Indra hymns of VII (save for VII.18):

VII.19 Indra

VII.19.1: Rhetorically interesting to begin a hymn with a syntactically non-independent verse. This verse consists only of relative clauses (*pace* Ge; see below), which find their main clause referent in the first word of the 2nd verse (and indeed subsequent verses), namely *tvám*. Although 'you' clearly is the referent, the first relative clause of vs. 1 has a 3rd ps. verb (*cyāváyati*), though the second one switches to the 2nd person (*prayantāsi*). It might be possible to attribute the 3rd ps. in ab to attraction to the simile, but such a switch would be very rare.

   The simile marker *ná* in pāda a is wrongly placed, after the 2nd member of a three-word simile, not the first (*tigmáśṛṅgo vṛṣabhó ná bhīmáḥ*). Ordinarily, given such a structure, the first word would be interpreted as the common term and therefore not a part of the simile proper ("sharp-horned like a fearsome bull"), but Indra doesn't have horns, which should certainly belong to the bull. The wrong position may result from the fact that X *ná bhīmá-*, where X = an animal, appears to be a formulaic structure, esp. *mṛgá- ná bhīmá-* (I.154.2, 190.3, II.33.11, etc.; also *siṃhá- ná bhīmá-* IV.16.14, IX.97.28 and others). This smaller fixed phrase would then be fitted into a simile containing another term.

   Ge takes pāda d as a main clause, following the Pp., which analyses *prayantāsi* as containing unaccented *asi*. But this requires him to invent a verb for the relative clause of c ("raubst") for which there is no support – and no need. Already Old suggested accenting *ási* contrary to the Pp.

   Old (see also Tichy) also notes the nice example of case disharmony, where both gen. *gáyasya* and acc. *védaḥ* are objects of the agent noun *prayantā*. As has often been noted, suffix-accented *-tar*-stems generally have genitive complements, as opposed to root-accented ones, which generally take accusatives. But enough exceptions exist to allow *prayantā* to take both. That *gáyasya* is parallel to *védaḥ* and not to *ádāśuṣaḥ* is shown by passages like IX.23.3 … *ádāśuṣo gáyam* and VIII.81.7 *ádāśūṣṭarasya védaḥ*. It is possible, but not necessary, that *prayantāsi* is a periphrastic future.

   I have no explanation for the comparative *súṣvitara-* 'better soma-presser', beyond the occasional use of the comparative for emphasis or intensification, without comparandum.

VII.19.2: Pāda b is repeated in IV.38.7, there of Dadhikrā the racehorse. (This repetition is not noted in Bl RR.) Re at IV.38.7 and Ge here (but not there) take *śúśrūṣamāṇaḥ* as meaning something like "putting oneself at the disposal (of someone else, here Kutsa)." I assume that they are thinking of the enlarged root √*śruṣ* 'be obedient', but the two meanings seem quite distinct to me – I can't see Indra being obedient to any man – and formally our participle is a well-formed desiderative to √*śru*. In both places I take it as meaning "desiring to be heard/famed"; here Indra also helps out Kutsa, but at least part of his aim is to ensure his own fame.

In IV.38.7 there is no subsidiary beneficiary, and so the focus on the subject and his fame is ever clearer. Heenen is similarly puzzled by Ge (238 n. 263) but tr. "(toi qui) en personne as la volonté d'écouter au combat," attributing an active sense to the middle participle.

The word *dā́sam* beginning c plays off both *(á)dāśuṣo* in 1c and *sudā́sam* in 3b.

VII.19.3: Trasadasyu and the Pūrus also appear in IV.38 (vss. 1, 3), which contains the pāda in common with our 2b.

VII.19.4: This verse puts into analytic (that is, syntactically independent) form some expressions met as compounds in the previous verse. Most obvious is *(bhū́rīṇi) vṛtrā́ … haṃsi*, which realizes *vṛtrahátyeṣu* in 3d. (Notice that both refer to plural events, handling their grammatical plurality in different ways.) A real *dásyu-* is destroyed in 4cd, plucked from the name Trasadasyu in 3c. In a slightly different relationship, *devávītau* 'in pursuit of the gods' here contains a form of the root √ *vī* 'pursue' found as 1st compound member in *vītahavyam* 'whose oblation is worth pursuing' in 3a. And within this verse *nṛ́bhiḥ* doubles the first member of the next word, *nṛmano*.

VII.19.5: This verse presents some interlocking syntactic and lexical problems. Unlike Ge, I take pādas b and c together. Splitting them requires him to supply a verb for b ("brachst") again lacking support or necessity. Presumably again he is following the Pp, which analyzes *śatatamā́viveṣīḥ* as containing unaccented *aviveṣīḥ*. I prefer to accent it and thus allow it to be the verb of the *yád* clause beginning in b.

In either case *śatatamā́* is a problem. Everyone wants it to be the 100th thing (probably *púr-* 'fortification') that Indra destroys (after the 99 in b). Gr suggests reading *śatatamā́m*, which would provide the desired feminine accusative (agreeing with *púr-*), but among other things would damage the meter (since, s.v. *viṣ*, he is still reading an augmented *aviveṣīḥ*). Ge suggests that it [what is unspecified, presumably the sandhi agglomeration] is to be dissolved ("aufzulösen") into masc. *śatatamám*, and the 100th thing that Indra destroys is Śambara himself. He makes no mention of meter, though this dissolution would cause the same metrical problem. Old suggests supplying neut. pl. *cyautnā́ni* (without translating), but I don't see how an ordinal "hundredth" can qualify all hundred items in the plural. There is a much simpler solution: to take *śatatamā́* as a feminine instrumental with the old ending -*ā*. Although Old claims (in arguing against Gr) that the fem. stem should be *śatatamī́-*, this is simply wrong. See AiG II.2 §457, which establishes -*ā* as the rule and -*ī* as the rare exception. Cf. for -*tama*-stems *purutámā-* of Uṣas and *mātṛ́tamā-*, and for ordinals the well-attested feminine *prathamā́-*. Or, if Ge is correct that the reference is to Śambara himself, *śatatamā́* can be a masculine instr. sg. In either case the text can stand as it is, with no metrical or sandhi problems, and the syntax can be rescued.

Ge takes *nivéśane* in c as 'at evening'. The word generally means 'causing to settle down' (the usual association of -*ana*-nominals with the transitive-causative *áya*-formations) or, as a noun, 'settling down', and is sometimes associated with

Savitar's bringing the world to rest in the evening (IV.53.6, I.35.1, VI.71.2), an association that must have led to Ge's tr. But the word never otherwise means 'evening'. I read it with its full lexical value, but with a sinister edge. "Bringing them to rest" is a euphemism like *ásvāpayaḥ* 'you put to sleep' in 4d. Old mentions the "going to rest" possibility, but opts instead for "in the dwelling place (of the enemy)." Again, there seems to me no reason for this attenuation of the meaning.

The root √*viṣ* means 'work, work over', or here 'work to the end', again used in a slightly euphemistic sense. Note the phonetic echo between *nivéśane* and *(a)viveṣīr*.

The d pāda is a perfect chiasmus, even to the positioning of a conjunction between verb and object: *áhañ ca vṛtrám námucim utāhan*. The mixture of *ca* and *utá* is curious. Klein (DGRV I.186–87) is not sure how to analyze it; he suggests either that it's a "both … and" type of construction, with each conjunction appearing 2nd in its phrase (or so I interpr. his lapidary disc.), or that "*ca* is a sentential conjunction adjoining d to the rest of the stanza, and *utá* conjoins the clauses of d." I prefer the former.

VII.19.6: *sánā* is generally taken (Gr, Ge) as a neut. pl. adj. 'old' agreeing with *bhójanāni*, and this is certainly possible. I find the sentiment somewhat odd, however: to announce to Indra that the delights he has given to his client are "old" seems slighting. I prefer to interpret the word as the 2nd sg. act. impv. to √*san* 'win'; exactly this form occurs several times in initial position elsewhere. What gives me pause, however, is I.178.4, which contains very parallel phraseology, *sánā tā te indra návyā āguḥ*, and where I do interpret *sánā* as 'old'. The difference there is that the poet contrasts the old deeds of Indra with the new ones (*návyā*) that have come and so avoids insulting the god. In any case, either the 'old' or the 'win' interpretation is possible here, though I have a preference for the latter.

