trailing off into uncertainty is found here as in X.129.7. The lower seats of the gods in heaven can be seen, but not the ones in the higher realms. We can only discover so much. As for grammar, I take the *yā* of d as a neut. pl. referring to *sádāṃsi* in c (so also Re, though with a slightly different interpr. of the rest). Ge (/WG) instead take it as a fem. nom. sg. referring to the *pathyā* in b, with c as parenthetical. I do not entirely understand the *vratéṣu* in d. The hidden commandments may be the laws that govern the further reaches of the cosmos.

III.54.6: On the somewhat anomalous use of *nṛcákṣas-* here see comm. ad III.53.9.

The first pāda of this vs. seems to imply that, though the higher seats of the gods are not generally visible (5d), a *kaví-*, despite having only a man’s sight, has been able to see (*abhí ... acaṣṭa*) Heaven and Earth whole, and that he is cognizant of the crucial paradox about them --- that they are joined but still distinct -- a paradox treated in the rest of the vs. and the following one (7).

The interpr. of b is hampered by the hapax *vighṛte*. On the surface it appears to belong to the root  $\sqrt{ghṛ}$  ‘sprinkle’, but it is difficult to make this yield immediate sense. It appears to serve the same function as *víyute* ‘separated’ in the next vs. (7a), and it has therefore been suggested that *-ghṛta-* actually belong to the root  $\sqrt{hṛ}$  ‘take’ or is a byform thereof (see, e.g., KEWA III.578). My publ. tr. reflects a tacit acceptance of such a view (or at least a willingness not to probe it too deeply), but I now wonder (without full conviction) whether in the context of *mádantī* ‘becoming exhilarated’ a sense that connects *vighṛte* to  $\sqrt{ghṛ}$  ‘sprinkle’ might be possible: “sprinkled separately but becoming exhilarated (together).” In any event I take it as a dual fem. acc. (with Ge [/WG]), not, with Re, a loc. sg. with *yónā*.

My tr. also depends on assuming that the exhilarating is happening jointly, in contrast to whatever type of separation is indicated by the *ví-*prefixed ppl. -- the same contrast between unity and separation found in cd. The place where this is happening in b, “the womb of truth” (*ṛtásya yónā*), may refer to two different places, the ritual ground (as so often) and, perhaps, the distant invisible seats referred to in 5d.

III.54.7: The *-ūka-*stem *jāgarūka-* in b is found only here in Vedic. I wonder if it owes its *-ka-*suffix to the feminized context of c, where H+E are identified as “sisters and young women” (*svásārā yuvatī*) despite their oppositely gendered names. On *-ka-* in women’s language, see my “Women’s Language in the Rig Veda?” (Gd. Elizarenkova, 2008) and “Sociolinguistic Remarks on the Indo-Iranian \*-ka-Suffix: A Marker of Colloquial Register” (IJ 53 [2009]).

Note the virtual mirror image of *víyute* (a) and *yuvatī* (c).

I do not understand the use of *ād u* here. Ordinarily this old ablative has a fairly strong temporal (“just after that”) or logical (“because of that”) sense, but since

c has a concessive force (“although being ...”), it is difficult to get *āḍ* to have logical force, and the fact of being sisters but called different names does not seem to have a temporal dimension. It reminds of the *ca ... āḍ* in 11cd, but there *āḍ* easily expresses a standard temporal sense. It is possible, but extremely speculative, that the *āḍ* does reflect some sort of cosmic temporality: H+E, originally joined together, had a single identity and gender, but after the cosmogonic separation they received different, and genderedly oppositional, names. The monism of the next vs. (8cd) might (barely) support such an idea; note that “the One” there is neut. (*ékam*).

The standard interpr. (see Ge, etc.) of *mithunāni nāma* is that their names are of different genders when they are given separate names, with *dyaúh* generally masc. and *prthivī* fem. But they are also paired sisters, with the fem. du. designation *ródasī*. This seems correct, and the publ. tr. should probably have reflected this sense of *mithuná-* better. I am somewhat puzzled by why the names are in the plural, however.

III.54.8: The notion of the pair of H+E, separate but unified, is in the 2<sup>nd</sup> hemistich replaced by an even starker contrast, the One (*ékam*, neut. as noted in comm. to previous vs.), which controls the Many, with the Many first configured as oppositional pairs in the neuter: the moving and the fixed (*éjad dhruvám*), the walking/roaming and the flying (*cárad patatrī*). *ékam* is found at the end of its pāda, just as it is in the refrain to the next hymn (III.55).

III.54.9: On the meaning of this vs. see publ. intro. It is the final vs. of the hymn-within-the hymn, vss. 2–9 dedicated to Heaven and Earth. The 1<sup>st</sup> ps. poet reappears here; he is first found in vs. 2, the beginning of this self-contained portion, and has been absent since, though he may be related to the 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. *kavī-* in vs. 6.

As indicated in the publ. intro., I think this vs. has a double meaning, aided by the double readings of two items in it: *ádhi √i*, which means both ‘go upon’ (literally) and ‘study’ (‘go over’, figuratively), and the unnamed *dyaúh*, present both as the divinity Heaven alluded to in the phrase in b “great father, begetter” (gen. *mahāh pitúr janitūh*; for this as a designation of *dyaúh* cf., e.g., I.164.33 *dyaúr me pitā janitā*) and as heaven the place, suggested by the locational adv. *yātra* ‘where’ in c, introducing the place where the gods take their stand. The poet is both studying the ancient cosmic mysteries he has been attempting to understand in the previous vss. (esp. 5–6) and is embarking on the path that leads to the place where the gods are established, beyond the ken of mortals. Recall the question in 5b “What is the pathway that leads to the gods?” (*devāṁ āchā pathyā kã sám eti*), a question followed by the statement that only the lower seats of the gods are visible. Here *purāṇám* in pāda a can qualify ‘path’ -- not the fem. *pathyā* in 5b but the more familiar masc. *pánthā-*, qualified as *purāṇá-* in IV.18.1 (cf. also *purāṇám ókaḥ* ‘ancient home’ in nearby III.58.6, referring to the Aśvins’ dwelling, presumably also heaven). The gods are themselves on a separate path (*pathī vyūte d*) in the same place, at least by my interpr. Despite their different representations in the (written) Saṃhitā text and in the Pp., *vyūta-* here and *vīyuta-* in 7a must be the same form, ppl. to *vī √yu*; in recitation they would be identical. The verb *unoti* to the supposed root *√u* to which *vyūta-* is

sometimes referred (see, e.g., Ge n. 9d) is actually also a form of  $\sqrt{yu}$ , in the sequence *vyūnoti* in V.31.1, also meaning ‘separates’. Cf. EWA II.503.

III.54.10: This vs. forms a sort of ring with vs. 1, enclosing the Heaven and Earth hymnlet of vss. 2–9. Like vs. 1 it begins with *imám* followed by a word for hymn (1a *imám ... śūṣám*, 10a *imám stómam*), and with 1cd it contains a verb form of  $\sqrt{śru}$  ‘hear’ with god(s) as subject (10b).

On *ṛdūdāra-* see EWA s.v. *ARD*, though he is somewhat cagey about its formation. I assume the 2<sup>nd</sup> member is *udāra-* ‘belly’, with the literal sense ‘moist-bellied’ being equivalent to our ‘tender-hearted’. This assumes a bahuvrīhi with an adjectival first member of the form *ṛdu-*, a shape (disyllabic adj. ending in *-i-* or *-u-*) that often triggers (or is at least associated with) 2<sup>nd</sup> member accent in bahuvrīhis (see AiG II.1.296ff.).

III.54.11: The first hemistich is either a syntactic fragment -- a long NP in the nominative establishing the topic -- or *pátyamānaḥ* is a predicated pres. part. (The publ. tr. takes it as the former.)

In c *ca* appears to be subordinating, given the accent on the verb *ásreḥ*. I would now be inclined to delete the “and” in the publ. tr. and remove the parens. from “when.”

III.54.14: I am not entirely certain why “victorious Bhaga” is brought in here in a simile in this Viṣṇu vs. I suppose that our praises are making a triumphal procession to Viṣṇu, and the mention of Bhaga may suggest our hope that these praises will be met with a satisfactory portion of goods in return. See 21c below.

In cd it is tempting (see, e.g., Old) to make *mardhanti* the verb of the rel. cl. beginning with *yásya*, which otherwise lacks a verb and appears truncated. But *mardhanti* is stubbornly unaccented. Construing *yásya pūrvīḥ* as a relativized expression of possession, we can assume that it asserts that Viṣṇu has a large female entourage; these females are further characterized in the independent clause in d as “generatrices” (*jānitrīḥ*), for which “mothers-to-be” seemed a more acceptable English rendering, who attend on him and do not neglect him. What this is all about escapes me, though Viṣṇu is associated with the wives of the gods in I.156.2.

III.54.15: The standard tr. construe the instr. *vísṣvair vīryaiḥ* as the object of *pátyamānaḥ* (“being master of all *vīryá-*), but when *pátya-* takes an object, it is in the acc., including once in this hymn: 8c *patyate vísṣvam*. In the only other passage in which Gr identifies the verb stem as taking an instr., VI.13.4, I take the instr. as here, as expressing the means by which the subject displays his mastery.

III.54.16: The first half-vs. treats the kinship we share with the Áśvins, a theme occasionally touched on elsewhere (e.g., VIII.73.12 adduced by Ge). The grammatical problem in the hemistich is the (pseudo-)root noun cmpd. *bandhupṛch-*, which has been interpr. both actively (“asking about [their] kinship”: Gr, Ge [/WG],

Lü 526, Scar 328–29) and passively (“asked about [their] kinship”: Re). I have followed the Re path, on the assumption that it is more likely that humans are asking the Áśvins about it than that the Áśvins are wondering about it themselves. But in general I prefer root noun compounds to have active meaning, and it is possible that the majority position is the correct one. It does not seem to have too much effect on the interpr. of the rest.

III.54.17: There is phraseological connection between the first pāda of this vs. and the previous vs.: *cāru nāma* “dear name” repeats verbatim the end of 16b, and though they are etymologically unrelated, *kavayaḥ* in 17a echoes *ákavaiḥ* in 16d.

The first half of the verse most likely refers to the Ṛbhus, though they are not named until c. The “dear name” of these unnamed subjects is probably “gods,” the predicative voc. *devā(h)* in b. The Ṛbhus were not originally divine, but achieved the status of gods because of their wondrous acts in the sacrifice. So to be addressed as “gods” by Indra is precious to them indeed.

The second half-vs. consists of a pāda (c) with a sg. nom. (*sákhā*) referring to Indra, accompanied by a pl. instr. (*ṛbhúbhiḥ*) and no verb, followed by one (d) with a 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. impv. (*takṣatā*). It is tempting to construe the two pādas together, with a mixture of constructions: the sg. nom. + instr. serving as the equivalent of a pl. subj. to the verb in d, but I have kept strictly to the grammar, as do the standard tr.

III.54.18: Ge (/WG) takes pl. *yajñīyāsaḥ* as predicated of *aryamā ... áditiḥ* with pāda a simply a nominal clause; this is strictly impossible, since the predicate adj. should be dual. Ge explains the plural on the grounds that the poet is thinking of the other Ādityas. This is possible, but I prefer to take *yajñīyāsaḥ* as a third term referring to an unspecified set of other gods (quite possibly the rest of the Ādityas), and all three terms as the subj. of pl. *yuyóta* in c. (So also Re.) The *naḥ* in pāda a then simply anticipates the same form in c, and b is parenthetical.

III.54.19–20: The call to the gods to hear us, found first in vs. 1, returns here at almost the end of the hymn (19c, 20a, 20c). Note that in 19c the verb is sg. (*śṛṇótu*) with a series of sg. subjects (and one pl., *āpāḥ*, in the middle), while in 20a it is pl. (*śṛṇvantu*) with a grammatically pl. subj. In 20c a sg. nom. with an instr. pl. of accompaniment (rather like the construction I suggested in 17c) takes a sg. verb, which suggest that my suggestion for 17c is incorrect.

III.54.21: The standard tr. take *bhágaḥ* as the subj. of *mṛdhyā(h)* in c; e.g., Ge “Bhaga [das Glück] möge in meiner Freundschaft nicht fehlen, o Agni.” With such a 3<sup>rd</sup> ps. subj., this requires *mṛdhyāḥ* to be a precative (Re calls it a “pseudo-précatif” for some reason) rather than a straight 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. opt. This is, of course, not impossible. But the desire expressed here, that Agni make sure that Bhaga does the right thing, does not seem the usual type of prayer addressed to gods in the RV. I take pāda c as consisting of two clauses, the first nominal, the 2<sup>nd</sup>, addressed to Agni, consisting only of a negative and a verb (cf. for this construction with this verb, *ná mardhanti* in

14d above), with Agni the subj. I take *bhágaḥ* as a common noun in the publ. tr.; alternatively it might mean “(May) Bhaga (be) in partnership with me.”

The final word of the vs., the gen. *puruṣóḥ* ‘consisting in much livestock’, is a bahuvrīhi variant of the phrase *bhūri paśvāḥ* ‘abundance of livestock’, likewise ending its vs. in 15d.

III.54.22: Old is disturbed by *tāṁ* in c and suggests emending *pr̥tsú tāṁ* to *pr̥tsutā*, loc. sg. of *pr̥tsutí*-. Because of the peculiar mid-pāda position of *tān*, I favor this suggestion though it requires erasing one accent.

### III.55 All Gods

As noted in the published introduction, this hymn is notable for its refrain, “great is the one and only lordship of the gods” (*mahād devānām asuratvām ékam*), with its juxtaposition of *devá*- and *ásura*-.

III.55.1: The perfect in b, *ví jajñe*, is entirely ambiguous between  $\sqrt{jan}$  and  $\sqrt{jñā}$ , and I think it likely that both are meant. In this context there is not too much difference between a syllable being born and being discerned. The “track of the cow” is presumably here the ritual ground, and the reference is to the ritual speech of the dawn sacrifice.

Re astutely notes the juxtaposition of *akṣára*- and *padá*-, reinforcing the speech theme, even though *padá*- has the sense of ‘track, footprint’ here. See *padá*- in the next vs. (2b) for a possible reference to speech.

The standard tr. all supply a first-person subject in c, with a verb like “I proclaim.” No one but Old attempts to justify this addition, and his attempt is half-hearted. I instead take c as continuing b and take the underlying form of *prabhūṣan* to be *prabhūṣat*, neut. nom./acc. sg., before a following nasal, against the Pp. The participle modifies *akṣáram* in b. In my interpr. the “syllable” (that is, the essence of speech) attends to the gods’ commandments, perhaps by giving them imperishable verbal form. I also suggest that the “great syllable” is actually the refrain found in d; note that *mahāt* in b takes the same position as it does in the refrain. The refrain may also be the most important of the gods’ vratas; see also 6c.