The oblation of Sudās's that was worth pursuing (*vītáhavyam*) in vs. 3 has now been given by him (*rātáhavyāya*) here, tracking the progress of the sacrifice to the point of mutual benefit of man and god.

The phrase *dāśúṣe sudāse* "for the pious Sudās" displays syllabic metathesis, *dā-śú / su-dā*, with neutralizing play on all three sibilants. The poet seems to like this collocation: see comment above on vs. 2 for connections across three verses and below on VII.20.2.

VII.19.7: My construction of the first hemistich differs from Ge's, both with regard to the syntactic role of *te* and the sense of *páriṣṭau* and leads to a very different interpretation of the meaning. The latter word, literally 'encirclement', is generally taken as always negative, a tight spot or constriction (Ge's "in dieser Klemme"), but I find this interpretation hard to reconcile with the hic-et-nunc deictic *asyām*, since the poet has given no indication that he is currently in distress. (Ge's note suggests that this is a memory of the situation in VII.18, the Ten Kings battle, but this seems to me an ill-supported attempt to account for the deictic.) I therefore think the *páriṣṭi*- here is positive – Indra's encirclement (that is, protection) of us now – and *te* is to be

construed with *párișțau*: "in this enclosure (that is, protection) of yours." Weak support for this may be provided by the first pāda of the next verse, 8a, where … *te … abhíșțau*# matches … *te … párișțau*# here, with rhyming forms and identical morphology – and a parallel positive sense: "in your charge." There is also a parallel in the next hymn, in roughly the same part of the hymn, with *te asyā́m* as here and a string of locatives: VII.20.8 … *te asyā́m sumataú …várūthe … nŕ̥pītau* "in this benevolence of yours, in your defense, in your protection for men." Ge (followed by Scar 207) instead takes *te* as the subject of the infinitive *parādaí*; in order to make this work he has recast the sentence from one with 1st person subject (*mā́ … bhūma* "may we not be…") to one with 2nd ps. subject: "Nicht sollst du uns … dem Bösen preisgaben." Scar's tr. maintains the syntactic structure of the original, but otherwise follows Ge's interpretation. Better is Keydana's (*Infinitive im R̥gveda* 156, 203) interpretation of *parādaí* as a passive infinitive, as I take it – though he still takes *te* as the ultimate agent of the handing over. Again, I don't see that the poet has expressed any fear that Indra will betray them; rather, he hopes that the protection Indra provides them will keep any such ill-fortune from befalling them, a hope that is repeated in the next pāda.

The poet's penchant for case disharmony (see 1cd above) recurs in pāda d, where I read *priyā́saḥ* both with gen. *táva* and with loc. *sūríșu*.

VII.19.9: I take pāda c with ab, since all three have 3rd ps. subjects referring to Indra's worshipers and clients, with pāda c a rel. cl. beginning with *yé*. Ge, by contrast, connects c with d, although d now refers to the same people in the 1st ps. (*asmā́n vr̥ṇīṣva* "choose us"). He does not, however, take *asmā́n* as coreferential with the *yé* of c, but rather apparently interprets the relationship between the clauses as a kind of improper relativization: "for the same alliance (*yújyāya tásmai*) as (those) who (*yé*)…" This has the advantage of providing some reason for the final *tásmai*, which I find hard to account for, though I find his way of linking the clauses too tricky. Scar takes the first pāda as a temporal subordinate clause ("As soon as they are in your charge, the men…"). This is worth considering, although I am dubious about the subordinating quality of *sadyáś cid*. In the end, although I am not entirely certain of my own way of putting together the various elements in this verse, I have not been convinced by those of other tr. either.

Note the poet's playful variation on 8a … *te maghavann abhíșțau* with … *té maghavann abhíșțau*, where the simple addition of an accent turns the 2nd ps. sg. into a 3rd ps. pl.

náraḥ śaṃsanti recalls the epithet *nárāśáṃsa*, and then participates in an interweaving of two words for ritual speech: *śaṃsanti ukthaśā́sa ukthā́*.

The lexeme *ví √ dāś* occurs only here, as far as I know. Like the idiom *ā́ √ yaj* 'attract by sacrifice', it combines a directional preverb with a root of ritual activity, producing a portmanteau "(send) away by performing ritual service'. So Old 'hinweghuldigen', which he paraphrases as "honor the god such that the Pāṇis become distant."

VII.19.10: We might have expected an unaccented gen. pl. *narā́m* in the voc. phrase with *nṛtama*, but don't get it. There are no unaccented occurrences of this genitive. It would be possible instead to read *narā́m* with *eté stómāḥ* ("these praises of men"), but *nṛ́tama-* + gen. pl. of *nṛ́-* is a fixed phrase, though usually with *nṛṇā́m* (I.77.4, III.51.4, IV.25.4, etc.). I am now inclined to read *narā́m* with both *stómā(ḥ)* and *nṛtama.* It is positioned between them, adjacent to both. The publ. tr. could be modified to "These praises of men are for you, o most manly of men." The first gen. is subjective. Note the co-occurrence of *narā́m,* the older gen. pl. to *nṛ́-*, and the newer one *nṛṇā́m* in this verse.

Ge takes b as an independent nominal clause, while I consider it a sort of definitional relative clause manqué, that is, lacking the relative pronoun *yé* which would find its referent in the initial *téṣām* of c.

Although d looks to contain a simple conjoined NP, each of whose members consists of two members, *sákhā śū́raḥ* and *avitā́ nṛṇā́m*, each with a *ca* between the two members (so Ge, JSK I.195), I prefer to take *śū́raḥ* as the principal predication of Indra, with the other two terms, *sákhā* and *avitā́ nṛṇā́m*, secondarily predicated of Indra as *śū́ra-*. Although this introduces a minor complication in word order, the fact that *śū́ra-* is overwhelmingly a noun and is used independently of Indra in the very next pāda (11a) persuades me that this analysis is correct, especially since both "comrade" and "helper of men" are terms that explicitly encode Indra's relationship to men, while "champion" is of a different order. The distribution of *ca*'s makes no problems for this analysis.

VII.19.11: The finals of pādas a and c echo each other: … *ūtî* # … *úpa stîn* #

I think it quite likely that *mimihy* out of sandhi should be accented (*mimihí*) contra the Pp., given the balanced clausal-type constructions before and after (*úpa no vā́jān … úpa stîn*), a possibility Old raises but considers uncertain.

VII.20 Indra

This hymn shows some stylistic tics, esp. a penchant for oddly placed particles (vss. 2, 4, 5) and for final enclitics (1d, 7d, 8b, 9a, 9d, as well as the refrain 10d).

VII.20.1: A grammatical figure in the pāda-initial reduplicated *i*-stems, b *cákriḥ*, c *jágmiḥ*, both functioning as verbs (*cákriḥ* takes acc. direct object *ápaḥ*; *jágmiḥ* an acc. goal *nṛṣádanam*). For this type see Grestenberger 2013 (JAOS 133).

ápo náryaḥ is reminiscent of *ápāṃsi … náryāṇi* in the next hymn (VII.21.4), though there the words form a phrase and here they are in two different cases and numbers.

VII.20.2: Continuing the focus on nominal forms with verbal rection, the poet picks up the pāda-initial agent noun *trātā́* of 1d and deploys three more pāda-initial nominative *tar*-stems in 2a, c, d: *hántā*, *kártā*, and *dā́tā*, each with an acc. object (*vṛtrám*, *ulokám*, and *vásu* respectively). Although pāda b lacks a subject *tar*-stem, it does have one as object: *jaritā́ram*. The stem that began it all, *trātā́* in 1d, contrasts

with those in vs. 2 by being suffix-accented, and it should therefore, according to general practice, have a genitive complement. I suggest that it's not an accident that its object is the enclitic *naḥ*, which could be accusative (and thus parallel with the objects in vs. 2) or genitive (and thus conform to the usual rule). Recall this poet's tricky case syntax with the *tar*-stem *prayantā* in VII.19.1.

 The occurrence of parallel datives *sudāse* (c) and *dāśúṣe* (d) recall their collocation in VII.19.6.