III.55.2: For *juhuranta* see comm. ad I.43.8; I take the form to  $\sqrt{hvr}$  ‘go crookedly’, not  $\sqrt{hr}$  ‘anger, be angry’. The point here is that the gods and the ancestors, who themselves know the path/word, should not keep us from following this same ritual cursus. There is no question of anger that I can see.

The standard interpr., that c refers to the beacon of the kindled ritual fire visible between heaven and earth, is surely correct. This kindled fire is referred to more straightforwardly in the next vs., 3c *sámiddhe agnaú*.

III.55.3: The flying, scattered desires of the poet here and his turn, in a ritual context, to the old ways of doing things reminds us of the opening of III.38, a hymn about the development of a poetic vocation within the age-old tradition, esp. III.38.1cd. In this

connection it's worth noting that our refrain, *mahád devānām asuratvām ékam*, finds an echo in III.38.4c *mahát tát vṛṣṇo ásurasya nāma* "Great is that name of the bull, the lord." Ge also appositely adduces VI.9.6, also about a poet's training and his self-conscious assumption of the mantle of tradition, with his inspiration deriving from the ritual fire.

The *ṛtá-* that we wish to speak may again be the refrain that follows immediately.

III.55.4: The *ví ... purutrā* of the preceding vs. (3a) returns here, though with the preverb bound to a ppl. (*víbhṛtaḥ*); the phrase is contrasted with *samāná-* to express the theme of unity and diversity in balance. The "common king" is of course Agni, and the image is both of this single god being found on many different ritual grounds and of the ritual fire on any particular ritual ground being divided into three.

With Ge, I assume that the pair in c is the kindling sticks. Cf. III.31.2d and X.27.14b, esp. *tasthaú mātā* "the mother stands still," comparable to our *kṣéti mātā* "the mother rests peacefully." The epithet 'having two mothers' (*dvimātár-*) used of Agni in 6a and 7a is a reference to the paired kindling sticks.

III.55.5: As is generally acknowledged, the feminine plurals in the first hemistich refer to plants; the idea is the common paradox that fire is covertly present in all plants because overt fire is produced from wood. Here the three types of plants must be 1) 'older' (*pūrvā-*) = woody and easily burned, 2) 'later' (*áparā-*) = still green and obviously growing and fire grows up with them, 3) tender (*tárunī-*) = sprouting ones, which are hard to burn, but he's in them already anyway. Most tr. take *sadyáḥ* with Agni, not the new-born plants -- e.g., Re "est d'un coup au dedans des (plantes) nouvelle(-ment) nées" -- but *sadyáḥ* is strongly associated with forms of  $\sqrt{jan}$ , esp. in III (e.g., III.5.8 *sadyó jātáḥ*; sim. III.32.9, 10; 48.1), in the sense of "just born."

The covert presence of fire is the topic of the paradox in c: he is always within the plants (*antárvaṭīḥ*) even though they have not been impregnated (*ápravītāḥ*) sexually.

III.55.6: There seems to be a consensus that the phrase *śayúḥ parástāt* in pāda a refers to a form of Agni in the other world, that is, to the sun in some manifestation (see esp. Ge n. 6ab). This seems to me entirely unnecessary and a cosmic intrusion in a sustained description that is otherwise entirely focused on the ritual fire (vss. 1–9). Instead the hemistich seems to contrast the fire that was immanent and motionless (*śayúḥ*) in the plants, as described in vs. 5, released after birth and roaming restlessly, as a newly kindled fire does. The depiction of his resting place as 'far away' (*parástāt*) may seem exaggerated if only plants are involved, but conceptually, and to a certain extent physically (since the kindling wood has to have been gathered from somewhere), it seems to me appropriate.

III.55.7: Pāda b is an elaboration on and corrective of 6b. It is not the whole fire that wanders untethered, only the top of it (*ágram*), while the base stays put on the hearth.



Most tr. take *ágram* as an acc. with *ánu*; I follow Re (who in turn follows Bergaigne) in taking it as the neut. nom. subj.

The accent on *cáratī* is contrastive with the immediately following *kṣéti*, which opens a new clause.

III.55.8: This verse contains quite oblique phraseology. The first half-verse appears to describe the increasingly aggressive ritual fire after it has been kindled. I take *āyát* as the neut. pres. part. to  $\sqrt{i} + \tilde{a}$  ‘come’, substantivized to mean ‘approach, advent’, and I supply a gen. ‘of him’, which is parallel to the gen. simile in pāda a. The growing fire is compared to a fighter involved in close combat. I have rendered *pratīcīnam*, lit. ‘turned outward, opposite, face to face’, as the slangy ‘right in your face’ to convey the belligerent nearness of the fire’s approach.

The c pāda is likewise hard to interpret. As Ge notes, the lexeme *antár*  $\sqrt{car}$  is generally used for the journey between earth and heaven undertaken by Agni, the messenger or “go-between” for the earthly and heavenly realms. This usage is found in fact in the very next vs., 9b, where Agni is clearly the subject and is journeying through the space between heaven and earth -- as well as in numerous other passages (see esp. X.4.2). As Ge also points out, in I.173.3 it is ‘Speech’ (*vāk*) who plays this role. Similarly, in our passage ‘thought’ (*matī-*) -- i.e., as often, thought that has taken shape as ritual speech -- is the subject and undertakes the role of messenger. As for the tribute of the cow (*niṣṣīdham góḥ*), with Ge I take this as referring to the bovine product that serves as oblation, namely ghee. Thus, ritual speech makes the swift journey to the gods in heaven from the ritual ground, bringing the news of the oblation or serving as its envoy. On *niṣṣīdh-* see comm. ad III.51.5.

III.55.9: In pāda a the “gray messenger” is Agni, gray because of his ash; I take the fem. pl. *āsu* as referring to the plants (see vs. 5) that provide the fuel that feeds Agni’s flames. The fire “bears down on them” (/ “keeps pursuing them”; *ní veveti*) as it spreads over the firewood. (A reference to his hearths is also possible, but I think less likely.)

In contrast to the earthly spread of the fire depicted in pāda a, b shows it rising towards heaven in its messenger role. I take *rocanéna* as an instr. of extent of space, rather than referring to Agni’s own luminosity with the standard tr. However, taking it in the latter way would not appreciably alter the sense of the pāda.

The publ. tr. is somewhat misleading, in having ‘bearing’ for both *ní veveti* in a and *bíbhṛat* in c, though of course English ‘bear’ has entirely different senses in the two idioms.

III.55.10: This verse continues the theme of vss. 8–9, Agni’s role as go-between. Its point is to show us that Agni as messenger reaches to the highest places in heaven, those defined by the endpoint of Viṣṇu’s famous striding. But the introduction of Viṣṇu also initiates the transition from the exclusive focus on Agni and his kindling.

Note the alliteration: (*go*)*pāḥ paramaṃ pāti pāthaḥ, priyā* ...

III.55.11: The *yád* in pāda c has no obvious function. JSK (I.136) interprets the pāda as containing an “X and which Y” construction (“the dusky one and [the one] who is ruddy”), with *yád* instead of *yā* by attraction to the *anyád* of b. Although this is a tempting way to account for the *yád*, in addition to the wrong gender the rel. is wrongly positioned: we should expect *\*yád/yā ca áruṣī*. Ge’s suggestion, that this contains the izafe-like [not Ge’s term] *yád* that attaches appositives in Vedic prose, may be correct. It’s also worth noting that the structure of c is identical to 12a *mātā ca yātra duhitā ca dhenū*, with two nom. singulars conjoined by double *ca*, a *ya*-subordinator between them, and a dual nom. at the end of the pāda referring jointly to the two singulars. So it is possible that the *yád* of 11c comes from the model of 12a, where *yātra* has function.

III.55.12: With Ge I interpret this fem. pairing to be Night and Dawn, who in the previous vs. were identified as sisters. They jointly nurse the infant fire at the early morning sacrifice; the reference is probably to twilight, the transition between Night and Dawn. Re prefers to identify them as Heaven and Earth, but this requires him to interpret Heaven as a female, and it also makes less ritual sense.

III.55.13: The pāda-initial position of *anyāsyā(h)* strongly suggests that it is indefinite (‘another’, not ‘the other’), contra the standard tr. Since definite *anyā-* ... *anyā-* (“the one ... the other”) is correctly positioned in 11b, 15b, and 17ab, I think we should take the contrastive positioning seriously and connect this phraseology with 4c, which also contains initial *anyā-* (*anyā vatsām bhāratī kṣēti mātā* “Another bears the calf; the mother rests peacefully.”). In that passage the “mother” of the fire, the lower kindling stick, rested, while the upper kindling stick, identified as “another,” carried the infant fire. Here the situation is reversed: the *anyā-* form refers to the mother of the calf/fire, which is now being licked by a different feminine entity -- in this case, in my opinion, the ghee oblation. A second pairing also imposes itself, however: in vs. 12 we had a different feminine duo: Night and Dawn. Their proximity in 12 invites an alternative reading of 13a, underscoring the temporal transition, with Night functioning as the mother of the fire, but Dawn taking over, tending it and bellowing over it. This latter interpr. seems to be continued in the next vs. (14ab).

I confess that I do not understand the purport of pāda b (nor, as far as I can see, does anyone else). The hemistich is found identically also in X.27.14cd, though given the virtual impenetrability of that hymn, this doesn’t help much. Contra Ge (/Gr, etc.), I do not think *bhū-* here is ‘world’, nor that the instr. expression *kāyā bhuvā* means “in welcher Welt” (see Old for objection to this tr.). Instead I take *bhū-* as ‘form’ or (with Old, etc.) ‘existence-form’, with the phrase meaning “in what shape or guise.” I suspect that the pāda asks how the surrogate mother/cow, who took over from the fire’s mother in pāda a, will deliver nourishment (symbolized by her udder) to the infant fire. The answer may be given in pāda c: it is “the milk of truth” (*rtāsya* ... *pāyas-*), which we might further translate into “the milk of correct ritual speech.”

III.55.14: Ge (/WG) takes *pádyā* as merely a locational ‘unten’, contrasting with *ūrdhvā* at the beginning of the next pāda. It seems unlikely that a formation with so much lexical content would be used in so colorless a manner, esp. given the deployment of *padā*-forms elsewhere in the hymn (*padé iva nīhite* beginning the next vs. [15a], *padé góḥ* 1b, *padajñāḥ* 2b). The “feet” of Dawn are presumably, in naturalistic terms, the light of dawn nearest to the horizon; shining through morning mists it will take on various shapes and colors. (Lü [617 n. 3] suggests that the various shapes and forms are vegetation on the earth, which is also worth considering.) But in mytho-ritual terms, if Dawn is the cow nurturing the young fire in 13b (as well as pāda b in this vs.), the “wondrous forms” (*vápūṃṣi*) she clothes herself in and the “many shapes” she possesses (*pururūpā*) are the forms and colors of the fire over which she stands. That the scene is set on the ritual ground is suggested by pāda c, where “I” roam across “the seat of truth” (*ṛtāsya sádma*), which I take as a reference to seat of the ritual. Ge (/WG), however, interpret the pāda as simply meaning “I wander ‘im Geiste’” -- I *think* because of the *vidvān* ‘knowing’, though that word usually refers to knowledge of the ritual or to cosmic knowledge related to the religio-ritual system.

With Ge (/WG) I take *pururūpā* as fem. nom. sg.; however, it can equally be neut. acc. pl. (with Gr and Re) modifying *vápūṃṣi*. The choice actually has almost no effect on the sense of the pāda.

III.55.14–15: The publ. tr. is somewhat misleading, in that *vápūṃṣi* in 14a is tr. as “wondrous forms” and *dasmé* in 15a as “the wondrous one.” I might substitute “marvellous forms” for the first, to avoid the impression of an etymological connection.

III.55.15: This vs. seems to continue the theme of Night and Dawn. The *anyád* ... *anyád* construction of pāda b echoes that in 11b, where Night and Dawn were first introduced, and in fact our pāda b, with one hidden and one visible, paraphrases 11b, with one shining and the other black, and forms a small ring.

Moreover, the two “set down within the wondrous one” echoes 12c *ṛtāsya té sádasy īle antáḥ* “I reverently invoke the two within the seat of truth.” I take *dasmá-* to refer to the ritual fire/ritual ground, and one of the marvels is that two such large entities (Night and Dawn) can fit into something so small.

The vs. also recycles various thematically significant lexical items: *padā-* (see comm. ad 14); *nīhité* echoing *ní dadhe* (13b); *antár* (12c and passim: 2c, 5b, 5c, 8c, 9b, 12c; *antár* is in a sense the signature word of this hymn); *anyád* ... *anyád* 11b. The ‘pathway’ (*pathyā*) takes us back to III.54.5 where a question about “the pathway leading to the gods” (*devāṃś áchā pathyā*) initiated the mysteries that have dogged us ever since.

III.55.16: The miraculous milkers in this vs. are taken by all standard tr. as rain clouds, flg. one of Sāy.’s suggestions (the other being the heavenly regions). In

context this interpr. seems perverse. The verse forms part of a tight little section (beginning with vs. 11) concerning Night and Dawn and their nourishing of the infant ritual fire. Our vs. esp. echoes vs. 12: *dhenávaḥ ... sabardúghāḥ ... ápradugdhāḥ* “milk-cows, sap-yielding, not milked out” is the equivalent in the plural of 12ab *dhenū, sabardúghe dhāpayete* “the two milk-cows, sap-yielding, give suck” in the dual. I find it highly unlikely that the vocabulary here repeated from 12 would refer to entirely different entities (clouds), which, moreover, have no connection with the dawn ritual depicted here. Instead, in the course of this section the joint nurturing activity of Night and Dawn (11–12) has given way to the dominance of Dawn over Night (13ab, 14ab), and though both Night and Dawn are present in vs. 15, one of them (Night) is hidden (15b). This trend accords with the natural phenomenon: at dawn, light dissipates darkness. In our vs. 16 the plural cows either represent the Dawns in general -- the plural of Dawn being often interchangeable with the singular -- or the beams of light, the “dawn cows,” of a single Dawn. The expression “becoming new ever again” (*pāda c nāvya-navyā yuvatāyo bhavantīḥ*) might favor the former possibility, since it reminds us of the daily parade of ever-new youthful Dawns. My identification of the cows with the dawns here admittedly leaves the noisiness (“let them be noisy,” *ā ... dhunayantām*) unexplained. I would suggest either that there is also a reference to the crackling of the fire wood as the ritual fire is kindled at dawn, or that it refers to the general noise attendant on dawn as the various creatures awake, including real cows mooing to be milked. Note that already in vs. 13a Dawn (in my interpr.) ‘lows’ (*mimāya*) over the infant fire. I think we can safely banish the putative rain clouds.