 The phrase *áha vaí* (*áha vā* in sandhi) interrupting the VP is very peculiar. It is easier to account for the *vaí* than the *áha*: the particle *vaí*, rather rare in the RV though very common in Vedic prose, is often found directly before the particle *u*. In this hymn it occurs twice (also 4d), in both cases before *u*, though not the particle *u*. Here before *ulokám,* which by most accounts is a haplology of **urú [*ulú] lokám*, and in 4d before the perfect *uvoca.* I have no explanation for *áha*, whose function is also opaque to me in general. Although *áha* often takes Wackernagel (or modified Wackernagel) position, it is more flexibly positioned than most RVic particles, so showing up in the middle of the pāda as here is not as anomalous as it might be. My exclamatory tr. is meant to signal the interruptive quality of the phrase, but makes no claims as to its semantic accuracy. I suspect that the poet is indulging in phonological play (one faint possibility: *áha vā u* mimics the opening of the next pāda, *dātā vásu*) or morphological or lexical manipulation, but it's too deep for me.

VII.20.3: *khaja-* lacks an etymology (see EWA s.v. *khaja-kŕt-*), but embedded in an epithet of Indra in martial contexts like this, 'tumult' serves as well as anything else.

 The particle *īm* here lacks its usual accusative function (see Jamison 2002) and does not take its usual Wackernagel position; it therefore reminds us a bit of the similarly irrational *áha vaí* of the preceding verse. However, *īm* does serve to forestall a hiatus between *janúṣā* and *áṣaḷhaḥ* and its position immediately after the former can be taken to signal that *janúṣā áṣaḷhaḥ* are to be construed together. For another example of *janúṣem* see the next hymn (VII.21.1).

 Note the sibiliant play beginning with *samádvā* and continuing through the end of the hemistich.

VII.20.4: Again the poet plays with case disharmony, construing both inst. *ándhasā* and loc. *mádeṣu* with *uvoca*.

 Note again the apparently functionless *vaí* and see disc. above ad vs. 2.

VII.20.5: Once again a particle is positioned oddly: *ádha* in the middle of the relative clause (versus properly positioned *ádhā* in 3d). Klein (II.130) suggests the *ádha* here "is either a subclausal conjunction [but conjoining what? sj] or weakly conjoins the second distich with the first," but neither explanation accounts for the mid-pāda position.

VII.20.6: The final pāda has two linked uncertainties: the identity of the verb and the case form of *rāyá*. Though the Pp. reads dat. *rāyé*, gen.-abl. *rāyaḥ* is equally possible.

The choice depends in great part on the analysis of the verb *kṣáyat*: whether it belongs to √*kṣi* 'dwell' or √*kṣi* 'rule'. If the former, it would be a subjunctive; if the latter, an injunctive. The immediate context favors a subjunctive (*dádhate* in the rel. clause attached to this main clause, plus *bhreṣate* [on this form as an s-aor. subj. to √*bhrī*, see EWA s.v. *bhrī,* with ref. to Hoffmann]*, reṣat* probably, and *āvívāsāt* in ab), but this does not necessarily decide for an affiliation to 'dwell', because there are no overt subjunctives to the Class I present of 'rule over' (no *kṣáyāt) and the injunctive might function modally here. Parallel passages cut both ways. On the one hand, 'rule' regularly takes the gen. of 'wealth': cf. I.51.14 (of Indra) *rāyáḥ kṣayati*, VII.93.2 *kṣáyantau rāyáḥ* (Indra and Agni), X.106.7 *kṣayad rayīṇ́ām* (though in an otherwise incomprehensible verse); on the other, a form of 'dwell' appears in a parallel passage with the material from the end of the pāda: VI.3.1 … *sá kṣesad r̥tapā́ r̥tejā́ḥ*. Old, having considered both possibilities, opts (slightly) for the latter; Ge's tr. also assumes an affiliation with 'dwell' and a dat. *rāyé*: "der wird im Frieden lassen, um zu Reichtum (zu gelangen)." The publ. tr. instead chooses 'rule over' and gen. *rāyáḥ*, though I recognize that both possibilities were probably in the poet's mind. One slender support for my choice may be the parallel phrase in 9d … *vásva ā́ śakaḥ*… "you hold power over goods," with gen. *vásvaḥ* reprising the gen. *rāyáḥ* that opens 9c.

VII.20.7: By my interpr. (and Ge's) *śíkṣan* is a predicated pres. participle, parallel to the subjunctive *áyat* in the 2ⁿᵈ clause; it seems to have adopted the modal sense of this parallel finite verb.

      Note the play between the two initial words of pādas a and b: *yád* and *áyad* (*áyaj* in sandhi), where the second is actually a subjunctive to the root present of √*i* 'go'.

      The question in c is not overtly marked, but I follow both Old and Ge in taking it as such.

VII.20.8: *ághnataḥ* is a gen. sg. negated act. pres. part. modifying *te* 'of you' in the preceding pāda; the heavy modal tr. is a concession to English.

VII.20.9: *stāmú-* is a hapax and there is no agreed upon etymology or interpretation. Gr takes it as belonging to √*stan* 'thunder' and meaning something like 'sighing' (with no explanation of the semantic distance), and he is followed implicitly by Oberlies (II.210). KEWA also registers this idea, but in EWA it seems to have been abandoned, without anything to replace it. Ge, on the other hand, connects it to the root √*stā* 'steal', a suggestion I find very appealing. However, his further interpretation does not seem compelling: "und verstohlen hat (der Sänger) geklagt." The structure of the hemistich, with two clauses joined by *utá*, each with a verb of noisemaking, whose subject in the first clause is an animal, suggests that an animal should be the subject of the second as well. I therefore suggest that *stāmú-* means 'thieving' and it is a well-known characteristic of some animal or other. I suggest 'monkey': monkeys are of course well known for thievery and Vr̥ṣākapi, Indra's

monkey pal in X.86, steals "the goodies of the Arya" (X.86.1). Monkeys are also know for their sharp cries. The presence of *vŕṣā* (recalling Vṛṣākapi) in pāda a may support this idea, but of course all of this is very tentative, and in particular I have no explanation for why configuring his praise as a screeching monkey would please Indra (unless, again, to remind him of his friend Vṛṣākapi). An alternative animal possibility is the magpie, which has a reputation at least in the West as a thief (cf. Rossini's opera "The Thieving Magpie" [La gazza ladra]), although the internet tells me that this reputation is undeserved. There are species of magpies in northern India and they do make sharp cries.

While it is impossible to be certain about the meaning and etymology of the hapax, as often with hapaxes and other rare words it is possible to suggest reasons why it appears in just this passage. Its position in its pāda is identical to that of *stómo* in the preceding pāda, and it echoes that word phonologically. In fact, the phonological play is quite subtle: underlyingly *stoma = s t a u m a*, and *stāmu = s t a a m u,* with the vowels around the *m* simply reversed.

The return of the singer (*jaritár-*) in the last two verses of this hymn (9c, 10c) forms a faint ring with his appearance in 2b.

VII.21 Indra

VII.21.1: Some recycling and recombination from the last hymn: *janúṣem uvoca* combines *janúṣem* (20.3b) and *uvoca* (20.4d), each in its metrical position, and *ándhaso mádeṣu* echoes *ándhasā mádeṣu* of 20.4d.

devám appears to be one of the few adjectival forms of the stem, modifying neut. *ándhaḥ*. Although I would like to reduce the number of these supposed adjectival forms to zero, it is difficult to see what else to do with it here.

VII.21.2: In the -*áya*-book (Jamison 1983: 50), I take *vipáyanti* as intransitive, in keeping with its vocalism, supplying a form of √*sad*, which is extraordinarily common with *barhís-*: "(Sitting on) the barhis, they become inspired." However, the publ. tr. takes *vipáyanti* as transitive, despite the vocalism, both to avoid supplying extraneous matter and because I did not think the pressing stones that are the verb's unexpressed subj. should sit on the barhis. I failed to note that in V.31.12, adduced by Ge, the pressing stone "will be brought down to the vedi" (*áva védim bhriyāte*). Since the vedi is where the barhis is strewn, the passage seems to put the stone in a position actually to "sit on the barhis." See also VIII.27.1 *agnír ukthé puróhito grávāṇo barhír adhvaré* "Agni has been set in front while the solemn speech (is being recited), as have the pressing stones and the ritual grass while the ceremony (is going forth)," which has the stones and the barhis set out together, and III.42.2, which describes soma as *barhiṣṭhā̃ṃ grávabhiḥ sutám* "stationed on the ritual grass, pressed by stones." The transitive interpr. found in the publ. tr. has the merit of not requiring an extra verb to be supplied, but what ritual event it might depict is unclear. I suppose that the vigorous activity that pressing required would make the material on which the pressing apparatus was placed (presumably the barhis) tremble. But I

now tentatively favor my old 1983 intransitive interpr., which takes better account of the vocalism. Moreover, since what is most often emphasized about the pressing stones is the noise they make, "become inspired" (like *vípra*s 'inspired poets') would express this well-known characteristic of theirs. Note in the next hymn, VII.22.4ab, where the call of the pressing stone (*hávam … ádreḥ*) is parallel to the thought of the inspired poet (*víprasya … manīṣām*). Indeed in that passage the *vípra* might refer to the pressing stone itself. On the vedi as the place where the soma pressing apparatus is placed, see Oberlies, *Der Rigveda und seine Religion,* 254.