III.55.17: As indicated in the publ. intro. I consider this vs. to be transitional between the fire-kindling vss. and the arrival of Indra at the sacrifice. I therefore think that the reference is ambiguous. In the publ. intro. I suggested a trio of possible referents: Agni, Soma, and Indra. I now think it is only Agni and Indra and that Agni is the sole referent in ab, with transition from Agni to Indra in c.

This opinion is very different from the standard, which takes Parjanya as the subject here (flg. on the supposed rain cloud vs.). The issue is further complicated by the fact that in the next hymn (III.56.3) yet another being, possibly Tvaṣṭar or Tvaṣṭar’s son, is described as *retodhā vṛṣabhāḥ* “a bull, depositor of semen,” which matches our *vṛṣabhāḥ ... ní dadhāti rétaḥ*. Although I must concede that Parjanya is described with the same phrase as III.56.3 in VII.101.6 and is said to deposit semen also in V.83.1, such designations are not exclusive to Parjanya. In I.128.3 it is Agni who is ... *réto vṛṣabhāḥ kánikradat, dádhad rétaḥ kánikradat* “a bull ever-roaring, depositing his semen” (with  $\sqrt{krand}$ , rather than  $\sqrt{ru}$ , ‘roar’), and I think Agni is the referent here as well. I do not entirely understand the two herds of cows, but suggest that it may have to do with the embryonic doctrine of the cycle of waters that is later developed in the Upaniṣads, whereby rain falls from heaven and causes plants to grow; the plants, as fuel, produce/give birth to the fire, whose smoke goes to heaven and becomes clouds from which the rain falls, and the cycle begins again. Our passage may have an abbreviated form of this: the bull Agni is roaring (that is,

crackling as fire) among one set of cows (plants as firewood); the smoke goes to heaven and the rain (his semen) falls to earth and produces plants (the other herd). Note vs. 5 much earlier in the hymn, where it is said of the plants “Having (him) within, (though) unimpregnated they give birth to (him).”

The transition from Agni to Indra occurs in pāda c, in my interpr. Both Agni and Indra can be called *kṣápāvant-* (*/kṣapāvant-*) ‘earth-protector’, indeed simultaneously. (See X.29.1 and my “Śleṣa in the Rig Veda?” [Fs. Gerow], 163–64.) Indeed this epithet is even more flexible: as I discussed in the Gerow Fs., the first element may be either *kṣá(m)* ‘earth’ or *kṣáp-* ‘night’. (For the possible morphological analyses, see the loc. cit.) Under the latter analysis, the epithet would be appropriate only for Agni, but under the former to both Agni and Indra, so the first word in c may slip from clear reference to Agni to double reference. The following two words, *bhága-* and *rājan-*, are also used in the RV of both Agni and Indra, though ‘king’ is more common for Indra than Agni. The transition is complete.

III.55.18: In my interpr. this vs. announces the arrival of Indra with a splendid team of horses. This new topic is signalled by *prá nú vocāma* beginning pāda b. The exact arrangement of the six and five isn’t clear to me. Re suggests that the double *nú* indicates that there are two separate clauses here. He may be right (“now there is an abundance of horses of the hero; we will proclaim (it) now”), though the difference in sense is slight.

III.55.19–21: I’m not sure why Tvaṣṭar appears here. The previous vs., with the arrival of Indra at the sacrifice, may mark the end of the ritualistic vss. that dominated the hymn up till now. The few remaining vss. then celebrate the prosperity and abundance that our good relationship with the gods, via the sacrifice, will produce: teeming life provided by Tvaṣṭar (19), goods filling the two worlds provided by Indra (20), peace provided by Agni (21), and the inanimate earthly supports for all this prosperity, which provide their gifts to Indra (22).

III.55.19: It is striking that pāda a is reused in the famous Yama-Yamī dialogue hymn (X.10.5b), where Yamī claims that Tvaṣṭar made them a married couple in the womb. I do not think there is an echo of that story here; the point of intersection is simply the association of Tvaṣṭar with conception, pregnancy, and birth (cf., e.g., X.184).

Acdg. to the standard interpr. (Ge [/WG], Re; cf. Klein I.218, Kü 314), *prajāḥ* is to be construed with *pupóṣa*, on the basis of X.170.1 *prajāḥ pupoṣa purudhā ...* This is not impossible, but it seems unnecessary, esp. as the latter hymn is quite late. It also implies that *purudhā* should also be construed with *pupóṣa*, but this is impossible because *jajāna* is unaccented. It is also unlikely that *prajāḥ* and *purudhā* should be separated, given *purudhā prajāvān* in the next hymn (III.56.3b). At best we can take *prajāḥ purudhā* with both verbs: “thrives with regard to offspring in great quantity and has begotten them [=offspring in great quantity]” or perhaps “thrives with regard to offspring and has begotten them [=offspring] in great

quantity.” Such an interpr., with an acc. of respect and a fundamentally intransitive verb, follows that of Kü (314). I do not believe that *pupóṣa* here can have the transitive/causative sense that the other tr. ascribe to it (e.g., Re “a fait fleurir les créatures”).

III.55.20: I assume that the subject of this vs. is Indra. One of his standard cosmogonic deeds involves the creation and separation of the two worlds, the separation here implied by the material crammed between them. Indra is of course commonly identified as a *vīrá-*; he also “finds goods” (e.g., II.13.11, VIII.61.5), though so do other gods as well as mortals.

III.55.21: The first three pādas here are almost identical to I.73.3abc, where Agni is definitely the referent. For disc. of some of the detail, see comm. there.

### III.56 All Gods

I will not attempt to further identify the referents in these enigmatic vss. beyond the sketchy suggestions given in the publ. intr. Ample disc. can be found in the standard tr. As in many such mystical hymns, the grammar is mostly quite straightforward; it’s the purport that remains cloaked in obscurity.

III.56.1: The standard tr. take b as obj. of *minanti* in a, which is certainly possible, while I take it as a separate nominal clause. The choice has no real implications.

In c I take *ródasī* as subj. of the infin. *nináme* in d, along with *párvatā(h)*, but the standard tr. (also Thieme, ZDMG 95: 90) supply a different infinitive in c, generated from *minanti* in a. So, e.g., Ge “Weder die Zauberkundigen noch die Weisen schmälern ... / Nicht sind Himmel und Erde ... (zu schmälern) ...” I do not see the need for supplying additional material. The only possible semantic arguments might be 1) that the two worlds would not be subject to being bowed down (but I don’t see why), or 2) that *vedyā-* wouldn’t be capable of performing something physical (like bowing down) but only mental/moral (like transgressing), but such an action seems well within normal limits for the Vedic conceptual universe. Another possible way to construe pāda c is to take *ródasī* as another subject of *minanti*: “nor do the two worlds transgress the commandments.” This has the merit of not supplying anything, but makes *vedyābhiḥ* harder to incorporate. Old suggests this possibility as well as supplying *nináme*; he does not suggest supplying a different infinitive in c.

The word *vedyā-* can be either positive or negative depending on context. Here it must be the latter; cf. also VII.21.5.

III.56.2: WG suggest that *átyā(h)* is a hapax related to *ánta-* ‘border, edge’, *ántya-*, tr. ‘Begrenzungen’. Since no other forms show such a putative zero-grade, since *ántya-* is not found in the RV, since the stem *átya-* is well attested, and since there is no metrical advantage to reducing an *\*antyā(h)* here to *átyā(h)*, this suggestion doesn’t merit adopting. In a hymn of this nature, the females might as well be steeds as

boundaries. For other attempts to reinterpret. *átyā(h)* see those rejected by Old and another given by Ge (n. 2c).

III.56.3: On the basis of *tváṣṭā ... viśvārūpaḥ* in the preceding hymn (III.55.19) I take the subj. here to be Tvaṣṭar. Since Tvaṣṭar has a large role in the shaping and begetting of offspring, the identification makes sense in this context.

As Ge (et al.) points out, the deriv. *pājasyà-* at the beginning of the Bṛhad Āraṇyaka Up. (ŚBM X.6.4.1) in the list of the body parts of the sacrificial horse seems to refer to the underbelly: *dyaúṣ prṣṭhám antárikṣam udáram prthivī pājasyám díśaḥ pārśvé ...* “heaven its back, midspace its belly, earth the underbelly, directions its flanks ...,” which accounts of the standard tr. here ‘having three bellies’. However, here in this passage with polarized gender and a sexual tone, I think it should also contrast explicitly with *tryudhā* (better *\*tryūdhā*; see Old, who explains the shortening on the basis of following *purudhā*) ‘having three udders’. On a four-legged animal the underbelly would be the part that sags behind the ribcage, where on a female paśu the udder would be. The corresponding male body part located there would be the groin, hence my tr. The image is the common one of the ur-creator as androgynous. See III.38.4–7, a deeply enigmatic hymn in this same maṇḍala, where the creator is also both a bull and *viśvārūpa-*.

In c I suggest that *patyate* may be ambiguous between ‘be master’ and ‘be husband’ (on the basis of *pāti-*, which of course means both) because of the sexual activity in d.

III.56.4: I have no suggestions for the identify of the singular referent of a, cd (though the waters call to mind Indra), nor for the reason of what seems the intrusive b.

III.56.5: On this vs. see Thieme, *Untersuchung* 43–44 and 47–48. He is responsible for the second interpr. of *vidátheṣu* in b. See also *vidátha-* in III.38.5–6, a passage already adduced above ad vs. 3, and comm. thereon: ‘cosmic division’ seems the most likely interpr. of the stem there.

The three watery maidens in c may be evaluated in conjunction with II.5.5, also with the three (apparently watery) women who nourish Apām Napāt in II.35.5, and perhaps with the three goddesses of the Āprī hymns (Sarasvatī, Idā, and Bharatī). Who they are here and what they are doing are unclear to me.

In d *pátyamānāḥ* ‘acting the master’ may be a sly joke, since it has females as its subj. and it was just used (3c) for the hyper-virile inseminator.

III.56.6: The emphasis on the day here is striking. Two different ‘day’ words get used: *#trír ā divaḥ ... divé-dive ... trír no áhnaḥ#*, with the two parallel expressions polarized at the beg. and end of the hemistich.

III.56.7: Schaefer (196–97) nicely points out that the “intensive” (i.e., frequentative) *soṣavīti* is the verbal equivalent of the *āmreḍitas* in 6cd (see comm. above), with the simple verb *suva*.

I am not certain what to do with pāda b. The standard tr. take Mitra-Varuṇa as parallel subjects with those in c, with the main verb in d. This is certainly possible, but conceptually it seems a bit odd. Do Mitra and Varuṇa want things from other gods? would they beg for such a gift? Also Savitar is regularly *hīraṇyapāṇi-* (as in III.54.11), so the *-pāṇi-* adj. here (*supāṇī*) would associate M+V with him.

### III.57 All Gods

III.57.1: The plural agent noun *panitāraḥ* predicated of just two gods, Indra and Agni, assumes other gods are covertly present; cf. III.54.9 in the same VD series, with *devāsah ... panitāraḥ*, after which the expression here may be modeled.

III.57.2: The standard tr. all take Indra and Pūṣan in pāda a as the subj. of *duduhre* in b and as modified by *prītāḥ* in that pāda. There are several difficulties with this interpr. First, pāda a has entirely dual reference: the two god names *īndraḥ* and *pūṣā*, followed by two dual descriptors, *vṛṣaṇā suhāstā*, but both the adj. *prītāḥ* and the pf. *duduhre* in b are plural. Although Old suggests that this dual/plural disharmony is similar to (and therefore presumably no more problematic than) the pl. *panitāraḥ* in 1d, I think the cases are different: Indra and Agni have no dual descriptors in 1d and there is a plausible source nearby for the pl. *panitāraḥ*.

Moreover, in 2ab Old and Ge (/WG) take Indra and Pūṣan as agentive milkers, supplying what produces the milk (namely in this case the udder) as the object of *duduhre*. But medial forms of  $\sqrt{duh}$  ordinarily take the milk-producer (cow or, by synecdoche here, the supplied udder) as subject; if there is an object it is the milk, either actual or metaphorical. This is exactly the use of the med. 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. pf. *duduhe* (that is, the identical form to *duduhre* save for number) in 1c. It seems highly unlikely that these two nearly superimposable forms would be used with entirely different syntax/semantics in near adjacency. The construction that would be reflected by the tr. of Old et al. is generally in the active; cf., e.g., I.64.5 *duhānti ūdhaḥ* “(The Maruts) milk the udder.” (Re avoids the syntacto-semantic difficult by taking Indra and Pūṣan as the milk-producers -- “Indra donc, Pūṣan ... ont donné un lait inépuisable” -- but the number disagreement remains.)

To avoid these two problems, I propose taking 2a as a variant pairing continuing 1d -- Indra and Pūṣan are often found together, as are Indra and Agni, and could equally admire the cow. In fact, if 2a continues 1d, the pl. *panitāraḥ* could be accounted for by the addition of Pūṣan in 2a. (Alternatively 2a can be a nominal clause with *suhāstā* as predicate: “Indra and Pūṣan, the two bulls, have dexterous hands” or sim.) I then take 2b as a separate clause, with *prītāḥ* a fem. nom. pl. referring to cows, who are “pleased” because they are well-treated and produce milk accordingly; they are the subj. of *duduhre*, and *śaśayām* refers to the milk they produce. In this interpr. the unnamed cows in b stand for the inspired thoughts, the



poems, of “me” -- the poet who called his *manīṣā-* a milk-cow (*dhenú-*) in 1ab. The productive result of these poems in the sacrificial exchange, their “milk,” is compared to the “(milk) of heaven,” namely, rain. This theme is further developed in cd: when/if the gods take pleasure in her, i.e., the poet’s inspired thought offered at the sacrifice, he hopes to get the reciprocal benefit of the gods’ benevolence. (Note the echo of *asyām* in c and *aśyām* in d, though unfortunately they are in different metrical positions.)

It might be objected that the cow in vss. 1–2 is otherwise singular (*dhenúm* 1b, *yā duduhe* 1c, *asyāḥ* 1d, *asyām* 2c), but the feminine plural dominates vs. 3 (*jāmāyaḥ* 3a, *dhenávaḥ* 3c), and this may simply anticipate the number shift.

III.57.3: Ge takes *śaktīm* as an infinitive, governing a dat. *vṛṣṇe* (flg. the Pp.): “... dem Bullen einen Dienst zu leisten wünschen.” This somewhat wayward interpr. is not followed by the other standard tr., where *śaktī-* receives its usual abstract sense -- though WG do preserve the dative interpr. of the ambig. *Samhitā vṛṣṇa* (“die dem Stier das Kraftvermögen wünschen”). The more natural interpr. is Re’s, with underlying gen. *vṛṣṇaḥ*: “qui recherchent la force-active du taureau,” and my tr. reflects that.