  Ge takes *gṛbhãd ã* as "bis zur Handhabung," but in this use of the ablative with *ã* ("all the way to") the noun follows the *ã* (see Gr s.v. *ã*). Better to interpret it as a standard ablative expressing the place/person from which the pressing stones are being brought to the ritual ground for use (so, e.g., Scar 591). Old argues persuasively that *gṛbhá-* is an agent noun. For √ *grabh* with the pressing stones, see *grāva-grābhá-* (I.162.5), the title of a functionary, "Handler of the Pressing Stones."

  dūráüpabdaḥ most be nominative plural, so, although the stem is universally (Gr, EWA, AiG II.2.75) given as thematic, this form (versus *upabdaíḥ* VII.104.17) must belong to a root noun. Gr suggests instead reading *–upabdās*, an emendation Old rejects as unnecessary without commenting on the stem.

VII.21.4: Ge supplies a second, accusative, form of *ãyudha-* as object of *viveṣa* and supplies "enemies" as the referent of *eṣām* 'of them', while making the accusative phrase in b the object of *vidvãn* 'knowing': "Der Fürchtbare hat mit den Waffen ihre (Waffen) abgetan, der aller mannhaften Werke kundig ist." But there are several reasons to reject this interpretation in addition to the necessity of supplying a significant word. The root √ *viṣ* 'labor, bring to fulfillment' does not mean 'abtun' (dismiss, brush aside). Moreover it regularly takes *ápas-* 'work', a form of which appears in pāda b, as object; see esp. IV.19.10 *ápāṃsi ... náryãviveṣīḥ*. By contrast, the participle *vidvãn* is usually used absolutely, without object. As for the referent of *eṣām* it would of course possible to supply "enemies," although they are not mentioned previously in the hymn: the only preceding masc. or neut. plurals are the pressing stones (subject of the whole of vs. 2), the "finely made (fortifications)" of 3d, and, in a simile, the charioteers in 3c. Because the pressing stones are extravagantly celebrated in vs. 2 and called Indra's "companions," I think it likely that they are the referents here: the soma they produce is their weapon, and this soma fuels Indra's labors. This is also Caland-Henry's solution (*L'Agniṣṭoma*, p. 285 and n. 3).

  I supply "fortifications" (*púraḥ*) from c as the obj. of *jaghāna* in d. It is possible that we are meant to think instead (or in addition) of the archetypal obj. of this verb, the serpent Vṛtra, who is concealed in the instr. *(m)ahi(nã)* directly before the verb. Cf. *áhinā* in 3b.

  The first word of the verse, *bhīmáḥ*, picks up the last word of vs. 3, *bhīṣã*.

VII.21.5: A verse with several rare words. The neut. pl. *vándanā* in b is unclear; the neut. sg. *vándanam* in VII.50.2 appears to be some medical condition, and in AV

VII.115.2 it refers to some sort of negatively viewed plant (a parasitic plant, acdg. to Gr; see also EWA s.v.), neither of which is helpful here. I think it better to start with the root √*vand* 'praise, extol' and give it a negative twist appropriate to the context, hence my 'sycophant': praise gone wrong. A similar negative interpretation is needed for the usually positive term *vedyā-* in the same phrase. Why *vándanā* is neuter and not masculine isn't clear to me; perhaps a better tr. would be "sycophancy, sycophantic (words)." With sorcerers and flatterers in this first hemistich we then have two different ways in which *ṛtá* can be undermined within our own community, while the *arí-* 'stranger' whose ways are contrary to ours and the phallus-worshippers in the second hemistich represent external threats to *ṛtá-*.

In c *víṣuṇa-* ordinarily means 'variable, various', which here shades into 'variant' and, with the negative reading prevailing in this verse, 'contrary'.

The lexeme *ápi* √*gā* occurs in the RV only here, but *ápi* √*gam* can have a sexual sense ("inire feminam" as Gr chastely phrases it), and that image would be appropriate here, given the grammatical subject.

VII.21.6: I take the injunc. *bhūḥ* in the first pāda as imperatival, although Ge's preterital value is also possible.

The particle *ádha* is once again oddly positioned; cf. VII.20.5. In this case, however, it seems a mistake for (or a play on?) *ádhi*, which regularly appears with locatives (esp. cosmological locatives) in just this metrical position – including a number of times with the phonological variant of the endingless loc. *jmán* here, namely the *i*-loc. *kṣámi*: … *ádhi kṣámi*# (5x, e.g., I.25.18). See also nearby pāda-initial *ádhi kṣámi* in VII.27.3b.

Pāda b contains one of the standardly cited examples of neut. pl. subject with singular verb: … *vivyak* … *rájāṃsi*.

The verb in d, *vividat*, is morphologically slightly problematic. Following Gr I interpret it as a subjunctive to the act. pf. of √*vid* 'find', but we ought then to have full-gr. root syllable *vivedat. Kü (493) takes it as an injunctive "in komprehensivem Gebrauch," but the perfect injunctive ought not to be thematic, but rather *vivet (like *vivyak* in b). In the end I take it as a wrongly formed subjunctive.

Ge. construes the enclitic *te* with *ántam*: "… dein Ende finden," but the enclitic seems wrongly positioned for this interpretation (insofar as we understand the positioning of adnominal enclitics – but see *te asuryàya* in 7a), and at least one parallel passage suggests that it is the end of his *śávas-* that is at issue: I.100.15 *ná … śávaso ántam āpuḥ*.

VII.21.7: Note the juxtaposition of the gods (*devāḥ*) and Indra's "lordship" (*asuryàya*).

For the meaning of the idiom *ánu* √*mā*, see Kü (279). It parallels the concessive sense of *ánu* √*dā* 'concede' and *ánu* √*dhā* 'id.'

VII.21.8–9: Final *varūtā́* of 8d is matched by final *tarutra* in 9b.

VII.21.8: The "man like you" (*tvắvataḥ*) is the human patron because he, too, distributes largesse. So also Ge (n. 8d).

VII.21.9: *vanvántu* 'let them combat' and *vanúṣām* 'rapacious ones' are presumably derived from the originally separate roots *van* 'win, vanquish' and *van^i* 'love, desire', but since these roots have become synchronically entangled, the pair presents itself like an etymological figure, like I.132.1=VIII.40.7 *vanuyắma vanuṣyátaḥ* "may we win against those who seek to win."

VII.21.10: This verse is identical to the final verse of the last hymn (VII.20.10), but in this case *maghávāno junánti* "the bounteous ones incite (us)" is the positive equivalent of the negative *ná … jūjuvur naḥ* "They do not incite us" in vs. 5, where the internal enemies served as subject.

VII.22 Indra

VII.22.2: I tr. *ásti* as an existential ("exists to be yoked") rather than simply a copula with the predicated gerundive *yújyaḥ* ("is to be yoked") because the 3rd sg. pres. of √*as* is almost always an existential, given that the copula is almost always gapped. However, this may be too emphatic a tr., and it is the case that a surface copula is more likely to be found in subordinate clauses than main clauses. See Jamison 1990 ("Tense of the Predicated Past Participle …," IIJ 33: 1–19) pp. 4-–5. The gerundive + *asi* in 7c (*hávyaḥ … asi* "you are to be invoked") supports a simple copula interpr. here.

VII.22.3: The position of *ắ* in the middle of the NP *vắcam … imắm* is worth noting. Gr takes it as a preverb with *bódhā*, but √*budh* does not otherwise occur with *ắ*, and its position would not be normal for a preverb in tmesis. Note also that *bódhā* + SPEECH is found in the next vs. (*bódhā … manīṣắm*) and in the preceding hymn (VII.21.1d *bódhā … stómam*), both times without preverb. I am tempted to assume that the poet inserted an unnecessary adverbial *ắ* 'here' to produce a proper cadence. Pāda-final *vắcam émắm* is also found in IX.97.13, a verse attributed to Upamanyu Vāsiṣṭha, again without obvious function.