As Ge suggests, the “sisters” in ab are the fingers of the officiant that produced the ritual fire with the kindling sticks; the cows in cd may be the ghee-oblations or (supported by vss. 1–2) the hymns accompanying the production of the fire, or both.

III.57.4: The first hemistich faintly echoes 1a, with *manīṣā* (4b) corresponding to *manīṣām* and *vivakmi* (4a) reminiscent of *vivikvān*, though they belong to two different roots ( $\sqrt{vac}$  and  $\sqrt{vic}$  respectively).

Various referents have been proposed for the feminine pl. in cd: dawns (Old), tongues, flames (Ge), flame-tongues (WG). Though Re favors flames in his tr., his comment in his notes is more illuminating: “Type d’ellipse d’un nom fém. pl., notamment dans le cycle d’Agni; plusieurs possibilités concurrentes.” This remark seems esp. apt to this hymn, with its focus on feminine entities.

III.57.5: The two descriptors of Agni’s tongue, *mádhumatī* ‘possessing honey’ and *sumedhā(h)* ‘very wise’, seem almost to clash in their juxtaposition, but they were probably chosen to reflect two different aspects of the tongue. On the one hand, Agni’s tongues of flame flare up when the libations are poured upon them; ‘honey’ presumably here refers to these libations (rather than to soma, despite the common identification of soma with honey; soma would put the flames out if poured on them). But *real* tongues, the kind that produce speech, can be qualified as ‘very wise’ because of that speech, and the crackling of the ritual fire often stands for ritual speech.

[III.58–60 JPB]

### III.61 Dawn

III.61.1: In the publ. tr. “with a rich prize” is slightly misleading, since it represents only *vājena*, but “prize-giver with a prize” sounded flat.

“Young woman from of old” (*purāṇī ... yuvatīḥ*) reflects the usual paradox that Dawn is both new every day and the same every day from the beginning of time. She is “Plenitude” (*púramdhiḥ*) because she distributes the priestly gifts at the dawn sacrifice.

III.61.3: The hapax *caranīyāmāna-* seems an elaborate way to express what might as easily have been simply *cárant-*. Re tr. ‘traçant la marche’ and comments that it has “valeur durative-technique par rapport au simple *cárantī*.” My ‘making progress’ also attempts to differentiate it from the simple pres. to  $\sqrt{car}$  and to indicate its denominative origins.

III.61.4: The puzzle in this vs. is the image in pāda a, *áva syūmeva cinvatī*. Some factors that contribute to this puzzle: 1) *áva*  $\sqrt{ci}$  is not otherwise found in Vedic. (In epic/classical Skt. it means ‘gather’.) 2) *áva* need not be construed with *cinvatī*, but could go with *yāti*, esp. since tmesis in participles is considerably rarer than in finite verbs. 3) There are several roots  $\sqrt{ci}$ . 4) The referent of *syūman-* isn’t clear.

To begin with the last, most interpr. locate *syūman-* in the realm of sewing and garments. Ge tr. “die die Naht auszieht” (“who undoes/rips out a seam”), sim. Old “... die Naht auftrennend,” Re “défaisant le fil.” Old suggest that it is the seam that holds the darkness(es) together. Sāy. goes further, in suggesting that it refers to a garment (*vastram*), which Dawn takes off. WG’s “Wie eine (Frau) den Gurt ablegend” may also reflect this image, though their n. vacillates between sewing and equestrian interpr. The problem with all of these attempts is that, in its few occurrences, *syūman-* is otherwise used of horse tackle, esp. of reins; cf. the PN *syūma-raśmi-* (“\*Band-Bridle” Mayrhofer, PersNam s.v.) and the cmpds *syūma-gabhastī-* (I.122.15 ‘with hands as its guiding rope’), *syūma-gṛbh-* (VI.36.2 ‘pulling at the reins’), as well as instr. *syūmanā* (I.113.17), all in horse/chariot contexts. Despite its derivation from  $\sqrt{sī}$  ‘sew’, it therefore seems unlikely that only here in the RV would it refer to garment construction. And, although Dawn as a female might in principle be connected with sewing (if that is women’s work), in fact she is usually not, whereas her travels are a standard theme; note, e.g., her chariot in 2b, her horses in 2c, and her driving (*yāti*) in this vs.

We must then turn to the verb. If we use the later ‘gather’ sense for *áva*  $\sqrt{ci}$ , the simile might mean “gathering up the reins (preparatory to setting out on a journey).” A similar idea, though not related to horses, seems to be reflected in Ge’s alternative given in n. 4a: “Wie (die Hausfrau), die das Halfterband (den Tieren) abnimmt (um sie auf die Weide zu treiben),” relating it thematically to *svásarasya pátinī* “mistress of good pasture” in the next pāda. I prefer to compare the lexeme *áva*  $\sqrt{tan}$  ‘unstring, slacken’ of bowstrings (e.g., AV VI.42.1 *áva jyām iva dhánvano manyūṃ tanomi te hṛdāḥ* “Like a bowstring from a bow, I make slack the fury from

your heart”; RVic exx. similar but without an explicit bowstring). The image is of Dawn letting the reins go slack to give the horses their head. Curiously, Griffith’s tr. is similar, “letting her reins drop downward,” though he thinks it refers to her sending down rays of light. If this interpr. is correct, I assume that it belongs to the root  $\sqrt{ci}$  ‘pile’, with a highly developed idiomatic sense. In fact combinations of  $\sqrt{ci}$  + PREVERB tend to show fairly extreme idiomaticity.

Arnold (Ved. Met., 300) suggests reading *uṣā ā yāti* for simple *uṣā yāti*, which would yield an 11-syl. line. Old is tempted but seems to favor the transmitted reading; Re, however, is convinced. HvN reject it without explan. (“a rest at the 5<sup>th</sup> place seems preferable”). I would follow Arnold and Re, and therefore the publ. tr. should be emended to “drives here.”

Pāda d is taken by Ge and Re (and me) as containing one of the relatively rare RVic occurrences of  $\tilde{a}$  + following abl. in the meaning ‘all the way to’. The source of this counterintuitive use of the abl. can be seen in passages like this, where ‘all the way to’ and ‘all the way from’ are essentially identical in sense: the light of dawn stretches throughout the midspace, and the directionality (from/to heaven/earth) is irrelevant.

III.61.5: The standard tr. supply a form of  $\sqrt{vac}$  (Ge specifically *vivakmi*, invoking *áchā vivakmi* in nearby III.57.4a) in pāda a, which is then taken as a separate clause: “I (call) to Dawn for you ...” Although I resisted this in the publ. tr., I now see its merits, in accounting for the preverb *áchā*, the double *vaḥ* (pādas a and b), and the acc. case of Dawn. I would therefore emend the tr. to “(I invite) for you the goddess Dawn, radiating widely; proffer your well-twisted (hymn) (to her) with reverence.”

The standard tr. (also Lü 73, Kü 430) take *rocanā* as a fem. nom. sg., in order, as Ge says (n. 5d), to allow *prá ... ruruce* to have its expected intrans. sense. But well-attested *rocaná-* is otherwise only neut. (X.189.3 adduced by Ge, etc., as another ex. of a fem. should be otherwise explained), and in the pl. it regularly refers to the luminous realms. I would prefer not to create a separate stem to apply to a single example, esp. because the default interpr. of the form would be neut. pl. There is a simple solution that allows the neut. pl. analysis to be preserved without imperiling the intransitivity of *ruruce* -- to interpr. the neut. pl. as an acc. of extent, as often. The publ. tr. reflects this.