VII.22.4: The lexeme *ví* √*pā* in later Vedic is regularly found in specialized sense in the Sautrāmaṇī ritual, and there it refers to the feat of separating the surā from the other liquid (milk or soma). This sense and context are already found in the late RVic hymn X.131.4 in the med. part. *vipipānắ*. See Old ad loc. (and NGGW 1893, 348–49). Though it has been suggested that this usage belongs to a separate root √*pā* 'go' (see, e.g., EWA s.v. *PĀ*^{3}), this seems unnecessary and somewhat perverse. Although the other *ví* √*pā* passages (all medial) don't have a Sautrāmaṇī association, I think they (or most of them) belong to this same lexeme, though Old is less certain. Here the stones are separating the soma juice from the stalk. In IV.16.3 the pressing stone is also the subj., and there is a pressing stone association in III.53.10. However,

I.112.15 is more enigmatic. The subj. there is an ant (or someone called "ant"), *vamrá-*, and the vignette occupies half a pāda in a list of the Aśvins' helpful deeds. For further on that passage, see disc. ad loc.

VII.22.5: A nice example of the potential iterative-repetitive value of a reduplicated present (*vivakmi*) reinforced by an adverb (*sádā* 'always').

VII.22.7: The first pāda could also be another obj. of *kṛṇomi* in b.

VII.22.8: Ge seems to take the participle *mányamānasya* as a functional reflexive 'think oneself to be', with the added sense of self-conceit ("der du dir darauf etwas einbildest"). Although I would certainly not ascribe to Indra excessive modesty, in this context, where the poet is emphasizing the poets' inability to capture all of Indra's greatness, I think it unlikely that he is focusing on Indra's egotism. I instead take the participle in a passive sense 'be thought to be', as sometimes elsewhere – *pace* Kulikov (339–40), who follows Gotō.

VII.22.8–9: The subject of the verb in 8b, *úd aśnuvanti,* is not specified. In my view the subject is postponed to 9ab: neither the older nor the younger poets are capable of expressing all of Indra's powers in their formulations. Although this interpretation requires enjambment over a verse boundary, the main clause in 9c to which 9ab is supposedly subordinate has no appropriate referent for the relative pronoun (*asmé* works awkwardly at best), whereas 9ab neatly completes the thought of vs. 8.

VII.23 Indra

VII.23.1: I follow Ge in taking *upaśrotā́* as a periphrastic future (contra Tichy, 189, 364).

VII.23.2: Note the echoes at the beginning and end of the first pāda: *áyāmi … (dev)ájāmi(r).* As often, the local patterns created by the use of hapaxes (as *devájāmi-* is in the RV) may help account for their deployment.

   I don't understand Ge's rendering of pāda b, where he seems to take singular *ghóṣa(ḥ)* of pāda a as the implied subject of plural *irajyánta.* I take the verb as a contrastive passive/reflexive to the otherwise active stem, more or less following Old's interpretation, with *śurúdhaḥ* as subject.

   The root noun cmpd *vívāc-* echoes the redupl. pres. *vivakmi* in the preceding hymn, VII.22.5, though of course the *vi*'s have nothing to do with each, being the preverb and the reduplicating syllable respectively.

VII.23.4: 'Teams' (*niyút-*) often appear in context with Vāyu and his driving. Often, of course, they are his teams, but here and frequently elsewhere the 'teams' clearly stand for our poetic thoughts. Cf., e.g., I.135.2, VI.47.14, X.26.1. Therefore, it is

unnecessary to supply, with Ge, a verb of guiding or yoking to make the teams into Vāyu's.

The instr. *dhībhíḥ* is taken in the publ. tr. as an instr. of accompaniment, but it could also be an instr. of price/exchange: "in exchange for (our) visionary thoughts."

VII.23.5: The syntactic frame of *dáyase* here is wrong: it ordinarily takes an accusative of the material distributed and a dative of recipient on the rare occasions on which the recipient is made explicit. A clear example is found in the preceding verse, 4d … *dáyase ví vájān*, also nearby VII.21.7 *maghāni dayate*. The position of *hí* is also anomalous, though note that it exactly replicates the position of *ví* in the phrase in the preceding verse just cited and may well owe its position to this rhyme. Despite the syntactic aberrancy I think that *mártān* must represent the recipient, and the parallelism of the *dáyase* phrases in the adjacent verses has imposed the accusative recipient. (There is also an apparent double accusative, of goods and recipient, in one other passage: VI.37.4 *maghā … dáyase ví sūrín* "you apportion bounties to our patrons.")

VII.24 Indra

VII.24.1: The conjoined phrase *avitā vṛdhé ca* is not syntactically parallel in the strict sense, but both the agent noun *avitár-* and the purpose dative *vṛdhé* are properly construed with the 2nd sg. copula, subjunctive *ásaḥ*. For the latter, cf., e.g., I.89.5 … *yáthā … ásad vṛdhé*, and for the cooccurrence of the two terms VI.33.4 … *avitā vṛdhé bhūḥ*.

VII.24.2: The striking expression "your mind … has been captured" presumably indicates that our successful preparations for the ritual have forcibly brought Indra to the soma sacrifice, with the implication that he is prevented from going to the sacrifices of others.

In pāda a *dvibárhāḥ* appears to be a masc. nom. sg., though I take it (as Ge does) as modifying neut. *mánaḥ*. Gr, by contrast, suggests that it belongs with masc. *sutáḥ sómaḥ* in the following pāda. Although Gr's solution might seem to be grammatically more satisfactory, on several occasions *dvibárhā(ḥ)* does seem to modify a neut.: I.114.10, VII.8.6, possibly IV.5.3, and AIG III.288 allows neut. sg. to -*as*-stem adj. in -*āḥ*. In most instances, as here, the -*āḥ* is pāda-final, and so the long vowel isn't metrically guaranteed.

Gotō (1st Cl., 226 n. 483) interprets *bharate* in c not as a passive (with Gr, Ge, and me; also H-P Schmidt, Fs. Nyberg), but as a self-involved middle: "Lobpreisung, deren Milchstrom losgelassen ist, bringt [ihre Milch] dar," on the basis of his principle that medial Class I presents cannot be used passively. But in my opinion at least, this principle cannot be maintained in general, and certainly in this context, with passive expressions dominating the first hemistich, a passive reading is most natural and the image of the praise hymn bringing its own milk borders on the comic.

With others I take pāda d as an extension of c, with *iyám … manīṣā́* an appositive to *suvṛktíḥ*. However, it would be possible to take it independently: "this inspired thought is constantly invoking Indra," since, though fairly rare, predicated present participles do exist, and the short staccato clauses of the earlier part of the hymn may invite an independent reading here.

VII.24.3: Despite its position, *tavásam* should not modify *āṅgūṣám*, though that is grammatically possible, but *tvā*, since the adjective is a regular epithet of Indra.

VII.24.4: The intens. part. *várīvṛjat* can only be intransitive here, as there is nothing overt or latent that could serve as object (so also Ge "zu uns einbiegend," Schaeffer [191] "immer wieder (zu uns) einbiegend" -- though with a different nuance from my tr.). However, forms to the root √*vṛj* 'twist' are otherwise always transitive, including the other ex. of the intens. part. (VI.58.2). I do not have an explanation.

VII.24.5: Uncompounded vṛddhied *vā́h-* to √*vah* 'convey' is attested only here, but it is common in compounds, e.g., *indra-vā́h-* (4x). See Scar (473-80; for the grade of the root, esp. 479).

The two different simile markers in b (*iva … ná*) may be highlighting two different aspects of the complex simile.

The genitive of goods with √*īḍ* 'invoke' is somewhat aberrant. Although for this root Gr allows acc., dat., or gen. of the material desired, the only other genitive passage he cites is VIII.31.14, where the genitive is otherwise to be construed. However, there seems nothing else to do with *vásūnām*, and the construction is reminiscent of nearby VII.32.5 ... *śrútkarṇa īyate vásūnām* "he of listening ears is implored for goods." Alternatively we could assume the gapping of a noun like *sambhárāṇam* 'assemblage' as in the next hymn, VII.25.2d *sambhárāṇaṃ vásūnām*.

In d the *śrómatam* is presumably the 'hearing" that gods extend to men's hymns. See VII.32.5 just cited for a similar sentiment.

The simile *divī́va dyā́m* is opaque to me. Ge tr. "Wie Tag auf Tag," but neither of these case forms of *div-/dyu-* is used temporally, but only spatially of 'heaven'. Placing "heaven upon heaven" must refer to Indra's cosmogonic deeds, but the connection with Indra's activity in the frame is vague. Old believes that setting heaven on heaven means that Indra is fixing heaven in its proper place.

VII.24.6: For *pūrdhi* see EWA s.v. *PAR[ī2]* 'give'.

VII.25 Indra

VII.25.1: Although *mahá(ḥ)* in the first pāda is a genitive, I have tr. it in the vocative phrase to avoid the awkward "(Be) here with the help of you, the great one, o strong Indra."

Ge supplies 'mind' from d as the subject of the first pāda, but this seems unnecessary.

I take pāda c as a clause parallel to b, with the *yád* in b having domain over both, hence accented *pátāti* in c. By contrast, Ge (see also Old) takes it as a circumstantial clause dependent on d and supplies "(Wenn)." This is certainly possible, but my solution seems simpler.

The threatened possibility of Indra's wandering mind may account for the capturing of his mind in the previous hymn, VII.24.2.

VII.25.4: The prohibitive clause *ná mardhīḥ* is of course grammatically incorrect. We expect *mā̆* with the injunctive in prohibitives, and in fact find it with this same stem several times: *mā̆ no mardhīḥ* IV.20.10, *mā̆ no mardhiṣṭam* VII.73.4, 74.3, always with the 1ˢᵗ pl. enclitic following the *mā̆*. Non-prohibitive forms of √*mṛdh* almost always occur with the negative *ná*, e.g., *ná mardhanti* (I.166.2, III.54.14); there are no positive attestations of this verb. Our passage must be an odd conflation of the prohibitive passages with enclitic *no* and the non-prohibitive passages with negative *ná*. Or alternatively, and in my opinion less likely, this is a non-prohibitive use of the injunctive: "you do/did not neglect." That, however, is Hoffmann's solution (Injunk., 101), taking it "als allgemeine Eigenschaft" of Indra's: "du lässt nicht im Stich." See his discussion, where he also points out that that **mā̆ mardhīḥ* would be metrically bad.

VII.25.5: The opening of my tr. of this verse is meant to capture the odd order of noun and demonstrative, *kútsā eté* …

With Ge I supply a form of √*ṛc* 'chant' as the main verb of the first hemistich, since this verb takes *śūṣám* as object in a number of passages (e.g., I.9.10, X.96.2). Cf. nearby VII.23.6 *vásiṣṭhāso abhí arcanty arkaíḥ*, with the nom. pl. subj. of a group of contemporary singers and the verb √*ṛc* in the last vs. of the hymn (VII.25.6 is repeated from VII.24.6).

VII.26 Indra

VII.26.1: *nṛvát* in d may, as frequently, be adverbial ("I manfully beget…") or, as in the publ. tr., a neuter acc. sg. modifying *ukthám*.

VII.26.3: The use of *sárva-* rather than *víśva-* for 'all' may be a sign of lateness.

VII.26.4: The *utá* of pāda a is echoed by *ūtáyo* in c, which in turn is picked up by *ūtáye* in 5a.

Pāda b opens with *ékaḥ* 'one, single' and c ends with *pūrvīḥ* 'many', a contrast that appears to be hightlighted.

The verb *saścata* in d is morphologically ambiguous. My publ. tr. follows Ge in rendering it as a modal (Ge "… sollen … zufallen," SWJ "will be companions"). Ge does not, however, comment on the form. Gr identifies it as a 3ʳᵈ pl. to an athematic redupl. stem *saśc-*; since this stem precedes and is distinct from his "schwaches Perf. *saśc-*," he must consider it a redupl. pres., as Whitney and

Macdonell (VGS) do; Hoffmann (Injunc. 260) likewise calls our form an injunctive. A 3rd pl. mid. injunc. is certainly possible here, but if we wish to maintain the modal value (which, in fact, is not actually necessary), the injunctive is a small embarrassment, since modal value is fairly rare, and generally limited to particular forms like *dhā́s* for the injunctive. An alternative would be to take it as a 3rd *singular subjunctive*, possibly built to the perfect stem. The neut. pl. *bhadrā́ṇi … priyā́ṇi* could serve as subject to the singular verb in the well-known inherited construction, though it is not overwhelmingly common in the RV. Of course, we would far prefer a primary *-te* ending for the middle subj., but I do not think secondary *-ta* is impossible. Alternatively, with an analysis as 3rd plural injunctive, the tr. could be changed to "… are companions to us."

VII.27 Indra

VII.27.2: The relative clause in the first pāda has no overt referent in the main clause of b, but I supply an instr. *téna* (see also Ge's n.; his first alternative, to supply *tám*, is less attractive because *śikṣa-* doesn't ordinarily take an acc.).

I interpret c as containing an implicit pun. The form *vícetā(ḥ)*, masc. nom. sg. of *vícetas-*, derived from the root √*cit* 'perceive', means 'discriminating', hence my 'tell things apart', and is regularly applied to Indra (and other gods). But this leaves *dr̥ḷhā́* with no verb to govern it. (It cannot be object of *ápa vr̥dhi* in d, because the *hí* in c should trigger verbal accent.) I suggest that *vícetā* (in sandhi) might also be secondarily construed as the agent noun of *ví* √*ci* 'pile apart, pull apart', governing *dr̥ḷhā́*. Of course we would expect the Saṃhitā text to show coalescence of the final vowel of the agent noun and the initial vowel of the next pāda, but the recitational text would not reflect that. Although most agent nouns compounded with preverbs take suffix accent, compare *nícetar-* (I.184.2) to a different root √*ci* 'perceive'. If this suggestion seems too radical, it would also be possible to detach the preverb *ví* from *vícetā(ḥ)* and supply a form of √*vr̥* 'cover' (found in *ápa vr̥dhi* in d), producing the familiar lexeme *ví* √*vr̥* 'uncover'.

VII.27.3: The *cid* in d is somewhat surprising: *cid* generally means 'even', but "even when praised" (*úpastutaś cid*) is the opposite of what we should expect. Both Ge and I have avoided this problem by tr. *cid* almost as a subordinator or at least a circumstantial (Ge "zumal da …," SWJ "just when"). I now wonder if it expresses anticipatory polarity with *nū́ cid* in the following pāda (4a). Since *nū́ cid* means 'never', *cid* in 3d could mean 'always'.

VII.27.4: Note the rhyming pāda-final … *(sáh)ūtī́* (a), … *ūtī́* (b).
In b Ge takes *dānáḥ* as gen. sg. of *dāmán-*, dependent on *vā́jam*: "… den Lohn der Gabe." This is possible, though it would be more natural to have *vā́jam* as object of some form of √*dā* (esp. given the parallel he cites, VI.45.23 *dānám vā́jasya*, with *vā́jasya* dependent on *dānám*). I therefore prefer to take *dānáḥ* as the ablative

singular of the *mán*-stem, with verbal rection, or, possibly (but somewhat farfetched) the nom. sg. of an otherwise unattested medial root aorist participle of √*dā*.

The combination of *abhí* with √*vī* 'pursue' would occur only here in the RV (and the other saṃhitās); Ge renders it as 'willkommen'. I suggest that it belongs rather to √*vyā* 'envelop' and continues the theme of confinement found in 1d and 2d. The idea here is that the cow was once enwrapped or enclosed but freed by Indra to swell for us. It is possible that *abhívītā* is actually a pun on both those roots, and the tr. should reflect this ambiguity: "… gift-cow swells …, (previously) enclosed, (now to be) pursued by his comrades," vel sim. The presence of *vyántaḥ* 'pursuing' in 5c supports this possibility.

VII.28 Indra

VII.28.1: The 2ⁿᵈ hemistich begins and ends with a form of *víśva-* 'all': #*víśve* … *viśvam(-inva)*#.

VII.28.2: Pāda a continues the theme of competitive invocations embodied in the lexeme *ví* √*hvā* in 1c *vihávanta* with *hávam … ví*, even though the two words are not to be construed together.