III.61.6: The phrase *arkaír abodhi* has double sense, since *arká-* can mean both ‘chant’ and ‘ray’ and *abodhi* both ‘has (been) awakened’ and ‘has been perceived’. The ambiguity nicely captures the ritual situation: we ritualists (wish to) believe that the natural world is set in motion and controlled by our ritual activity (in this case chanting that makes Dawn awaken and dawn), but the ritual is itself set in motion by phenomena in the natural world, in this case the appearance of the first light of dawn.

III.61.7: This vs. offers a surprising number of small puzzles. The first is how to construe *uṣásām iṣanyán*. Most take gen. pl. *uṣásām* as the obj. of the participle, despite its unexpected case. (Others, like Pischel and Lü [for details see Lü 596–97],

simply label *uṣásām* an acc. -- convenient but unconvincing.) I supply ‘cows’ (*gās*) as obj. on the basis of III.50.3 (in this maṇḍala) *sám ... gā iṣanya* and IX.96.8. That the bull (*vṛṣā*) in the next pāda is the subject of ‘drive’ invites a bovine object. The cows, as often, can be the rays of the Dawn (the “dawn cows”). They are driven “on the foundation of truth” (*ṛtásya budhné*), that is, the earth and more specifically the ritual ground.

The bull doing the driving is, in my view, the sun, which follows dawn and could therefore be conceived as driving the rays of dawn before him. His “entering the two world halves” is, of course, his rising above the horizon.

The standard tr. take *candrēva* in d to mean “like gold,” but if the reference is to the precious metal, it should be *candrām iva*, as they all acknowledge. With Gr and Old I instead take it as the fem. nom. sg. it appears to be, referring to Dawn. But who/what is the subj. of the frame? Most tr. take it to be the sun, who spreads his radiance (*bhānám*) far and wide. This is certainly possible, but it leaves the *māyā* of Mitra and Varuṇa announced in c rather orphaned. I therefore prefer to take *māyā* as the subject of *ví dadhe*, in intransitive usage (“the magic power spreads/is spread”); the syntax of this frame is contrasted with the transitive but self-involved *ví dadhe* in the simile: “as shimmering (Dawn) has spread her own radiance,” with *bhānám* belonging to the simile. This kind of syntactic disharmony is commonly exploited in similes, as I have discussed at length elsewhere (“Case disharmony in RVic similes”, *IJ* 24 [1982] 251-71).

### III.62 Various gods

III.62.1: For the sense of this complex vs. and its relation to the rest of the hymn, see publ. intro. The point of the verse appears to be that our hymns, however frenetic (a), are not longer effective (b), and therefore the activity of Indra and Varuṇa on behalf of their partners [=us] is in abeyance (cd).

With the standard tr. I supply ‘hymns’ with the opening *imā(h)*: *imā girāḥ* is pretty common.

The praise hymns to Indra and Varuṇa appear to be whirlwinds (*bhṛmāyaḥ*) to us, but they cannot be ‘thrust/brandished’ (*ná tújyā(h)*) by the devotees of the gods -- that is, they have lost their oomph, their energy, and therefore their effectiveness. For the connection between *bhṛmí-* and  $\sqrt{tuj}$ , cf. IV.32.2 *bhṛmíś cid ghāsi tūtujih* “You are a whirlwind, constantly lunging” of Indra. For the connection of hymns with  $\sqrt{tuj}$ , cf. V.17.3 *tujā girā*. Despite its position, *ná* in b should be the negative, not the simile marker. See Old.

On *sína-* see comm. ad II.30.2.

I take *sma* as indicating habitual action.

III.62.2: In ab the combination of an intensive (*johavīti*) and two superlatives (*purutāmaḥ* and *śaśvattamám*) gets its point across!

III.62.3: The “Shielding Goddesses” (pl.) appear here and in VII.34.22. In both cases they are associated with *śaraṇá-* ‘shelter’. A singular *várūtrī-* also occurs 4x, once (I.22.10) in association with *hótrā bhāratī* as here. Beyond their/her protective role, the *várūtrī* appear(s) to be featureless.

III.62.5: Ge (/WG) take *ā cake* as 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. (Ge: “Er liebt unbeugsame Kraft”). This is certainly possible, but Schmidt (B+I, 131) makes good arguments for flg. Sāy and Gr in taking it as 1<sup>st</sup> sg.; see also Re (EVP XVI, ad loc.).

III.62.5–6: Vs. 6 is entirely couched in the acc. and picks up from 5ab, where the acc. phrase is obj. of *namasyata*; 5c is a parenthetical intrusion.

III.62.7: Ge suggests in his notes that this vs. could be a single clause, essentially “This praise-hymn is recited to you by us,” with *te* (a) and *túbhyam* (c) tautological. This is possible, but it seems rhetorically unlikely.

III.62.8: This vs. is more complex than it first appears, at least in my interpr. The dominant reading is the one given by Ge: the simile in c matches the frame in a, with b parenthetic. Nearby III.52.3bc [=IV.32.16bc] is nearly identical with minor morphological variation in the frame: *joṣáyāse gíraś ca naḥ / vadhūyúr iva yóṣaṇām*. This interpr. is undeniable. However, I think the intervening b pāda can also be seen as a target of the simile, but in a syntactically twisted way. The object of the verb *avā* ‘help’ is the NOUN + PARTICIPLE phrase (in reverse order) *vāyayántam ... dhíyam* “the insight seeking the prize,” which, extracted from its role as object and presented as a simple clause, would represent “the insight (nom.) seeks the prize (acc.),” with subject/object syntactic relations. Thus reconfigured, the phrase in b would match the simile in c: “our insight seeks the prize, as a bride-seeking man (seeks) a maiden.” The syntactic transformation of one of the parts of the structural pair from clause into acc. participial phrase does not disrupt their functional and semantic matching -- it rather shows again the pleasure that RVic poets get from off-kilter correspondences. (See, e.g., the simile/frame pair at the end of the previous hymn, III.61.7d with comm. above.)

This secondary reading presents another twist. In the dominant reading the subj. of the impv. *juṣasva* is a (male) god, the obj. a hymn (*gír-*), a word feminine in gender. These genders match those of the simile: the subj. a bride-seeking male, the obj. a maiden. But when we consider the underlying clause in b, the genders are reversed: the insight (*dhī-*) is feminine; she is the seeker, not the sought, while the prize (*vāja-*) she seeks is a masc. noun.

III.62.9: The usual sharp polarity between the preverbs *ví* and *sám* is emphasized by keeping the verb constant (*páśyati*) and explicitly conjoining the two verb complexes with *ca*. My “looks at all creatures separately and sees them whole” is meant to capture the contrast of the two preverbs in idiomatic Engl.

III.62.10–12: All three vss. in this *ṛca* contain *déva-* (...) *śavitár-* (or vice versa).

III.62.10: And here, buried in this not particularly noteworthy hymn, is the Gāyatrī mantra, which is itself not particularly noteworthy on its own terms.

Note the play on *dhīmahi* / *dhíyah* juxtaposed across the hemistich boundary, belonging to different roots.

III.62.11: I take *púraṃdhyā* as an instr. of accompaniment, not (with Ge [/WG]) an instr. of means.

III.62.17: The sense of the splv. instr. pl. *drāghīṣṭhābhiḥ* is unclear. This is the only occurrence of the superlative in the RV, and neither *dīrghá-* nor the cmpv. *drāghīyas-* occurs in the instr. pl. The standard interpr., that the splv. here is temporal (Gr ‘in längster Dauer’), seems reasonable, but not assured.