"Your greatness" as an agent may seem odd, but consider "your majesty, your highness," which pose no such problems in English.

I interpret *bráhma* in b as plural rather than singular because of pl. *bráhmā* in 1a and because there are multiple seers in 2b.

I take c with ab, contrary to Ge, who takes it with d. His is technically possible, but it seems to imply a backwards sequence of events: Indra is born only when he has taken the mace in his hand. Ge avoids the problem by radically bleaching the meaning of *janiṣṭhāḥ* to make it an auxiliary or copula substitute ("wardst") with *áṣāḷhaḥ*: "so wardst du unbezwinglich." This seems too high a price, esp. as *jajñé* appears in the next verse, where Ge gives it its full lexical value ("er ist … geboren").

With *janiṣṭhā áṣāḷhaḥ* compare VII.20.3 *janúṣem áṣāḷhaḥ*.

Although nominative forms of the pres. part. to √*as* 'be', particularly *sán*, are ordinarily concessive, I cannot see a concessive force here. Perhaps it is here almost as a place-holder, to match the *yád* forms in the same position in surrounding pādas (2b, c, 3b [whose *yán* in sandhi rhymes with *sán*]).

VII.28.3: I take ab as dependent on the previous verse, 2d, describing Indra's cosmogonic deeds right after birth. For a novel, but not ultimately persuasive interpretation of this hemistich, see Old. Note that forms of √*nī* open and clause this half-verse: #*táva praṇītī … ninétha*#.

The position of *yád* in this dependent clause is somewhat disturbing. It occurs in Wackernagel's position in the second pāda (b), but the a-pāda is part of this same clause and is intimately interwoven with the elements in pāda b: note esp. the acc. pl. *jóhuvānān*, which modifies *nr̥̄n*, the third word in b. Although superficially late

position of subordinating elements is not uncommon in the RV (see, e.g., *hí* in pāda c), what precedes is generally syntactically unified, belonging to a single constituent (as in pāda c), but this is not true of the assorted material found in pāda a. I have no explanation.

For the oppositional pun in *sám … ninétha*, standing for *ví* (*… ninétha),* see the publ. intro. As I explained there, since *sám* and *ví* are preverbs of opposite meaning that frequently pattern together, the *sám* here evokes the *ví* of the lexeme *ví √hvā* earlier in the hymn (with √*hvā* present here in the intensive part. *jóhuvānān*) and the various expressions of Indra's pushing *apart* the two world-halves. E.g., nearby VII.23.3c *ví bā́dhiṣṭa syá ródasī mahitvā́* (I.51.10, VI.29.5, etc.). These associations would prompt the audience to take "bring together" as standing for "push apart," in the standard mythology of Indra.

After the 2nd ps. description of Indra's mythological activity in 2d–3ab, the second half of vs. 3 summarizes the birth in the 3rd person. Ge's interpretation, which makes c parenthetical and connects ab with d despite an awkward change of person, seems clumsy.

VII.28.4: A curious verse. It begins conventionally enough, with a plea to Indra to favor us "though these days" (*ebhíḥ … áhabhiḥ*). *Which* days is not clear, but I assume it means "now." The verse then turns towards the moral sphere: the peoples (*kṣitáyaḥ*) who are *durmitrá-* 'having bad allies/alliances' (or possibly 'bad allies') are purifying themselves (*pávante*). This pāda presents a number of problems: not only whether *durmitrá-* is a bahuvrīhi or tatpuruṣa (opinion is divided; I take it as the former), but also whether the *kṣitáyaḥ* are intrinsically our enemies or are members of our larger community who have fallen into an evil state. *kṣitáyaḥ* are ordinarily presented either positively or neutrally, but see III.18.1, where they are *purudrúhaḥ* 'possessing many deceptions', so an intrinsically hostile reading is possible (if, in my opinion, less likely). If here they are intrinsically hostile, the point may be that if they're sprucing themselves up, we had better get to work on it as well, to meet the challenge of our enemies. If they are not our sworn enemies but peoples with whom we have dealings (or who we ourselves actually are), is it that they are purifying themselves *of* their bad allies/alliances, and therefore are worthy of Indra's aid? Varuṇa, as if evoked by his partner Mitra in *durmitrá-*, then makes his appearance, noting untruth and releasing us from it. As was stated in the intro., Varuṇa's presence is unexpected here. I now wonder if the hymn is specialized for a particular ritual context (signaled by "these days"), perhaps the Varuṇapraghāsa. A purificatory period (like that described in pāda b) might be appropriate then. For this reason I favor an interpretation of pāda b in which the *kṣitáyaḥ* are identified with, or associated with, us.

VII.28.5: As noted in the publ. intro., this verse serves as refrain for VII.28–30, so that it does not respond to (or at least need not respond to) the immediately preceding Varuṇa verse.

In b the genitives *mahó rāyáḥ* and *rādhasaḥ* may either be parallel or one dependent on the other. I follow the latter interpr., with the *rāyáḥ* phrase dependent on *rādhas-*. Although I have not found absolutely diagnostic passages, *rādhas-* is regularly modified by adjectives (like 'bovine') that specify the type of *rādhas-*, and *mahó rāyáḥ* may be a defining genitive of the same type.

VII.29 Indra

VII.29.1: Pāda d (*dádo maghā̆ni maghavann iyānáḥ*) is almost a rewrite of V.28.5ab *vocéma … maghávānam …, … rādhaso yád dádan naḥ*, with *iyānáḥ* 'being implored' substituting for *vocéma* and *rā̆dhaḥ* for *maghā̆ni*.

VII.29.2: The pāda-initial voc. *bráhman* shows the accent of the neut. *bráhman-* 'formulation', though it clearly belongs to the m. *brahmán-* 'formulator'. The confusion is probably deliberate; the first word after the voc. phrase is *bráhmakr̥tim* with the neut. 1st cmpd member, neut. pl. *bráhmāṇi* is found in pāda d, and note that the preceding hymn begins *bráhmā* (V.29.1a), with the neut. (see also V.29.2b).
    Just as 1d is a variant of V.28.5ab, so also does 2b (*arvācīnó háribhiḥ yāhi tū̆yam*) appear to play on V.28.1ab … *úpa yāhi …, arváñcas te hárayaḥ …*, as well as echoing the immediately preceding vs. (29.1b *ā̆ tu prá yāhi harivaḥ …*) with *háribhir yāhi tū̆yam*.

VII.29.3: Ge takes *tatane* as a preterite ("… habe ich … gespannt"), but the full-grade root syllable should signal a subjunctive, which also fits the context better (opt. *daśema* [b], subj. *śr̥ṇavaḥ* [d]). In contrast Kü (210) considers the form a properly formed indicative and a relic, the regularly developed product of *ta-tn̥-h₂ai*; although this could be possible, it seems unnecessary, given that the context favors a modal form.
    Note that the hemistich finals *dāśema* (b) and *hávemā̆* (d) rhyme, though they are morphologically entirelhy distinct.

VII.30 Indra

VII.30.1: Although tr. as if parallel, *máhi* in d is an adverbial neuter, whereas *mahé* in c is a dative modifying *nr̥mnā̆ya*. However, "greatly for dominion" seemed overly fussy in English.

VII.30.2: The first hemistich is characterized by alliteration, *v*-s in a, *u*-s and sibilants in b: *hávanta u tvā hávyaṃ vivā̆ci / tan**ū̆ṣu śū̆**rāḥ **sū̆**ryasya **sā̆t**a**ú**.
    suhántu in d is a nice example of a proleptic adjective: "weaken the obstacles (so that they are) easily smashed."

VII.31 Indra

VII.31.2: Unlike other interpretors, I take *utá* as marking a new clause, summing up the actions of the poet (who addresses himself in 2a) and his ritual companions (whom he addresses in vs. 1) and comparing them to the actions of the Maruts (*yáthā náraḥ*). Klein (I.409) takes *utá* as connecting vss. 1 and 2, but the position of *utá* in 2b makes that interpretation awkward. Ge takes it as connecting *ukthám* and *dyukṣám* ("… ein Loblied … und zwar ein himmlisches"). His interpretation assumes a new clause beginning with *yáthā* in the middle of b and also takes *cakṛmā* in c as a sort of dummy verb substituting for a verb of poetic speech ("wie wir Männer es … gedichtet haben"). But, although "just as we have done" works fine in English as a dummy verb, I am not sure that √*kṛ* can be bleached in the same manner in Sanskrit – though I notice, with some chagrin, that I suggest just such an explanation for *kṛṇóti* in I.77.1. Since the Maruts as Indra's singers are mentioned elsewhere in the hymn (explicitly vs. 8, implicitly vs. 12) and are often called *náraḥ*, my interpretation of b has some support. The position of *yáthā* as a simile marker might be problematic, however; it can be ameliorated by assuming that *dyukṣám* forms part of the simile "as the superior men (made/make) a heavenly (speech), we have made …" For *dyukṣá-* qualifying 'speech', cf. the compound *dyukṣá-vacas-* (VI.15.4).

VII.31.3–4: Although these verses straddle a tṛca boundary, they are neatly responsive. The repeated *tvám* of vs. 3 is matched by the initial *vayám* of vs. 4, and the repeated -*yú*- ('seeking X') adjectives of 3 are again matched by the *tvāyú*- 'seeking you' of 4a. The final word of both verses is the voc. *vaso*. Even the *gavyú*- 'seeking cows' of 3b has its complement in 4b *vṛṣan* 'o bull'.

There is no obvious noun to supply with *asyá* 'of this' in c. Ge supplies "Schrei," and my "cry" follow him; Klein (I.175) instead "act." The phraseology reminds us of the refrain of I.105 *vittám me asyá rodasī*, which I tr. "Take heed of this (speech) of mine, you two world-halves."

VII.31.5: Contra Ge (and Klein DGRV I.175), I take *váktave* with *nidé*, not with *árāvṇe*, which respects the pāda boundary and also conforms better to the semantic domain of the two nouns: *níd-* 'scorn' is verbal, whereas *árāvan-* is more general. In either interpretation the position of *ca* is a problem, since it appears with the first member of a conjoined NP, not the second. In my interpretation the configuration is X ca X' ... Y, in the Ge/Klein interpretation X ca Y...Y'.

VIII.31.6: On the basis of VIII.92.32 *tváyéd indra yujā vayám, práti bruvīmahi spṛdhaḥ* "With you as yokemate, we would respond to the challengers," I supply 'challenger' here.

VII.31.6–7: Again there is response across the tṛca boundary: 7a *mahāṁ utāsi* echoes 6a *tvám vármāsi*.

VII.31.7–8: Echo between 7b *svadhāvarī* and 8b *sayāvarī*, though they occupy different metrical positions.

VII.31.10: Much phonetic and morphological play, with the repeated *prá*'s, the repetition of *mahé mahi-* (note that this replicates the *mahé … máhi* of VII.30.1cd), and, especially, the chiastic finale: *prá carā carṣaṇiprā́ḥ*, where the last element, the root noun *-prā́ḥ*, is of course unrelated to the first one, the preverb *prá*.

VII.31.12: Because the *vā́ṇī* 'choir' in vs. 8 was qualified as *marútvatī* 'composed of Maruts', I supply Maruts here with pl. *vā́ṇīḥ*. It is also possible, and perhaps preferable, to assume that the plural indicates that several choirs are involved: both the Maruts and (we) the human singers.

        In c *barhayā* could also be 1ˢᵗ sg. subjunctive, as Ge takes it. Either interpretation fits the context fine; I slightly prefer the 2ⁿᵈ sg. imperative, because it returns us to the imperatives of vss. 1–2.

VII.32 Indra

VII.32.2: It is tempting to take *suté* as parallel to *mádhau* in the simile and *sácā* with *ā́sate*, rather than taking *suté sácā* as a formulaic phrase with semi-pleonastic *sácā* as the publ. tr. does. The former interpr. would yield "because these who craft sacred formulations for you sit together at [=by/around] the soma like flies on honey when (the soma) is pressed," an interpr. also suggested to me by Dieter Gunkel (p.c., 11/5/15). I chose the latter path because of the parallel cited by Ge, X.50.7 ... *brahmakṛ́taḥ suté sácā* # However, it could be argued that X.50 is presumably a later composition than VII.32 and need not provide unassailable evidence for how VII.32.2 should be interpreted.

VII.32.3: *sudákṣiṇa-* is a triple pun. In its only other RVic occurrence (VIII.33.5) it means 'having a good right (horse)', but it could equally mean 'having a good right (hand)', alluding to the immediately preceding *vájrahasta-* 'having the mace in his hand'. And, in keeping with the theme of giving, it can refer to the *dákṣiṇā-*, the priestly gift' distributed at the dawn sacrifice. This would respond to the *rāyáskāma-* 'desirous of wealth', which opens the verse.

VII.32.5: Ge joins c with b, rather than d as I do. This is possible, but the topic of giving in both c and d connects them thematically.

VII.32.8: *ávase kṛṇudhvam* is close to a periphrastic causative, since "make [=create] (him) for help" is unlikely to take the long-created Indra as object. Zehnder (p. 7 and passim) takes it as such.

VII.32.9: *kṛṇudhvám … ātúje* similarly functions as a periphrastic causative. So also Zehnder (p. 20 and passim).

VII.32.11: Although 'seeking the prize' is ordinarily accented as a denominative (*vājayánt-*), as opposed to 'incite' (*vājáya-*) with causative accent, in this context, the denominative sense seems clear. See comm. on 14d below.

VII.32.14: *śraddhá* is most likely instrumental, but its lack of contraction with the following vowel in the Saṃhitā text gives pause. See Old on this problem.

    vājī́ vājaṃ siṣāsati seems like a variant of *gámad vā́jam vājáyan* in 11a with different emphasis. See also 20a below.

VII.32.17: The relative clause of b is very peculiar. There is no possible referent for the *yé* in either the preceding or the following main clause, and in addition the *īm* lacks function. It seems like a mangled paraphrase of I.81.3 *yád udī́rata ājáyaḥ* "when (battle-)drives arise/happen," but what caused the mangling is unclear to me. The *yé* can be by "attraction" to the m. nom. pl. *ājáyaḥ* from putative *yád, and this set of Indra hymns has several examples of functionless *īm* (VII.20.3, 21.1). But it still lacks motivation.

    The VP *nā́ma bhikṣate* "desires a share in your name" is striking and a little puzzling. The same phrase *nā́ma √bhaj* is found in V.57.5, but there it means that the Maruts, the subjects of the verb, all share the same name. Here, by contrast, it must be a clever way of saying that everyone calls Indra's name, a novel paraphrase of the common epithet of Indra *puruhūtá-* 'called upon by many', found in this verse and vss. 20 and 26. (The English slang equivalent would be "wants a piece of you.") Ge renders *nā́ma bhikṣate* as "Deinen Namen fleht … an" (implores), robbing the expression of its vividness.

VII.32.22: Despite Ge's easy "dessen Auge die Sonne ist," I cannot accept this for *svardŕ̥śam*. First, *dŕ̥ś-* is never an 'eye', but rather 'seeing' or 'having the appearance of', and furthermore, it's Varuṇa who has the sun as his eye (that is, his spy). Here I think the point is rather that Indra, like the sun, sees everything in the world, here expressed by the merism "the moving and the still."

VII.32.24: There are two word plays in this verse. The simpler one is between the impv. *bhara* 'bring' in pāda a and the āmreḍita *bháre-bhare* 'at every raid', where the noun *bhára-* has been specialized from '(an occasion for) bearing away' to 'raid'.

    The more complex one involves the creation and disappointment of expectations. The verse begins with *abhī́ ṣatáḥ*. The juxtaposition of these two forms (the latter being the pres. part. to √*as* 'be' in either gen.-abl. sg. or acc. pl.) and their close sandhi, with retroflex initial *ṣ*, invites the audience to fill in the semantics of the lexeme *abhí √as* 'be superior'. But to our surprise, at the end of this hemistich we find the semantic opposite, *kánīyasaḥ* 'the lesser ones', requiring us to revise our analysis of the opening, dissolving the presumed lexeme into the directional preverb/preposition *abhí* and the independent pres. participle modifying *kánīyasaḥ* much later in the line. For extensive discussion see Old.

I cannot follow Gr, Old in interpreting *jyā́yaḥ* as voc., but take it, with Ge, as neut. sg. with *tád*. Among other things, AiG III.296 notes only two masc. vocatives in *-īyas* in the RV, this one and *ójīyaḥ* in X.120.4, which is also better taken as a neut.